ELŻBIETA CIŻEWSKA-MARTYŃSKA
University of Warsaw

The Cultural Perspective in Social Movement Theories and Past Research on the Solidarity Movement

Abstract: The issue of culture, while present in the Polish scholarship on the Solidarity movement, remains untheorized. Explorations of culture in the literature are largely descriptive rather than explanatory in nature. In this article, I examine the opportunities that arise when we assume a cultural theoretical perspective in the sociological study of social movements. I focus primarily on the available definitions of culture and their relevance to the problem. I consider the role of culture from three perspectives: first, as the cause of the social movement's emergence; second, as the movement's internal organizing structure; and third, as a consequence of the movement. The issues discussed in this essay will be related both to the current state of the theory as well as the ongoing and potential studies of the Solidarity movement, thus providing an illustration to the subject at hand and paving the way for research on other Polish movements. The article concludes with a discussion of the benefits and drawbacks of the cultural approach in the sociology of social movements and considers its place within the scope of the Polish research on the subject.

Keywords: cultural theories of social movements, Solidarity, Polish sociology

Introduction:
The Cultural Perspective in the Study of Social Movements

The cultural perspective is becoming increasingly popular in the sociology of social movements. Considered a revolutionary approach not too long ago, and now ubiquitous and even taken for granted, this perspective assumes that economic and political structural conditions are not the only factors behind the emergence and dynamic of social movements. The list of crucial determinants also includes common shared values, ideologies, lifestyles, laws, organizational models, webs of meaning, collective identities, rituals, and beliefs. The first challenges to the structural paradigm occurred in the early 1980s with the appearance of studies in the field of cultural analysis, initially loosely associated with social movements (Swidler 1986), and with growing interest in the social constructionist perspective (Klandermans and Tarrow 1988; Morris and Mueller 1992). While it would be incorrect to describe the cultural perspective as completely absent from the sociology of social movements prior to this period, it is only henceforth that it is more systematically encapsulated in a theoretical framework and spreads into fields of study other than those bordering on ethnography. This was undoubtedly prompted by the appearance of the theory of new social movements (e.g., Touraine 1989), master frames (e.g., Snow et al. 1986; Benford and Snow 2000), and collective identities (e.g., Melucci 1989). Authors who have observed the

evolution of the theory towards a more serious consideration of cultural factors include Francesca Polletta (2008), Jennifer Earl (2004), and Jan Kubik (2007–2008), while others (including Johnston and Klandermans 1995; Goodwin and Jasper 2004; della Porta and Diani 2006; Baumgarten, Daphi and Ulrich 2014) have gone further, engaging in an interesting discussion on the strong and weak points as well as the prospects of the cultural perspective in the study of social movements. With the exception of one article by Jan Kubik (2007–2008), Polish studies of social movement theory devote little if any attention to the approach, often due to their date of publication (cf. Gliński 1996; Kuczyński 1994; Sztompka 2005; Żuk 2001). The occasional early mentions of the cultural perspective were warranted by the need to explain that which could not be explained by referencing structural conditions, that is, in order to fill in gaps in older theories (Polletta 2008: 78–79); it has since become a truism to say that social movements strive not only to effect economic and political change, but also pursue cultural goals of their own: being themselves a product of a particular culture by which they are defined, enabled, and limited, they create their own more or less open culture, which then facilitates the reproduction—and the challenging—of existing structures.

Definitions of Culture

There exist many definitions of culture and choosing among them is not always an arbitrary matter (Sewell 1999). In this paper I employ a broad understanding of the term, not limiting it to artifacts and the social movements activities directly associated with the field of culture. The definitions of culture used in the study of social movements typically revolve around a Weberian sociology—emphasizing the agency and initiative of social actors (leaders and participants of a social movement)—or, alternatively, around Durkheimian sociology, now supplanted by Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Foucault, emphasizing the power and influence of the cultural context over the actions of the individual (Swidler 1995; Williams 2004).

Here, I apply definitions associated with both Weber and French sociologists. I take as my point of departure the categorization proposed by Stephen Hart (1996; cf. Earl 2004), which is only one possible division (cf. Johnston 2009), but has the advantage of presenting the broadest range of uses of the term *culture*. Building on a body of several works that attempt to overcome the structural paradigm, Hart lists three concepts of culture employed by social movement scholars (1996: 88–89):

• The *social-psychological approach*, which defines culture as a set of values, beliefs, and motivations characterizing individuals. This understanding neglects the collective dimension of culture found in codes and structures. A contemporary example of this approach is the position espoused by James Jasper, who defines culture through "shared thoughts, feelings, and morals" (2014: 7–12). Contrary to Hart's intentions, this approach is now sometimes expanded to include the meaning individuals bestow on their actions (cf. Earl 2004).
• The *diffuse approach*, in which culture is defined as the lifestyle of the entire community of people.
• The *analytical approach*, in which culture is treated as one of many dimensions of action, a web of signs, symbols, and codes accompanying social structures, institutions and practices, often independently of an individual's choices, e.g., religion, economics, politics, fashion, science, law, public discourse, etc. This approach is particularly promising in that it enables the evaluation, in retrospect, of the mutual influence of culture and other dimensions of action, and requires analytical differentiation between cultural factors and socio-structural determinants. In this perspective, culture leaves its mark on social movements while also being transformed by them;

it facilitates certain actions while limiting others. Rather than occurring solely in the minds of people, as is the case in the social-psychological theory, culture accompanies objective institutions (Polletta 2004, cf. Earl 2004).

Each of the above approaches concentrates on only one of many dimension of culture, thus presenting a narrow understanding of it and sometimes wrongly juxtaposing culture and structure. Each definition also allows us to treat culture as a feature of a given movement's strategy—an approach that may be a cognitive bias when we overlook the non-instrumental functions of culture (cf. Baumgarten et al. 2014). On the other hand, a broad definition can be unwieldy and imprecise, which is why Hart omits diffuse definitions of culture in favor of analytical approaches. He discusses them using the example of religion as a cultural code. Following Hart's line of reasoning, I also adopt the social-psychological and analytical approaches in this article. In a separate subsection, I discuss issues surrounding collective identity, providing examples of studies and discussions of the Solidarity movement that employ each of these definitions of culture. It should be noted, however, that the scholarship cited varies in relevance: some works are based on empirical studies, others propose interpretations, while others take the form of sociological essays. Not all of them are strictly sociological in nature, but all are concerned with social matters. I reference them in order to illustrate the point I make in this article, as well as to demonstrate the potential offered by the cultural perspective. Most of the literature cited here employs concepts of culture that are implied and not expressed directly. The assumption of a particular definition of culture is crucial in later determining a social movement's causes and consequences, and also becomes relevant when describing a movement's actions. This problem is described in greater detail below.

Culture and the Emergence of Social Movements

When we assume a social-psychological approach to culture, we concentrate on the values, beliefs, and motivations of individuals while also focusing on the emotions that drive them to act. In the view of some scholars, the cognitive element is accentuated more strongly than the emotional one (Baumgarten et al. 2014: 3). A theoretical elaboration of this viewpoint can often be found in the literature devoted to new social movements (Touraine 1989) and, outside Europe, in the work of James Jasper, James Goodwin, and Francesca Polletta (2001). The social-psychological approach in the study of the causes behind the emergence of Solidarity and its dynamics is represented by such authors as Colin Barker (2001) and David Ost (2005), who have written about the role of emotions (fear, joy, and anger), and, indirectly, Gadomska (1984), who has discussed the research on the social processes observed immediately prior to the formation of Solidarity, which may be of interest to scholars of the movement.

The analytical approach—in which culture is treated as one of many dimensions of action, as a web of signs, symbols, and codes accompanying social structures, institutions and practices—requires a more thorough discussion. This perspective is frequently—if not most commonly—encountered in the sociology of social movements. Recent scholarship typical of this approach emphasizes, however, that culture is more than merely an accessory to structure (the economy, demographics, the political system, etc.), and therefore cannot

be examined solely as a means of explaining that which cannot be elucidated by reference to structure; rather, culture is regarded here as an inextricable dimension of every structure, and even as a significant determinant of its form (Polletta 2008). The strategies and interests of social movements are determined by structure and culture in at least equal degrees, which is why Polletta proposes that culture be defined as *institutional schemas*, "the models underpinning sets of routinized practices around a culturally defined purpose" (2008: 85; Jepperson 1991), which allows us to to explain how prevailing cultural beliefs limit action, while also helping us identify the conditions under which culture challenges the status quo instead of reproducing it.

Earlier scholarship reveals an analytical approach in its use of the "tool kit" definition of culture. Ann Swidler, who coined the phrase, writes: "Culture influences action not by providing the ultimate values toward which action is oriented, but by shaping a repertoire or 'tool kit' of habits, skills, and styles from which people construct 'strategies of action.'" (Swidler 1986: 273). While her understanding of culture is instrumental to some extent, it does not necessarily follow that cultural elements (tools) are selected deliberately or on an ad-hoc basis, depending on the interests at hand. Her view downplays culture's affective, moral, and other (conscious and unconscious) meanings. Another metaphor of culture, one sometimes used in the analytical approach, is the theatrical metaphor of the script, which ascribes great power to the cultural side of the equation, and lesser to the actors and their actions: culture is perceived as a system which imposes certain action schemas, leaving less room for innovation and agency on the part of the actors (Swidler 1986, 1995).

The analytical approach is also partially present in Charles Tilly's writings on social movement repertoires (1995). A repertoire is set of methods of action available within a society and which a given movement can use. The metaphor of the repertoire combines the structural approach (the cultural and historical context, which limits the number of "plays" that can be staged, even encouraging actors to choose some at the cost of others) with the free choice of strategy on the part of the actors, who select the play, the method of expression, the props, and the order in which the scenes are acted out. In the context of the Solidarity movement, examples of this tool kit or repertoire could include the experience of earlier protests in the Polish People's Republic (PPR) and clandestine activity during World War II, which was mined for lessons during the establishment of the underground press (Fałkowski 2011). Another example of this approach can be found in the study of cultural codes, that is, the discursive context of social movements (Koopmans and Statham 1999). Studies of this type involve analyzing the written and spoken language that facilitates or hinders the emergence of a social movement; by the same token, this perspective places less emphasis on action and non-verbal symbols (attire, drawings, photographs).

All of the above definitions share a certain metaphorical quality and cannot be regarded as fully distinct from each other (Williams 2004). I mention them here because they have become a permanent part of the body of social movement theory and can be used to explain the reasons for a particular movement's appearance, the mechanisms driving its operation, and its consequences. They will not be explored in this article, however, due to limited space. Their application to the case of the Solidarity movement would involve posing questions regarding the symbolic dimension of religion, the economic system of the PPR, its politics, education system, media, law, and public discourse, to list but a few key institu-

tions and practices that shaped the movement, the nature and language of its demands, and its chosen methods of action (marches, meetings, strikes, masses, underground publishing, etc.): which of these cultural tools proved effective, and which did not? What did the participants of the movement learn from previous protests? What slogans did they write on their placards, and why? What themes did they refer to (romantic, republican, national, socialist, Christian, etc.) and what guided their choices? What did they sing about and what language did they employ? How did these tools steer the movement? What laws were invoked? These questions have been addressed in varying degrees by Kubik (1994), Osa (1997), Morawska (1984), and Jawłowska (1986).

How does culture create favorable conditions for the emergence of a social movement? How do scholars explain its influence? Naturally, there are many possible ways to account for this phenomenon. Some theoreticians will emphasize, in a Weberian manner, the agency of the individual in his or her choice of values and strategies, its role in imbuing action with meaning, and will see the appearance of a social movement as the cumulative change of individual stances. Others, à la Foucault, will underscore the mysterious and overpowering influence of context, where the individual can do little more than modify, to a lesser or greater extent, the script which has been imposed on them. There are two concepts that are frequently mentioned in the course of explaining the influence of culture: that of master frames (cf. Gamson 1992; Benford and Snow 2000), which owes more to the Weberian approach to culture, and the concept of the cultural opportunity structure (cf. Kriesi et al. 1995), which is closer to the approach informed by Foucault, but stops short of ruling out the active role of the individual. Social movements appear when changes occur either in the dominant interpretations of situations or in the cultural environment of the conflict. Both concepts rely in various degrees on the social-psychological and analytical understanding of culture. The first is concerned primarily with shifts in the definition of the problem (injustice), its causes, and ways in which it can be resolved, and falls largely under the analytical approach to culture, but nevertheless hinges on individual convictions and not collective cultural structures (Hart 1996: 95). [1] The second is concerned with the cultural conditions that encourage the appearance of social movements and decide their success or failure, all other factors remaining constant and unchanged. The research method that is characteristic of this concept is qualitative and quantitative analysis. While the theory of master frames may be used at the micro scale to describe cognitive shifts within the group, and at the macro scale to examine interactions between the movement and its social milieu, the theory of cultural opportunity structures is applied mainly at the macro level: that of society-wide changes. Below I give but three examples of the possible routes through which culture affects social movements, after Doug McAdam (1994: 37–45), who writes about the frame alignment process, expanding cultural opportunities, and the role of long-standing activist subcultures.

---

[1] It is precisely because the concept of master frames relies on values, beliefs, and the formation of convictions that some scholars associate it with both the social-psychological and analytical understanding of culture (cf. the overview article by Jennifer Earl (2004) on the cultural consequences of social movements. The author refers to the analytical approach to culture as "cultural production and practices").

The Frame Alignment Process

The frame alignment process involves the cultural appropriation of content present in the movement's environment and combining it with the goals of the movement. Master frames legitimize and encourage action. The success of a given frame hinges on its cultural resonance, that is, on the degree in which the proposed definition of the situation (statement of injustices, naming those responsible for them, and providing potential solutions to the problem) matches the feelings and convictions of the message's intended audience and can be understood by them. McAdam mentions the example of how Martin Luther King, Jr.'s combining of biblical rhetoric and American patriotic songs proved far more relevant than his interest in the tenets of Mahatma Gandhi's non-violence movement. Dr. King succeeded in framing "civil rights activity in a way that resonated not only with the culture of the oppressed but with the culture of oppressor as well" (McAdam 1994: 38). The aspect of framing has been examined in the context of Solidarity chiefly by foreign scholars, who have used the concept to examine the existing movement rather than its causes. For this reason, we will later return to the subject of master frames, which remain unexplored by Polish scholars.

Expanding Cultural Opportunities

Structural changes and new political circumstances bring about new cultural opportunities, possibly providing favorable conditions for the emergence of social movements. New cultural opportunities include such events and processes that may lead to the formation of new master frames (McAdam 1994: 39); therefore, when we refer to new cultural opportunities, we are in fact referring to new cognitive opportunities. McAdam lists four such types of events and processes (1994: 39–43): 1) the newfound visibility of ideological or cultural contradictions between widely held or professed values and conventional social practices. In the case of the Solidarity movement, a cultural opportunity of this type accompanied the increasingly visible contradiction between the ideals of socialism and the position of workers in the PPR; 2) suddenly imposed grievances (human-made disasters, court rulings, acts of violence) that increase public awareness of a problem and public opposition to previously tolerated conditions. In the case of Solidarity, the price hike of July 1980 was an example of such a "suddenly imposed grievance"; 3) dramatization of system vulnerability, highlighting the vulnerability of one's political opponents, exemplified by the political and economic situation in Poland and the USSR during the 1980s (cf. Tarrow 1991); 4) the availability of master frames developed by previous social movements (cf. Benford and Snow 2000). This type of cultural opportunity emphasizes the continuity between earlier protests and the ideals they produced, and new protests, even if they do not have shared goals. The master frames of the previous movement provides ideological resources for subsequent protests. A classic example is the transfer of frames from Martin Luther King, Jr.'s civil rights movement to later protest movements by Native Americans, sexual minorities, women, and others. The formation of Solidarity can be seen as a consequence of definitions of situations formulated in earlier protest waves in 1956, 1968, 1970, and 1976 (Goodwyn 1991) and the ideological activities of the opposition (Gawin 2013).

The success of the movement also encouraged dissidents in other Central European states to undertake pro-democratic actions (McAdam 1994: 42).

Long-standing Activist Subcultures

Groups and activist organizations that existed before the appearance of a given movement can provide a source of members, leaders, communications networks, material resources, and venues, etc., but they are also repositories of ideas and other cultural content that can be used by the new generation of activists when formulating the goals and ideals of subsequent movements, in time augmenting and transcending them. The subculture developed by earlier activists then provides a tool kit to be used by new movements (cf. Swidler 1986). In the case of Solidarity, the list of such subcultures would include members of previous protests, KOR and ROPCiO, and the network of Catholic organizations (Osa 1997; Gawin 2013).

The following table lists the social-psychological and analytical approaches outlined above along with examples of research concerning the cultural causes that led to the formation of the Solidarity movement. Their authors often employ several definitions of culture in parallel, thus the texts have been classified according to the prevailing approach used in the research. This scholarship differs in terms of rigidity and discipline: some of the texts cited constitute empirical research, while others are merely hypothetical considerations and intellectual exercises. Texts that refer directly to social movement theory have been emphasized.

Table 1

Cultural Causes Underlying the Emergence of Solidarity as Identified Through Particular Definitions of Culture in Social Movement Sociology

How culture is defined	Causes	Studies
Social-psychological approach	values, beliefs, and opinions held by individuals	Gadomska 1984, Giza 2004, Nowak 2004
Analytical approach	cultural production and practices; cultural codes; webs of signs and symbols accompanying social structures, institutions and practices: religion, economics, the education system, media, art, fashion, science, law, public discourse	2010; Gawin 2006; Goodwyn 1991; Jawłowska 1986; Laba 1991; Morawska 1984; Osa 1997; Świderski 1996

Culture in Social Movements

Social movements are not only shaped by their cultural context: they also create a unique culture of their own, one that can in turn significantly influence the culture of society at large, countering or strengthening the traditions present within it.

The social-psychological approach to studying the culture of a given movement mainly involves relating actions to values and convictions, as well as describing the process of understanding one's own experiences—the creation of master frames—as previously discussed. In this case, however, what matters is not how the previously existing master frames

(statement of injustices, naming those responsible for them, and providing potential solutions to the problem) led to the emergence of a movement, but how they operated and changed throughout the movement's period of activity. In the context relevant to our discussion, Payerhin and Zirkakzadeh (2006) describe how this process played out at the First Solidarity Congress, while Maria Ivancheva (2007) employs the concept of discursive frames to examine the dissident philosophy of Václav Havel (who is portrayed in his role as an opinion leader who influences the beliefs of others). The aforementioned Barker (2001) and Ost (2005) present a somewhat dissenting view of the dynamics of the cognitive and emotional processes in Solidarity. In their opinion, the reason for involvement in the movement and its subsequent sustainment can be found not in the intellectual definition of the situation, but rather in the experience of powerful group emotions (cf. Goodwin, Jasper, Polleta 2001). The social-psychological approach is also characteristic of the scholarship on new social movements, which are perceived on the one hand as a result of the popularization of post-material values (cf. Inglehart 1977), and on the other as propagating and advocating for these values. The seminal work in regard to Solidarity is the research conducted by Alain Touraine, who employed the method of sociological intervention to describe and elicit cognitive changes among the members of the movement, allowing them to become aware of the values and goals espoused by the movement and to subsequently determine their hierarchy.

The analytical perspective is used, for instance, to study the trends that exist within a given movement and allow its members to differentiate themselves from, and identify each other in, their surroundings (one example in the context of Solidarity was the custom of wearing resistors as lapel pins): the manner in which members addressed each other (rejecting the term comrade [towarzysz], in favor of the third-person pronouns [pan, pani, and państwo], cf. Świderski 1996; Ciżewska 2010), important individuals (John Paul II, Lech Wałęsa, Jerzy Popiełuszko), books and press, spatial organization customs, collective rituals that fostered a sense of community (speech delivery style, customs associated with rallies, strikes, prayers, marches, holidays, and anniversaries), and initiation rites. Studies of the internal organization of the organization constitute a separate trend (cf. McCarthy and Zald 1977) and are not conducted from the cultural perspective, strictly speaking, but can be interpreted as such if we approach the organizational models, including the division of work and responsibilities, as manifestations of the movement's internal culture. While it has been discussed by historians, the internal organization of Solidarity has only rarely been analyzed by sociologists; one exception that can more properly be regarded as an example of the combination of these two perspectives is Mateusz Fałkowski's book on the organization of the underground publisher CDN and the fostering of entrepreneurship under an authoritarian regime (Fałkowski 2011). Examples of the analytical approach to culture in Solidarity scholarship include discussions of how symbols functioned and were used in the movement (Kubik 1994; Smoleń 2000; Laba 1991), the role of history (Baczko 1986; Meller 2000), written poetry (Błaszkiewicz 1987), the role of religion and the church (Osa 1997; Krzemiński 1987; Morawska 1984), as well as discourse studies (Rojek 2009). The following table enumerates the two approaches to defining culture discussed above as well as research concerning the cultural aspects of the operations of the Solidarity movement. Texts that refer directly to social movement theory have been emphasized.

Table 2

Cultural Dimension of the Actions of the Solidarity Movement as Identified Through Particular Definitions of Culture in Social Movement Sociology

How culture is defined	Actions	Studies
Social-psychological approach	values, beliefs, and opinions held by individuals	Marody 2004, Barker 2001
Analytical approach	cultural production and practices; cultural codes; webs of signs and symbols accompanying social structures, institutions and practices: religion, economics, the education system, media, art, fashion, science, law, public discourse	Ciżewska 2010; Bakuniak 1987; Baczko 1986; Błaszkiewicz 1987; Kaliski 2003; Kowalski 1990; Krzemiński 1987; Kuczyński and Nowak 1988; Kubik 1994; Latoszek 2006; Leszczyński 2006; Malinowska 2005; Meller 2000; Morawska 1984; Payerhin and Zirkakzadeh 2006; Rojek 2009; Skłodkowska 2006; Smoleń 2000; Świderski 1996; Touraine 1989

Culture as a Consequence

Beyond their cultural and economic effects, social movements produce cultural consequences that may prove more significant in the long run. It should be observed, however, that unambiguous definitions of the outcome of a given social movement, be they political or economic, are difficult and methodologically laborious, while attempts to determine the cultural consequences appear even more challenging (cf. Bosi, Giugni, and Uba 2016; Johnston 2009). Furthermore, the cultural consequence are often (incorrectly) regarded as less important than the political (Polleta 2008: 82). This subject has rarely been addressed by theoreticians or field researchers (Earl 2004). Until recently, the scope of social movement research was mostly limited to the political and economic dimensions, and rarely ventured into cultural aspects (cf. Giugni 1998, Giugni, McAdam, and Tilly 1999). Yet social movements are sources of new ideologies and belief systems; they modify and augment existing ideologies (e.g., national versions of communism), they create master frames that can subsequently serve as foundations for new movements, as discussed above. They encourage the creation of new identities and institutions: for example, it was thanks to Solidarity that the strike, once an illegal form of protest, became a legal political institution. They produce a material culture, a good example of which is the popular Solidarity logo, now used by a number of protest movements, including pro-democracy protests (the Free Belarus campaign, the Orange Revolution, the 2014 Euromaidan), migrant support campaigns (2015), and in feminist movements (Manifa). Setting aside the considerable significance of social movements to a given society's culture in general, the movement itself serves as a resource for future movements, providing a repertoire, tools, scripts, and institutional schemas. The consequences of the movement are often easier to determine and explain at the individual level than on the societal plane, as is the case with biographical research of former activists (Bosi et al. 2016).

Below I discuss the possible consequences of the emergence and operations of the Solidarity movement by referring to the social-psychological and analytical approaches to defining culture. I mention these inspirations explicitly in some places and leave them

implicit in others, which is not to imply that they are absent. It should be noted that there exists a rich body of literature on the various aspects of the heritage of Solidarity and other East European dissident movements (cf. Grabowska 2004; Rychard and Motzkin 2015), but these texts rarely approach their subjects from the perspective of social movement theory. Furthermore, I avoid discerning between intended and unintended changes, even in cases where doing so would broaden our understanding of Solidarity as well as contemporary Polish society. Barring further analyses that exceed the scope of this article, it is impossible to determine unambiguously the extent to which these cultural changes can in fact be attributed to Solidarity, therefore I will present effects that have been discussed in the literature and possible consequences that have yet to be studied.

In using the social-psychological understanding of culture, I focus my attention on the observed changes in professed values and attitudes. These are studied at the macro scale through public opinion polls and at the micro scale through interviews, questionnaires, and other tools. Elements of this approach are apparent in studies conducted by Adam Mielczarek (2006, 2011a, 2011b) on the personal consequences of and attitudes toward activism, as well people's assessments of political and economic transformations in the research of Mirosława Grabowska (2004). Interesting data can be found in cyclical public opinion polls concerning democratic attitudes, the ideals of Solidarity, and the memory of the movement conducted regularly by institutions such as CBOS (cf. Krzemiński 2010). Jack Bielasiak (2015) discusses contested values during the period of social transformation. These are merely a few examples of the abundant research on the topic. The data amassed are rich but have not yet been analyzed from the perspective of social movement theory—one exception is the book by Glenn (2001), who employs master frames in his analysis. The conclusions stemming from the above are far too abundant to enumerate, however there undoubtedly is an observable tendency to assess current affairs from the perspective of the ideals and demands put forth by Solidarity.

The analytical approach—which emphasizes the significance of the cultural codes and the webs of meaning and symbols that accompany structures, institutions, and social practices—enables us to perceive the social movement's effects, for example, in law, beginning with the constitution (Skąpska 2011; Blokker 2011), and in public discourse (Dryzek 2004). The matter of discourse is also raised by Robert Brier (2009), who uses semiotic cultural theory to explain why Polish public discourse centers on conflicts over identity and to elucidate the role of religion in public life. The depiction, within Solidarity, of democracy as the reconstruction of society—that is, the return to pre-PPR political traditions as an expression of justice and righteousness—clashes following 1989 with more pluralistic political visions. Discussions of other aspects of Solidarity's heritage can be found in the volume edited by Karolina Ciechorska-Kulesza, Radosław Kossakowski, and Paweł Łuczeczko (2011), the contents of which include studies of the movement's influence on non-governmental organizations (Rymsza 2011) and analyses of the extent to which the proposals of the Samorządna Rzeczpospolita program were implemented (Gliński 2011).

Assuming the analytical approach to culture also involves examining the emergence of new subcultures, including "mobilization cultures." These are cultures that "endure for periods after significant structural change and can continue to influence contention despite radically changed political opportunity structures. These cultures typically result from long

term mobilization, such as that of the U.S. civil rights movement and the Solidarity movement in Poland, and create patterns of organization and interaction that exert influence several years after demobilization" (Johnston & Klandermans 1995: 9). Examples of such "mobilization cultures" include groups, protest or social movements formed by former Solidarity activists—a network of non-governmental organizations, associations of former activists that emphasize their community of experience (e.g. Stowarzyszenie Pokolenie [Generation Association], Stowarzyszenie Wolnego Słowa [Free Speech Association]), part of the feminist movement, part of the environmental movement—and the very appearance of protest culture (cf. Ekiert & Kubik 2001). Contemporary social movements and protest movements are said to have inherited from Solidarity their non-hierarchical structures and reliance on grassroots participation (Meardi 2005).

Biographical studies of former activists (Mielczarek 2006) also reveal both a social-psychological understanding of culture and an analytical one that emphasizes the impact on their identities. Guglielmo Meardi (2005) considers the aftermath of three popular interpretations of Solidarity as a class, democracy, and nation, and eschews the cultural interpretation (nation) and the political interpretation (democracy) in favor of class—albeit from a non-Marxist perspective—as the most productive contemporary approach to discussing the Polish social movement. Meardi hypothesized that modern-day social mobilization in Poland would be grounded in labor activism and marginal culture movements, which turned out not to be the case. On the other hand, not unlike descriptions of the cultural dynamics of the movement itself, discussions of its cultural consequences sometimes fail to express identity, or do so rarely, as some authors observe with regard to the working-class identity (Ost 2005). Opinions thus differ on the productivity of class-based approaches, which often reveal more about a scholar's views than they do about the social reality in question. The problem of constructing a national identity in the debate preceding the enactment of the 1997 constitution is raised by Elżbieta Hałas (2005), who nevertheless does not examine the issue through the lens of social movement theory.

How do social movements influence culture? McAdam lists four factors which he believes may have an effect on the cultural consequences of social movements: the breadth of the movement's goals (the broader it is, the greater the likelihood of it leaving a mark on the culture at large), the degree of success achieved by the movement (the greater the political and economic success, the greater the cultural change), contact between previously segregated groups (the more groups are linked by the movement, the greater the likelihood of effecting significant change in mainstream culture), and ties to established cultural elites (the greater the ties, the greater the cultural change) (McAdam 1994: 52–54). All of these factors explain macro-level changes and can be explained through master frames and their social resonance as well as though the development of social contact networks. McAdam, above all else a theoretician of the political opportunity process, combines the political, economic, and cultural consequences in a manner characteristic of his chosen approach, making the cultural ones practically contingent on the political and economical. Theoretical foundations can also be found in scholarship devoted to new social movements, which are described as operating primarily in the cultural field in the broad sense. Cultural change, according to this logic, is the main goal of such movements. While these shifts may entail changes in other areas, they need not be the stated aims of the movement.

Table 3

Cultural Consequences of the Actions of the Solidarity Movement as Identified Through Particular Definitions of Culture in Social Movement Sociology

How culture is defined	Consequences	Studies and research projects
Social-psychological approach	values, beliefs, and opinions held by individuals	Bäcker 2001; Glenn III 2001; Krzemiński 2010; Mielczarek 2006, 2011b
Analytical approach	cultural production and practices; cultural codes; webs of signs and symbols accompanying social structures, institutions and practices: religion, economics, the education system, media, art, fashion, science, law, public discourse	Bielasiak 2015; Blokker 2011; Brier 2009; Dryzek 2004; Grabowska 2004; Kurczewski 2009; Meardi 2005; Ost 2005; Skąpska 2011; Szacki 1995

The following table lists the aforementioned approaches to defining culture along with scholarship that discusses the cultural consequences of the Solidarity movement. Texts that refer to social movement theory have been emphasized.

Discussion and Conclusions

The causes, dynamics, and consequences of social movements as seen from the cultural perspective have been defined and explained in myriad ways. This article uses just one of several possible typologies—though undoubtedly useful, it is still far from perfect. In illustrating the consequences of assuming a particular definition, I have attempted to consider its benefits and drawbacks: the issues and phenomena that appear in greater relief or disappear from the scholar's field of view. Definitions of culture can also be discussed in reference to the agency of social actors (à la Weber) and the power of the context in which the movement appears (à la Foucault and Bourdieu), as mentioned in the introduction above, as well as other models (cf. Williams 2004). However, social movement scholars are far from reaching a consensus on the best way to define culture and relate it to structure. This should not come as a surprise: separating out cultural elements is to some extent an arbitrary endeavor. It is apparent that in theoretical discussions, culture cannot replace structure (Johnston & Klandermans 1985: 21), while the problem of the ratio between the two is yet to be settled, making this area of social movement sociology particularly interesting, if fraught with methodological difficulty. It is already apparent that the increased focus on the role of culture has produced better theories on the mobilization, dynamics, and organization of social movements themselves. On the other hand, the increased attention placed on the cultural dimension of a given movement's actions cannot result in the rejection of the hypothesis about its structural determinants. As I have attempted to demonstrate, oppositions such as culture–structure, culture–strategy, culture–economy, and others are largely meaningless. Ideally, all available theories would be used as broadly as possible in order to explain the emergence, actions, and consequences of a given social movement. This is not always possible, however.

What does seem possible is to perceive cultural phenomena within the structure itself and in its influence on the actions of social actors, at least to some extent. In this spirit, after Polletta, we can call: firstly, for greater emphasis on cultural traditions in the sense of

the ideological principles, institutional memory, and political taboos that shape the actions of political elites and protesters; secondly, for greater criticism with regard to models of resource mobilization and political processes, in which the government and protesters are treated as permanent, pre-existing groups, while protest groups in fact sometimes coalesce on an ad hoc basis as an expression of moral indignation or opposition to government policy (2003: 102–103). Approaching structure itself as a cultural phenomenon may also help explain the resonance of certain master frames and ideologies as well as a given organization's choice of organizational structure, if we consider the cultural roots of these aspects (cf. Polletta 2003: 103). It is the view of some scholars that engaging with the anthropological and broad cultural perspectives could help perfect cultural social movement theories and overcome their prejudices (Baumgarten et al. 2016: 3).

The Problem of Collective Identities

Cultural studies of social movements sometimes focus on collective identities, subcultures, mentality, and worldview, which are subjects of study typical of analytical approaches to culture and of analyses carried out in the spirit of cultural codes, but can also be studied through the social–psychological approach, provided that changes in attitudes are considered. However, identities can sometimes be defined so broadly and in a sense inclusively that their boundaries become difficult to delineate. Referencing them essentially serves no analytical purpose. Such is the case with the frequently-encountered division between "us" and "them" in the context of the Solidarity movement. The term "them" was used to denote representative of the regime, while "us" was used to mean everyone else.

It appears that in the creation of collective identities, a crucial role is played by shared action and conflict, meaning, firstly, the demarcation of boundaries between the individual sides of the conflict (the aforementioned division between "us" and "them" widely discussed in the context of Solidarity) and the uninvolved public; secondly, the formation of new relations among participants of the movement (e.g. bonds of solidarity and trust); and thirdly, the ascription of common meaning to events separated by time and space (the protests of 1956, 1968, 1970, 1976, and even the 1944 uprising), the attribution of fundamental significance to certain generational and biographical experiences (participation in earlier protests, the election of Karol Wojtyła as pope), and the abandonment of certain previously held convictions (widespread religious conversions). These result in the reinforcement or weakening of a person's sense of belonging to given groups (cf. Della Porta and Diani 2006).

A majority of the studies that address the issue of identity should be placed in the category of the analytical perspective. The concept of new social movements has played a significant role here. Scholarship representative of this approach to culture includes research by Grzegorz Bakuniak and Krzysztof Nowak on the shaping of the participants' identities in connection with their religious experiences (1987), as well as other discussions of the dominant identities within the Solidarity movement, which their authors believe played a decisive role in shaping the dynamic of the movement. The main identities considered in this context include the working class, intellectual, and national identities,

and less frequently the peasant and religious ones, a fact that resonates in interpretations of Solidarity as a workers' revolution (Goodwyn 1992) or the emergence of a middle class (Kurczewski 1980), a civil society (Skłodkowska 2006), a national uprising (Kula 1991), and the church (Karłowicz 2002). This approach is characterized by the use of a single term to define the entire movement in an attempt to convey the nature of the movement and explain its workings. This goal is not always achieved, however, most often in cases when the supposed identity is defined imprecisely. Sometimes the explanation process involves considering several potential coexistent identities among participants of the movement (Kubik 1994; Ost 2005) or—in a sense *à rebours*—observing the absence or insufficient articulation of a certain identity. This applies to the female identity in particular (Malinowska 2005). Examples of the analytical approach to culture also include work that references an insurrectional cultural code, for example Marcin Kula's *Narodowe i rewolucyjne* [National and Revolutionary, 1991] and research by Elżbieta Ciżewska (2010), which examine the presence of the republican cultural code and the attendant republican identity of the movement. Studies of the cultural causes of Solidarity and the sources of its identity conducted in the spirit of the analytical perspective may also benefit from work published before 1980, for example Aldona Jawłowska's *Drogi kontrkultury* [Countercultural Paths, 1975], which describes youth opposition to the authoritarian system. To sum up, matters of collective identity are typical of the analytical approach to culture, but, in practice, their raising does not always serve an analytical purpose; as an imprecisely defined category, collective identity may produce the same problems that are commonly encountered in the diffuse approach.

Culture in Studies of the Solidarity Movement

The cultural perspective in social movement sociology only developed after the emergence of Solidarity, by which time many of the canonical studies of the Polish social movement had already been written, thus it comes as no surprise that this approach is absent from the research on the Solidarity movement. This is not to say that other theoretical frameworks were not employed. New social movement theory (Touraine 1989; Mason 1989; Misztal & Misztal 1988) was applied most frequently, while other models remained less popular among scholars (Crighton 1985; Osa 1997; Barker 2001). Years later, as part of an intellectual experiment and debate with the extant literature, attempts were made to describe Solidarity through the lens of several other theories (Ciżewska 2010b; Latoszek 2006; Mielczarek 2011a), all of which were nevertheless distant from the cultural perspective.[2] It is worth emphasizing that in Polish studies of the subject, the topic of culture is addressed frequently and with extraordinary sensitivity. As early as the 1980s, the problem of culture was recognized more often in Polish research than in contemporaneous foreign studies, in which the dominant perspectives were those of the political and economic processes; on the other hand, the overwhelming majority of Polish sociologists neither created their own theories nor used the theories that were being developed at the time and later by their foreign colleagues in order to describe and explain the observed phenomenon. Though their

---

[2] These included resource mobilization theory, new social movement theory, and relative deprivation theory.

research was concerned with similar problems and phenomena, they rarely employed the terms and theories used in other countries. Their acute cultural sensibilities have yet to produce any significant contributions to the international study of sociology (largely due to their use of hermetic language, their political isolation, as well as the lack of precise definitions), a consequence of which is, for instance, the relatively small number of comparative studies of Solidarity and civil rights movements. When Polish studies of Solidarity address cultural concerns, they are often burdened by a lack of precision in defining culture itself and a lack of awareness of the theoretical significance of the problems being discussed. Sociologists wrote as events unfolded; their goal was not to create or test theories, and there is often a noticeably emotional, personal element to their analyses. These writings can even be considered sources in their own right, but they are not accompanied by an awareness of their own discoveries. Thus, for example, foreign scholars failed to understand the extraordinarily important religious dimension of the movement, a theme often addressed in Polish studies but rarely discussed—and often misunderstood—in foreign studies. Notable exceptions include the work of Kubik (1994) and Osa (1997). Is this absence of references to social movement theory detrimental to the Polish studies of the Solidarity movement? There can be no unambiguous answer: the significance of a given study does not hinge on its use of a particular theoretical perspective, and the body of literature contains many valuable works that rely on other theoretical traditions. On the other hand, the culture of Solidarity had been studied enough that we can now attempt detailed analyses using the tools and language provided by modern theories—analyses that would engage with, and perhaps even challenge, studies that rely on alternative perspectives, which would serve to popularize the substantial achievements of Polish sociology in this field and, more importantly, would expand our understanding of Solidarity: a phenomenon that continues to wield considerable influence over contemporary Polish politics and society.

References

B ä c k e r, R. 2001. Przeobrażenia wizji świata społecznego działaczy Solidarności lat 1980–1989, in: R. Bäcker (ed.), „Solidarność": Dwadzieścia lat później. Kraków: Arcana.

B a c z k o, B. 1986. Polska Solidarności — pamięć eksplodująca, Krytyka 21.

B a k u n i a k, G., N o w a k, K. 1987. The Creation of a Collective Identity in a Social Movement. The Case of Solidarność in Poland, Theory and Society 16(3): 401–429.

["

G o o d w i n, J., J a s p e r, J. M. (eds.). 2004. *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotion*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman&Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

G o o d w y n, L. 1991. *Breaking the Barier: the Rise of Solidarity in Poland*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

G r a b o w s k a, M. 2004. *Podział postkomunistyczny : społeczne podstawy polityki w Polsce po 1989 roku*. Warszawa: Instytut Socjologii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Scholar.

H a ł a s, E. 2005. Konstruowanie tożsamości państwa-narodu. Konflikt symboliczny o preambułę *Konstytucji*, in: M. Latoszek, (ed.), *„Solidarność" w imieniu narodu i obywateli*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo ARCANA, 56–85.

H a r t, S. 1996. The Cultural Dimension of Social Movements: A Theoretical Reassessment and Literature Review, Special Issue: Sociology of Culture and Sociology of Religion , *Sociology of Religion* 57 (1): 87–100.

I n g l e h a r t, R. 1977. *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles among Western Publics*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.

I v a n c h e v a, M. 2007. Civil Society as a Discursive Frame: Vaclav Havel's Anatomy of Reticence as a Case Study, unpublished MA thesis, www.etd.ceu.hu/2007/ivancheva_mariya.pdf, accessed 07.06.2015.

J a s p e r, J. 2014. *Protest. A Cultural Introduction to Social Movements*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity.

J a s p e r, J., G o o d w i n, J., P o l l e t a, F. (eds.). 2001. *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

J a w ł o w s k a, A. 1975. *Drogi kontrkultury*. Warszawa: PIW.

J a w ł o w s k a, A. 1986. *Więcej niż teatr*. Warszawa: PIW.

J e p p e r s o n, R. 1991. Institutions, Institutional effects, and Institutionalism, in: W. W. Powell, P. DiMaggio (ed.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

J o h n s t o n, H. (ed.). 2009. *Culture, Social Movements, and Protest*. Burlington: Ashgate.

J o h n s t o n, H., K l a n d e r m a n s, B. (eds.). 1995. *Social Movements and Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

K a l i s k i, B. 2003. *„Antysocjalistyczne zbiorowisko"? I Krajowy Zjazd Delegatów NSZZ Solidarność*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Trio.

K a r ł o w i c z, D. 2002. „Solidarność" jako Kościół, in D. Gawin (ed.), *Lekcja Sierpnia. Dziedzictwo „Solidarności" po dwudziestu latach*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.

K l a n d e r m a n s, B., T a r r o w, S. 1988. Mobilization into Social Movements: Synthesizing European and American Approaches, in B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi, and S. Tarrow (eds.), *International Social Movements Research*. Vol. 1, *From Structure to Action: Comparing Movement Participation across Cultures*. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

K o o p m a n s, R., S t a t h a m, P. 1999. Ethnic and Civic Conceptions of Nationhood and the Differential Success of the Extreme Right in Germany and Italy, in: M. G. Giugni, D. McAdam, Ch. Tilly (eds.), *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.

K o w a l s k i, S. 1990. *Krytyka solidarnościowego rozumu. Studium z socjologii myślenia potocznego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PEN.

K r i e s i, H. et al. (eds.). 1995. *New Social Movements in Western Europe*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minneapolis Press/UCL Press.

K r z e m i ń s k i, I. 1987. Religia i „Solidarność," *Aneks* 48: 43–59.

K r z e m i ń s k i, I. et al. 2010. *Solidarność — doświadczenie i pamięć*. Gdańsk: Europejskie Centrum Solidarności.

K u b i k, J. 1994. *The Power of Symbols Against the Symbols of Power: the Rise of Solidarity and the Fall of State Socialism in Poland*. The Pennsylvania State University Press.

K u b i k, J. 2007–2008. Polityka kontestacji, protest, ruchy społeczne: logika rozwoju teorii, *Societas/Communitas* 2 (4); 2008, 1 (5) 2008: 41–82.

K u c z y ń s k i, P. 1994. Początki socjologii ruchów społecznych w Polsce, in: M. Frybes, P. Kuczyński, *W poszukiwaniu ruchu społecznego. Wokół socjologii Alaina Touraine'a*. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa, pp. 156–181.

K u c z y ń s k i, P., and N o w a k, K. 1988. *The Solidarity Movement in Relation to Society and State: Communication as an Issue of Social Movement*. In: 'Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change', vol. 10: 127–145.

K u l a, M. 1991. *Narodowe i rewolucyjne*. Warszawa: Aneks.

K u r c z e w s k i, J., 1980. Dawny ustrój i rewolucja, *Res Publica* 7.

K u r c z e w s k i, J. 2009. *Ścieżki emancypacji. Osobista teoria transformacji ustrojowej w Polsce*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Trio.

L a b a, R. 1991. *The Roots of Solidarity: A Political Sociology of Poland's Working-Class Democratization*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

L a t o s z e k, M. 2006. "Solidarity"—A Contribution to Social Movement Theory, *Polish Sociological Review* 153: 39–53.

L e s z c z y ń s k i, A. 2006. *Anatomia protestu. Strajki robotnicze w Olsztynie, Sosnowcu i Żyrardowie, sierpień– listopad 1981*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Trio.

M a l i n o w s k a, E. 2005. Niekobieca „Solidarność," in: Marek Latoszek (ed.), *„Solidarność" w imieniu narodu i obywateli*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo ARCANA, pp. 132–151.

M a r o d y, M. et al. 2004. *Polacy'80*. Warszawa: WFiS UW.

M a s o n, D. S. 1989. Solidarity as a New Social Movement, *Political Science Quarterly* 104 (1): 41–58.

M c A d a m, D. 1994. Culture and Social Movements, in: E. Laraña, H. Johnston, J. R. Gusfield, *New Social Movements. From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 36–57.

M c C a r t h y, J. D., and Z a l d, N. 1977. Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory, *American Journal of Sociology* 82: 1212–1241.

M e a r d i, G., 2005. The Legacy of 'Solidarity': Class, Democracy, Culture and Subjectivity in the Polish Social Movement, *Social Movement Studies* 4 (3): 261–280.

M e l l e r, M. 2000. Rola myślenia o historii w ruchu Solidarność w latach 1980–1981, in: M. Kula, *Solidarność w ruchu 1980–1981: studia*. Warszawa: Nowa.

M e l u c c i, A. 1989. *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

M i e l c z a r e k, A. 2006. *Śpiący rycerze. Szeregowi działacze warszawskiego podziemia wydawniczego lat osiemdziesiątych*. Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Wolnego Słowa.

M i e l c z a r e k, A. 2011a. Ruch Solidarności w świetle teorii ruchów społecznych, in: K. Ciechorska-Kulesza, R. Kossakowski, & P. Łuczeczko, *Kultura solidarności. Socjologiczno-antropologiczne analizy kulturowego dziedzictwa „Solidarności"*. Pszczółki: Wydawnictwo Orbis Exterior, pp. 107–131.

M i e l c z a r e k, A. 2011b. Przemiany roku 1989 w oczach szeregowych działaczy podziemia, in: K. Brzechczyn (ed.), *Interpretacje upadku komunizmu w Polsce i w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej*. Poznań: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, pp. 251–262.

M i s z t a l, B., and M i s z t a l, B. 1988. Democratization Process as an Objective of New Social Movements, *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 10: 93–106.

M o r a w s k a, E. 1984. Civil Religion vs. State Power in Poland, *Society*, May/June.

M o r r i s, A. D., and M c C l u r g M u e l l e r, C. (eds.). 1992. *Frontiers in Social Movements Theory*. New Heaven Conn.: Yale University Press.

N o w a k, S. 2004. *Społeczeństwo polskie czasu kryzysu*. Warszawa: WFiS.

O s a, M. 1997. Creating Solidarity: The Religious Foundation of the Polish Social Movement, *East European Politics and Society* 112: 339–365.

O s t, D. 2005. *The Defeat of Solidarity: Anger and Politics in Postcommunist Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

P a y e r h i n, M., Z i r k a k z a d e h, C. E. 2006. On Movement Frames and Negotiated Identities: The Case of Poland's First Solidarity Congress, *Social Movement Studies* 52: 91–115.

P o l l e t t a, F. 2004. Culture Is Not Just in Your Head, in: J. Goodwin, J. M. Jasper (eds.), *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotion*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

P o l l e t t a, F. 2008. Culture and Movements, *Annals of the American Academy of Political Science* 619: 78–96.

R o j e k, P. 2009. *Semiotyka solidarności : analiza dyskursów PZPR i NSZZ Solidarność w 1981 roku*. Kraków: Nomos.

R o y, W. G., 2010. How Social Movement Do Culture, *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society* 23 (2/3): 85–98.

R y c h a r d, A., and M o t z k i n, Gabriel (eds.). 2015. *The Legacy of Polish Solidarity. Social Activism, Regime Collapse, and Building of a New Society*. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang.

R y m s z a, M. 2011. Jaka samorządna Rzeczpospolita? Współpraca międzysektorowa w Polsce a dziedzictwo ruchu społecznego Solidarność, in: K. Ciechorska-Kulesza, R. Kossakowski, & P. Łuczeczko, *Kultura solidarności. Socjologiczno-antropologiczne analizy kulturowego dziedzictwa „Solidarności"*. Pszczółki: Wydawnictwo Orbis Exterior, pp. 233–252.

S e w e l l, W. Jr. 1999. The Concept(s) of Culture, in: V. E. Bonnell, L. A. Hunt (eds.), *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

S k ą p s k a, G. 2011. *From 'Civil Society' to 'Europe'. A Sociological Study on Constitutionalism after Commu-nism*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

S k ł o d k o w s k a, I. 2006. *Społeczeństwo Obywatelskie na tle historycznego przełomu. Polska 1980–1989*. War-szawa: ISP PAN.

S m o l e ń, D. 2000. Tłum czy społeczność zorganizowana? Strajkujący w Stoczni Gdańskiej w sierpniu 1980, in: M. Kula, *Solidarność w ruchu 1980–1981: studia*. Warszawa: Nowa.

S n o w, D. A., R o c h f o r d, B. Jr., W o r d e n, S. K., and B e n f o r d, R. D. 1986. Frame Alignment Processes, Micromoblization and Movement Participation, *American Sociological Review* 51 (4): 464–481.

S w i d l e r, A. 1986. Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies, *American Sociological Review* 51: 273–86.

S w i d l e r, Ann. 1995. Cultural Power and Social Movements, in: H. Johnston, B. Klandermans (eds.), *Social Movements and Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 25–40.

S z a c k i, J. 1995. *Liberalism after Communism*. Budapest, London and New York: Central European University Press.

S z t o m p k a, P. 2005. *Socjologia zmian społecznych*. Kraków : Znak.

Ś w i d e r s k i, B. 1996. *Gdańsk i Ateny: o demokracji bezpośredniej w Polsce*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.

T a r r o w, S. 1991. 'Aiming at a Moving Target': Social Science and the Recent Rebellions in Eastern Europe, *Political Science and Politics* 29: 12–20.

T i l l y, Ch. 1995. *European Revolutions 1492–1992*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher.

T o u r a i n e, A., S t r z e l e c k i, J., D u b e t, F., W i e v i o r k a, M. 1989. *Solidarność. Analiza ruchu społecznego 1980–1981*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Europa.

W i l l i a m s, R. 2004. The Culturl Contexts of Collective Action: Constrains, Opportunities, and the Symbolic Life of Social Movements, in: D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, H. Kriesi (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., pp. 91–115.

Ż u k, P. 2001. *Społeczeństwo w działaniu. Ekolodzy, feministki, skłotersi*. Warszawa: Scholar.

Biographical Note: Elżbieta Ciżewska-Martyńska, is Assistant Professor at the University of Warsaw. Her research areas include the ideas and legacy of the East Central European dissident movement of 1970s and 1980s, European and American intellectual history, civic republicanism and sociology of social movements. She is an author of a book *Filozofia publiczna Solidarności 1980–1981* [Public Philosophy of Solidarity 1980–1981], published by Narodowe Centrum Kultury 2010. The book explains Solidarity's dynamics by placing its cultural identities in a broad Euro-Atlantic intellectual context. She was a 2016–2017 James Madison Program Visiting Fellow at Princeton University, and a visiting scholar at Columbia University in 2012. She is a member of a research group "New Approaches to the Solidarity Movement."

E-mail: e.cizewska@uw.edu.pl