THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYGODNIK POWSZECHNY AND CENSORSHIP AUTHORITIES IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF POLAND

By

Roman Jankowski

Submitted to
Central European University
History Department

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Marsha Siefert
Second Reader: Professor Maciej Janowski

Budapest, Hungary

2012

Abstract

During the postwar-period, the Polish United Workers´ Party (Polska Zjednoczona Partia Robotnicza, hereafter PZPR), the communist party of Poland, used the institution of the Main Office of Control of Press, Publications and Public Performances (Główny Urząd Kontroli Prasy, Publikacji i Widowisk, hereafter GUKPPiW) to control all media, including the press, books, theatre and arts, as well as radio and television broadcasts. This thesis analyzes print media and censorship practices during the period of the People's Republic of Poland. Furthermore, the materials collected and analyzed as part of the theoretical framework on media and censorship in communist Poland are supplemented with interviews conducted by the author with the formal editorial staff of *Tygodnik Powszechny*, hereafter TP (Universal Weekly), considered the only magazine, which to some extent (determined by censorship) could contain views critical of the communist authorities. The aim of this analysis is to describe the situation of print media in People's Poland, as well as to provide a background and a detailed description of Polish censorship. Furthermore, this thesis describes and analyzes the relationship between TP and censorship, concentrating on the latter's practices, aiming at explaining the weekly's ability to publish contents critical of the communist ideals. More specifically, this thesis concentrates on the procedures in place, the tactics used by the editors to 'trick' censors, as well as the process of negotiating as to what could and what could not be published. Finally, as TP is a Catholic weekly, its relationship with the hierarchy of the Polish Roman Catholic Church is also discussed. An extensive outline of the unique socio-political role of the Polish Roman Catholic Church in communist Poland accompanies the above analysis.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Prof. Marsha Siefert for dedicating the time to advise and guide my research, as well as Prof. Maciej Janowski for acting as the second reader for my thesis.

I would also like to thank Dr. Eszter Tímár, Academic Writing Instructor at Central European University in Budapest for her guidance in the aspect of academic writing.

I would like to thank Jerzy Sadecki, a former editor of *Gazeta Krakowska* (Krakow Daily) for his invaluable knowledge and guidance on the topic of media and censorship in communist Poland, as well as for his help in contacting former members of the editorial staff of *Tygodnik Powszechny*.

I would also like to acknowledge my interviewees: Józefa Hennelowa, Marek Skwarnicki, Fr. Adam Boniecki, Roman Graczyk, Witek Bereś and Joanna Podsadecka for providing me with knowledge, which was instrumental for my research and the completion of this thesis.

Table of Contents

Introduction

During the period of the People's Republic of Poland, the aim of the Polish communist government was to control all aspects of society. In the postwar-period, communist ideals were enforced in books and publications; censorship was introduced on all published materials as they might have otherwise contradicted or challenged the regime's political ideals and agendas. Institutional framework of control of all media was established. This included standardized although not uniform instructions regarding censorship of books, publications, theatre and arts, as well as radio and television broadcasts.

This aim of this thesis is to analyze the relationship of the editorial staff of *Tygodnik Powszechny*[1], hereafter TP (Universal Weekly) with the regional censorship office in Krakow and The Main Office of Control of Press, Publications and Public Performances (Główny Urząd Kontroli Prasy, Publikacji i Widowisk, hereafter GUKPPiW) in Warsaw, based on interviews with those who were part of the editorial staff and those who published in TP under communism. The main aim of this thesis is to explain the weekly's ability to publish contents critical of communist ideals by outlining the procedures and instructions in the relationship of the editorial staff of TP with censorship. More specifically, this thesis concentrates on the tactics used by the editors to 'trick' censors, as well as discusses the process of negotiating that took place between the editorial staff of TP and censors with the publishing of every issue of the weekly. Furthermore, its aim is to outline the significant socio-political role of TP in Polish society and therefore the role of religion and the Polish Roman Catholic Church during the

[1] A Roman Catholic weekly magazine, which focuses on social and cultural issues; established by Cardinal Adam Sapieha, archbishop of Krakow, in 1945.

communist period in Poland. This thesis also discusses the topic of (print) media and censorship in in the People's Republic of Poland.

TP played an important role under communism, as it was the only medium of the Catholic intelligentsia and a center for the exchange of opinions among Polish intellectuals. Among others, Karol Wojtyła (the later Pope John Paul II), as well as other poets and writers, such as Czesław Miłosz[2] wrote for TP. It was considered the only magazine, which to some extent (determined by censorship) could contain views critical of the communist authorities. The communist government officially closed down TP between 1953 and 1956 and for a few months after the declaration of Martial Law in Poland in 1981. Today TP is regarded as the voice of the modern and liberal wing of the Catholic Church in Poland.

Methodology

As time moves forward, the task to collect first hand information from those that were once part of the communist system becomes more challenging and therefore pressing. For this reason, this thesis is based mainly on interviews with those who were part of the editorial staff and those who published in TP during the period of the People's Republic of Poland. This research, apart from oral history sources, consists also of a literature review on the topic of Polish (print) media, as well as the structure and functioning of censorship in People's Poland. Furthermore, it is supplemented with literature relating to the socio-political role of the Roman Catholic Church in communist Poland.

The methodology I have intended on following while conducting my interviews is Biographical Research, which looks at the experiences preceding and following a certain phenomenon, and the order in which they occurred. Biographical Research can be dated as

[2] A Polish poet, prose writer and translator, who served as a cultural attaché of the communist People's Republic of Poland, was forbidden to be published in Polish media as he defected obtaining political asylum in France in 1951.

early as the 1920s and the migration study of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* by William Isaac, Thomas and Florian Znaniecki at the University of Chicago. The authors expressed their concern about the methodology used in their study and their demand that "social science cannot remain on the surface of social becoming, where certain schools wish to have it float, but must reach the actual human experiences and attitudes which constitute the full, live and active social reality beneath the formal organization of social institutions."[3] Furthermore, researchers became motivated to get inside of the actor's (the subject's or the interviewee's) perspective. In the 1970s a significant boom could be seen in interpretative biographical research. In 1978, the first anthology of biographical research was published in Germany by Martin Kohli and in 1981, an international reader followed, published by Daniel Bertaux, a French sociologist.[4] This research method is expanding up until today in various disciplines. For example in sociology, "biographies are considered and examined as a social construct of social reality in themselves, whereas initially written or narrated biographies were used instrumentally as a source of specific information."[5] Biographical research became well established also in educational sciences. At the time when Gabriele Rosenthal decided to adopt a life-story approach in her personal research, "the narrative interview method of Fritz Schutze was provoking a great deal of discussion in the field of qualitative research."[6] Therefore, following this method, Rosenthal asked her interviewees to tell her their whole life story. This approach requires the interviewer to put aside his or her acquired traditional methodological training, which involves a significant effort. Rosenthal distinguished between "the perspective

[3] Gabriele Rosenthal, "Biographical Research," in *Qualitative Research Practice*, eds. Clive Seale, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber Gubrium and David Silverman, (London: SAGE Publications, 2004), 48.
[4] Ibid., 48.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid., 49.

of the biographer in the past and the perspective of the biographer in the present,"[7] which is crucial in biographical research.

When trying to reconstruct the past from the perspective of the present, it is necessary to remember that "the presentation of past events is constituted by the present of narrating."[8] Furthermore, the current situation of the person narrating the story determined their perspective on the past and can produce a specific past at times. This does not mean that separate pasts are being constructed but the narratives of past experiences refer both to current life and these past experiences. "Just as the past is constituted out of the present and the anticipated future, so the present arises out of the past and the future. In this way biographical narratives provide information of the narrator's present as well as about his or her past and perspectives for the future."[9]

What is now called the Rosenthal Method, after its primary author, is based on fundamental theoretical assumptions. According to her approach, the key is to ask for the whole life story regardless of the specific research question. History relating to social experiences and tied to people's experiences, which has biographical meaning for them, requires us to interpret them in the overall context of their biography. What is important is not to restrict the narration to parts or individual phases of the biography. Individual areas of life can only be interpreted after the whole life narrative has been taken into consideration. The sequence of a narrative interview is to begin with a period of main narration where the interviewer asks an initial narrative question and the interviewee provides the main narration or self structured biographical self-presentation. This request for the interviewee's life story is generally followed by a long biographical narration, which can take hours. The main narration

[7] Ibid.
[8] Ibid., 50.
[9] Ibid.

is at no time interrupted but only supported by paralinguistic expressions of interest and attention; the interviewer restricts himself or herself mainly to active listening and note taking. The questioning period does not begin until the interview's second phase. Furthermore, these questions do not relate to opinions or reasons but are to encourage people to talk about either specific phase in their life or particular situations. The questioning period that follows the period of main narration begins with internal and is then followed by external narrative questions. Internal narrative questions refer to what has already been discussed, whereas external narrative questions refer to topics that are of our interest but have not been mentioned during the initial phase. The internal questions are to be formulated based on the notes taken during the main narrative. The external questions are kept until the last phase of the interview so that the interviewer does not impose his or her own interpretation. It is also helpful during the reconstruction of the interview as it simplifies answering for example why certain thematic areas of biographical phases were not covered by the interviewee himself or herself.[10]

My initial question was broken into two questions. Each interview started with a question: Could you please tell me what was your role in TP? [Czy może Pan/Pani opisać swoją rolę w Tygodniku?]. In some cases, this generated a very short answer. I was looking to have the interviewee provide me with a description of not only his or her role in the weekly but also how did he or she become part of the editorial staff of TP. My intention was to learn as much as possible about the relationship of TP with the censorship authorities from the initial narration. Therefore, in cases where the answer was not satisfactory, the initial question was immediately followed by another opening question: How did you end up at TP? [W jaki sposób Pan/Pani znalazła się w Tygodniku?]. This mostly generated a longer narration, providing me with the answers I was looking for. I then only needed to follow with internal narrative

[10] Ibid.

questions where I asked the interviewee to elaborate on certain issues that were already discussed and only in some cases I followed up with external narrative questions, asking for things not yet mentioned.

Outline

Chapter One (The Polish Roman Catholic Church under Communism) of this thesis will describe the unique socio-political role of the Polish Roman Catholic Church in communist Poland, which is of significant relevance to the Catholic weekly. *Chapter Two* (Media and Censorship in the People's Republic of Poland) of this thesis will provide a historical analysis of (print) media (both official and unofficial) in the People's Republic of Poland. It will also comprehensively analyze the structure and functioning of censorship in People's Poland, based on the existing literature. *Chapter Three* (Censorship and *Tygodnik Powszechny*) will provide an analysis of interviews conducted with the formal editorial staff of TP: Marek Swarnicki, Józefa Hennelowa, Witek Bereś, Roman Graczyk, and Fr. Adam Boniecki, outlining the role and significance of each person in the structures of the weekly but most importantly their recollection about the relationship of TP with the censorship authorities, and being a Catholic Weekly, the hierarchy of the Polish Roman Catholic Church. Furthermore, it will provide the procedures and instructions available to the editors and writers of TP under the unique political circumstances. This chapter will also include a commentary of the specificity of TP and the editorial team from the perspective of those who were part of the team and who published in TP during this period. Finally, the *Conclusion* will summarize and discuss the main findings of the theoretical, as well as the empirical chapter.

1 The Polish Roman Catholic Church under Communism

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and, in some cases, increasing measure of control from Moscow. […] The Communist parties, which were very small in all these Eastern States of Europe, have been raised to pre-eminence and power far beyond their numbers and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control.[1]

–Winston Churchill, 1946

1.1 The socio-political role of the Polish Roman Catholic Church

Poland, from 1945 until 1989, was under the Soviet sphere of influence. A Soviet-backed provisional government, which operated in opposition to the London-based Polish government in exile, was formed with the 1944 political manifesto of the Polish Committee of National Liberation (Polski Komitet Wyzwolenia Narodowego, hereafter PKWN). It exercised control over Polish territory re-taken from Nazi Germany and was fully sponsored and controlled by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In 1948, the communists consolidated their power by forming the Polish United Workers' Party (Polska Zjednoczona Partia Robotnicza, hereafter PZPR)[2], which would monopolize the political stage in Poland until 1989.[3] Nevertheless, in the studies of communist history of East and Central Europe, Poland could be singled out mainly because of the unique socio-political role of the Polish Roman

[1] Winston Churchill, "The Iron Curtain," in *Essays in Context*, eds. Sandra Fehl Tropp and Ann Pierson D'Angelo (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 179.
[2] The Communist Party of the People's Republic of Poland from 1948 until 1989, established at the unification congress of the Polish Workers' Party (Polska Partia Robotnicza - PPR) and Polish Socialist Party (Polska Partia Socjalistyczna - PPS) held from 15 to 21 December 1948; ideologically based on the theories of Marxism-Leninism; see Norman Davies, *God's Playground*, 549.
[3] Norman Davies, *God's Playground: A History of Poland.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 556-557.

Catholic Church. According to Robert Brier, "the role played by the Roman Catholic Church in Polish society is often taken for granted."[4] As Brian Porter observes, "the linkage between Catholicism and Polish culture is more tenuous than is usually assumed."[5] Robert Brier rightly notes that "the Catholic Church's strong position in both communist and post-communist Poland has to be considered a historical problem in need of explanation."[6]

In the initial post-World War II years the situation of the Polish Roman Catholic Church was threatened. During the period of Stalinism (1945-1956) it experienced strong persecution, including confiscation of properties, as well as internment and imprisonment of priests and bishops, including the Primate of Poland, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński (imprisoned by the communist regime from 1953 until 1956). The end of Stalinism marked a general softening of the state's religious policies, as well as the relations between the State and the Church. Zbigniew Pelczyński in his article *Solidarity and 'The Rebirth of Civil Society' in Poland, 1976-81*, rightly observes that "the Roman Catholic Church fully recovered its internal autonomy after 1956 – it acted as an independent body in social, cultural and religious matters and, on select issues, even as a political opposition."[7] The Church during communism has become the "leading force in patriotic attempts to shake off foreign domination."[8]

The Polish Roman Catholic Church, by strongly opposing communism, developed a unique social position; "[it] reached a particularly prominent position in politics and culture."[9]

[4] Robert Brier, "The Roots of the 'Fourth Republic': Solidarity's Cultural Legacy to Polish Politics," in *East European Politics and Societies* (Warsaw: German Historical Institute, 2009), 71.
[5] Brian Porter, "The Catholic Nation: Religion, Identity, and the Narratives of Polish History," in *Slavic and East European Journal* 45:2 (2001): 289, in Robert Brier, "The Roots of the 'Fourth Republic': Solidarity's Cultural Legacy to Polish Politics," in *East European Politics and Societies* (Warsaw: German Historical Institute, 2009), 71.
[6] Brier, "The Roots of the 'Fourth Republic,'" 71.
[7] Zbigniew Pelczyński, "Solidarity and the Rebirth of Civil Society in Poland 1976-81," in *Civil Society and the State*, ed. John Keane (London and New York: Verso, 1988), 36-37.
[8] Tom Inglis, Zdzisław Mach and Rafał Mazanek, *Religion and Politics: East-West Contrasts from Contemporary Europe* (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2000), 116.
[9] Ibid.,113.

It acted as an anti-state force, opposing among other things official atheism, secularization of education, liberal divorce law and especially legalization of abortion. The Catholic Church was the only national institution independent of the State.

The election of Karol Wojtyła to Papacy in October of 1978 had a great significance on the role that the Polish Roman Catholic Church played vis-à-vis the Polish communist regime in the last decade of communist rule in Poland as it certainly strengthened the role of the Church even further, and the Pope's numerous visits to Poland became nation-wide demonstrations against the regime. Furthermore, the Pope from behind the Iron Curtain, through the institution of the Church was able to internationalize the problems and the struggles of Polish society, which was a significant disadvantage for the communist regime.

The Pope's first visit to Poland in June of 1979 was the most influential for the later events. The most significant part of the visit was the homily at the Victory Square in Warsaw on June 2, 1979. The Pope spoke indirectly to the communist government while at the same time proclaiming the undoubtful connection between Polish history and religion, and particularly the Roman Catholic Church:

> It is impossible [...] to exclude Christ from the history of the human race anywhere in the world, in any geographical longitude and latitude. [...] Apart from Christ it is impossible to understand the history of Poland and, above all, the history of the men and women who have traveled and are now traveling the road of life in this land. [...] It is also impossible, without reference to Christ, to understand the history of the Polish nation, this great thousand-year-old community. [...] Apart from Christ it is impossible to understand this nation with its past that has been so splendid and yet so terribly burdened.[10]

The Pope also called upon Poland to play the leading role in the transformation when he stated: "with these words of Christ in mind, are we not perhaps justified in thinking that Poland in our

[10] Pope John Paul II, "Pope John Paul II Speaks in Victory Square, Warsaw," in *From Stalinism to Pluralism. A Documentary History of Eastern Europe since 1945*, ed. Gale Stokes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 201.

time has become a land called to give an especially important witness?"[11] The Polish Pope's visit to his homeland produced, as Gale Stokes summarizes, a 'psychological earthquake' that opened the door to transformation, paving the road for the Solidarity movement a year later:

> John Paul II's tremendous personal appeal, as well as the nationalist overtones of his visit [...] helped create the conditions in which Solidarity could emerge a year later. After a generation of debasement of public rhetoric, the airing of John Paul's ethical, moral, and national appeals to literally millions of people in the face of official foot-dragging demonstrated to ordinary Poles that it was possible to discuss public affairs in a vocabulary that did not derive from the single-party state.[12]

The Independent Self-governing Trade Union "Solidarity" was founded in Gdansk one year after the Pope's visit to Poland. Solidarity was the first non-communist trade union in any communist country. However, "although Solidarity was in name a trade union it was in fact, from the start, a political movement."[13] Pelczyński accurately observes that "[…] few leaders and advisers of Solidarity believed that the movement's most important task was to entrench itself within the existing system and to enjoy the enormous gains of the August 1980 agreements. It was principally the Church hierarchy, dominated by the personality of the aged and ailing Cardinal Wyszyński, which believed in consolidation."[14] He wanted Solidarity "to pause and take stock of the situation, to streamline its organization, to train a large cadre of activists and officials, to focus its attention on various social and economic grievances of the population, and to help other social groups."[15] Wyszyński wanted Solidarity first to master the difficult task of establishing itself as an independent trade-union movement and only then "extend its activities gradually to broader, more political issues."[16] Nevertheless, the emergence of Solidarity in Poland in 1980 was a phenomenon of a global importance. The

[11] Ibid.
[12] Gale Stokes, "Poland in the Late 1970s," in *From Stalinism to Pluralism. A Documentary History of Eastern Europe since 1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 193.
[13] Pelczyński, "Solidarity and the Rebirth of Civil Society in Poland," 369.
[14] Ibid., 373.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.

movement's growth and popularity weakened the position of the communist party, what eventually led to the round-table talks in 1989 and the first semi-free elections and the first democratic government in over 40 years. As a result, the People's Republic of Poland became the Third Polish Republic. It was these events that led to the fall of the Berlin Wall and eventually to the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, which marked the end of the Cold War and communism. The Polish Roman Catholic Church played an important role in this process.

1.2 Conclusion

The role of the Polish Roman Catholic Church during communism cannot be associated strictly with religion. The Polish Church during communism was the only institution independent of the State. Moreover, it was the center for the exchange of opinions among Polish intellectuals. This was possible because the Church by focusing on social and cultural issues would allow people of different religious attitudes to meet. The Church was able to fulfill this role also through media, specifically Catholic press, by concentrating on social and cultural rather than strictly religious issues, which would increase its scope, as well as its influence in the society. Furthermore, the Polish Roman Catholic Church, including Wyszyński as the head of the Polish Church and later, after his death, Wojtyła as Pope were with no doubt were the most significant players in leading the Polish nation towards transformation. Wyszyński was able to gain authority and trust of the society to the Church in a fight with the common enemy – the communist regime; Wojtyła was able to make the society believe that united they can change the reality, what had a strong influence on the later events.

2 Media and Censorship in the People's Republic of Poland

In communist Poland, according to Tomasz Goban-Klas "the media was instrumental both in building the system and then destroying it [and the Polish press was] the most active and the most subversive of all Eastern European media."[1] The mass media in postwar Poland, which was modeled after the Soviet system, should be interpreted within the framework of what Goban-Klas calls a closed society. In a closed society, the ruling elite is to have monopoly on information, which means controlling "all knowledge (collected in universities, archives, libraries etc.) and the institutions that retrieve and analyze information (research institutes), process it (bureaucratic apparatus), and distribute it (media)."[2] In Poland, the Party worked together with the censorship authorities in creating the most complete constructed reality. The exception was Catholic and peasant party[3] press. Although the communist leadership, in order not to allow the Church to get too strong did not grant it access to either radio or television, Catholics were allowed to publish only printed materials.[4] Only after the agreement between Solidarity and government representatives was signed in August of 1980, "the Roman Catholic mass and religious services (or programmes) of other churches were introduced into the radio schedule."[5] This was a unique period in the institutional infrastructure of Polish mass media. The aim of this chapter is to describe the complex situation of (print) media in communist Poland, which includes both official, as well as unofficial press, including Catholic and

[1] Tomasz Goban-Klas, *The Orchestration of the Media: The Politics of Mass Communications in Communist Poland and the Aftermath* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1994), 3-4.
[2] Ibid., 15.
[3] Polish Peasants' Party (Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe, abbreviated to PSL) is a centrist, agrarian and Christian democratic political party, which was formed after Poland regained independence following World War I in 1918.
[4] Jane Leftwich Curry, ed. & trans., *The Black Book of Polish Censorship*. (New York: Vintage Books, 1984), 32.
[5] Karol Jakubowicz, "'Solidarity' and Media Reform in Poland," *European Journal of Communication* 5 (1990): 344.

underground publications. Also, this chapter outlines the structure and functioning of censorship in the People's Republic of Poland, including the changes that followed after the August 1980 agreement between Solidarity and the communist leadership, as well as their aftermath.

2.1 Media in the People's Republic of Poland

The media system in the People's Republic of Poland was the most diverse in the Soviet bloc. According to Antony Buzek, "the Polish press […] stands out from that of other Soviet bloc countries."[6] For a population of over 30 million people, there were 56 different dailies, 595 magazines, 4 radio stations and 2 television channels, as well as 220 different factory newsletters and a lively world of theaters and cabarets. During the post-Stalinist period, Catholic periodicals also began to appear.[7]

The Polish press was in a miserable situation at the end of World War II. More than 50% of printing devices were not suitable for use; 70% of the paper industry and 90% of the broadcasting industry was destroyed. More than 4000 skilled journalists were murdered or died between 1939 and 1944. The press came under communist control already during the war.[8] The 1944 political manifesto of the Polish Committee of National Liberation promised freedom of press, but already in 1944 "all printed works were put under military censorship and, after 1946, under state censorship."[9] Furthermore, "the postwar newspapers proudly called themselves 'new press' or a 'press of a new type' [as] they voluntarily endorsed a new style of

[6] Antony Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works* (London and Dunmow: Pall Mall Press, 1964), 96.
[7] Curry, *The Black Book of Polish Censorship*, 25-26.
[8] Sylwester Dziki, "Prasa w Rozwoju Historycznym" [Historical Development of the Press], in *Dziennikarstwo i Świat Mediów* [Journalism and the World of m=Media] edited by Zbigniew Bauer & Edward Chudziński (Krakow: Universitas, 2000), 49.
[9] Goban-Klas, *The Orchestration of the Media*, 54.

journalism."[10] Following World War II, the press became completely dependent on the Party, its political allies as well as subject to State censorship.[11]

The first restrictions in publishing activity began in 1947 and were coordinated by the Ministry of Propaganda.[12] A political officer nominated and accepted editors and managers of newspapers, radio and television. The Central and Regional Committees of the Polish United Workers' Party were directly influencing the messages transmitted by the media. During periodic meetings and conferences journalists were informed about what and how they should write.[13] In Poland, *Robotnicza Spoldzielnia Wydawnicza 'Prasa-Ksiaska-Ruch'*, hereafter RSW (Workers' Publishing Cooperative 'Press-Book-Movement') provided the institutional framework for a full control of the press by the State. It was established as a cooperative in 1947, being also one of the main administrative units of the Office of Control of Press, Publications and Public Performances and "a formal owner of 22 publishing houses, 17 printing houses, 2 press photo agencies, some 34,496 newspaper selling kiosks and other small shops, numerous press clubs as well as the foreign trade agency Ars Polona and of two media research institutes."[14] Following the creation of the centralized publishing, *Trybuna Ludu*[15] (People's Tribune) became the main official media outlet of the Polish United Workers' Party. It was one of the largest newspapers in communist Poland.[16] Its role was to present the position of the Party, publish official materials and speeches, support its economical plans, initialize campaigns against 'enemies of the people', inform about changes in the Party's personnel, as

[10] Ibid., 57.
[11] Tomasz Mielczarek, *Między Monopolem a Pluralizmem* [Between Monopoly and Pluralism]. (Kielce: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej im. Jana Kochanowskiego, 1998), 14.
[12] Dziki, "Prasa w Rozwoju Historycznym" [Historical Development of the Press], 51.
[13] Mielczarek, *Między Monopolem a Pluralizmem* [Between Monopoly and Pluralism], 15.
[14] Liana Giorgi, *The Post-Socialist Media: What Power the West?* (Aldershot, England: Avebury, 1995), 74.
[15] A national daily published between 1948 and 1990 in Warsaw; see *Nowa Encyklopedia Powszechna PWN* vol. 5 (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1997), s.v. "Trybuna Ludu."
[16] Around 1.5 million issues published in the mid-1970s; see *Nowa Encyklopedia Powszechna PWN,* vol. 5. (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1997), s.v. "Trybuna Ludu."

well as comment its politics. It was fully subordinated and completely uncritical of the Party, as well as one of its main propaganda outlets.[17] In 1953, after Stalin's death, a spontaneous movement of journalists and writers started the wave of liberalization of the press. A variety of new publications began to appear in the entire country. However, by 1957, the Party – dissatisfied with the situation – re-imposed its control by "systematically reducing the number of certain newspapers and periodicals, and limiting the circulation of others. […] Party officials [claimed] that in a socialist country there was no need for a wide range of publications, which only duplicated each other's work and contents since there were no opposing classes or ideologies."[18]

Karol Jakubowicz explains that in addition to the official press network, Poland had since at least 1956, a second, alternative network, connected to the Roman Catholic Church. According to Tomasz Mielczarek, only the Catholic press could be considered partially independent.[19] Jakubowicz adds that "other churches and denominations also had their own periodicals, though on nothing like the scale of the Catholic press."[20] Madeleine Korbel Albright calls *Tygodnik Powszechny*, hereafter TP "the flagship of an extensive Catholic press network, which had grown up alongside the official press, [and which] included about 50 different publications with a circulation of about 500 thousand."[21] However, most of the publications had a limited scope being only regional or diocesan publications, as oppose to TP, which scope was much broader as it was a national publication. Nevertheless, Jakubowicz states that these publications have always been a major forum for voices from outside of the

[17] *Nowa Encyklopedia Powszechna PWN*, vol. 5. (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1997), s.v. "Trybuna Ludu."
[18] Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works*, 93-95.
[19] Tomasz Mielczarek, *Między Monopolem a Pluralizmem* [Between Monopoly and Pluralism], 12.
[20] Karol Jakubowicz, "Musical Chairs? The Three Public Spheres of Poland," Media Culture and Society 12 (1990): 198.
[21] Madeleine Korbel Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*. (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1983), 86.

regime.[22] Furthermore, the extensive Catholic press network that Albright mentions was not homogeneous; it could be divided into four distinct categories. The first group included publications put out by the Church Episcopate itself, for which priest-editors took responsibility, for example, weeklies or monthlies such as the *Tygodnik Katolicki* (Catholic Weekly) of Poznan, or the *Gość Niedzielny* (Sunday Visitor) of Silesia. The second group included publications such as *Tygodnik Powszechny* and the monthly *Znak*[23] (Sign) edited by lay Catholics with an assistance of so-called 'church assistant', who acted as a personal link between the Church and the editorial board. The third group consisted of publications issued by Catholics associated with the pro-regime PAX[24] organization. These publications did not have the blessing of the Church authorities. The fourth group consisted of uncensored publications. These consisted of the pre-Gdansk period underground press that included papers put out by the young Catholics and which appeared without being censored.[25] TP played a crucial role in the pre-August 1980 period. "It had been a refuge to those whose views had diverged significantly from the party line. Often under the cover of pseudonyms, used because the writers had been blacklisted, contributors presented outspoken criticisms of regime policies,"[26] for which it earned the respect of Western observers.

Madeleine Korbel Albright in her book about *The Role of the Press in Political Change in Poland*, written during the early days of Solidarity and Martial Law, states that by 1980, the Polish people were tired of being constantly told that their standard of living was improving, what was the main tactic of Gierek's propaganda of success press policy.[27] According to

[22] Jakubowicz, "Musical Chairs? The Three Public Spheres of Poland," 198.
[23] An intellectual magazine published in Krakow, concentrating on social and cultural issues, associated with *Tygodnik Powszechny*.
[24] A pro-communist secular Catholic organization created in 1947.
[25] Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*, 86-87.
[26] Ibid., 87.
[27] Ibid., 8.

Albright, Gierek believed that media should serve as a handmaiden to the Party and journalists' role was to interpret the Party line according to strict instructions. In order to guarantee that media fulfills its proper role, "journalists [prior to 1980] were controlled indirectly by limiting their access to information and, directly, through a pervasive censorship system."[28] PZPR took interest in all aspects of the media by appointing one member of Politburo as a Central Committee secretary for propaganda and ideology, as well as another as head of the Central Committee Press Department. The supervising occurred through speeches on media policy, attending meeting with the Journalists' Association or issuing special instructions to the editors in chief. Very often journalists were simply instructed to emulate *Trybuna Ludu*. The government's methods of indirect control over the media were fairly simple. Journalists were denied information on particular issues by not being allowed to interview knowledgeable individuals. Otherwise, government officials would call the editor or used the censor's office to prevent publication based on a formal ruling. Direct control over media was exercised by the Main Administration for Control of Press, Publications, and Public Performances, which will be discussed further in this chapter. Albright concludes that "Gierek's press policy contributed to his downfall."[29]

Naturally enough, the official domestic media were not the only sources of information about Polish and foreign events for the Polish people. The existence of alternative sources of information, such as the well-functioning rumor network, well-received foreign broadcasts, and a growing underground press provided the population with materials that contradicted the official propaganda. Karol Jakubowicz mentions the underground press network, which

[28] Ibid., 11.
[29] Ibid., 16.

consisted of periodicals and books that were published in Poland since 1976.[30] This is when *Komited Obrony Robotników*, hereafter KOR[31] (The Committee for the Defense of Workers) "started sponsoring the publication of a range of periodicals, spreading ideas of dissent and reform."[32] He further states that between the introduction of Martial Law in December of 1981 and early 1989, "a total of 2077 titles of underground periodicals of various description were published;" they ranged "from national and regional periodicals with a circulation of up to 50-80,000, to those serving particular regions and towns, socio-occupational groups, industries and factories, colleges and even a large number of secondary schools."[33] Furthermore, Madeleine Albright states that "in 1977 Poles made almost 12.5 millions journeys abroad and of this number more than half a million journeys were made to capitalist countries", which allowed for a great deal of nonofficial information.[34] Also, "by 1979 the underground press could boast 38 bulletins and journals appearing outside state censorship with circulations ranging from a few hundred to several thousand copies."[35] Furthermore, people learned about the matters left unsaid by the domestic media from foreign radio mainly Radio Free Europe, BBC, Voice of America or from the foreign press. Underground publications were smuggled into the West and then Radio Free Europe used the information they contained during its broadcasts at the same time confirming the existence of such material. Other broadcasts also supplied additional facts, further undermining the credibility of the regime.[36]

[30] Jakubowicz, "Musical Chairs? The Three Public Spheres of Poland," 198.
[31] A Polish civil society group of intellectuals determined to help persecuted workers and their families, which emerged after the 1976 protests.
[32] Jakubowicz, "'Solidarity' and Media Reform in Poland," 338.
[33] Ibid., 338.
[34] Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*, 17.
[35] Ibid., 17.
[36] Ibid., 16-19.

The underground press "came into the open during the Solidarity period in 1980-1, in the form of about 1000 Solidarity periodicals."[37] TP gave a great deal of publicity to Solidarity activities, through which it made itself "the primary intellectual forefather of the Solidarity press."[38] However, after the founding of *Tygodnik Solidarność* (Solidarity Weekly) and as uncensored bulletins proliferated, TP lost its monopoly over opposition ideas, which allowed TP to look at other – social – issues. Nevertheless, this continued only until December 13, 1981, when General Wojciech Jaruzelski introduced Martial Law, having military taking over the control of the country, imposing curfew hour, de-legalizing Solidarity and imprisoning its members. The Union's weekly was then suspended until the final years of communism in Poland.

2.2 Censorship during the period of the People's Republic of Poland

Censorship functioned in the People's Republic of Poland primarily through the Main Office of Control of Press, Publications and Public Performances (Główny Urząd Kontroli Prasy, Publikacji i Widowisk – hereafter, GUKPPiW), called to existence with the decree of July 5, 1946. GUKPPiW was responsible for the detailed control and verification of all media nation-wide, including press, books, all theatre and arts, as well as Polish radio and television broadcasts.[39] GUKPPiW comprised of a central main office, in addition to a series of regional offices.[40] The decree establishing GUKPPiW did not really reflect the reality as censorship functioned in Poland already for nearly two years; it arrived with the Soviet Troops in 1944. The Polish Committee of National Liberation established a Department of Censorship formally recognized a year later to supplement military censorship. In 1946 a law was passed

[37] Jakubowicz, "Musical Chairs? The Three Public Spheres of Poland," 198-99.
[38] Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*, 88.
[39] John Michael Bates, "Censorship in Poland in the Twentieth Century," in *Censorship: A World Encyclopedia*, ed. Derek Jones, vol 3.(London & Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 2001), 1891-94.
[40] Giorgi, *The Post-Socialist Media*, 74.

establishing and regulating the Main Office of Control of the Press, Publications and Images.[41] It was established as part of the government structure and was subordinated to the Council of State until 1975 and thereafter directly to the Prime Minister's office. In reality it always answered to the Party through the Central Committee Press Department. Censorship with its irritating methods was used by PZPR "to suppress the politically inconvenient or otherwise unwanted newspapers and periodicals," especially after the liberalization of the press in 1956-57.[42]

An interview with one of the censors, conducted by Barbara Lopienska in November of 1980 and printed in the 8 May 1981 issue of *Tygodnik Solidarność*, gives an invaluable insight to the work of a censor, as well as the functioning and practices of censorship as an institution. K-62 (a code number of the censor interviewed by Lopienska) explains the principles on which the business worked. He states: "there [was] a chairman, two vice-chairmen and a couple of unit directors; press, books, performances, analysis, and training. There was a sundry printing unit too. In all the old voivodship capitals there [were] branches of the main office, with a similar structure. Work in branch offices [was] much easier [but] in Krakow work [was] complicated if not more so, because this is where *Tygodnik Powszechny* comes out."[43] He further explains that "there [was] a specialized group in the press unit that read religious publications, and its actions [were] the outcome of relations between the Office for Religious Denominations and the Episcopate. […] Another group would attend movie shows, theatres,

[41] Aleksander Pawlicki, *Kompletna Szarość. Cenzura w Latach 1965-1972. Instytucja i Ludzie.* [Complete Grayness: Censorship in the Years 1965-1972: The Institution and the People]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo TRIO, 2001), 30.
[42] Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works*, 95.
[43] K-62, "The Censor Speaks - 'I, the Censor,'" interviewed by Barbara N. Lopienska, *Tygodnik Solidarność* (Warsaw) 8 May 1981, in George Schöpflin, *Censorship and Political Communication in Eastern Europe: A Collection of Documents.* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1982), 105.

and cabarets."[44] K-62 describes the job of censors of posters as the easiest, the job of the censors of books as terribly dull and the press people as the most noteworthy group. He calls them the foundation of the business, the largest and the brightest unit, and the first line of fire. Furthermore, he provides a detailed explanation of the procedure of becoming a censor. "Anyone with a university education and the desire to work in this business" could become a censor.[45] "In the beginning one [went] through thorough training being information about things that others must not be informed about, [including] the broadest interpretation of our recent history. The training [took] about two weeks and [was organized] according to needs" and was based on practical exercises.[46] K-62 explains that the censors worked "on the basis of a very thick instruction book and generally stated but not fully detailed principles of censorship. Each week [they would have] a conference for the press censors on censorship editing in the coming week."[47] K-62 further explains that "the training and the analysis unit published an information bulletin about how a good censor should act in a given case. Instructions were given on examples. [Furthermore], everything was numbered; you could not take it out of the office."[48] Curry adds that these encrypted classified regulations specifying in detail what could not be published were "sent to the various censorship offices to be used by censors but not referred to in any discussion with media personnel."[49]

Albright also explains the highly centralized censorship network significant to the Gierek period. It was "divided vertically into bureaus specializing in various types of media and public productions, such as newspapers, periodicals, television, radio, books, theater, and

[44] Ibid., 105.
[45] Ibid., 102.
[46] Ibid., 107.
[47] Ibid., 110.
[48] Ibid., 105-106.
[49] Jane Leftwich Curry, "The Conundrums of Censorship: Poland in the 1940s and 1950s," in *Central and Eastern European Media under Dictatorial Rules and in the Early Cold War*, ed. Olaf Mertelsmann. (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2011), 151.

films. Within theses divisions, censors were responsible for specific subject, such as religion, economics, and science" and their responsibilities were rotated quite frequently in order to discourage prejudices and personal relationship, which could as a result lead to less rigorous control.[50] The organizational structure of GUKPPiW and its work was never discussed publicly. Fifty percent of censors' interventions were based on regulations; they operated within well-defined guidelines. Any criticism of the Soviet Union, Marxist-Leninist ideology, or party officials was censored. Also, general economic policy, social problems, or failures of the government's delivery of social services could not be criticized. Very specific directives were at times issued to instruct censors how to deal with Poland's foreign economic relations; problems of industry, agriculture, and public health; as well as the possibilities of emigration. Also, a list of authors and personalities of Polish origin who were forbidden to be mentioned was created, among which were Czesław Miłosz, Leszek Kołakowski[51], and Zbigniew Brzeziński[52].[53] The list editions of name removals and additions were heavily influenced by social and political circumstances. Magda Stroińska confirms that "some people or historical facts ceased to exist because any mention of them was banned from public discourse."[54] She adds that "in communist Poland, [the secret protocol of] the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement was as secret in the 1960s or 1970s as it was in 1939. Deportations of Poles to Siberia or Kazakhstan never happened […] And it was Nazi Germans who killed Polish officers and buried them in the mass graves in Katyń."[55] Historical names of people, cities, countries not

[50] Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*, 12
[51] A Polish philosopher and historian of ideas, best known for his critical analyses of Marxist thought.
[52] A Polish American political scientist, geostrategist, and statesman who serves as United States National Security Advisor to resident Jimmy Carter from 1977 to 1981.
[53] Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*, 12-13.
[54] Magda Stroińska, *A Life with Propaganda. Language and Totalitarian Regimes.* (Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, 2010), 88.
[55] Ibid., 17.

approved by the current ideology, could not be used in the official language of the People's Republic of Poland; these names could only be seen in historical research.[56]

Although censors followed precise regulations they were allowed a certain leeway in interpreting their instructions, which was to be based on past experiences and common sense. "A rule of thumb seems to be that the lower the circulation of a publication the more information it was allowed to contain."[57] This meant that high circulation sociopolitical weeklies were the most censored, one of them being TP. Over the years those who published learned the art of self-censorship, knowing what not to write or presenting certain information in a nonthreatening manner. This was much easier for those who had once worked as censors. Under Gomułka, it was a common belief that the profession of a censor is permanent; however, Gierek's intention was to have censors go into party journalism or editorial work after more or less five years at GUKPPiW.[58] This was a perfect tactic as a censor who becomes a journalist or an editor will know best what not to write or how to write about certain issues; therefore, at the same time such practice could save work for the GUKPPiW, as well as eliminate any room for mistakes of inexperienced or disloyal censors.

George Schöpflin in a book on *Censorship and Political Communication in Eastern Europe*, written in 1982 states that the Polish model of censorship is likely to be troublesome for the regime because it relies on having it policed by outsiders; therefore, the writers are set against the censors and this can result in constant argument and attempts by writers to break down the censors by persuasion.[59]

[56] Jadwiga Sambor, "Nowomowa – Język Naszych Czasów" [Newspeak – The Language of our Times] *Poradnik Językowy* [Language Guide], zeszyt 6 [notebook 6], (1985): 373.
[57] Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*, 13.
[58] Ibid., 13-15.
[59] George Schöpflin, *Censorship and Political Communication in Eastern Europe: A Collection of Documents.* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1982), 4.

Jane Curry admits that although "individual censors had little contact with individual journalists, those that were assigned to specific journals, did work with the editors. Journalists and editors could […] argue their cases. Censors often engages with editors in finding ways around the censorship or in rephrasing words."[60] However, according to K-62, a censor had no contact with the author of a text.[61] It is necessary to remember that Jane Curry refers to these censorship practices in the context of the whole institution, whereas K-62 in his interview describes these practices from the perspective of only one office where he worked.

An interesting aspect is the fact that a process in place for appealing censors' decisions did in fact exist; however, it involved going back to those who issued the regulations in the first place and no government official would actively get involved in an appeal of a case against a censor. It was not until the new law on censorship of 1981 that Solidarity actually won its first appeal against the censors on November 2, 1981.[62]

According to the *Black Book of Polish Censorship*, "the world of the Polish censors was not a simple one."[63] Journalists and editors had developed what can be referred to as a sixth sense of what could be written, as well as "an arsenal of maneuvers for getting their material published despite the censors."[64] The substantial Catholic media was "subject to special censorship regulations, and […] specially trained censors scrutinized with great care everything that was to be published,"[65] whereas, the media of the Party was accorded special treatment. "In fact, most of the journals and programs in Poland needed little outside censorship [as] their editors chose not to take risks and so avoided anything they thought might be censored."[66]

[60] Curry, "The Conundrums of Censorship," 151.
[61] K-62, "The Censor Speaks - 'I, the Censor,'" 109.
[62] Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*, 124.
[63] Curry, *The Black Book of Polish Censorship*, 25.
[64] Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*, 25.
[65] Curry, *The Black Book of Polish Censorship*, 31-32.
[66] Ibid., 33.

Therefore, censorship in Poland was inconsistent, some things may be publish in one journal and not another, for example journals that specialized were able to publish more than other in their area of specialization. According to a TP editor, the weekly was the only censored, independent paper in Poland. Other papers and editorial boards were ashamed when censors marked them. It was considered a sign that they were not working well or that the editorial board was not politically mature. TP was proudly the paper that had the greatest number of censorship marks.[67]

During the negotiations between Solidarity and the communist government, it was agreed that a new censorship law would be passed within three months of the signing of the Gdansk Agreement.[68] On July 31, 1981 the Polish Parliament passed a legislation that invalidated the 1946 decree yet it did not place a formal restriction on official interference. This meant that censorship was to be removed from the control of the government and the Party with the Censor's Office to be the sole agency responsible for censorship.[69] Furthermore, the new law provided 22 categories of publications, which were not subject to censorship. This included internal union bulletins and religious materials. Any interference would need to be marked in the body of the censored text, describing the section of the law that applied. Also, other significant restrictions were introduced, such as the amount of time a censor could hold up an article and more significantly the introduction of the legal provision for a detailed appeals process. The law came into effect only on October 1, 1981 and although the passage of the new law on censorship was considered a great success, it did not solve all the problems with the media, as both the authorities and the journalists struggled to understand its meaning and its extent. According to Albright, although this law affected the work of the institution responsible

[67] Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*, 87.
[68] Ibid., 51.
[69] Ibid., 123-124.

for censorship, many censors changed their behavior mainly as a result of not knowing of how to react to the new situation; therefore, they behaved simply as though restriction had been relaxed.[70]

These alternations, however, were repealed following the introduction of Martial Law until the Round Table discussions. After December of 1981, the government got complete control of the media and the Censor's Office, what marked the official end to the 16-month period of relaxation. Following the transition from communism to democracy nearly a decade later, in 1989, the new government passed a Law on the Liquidation of the RSW, which came into force on March 22, 1990, setting guidelines about privatization by liquidation, and on April 11, 1990 censorship was finally abolished, including the Main Office of Control, as well as its regional equivalents.[71]

2.3 Conclusion

During communism in Poland official media mainly fulfilled the role of an organ of political and ideological propaganda. Only the Catholic press was partially independent. In this context, *Tygodnik Powszechny* played an especially important role, as it provided the population with information contracting that found in the official press. Also, TP served as the basis for Solidarity press. The implementation of freedom of the press in a liberal sense was one of the main and basic ideas of the Solidarity movement, historically stemming from the constant struggle for freedom of expression.[72] Although in the 1980's more press freedom was achieved through the agreement between the opposition movement and the communist government, the freedom of expression was not guaranteed as a citizen's right, but seen as a

[70] Ibid., 47-49.
[71] Giorgi, *The Post-Socialist Media*, 74-75.
[72] Mielczarek, *Między Monopolem a Pluralizmem* [Between Monopoly and Pluralism], 23.

general gift from the socialist state, and therefore limited according to the discretion of the authorities.[73] Censorship existed in Poland since 1944 throughout the entire period of the People's Republic of Poland; it was abolished only one year after the democratic changes in Poland. The official press, dependent on the Party concern and fully subordinated to the Party, which was published during the period of the People's Republic of Poland ceased to exist after 1990. It was replaced with independent press, which was an outcome of the Polish Round Table Agreement between the communist government and the Solidarity movement in 1989.

[73] Ibid., 17.

3 Censorship and *Tygodnik Powszechny*

The aim of this chapter is to describe the socio-political role of TP and its relationship with the censorship authorities, and being a Catholic weekly, its relationship with the hierarchy of the Polish Roman Catholic Church, from the perspective of those who were part of the editorial staff and who published in TP during the period of the People's Republic of Poland. This chapter is based on conducted interviews with Marek Skwarnicki, Józefa Hennelowa, Fr. Adam Boniecki, Roman Graczyk, Witek Bereś, and Joanna Podsadecka. It outlines the procedures and instructions available to the editors of TP, and describes the process of negotiating between the editorial staff of TP and censorship with the publishing of each issue of the weekly.

Marek Swarnicki, a Polish poet, journalist, columnist, and a translator, born in 1930 in Grodno (now Belarus), worked and published in TP from 1958 until 1992. Between 1978 and 2000, Skwarnicki accompanied Pope John Paul II on five transcontinental (to Mexico, Philippines, Japan, Canada and Australia) and five European pilgrimages as TP reporter, accredited to the Vatican Press Office.

Józefa Hennelowa, a Polish journalist and a columnist, born in 1925 in Vilnius (now Lithuania), worked in TP from 1948, where she was an editor, as well as a deputy editor-in-chief until 2008. She is a member of the Club of Catholic Intellectuals (Klub Inteligencji Katolickiej) in Krakow and since 1963 a member of the Krakow branch of Association of Polish Journalists (Stowarzyszenie Dziennikarzy Polskich).

Fr. Adam Boniecki, born in 1934 in Warsaw, worked in TP from 1964, between 1999 and 2011 as the editor-in-chief. In 1979, he was asked by Pope John Paul II to edit the

Polish version of *L'Osservatore Romano*[1]. After his return to Poland in 1991 he became TP's 'church assistant' and following the death of Jerzy Turowicz in 1999 he became its editor-in-chief. In November of 2011 he was requested by his Provincial Superior not to appear or publish in the media with the exception of TP. The reasons behind this request are publicly unknown.

Roman Graczyk, a Polish journalist, born in 1958 in Krakow, worked as a journalist in TP from 1983 until 1991. He is a specialist in the history of the People's Republic of Poland, issues related to the Polish Roman Catholic Church, as well as lustration, currently working for the Institute of National Remembrance, Commission for the Prosecution of Crimes against the Polish Nation (Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, hereafter IPN). In 2011, he published a controversial book entitled *Cena Przetrwania? SB wobec Tygodnika Powszechnego*. [The Price of Survival? The Secret Police versus the Universal Weekly], which uses secret police files on the surveillance of TP, listing the most important names of editors, who according to the author were collaborating with the secret police during the period of the People's Republic of Poland. The book shows successful and unsuccessful recruiting of collaborators among the staff of TP by the secret police. It is a controversial publication and caused a countrywide debate even before being published; *Znak*, a publishing house associated with TP refused to publish this book.

Witek Bereś is a Polish film and television producer, scriptwriter and a journalist, born in 1960. From 1982 until 1989 he edited an underground publication entitled "Prominieści". The day after the first semi-free election in Poland in 1989 he 'officially' began working for TP after 'unofficially' working for TP prior to the democratic changes. He is an author of several books on the media in the People's Republic of Poland. Joanna Podsadecka, introduced by Witek Bereś during his interview, is Bereś' co-worker, an author

[1] A semi-official newspaper of the Holy See, covering Pope's public activities, publishing editorials by important clergymen and running official documents after being released.

and a co-author of several books on the press in the People's Republic of Poland, as well as the editorial staff of TP.

Three individuals who were also part of the editorial staff of TP during the period of the People's Republic of Poland are repeatedly mentioned in these interviews. They are: Jerzy Turowicz, editor-in-chief of TP from 1945 when TP was established, until his death in 1999, Mieczysław Pszon, member of the editorial staff of TP from 1960 until his death in 1995, one of the two editors responsible for contacts with censors, and Krzysztof Kozłowski, deputy editor-in-chief, a member of the editorial staff of TP from 1965 until 2008 and one of the two editors responsible for contacts with the censorship authorities, who due to health reasons was unable to give an interview.

3.1 TP's attitude towards censorship

TP was a publication – according to many – that was not at all edited, in the sense that materials or articles were not ordered based on a predetermined idea of the content of each issue. This was possible due to the fact that TP after several years in isolation gained a reputation of being a proper opposition paper, which meant that it took a strong stand against the norms dictated by the regime. As a result, the editorial office would receive many articles written by famous writers and journalists, who would refuse to publish in official publications. For this reason there were always many texts to choose from.[2]

TP had a very loose structure; there was the editor-in-chief: Jerzy Turowicz, deputy editor(s)-in-chief: Krzysztof Kozłowski and later also Józefa Hennelowa, and individual editors who voluntarily were in charge of certain sections. TP was considered politically semi-independent, rather than fully independent, because it was subjected to censorship.[3]

[2] Roman Graczyk, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.
(N.B.: All of the interviews included in this chapter were conducted in Polish and translated into English by the author.)
[3] Marek Skwarnicki, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 12, 2012.

As noted by Jane Curry, the Catholic media was subject to a more scrutinized censorship.[4] Describing TP's attitude towards censorship, Marek Skwarnicki recalls: "we assumed that when we cannot, we will not print the whole truth but we will never lie."[5] This was a characteristic that differentiated TP from other, especially official publications.

After 1980, TP was able to show censorship interferences in the text with three dots or dashes in square brackets: [...] or [---], while the official press was not allowed to show any interference. Among more independent publications, there was even a competition of how much interference each one had.[6] Fr. Adam Boniecki believes that the existence of an institution responsible for detailed control and verification of all media nationwide, including the press, provided the editorial staff of TP with some sort of freedom. He states: "we were very afraid of a situation when the Main Office of Control of Press, Publications and Public Performances or external censorship would not exist and there would be only internal censorship, where we would have to censor ourselves; this would have been scary. But they [the regime] never actually had the courage to do this. This short period when we could show censorship interferences was a period of extraordinary freedom."[7]

Everything during the period of the People's Republic of Poland was censored, including TP. According to Roman Graczyk, the difference was in the attitude of the editorial staff of each publication towards censorship. In the official press of the People's Republic of Poland there was a general attitude of allowing censorship to interfere since it was seen as an inseparable part of the system. Graczyk adds that during the 1980s, "self-censorship was almost non-existent at TP. Internal censorship was minimal. There were situations when the editor-in-chief or deputy editor-in-chief would say what will or will not pass [the censor], sometimes asking the author to hold on and try again in a few months. TP

[4] Jane Leftwich Curry, ed. & trans., *The Black Book of Polish Censorship.* (New York: Vintage Books, 1984), 31-32.
[5] Marek Skwarnicki, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 12, 2012.
[6] Józefa Hennelowa, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 15, 2012.
[7] Fr. Adam Boniecki, interviewed by author, Warsaw, Poland, March 16, 2012.

was not going to passively accept everything that the censorship office said or did." [8] However, as Graczyk emphasizes, it is important to remember that in the end there was a deadline and sometimes there was no other choice than to give in; therefore, the censor always had the last word.

3.2 Procedures

The procedures in place regarding the relations between TP and censorship on a daily and weekly basis are important and necessary to understand how this relationship functioned. There was a rule at TP that only selected editor(s) would negotiate with censorship. Krzysztof Kozłowski and Mieczysław Pszon were responsible for negotiating with censors. The purpose of this rule was to protect those who would be susceptible to pressures. The procedure was that it was the editorial office that fought for articles, never the authors on their own. Roman Graczyk adds that "when it comes to the censors themselves, I don't remember a situation where censors would try to contact the author bypassing either Pszon or Kozłowski; they respected the rule that only these two are to be contacted."[9]

Józefa Hennelowa, deputy editor-in-chief and the only person that worked in TP in the first period prior to its closure in 1953, recalls:

> During the first period we would provide the censorship office with copies of printed pages. The censor would then personally mark his or her corrections in red ink and would then bring these pages back to us. We then had to make these corrections in the text without showing any sign of censorship interference, making sure that it makes sense, even grammatically. It was then taken back to the censorship office to obtain the final approval. The first printed issues were taken to the censor on duty, on the top floor of the publishing house and only after it obtained an official stamp allowing it to be printed, would the printing process begin. It was very formalized. In the post 1956 years it was all done over the telephone. We would not have any documentation of censorship interference other than the final stamp. We would correct our texts ourselves based on what the censor said on the telephone. There

[8] Roman Graczyk, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.
[9] Ibid.

> were situations where there was a bigger problem with a text and then it would be sent to the main censorship office in Warsaw.[10]

Fr. Adam Boniecki describes: "the procedure on weekly basis was that a runner from TP would take the proofs to the censorship office, in Krakow obviously, and then either Pszon or Kozłowski would receive a telephone call from the censors who advised them what to cross out. They then would sit there with these proofs, crossing out things accordingly. Finally, they would call the censorship office back to negotiate."[11] As Marek Swarnicki recalls: "on one side of the telephone the censor was screaming; on the other side it was Kozłowski." He continues: "one time Turowicz received a note advising him to instruct Kozłowski to behave more decently in relation with censors."[12]

Roman Graczyk explains the legal and practical aspect of the functioning of censorship in the 1980s: "there were three censors appointed to work with TP. There were always two of them on duty during the week. If there was a more serious issue then we would negotiate even with the main censorship office in Warsaw."[13] According to Madeleine Korbel Albright, at least at GUKPPiW in Warsaw, censors were responsible for specific subjects and their responsibilities were rotated quite frequently in order to discourage the formation of personal relationships, which could lead to less control.[14] On the other hand, as in the case of TP, there were censors assigned to specific journals and worked directly with the editors. This demonstrates the difference in the structure and the division of labor between the main office in Warsaw and regional offices. Describing the procedures in place, Graczyk recalls that:

> Very often censors would advise us that they need to forward a certain text to their supervisors in Warsaw. They were afraid to make some decisions on their own. Party politics at the moment was what was most important in the decision process.

[10] Józefa Hennelowa, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 15, 2012.
[11] Fr. Adam Boniecki, interviewed by author, Warsaw, Poland, March 16, 2012.
[12] Marek Skwarnicki, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 12, 2012.
[13] Roman Graczyk, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.
[14] Madeleine Korbel Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*. (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1983), 12.

> Sometimes Kozłowski would negotiate with censors by referring to the most recent plenum of the Party and quote some statements arguing against their decisions. They would sometimes give in, as they were afraid that their action could be considered a political mistake, and therefore cost them their position. Sometimes Kozłowski was called to Warsaw to negotiate by the supervisors themselves.[15]

Roman Graczyk also mentions that "there was a formal appeal process, which allowed TP to appeal to the Main Office of Control of Press; however, this took time." Moreover, "there was even a formal appeal process to the Administrative Court." Graczyk recalls that TP took this road twice but these were exceptional situations.[16] As previously mentioned, Solidarity also won an appeal against the censors in 1981. Graczyk states that "it was considered by General Jaruzelski and the ruling elite at the time as one of those rights that should not be used." There was a reason for this, as "the law stated that court sentences are not subject to censorship and the disputed text was part of the justification of every sentence. There was one situation when we printed such a sentence. It was a way to have the text printed regardless of the fact that it was withdrawn and at the same time to show the mechanism of the decision process of both the court, as well as censorship. However, this was not regarded favorably by the regime."[17]

3.3 Instructions

Tomasz Strzyżewski, an employee of the Main Office of Control of Press, Publications and Public Performances from August 1975, copied in its entirety the Book of Records and Recommendations of GUKPPiW and collected copies of original censorship documents. In 1977, Tomasz fled to Sweden, and published his collection of copied documents (with ANEKS publishing house based in London) in a book entitled *The Black Book of Polish Censorship* (Czarna Księga Cenzury PRL), which went on to become an invaluable document in demonstrating the practices of the main censorship institution in

[15] Roman Graczyk, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Ibid.

communist Poland.[18] Although the entire book is an invaluable source when researching Polish censorship, there are no specific instructions relating directly to TP. However, it provides a comprehensive introduction, which explains the significance of the Book of Records and Recommendations of GUKP for censors, the importance of the documents copied and then published by ANEKS, as well as the role of Tomasz Strzyżewski within the structures of the main institution responsible for censorship in Poland. It also provides an extensive illustration of the Polish media and the mechanism of censorship, an important knowledge when writing about censorship in communist Poland. Commenting on these regulations Witek Bereś recalls: "[they] were very often idiotic, not at all understandable. For that reason censorship was unpredictable. You always had to live with the awareness that censorship can chop your text for no reason. Editors and journalists of TP did not have such a thing as a blueprint. It was the editor-in-chief and deputy editors-in-chief who played the most significant role in TP,"[19] which would indicate the presence of internal censorship. This statement also confirms the inconsistency of Polish censorship, what has been mentioned in the previous chapter, where some things might have been allowed to be published in one publication but not another, which can very well define censorship as unpredictable.[20] Roman Graczyk states:

> We were not trained how to write but there were people who knew how to do it and if it proved to work; we would use the same tactic or style. During the time when I was working at TP, Stefan Kisielewski[21] was known to be the best in avoiding censorship interferences. This required a specific talent and a specific biography, not everyone had such talent or biography. He was using historical and literary concepts but also was playing stupid and did not follow any rules. This worked to a certain extent. Also, one of the tactics was to write about the present as a historical event. Anniversaries proved to be perfect occasions to do this. Tadeusz Szyma used another tactic, which proved to be successful as well. While writing a text, he knew which parts of the text he considered most important. He would write an additional

[18] Tomasz Strzyżewski, *Matrix czy Prawda selektywna? Antycenzorskie Retrospekcje* [Matrix or Selective Truth? Anti-censored Flashbacks] (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Wektory, 2006), 7-12.
[19] Witek Bereś, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 14, 2012.
[20] Albright, *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*, 87.
[21] A feuilletonist in TP from 1945 until 1989, member of the Sejm (lower chamber of the Polish Parliament) form 1957 until 1965.

> few provoking sentences that he knew would be crossed out. In most cases it resulted in censorship crossing out these extra few provoking sentences but leaving the remainder of the text untouched.[22]

K-62 in his interview mentions Kisielewski as well, adding that sometimes he "would write a little note to the censor: 'How about letting it through this time, pussy cat?'"[23]

Józefa Hennelowa recalls: "we didn't have any written instructions. However, we can't pretend that there was no self-censorship."[24] Hennelowa confirms what Madeleine Korbel Albright previously mentioned: "one regulation that we were aware of was that you couldn't write anything critical about the Soviet Union, that there are facts that we can refer to as long as we don't name them. There was also a period when we could cite Miłosz but we couldn't write that it's Miłosz. There was also a regulation for names and for historical facts."[25] Furthermore, Joanna Podsadecka states that TP used allusions and metaphors to avoid censorship interference. One example is the issue immediately after the Warsaw Pact intervention of Czechoslovakia in 1968. For the first time in history the main first page column – *Obraz Tygodnia* (Review of the week) – edited by Krzysztof Kozłowski did not appear because censorship would take down any information regarding Czechoslovakia. The editors decided that they didn't want to print lies; therefore, if they couldn't print the most important information of the week, they would rather withdraw the entire column. The first page of the issue showed a picture of a tank on the offensive. The issue was printed on September 1, 1968, which was also the anniversary of Hitler's invasion of Poland, but those who knew what was happening at the moment in Czechoslovakia understood the allusion. According to Podsadecka, there was some sort of communication with the readers, counting on their intelligence to read between the lines.[26]

[22] Roman Graczyk, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.
[23] K-62, "The Censor Speaks - 'I, the Censor,'" interviewed by Barbara N. Lopienska, *Tygodnik Solidarność* (Warsaw) 8 May 1981, in George Schöpflin, *Censorship and Political Communication in Eastern Europe: A Collection of Documents.* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1982), 107.
[24] Józefa Hennelowa, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 15, 2012.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Joanna Podsadecka, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 14, 2012.

Marek Swarnicki explains that "there was a rule that if there is an article, especially historical, in which censorship crossed out the most significant parts, we would then withdraw the article." He also adds that "there was also the issue regarding the number of pages and copies. There was a protest of 34 intellectuals in 1964 against censorship and the reductions of paper supplies, which Turowicz also signed. We received a phone call immediately after advising us that from eight pages that we were allowed to print we now can only print six." Commenting on the work of the regional censorship office in Krakow, he further states: "sometimes our issues were sent to Warsaw to be censored. The censors in Krakow were afraid to censor TP as any mistake could result in termination of their employment, so sometimes they crossed out more than they should. However, they never suggested what we should print."[27] Fr. Adam Boniecki explains: "there was this constant harassment of TP. Our procedure was that if any correction would change the sense of the article, we would withdraw the entire article; if what remained changed the sense of the article, sometimes we would delete additional parts in order not to deform it. These censorship interferences were sometimes subtle."[28] TP was closed after it refused to print Stalin's obituary, which as Fr. Boniecki explains, "actually wasn't even an obituary but some sort of a praise that was to be printed on the first page. During this time censorship was interfering in such ways that one number was not even issued because it was so chopped."[29]

Marek Skwarnicki recalls TP's first resistance towards censorship interference, which was with the first homily of John Paul II in 1978. "We printed the homily in its entirety but censorship crossed out two sentences. We told them that we wouldn't cross

[27] Marek Skwarnicki, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 12, 2012.
[28] Fr. Adam Boniecki, interviewed by author, Warsaw, Poland, March 16, 2012.
[29] Ibid.

them out because it was impossible, it would be as if we were falsifying a Papal homily. Ultimately they agreed and we published it."[30]

Józefa Hennelowa also mentions "Stefan Kisielewski, [who] was able to write what he wanted and was able to pass his message between the lines, regardless of censorship." She then adds that:

> During the Gierek period an Information Bulletin (Biuletyn Informacyjny) began to appear for internal use. The information from the bulletin was considered legal and could be cited in TP. However, censorship could still interfere. Krzysztof Kozłowski, who edited *Obraz Tygodnia*, which consisted of information of the most important events from the previous week, was aware that regardless of the fact that each piece of information in the bulletin was legal it still could be censored either in its entirety or partly. It was interesting when the censor would call to advise that he or she was crossing out certain information that was taken by Kozłowski from the bulletin. Sometimes it was possible to negotiate based on that and such information could still appear.[31]

The new law on censorship of 1981, which allowed internal union bulletins and religious materials to indicate places where any changes were made in the body of the censored text and describing the section of the law that applied was problematic for both the regime, as well as for censorship. According to Roman Graczyk, "the regime would prefer if there were no rules whatsoever so that there was no possibility to appeal." He explains that "the new law did not mention how much interference was allowed in a text or on a page or in the entire issue. The ruling elite forced the official press not to show any interference, allowing only some independent publications to show them; TP was one of the most important ones. Finally, the regime came up with a limit of four interferences in one text; if there were more, the article would be withdrawn."[32] This demonstrates the supremacy of the regime over the editorial office of TP as in these cases TP would have to give in. As Graczyk explains, "in the end the final word was theirs. Another tactic used by the censors

[30] Marek Skwarnicki, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 12, 2012.
[31] Józefa Hennelowa, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 15, 2012.
[32] Roman Graczyk, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.

was to suspend an article, which meant that it was not withdrawn but it was not allowed to be printed either. This could last for weeks or even months."[33]

Roman Graczyk further explains that "the reason for this was to soften us, as the text is getting older and any responsible editor will negotiate, ultimately giving in to some changes. It was a great tactic from their perspective. I don't remember a situation where a suspended text would be printed in its original form; usually it always required a compromise of some sort. Very often they allowed a text to be printed but would request that no interference would be shown."[34] However, Graczyk adds that such situations were very rare as the aim behind suspending of articles was to pressure the editorial office and it was usually effective.

3.4 TP journalists compared

The editorial staff of TP considered their journalism to be significantly different from that of the official media. K-62 in his interview mentions that at the censorship office "there was a sort of admiration for the intelligent journalist who wrote his stuff and tried to be cleverer than [the censors]."[35] He defines TP journalists as good journalists. He adds that "good things were confiscated, not bad ones,"[36] and as previously stated TP had the greatest number of censorship interferences and articles that were suspended or withdrawn. According to Roman Graczyk there was in fact a difference between TP journalists and journalists of other publications. He states that:

> The editors and writers at TP did not consider themselves journalists, they considered themselves something more. This could be because journalists were generally not respected during the period of the People's Republic of Poland, they were considered to be close to the regime, especially by those in opposition. We considered ourselves something better and we had reasons for that. Another factor was that TP was an elite paper that employed doctors of philosophy or journalists

[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.
[35] K-62, "The Censor Speaks - 'I, the Censor,'" 107.
[36] Ibid., 107.

> with literary ambitions who had some sense of a mission and therefore resulted in the fact that they felt intellectually higher than regular journalists.[37]

Józefa Hennelowa agrees that they were indeed something completely different. She states: "I had the conviction that it was incredibly easy for us. When we were visiting different organizations abroad we felt very much appreciated. We also visited many places in Poland and always enjoyed special privileges due to the fact that people trusted us and wanted to host us."[38]

On the other hand, Joanna Podsadecka emphasizes that "journalists from TP were subjected to the same rules as other journalists."[39] Witek Bereś recalls that Jerzy Turowicz always referred to himself as a journalist.[40] Fr. Adam Boniecki states that TP journalists "belonged to the Association of Polish Journalists. They held press conferences." He adds that "journalists from TP had a sense of a mission; they were the best in the country. TP's singularity was an objective fact. It was the only publication of this sort between the Elbe and the Ural. It was at the expense of something. Several things were not available if you were an editor of TP. It was a conscious choice of engaging yourself in something more than just journalism."[41] The difference was in the perception of TP journalists and their work, seeing it as something more than just journalism in comparison with the perception of journalists and the definition of journalism under these specific circumstances.

3.5 The hierarchy of the Church and TP

TP was established by Cardinal Adam Sapieha immediately after World War II, and belonged to the Krakow Curia until it was given to the pro-regime PAX organization in 1953. After 1956, when it was given back to the original editorial team, TP was no longer a property of the Krakow Curia; instead the regime allowed TP to be a private enterprise.

[37] Roman Graczyk, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.
[38] Józefa Hennelowa, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 15, 2012.
[39] Joanna Podsadecka, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 14, 2012.
[40] Witek Bereś, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 14, 2012.
[41] Fr. Adam Boniecki, interviewed by author, Warsaw, Poland, March 16, 2012.

Regardless of the fact that after 1956 TP was a private enterprise, it was still indirectly representing the Church as an institution; therefore, it was subjected to the opinions and actions of the hierarchy of the Church. In regards to TP's relations with Church hierarchy, Marek Skwarnicki recalls: "the Church hierarchy either liked us or not. There were differences in opinions about TP. Several bishops would criticize us, Wojtyła would always support us."[42] At the beginning when the Krakow Curia was the publisher of TP, it meant that it was officially representing the Church. However, after 1956 when it was reestablished, it was a Catholic publication, yet not representative of the Church as an institution. Józefa Hennelowa explains: "in communist Poland, where the Party tried to seduce the clergy by creating such bodies as Patriot Priests[43], the Church in order to demonstrate its trust towards a publication, would provide them with an assistant. TP was the only publication, which had its own 'church assistant,' who was always a priest nominated by the bishop."[44]

Commenting on the relationship of TP with the hierarchy of the Polish Roman Catholic Church, Roman Graczyk states that:

> In the 1980s there was an overall consent between TP and the hierarchy of the Church. However, prior to 1978 and the election of Wojtyła to Papacy, for many years TP was seen as a problem for the Church and TP itself had a problem with the Church. This relates mainly to the different mentalities of Wyszyński and Turowicz. Wyszyński believed that the most important thing to do was to protect the Catholic faith of the Polish nation from atheist communism. Turowicz believed that the most important thing was for Catholicism in Poland to modernize following the provisions of the Second Vatican Council; he was more towards reforms within the Church. They also disagreed about resistance to communism. Wyszyński saw it as a primary concern and because there was communism, the Church couldn't introduce reforms. Turowicz said that reforms were necessary regardless of the fact that there was communism. At that time many bishops considered TP too progressive and therefore a little suspicious. Wojtyła took TP's side from the very beginning, when he became an auxiliary bishop of Krakow. He was more willing to

[42] Marek Skwarnicki, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 12, 2012.
[43] "Księża Patrioci", a term introduced by the authorities from the early period of the People's republic of Poland, refers to priests who opposed Church hierarchy and supported communism. In addition to blackmail, there were tangible rewards, such as much desired passports for travel to Rome. The Church allowed them to remain at their posts but they were ostracized by the faithful.
[44] Józefa Hennelowa, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 15, 2012.

> accept the right of the faithful to err in their search for the truth, understanding the differences between clergy and lay people.[45]

Witek Bereś emphasizes the significance of the friendship between Karol Wojtyła and TP prior to his election to Papacy. "He was a bishop, yet he would come and sit down with the editorial staff as an equal; he listened more than he spoke. TP always had Wojtyła's support, it always had a problem with Cardinal Wyszyński." Nevertheless, Bereś states that "the Church supported TP and TP supported the Church."[46] Fr. Adam Boniecki confirms that "Cardinal Wyszyński had a somewhat a critical attitude." He adds that "Wyszyński once wrote a public letter criticizing TP for not participating in the work of the Episcopate yet he concluded by saying: 'but I assure you that I respect you much more than this letter may indicate'. There were bishops who expected a more religious paper, but TP never wanted to be strictly a religious paper, a Catholic one but not a Church [devotional] paper, so there was some sort of resentment towards TP."[47]

According to Józefa Hennelowa "Wyszyński did not consider TP very useful and he felt that TP did not appreciate certain things enough, which demonstrated some form of dissidence. On the other hand, Cardinal Wojtyła believed that there were issues, which could and should be discussed. It was priceless that we had such an opportunity that we could go to Wojtyła with any issue. A few times a year the entire editorial team would sit with him and talk about everything."[48]

There was undoubtedly a distinction in the attitude of the hierarchy of the Church towards TP; nevertheless, although the hierarchy sometimes saw TP as disobedient or disappointing, it would still be respected and supported by the Church as an institution. This could also be the result of the personal relationship between Wyszyński and Wojtyła, which was very hierarchic but at the same time mutually loyal and respectful.

[45] Roman Graczyk, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.
[46] Witek Bereś, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 14, 2012.
[47] Fr. Adam Boniecki, interviewed by author, Warsaw, Poland, March 16, 2012.
[48] Józefa Hennelowa, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 15, 2012.

3.6 TP as an opposition paper

As previously mentioned, TP was considered, during the time of the People's Republic of Poland, the only magazine, which to some extent (determined by censorship) could contain views critical of the communist authorities. It is considered the only legal opposition paper during the communist period. Roman Graczyk disagrees as he states that if we take 1945 as the starting point, he believes "*Tygodnik Warszawski*, hereafter TW (Warsaw Weekly) could be considered more as an opposition paper. Because of this, it was closed down in 1948, its editorial staff was imprisoned, and one – Fr. Kaczyński – did not survive. In comparison to TW, TP was much more cautious."[49] It can be seen as a merit; however, it is necessary to emphasize that TP was not the only opposition. According to Graczyk, "TP claims that it was hard opposition;" he disagrees because of the fact that "it would be simply impossible for hard opposition to survive under a communist regime, which had all instruments in hand." Nevertheless, according to Graczyk, "such a long experiment was possible due to TP's ability to avoid an open conflict with the regime. When it was impossible to avoid it, the regime eventually closed it down, but it happened many years after TW." Roman Graczyk states that:

> After 1956, TP was pretty much flirting with the regime by nominally recognizing the regime. It was sort of a compromise. Only after 1976, did TP take a position of an open opposition. That was a very specific period as the regime was weakening and then there was the Polish Pope, which was a significant inconvenience for the communists. Then there was Solidarity, which proved to be an even bigger problem. In comparison to the official media, TP was distinct. A significant difference could be observed comparing the content of any official newspaper and TP between 1956 and 1976. From this perspective it can be perhaps argued that such compromise was worth it.[50]

Fr. Adam Boniecki clearly states that the difference between TP and TW was that TW decided to be politically engaged. "They attacked the system directly and they finished in prison. TP decided to concentrate on culture; religion and political affairs were to be

[49] Roman Graczyk, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.
[50] Ibid.

treated marginally and TP was not to engage in a direct conflict with the regime. He adds that "for the ruling elites, it was rather irritating that there was this Catholic paper [TP] that all sorts of people were reading. For the regime it would have been safer if TP was just a devotional paper. But it survived by some miracle; it was definitely because of TP's ability to compromise."[51] Józefa Hennelowa simply states that for her "TP was incredibly authentic and it was performing really well under these strange circumstances."[52]

Roman Graczyk believes that the 1980s were the best years for TP because of the fact that it clearly defined itself as opposition by providing a great deal of publicity to Solidarity activities. It was suspended during Martial Law but it was considered a triumph when it was allowed to be published again (May of 1982). It positioned itself against the regime right away. Every issue until the end of Martial Law in Poland (July 1983) began with a message counting the number of weeks since the beginning of Martial Law. Graczyk refers to the estimates made at the time that about 10 people were reading each copy of TP, whereas only 1.5 persons read any official paper, which shows the scope and the strength of TP in society in comparison to official press.[53]

Witek Bereś adds that "after 1980 and the emergence of Solidarity and then the introduction of Martial Law in 1981, anyone regardless of their political or religious affiliation could publish in TP. This was not the case prior to 1980."[54] Joanna Podsadecka recalls that "TP was considered an unofficial organ of the opposition after 1980,"[55] unofficial as this information was not officially stated, as it was in the case of *Trybuna Ludu*, which stated on the first page of every issue that it was an organ of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party. She adds that:

[51] Fr. Adam Boniecki, interviewed by author, Warsaw, Poland, March 16, 2012.
[52] Józefa Hennelowa, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 15, 2012.
[53] Roman Graczyk, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.
[54] Witek Bereś, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 14, 2012.
[55] Joanna Podsadecka, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 14, 2012.

> Even prior to 1980 TP would engage in issues that other papers would not engage in. It was TP that defended Jews in 1968 when there was the anti-Zionist campaign in Poland. Turowicz [editor-in-chief of TP from 1945 until his death in 1999] published a review of Władysław Bartoszewski's book about the history of Poles who helped Jews during the Nazi occupation[56]. Also, they would engage in the Polish-German reconciliation, it was their initiative; it was them who tried to reconcile historical differences.[57]

Witek Bereś concludes by saying that "prior to 1989 TP could not publish much about politics, it could only publish hidden messages in order to avoid censorship interference. After 1989 it became more political mainly because it was possible to write openly about politics. Prior to 1989 you had to write about culture to write something about politics, whereas now you don't have to do that, you simply write either about culture or about politics."[58]

3.7 John Paul II and TP

In all of the countries under the Soviet sphere of influence, the Church conceded the State's right to approve selection of high Church officials, and as for its part, the government promised not to interfere with the institution's work.[59] Also in Poland the ruling elite interfered in Church politics and although it is the Pope who nominates bishops, each candidature was subject to the approval of the regime. It was a constant process of negotiating. In 1958, the regime agreed to Wojtyła's appointment as bishop, assuming he would be a conciliatory bishop, who would not be opposing the regime like Wyszyński, with whom the regime had a problem.

The election of Karol Wojtyła to Papacy on the October 16, 1978 was a great surprise for everyone, for the regime who agreed to Wojtyła's appointment as bishop, but also for TP with whom Wojtyła had a very close relationship as he was an archbishop of

[56] Władysław Bartoszewski and Zofia Lewinówna, *Ten Jest z Ojczyzny Mojej: Polacy z Pomocą Żydom 1939-1945* [He is From my Fatherland: Poles Helping Jews 1939-1945] (Krakow: Znak, 1969).
[57] Joanna Podsadecka, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 14, 2012.
[58] Witek Bereś, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 14, 2012.
[59] Patrick Michel, *Politics and Religion in Eastern Europe* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), 36.

Krakow and worked closely with TP. Furthermore, he had a personal relationship with the weekly as he debuted as a poet and a writer in TP in 1949. As previously mentioned, Wojtyła was the main support for TP in its relationship with the hierarchy of the Church. The election of John Paul II changed the position of TP vis-à-vis the regime and it was definitely a problem for the ruling elite. Roman Graczyk states that

> The editorial staff of TP definitely felt safer after the election of John Paul II. There are several documents that show that the regime considered Wojtyła very dangerous and having Wyszyński sick and about to die, they were afraid Wojtyła could become the head of the Polish Church. Therefore, they engaged in surveillance practices, which were to decrease Wojtyła's chances to succeed Wyszyński. The regime originally considered Wojtyła to be more understanding when they agreed to his appointment as bishop in 1958. This changed over the years. In 1978, when Wojtyła became Pope they saw it as the worse possible thing that could have happened. The regime had a problem whereas TP on the contrary. They felt safer and had more courage and determination than ever before. Prior to the election of John Paul II, TP had 40 thousand copies. The first issue after the election [October 22, 1978] appeared with a circulation of 100 thousand copies; it then was reduced again to 40 thousand. It was a symbolic victory but it demonstrated how the regime took a step back.[60]

Fr. Adam Boniecki states that TP felt obliged to stand by the Pope. "The first issues after the election are full of Papal speeches. It was a constant probing about how far we can go. The system and the ruling elite undoubtedly saw it as a problem because of the international resonance, which was very effective in the case of TP because of Turowicz, who was known in world media and the possibility that they could hit here and it would be heard down there was scary."[61] This includes the Pope's ability to internationalize any issue violating human rights or basic freedoms of the oppressed societies from behind the Iron Curtain. Also, broadcasters such as Radio Free Europe, BBC or Voice of America would not hesitate to publicize any action taken by the regime against TP, the Church or the opposition (Solidarity). Józefa Hennelowa adds:

> We were extremely proud when John Paul II was elected, whereas the regime had a big problem. I think that only after the Pope's first pilgrimage to Poland in 1979 did they calm down because they saw that the Pope was able to manage [the people]

[60] Roman Graczyk, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.
[61] Fr. Adam Boniecki, interviewed by author, Warsaw, Poland, March 16, 2012.

> very well, without creating any aggressive impulses. However, directly after the election I heard that they immediately brought those who agreed to Wojtyła's appointment as bishop in 1958 and blamed them for this decision. They originally thought that he would be a conciliatory bishop, who would not be opposing the regime like Wyszyński, and yet they've suggested someone who would now talk about Poland on an international stage and who would interfere in its politics.[62]

This assumption proved to be the accurate as according to the biography of the John Paul II by George Weigel[63], it is believed that the Pope contributed greatly to the collapse of communism.

3.8 Conclusion

The above sections provided a comprehensive description of the relationship of the editorial staff of TP with censorship, including TP's attitude towards censorship, the procedures in place in the relations between TP and the censorship authorities on a daily and weekly basis, as well as instructions or linguistic tactics used by editors to avoid censorship interference. The above sections also describe the socio-political role of TP in communist Poland from the perspective of those who were once part of the editorial staff of TP. The peculiarity of TP, being a Catholic weekly concentrating on social and cultural rather than strictly religious issues, and being a private enterprise after 1956 as opposed to being under the Church's ownership (as it had been until 1953) made it also necessary to comment on the relationship of TP with the hierarchy of the Polish Roman Catholic Church.

TP took a strong position against the regime, especially in the 1980s when it became an unofficial organ of the opposition by supporting the newly founded Solidarity movement. It also demonstrated its resistance towards censorship interference through engaging in negotiations with the censorship office and not just passively accepting censorship interference. After the new law on censorship was introduced following the August 1980 strikes, TP exercised its right to appeal certain decisions of the censorship office by taking

[62] Józefa Hennelowa, interviewed by author, Krakow, Poland, March 15, 2012.
[63] George Weigel, *Witness to Hope: The Biography of John Paul II* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1999).

the legal path. Nevertheless, it is necessary to emphasize that TP was published under very specific political circumstances; therefore, the editorial office had to adhere to certain rules and in many situations lost the battle for expressing its views and ideas, very often in accordance with the general mood of the society but in clear violation of communist ideals.

Regardless of the negative connotation of the term 'journalist' during the period of People's Republic of Poland, members of the editorial staff of TP would nevertheless refer to themselves as journalists, sometimes defining themselves as Catholic journalists in order to distinguish themselves from journalists of official publications, and therefore categorizing themselves as opposition journalists. They were considered as such by the State and were subjected to the same rules as journalists of other publications. As mentioned in one of the above sections, they considered themselves something more, intellectually higher, which resulted in the fact that the editorial staff was composed of a variety of personalities, with a variety of specialties and ambitions. This is also how the editors hoped readers would perceive them, which resulted in the overall respect for TP, what reflected also in the quality of the texts.

TP was a religious paper until 1953 and was owned by Krakow Curia; therefore, it was representing the Church as an institution. In 1956, it returned to its original editorial staff. It can be categorized as an opposition paper because of the fact that it would resist suggestions or norms centrally imposed onto it by the regime, as opposed to official press, which would passively accept them. However, as stated by Roman Graczyk, in comparison to other publications, which suffered more drastic consequences as a result of its resistance, TP's characteristic as an opposition paper may be debatable. TP was definitely a proper opposition paper after 1976, as it took a strong stand against the regime. The majority of the editorial staff considers TP as an opposition paper throughout the entire period of the People's Republic of Poland and it was treated as such also by the regime. Furthermore, it

was also seen as such by other institutions abroad, which considered TP as something *sui generis* in the Soviet sphere of influence.

During the period of the People's Republic of Poland the two main representatives of the Polish Church were Stefan Wyszyński, the head (Primate) of the Polish Church and Karol Wojtyła, the later Pope John Paul II, who prior to his election to Papacy in 1978 was the archbishop of Krakow, the diocese in which TP was published. A significant difference in the relationship of the editorial staff with the hierarchy of the Polish Roman Catholic Church is visible in the recollection of the former members of the editorial staff of TP. Furthermore, a distinction among the hierarchy of the Church itself, especially between the two most significant representatives of the Polish Roman Catholic Church, Stefan Wyszyński and Karol Wojtyła can be observed. Wojtyła, as a result of his personal relationship with TP and its editor-in-chief for over 50 years, Jerzy Turowicz was a constant support for TP in relations with the hierarchic Wyszyński. These relationships, as described above, illustrate the complexity of the situation of the Church in the People's Republic of Poland, as well as within the Church itself. They also illustrate the complex circumstances under which TP was published. The election of Karol Wojtyła to Papacy in 1978 gave TP international significance, which allowed it to ground its position vis-à-vis the regime and serve as an unofficial organ for the opposition. Regardless of the numerous strikes of the regime against TP following the 1980 agreements, it continued to be published until the end of communism in Poland and reformed it is still being published, having a meaningful influence in the society until today.

Conclusion

Poland definitely stands out in the studies of communist history of East and Central Europe, mainly as a result of the socio-political role of the Polish Roman Catholic Church under communism. The Church played a significant role in the fight for independence and national survival during the period of the People's Republic of Poland between 1945(48) and 1989. Furthermore, during communism in Poland, the Church developed a unique social and political position and acted as a center for the exchange of opinions for all intellectuals by focusing on social and cultural rather than strictly religious issues. The Polish Roman Catholic Church was the only institution that was fully independent of the State. However, the Catholic press was only partially independent from the regime. Regardless of its ideological autonomy, the Catholic press was still subjected to State censorship. *Tygodnik Powszechny*, the flagship of the Catholic press network, is considered the only legal opposition paper in communist Poland. Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński, the head of the Polish Roman Catholic Church, played an important role in the fight with the communist regime; moreover, the election of a Polish Pope had a great significance and a great influence on the later events that led to the democratic changes in 1989. Therefore, the socio-political role of the Polish Roman Catholic Church is an inseparable part of the history of the People's Republic of Poland.

The development of free mass media has been going on for just 20 years as Poland is considered to be a free and democratic country only since the fall of communism in 1989. The mass media in communist Poland was the most diverse in the Soviet bloc. Although media in postwar Poland mainly fulfilled the role of an organ of political and ideological propaganda, Poland had an alternative press network, which included Catholic press, as well as an underground press network. Both provided the population with information that

contradicted State propaganda found in the official press and therefore influenced the public opinion in opposition to the regime. TP, as a result of its strength, which resulted from the association with the Roman Catholic Church and therefore the opposition, had a significant influence among the population during communism.

Censorship functioned in the People's Republic of Poland primarily through the Main Office of Control of Press, Publications and Shows (Główny Urząd Kontroli Prasy, Publikacji i Widowisk – hereafter GUKPPiW), created with the decree of July 5, 1946. In addition to the main office located in Warsaw, a series of regional offices existed in each voivodship capital. GUKPPiW was responsible for controlling all media, including the press, books, theatre and arts, as well as radio and television broadcasts. High circulation socio-political weeklies – one of them being TP – were the most censored. Furthermore, the Catholic press was subject to more scrutinized censorship. Following the agreement between Solidarity and the communist leadership, the new law on censorship allowed unofficial publications independent of the Party concern to mark censorship interferences with three dots or dashes in square brackets: [...] or [---]. Also during this period, a formal appeal process to GUKPPiW, as well as a formal appeal process to the Administrative Court would be in place. However, although the legal framework existed in theory, in practice taking this path was not regarded favorably by the regime and sometimes could result in repercussions for the editorial office. Also, a list of authors who would be forbidden to publish or be published was created. This list was subsequently modified several times. The list editions of name removals and additions were heavily influenced by social and political circumstances.

Everything during the period of the People's Republic of Poland was censored; however, the existence of GUKPPiW provided the editorial staff of TP with some sort of freedom as lack of an official institution responsible for censorship would instate stronger

internal censorship. TP took a strong position against censorship by not passively accepting all of the interferences of the censorship office but instead engaging in negotiations. Nevertheless, publishing under these specific political circumstances meant that the editorial office would have to adhere to certain rules and in many cases would have to give in to the instructions imposed onto them by the regime. Regardless of the negotiation tactics and the arguments used, the censors and therefore the regime would always have the last word.

The procedures in place regarding the relations between TP and censorship on daily and weekly basis differed in different periods. In the first period of publishing between 1945 and 1953, the editorial office would provide censorship with actual copies of printed pages, on which the censor would mark his or her interferences. During this period, the editorial staff would have an actual documentation of censorship interference. TP was closed down by the communist regime in 1953 and it was given to the pro-regime PAX organization. After 1956, when the publication returned to the original editorial staff, all censorship interferences were done over the telephone, with no written documentation of censorship interference. The editors themselves based on the instructions given to them over the telephone marked them in the texts. In order to protect individual editors who would otherwise be susceptible to pressures, TP selected two editors who would be responsible for contacts with the censorship office either in Krakow or the main office in Warsaw.

Censors had written instructions, which were printed in *The Black Book of Polish Censorship* and later published in exile in 1977. It revealed the practices of the main institution responsible for censorship in communist Poland. Censors would also receive additional instructions on daily basis. The instructions issued by GUKPPiW were not available to anyone outside of the institution; the editorial office of TP would not provide its editors with any written instructions. There were regulations that were publicly known;

otherwise, editors would use common sense based mainly of previous experiences. Furthermore, the editors would use linguistic tactics, such as allusions or metaphors to write about issues that were in violation of communist ideals, expecting the readers to read between the lines.

Censorship and state-control were abolished after the fall of communism in 1989 and an independent, free system of media was gradually established. Polish press is currently completely independent from the government and there are no state-owned newspapers or magazines. The only non-private media in Poland is public television (TVP1 and TVP2) and a set of public radio stations.

The interviews conducted for the purpose of this research project supplement what has already been written about censorship practices in the People's Republic of Poland. The most unique characteristic of this research project is the contrast between the primary and the secondary sources. The theoretical framework chapter of this thesis provided a detailed description of print media, as well as the structure and functioning of censorship in People's Poland, based on the existing literature, published during the period of the People's Republic of Poland, as well as after the transition of 1989. On the other hand, the empirical chapter provided a detailed description of the circumstances under which TP was published, from the perspective of the editorial staff of an unofficial or partially independent Catholic publication. These interviews show the attitude of the editorial staff of TP towards censorship in contrast to the attitude of official publications, as well as TP's attitude towards the hierarchy of the Polish Roman Catholic Church. Also, they describe the procedures in place regarding the relationship between the editorial office and the censorship authorities. Moreover, they provide a detailed description of the weekly within the structures of the Polish media in the People's Republic of Poland, emphasizing its peculiarity, as well as its strength in the society.

TP's resistance against the norms imposed onto it by the censorship office through engaging in negotiations instead of passively accepting all of censorship interferences, and at the same time its ability to compromise (when necessary and unavoidable) allowed it to survive as an opposition paper in the People's Republic of Poland. Moreover, TP was able to publish contents critical of communist ideals also by a specific style of writing, which was possible as a result of the unspoken communication that existed between the editors and the readers to read between the lines. Furthermore, TP was not dependent of the Party concern, what allowed it to mark censorship interferences in the texts after the new law on censorship was passed in 1981. This placed TP in clear opposition to the regime and therefore increased its influence in the society. Also, as a Catholic weekly, it was associated with the Polish Roman Catholic Church, which was the only institution fully independent of the State. TP's position got even stronger after the election of the Polish Pope, who was directly associated with TP as a result of his personal relationship with the weekly. It continued to be published until the end of communism in Poland, surviving the numerous strikes of the regime against TP. Reformed, it is still being published, having a significant influence in the society until today.

This project contributes to the strengthening, widening and deepening of the research of censorship practices in Poland and can contribute to the study of censorship practices in other Central European countries under the Soviet sphere of influence (GDR, Czechoslovakia and Hungary), as well as the Soviet Union itself. This research project could also be used in a comparative study of censorship practices in other regions subjected to communist ideology in Europe (Yugoslavia, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania), and the world (China, North Korea, Cuba).

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Bereś, Witek. Interviewed by the author. Krakow, Poland, March 14, 2012.

Boniecki, Adam Fr. Interviewed by the author. Warsaw, Poland, March 16, 2012.

Graczyk, Roman. Interviewed by the author. Krakow, Poland, March 13, 2012.

Hennelowa, Józefa. Interviewed by the author. Krakow, Poland, March 15, 2012.

Podsadecka, Joanna. Interviewed by the author. Krakow, Poland, March 14, 2012.

Skwarnicki, Marek. Interviewed by the author. Krakow, Poland, March 12, 2012.

Secondary Sources:

Albright Korbel, Madeleine. *Poland: The Role of the Press in Political Change*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1983.

Bates, John Michael. "Censorship in Poland in the Twentieth Century." In *Censorship: A World Encyclopedia*, ed. Derek Jones, vol 3. London & Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 2001.

Brier, Robert. "The Roots of the 'Fourth Republic': Solidarity's Cultural Legacy to Polish Politics." In *East European Politics and Societies.* Warsaw: German Historical Institute, 2009.

Buzek, Antony. *How the Communist Press Works.* London and Dunmow: Pall Mall Press, 1964.

Churchill, Winston. "The Iron Curtain." In *Essays in Context*. Eds. Sandra Fehl Tropp and Ann Pierson D'Angelo. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Curry, Jane Lefthwich, trans. & edit. *The Black Book of Polish Censorship*. New York: Vintage Books, 1984.

Curry, Jane Leftwich. "The Conundrums of Censorship: Poland in the 1940s and 1950s." In *Central and Eastern European Media under Dictatorial Rules and in the Early Cold War*, ed. Olaf Mertelsmann, 139-154. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2011.

Davies, Norman. *God's Playground: A History of Poland*, vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Dziki, Sylwester. “Prasa w Rozwoju Historycznym” [Historical Development of the Press]. In *Dziennikarstwo i Świat Mediów* [Journalism and the World of Media]. Eds. Zbigniew Bauer & Edward Chudziński. Krakow: Universitas, 2000.

Giogri, Liana. *The Post-Socialist Media: What Power the West?* Aldershot, England: Avebury, 1995.

Goban-Klas, Tomasz. *The Orchestration of the Media: The Politics of Mass Communications in Communist Poland and the Aftermath.* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1994.

Inglis, Tom, Zdzisław Mach, and Rafał Mazanek. *Religion and Politics: East-West Contrasts from Contemporary Europe.* Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2000.

Jakubowicz, Karol. “Musical Chairs? The Three Public Spheres of Poland.” *Media Culture and Society* 12 (1990): 195-212.

Jakubowicz, Karol. “’Solidarity’ and Media Reform in Poland.” *European Journal of Communication* 5 (1990): 331-51.

K-62, "The Censor Speaks - 'I, the Censor,'" interview by Barbara N. Lopienska, *Tygodnik Solidarność* (Warsaw) 8 May 1981, in George Schöpflin, *Censorship and Political Communication in Eastern Europe: A Collection of Documents.* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1982), 102-112.

Michel, Patrick. *Politics and Religion in Eastern Europe.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

Mielczarek, Tomasz. *Między Monopolem a Pluralizmem*. [Between Monopoly and Pluralism]. Kielce: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej im. Jana Kochanowskiego, 1998.

Pawlicki, Aleksander. *Kompletna Szarość. Cenzura w Latach 1965-1972. Instytucja i Ludzie*. [Complete Grayness: Censorship in the Years 1965-1972: The Institution and the People]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo TRIO, 2001.

Pelczyński, Zbigniew. “Solidarity and the Rebirth of Civil Society in Poland 1976-81.” In *Civil Society and the State*. Ed. John Keane. London and New York: Verso, 1988.

Pope John Paul II. “Pope John Paul II Speaks in Victory Square, Warsaw.” In *From Stalinism to Pluralism. A Documentary History of Eastern Europe since 1945,* ed. Gale Stokes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Porter, Brian. “The Catholic Nation: Religion, Identity, and the Narratives of Polish History.” In *Slavic and East European Journal* 45:2 (2001): 289. In Robert Brier. “The Roots of the ’Fourth Republic’: Solidarity’s Cultural Legacy to Polish Politics,” in *East European Politics and Societies.* Warsaw: German Historical Institute, 2009.

Rosenthal, Gabriele. „Biographical Research." In Qualitative Research Practice, eds. Clive Seale, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber Gubrium and David Silverman. London: SAGE Publications, 2004.

Sambor, Jadwiga. (1985). Nowomowa – Język Naszych Czasów [Newspeak – The Language of our Times]. *Poradnik Językowy* [Language Guide], zeszyt 6 [notebook 6], (1985): 365-377.

Schöpflin, George. *Censorship and Political Communication in Eastern Europe: A Collection of Documents.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1982.

Stokes, Gale. "Poland in the Late 1970s." In *From Stalinism to Pluralism. A Documentary History of Eastern Europe since 1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Stroińska, Magda. *A Life with Propaganda. Language and Totalitarian Regimes*. Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, 2010.

Strzyżewski, Tomasz. *Matrix czy Prawda Selektywna? Antycenzorskie Retrospekcje* [Matrix or Selective Truth? Anti-censored Flashbacks]. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Wektory, 2006.