

Planning session on Poland's future

by Luba George

When labor unrest in Poland first began to disrupt growing political and economic cooperation between Western Europe and the Soviet Union, *EIR* researchers and intelligence analysts, proceeding on a "who benefits" basis, reported that the problems in Poland were the outcome of a specific project launched by the British-dominated apparatus of NATO intelligence to create precisely those problems (*EIR*, Sept. 9, 1980). Now, as Poland's internal crisis continues to pose a grave threat to international relations, proof of the *EIR* analysis has been provided first hand, by a score of intelligence operatives actively involved in the Polish events who held two recent little-publicized meetings at Columbia University in New York City.

Called "roundtable seminars," sponsored by the Institute for East Central Europe within Columbia's School of International Affairs, one Sept. 10 gathering of intelligence operatives was entitled "The Strikes in Poland: An Assessment," and featured old hands in the Eastern European networks operated by Sussex, England's Tavistock Institute, a psychological warfare division.

The strategic perspective guiding such intelligence deployments, as it emerged from the meeting on Poland, featured the following:

- The strikes in Poland were an element of a decade-old project of, in particular, the British intelligence services, to halt the industrial development of Eastern Europe, thereby forcing the Soviet bloc into "convergence" with the deindustrialization that Anglo-American policymakers have increasingly imposed on the West.

- The "dissident" networks responsible for the Gdansk-centered strike activity that succeeded in toppling industrialization proponent Edward Gierek were controlled directly, on an hour-to-hour basis, by a set of intelligence institutions clustered around Tavistock, featuring the "Arts Council of Great Britain," "Freedom House" in New York, and Trinity College, Oxford.

- The demands of the strikers were formulated outside Poland, and inserted into the deliberations of the strikers by on-the-ground "dissident" agents in commu-

nication with NATO economic warfare specialists. The "consumerist" demands were designed to impose "from the inside" the same severe cutbacks in capital formation that Poland's leading British and American creditors have attempted to impose from the outside since 1974.

- Acceptance of such demands by duped Polish workmen was ensured by a corps of sociologists and psychologists, trained in Britain or closely associated with relevant, Tavistock-centered institutions, operating in Polish factories during the strike period.

- The option now exists to impose demands on Polish workers that would amount to the abolition of socialism, thus provoking Soviet intervention, if British "geopolitical" considerations from a strategic standpoint dictate that course of action against the détente-oriented economic development perspective of Western European nations. Soviet military action in Poland would put an end to the potential for reviving the war-avoidance understanding among Paris, Bonn, and Moscow.

'Too much investment'

The intelligence agents who gathered at Columbia focused their Polish assessment around the theme most succinctly stated by Alexander Ehrlich, a professor of economics at Columbia. Ehrlich was trained at the Frankfurt School with "New Left" intelligence control-agent Herbert Marcuse, "intellectual author" of American and European student movements' radical opposition to industrial development during the 1960s. To analyze the "economic causes" of the Polish unrest, Ehrlich employed the key-and-code reference for all such intelligence operations in the recent period: "the fall of the shah."

"The organization of the economic system in Poland," he stated, "is a result of errors of macroeconomics . . . the strong propensity to push investment too much into heavy industry and expand too rapidly. The case of the shah and Iran must be a lesson to all. Too many promises of massive aid were made to the shah. . . . Things went to his head and he started expanding Iran industrially and militarily."

Polish leader Edward Gierek, said Ehrlich, had also been "industrializing too rapidly."

This theme—economic progress causes misery and social upheaval—was reiterated again and again in the course of the proceedings. But as in the case of the shah, Ehrlich knows the opposite to be true in the case of Poland.

The facts of the Polish case are that from 1970 to 1975, Gierek's centralized industrial development program vaulted Poland to a new level of economic strength and higher living standards for the working class. The severity of the country's problems in the more recent period are a result of the slowing down of industrialization since 1976.

The decline in growth rates, apart from instances of mismanagement, resulted from four factors:

- rapidly rising costs for Western imports;
- simultaneous stiffening in credit terms to finance such imports;
- a four-year freeze on long-term development loans from the West;
- Anglo-American policy imposing International Monetary Fund-type “conditionalities” on all credits to Poland.

The net objective of such *economic warfare against Poland* was to prompt policy decisions favoring export-oriented, foreign-exchange earning sectors, away from heavy industry and domestic consumption.

The result was very real, very embittered frustrations in the Polish working population, without which British-NATO intelligence could not have enjoyed its recent general strike successes.

Brzezinski's students

Irena Lasota, speaking after Professor Ehrlich, asserted that continuation of economic warfare against Poland was essential to the strength of the new “free trade union” opposition. Lasota, who received indoctrination as a student of Zbigniew Brzezinski, is currently listed as a doctoral candidate in political science at Columbia. During the Polish strikes, she coordinated with Leszek Kolakowski at Oxford, under British intelligence executive Anthony Quinton, coordinating the “free trade union” movement. The networks in which Lasota operates, for example, are known to interface with the control apparatus behind Italy's Red Brigades terrorists. She joined these networks through Kolakowski's KOR organization inside Poland, then emigrated for training with Brzezinski at Columbia's School of International Relations.

Lasota reminded her audience that, in the fall of 1977, Kolakowski himself had participated in a similar gathering to plan the 1980 upheavals in Poland.

“I agree with Professor Ehrlich's comparison of Poland with Iran and the shah,” she stated. “Conditionalities should be attached to loans to Poland. Besides the economic conditions, the loans should attach strings that concessions given to workers be maintained. This is the most intelligent policy for lending to Poland. This should be the only basis for loans. . . . If this is not done this way, in one month's time from now there may be new strikes.”

Another speaker, Deborah Milenkovitch, turned to the types of demands that the Polish workers themselves should be manipulated into raising. Milenkovitch, a Barnard College economics professor, has been a research associate at a Tavistock subsidiary, the Research Institute for International Change, currently headed by Seweryn Bialer. Once a high-level “mole” inside the

Polish communist party's Central Committee, Bialer was pulled out of Poland after the unrest of 1956. His predecessor at RIIC was Zbigniew Brzezinski, who left to become Carter administration National Security Adviser. RIIC was founded by Herbert Marcuse.

Milenkovitch bitterly denounced Gierek's capital-formation policies, employing the special brand of “Marxism” Marcuse had devised: “The fundamental issue,” she proclaimed, is “class conflict” and “who controls the surplus product.” If the “workers” control the surplus product, then they will divert it to immediate consumption, she explained. If the state controls it, they will divert it to industrial development.

Milenkovitch's variety of British intelligence “Marxism”—duplicated word for word, phrase for phrase, by leading KOR agent Jacek Kuron in Poland—carefully opposes “working-class interests” and industrial progress. In the West, such “Marxism” is simply called Malthusianism. But frustrated Polish workers, following KOR's Kuron, demanded the diversion of funds earmarked for development to immediate consumer goods production such as food-price subsidies.

In short, what British agents foisted on workers as “demands” were measures specifically designed to aggravate the very economic backwardness which is the cause of the economic grievances of Polish urban working-class households.

It was Irene Lasota who called the gathering's attention to the effectiveness of sociological and psychological manipulation in bringing strikers to such a muddled state of perception of fundamental self-interest. “In every factory,” she reported, “you have a sociologist and a psychologist who is ready to give guidance to the worker.”

The sociologists and psychologists, she reported, were provided by the intelligence front called “Experience and the Future,” whose Polish acronym is DiP. The DiP group was cofounded by Jan Szczepanski, a Polish associate of the Sussex Tavistock Institute itself. Among the outside controllers of Szczepanski's DiP is Jane Curry, a Polish specialist with the RAND Corporation, U.S. Air Force intelligence's leading think tank. Curry, who is currently listed as a research associate of the Institute for East Central Europe at Columbia, organized the entire Columbia seminar.

In the future, the panelists indicated, DiP “experts” inside Polish factories would guide “free trade union” workers toward demands that, as Lasota put it, “attach political with economic demands.” “The events of 1980 showed that we can get workers to stay in the factory and push such demands,” she said, referring to the DiP program, which in addition to Milenkovitch-Kuron “consumer” economics, specifies a “shift away from central control of the economy and toward autonomy of regional and smaller units.”