

Who's doing what to whom in Poland

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Contributing Editor

In former times, most sensible adults walked through life forewarned that a certain kind of experience might await them around the next corner.

Two men, two women, or perhaps a man and a woman, begin a crescendo of a squabble in a public place. A crowd of onlookers is aggregated. The fight ends. The protagonists disappear. The onlookers wonder what the fight was really all about—until they reach to their purses and wallets.

For weeks, the world has watched a crescendo of destabilization in Poland. We have gathered, chiefly as onlookers, anticipating that Grand Guignol of a day on which Soviet armored forces re-enact, perhaps on a larger and much bloodier scale, the final scene of Prague Spring 1968. Now, I say: "Ladies and gentlemen onlookers, it is time to look to your purses and wallets!" This situation is not quite what it seems to be.

The "solidarist" conspiracy, which gave its name to Lech Walesa's new trade-union organization, is quite real. Within Poland itself, this conspiracy is indeed directed by Jesuits, and is indeed coordinated with the West chiefly through Vienna. It, Polish "solidarism," is admittedly both bitterly anti-Soviet and is determined to bring Polish approximations of Soviet socialism to an end. Those facts, which accord with prevailing opinion of the matter in the Western press, are quite real—within certain limits.

Yet—ladies and gentlemen, your purses and wallets, please!—did it ever occur to any of you that the Polish

"solidarists" might turn out to have been merely a gambited pawn, or, at most, a gambited bishop? The "solidarists" are pieces of great significance in the current Polish chess game, but they are not playing the game; they are being played.

Who is playing the Polish chess game? The hard evidence is that the Polish game is being fought out between two factions at the highest level in Moscow itself.

One of the two Moscow factions playing the Polish chess game is conveniently identified as a pro-Paris, pro-Bonn faction. This Moscow faction suffered a serious setback throughout the Comecon bloc with the fall of the Polish government of former party leader Edward Gierek. This Moscow faction may have had strong criticism of Gierek's handling of Poland's domestic affairs, but it was tied to Gierek's "special relationship" with both France's Giscard and Germany's Schmidt.

The opposing Moscow faction is anti-Bonn, anti-Paris, and pro-London. This faction's policy is typified by declarations of Soviet Politburo member Boris Ponomarev at the recent East Berlin meeting of representatives of communist parties. This Moscow faction is on relatively the friendliest of terms with General Secretary Gus Hall of the Communist Party U.S.A.

The latter Moscow faction is playing with a British secret-intelligence asset inside the leadership of the Polish communist party, Stefan Olszowski.

Olszowski is a close associate of British intelligence

operative Jan Szczepanski. Former Polish "KGB" chief Stanislaw Kania provided the key role in effecting the ouster of Edward Gierek, and is performing the function of a bridge-government during a transitional period leading toward, presumably, a takeover of Poland by Olszowski and his friends.

From the point of the fall of Gierek, leading Polish Catholic circles feared that Moscow was orchestrating Lech Walesa's strike movement to some end-goal which included the victimization of the Polish Church. This fear was a prominent consideration included in the calls for moderation issued by Cardinal Wyszynski. Although the "solidarist" movement itself is predominantly a creation of the Jesuit order in Poland, and although the rank and file of the movement is under effective ideological control of priests coordinated by the Jesuits, Poland's Jesuits are not such amateurs as to believe that their movement cannot be effectively manipulated by Moscow.

It becomes "curiouser and curiouser." Although Moscow factions are immediately on top of the Polish chess game, are the Moscow players themselves being played by other forces?

Naturally, the Carter administration has had its fingers in the Polish situation. Yet, one must not be taken in by Zbigniew Brzezinski's delusions of grandeur.

Brzezinski is merely a hired gun, and on a significantly lower level in the pecking order than hired gun Henry Kissinger. Brzezinski is a bungling schoolboy by comparison with old hand Jay Lovestone, and Lovestone himself is a mere underling in the establishment of which he is a part. Granted, Brzezinski and Lovestone have been playing in the Polish situation, but who is playing Brzezinski and Lovestone?

Essentially, London is using the pro-British faction in Moscow in an effort to isolate France and the Federal Republic of Germany. That is the primary strategic significance of the fall of Edward Gierek. The game being played in Poland features British secret-intelligence operatives and assets such as Szczepanski, Olszowski, and Mieczyslaw Moczar. Yet Moscow is fully conscious of these connections to British intelligence.

Is London playing Moscow, or is Moscow playing London? That is where the key question mark on the Polish situation is to be placed.

The highest Jesuit levels are well aware of such question marks. Those Jesuits have alliances to and sympathies for London's side of the game. Yet the Jesuits are worried. They are quite familiar with the ethics of British secret intelligence. They are therefore suspicious that London may be gambling the fate of the Polish Church in the current game between London and Moscow.

Soviet armor could roll

This does not mean that we exclude entirely the

deployment of Soviet armored forces against the Polish "solidarist" insurgency. We merely insist that if those tanks moved, it would not be for precisely the reasons given in most of the Western press.

First, the kind of game which London and Moscow are playing out in Poland is a risky one. For example, the "solidarists" do represent to a certain degree an independent factor in the situation, a potential wild card. For that or other reasons, the present "controlled destabilization" of Poland might go over into becoming an "uncontrolled destabilization," as the Jesuits, among others, fear. With so many players playing independent games in the situation, and the situation so close to the edge of "uncontrolled disintegration," the risk of miscalculation is relatively enormous.

Second, it is by no means certain that the present Moscow majority will continue to be the majority.

The policy declaration delivered by Boris Ponomarev at the recent East Berlin meeting was a brutal repudiation of the protocol of the May 1978 meetings between Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev and West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt. This change in Soviet policy was one of London's leading policy objectives for British secret-intelligence's leading role in the destabilization of the Gierek government. London's objective has been to bring down the Deutschmark and collapse the European Monetary System. Ponomarev's policy declaration will tend to promote such chain-reaction side effects.

For related reasons, the policy set forth by Ponomarev could be repudiated rather abruptly by Moscow.

Under the global conditions defined by the Carter administration, the relative weight of France's Giscard and Germany's Schmidt governments was the principal obstacle to the growing danger of actual nuclear warfare between NATO and Warsaw Pact forces. If Schmidt and Giscard were to be destabilized, as a collapse of the EMS would virtually ensure, the last important obstacle to nuclear war would be removed from the situation.

Fortunately, the landslide victory of President-elect Ronald Reagan has dramatically lessened the overall danger of a nuclear confrontation.

The fact that Mr. Reagan's victory was of landslide proportions is of great importance strategically. The large base of support gives the new President-elect a maneuvering room within his own circles which would not exist had his election been a "squeaker." The fact that there is room for policy conflicts within the "Reagan camp" means that the Reagan forces will enjoy a flexibility, a capacity for sophisticated, rational policy initiatives and policy responses altogether absent from the Carter administration.

As this fact penetrates even the heads of Moscow

circles, a certain amount of rethinking will occur in such quarters. That could mean a tilt away from pro-London factions in Moscow, back toward pro-Gaullist factions, and a resumption of the May 1978 perspectives. Under such conditions, British assets such as Szczepanski, Olszowski, and Moczar will tend to suffer the political fate they administered to their victim, Edward Gierek. If the "solidarists" attempted to prevent this shift by forcible means, things could become very rough.

If, on the other hand, the coordinators of the "solidarists" elected to adapt calmly to the abrupt shift in political winds from Moscow, repression and bloodshed would be avoided.

The foolish admirers of Gertrude Stein brush such analysis aside. Such simple-minded bunglers babble, "A Soviet tank is a Soviet tank is a Soviet tank." Such miserably ignorant people remind us properly of the morality of the *Commedia's* "Inferno." In Hell it is permitted only to ask "What?" but never "Why?" Similarly, nations which limit their policy making to "What," not asking "Why?" often find themselves plunged into the sort of Hell designed to receive persons and nations of such simple-minded persons.

To act efficiently in response to any actual or threatened occurrence one must first determine the nature of the process which is producing such effects. To stop the effect, or to correct it once it has occurred, one must apply one's action not to the effect itself, but to the process which has caused the effect. A Soviet tank under condition "A" is not a Soviet tank under condition "B." The person who has not mastered such distinctions should keep his mouth shut until he learns better.

The 'solidarism' factor

The enraged bear, if loosed from his cage, becomes extremely *significant* to the persons proximate to that cage. It is the person who might open the cage under those circumstances which is the *important* matter in such a setting.

The "solidarist" movement is extremely *significant* but its *importance* is much exaggerated.

"Solidarism" is not an autonomous movement, nor is it in fact a creation of the Catholic Church. It is a tool created by a powerful faction in world affairs, a faction usefully identified as the "Hospitaliers," and identified since the late 13th century as the "Genoese" black nobility. As is a common enough sort of occurrence in the popular naming of things, what is called the "Genoese black nobility" is in fact the "Venetian black nobility"; the Genoese were—and are—but the junior partners of the Venetian oligarchs.

"Solidarism" was developed during the last half of the 19th century as a technique for neutralizing both

industrial employers and trade unionists as political forces endemically dedicated to technological progress under industrial-capitalist development.

The authors of this technique were the Venice-centered oligarchical faction of Europe. The method used was the brainwashing of recruited circles of both employers and trade unionists according to the procedures of rhetoric set forth in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*.

Although the Catholic Church was heavily targeted for penetration by the authors of "solidarism," "solidarism" is by no means an outgrowth of any variety of Apostolic Christianity. The typical center for "solidarist" ideology in Europe today is the University of Louvain, an avowed international center of the anti-Christian pagan doctrine called *Gnosticism*. The first Gnostic of significance in the history of the Christian Church was Simon "the Magician" Magus, the common foe of Saint Peter and Rabbi Philo Judaeus in Rome. Gnosticism was one of the principal pagan, pseudo-Christian cults outlawed by the Council of Nicea, and is in fact a form of pseudo-Christianity based upon the Ptolemaic version of the Cult of Isis.

Although Gnosticism was maintained in Italy prior to the 13th century, chiefly by Isis-worshipping families descending from leading families of the ancient Roman imperial senate, the main bastion of Gnosticism was in Byzantium. The Byzantine Church is divided to the present day between a traditionally Apostolic current, and a Gnostic, pseudo-Christian current, which identifies itself with the teaching of the ancient Apollo-cultist Aristotle (Apollo = Lucifer). It was by way of Venice that a broad wave of Gnosticism was introduced into the West during the second half of the 13th century.

Among leading circles of "solidarists" today, "solidarism" means essentially the solidarity in common action of the combined Gnostic factions penetrating both Eastern and Western Churches.

During the 1920s and 1930s, the best-known expression of "solidarism" was the variety of fascism known as "corporativism" (as equal to the idea of the "corporate state"). This version of solidarism was identified with Benito Mussolini's fascism in Italy, with that of Dollfuss in Austria, and Gregor Strasser's solidarist version of Nazism in Germany. It was also the basis for the fascist regimes of Hungary, Rumania, and Poland prior to the Nazi takeover of those countries.

Today, "solidarism" is predominantly a movement on the European continent, deeply implanted in both western and eastern parts of the continent. It is nominally centered in the Gnostic factions' penetration of the Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches, but is equally represented in Gnostic (existentialist) perversions of Protestantism.

The "solidarist" network's largest assets are outside

professedly Christian bodies. These non-Christian efforts exude a "pagan" (Lucifer-worshipping) element: theosophist networks and atheistic elements in the footsteps of such figures of the 1920s as Gregor Strasser, the "left fascist," and Karl Korsch, the leading anarchist philosopher of the 1920s Communist Party of Germany.

In brief, "solidarism" is a doctrine and method used to develop a force of dupes into a social battering ram against the institutions of industrial society.

Since the close of the 1920s, "solidarism" has been widely known as variously the "Third Way," or "Third Camp." It is, so to speak, the "inner Morgenthau Plan" for all of continental Europe, an effort to destroy industrial society from within both Western and Eastern Europe.

Its particular focus of hatred is against industrial capitalism. It is opposed to profit, and opposes capital-intensive forms of technologically-advanced capital investment in both industry and agriculture. It views the Soviet industrial form of socialism as another expression of the same principle as industrial capitalism, and is resolved to eliminate both.

The fact that "solidarism" is a mobilization of mere dupes is symptomized in two most obvious ways.

First, the possibility of sustaining a population of any given size within a nation depends upon what is best termed the complicated-sounding name of "potential relative population density." This potential for sustaining a given population of human beings depends upon not only a certain level of technological development, but also a certain range of advancement of technology. Without continuing technological advancement, it is not possible to overcome the effects of relative depletion of "natural resources." This technical progress requires not only a growth in the amount of energy used per person in society, but also a rise in the energy flux density of energy sources used for production.

Consequently, any national movement which proposes to turn back the clock on industrial progress is proposing to wipe out a corresponding proportion of its own population: genocide. No people ever secreted a spontaneous perception that it ought to subject itself to genocide. "Solidarism" is not a sane expression of the independently perceived self-interests of any large population. "Solidarism" is a form of mass brainwashing of dupes into complicity with their own mass suicide.

Who benefits? What sort of political forces would develop and deploy such an instrument of mass brainwashing as "solidarism"? One has but to read the bucolic, cultist ravings of Hesiod, or the draft proposal for creating a Western Division of the Persian Empire from the fourth century B.C. to find suitable precedents.

The latter was the policy of the Cult of Apollo at Delphi, Aristotle's patron. This policy is known to classical historians down through the millennia since as the *oligarchical doctrine*. That was the name given to this doctrine by the proponents of the "Persian Model" from the fourth century B.C.

Who represents such an oligarchical doctrine today? Insiders call the leading oligarchists of today "Venetians," "Genoese," "Hospitaliers." It is not properly astonishing, therefore, to discover that the highly-placed forces behind the creation and continuing deployment of "solidarism" is the same "Venetian" network which insulted Queen Elizabeth II during her visit to the Pallavicini palace in Genoa recently—a Venetian princess who insulted the queen as some boorish parvenu whose presence presumably "let down the quality of the neighborhood."

This is the same crowd which is behind the Club of Rome and its genocidal limits-to-growth proposals.

The faction of British intelligence which controls the Polish "Experience and the Future" group is known in its international guise as "The Futurologists." The London Tavistock Institute (Sussex), to whose international "Russian Studies" branch Brzezinski was attached, is a key part of that oligarchical element of British intelligence. That element of British intelligence is an outgrowth of what was known during the 17th century as the "Genoese" financial interest which took over the City of London with James I's 1603 accession to the then-newly-created throne of the United Kingdom. This "Genoese" faction in Britain became known as the British East India Company, the force against which the American Revolution was fought.

Consequently, it would be a grave error to view the British involvement in the Polish destabilization as an outgrowth of the British people generally or Britain's adducible interests as an industrial-capitalist nation. The crowd involved is the "one worlders," the oligarchs who reject national loyalties and the very idea of an industrial-capitalist form of vital national interests.

The "solidarists" of Europe are generally merely gambited pawns, and sometimes gambited bishops, in a game being played by the oligarchical faction. That latter faction, which formerly owned the N. Bukharin to whom Jay Lovestone was formerly attached, controls a significant "neo-Bukharinist," pro-London faction in the leadership in Moscow today—as well as in other East bloc nations.

Those are the general dimensions of the game being played by evil old men. Poland is but a chessboard—a victim—of that game.

Nonetheless, although a mere pawn, "solidarism" is not to be underestimated. In chess, a pawn sometimes captures a queen.