

**SOVIET DELIBERATIONS  
DURING THE POLISH CRISIS, 1980-1981**

**Edited, Translated, Annotated, and Introduced by  
Mark Kramer**

**Special Working Paper No. 1**

**Cold War International History Project  
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars  
Washington, D.C  
April 1999**

**THE COLD WAR INTERNATIONAL HISTORY PROJECT  
WORKING PAPER SERIES**

**CHRISTIAN F. OSTERMANN, Series Editor**

This paper is the first of a special series of Working Papers published by the Cold War International History Project of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, D.C. Established in 1991 by a grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Cold War International History Project (CWIHP) disseminates new information and perspectives on the history of the Cold War as it emerges from previously inaccessible sources on “the other side” of the post-World War II superpower rivalry. The project supports the full and prompt release of historical materials by governments on all sides of the Cold War, and seeks to accelerate the process of integrating new sources, materials and perspectives from the former “Communist bloc” with the historiography of the Cold War which has been written over the past few decades largely by Western scholars reliant on Western archival sources. It also seeks to transcend barriers of language, geography, and regional specialization to create new links among scholars interested in Cold War history. Among the activities undertaken by the project to promote this aim are a periodic *BULLETIN* to disseminate new findings, views, and activities pertaining to Cold War history; a fellowship program for young historians from the former Communist bloc to conduct archival research and study Cold War history in the United States; international scholarly meetings, conferences, and seminars; and publications.

The *CWIHP Working Paper Series* is designed to provide a speedy publications outlet for historians associated with the project who have gained access to newly-available archives and sources and would like to share their results. We especially welcome submissions by junior scholars from the former Communist bloc who have done research in their countries’ archives and are looking to introduce their findings to a Western audience. As a non-partisan institute of scholarly study, the Woodrow Wilson Center takes no position on the historical interpretations and opinions offered by the authors.

Those interested in receiving copies of the *BULLETIN* or working papers should contact:

Christian F. Ostermann  
Director  
Cold War International History Project  
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars  
1 Woodrow Wilson Plaza  
1300 Pennsylvania Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20523

Telephone: (202) 691-4110  
Fax: (202) 691-4001  
Email: COLDWAR1@wwic.si.edu

**CWIHP Web Page: <http://cwihip.si.edu>**

## COLD WAR INTERNATIONAL HISTORY PROJECT WORKING PAPERS SERIES

Christian F. Ostermann, Series Editor

### Working Papers

- #1 **Chen Jian**, “The Sino-Soviet Alliance and China’s Entry into the Korean War”
- #2 **P.J. Simmons**, “Archival Research on the Cold War Era: A Report from Budapest, Prague and Warsaw”
- #3 **James Richter**, “Reexamining Soviet Policy Towards Germany during the Beria Interregnum”
- #4 **Vladislav M. Zubok**, “Soviet Intelligence and the Cold War: The ‘Small’ Committee of Information, 1952-53”
- #5 **Hope M. Harrison**, “Ulbricht and the Concrete ‘Rose’: New Archival Evidence on the Dynamics of Soviet-East German Relations and the Berlin Crisis, 1958-61”
- #6 **Vladislav M. Zubok**, “Khrushchev and the Berlin Crisis (1958-62)”
- #7 **Mark Bradley** and **Robert K. Brigham**, “Vietnamese Archives and Scholarship on the Cold War Period: Two Reports”
- #8 **Kathryn Weathersby**, “Soviet Aims in Korea and the Origins of the Korean War, 1945-50: New Evidence From Russian Archives”
- #9 **Scott D. Parrish** and **Mikhail M. Narinsky**, “New Evidence on the Soviet Rejection of the Marshall Plan, 1947: Two Reports”
- #10 **Norman M. Naimark**, “‘To Know Everything and To Report Everything Worth Knowing’: Building the East German Police State, 1945-49”
- #11 **Christian F. Ostermann**, “The United States, the East German Uprising of 1953, and the Limits of Rollback”
- #12 **Brian Murray**, “Stalin, the Cold War, and the Division of China: A Multi-Archival Mystery”
- #13 **Vladimir O. Pechatnov**, “The Big Three After World War II: New Documents on Soviet Thinking about Post-War Relations with the United States and Great Britain”
- #14 **Ruud van Dijk**, “The 1952 Stalin Note Debate: Myth or Missed Opportunity for German Unification?”
- #15 **Natalia I. Yegorova**, “The ‘Iran Crisis’ of 1945-46: A View from the Russian Archives”
- #16 **Csaba Békés**, “The 1956 Hungarian Revolution and World Politics”
- #17 **Leszek W. Gluchowski**, “The Soviet-Polish Confrontation of October 1956: The Situation in the

Polish Internal Security Corps”

#18 **Qiang Zhai**, “Beijing and the Vietnam Peace Talks, 1965-68: New Evidence from Chinese Sources”

#19 **Matthew Evangelista**, “‘Why Keep Such an Army?’” Khrushchev’s Troop Reductions”

#20 **Patricia K. Grimsted**, “The Russian Archives Seven Years After: ‘Purveyors of Sensations’ or ‘Shadows Cast to the Past’?”

#21 **Andrzej Paczkowski** and **Andrzej Werblan**, “On the Decision to Introduce Martial Law in Poland in 1981: Two Historians Report to the Commission on Constitutional Oversight of the *SEJM* of the Republic of Poland”

#22 **Odd Arne Westad, Chen Jiang, Stein Tonnesson, Nguyen Vu Tung, and James G. Hershberg**, “77 Conversations Between Chinese and Foreign Leaders on the Wars in Indochina, 1964-77”

#23 **Vojtech Mastny**, “The Soviet Non-Invasion of Poland in 1980-81 and the End of the Cold War”

#24 **John P. C. Matthews**, “Majales: The Abortive Student Revolt in Czechoslovakia in 1956”

### **Special Working Papers**

#1 **Mark Kramer**, “Soviet Deliberations During the Polish Crisis, 1980-81”

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	7
Doc. No. 1: CPSU Politburo's Assessment of Recent Developments in Poland, 3 September 1980	35
Doc. No. 2: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 29 October 1980	44
Doc. No. 3: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 31 October 1980	55
Doc. No. 4: Letter from Leonid Brezhnev to Erich Honecker, 4 November 1980	60
Doc. No. 5: Directive from the CPSU Secretariat, 14 November 1980, Reducing Tourist Exchanges with Poland	62
Doc. No. 6: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 11 December 1980	69
Doc. No. 7: Directive from the CPSU Secretariat, 14 January 1981, with Supporting Cables	73
Doc. No. 8: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 22 January 1981	79
Doc. No. 9: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 12 March 1981	86
Doc. No. 10: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 26 March 1981	89
Doc. No. 11: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 2 April 1981	92
Doc. No. 12: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 9 April 1981	103
Doc. No. 13: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 16 April 1981	112
Doc. No. 14: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 30 April 1981	115
Doc. No. 15: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 18 June 1981	119
Doc. No. 16: Notes from Brezhnev's Meeting with Stanislaw Kania and Wojciech Jaruzelski, 22 August 1981	125
Doc. No. 17: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 10 September 1981	137

Doc. No. 18: Transcript of Brezhnev's Phone Conversation with Kania, 15 September 1981	141
Doc. No. 19: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 17 September 1981	146
Doc. No. 20: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 29 October 1981	148
Doc. No. 21: Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 10 December 1981	157
Doc. No. 22: KGB Annual Report for 1981 (Excerpts)	171
 IDENTIFICATION LIST	 175

## INTRODUCTION

These twenty-two documents include a top-level Soviet report prepared at the beginning of the crisis; two directives issued by the Secretariat of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) in late 1980 and early 1981; fifteen transcripts of CPSU Politburo meetings held between October 1980 and December 1981; a letter from the CPSU General Secretary, Leonid Brezhnev, to the East German leader, Erich Honecker, in December 1980; notes from a meeting in the Crimea between Brezhnev and Polish leaders in August 1981; a transcript of a telephone call by Brezhnev to the new Polish leader, Wojciech Jaruzelski, in October 1981; and excerpts from the annual report for 1981 issued by the Soviet Committee on State Security (KGB). Eighteen of these documents were released from the Russian Presidential Archive in 1993 and 1994, and copies are now housed in Moscow at the former archive of the General Department of the CPSU.<sup>1</sup> The four exceptions are Documents Nos. 4, 16, 18, and 22, the first three of which are stored in Berlin in the former Central Archive of the Socialist Unity Party (*Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands*, or SED) of the former German Democratic Republic (GDR).<sup>2</sup> Document No. 22, from the Russian Presidential Archive in Moscow, was provided to me by relatives of the late Russian military historian General Dmitrii Volkogonov.

It is best if the twenty-two documents are read in conjunction with other items I translated in both Issue No. 5 and Issue No. 11 (the current issue) of the *Cold War International History Bulletin*. Two of the documents below (Nos. 1 and 18) were included in the group published in Issue No. 5, but the versions here have been revised and are much more extensively annotated. The other twenty documents below have not appeared before.

In both format and style, the translations are as close to the original documents as possible. My annotations are intended to provide a fuller context for the documents and to clarify

---

<sup>1</sup>This archive is currently known as the Center for Storage of Contemporary Documentation (*Tsentr khraneniya sovremennoi dokumentatsii*, or TsKhSD).

<sup>2</sup>This archive is now known as the Bundesarchiv Institute for the Archives of Parties and Mass Organizations of the GDR (*Stiftung Archiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen der DDR im Bundesarchiv, Zentrales Parteiarchiv der SED*, or SAPMDB/ZPA).

references to events, organizations, and the like. In addition, I have compiled an alphabetical list of all individuals mentioned in the documents.

Before highlighting a few of the most intriguing aspects of these documents, I should note three specific points about the translations that are worth bearing in mind:

First, the Soviet Politburo took up a wide range of domestic and foreign issues at most of its sessions in 1980-81. Only rarely was the situation in Poland the first item on the agenda. The translations provide the main headings and attendance list for each session, but after that only the portions directly relevant to the Polish crisis are included. Ellipses (. . .) have been inserted whenever extraneous parts of the transcript have been omitted.

Second, at times, instructions issued by the Soviet Politburo refer simply to “the CPSU CC Department” (*Otdel TsK KPSS*) or “the CC Department” (*Otdel TsK*). This is short-hand for the “CPSU Central Committee Department for Ties with Communist and Workers' Parties of Socialist Countries,” the body responsible for handling relations with other Communist countries, notably in Eastern Europe. Rather than writing out the whole name (as would be done with other CPSU CC departments), Soviet documents normally mentioned this department in highly abbreviated form.

Third, for purposes of clarity, a few abbreviations of countries have been spelled out in the translations. The abbreviation PPR (for Polish People's Republic) is used so frequently here that it has been retained; and the abbreviations GDR (for German Democratic Republic), FRG (Federal Republic of Germany), USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), and CPSU are familiar enough that they, too, have been retained. The Polish acronym for the Polish United Workers' Party (*Polska zjednoczona partia robotnicza*), PZPR, also has been preserved here. But the abbreviations HPR, BPR, CSSR, and SRR appear here only once or twice, and therefore have been written out as Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Romania, respectively.

\* \* \* \* \*

Caution must be used when reading these documents and other new sources. Even if the transcripts contained a full record of Soviet leaders' deliberations on specific days—which they do not—crucial gaps would remain. The twenty-two documents below, the twelve items



translated in Issue No. 5 of the CWIHP *Bulletin*, and a host of other newly declassified materials from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union (including additional items I have translated in CWIHP Bulletin 11 (Winter 1998/1999)) provide a wealth of fresh evidence, but countless other documents of equal or greater importance have not yet been released. Because the documentary record of the 1980-81 Polish crisis is still fragmentary, some of the conclusions derived from existing materials may be in need of revision as additional items become available.

Moreover, even if all relevant documents from the former Soviet-bloc archives were suddenly released, differences of interpretation would undoubtedly persist. This is not to deny the immense scholarly value of the documents now available and others that may be declassified in the future. These materials permit a vastly more detailed and insightful analysis of the Polish crisis than was ever possible before. Nevertheless, it would be too much to hope that a scholarly consensus will emerge on every point, no matter how many documents are released. Indeed, as the controversy about Jaruzelski's role in the crisis has shown (see my article in Issue No. 11 of the *Cold War International History Project Bulletin*), new materials sometimes generate at least as many questions as they answer.

Many of the key passages in the documents are discussed at some length in the annotations, and numerous other points will be examined in my forthcoming CWIHP Working Paper on Soviet policy during the 1980-81 crisis. However, it is worth adding some brief comments here about five topics that the documents help illuminate: (1) Soviet decision-making procedures during the crisis, (2) differing Soviet and Polish conceptions of martial law, (3) Soviet—Polish economic relations during the crisis, (4) Soviet perceptions of Solidarity, and (5) the political spillover from Poland into the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact states.

## 1. Soviet Decision-Making Procedures

The documents indicate that Soviet decision-making throughout the crisis was highly centralized. A special Politburo Commission on Poland, which was set up on 25 August 1980 under the direction of Mikhail Suslov, became a core decision-making group.<sup>3</sup> The formation of this commission was precisely the sort of step that the Politburo usually took during prolonged crises. (Similar commissions existed for Afghanistan and other pressing issues.) The Commission on Poland, known informally as the Suslov Commission, met at least twice a month, and more regularly when needed.<sup>4</sup>

The Commission on Poland initially consisted of nine officials and was then expanded to include Konstantin Rusakov, the CPSU Secretary responsible for intra-bloc relations, who had earlier been represented on the Commission by his chief deputy, Oleg Rakhmanin. Along with Brezhnev (whose physical ailments by this time were far advanced), the four senior members of the Commission—Suslov; Soviet foreign minister Andrei Gromyko; the head of the KGB, Yurii Andropov; and the Soviet defense minister, Marshal Dmitrii Ustinov—dominated the Politburo's deliberations about the Polish crisis. (Following Suslov's death in January 1982, Andropov took over as head of the Commission.<sup>5</sup>) Several other members of the Commission, notably Rusakov, Konstantin Chernenko, Ivan Arkhipov, and Leonid Zamyatin, also figured prominently during the Politburo meetings, and the two remaining Commission members, Oleg Rakhmanin and Mikhail Zimyanin, played key roles in obtaining information, providing advice, and drafting recommendations.

A few other high-ranking Soviet officials who were not on the Commission, notably the state planning director, Nikolai Baibakov, the commander-in-chief of the Warsaw Pact's Joint Armed Forces, Marshal Viktor Kulikov, and the Soviet ambassador in Poland, Boris Aristov, were frequently called upon to supplement the Commission's efforts and to help implement the

---

<sup>3</sup>"Vypiska iz protokola No. 210 zasedaniya Politbyuro TsK KPSS ot 25 avgusta 1980 goda: K voprosu o polozhenii v Pol'skoi Narodnoi Respublike," No. P210/II (Top Secret), 25 August 1980, in TsKhSD, Fond (F.) 89, Opis' (Op.) 66, Delo (D.) 1, List (L.) 1. My translation of this document appeared in Issue No. 5 of the CWIHP *Bulletin*.

<sup>4</sup>Information provided to the author by the former secretary of the Suslov Commission, Georgii Shakhnazarov, in an interview in Jachranka, Poland, 8 November 1997.

<sup>5</sup>This is clear from the account in Vitalii Pavlov, *Bylem rezydentem w Polsce* (Warsaw: BGW, 1994), pp. 244-246. Pavlov, the Soviet KGB station chief in Warsaw from 1973 to 1984, took part in at least one of the Commission's sessions in 1982.

Politburo's decisions. Moreover, in March 1981 the Commission set up a Working Group, which consisted of senior officials (mostly at the deputy minister level) from the CPSU Central Committee apparatus, the KGB, the Soviet General Staff, and the Soviet foreign ministry.<sup>6</sup> Among the members were Vladimir Kryuchkov, deputy chairman of the KGB and head of foreign intelligence, and Georgii Shakhnazarov, a high-level official in the Central Committee apparatus. All authority to decide matters, however, rested predominantly with the commission (subject only to approval by the full Politburo) and especially with Suslov, Andropov, Gromyko, and Ustinov.

The consolidation of decision-making authority within this core “group of four” was facilitated by characteristics of the Soviet Politburo that favored some members over others. The fifteen Politburo transcripts below, and many others that have been released over the past few years, indicate that Politburo members who were not permanently based in Moscow were rarely able to attend meetings. At none of these fifteen sessions was even a single member present whose main duties were outside Moscow. This applied to full members such as Dinmukhamed Kunaev, the first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party; Volodymyr Shcherbytskyi, the first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party; and even Grigorii Romanov, the head of the CPSU committee in Leningrad. It was equally true of four candidate members: Geidar Aliev, the first secretary of the Azerbaijani Communist Party; Tikhon Kiselev, the first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party; Sharaf Rashidov, the first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party; and Eduard Shevardnadze, the first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party. The *de facto* exclusion of these seven officials from the bulk of the Politburo's deliberations about Poland guaranteed that the roles of the other Politburo members, especially those on the Suslov Commission, were even more important.

The leeway enjoyed by the core decision-making group was evident several times when the Moscow-based members of the CPSU Politburo acted on behalf of the full CPSU Central Committee. For example, Document No. 5 indicates that a brief “Central Committee resolution” published in the Soviet press on 12 December 1980 was in fact drafted and approved exclusively by a few members of the Politburo (Suslov *et al.*). Until the archives were opened, Western analysts could not be sure whether statements appearing in the name of the full Central

---

<sup>6</sup>See V. I. Voronkov, "Sobytiya 1980-1981 gg. v Pol'she: Vzglyad so Staroi ploshchadi," *Voprosy Istorii* (Moscow), No. 10 (October 1995), pp. 104-105. Voronkov was a senior official in the Polish affairs sector of the CPSU Central Committee department for intra-bloc affairs, headed by Rusakov.

Committee had in some way been approved by that body. It is now clear, from a vast number of declassified documents, that the Politburo and Secretariat regularly acted in the name of the full Central Committee (which, despite being nominally superior to the Politburo and Secretariat, was in fact little more than a rubber-stamp organization). The Central Committee itself rarely met, and when it did meet it had only a peripheral role, often doing no more than expressing “ardent and unanimous approval” of the Politburo's decisions.<sup>7</sup>

## 2. Soviet/Polish Conceptions of Martial Law

The documents below indicate that Soviet leaders conceived of the terms “state of emergency” (*chrezvychainoe polozhenie* in Russian; *stan wyjatkowy* in Polish) and “martial law” (*voennoe polozhenie* in Russian; *stan wojenny* in Polish) quite differently from the way those two terms were construed by Polish officials. Soviet leaders often used the terms interchangeably. In their contacts with Polish representatives, Soviet officials often demanded the prompt imposition of a state of emergency, but at other times they referred to the need for martial law. The precise terminology seemed to matter relatively little to them; their main concern was to induce the Polish authorities to impose a sweeping crackdown.

By contrast, Polish leaders drew a careful distinction between the two terms, citing specific legal grounds. The 1952 Polish constitution, as amended in 1976, stipulated in Article 33 that the State Council could impose martial law (*stan wojenny*, literally a “wartime situation” or “state of war”) “on part or all of the country's territory . . . if this is deemed necessary for the defense or security of the state.”<sup>8</sup> Nowhere, however, did the Constitution even mention a state of emergency (*stan wyjatkowy*).<sup>9</sup> Nor was the Polish prime minister, General Wojciech Jaruzelski, able to gain “emergency powers” from the Polish Sejm (parliament) in 1981, despite his repeated requests. In practical terms, the difference between martial law and a state of emergency may

---

<sup>7</sup>For more on the role of the CPSU Central Committee in the Soviet decision-making process, see Mark Kramer, “Declassified Materials from CPSU Central Committee Plenums: Sources, Context, Highlights,” *Cold War International History Bulletin*, Issue No. 10 (March 1998), pp. 7-26 esp. pp. 8-10.

<sup>8</sup>*Konstytucja Polskiej Rzeczypospolitej Ludowej* (Warsaw: KiW, 1976), Art. 33, Sec. 2. Section 1 of Article 33 provided for the imposition of martial law if needed to contend with outside armed aggression or to fulfill allied obligations.

<sup>9</sup>This was not true of the two interwar Polish constitutions (1921 and 1935) and the Small Constitution (*Mala konstytucja*) of 1947, all of which distinguished between martial law and a state of emergency.

well have been negligible—either option would have entailed thousands of arrests, a curfew, a ban on strikes, and a clampdown on foreign travel, communications, and the media—but in most countries a state of emergency would likely precede the imposition of martial law.<sup>10</sup> Because legal considerations in Poland dictated otherwise, the military and administrative planning for a crackdown in 1980-81, under the supervision of General Florian Siwicki, the chief of the Polish General Staff, was geared from the outset toward full-fledged martial law rather than a state of emergency.<sup>11</sup>

Even for martial law, however, the legal situation was by no means clear-cut. Aside from the broad authorization in Article 33 of the Constitution, no guidance was available on how to introduce martial law.<sup>12</sup> The ambiguity surrounding the Polish army's internal functions posed a problem as early as 1956, when riots in Poznan were violently suppressed by Polish military units and security forces.<sup>13</sup> It was unclear at the time what would have happened if the unrest had spread and emergency rule had seemed necessary throughout the country. Even more troublesome was the experience of December 1970, when turmoil erupted along Poland's Baltic coast. As soon as the first signs of widespread labor unrest emerged in 1970, Jaruzelski (who had been appointed national defense minister in 1968) issued a secret directive stipulating that the army was to cooperate with security forces deployed by the Internal Affairs Ministry (*Ministerstwo Spraw Wewnętrznych*, or MSW) to “combat hostile activities, maintain public order and safety, and prepare to defend the state.”<sup>14</sup> When the protests intensified, joint army-MSW command centers were set up all along the coast. However, rather than waiting to see whether

---

<sup>10</sup>For more on this distinction in the Polish context, see the official *Mala Encyklopedia Wojskowa*, 3rd ed. (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo MON, 1971), p. 195.

<sup>11</sup>For example, one of the earliest documents drafted by the martial law planners looked in part at how martial law could be imposed under the existing constitution; see “Propozycje w przedmiocie trybu wprowadzenia stanu wojennego ze wzgledu na bezpieczenstwo panstwa oraz okreslenia skutkow wprowadzenia tego stanu,” No. 2171/IV, 22 October 1980 (Top Secret), and No. 2177/IV, 23 October 1980 (Top Secret), in Centralne Archiwum Wojskowe (CAW), Sygnatura (Sygn.) 1806, Tom (T.) 38, Stronicy (Ss.) 214-220.

<sup>12</sup>Before 1976, the relevant portion of the Constitution was Article 28. It became Article 33 under the constitutional amendments adopted in 1976.

<sup>13</sup>This incident is covered at greater length in my forthcoming article “Soviet-Polish Relations and the Crisis of 1956: Brinkmanship and Intra-Bloc Politics.” See the analysis and valuable collection of declassified documents in Edward Jan Nalepa, *Pacyfikacja z buntowanego miasta: Wojsko Polskie w Czerwcu 1956 r. w Poznaniu w swietle dokumentow wojskowych* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Bellona, 1992).

<sup>14</sup>“Sprawozdanie komisji Biura Politycznego powolanej dla zbadania niektorych kwestii szczegolowych zwiazanych wydarzeniami grudniowymi 1970 r.,” November 1971 (Top Secret), reproduced in Pawel Domanski, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego, Grudzien 1970* (London: Aneks, 1991), pp. 356-360 and 361-365, respectively.

the security forces could quell the disorders on their own, the top Polish leaders, Wladyslaw Gomułka and Jozef Cyrankiewicz, ordered Polish military units into action against the unarmed strikers.

The resulting bloodshed, which left at least 45 dead and nearly 1,200 wounded, came as a shock to the population and to large segments of the army. Even Jaruzelski, despite his role in enforcing Gomułka's and Cyrankiewicz's orders, was well aware that the crisis had been demoralizing both for draftees and for professional officers. To avoid such problems in the future, Jaruzelski urged the Internal Affairs Ministry to give greater emphasis to special squads of heavily armed anti-riot troops, known as Mechanized Detachments of the Citizens' Police (*Zmotoryzowane odwody milicji obywatelskiej*, or ZOMO), which had been used only sporadically since they were formed in the late 1950s. The purpose of these troops was to crush severe outbreaks of domestic unrest, a task for which the army would no longer be chiefly responsible.

Despite the projected buildup of the ZOMO, the problem of actually coping with internal crises continued to bedevil Polish leaders throughout the 1970s. Memories of the December 1970 bloodshed were one of the main factors that induced Gomułka's successor, Edward Gierek, to back down almost immediately when confronted by similar protests and strikes in July 1976.<sup>15</sup> Afterwards, when the unrest had subsided, Gierek ordered the security forces to exact harsh reprisals against the strike organizers. This crackdown was a standard practice, and it gave no indication of the procedures needed to impose full-scale martial law. It is far from clear what would have happened in June 1976 if Gierek had decided to use large-scale force (as Gomułka did in 1970) when the strikes were still under way.

This same ambiguity was very much present when the 1980-81 crisis began. A document regarding "martial law for purposes of defending the state" had been submitted to Poland's Homeland Defense Committee (*Komitet obrony kraju*, or KOK) in January 1979, but it was never formally adopted by the Sejm.<sup>16</sup> Nor did the KOK devise any guidelines or detailed contingency plans of its own.

---

<sup>15</sup>"Protokol Nr. 16 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR w dniu 28 czerwca 1976 r.," 28 June 1976 (Secret), in Archiwum Akt Nowych (AAN), Protokoly z posiedzen Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 1976 r., T. 2, Ss. 5-11.

<sup>16</sup>"O stanie wojennym ze wzgledu na obronność panstwa," 19 January 1979 (Top Secret), in CAW, Materiały z posiedzen Komitetu Obrony Kraju, Sygn. 2309/IV, T. 1.

The lack of explicit procedures for martial law was often raised by Polish leaders during their talks with Soviet officials. Although most of their concerns were undoubtedly sincere, the issue also provided Jaruzelski and Stanisław Kania, the PZPR First Secretary from September 1980 until mid-October 1981, with a convenient pretext to defer the imposition of a crackdown. Because they could argue that more work was needed to lay the appropriate legal and administrative groundwork for martial law, they were able to put off any final decision on whether and when to proceed with a crackdown.

This delaying tactic, especially on Kania's part, provoked a good deal of irritation and anger in Moscow. The transcripts below of Soviet Politburo meetings feature endless complaints about Kania's and Jaruzelski's "failure to take decisive measures," their "endless concessions to the counterrevolutionary forces in Solidarity," and their "failure to grasp the full seriousness of the situation." At the Politburo session on 31 October 1980 (Document No. 3), Brezhnev expressed dismay at the Polish leaders' "lack of resolve" and said that when he asked them, during a meeting the previous day, "whether [they] have a plan to declare a state of emergency," he "got the sense that they are not yet prepared to take such a step and have put it off for the indefinite future."

Soviet impatience rapidly increased over the next several months when the Polish authorities continually failed to act. At a Politburo meeting on 2 April 1981 (Document No. 11), the Soviet KGB chairman, Yuri Andropov, emphasized that the Soviet Politburo "must tell [Polish leaders] that the introduction of martial law means the establishment of a curfew, limitations on movement along city streets, and heightened security around state and party institutions, enterprises, etc." The following day, Andropov and the Soviet defense minister, Marshal Dmitrii Ustinov, met secretly in Brest with Kania and Jaruzelski. Andropov reported to the CPSU Politburo on 9 April (Document No. 12) that he and Ustinov had raised this matter directly with the Polish leaders:

It was possible [for Kania and Jaruzelski] to introduce martial law long ago. We all know what the introduction of martial law would mean. It would help them [the Polish leaders] smash the onslaught of the counterrevolutionary forces and other rowdy forces, and put an end once and for all to the strikes and anarchy in economic life. A draft document on the introduction of martial law has been prepared with the help of our [Soviet] comrades, and these documents must be signed. The Polish comrades say: But how can we sign these documents, when they haven't yet been approved by the Sejm, etc. We say that there's no need to submit these documents to the Sejm, and that the documents will specify what the

Polish leaders must do when they introduce martial law.

Ustinov's expressions of impatience evidently had their desired effect in Warsaw. Any inclination that Polish leaders may have had to obtain the Sejm's approval before imposing martial law was soon abandoned. Indeed, even at the time of the Brest meeting, the conceptual phase of the planning for martial law was nearly over. In late March and early April 1981, after consulting with high-ranking Soviet military, KGB, and economic officials, Kania and Jaruzelski had signed four key documents pertaining to the military, legal, administrative, and economic aspects of martial law.<sup>17</sup> Over the next two months, senior officers from the Polish General Staff and Internal Affairs Ministry prepared a large number of legal documents, including draft legislation, decrees, and resolutions, which were submitted for approval to the KOK on 19 June.<sup>18</sup>

Other items were drafted in July and August, ready to be printed in bulk at publishing facilities in the Soviet Union operated by the KGB.<sup>19</sup> The KOK gave final approval to all the legal and administrative documents in mid-September.<sup>20</sup> Because the whole process was carried out extralegally and the planning for martial law was controlled by the KOK (rather than by the constitutionally designated authorities), it is ironic that Polish leaders were wont to cite legal considerations when explaining to their Soviet counterparts why more time was needed to prepare for martial law.

Even when the legal underpinnings of the martial law operation were finally in place, the Polish authorities were still able to buy time by insisting (quite justifiably) that a crackdown required extraordinary planning. Soviet leaders failed to understand why legal obstacles or other factors should pose any hindrance, and they continued to demand "urgent and decisive measures

---

<sup>17</sup>"Mysl przewodnia wprowadzenia na terytorium PRL stanu wojennego ze wzgledu na bezpieczenstwo panstwa," "Centralny plan dzialania organow politycznych wladzy i administracji panstwowej na wypadek koniecznosci wprowadzenia w PRL stanu wojennego," and "Ramowy plan dzialania sil zbrojnych," 27 March 1981 (Top Secret), and "Ramowy plan przedswiezec gospodarczych," 5 April 1981 (Top Secret), all in CAW, 1813/92, Sygn. 2304/IV.

<sup>18</sup>"Protokol z posiedzenia Komitetu Obrony Kraju w dniu 19.6.1981," 19 June 1981 (Top Secret), in CAW, Materiały z posiedzen Komitetu Obrony Kraju, Teczka Sygn. 38.

<sup>19</sup>"Notatka z 27 VIII 1981 r.," 27 August 1981 (Top Secret), in Centralne Archiwum Ministerstwa Spraw Wewnetrznych (CAMSZ), Sygn. 2304/IV. The printing of these "announcements concerning martial law" was to be completed by 4 September to allow ample time for them to be transported back to Poland. The reason the materials were printed in the Soviet Union rather than Poland is that the use of printing presses in Poland would have risked leaks to Solidarity by sympathetic workers.

<sup>20</sup>"Protokol No. 002/81 posiedzenia Komitetu Obrony Kraju w dniu wrzesnia 1981 r." 13 September 1981, in CAW, Materiały z posiedzen Komitetu Obrony Kraju, Teczka Sygn. 48. This document was recently unearthed at the Polish military archive. These handwritten notes, compiled by General Tadeusz Tuczapski, the secretary of KOK, are the only official record of this landmark meeting. All other participants were prohibited from taking notes.



against the counterrevolution.”

Ultimately, the only way the Soviet Union was able to resolve this impasse was by pressing for Kania's removal. When Jaruzelski took over as PZPR First Secretary on 19 October 1981, the final preparations for martial law moved rapidly ahead. Even Jaruzelski proved hesitant and uncertain as the deadline approached in December, and Soviet leaders began to fear that he might lose his nerve, causing the whole operation to unravel (see Document No. 21). In the end, however, Jaruzelski, unlike Kania, was willing to crush Solidarity and impose military rule.

### 3. Soviet-Polish Economic Relations

It is interesting to see what a large role economic factors played in the Soviet Politburo's deliberations throughout the crisis. The documents reveal that by the early 1980s Soviet leaders were convinced that they faced great economic difficulties. One of the ways they hoped to alleviate those problems was by restructuring their economic ties with the East European countries. Beginning in 1981 the Soviet Union cut back sharply on its exports of oil and natural gas to East Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, a move that prompted vigorous complaints from the East German leader, Erich Honecker, as well as more discreet objections from the other countries (see Document No. 10). In the case of Poland, however, Soviet officials realized that any cuts in trade and economic assistance in 1980-81 might have disastrous political consequences. Hence, far from reducing economic ties with Poland, the Soviet Union significantly stepped up its economic assistance during the first several months of the crisis, despite the obvious burdens involved. Some of the funding for this effort was raised by taking oil designated for East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria and selling it on the world market for hard currency. The proceeds, as Nikolai Baibakov explained to the CPSU Politburo, were “then turned over to the Polish People's Republic so that the Poles can buy what they need” (Document No. 2).

Although a few Soviet officials (for example, Andrei Kirilenko and Ivan Arkhipov) were skeptical all along about the wisdom of providing greater economic aid to Poland, the dominant view in Moscow during most of the crisis was (as Brezhnev argued in Document No. 3) that the Soviet Union “should give all possible economic assistance to Poland to ensure that the Poles

make it through this trying time. No matter how burdensome this will be for us, we must do it.”

By the latter half of 1981, however, as the crisis continued to deepen, Soviet leaders began questioning how long they should continue providing massive economic support for a country that appeared to be drifting away from the socialist camp. Brezhnev and his colleagues conveyed their misgivings to Jaruzelski and Kania, who increasingly suspected that Moscow was using economic pressure to force them to implement a crackdown. From at least mid-1981 on, the two Polish leaders had ample reason to assume—whether rightly or wrongly—that the question of economic aid was being linked with their willingness to crush Solidarity. When Gromyko visited Warsaw in early July 1981, he told Kania and Jaruzelski that “the nature of Soviet-Polish economic, political, and other relations will depend on the way things shape up in Poland.”<sup>21</sup> Brezhnev used this same formulation when he spoke by phone with Kania on 21 July, the day after the PZPR's Extraordinary Ninth Congress had ended.<sup>22</sup> The following month, Brezhnev told Erich Honecker that the Soviet Politburo had informed Kania and Jaruzelski that “our own [the USSR's] economic situation is very strained, and . . . our willingness to help the Poles [economically] will depend on what [political and military] measures the Polish leaders take.”<sup>23</sup>

An explicit link between possible cuts in Soviet economic assistance and the “intensified anti-Soviet campaign in Poland” was also raised during bilateral Soviet-Polish trade negotiations in September 1981.<sup>24</sup> That message was reinforced two weeks later by Nikolai Baibakov, the head of Soviet state planning, when he visited Warsaw for follow-up talks on trade. The same point was emphasized even more strongly in November 1981 by the Soviet ambassador in Poland, Boris Aristov, who played a key role during the crisis as an envoy for the CPSU Politburo. Aristov warned Soviet leaders that “although Poland will be unable to get out of its economic

---

<sup>21</sup>“Information über Gespräche des Mitgliedes des Politburos des ZK der KPdSU, Ministers für Auswärtige Angelegenheiten der UdSSR, Gen. A. A. Gromyko mit der Führung der PVAP in Warschau am 3.-5. Juli 1981,” 10 July 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, DY 30/J IV 2/202/550, Bl. 35.

<sup>22</sup>“Vermerk über ein Telefongespräch des Generalsekretars des ZK der KPdSU, Genossen Leonid Il'ic Breznev, mit dem Ersten Sekretar des ZK der PVAP, Genossen Stanislaw Kania, am 21.7.1981,” 21 July 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/202-550. Brezhnev voiced this warning, in almost identical terms, twice during the conversation.

<sup>23</sup>“Niederschrift über das Treffen zwischen Genossen L. I. Breznev und Genossen E. Honecker am 3. August 1981 auf der Krim,” notes by Bruno Mahlow, deputy head of the SED Central Committee International Department, 3 August 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/2/A—2419, Bl. 336.

<sup>24</sup>“Szyfrogram Nr. 2634/III z Moskwy,” 10 September 1981 (Secret), in CAMSW, Sygn. 228/16, Ss. 1-2.

crisis without additional aid from the USSR and other fraternal countries, the USSR must ensure that no such aid is provided unless certain political strings are attached.”<sup>25</sup> When word of these various Soviet statements leaked out, a few hardline Polish officials began secretly urging the Soviet leadership to make more direct use of economic coercion. Among those expressing this view was Zdzislaw Drewniowski, a member of the PZPR Central Committee, and Polish Sejm, who was closely aligned with the head of the pro-Soviet hardliners in the PZPR, Tadeusz Grabski.

When Drewniowski spoke with Soviet officials in late November 1981, he assured them that

the view is now widespread among stalwart Communists in Poland that if the Soviet Union were to cut off, or at least reduce, its shipments of oil, gas, ore, and other types of raw materials and finished goods to the PPR, and the Polish people genuinely felt the pinch, we would very quickly find that things would “sober up.” Such a measure would force the government to take decisive measures and would put an end to the “period of chattering” in the nation. People would finally understand that it is essential to work.<sup>26</sup>

Soviet leaders were not yet willing to risk such a drastic step, but Drewniowski's proposal was indicative of where things seemed to be heading.

These various comments by Soviet and Polish officials, and many other remarks of a similar nature, were bound to give Jaruzelski the impression that a failure to impose martial law would provoke Soviet economic retaliation. By the same token, Jaruzelski could surmise (or at least hope) that the successful imposition of martial law would be rewarded with stepped-up economic aid.

Whether economic sanctions would have been at all effective is of course a different matter. The documents below reveal that the CPSU Politburo as a whole was disinclined to make good on threatened cuts in aid. Although Soviet leaders may have sensed that they could use economic leverage *vis-a-vis* Poland for coercive purposes, they were well aware of the risks that such a strategy would have entailed, and they tended to be risk-averse on this matter. In that sense, Soviet policy in 1980-81 was quite different from the policies of East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria. Those three East European countries sharply reduced their trade

---

<sup>25</sup>"Polozhenie v PORP posle IX S"ezda," Cable No. 857 (Top Secret), 4 November 1981, from B. I. Aristov to the CPSU Politburo, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 596, Ll. 51-52.

<sup>26</sup>"Informatsiya o nekotorykh sobytyakh v Pol'skoi Narodnoi Respublike," Report No. 0242/1 (Secret), 2 December 1981, by V. Dobrik, first secretary of the L'viv oblast committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, in Tsentral'nyi Derzhavnyi Arkhiv Hromadnykh Ob'ednan Ukrainy (TsDAHOU), F. 1, Op. 25, Spravka (Spr.) 2235, L. 43.

with Poland in 1981 because of Poland's failure to meet its planned deliveries of coal and other products.<sup>27</sup> In September 1981, East German leaders publicly declared that they were halting all economic assistance to Poland (roughly 500 million Ostmarks' worth) until the Polish authorities suppressed the “raging counterrevolution” and “regained control of their society.”<sup>28</sup> Soviet leaders were just as alarmed by the turmoil in Poland as the East German, Czechoslovak, and Bulgarian authorities were, but officials in Moscow sedulously avoided any economic steps that might make the situation worse.

These findings from newly released documents are generally consonant with—though somewhat different from—the depiction of Soviet economic policy in Jaruzelski's two volumes of memoirs.<sup>29</sup> Jaruzelski contends that the Soviet Union used overt economic pressure (as well as military threats) to ensure that the Polish authorities would introduce martial law. Although Jaruzelski often overstates his case, it is certainly possible (indeed probable) that in 1981 he genuinely believed that Poland's economic relationship with the Soviet Union would be impaired unless he rebuffed the “counterrevolutionary onslaught.” Soviet leaders themselves may not have intended to force the issue at any specific point (unless Jaruzelski had overtly defied them), but the impression they created—whether deliberately or not—was that martial law and Soviet economic aid were linked.

Thus, the discrepancy between the Soviet Politburo's private deliberations (as revealed in these documents) and Jaruzelski's memoirs may be largely one of perspective. Because Soviet leaders were dismayed by the extra economic burden imposed by the Polish crisis, it is not surprising that they emphasized those concerns to Polish officials, hoping to spur them into action against Solidarity. From Jaruzelski's perspective, Moscow's frequent references to the economic burden that Poland represented may well have seemed like an explicit (or at least thinly-veiled) threat of future cutbacks, especially in view of the reductions that several of the East European countries had implemented. From the Soviet Union's perspective, however, efforts to highlight

---

<sup>27</sup> See “Vneshnyaya politika PNR na nyneshnem etape (Politpis'mo),” Cable No. 595 (Top Secret), 9 July 1981, from B. Aristov, the Soviet ambassador in Poland, to the CPSU Politburo, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 596, Ll. 21-34; and “Informatsiya o prebyvanii v GDR,” Memorandum No. 160-S (Secret), 17 July 1981, from V. P. Osnach, chairman of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Friendship Society, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2298, Ll. 15-18.

<sup>28</sup> “Zu aktuellen Fragen der Innen- und Aussenpolitik der DDR,” *Neues Deutschland* (East Berlin), 20 September 1981, p. 3.

<sup>29</sup> Wojciech Jaruzelski, *Stan wojenny: Dlaczego* (Warsaw: BGW, 1992); and *Les Chaînes et le Refuge* (Paris: Jean-Claude Lattes, 1992).

the economic repercussions of the crisis may simply have been a matter of common sense. Moreover, even if Soviet leaders were seeking to foster the impression that they would use economic coercion, the documents indicate that they probably would not have followed up on their complaints by sharply reducing economic aid to Poland. The Soviet Union's *potential* to rely on coercive economic leverage did not translate into the actual *use* of that leverage.

Indeed, it was Poland rather than the Soviet Union that was actually able to *use* economic leverage during the crisis. The severe problems afflicting the Polish economy, and the constant threat of social upheaval if the situation deteriorated further, allowed Jaruzelski to bargain for greater largesse from the Soviet Union. At a Soviet Politburo meeting on 10 December 1981 (Document No. 21), Andropov noted that “Jaruzelski has been more than persistent in setting forth economic demands from us and has made the implementation of 'Operation X' [the codename of the martial law operation] contingent on our willingness to offer increased economic assistance.” Suslov agreed that “Jaruzelski has displayed a certain degree of slyness” in pressing for greater economic aid. Other Soviet officials at the meeting made similar comments. Yet despite their awareness of what Jaruzelski was up to, they were not about to turn down most of the Polish leader's requests. On the contrary, the consensus within the Politburo on 10 December was that the Soviet Union should provide whatever economic aid was necessary to Poland in the aftermath of martial law, even if that meant “drawing down [Soviet] state reserves or sacrificing deliveries to the [USSR's] internal market.” On 13 December, the first day under martial law, Jaruzelski was able to report to the PZPR Politburo that “I received a phone call from Cde. Brezhnev, who expressed his warm feelings toward us and said we have acted effectively in struggling against counterrevolution. . . . I was assured that we could now count on economic aid, a subject I strongly emphasized during the conversation.”<sup>30</sup>

Thus, to a surprising degree, Poland's economic weakness became a key source of leverage for Jaruzelski in his dealings with Moscow.

In much the same way, Poland's heavy indebtedness to Western countries and banks provided leverage to Kania and Jaruzelski. Soviet leaders feared that if Poland did not receive enough Soviet aid, the Poles would become even more dependent on the West. The growing

---

<sup>30</sup> Quoted from "Protokol Nr. 19 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR w dniu 13.XII.1981 r.," 13 December 1981 (Top Secret), in AAN, T. 2343, Dokument (Dok.) 8, S. 4.

signs in the spring of 1981 that Poland would seek to regain membership in the International Monetary Fund—mainly to gain additional credits—were viewed with dismay in Moscow, spurring Soviet officials to increase their own subsidies to Poland rather than put up with “another concession to Western countries” (Document No. 10). Poland's dependence on the West for credits and imports also enabled Polish leaders to bargain with Moscow for more time in 1981 by arguing that the imposition of martial law would cause Western governments to exact economic reprisals against Poland. By the time martial law was imposed, Soviet leaders had conceded that the prospect of Western economic retaliation against Poland would require the Soviet Union to step in and boost its own economic aid (Document No. 21). Once again, therefore, Polish leaders were able to translate economic weakness and vulnerability into political and economic concessions from Moscow.

#### 4. Soviet Perceptions of Solidarity

The documents below, and many others, suggest that Soviet leaders were firmly opposed to a settlement that would have given Solidarity a genuine and lasting share of power in Poland. From the outset, Moscow's only apparent aim was to ensure that an internal crackdown would be implemented as soon as possible. In that sense, the documents merely corroborate what has long been suspected.

On the other hand, the documents reveal that, at least for a while, Soviet leaders had a more sophisticated understanding of Solidarity than their public comments usually implied. In public, Soviet officials tended to gloss over the cleavages within Solidarity—cleavages along political, geographic, and occupational lines—and to lump diverse union organizers together under the rubric of “antisocialist” and “extremist” elements. Most of the Soviet Union's press coverage of events in Poland made no attempt to explain the dynamics behind Solidarity or, even more, the Committee for Workers' Defense (KOR), an organization that invariably was depicted as a fount of “anti-Communist, anti-socialist, and anti-Soviet extremism.” Anyone relying solely on articles in the Soviet press would have assumed that almost all officials in Moscow viewed Solidarity as a largely monolithic entity.

Newly released documents do not wholly dissipate that impression, but they do yield a

more complicated picture. Soviet intelligence reports during the crisis often gave Soviet leaders a good sense of the diverse nature of Solidarity. One such report, citing a high-level KGB agent in the Polish state security apparatus, noted that “with regard to Wałęsa, the view increasingly is that he does not adhere to such a reactionary position. Unfortunately, no one from the PZPR leadership is seriously negotiating with him to ensure that his positive qualities are used in the interests of socialist Poland.”<sup>31</sup> Many other intelligence dispatches conveyed a similar evaluation of Walesa and the “moderates” within Solidarity.<sup>32</sup> Anyone who skimmed through these reports— or, better yet, studied them carefully—would have realized that Solidarity was not monolithic.

In that light, it is not wholly surprising that most of the participants in the Soviet Politburo's deliberations in 1980-81 occasionally displayed a nuanced understanding of Solidarity.

When the crisis began, Soviet leaders instinctively viewed Solidarity as nothing more than a “counterrevolutionary” and “alien” force acting at the behest of “international imperialism,” but before long their perceptions became somewhat less rigid. A report approved by the CPSU Secretariat in January 1981 (Document No. 7) described Solidarity as “a force to be reckoned with” and conceded that the union “is not a unified organization, either ideologically or politically.

It encompasses serious disagreements among individual leaders and regional groups.” Soon thereafter, one of the members of the Soviet Politburo's Commission on Poland, Leonid Zamyatin, acknowledged that Solidarity “is heterogeneous in its composition [and] is a fundamental movement with which the PZPR must come to terms” (Document No. 8). Similar comments were expressed in a report adopted by the full Suslov Commission in April 1981, which urged the Polish authorities to “strike a blow against the enemies of socialism without implying that Solidarity as a whole is identical to the hostile forces that exist within the organization.”<sup>33</sup> This

---

<sup>31</sup> "Spravka," Dispatch No. 636 (Top Secret), 17 April 1981, from S. P. Donchak, deputy head of the Ukrainian KGB's 7th border detachment for intelligence, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2235, Ll. 23—24.

<sup>32</sup> "Agenturnoe soobshchenie: Nekotorye soobrazheniya po povodu pol'skogo krizisa," Dispatch No. 22383 (Top Secret), 12 January 1981, transmitted by Colonel S. Jankunas, deputy head of the Lithuanian KGB's 2nd Directorate, in Lietuvos Ypatingasis Archyvas (LYA), F. 1, Apy. 50, B. 7, La. 108-118; and "Agenturnoe soobshchenie: O politicheskoi situatsii v Pol'she," Dispatch No. 2/2-1375 (Top Secret), 14 April 1981, transmitted by Colonel S. Jankunas, in LYA, F. 1, Apy. 50, B. 7, La. 120-130, esp. 124-125.

<sup>33</sup> "Plan meropriyatii po okazaniyu pomoshchi rukovodstvu PORP v organizatsionnom i ideologicheskom ukreplenii partii," 16 April 1981 (Top Secret), attachment to "Vypiska iz protokola No. 7 zasedaniya Politbyuro TsK KPSS ot 23 aprelya 1981 goda: O razvitii v Pol'she i nekotorykh shagakh s nashei storony," No. P7/VII (Top Secret/Special Dossier), 23 April 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 66, D. 3, Ll. 9-11.

remark, like the others, indicates that Soviet leaders were cognizant of the heterogeneity of Solidarity and the wide grassroots support that the organization enjoyed.

Not until the late summer of 1981 did Soviet officials largely abandon the notion that Solidarity was a diverse entity. The Soviet Politburo's reversion to a more dogmatic position was especially evident after the opening session of Solidarity's first National Congress in September 1981, which issued a "Message to Working-Class People in Eastern Europe."<sup>34</sup> The message pledged Solidarity's help and support for "workers in Eastern Europe" and "all the nations of the Soviet Union" who were seeking to establish their own independent trade unions. Brezhnev and his colleagues publicly denounced the statement as a "summons to counterrevolution," and they vowed in private to crush the "hooliganistic stunts of Solidarity's leaders . . . who would like to sow confusion in the other socialist countries and stir up groups of different types of traitors" (Document No. 17). From that point on, Soviet leaders' views of Solidarity, both publicly and privately, became more uniformly jaundiced. They were no longer willing to acknowledge that the union consisted of anything other than "counterrevolutionary" and "reactionary" forces.

Despite this shift, the Soviet Politburo's more balanced evaluations of Solidarity earlier in the crisis were revealing. Those earlier assessments, voiced only in private, were hardly enough to offset the torrent of public Soviet criticism and denunciations. Nevertheless, if Soviet leaders were at least privately willing to acknowledge the heterogeneity of Solidarity, this suggests that under a more innovative leader in 1981 the Soviet Union might have been willing to accept a genuine compromise with Solidarity, as was done in 1989 under Mikhail Gorbachev.

## 5. Political Spillover from Poland

Newly released documents leave no doubt that Soviet leaders were gravely concerned about the political spillover from Poland into other Warsaw Pact countries, above all the Soviet Union itself. The transcripts of internal deliberations in Moscow during Soviet-East European crises in 1956, 1968, and 1980-81 indicate that Soviet officials in each case were preoccupied by

---

<sup>34</sup> "Posłanie do ludzi pracy w Europie Wschodniej," *Tygodnik Solidarnosc* (Warsaw), No. 25 (18 September 1981), p. 6.



fears of an uncontrolled “anti-socialist” spillover.<sup>35</sup> Their fears, stemming from a Soviet version of the “domino theory,” were by no means far-fetched, as the events of 1989 later showed.

Concerns in Moscow about the potential for a spillover in 1980-81 arose as soon as the first wave of strikes engulfed Poland. Soviet intelligence reports, diplomatic cables, and contacts with East-bloc leaders all suggested that the unrest might soon spread into other East European countries, causing much wider disruption for the Warsaw Pact. The Soviet ambassador in East Germany, Pyotr Abrasimov, reported that “some officials from the Polish trade union Solidarity and other anti-socialist elements from the PPR have been trying to propagate their ideas among the 23,000 Poles who are permanently employed at enterprises in the GDR, and also in the GDR's own work collectives.”<sup>36</sup> Although Abrasimov claimed that “these actions were decisively suppressed and [that] numerous Poles were expelled from the GDR,” the very fact that this sort of thing was occurring was bound to spark disquiet in Moscow. The unease was compounded by frequent complaints from the East German leader, Erich Honecker, who periodically warned Brezhnev about the increasing spillover into the GDR: “Our citizens can watch the Polish events on Western television. . . . Revisionist forces [in the GDR] often refer to the new Polish model of socialism that can be transferred to other countries. We can no longer discount the possibility that the Polish disease will spread.”<sup>37</sup> This same point was stressed by the leaders of Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, Gustav Husak and Todor Zhivkov, who were just as alarmed as Honecker was and were just as intent on making their views known to Brezhnev.

Even if there had been no risk that the Polish crisis would destabilize the other East European regimes, the effect of Solidarity on the USSR itself was enough to provoke deep anxiety in Moscow. From late July 1980 on, the Soviet Politburo took a number of steps to propitiate Soviet workers and to bolster labor discipline. These actions were motivated by an

---

<sup>35</sup> The importance of this issue during the 1956 and 1968 crises is discussed in Mark Kramer, “The Soviet Union and the 1956 Crises in Poland and Hungary: Reassessments and New Findings,” *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (April 1998), 163-215, esp. 192-198; Mark Kramer, “The Czechoslovak Crisis and the Brezhnev Doctrine,” in Carole Fink, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker, eds., *1968: The World Transformed* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 111-172, esp. 141-145; and Mark Kramer, “Ukraine and the Soviet-Czechoslovak Crisis of 1968 (Part 1): New Evidence from the Diary of Petro Shelest,” *Cold War International History Bulletin*, Issue No. 10 (March 1998), pp. 234-248.

<sup>36</sup> “Informatsiya o prebyvanii v GDR,” Memorandum No. 160-s (Secret), 17 July 1981, from V. P. Osnach, chairman of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Friendship Society, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2298, Ll. 15-18.

<sup>37</sup> “Niederschrift uber das Treffen zwischen Genossen L. I. Breznev und Genossen E. Honecker am 3. August 1981 auf der Krim,” notes by Bruno Mahlow, deputy head of the SED Central Committee International Department, 3 August 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/2/A-2419, Bl. 336.

acute fear that the emergence of a free trade union in Poland would spur workers in the Soviet Union, especially in western Ukraine, western Belorussia, and the Baltic states, to press for improved living conditions, greater freedom, and an independent trade union of their own.<sup>38</sup> Even in Russia, the prospect of worker unrest loomed large. The KGB had harshly suppressed three separate attempts by labor activists to set up an independent union in Russia in the late 1970s, and ever since then the Soviet leadership had reacted with inordinate hostility to anything that might give renewed impetus to an unofficial workers' movement.<sup>39</sup> Newly declassified documents reveal that high-level concerns about labor unrest were well-founded. A report approved by the CPSU Secretariat in October 1980 acknowledged that strikes and labor disputes had “significantly increased” in the Soviet Union over the previous few months, in large part because of the Polish crisis.<sup>40</sup> This trend, according to the report, “is evoking grave consternation.” The incidence of labor unrest in the Soviet Union had been surprisingly high even before the emergence of Solidarity—secret data indicated that in 1979 alone there were more than 300 work stoppages involving some 9,000 workers—and Soviet leaders were apprehensive that strikes, work disruptions, and other “negative incidents” would sharply escalate.<sup>41</sup>

To forestall a surge of labor unrest, the CPSU Politburo in September 1980 ordered all party and state organizations in the Soviet Union to “take urgent, immediate steps to ensure that

---

<sup>38</sup> This analysis—both here and in the annotations—has been greatly aided by the opportunity to conduct research in Ukrainian, Lithuanian, and Latvian archives during the author's visits to Kyiv, Vilnius, and Riga in the summer of 1997 as part of a CWHIP delegation that included David Wolff, James Hershberg, and Vladislav Zubok.

<sup>39</sup> “K voprosu o t.n. 'nezavisimom profsoyuze,” Memorandum No. 655-L (Secret), 5 April 1978, from Yu. V. Andropov to the CPSU Politburo, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 18, D. 73, L. 1. The first attempt, in January 1978, was made by a long-time activist and mining engineer, Vladimir Klebanov, whose “Association of Free Trade Unions of Workers” was forcefully disbanded less than two weeks after it was founded. The second attempt, in April 1978, was by Vsevolod Kuvakin, who set up a short-lived “Independent Trade Union of Workers.” The third attempt, by a group known as the “Free Interprofessional Amalgamation of Workers,” lasted longer than the other two, from October 1978 until it was crushed in the spring of 1980. For further details, see Betty Gidwitz, “Labor Unrest in the Soviet Union,” *Problems of Communism*, Vol. 31, No. 6 (November–December 1982), pp. 25–42; “The Independent Trade-Union Movement in the Soviet Union,” *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 304/79 (11 October 1979); and Karl Schogel, *Opposition sowjetischer Arbeiter heute* (Koln: Bundesinstitut für ostwissenschaftliche und internationale Studien, 1981).

<sup>40</sup> “Ob otdel'nykh negativnykh proyavleniyakh, svyazannykh s narusheniyami uslovii organizatsii i oplaty truda rabochikh i sluzhashchikh,” Memorandum No. 27833 (Top Secret), 15 October 1980, from I. Kapitonov and V. Dolgikh to the CPSU Secretariat, attachment to “Postanovlenie Sekretariata TsK Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soyuza: O nekotorykh negativnykh proyavleniyakh, svyazannykh s nedostatkami v organizatsii i oplate truda rabochikh i sluzhashchikh,” St-233/8s (Top Secret), 24 October 1980, in Tsentr Khraneniya Sovremennoi Dokumentatsii (TsKhSD), F. 89, Op. 13, D. 37, Ll. 1–12.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, L. 9.

the everyday needs and requirements of the Soviet people are more fully satisfied.”<sup>42</sup> The Politburo explicitly linked this directive with the situation in Poland. A senior official from the CPSU Central Committee apparatus, Ivan Kapitonov, who was responsible for monitoring the implementation of the Politburo's decree, reported in mid-October that the preliminary results were auspicious:

Measures are being taken in certain places to improve the supply to the population of necessary goods and products. These measures include the direct supply of such goods at places of employment. Great attention is being devoted to the preparations made by enterprises, establishments, and organizations for work under wintertime conditions, especially the communal economy, transportation, and communications. Strict supervision is being exerted to ensure that plan targets are fulfilled for the construction of living quarters, day care, medical facilities, cultural and recreational sites, and eating establishments.<sup>43</sup>

Kapitonov also noted that party officials had “expressed harsh criticism about enterprise directors who display indifference and callousness toward ordinary workers.” He added that the party committees had condemned “the failure of certain party, government, and trade union officials to meet in person with the workers' collectives and their near-total ignorance of the conditions under which workers live.” Kapitonov said that the party committees had reminded enterprise directors of “their personal responsibility for the education of people, the resolution of social problems, and the establishment of a sound moral-psychological climate within the collectives.”<sup>44</sup>

In addition to promoting urgent improvements in workers' living standards, Soviet leaders tried to erect a number of barriers against Solidarity's influence. In early October 1980, at Moscow's behest, Lithuanian Communist Party officials ordered “the republic press, radio, and television to allocate more coverage to the role of [Communist-sponsored] trade unions in our country.” They also ordered local authorities to “intensify their ideological work.”<sup>45</sup> This notion of tightening discipline and strengthening ideological controls was emphasized constantly over the next several months. Carefully controlled meetings were held every week, and sometimes

---

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, “TsK KPSS: O provodimoi rabote v svyazi s informatsiei Tsk KPSS 'o razvitii sobytii v Pol'she,” Ll. 1-2 10-12; and Memorandum No. 27908 (Secret), 15 October 1980, from I. Kapitonov, head of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, to the CPSU Secretariat, TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 77, D. 105, Ll. 1-9. See also the supporting documents in Ll. 10-54 of the same file.

<sup>43</sup> “TsK KPSS: O provodimoi rabote v svyazi s informatsiei Tsk KPSS 'o razvitii sobytii v Pol'she,” Ll. 7-8.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, L. 8.

more than once a week, at factories and other worksites throughout the Soviet Union.<sup>46</sup>

As a further preventative step, the CPSU Secretariat adopted a resolution on 4 October 1980 providing for “certain measures to regulate the circulation of the Polish press in the USSR.”<sup>47</sup> The resolution authorized the USSR's Main Directorate for the Protection of State Secrets in the Press (Glavlit) to screen, and if necessary destroy, nearly all Polish newspapers and periodicals distributed within the Soviet Union. It also authorized the KGB to “sift out Polish publications sent through the mail to private individuals, libraries, and educational institutions in order to prevent the dissemination of potentially unsavory items.” The KGB's Border Guards were instructed to “adopt tighter controls at border checkpoints to uncover and prevent attempts to smuggle into the country any politically harmful literature and other materials about the events in Poland.”<sup>48</sup> In December 1980, the CPSU Secretariat adopted a large number of “supplementary measures to control the circulation of the Polish press in the USSR.”<sup>49</sup> This new resolution was approved after two members of the Suslov Commission, Leonid Zamyatin and Oleg Rakhmanin, determined that “the overwhelming majority of Polish periodicals contain anti-socialist and anti-Soviet information, and are not controlled by the PZPR Central Committee.”<sup>50</sup> The resolution expanded the scope of the earlier decree and provided for even stricter censorship. Subsequent reports from Zamyatin and other senior officials reinforced the censorship regime.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> "TsK KPSS: Informatsiya o rabote, provodimoi v Litovskoi SSR v svyazi s sobyitiyami v PNR," Memorandum No. 1074s (Secret), 1 October 1980, from P. Griskivicius, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party, in Lietuvos Visuomenes Organizaciju Archyvas (LVOA), F. 1771, Apy. 257, B. 193, La. 135.

<sup>46</sup> See, for examples, the large number of documents in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, Dd. 76, 85, and 86, and Op. 77, Dd. 86, 105, and 106.

<sup>47</sup> "Postanovlenie Sekretariata TsK Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soyuza: O nekotorykh merakh po uporyadocheniyu rasprostraneniya pol'skoi pechati v SSSR," St-231/8s (Top Secret), in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 46, D. 81, L. 8.

<sup>48</sup> For a valuable description of how the KGB handled these activities in Ukraine, see "O nekotorykh merakh po uporyadocheniyu rasprostraneniya pol'skoi periodicheskoi pechati i literatury v respublike," Memorandum No. 4339/42 (Top Secret), 25 October 1980, from I. Sokolov, V. Fedorchuk, and Ya. Pogrebnyak, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2129, Ll. 60-61.

<sup>49</sup> "Vypiska iz protokola No. 242/61gs Sekretariata TsK: O nekotorykh dopolnitel'nykh merakh po kontrolyu za rasprostraneniem pol'skoi pechati v SSSR," No. St-242/61gs (Top Secret), in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 46, D. 81, Ll. 1-26.

<sup>50</sup> "O nekotorykh dopolnitel'nykh merakh po kontrolyu za rasprostraneniem pol'skoi pechati v SSSR," Memorandum No. 7D-199 (Top Secret), 5 December 1980, from L. Zamyatin, O. Rakhmanin, and E. Tyazhel'nikov, head of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 46, D. 81, L. 6.

<sup>51</sup> "TsK KPSS," Memorandum No. 413ss (Top Secret), 19 March 1981, from P. K. Romanov, head of Glavlit, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 46, D. 81, Ll. 15-20; and "Informatsiya Glavlita SSSR, Ministerstva svyazi SSSR i Gosplana SSSR," Memorandum No. 30758 (Top Secret), 14 August 1981, from E. Tyazhen'nikov, head of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, with accompanying documents, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 46, D. 81, Ll. 21-26.

In addition to clamping down on Polish publications, the Soviet Politburo sought to limit all personal contact between Soviet and Polish citizens. In August 1980 the Politburo instructed KGB and Communist Party officials in the Soviet republics bordering Poland (Lithuania, Belorussia, and Ukraine) to keep stricter control over Polish tourists and to monitor the comments of Soviet tourists who visited Poland. The reports that these officials sent back to Moscow were often disconcerting. A typical report, from a senior official in Ukraine, found that “when Soviet tour groups have recently been in the PPR, the group leaders have detected unfriendly behavior toward the Soviet tourists as well as anti-Soviet sentiments on the part of wide segments of the local population.”<sup>52</sup> The report noted that food shortages and other problems in Poland were being blamed on the Soviet Union, and that many Poles were voicing “hostile and anti-Soviet slogans” and claiming that the Polish Communist regime was “maintained only through Russian bayonets.” Equally jarring reports came in from L'viv, which was one of the major rail transit points for Polish tourists arriving in the Soviet Union. The head of the L'viv oblast party committee expressed alarm about the “flagrant abuses and anti-Soviet statements by Polish tourists.” He said he would “adopt necessary measures to strengthen political-educational work with Polish tourists, to think more carefully about their programs of stay in L'viv, to train the interpreters and tour guides more thoroughly, and to focus the Polish tourists' special attention during their trips on propaganda highlighting the advantages of the socialist way of life.”<sup>53</sup>

Similar warnings continued to flow into Moscow over the next two months, prompting the CPSU leadership to order a sharp reduction in tourism both to and from Poland (Document No. 5). This cutback, imposed in early November 1980, came just a few days after the East German, Czechoslovak, and Bulgarian authorities had adopted similar measures. From the outset, the Soviet Union had been working closely with these other Warsaw Pact countries to develop a coordinated policy on tourism. The four governments exchanged information not only

---

<sup>52</sup> Quoted from "Informatsiya o nekotorykh vyskazivaniyakh, imeyushchikh mesto so storony pol'skikh grazhdan pri vstrechakh s sovetскими turistami, a takzhe vo vremya prebyvaniya v Ukrainskoi SSR po linii Byuro mezhdunarodnogo molodezhnogo turizma 'Sputnik'," Report No. 24-s (Secret), 3 September 1980, from G. Naumenko, chairman of the "Sputnik" Bureau of International Youth Tourism of the Ukrainian Komsomol, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2138, Ll. 138-142.

about Polish tourists, but also about the views expressed by East German, Czechoslovak, and Bulgarian citizens.<sup>54</sup>

The scaling back of Soviet-Polish tourist exchanges was a strong signal of Moscow's determination to ward off the "Polish disease," but it proved to have only a limited effect.<sup>55</sup> In March 1981, the head of the Latvian KGB, Boris Pugo, acknowledged that Polish tourists in Latvia were still "trying to exert an ideologically harmful influence on [Latvian] young people by tendentiously glorifying the process of social renewal now under way in Poland."<sup>56</sup> Pugo added that a systematic check of "mail correspondence between Polish citizens and their relatives and friends in the Latvian SSR" had uncovered "anti-socialist depictions of the events in Poland" and "exhortations for nationalist elements in the [Latvian] republic to follow the example of the so-called free trade union in Poland." Gloomy reports were still coming in from Ukraine as well. In May 1981, three leading Ukrainian party officials expressed dismay that many of the Polish tourists in Ukraine "view the situation [in Poland] from an anti-socialist perspective, speak pejoratively about the countries of the socialist commonwealth, and are ready to defend all types of counterrevolutionary elements."<sup>57</sup> The three officials averred that many of the Polish tourists were "seeking to lay territorial claims to western Ukraine" and were "equating Communism with fascism." These sorts of complaints, as well as accusations that "Polish tourists are trying to smuggle in ideologically hostile literature" and "are fomenting anti-Soviet and anti-socialist sentiments," continued to stream in from Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, and Belorussia all through

---

<sup>53</sup> Quoted from "Informatsiya o reagirovanii pol'skikh turistov na sobytiya v PNR," Report No. 0585 (Secret), 26 August 1980, from V. Svyatotskii, first secretary of the UkrCP oblast committee in L'viv, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2138, Ll. 66-71.

<sup>54</sup> See, for example, "O vyskazivaniyakh inostrannykh turistov po povodu sobytii v PNR," Memorandum No. 318-s (Top Secret), 26 August 1980, from Yu. Il'nyts'kyi, first secretary of the UkrCP Transcarpathian oblast committee, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2138, Ll. 51-53, as well as Il'nyts'kyi's follow-up report, "O prodolzhayushchikhsya vyskazivaniyakh inostrannykh turistov po povodu sobytii v Pol'she," Memorandum No. 330-s (Top Secret), 5 September 1980, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2138, Ll. 60-63.

<sup>55</sup> One of the possible reasons for this, as I point out in an annotation to Document No. 5, is that the proposed reductions may not have been fully implemented.

<sup>56</sup> "Dokladnaya zapiska o vremennom ogranichenii turisticheskogo i studencheskogo obmena s PNR," Memorandum No. 5/1598 (Top Secret), 9 March 1981, in Latvijas Valsts Arhivs, Fonds 101, Apridos 47, Lietas 141, Lapa 48-49.

<sup>57</sup> "O reagirovanii trydyashchikhsya respubliki, a takzhe zarubezhnykh grazhdan, nakhodyashchikhsya na Ukraine, na sobytiya v Pol'she," Memorandum No. 1810/44 (Secret), 12 May 1981, from G. Kryuchkov, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, L. Kravchuk, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Propaganda and Agitation Department, and A. Merkulov, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Department for Foreign Ties, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2295, Ll. 1-4.

1981.<sup>58</sup>

The Soviet Union's persisting concerns about tourism reflected the general inefficacy of the measures adopted by Soviet leaders to prevent a “contagion” from Poland. The measures at best only slowed, rather than averted, a spillover. Yuri Andropov acknowledged as much at the CPSU Politburo's meeting on 2 April 1981 (Document No. 11):

The Polish events are influencing the situation in the western provinces of our country, particularly in Belorussia. Many villages there are listening to Polish-language radio and television. I might add that in certain other regions, especially in Georgia, we have had wild demonstrations. In Tbilisi not long ago, groups of loudmouths have been gathering on the streets, proclaiming anti-Soviet slogans, and so forth. In this respect, we, too, must adopt severe measures internally.

Andropov's comments were based on a flood of alarming reports from KGB sources (see Document No. 22) and local party and government officials. His remarks, at a time of growing uncertainty about the political future of the USSR, implied that even worst-case scenarios could no longer be ruled out.

The situation, as Andropov noted, was especially troubling in the westernmost Soviet republics, where large communities of ethnic Poles still lived. Soon after the crisis began, the head of the Lithuanian Communist Party, Patras Griskivicius, had warned that “the 18 percent of residents in Vilnius who are of Polish nationality are following the situation in Poland with enormous interest.”<sup>59</sup> He expressed dismay that Polish television was broadcasting religious programs, Catholic masses, and “invidious films from Western countries,” which were “giving impetus to anti-socialist forces in Lithuania” and having “an unsalutary influence on the [Lithuanian] population, especially young people.” Griskivicius said he was “particularly worried about this matter because the regions of Lithuania adjacent to Poland can receive these broadcasts.”

Griskivicius continued to send periodic warnings to Moscow during the remainder of the crisis. In some cases he merely condemned the “pernicious activities” of Polish tourists, but in other cases he claimed that “Solidarity is trying to infiltrate the republic” and is “fomenting

---

<sup>58</sup> Quoted from “Infomatsiya o nepravil'nom povedenii grazhdan PNR, sleduyushchikh tranzitom cherez Chernovitskuyu oblast,” Memorandum No. 224/7s-3 (Secret), 10 June 1981, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2287, Ll. 8-10.

<sup>59</sup> “TsK KPSS: Informatsiya ob otklikakh sekretarei partiinykh komitetov Kompartii Litvy na itogi krymskikh vstrech General'nogo sekretarya TsK KPSS, Predsedatelya Prezidiuma Verkhovnogo Soveta SSR tov. Brezhnev L. I. s

unrest.” As an illustration of this latter point, he cited a strike in June 1981 by dozens of drivers at an auto transport factory in Salcininkai, which the party finally had to crush.<sup>60</sup> Griskiavicius also repeatedly “emphasized that Polish television broadcasts and radio broadcasts are having a negative ideological impact on segments of the Lithuanian population. Polish television reaches the whole southern part of our republic, including Kaunas, and channels 1 and 2 of Polish radio can be picked up throughout the republic.”<sup>61</sup> Although Griskiavicius assured Soviet leaders that he was taking appropriate steps to “intensify our ideological work, improve conditions for the labor force, and meet the everyday needs of workers,” he left no doubt that the spillover from Poland, if left unchecked, would cause growing “disruption and discontent” in Lithuania.

Officials in Belorussia, Ukraine, and other republics warned of similar problems. The first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party committee in Brest oblast, Efrem Sokolov, later described how the “events in Poland” and the “slandorous fabrications of Western radio stations targeted against Poland and against our country” had “aggravated the internal situation” in Belorussia:

Not a single resident of the oblast was indifferent to the events in Poland. . . . Many Brest residents are linked by familial ties with citizens of the Polish People's Republic. We have to remember that large segments of the oblast's population can receive broadcasts on Polish television. Until martial law was introduced in Poland, many of these broadcasts were anti-Communist in nature. The programs crippled the Poles' efforts to struggle for the ideals of the working class and failed to provide a class-based evaluation of the activities of the right-wing leaders of the Solidarity trade union and their KOS-KOR advisers. They distorted historical reality and featured vicious attacks against our country. The lack of political vigilance and the insouciance that characterized some Polish leaders could not help but upset the oblast's inhabitants.”<sup>62</sup>

From August 1980 on, Belorussian and Ukrainian leaders highlighted the “adverse consequences” of the Polish crisis in their republics, using examples similar to those cited by Griskiavicius about Lithuania.<sup>63</sup> All these reports inevitably contributed to the growing unease in Moscow.

---

rukovoditelyami bratskikh partii sotsialisticheskikh stran v 1980 godu,” Memorandum No. 949s (Secret), 27 August 1980, in LVOA, F. 1771, Apy. 257, B. 193, Ll. 113-117.

<sup>60</sup> “Protokol No. 10 zasedaniya Byuro Tsentral'nogo Komiteta Kompartii Litvy ot 2 iyulya 1981 goda: 1. O fakte otказа ot raboty voditelei Shal'chininskogo avtotransportnogo predpriyatiya,” 2 July 1981 (Top Secret), LVOA, F. 1771, Apy. 259, B. 58, La. 1-3.

<sup>61</sup> “TsK KPSS: Informatsiya o rabote, provodimoi v Litovskoi SSR v svyazi s sobyitiyami v PNR,” L. 134.

<sup>62</sup> E. Sokolov, “Za klassovuyu zorkost’,” *Kommunist* (Moscow), No. 4 (April 1984), p. 31.

<sup>63</sup> See, for example, “O provodimoi v Belorussii rabote v svyazi s sobyitiyami v PNR,” Memorandum No. 01065



Perhaps most troubling of all for the Soviet Politburo was the mounting evidence that events in Poland were taking their toll on the Soviet army. Andropov reported that “mass subversive ideological actions had been aimed at the personnel of Soviet military units in Poland” (Document No. 22). The KGB's military counterintelligence units had to adopt extra safeguards to defeat those actions. The KGB also had to take special steps to thwart what Andropov described as “a number of attempts to form groups of servicemen around politically hostile aims.”

The adverse effect of the Polish crisis on Soviet troops was especially pronounced in the Baltic Military District (MD), Major-General Ya. L. Zhuk, the head of the KGB's military counterintelligence units in the Baltic MD reported that many troops in the district, especially those of Lithuanian origin, “are indulging in politically hostile and nationalistic actions and, on this basis, are forming treacherous, malevolent, and anti-Soviet intentions. . . . [These soldiers] express anti-Russian sentiments and disparaging comments about Soviet reality. . . . They approve the subversive actions of Solidarity in the PPR and view anti-Soviet forces [in the USSR] as national heroes.”<sup>64</sup> Zhuk emphasized that his “analysis of materials about the politically hostile acts committed by certain soldiers leaves no doubt that . . . the events in Poland and the anti-Soviet subversive actions of Solidarity have had a major detrimental impact.”<sup>65</sup>

The emergence of these “treacherous, anti-Soviet, and nationalist sentiments among certain categories of soldiers” in the Baltic Military District was all the more worrisome because of the high state of readiness at which Soviet troops in the district had been maintained since the crisis began. A memorandum prepared in late August 1980 by the Suslov Commission indicated that a tank division and other forces in the Baltic Military District were to be put onto a wartime footing to ensure that they would be “ready in case military assistance is provided to Poland.”<sup>66</sup>

The crucial role of the Baltic Military District in Soviet contingency planning during the Polish crisis demanded a high level of troop morale. If events in Poland, as Zhuk reported, were steadily

---

(Secret), 30 September 1980, from P. Masherov, First Secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 77, D. 105, Ll. 20-27; and "Informatsiya o reagirovaniy trudyashchikhsya Ukrainskoi SSR na sobytiya v Pol'she i rabote, provodimoi partiinymi organizatsiyami," Memorandum No. 3/73 (Secret), 2 October 1980, from I. Sokolov, UkrCP Central Committee Secretary, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 77, D. 105, Ll. 49-53.

<sup>64</sup> "Spravka o faktakh i prichinakh politicheskii vrednykh proyavlenii so storony otdel'nykh voennosluzhashchikh, prizvannykh voenkomatami Litovskoi SSR," Memorandum No. 02670 (Top Secret), from Major-General Ya. L. Zhuk, in LVOA, F. 1771, Apy. 260, B. 182, Ll. 87-95.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, L. 92.

<sup>66</sup> "TsK KPSS," No. 682-op (Special Dossier/Top Secret), 28 August 1980, from Suslov, Gromyko, Ustinov, Andropov, and Ustinov, in Arkhiv Prezidenta Rossiiskoi Federatsii (APRF), F. 83-op, Op. 20, D. 5, L. 1.

eroding that morale, Soviet military options vis-a-vis Poland necessarily would be limited.

One further dimension of the spillover from Poland arose in December 1981, just after martial law was imposed. Officials in the neighboring Soviet republics took extraordinary measures, relying on the state security organs and internal affairs ministry troops, to “uphold public order, monitor the behavior of individuals who subscribe to extremist views, and strengthen political vigilance at the most important economic sites.”<sup>67</sup> Party officials also undertook a massive propaganda and political education campaign.<sup>68</sup> For the most part, these measures were successful. Once Solidarity had been crushed and orthodox rule had been restored in Poland, the spillover into the Soviet Union was much easier to contain. If martial law had not been successful and Solidarity had increasingly overshadowed (and eventually displaced) the PZPR, it is difficult to say what would have happened in the Soviet Union. It is certainly plausible that the western Soviet republics would have experienced growing instability. Although the success of Jaruzelski's “internal solution” spared Soviet leaders from having to face that dilemma, the unrest that surfaced in 1980-81 adumbrated what was to come on a much larger scale at the end of the decade.

---

<sup>67</sup> "O reagirovanii trudyashchikhsya Ukrainskoi SSR na poslednie sobytiya v Pol'she," Memorandum No. 1/147 (Secret), from Volodymyr Shcherbytskyi, UkrCP Central Committee First Secretary, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2209, Ll. 78-80.

<sup>68</sup> "O reagirovanii naseleniya oblasti na sobytiya v Pol'she," Memorandum No. 01/582-06 (Secret), 14 December 1981, from V. Kavun, first secretary of the UkrCP's Zhytomyr oblast committee, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2295, Ll. 10-11.

DOCUMENT No. 1

To be returned within 3 days to the  
CPSU CC (General Department, 1st sector)

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

Communist Party of the Soviet Union CENTRAL COMMITTEE

TOP SECRET  
SPECIAL DOSSIER

EYES ONLY

No. P/213/38

To: Cdes. Brezhnev, Andropov, Gromyko, and Rakhmanin

Extract from Protocol No. 213 of the Session of the CPSU CC Politburo on 3  
September 1980

---

On Theses for the Discussion with Representatives of the Polish Leadership.

To endorse the theses for the discussion with representatives of the Polish leadership (see attached).

CC SECRETARY

---

Regarding point 38 of Prot. No. 213

To be transmitted by the KGB in encrypted form  
to the designated point.

1. To give a precise evaluation of and take a clear position on the agreement with the so-called "United Strike Committees" (ZKS) in Gdansk and Szczecin.<sup>1</sup>

The agreement concluded by the PPR government, and endorsed by the plenum of the PZPR CC, exacts a high political and economic price for the "regulation" it achieves. We, of

---

<sup>1</sup> Translator's Note: Momentous agreements were concluded between the Polish government and the Inter-Factory Strike Committee (*Miedzyszakladowy Komitet Strajkowy*, or MKS) in Szczecin and Gdansk on 30 and 31 August, respectively. These agreements, coming after two months of deepening unrest all over Poland, were swiftly approved by the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party (*Polska Zjednoczona Partia Robotnicza*, or PZPR). Three days later, another agreement was concluded between the Polish government and the MKS in the Silesian mining town of Jastrzebie. The three agreements marked the full-fledged start of the Solidarity era in Poland.

course, understand the circumstances in which you had to make this onerous decision.<sup>2</sup> The agreement, in essence, signifies the legalization of the anti-socialist opposition. An organization has emerged that aims to spread its political influence through the entire country. The complexity of the struggle against it stems, in particular, from the fact that the members of the opposition disguise themselves as defenders of the working class and as laborers.

The agreement does not eliminate the underlying causes of the crisis events; and what is more, the urgent problems of the Polish economy and Polish society are now becoming more complicated.

Because the opposition intends to continue the struggle to achieve its aims, and the healthy forces of the party and society cannot acquiesce in regressive movement by Polish society, the compromise that has been achieved will be only temporary in nature. One must bear in mind that the opposition is expecting, not without reason, that help will be forthcoming from outside.

---

<sup>2</sup> Translator's Note: The PZPR First Secretary, Edward Gierek, had been on vacation in Crimea from late July to mid-August (see below), but he had to cut short his trip when an "occupation strike" (*strajk okupacyjny*) began at the huge Lenin Shipyard in Gdansk on 14 August. By the time Gierek arrived back in Warsaw on 15 August, the crisis was slipping beyond his control. The PZPR Politburo had met in an emergency session on 14 August at the behest of Stanislaw Kania, a senior Politburo member responsible for security affairs, who had ordered the mobilization of three army regiments near the strike areas and the severing of communications with Gdansk. On 15 August the PZPR Politburo resumed its deliberations, with Gierek present. Kania gave a disconcerting update on the crisis, prompting Gierek to aver that the strikers were acting "at foreign inspiration." He warned that the situation might soon become "so dangerous" that they would have to approve the "use of force" (*uzycie sily*). To this end, a task force was set up on 16 August at the Polish Ministry of Internal Affairs to prepare for a harsh crackdown, using the codename *Lato-80* (Summer '80). Under the supervision of a deputy minister, General Boguslaw Stachura, the *Lato-80* task force devised a plan involving the deployment of commandos in military helicopters to storm the Lenin Shipyard, followed by mass arrests. See the transcripts "Protokol Nr. 16 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 14 sierpnia 1980 r.," 14 August 1980 (Secret), and "Protokol Nr. 17 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 15 sierpnia 1980 r.," 15 August 1980 (Secret), both reprinted in Zbigniew Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego: PZPR a "Solidarnosc" 1980-1981* (London: Aneks, 1992), pp. 23-28 and 28-34, respectively. On the *Lato-80* planning, see "Posiedzenie Sztabu MSW, 29.VIII.1980 r.," 29 August 1980 (Top Secret), in Archiwum Urzedu Ochrony Panstwa (AUOP), Sygnatura (Sygn.) 2309/IV, Tom (T.) 2. See also the contributions by Janusz Krupski and Jarema Maciszewski in Kancelaria Sejmu, *O stanie wojennym: W Sejmowej Komisji Odpowiedzialnosci Konstytucyjnej* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1997), pp. 108-110 and 126-128, respectively. The task force's plan was never put into effect because of deep rifts within the PZPR Politburo, which came to a head at a meeting on 29 August. Before the 29th, Gierek had considered requesting Soviet military intervention to crush the strike movement, but he received no response from Moscow to his tentative overtures. Hence, by the 29th he had decided to seek other options. A few members of the PZPR Politburo, especially Wladyslaw Kruczek, wanted to cease negotiations with the strike committee and to impose martial law right away. Their position was based in part on Stachura's contention that the security forces could quickly "exterminate the counterrevolutionary nest in Gdansk." Most members of the Politburo, however, were much less sanguine than Stachura was. Kania, in particular, said it was a "fantasy" to expect that a large-scale crackdown could be implemented so soon. Heeding Kania's advice, the Politburo decided, if only with grave misgivings, to sign the proposed agreements establishing a "free, self-governing trade union." No one on the Politburo welcomed this decision — Gierek insisted that "under threat of a general strike, we must choose the lesser evil and then find a way to get out of it" — but in the absence of a viable alternative (including Soviet military intervention), the Politburo reluctantly concluded that, for the time being, the strikers' demands would have to be fulfilled. See "Protokol Nr. 28 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 29 sierpnia 1980 r.," 29 August 1980 (Secret), in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, pp. 84-90.

2. Under the pressure of anti-socialist forces, who have succeeded in leading astray a significant portion of the working class, the PZPR had to go on the defensive. Now the problem is how to prepare a counterattack and reclaim the positions that have been lost among the working class and the people.

In launching this counterattack, it would be advisable to use all the capabilities afforded by the ruling Party and its strong, healthy core, by the state apparatus, and by mass social organizations, while showing political flexibility. These institutions will provide necessary support to the vanguard ranks of the working class. If circumstances warrant, it would be advisable to use the contemplated administrative means.<sup>3</sup>

The Party must give a principled political evaluation of the August events and must also accelerate the formulation of its own program of action, which will include steps to improve the life of workers.

3. It is necessary to give overriding significance to the consolidation of the leading role of the Party in society.

The current political crisis has sharply weakened the influence and authority of the Party among the working class. In such circumstances one must adopt all necessary measures for its organizational and ideological cohesion and for the reestablishment of its influence and authority.

Among some concrete recommendations, one might list the following:

---

<sup>3</sup> Translator's Note: Planning for the use of "administrative" measures had begun in Poland even before the Gdansk and Szczecin accords were signed. One sign of this was the creation of the *Lato-80* task force (see previous annotation), which remained in existence until early 1982. In addition, a "Party-Government Crisis Staff" (*Partyjno-rzadowy Sztab Kryzysowy*) was set up on 24 August 1980, just after the conclusion of a PZPR Central Committee plenum, which endorsed personnel changes in the PZPR Politburo and approved efforts to seek an agreement with the striking workers. The newly-appointed prime minister, Jozef Pinkowski, was chosen to head the Crisis Staff. (Pinkowski had been designated to replace Edward Babiuch, whose removal adumbrated Gierek's own downfall on 6 September.) The Crisis Staff sought to keep the Gdansk and Szczecin accords as vague as possible so that Solidarity's gains could be gradually eroded. In conjunction with the Internal Affairs Ministry, the Crisis Staff devised "administrative" measures to curb the growing unrest. But by the end of September, when it had become clear to most officials that administrative measures were likely to be insufficient, the Crisis Staff authorized the drafting of preliminary guidelines for the imposition of martial law (discussed in annotation no. 17 below). The origins and role of the Party-Government Crisis Staff were first disclosed in 1987 by Colonel Ryszard Kuklinski, who called it by an alternative name, the Party-Government Leadership Staff (*Partyjno-rzadowy Sztab Kierowniczy*). Kuklinski was a top aide to Jaruzelski in 1980-81 and was one of five officers on the Polish General Staff overseeing preparations for the military aspects of martial law. (The Ministry of Internal Affairs was responsible for planning other aspects of the crackdown.) Kuklinski had been a crucial intelligence source for the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) since the early 1970s, having provided many thousands of pages of highly classified documents about Soviet and Warsaw Pact war planning and Soviet-Polish military relations. He had to escape from Poland in November 1981. Six years later, Kuklinski agreed to a lengthy interview, "Wojna z narodem widziana od srodka," *Kultura* (Paris), No. 4/475 (April 1987), pp. 3-55, which provides invaluable information for those studying the 1980-81 crisis. His discussion of the Party-Government Crisis Staff, on pp. 17-18 (and elsewhere), has been amply corroborated by newly declassified documents from the Polish military and internal affairs ministry archives.

— On an urgent basis, carry out measures to raise the combativeness of all Party organizations, taking account of the lessons of the political crisis. Act decisively in removing people who are clearly alien to the Party, while conforming with the specific conditions existing right now in the country.

— Convene a plenum of the Central Committee as soon as possible in order to work out a detailed, positive program specifying the main policy directions.<sup>4</sup> The program must, in particular, undercut the significance of the demands of the strike committees in Gdansk and Szczecin as much as possible in the eyes of the workers. In accordance with materials from the CC plenum, convene expanded plenary sessions of PZPR provincial, municipal, and local committees, sessions of the Party aktiv, and Party meetings at enterprises.

— Consider the possibility of convening a Party Congress, at which a full-scale program of action for the Party would be worked out, new directives for the five-year plan would be affirmed, and necessary changes in the leading organs would be introduced.<sup>5</sup>

— An increase in the combativeness of the Party in rural locations will require the comprehensive organizational strengthening of the PZPR's local committees, which since the administrative reforms of 1975 have been serving in the role of regional committees.<sup>6</sup>

— Consider directions for the leading work in party organs carried out by experienced political workers of the Polish Army.

#### 4. The reestablishment of severed links between the Party and the working class will

---

<sup>4</sup> Translator's Note: A PZPR Central Committee plenum was convened on 6 September 1980. The main action taken at the plenum was the removal of Edward Gierek as PZPR First Secretary. Stanislaw Kania was elected to replace him.

<sup>5</sup> Translator's Note: The PZPR's Extraordinary Ninth Congress was not convened until mid-July 1981.

<sup>6</sup> Translator's Note: Changes in the PZPR's administrative structure in 1975 were the last in a series of modifications begun in the early 1970s. Until the early 1970s Poland was divided into 17 provinces (*województwa*), which were sub-divided into counties (*powiaty*), which in turn were sub-divided into localities (*gromady*). Party organizations existed at all three levels, each of which was strictly accountable to the highest party organs in Warsaw. In 1975 this four-tier system (four tiers counting the highest-level organs) was replaced by a three-tier structure based on 49 newly demarcated provinces (*województwa*), which encompassed hundreds of localities (*gminy*). Under the old system, local party officials often had been frustrated in trying to manage their own affairs, but the new structure devolved greater authority to them. For the Polish state security organs, however, the changes were far less welcome. In March 1981 a senior official from the Polish internal affairs ministry complained that "the elimination in 1975 of the lower rungs of the administrative division of the country—the *powiaty*—meant that in the localities nothing was left of the state security organs, the police, and the PZPR (they were preserved only in the *województwo* capitals). In practical terms, this meant that the only remaining source of influence and authority in the localities was the Catholic Church. As a result of this, and also because of the opposition's efforts to disparage government organs, including the state security organs, it is now extraordinarily difficult [for us] to obtain accurate local information, especially about the Catholic Church." Quoted from "Sprawka ob informatsii, poluchennoi pri vstrechakh s sotrudnikom MVD PNR," No. 2/508 (Secret), 3 March 1981, by Colonel P. A. Gordienko, deputy head of the Ukrainian KGB directorate for L'viv oblast, with a cover note by V. Dobrik, first secretary of the L'viv oblast committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party (UkrCP), in Tsentral'nyi Derzhavnyi Arkhiv Hromadnykh Ob'ednan Ukrainy (TsDAHOU), Fond (F.) 1, Opis' (Op.) 25, Spravka (Spr.) 2235, Listy (Ll.) 16-20. Gordienko's claim that the Security Service (*Sluzba bezpieczenstwa*, or SB), police, and PZPR had no branches at the local level is spurious, but his general perception of the matter seems to have been widely shared within the SB.

require a fundamental renewal of the activity of trade unions. Do everything necessary to prevent the dissolution or disintegration of the existing trade unions (CRZZ) and their organizations.<sup>7</sup> Convene as soon as possible the regular 9th Congress of the trade unions of Poland, where the foremost task will be to move the trade unions as close as possible to the workers and to earn their full confidence.

— Put up a defense of the basic principles of the trade union movement in the conditions of a socialist society. Abide by certain provisions in the agreement with the ZKS and at the same time adopt all measures to limit and neutralize the effect of the most dangerous articles in the agreement. Come forward with bold initiatives of a social character, which would bolster the authority of the trade unions.

— Raise the quality of personnel in trade union organizations by bringing in advanced, trustworthy workers. Carry out elections of trade union activists before this is done in the so-called “self-governing” trade unions.

— Seek to limit the activity and influence of the so-called “self-governing” trade unions among the masses, a task that will be accomplished predominantly by mobilizing public opinion. Move actively in infiltrating the so-called “self-governing” trade unions with people devoted to the Party.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Translator's Note: Poland's official Central Council of Trade Unions (*Centralna Rada Związkow Zawodowych*, or CRZZ) had been thoroughly discredited by the time this document was issued.

<sup>8</sup> Translator's Note: An official campaign to infiltrate Solidarity soon began in earnest. Ryszard Kuklinski later recalled that "from around December 1980 to February of the following year, the [Polish] Ministry of Internal Affairs concentrated all its efforts on the use of agents to penetrate Solidarity." (Quoted from "Wojna z narodem widziana od srodka," p. 26.) Kuklinski's testimony is borne out by countless documents in the Polish and Russian archives. To cite but one example: A memorandum prepared for the CPSU Secretariat in early 1981 revealed that PZPR officials in the Radom province of Poland had informed a visiting Soviet delegation that "the party organs are trying to infiltrate the governing committees of 'Solidarity' at enterprises with as many party members as possible." The Radom officials expressed "certainty that within a year-and-a-half to two years the new trade union will be under party control." See "Informatsiya o poezdke delegatsii Yaroslavskogo obkoma KPSS v Radomskoe voevodstvo PNR," Memorandum No. 0035 (Top Secret), 21 January 1981, from I. Zaramenskii, first secretary of the CPSU's Yaroslavl oblast committee, in *Tsentr Khraneniya Sovremennoi Dokumentatsii (TsKhSD)*, F. 5, Op. 84, Delo (D.) 85, Ll. 298-301. It is unclear precisely how successful this infiltration campaign proved to be. Although at least one-third (perhaps as many as two-fifths) of all PZPR members openly joined Solidarity, most of them seemed to be genuinely supportive of the union's goals. Even those who initially joined Solidarity as PZPR infiltrators were, in some cases, inclined to shift their allegiances to the union. A hardline PZPR official, Stefan Olszowski, complained in November 1980 that "many" party members who were enrolled in Solidarity were proving "unreliable" and "weak." See "Vermerk uber ein Gespräch des Generalsekretars des ZK der SED und Vorsitzenden des Staatsrates der DDR, Genossen Erich Honecker, mit Genossen Stefan Olszowski, Mitglied des Politburos und Sekretar des ZK der Polnischen Vereinigten Arbeiterpartei," 20 November 1980 (Top Secret), in *Stiftung Archiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen der DDR im Bundesarchiv (SAPMDB)*, Zentrales Parteiarchiv (ZPA) der SED, J IV, 2/2 A-2363; reproduced in Michael Kubina and Manfred Wilke, eds., *"Hart und kompromisslos durchgreifen": Die SED contra Polen 1980/81* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1994), p. 105. Similarly, a Soviet diplomat reported in May 1981 that "members of the PZPR are taking part in strikes sponsored by Solidarity despite orders from the PZPR Politburo that they must not participate." Quoted in "O prazdnovanii pervogo maya i godovshchiny so dnya prinyatiya konstitutsii 3 maya (Politicheskaya zapiska)," Cable No. 68 (Secret), 4 May 1981, from N. P. Ponomarev, Soviet consul-general in Szczecin, in *TsKhSD*, F. 5, Op. 85, D. 597, Ll. 6-12. Soon thereafter, Soviet officials began expressing concern that Solidarity was steadily taking over the PZPR, rather than the other way around. In June 1981, for example, the Soviet ambassador in Poland, Boris Aristov, said he

5. In light of the danger created by the activity of the anti-socialist forces, use state structures to carry out necessary measures for the strengthening of the socialist legal order.

— Pay greater attention to the army and devote special attention to the military-political preparation of soldiers.<sup>9</sup> Use the opportunity to attract army command personnel to perform party-economic work as well.

— Adopt necessary measures to expose the political nature and designs of the ringleaders of the opposition.

6. In the sphere of the mass media and propaganda, concentrate efforts on the further strengthening of Party leadership and supervision over these organs. This is especially necessary when in practice the question has arisen of the “limitation of censorship” and the expansion of access for the anti-socialist forces and the Church to the mass media.<sup>10</sup>

---

"could not exclude the possibility that a significant number of supporters of Solidarity will be included in the new PZPR Central Committee. This could cause the PZPR to lose its Marxist-Leninist character." Quoted from "Obstanovka v PNR nakanune IX S"ezda PORP," Cable No. 568 (Top Secret), 30 June 1981, from Aristov to the CPSU Secretariat, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 596, L. 17. Despite the questionable utility of the infiltration campaign, the proposal in this Soviet document is interesting insofar as it reveals the extent of Moscow's enmity toward Solidarity from the very start.

<sup>9</sup> Translator's Note: As is evident in several documents below, Soviet and Polish leaders in 1980-81 were increasingly concerned about the reliability of the Polish armed forces for internal coercion. The passage of time meant that new recruits had been exposed to Solidarity's influence long before entering the army. As early as November 1980, a few senior PZPR officials were worried that "some 60 to 70 percent of the army is leaning toward Solidarity." Quoted from "Informatsiya o nekotorykh vyskazaniyakh pol'skikh grazhdan sovetskim turistam v PNR iz Vinnitskoi oblasti," Report No. 03/284 (Top Secret), 26 November 1980, from A. V. Merkulov, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Department on Foreign Ties, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2138, Ll. 46-49. This estimate, which was conveyed orally to a member of the CPSU Politburo Commission on Poland, Oleg Rakhmanin, may have overstated the problem, but Kania himself acknowledged in early December 1980 that "the adverse situation has also taken its toll in the army. . . . Among the new recruits are people who have taken part in strikes or whose parents have taken part in strikes. This means that political indoctrination and discipline in the armed forces are of the utmost importance. We must bear in mind the influence that the families of [new] troops in the army and security forces have on them." Quoted from "Stenografische Niederschrift des Treffens fuhrender Repräsentanten der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 5. Dezember 1980 in Moskau," 5 December 1980 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV, 2/2 A-2368; reproduced in Kubina and Wilke, eds., *"Hart und kompromisslos durchgreifen"*, p. 150. Despite Kania's awareness of the problem, reports from Soviet diplomatic and intelligence officials continued to highlight "shortcomings" in the "military-political preparation of [Polish] soldiers." Just a month before martial law was imposed, a lengthy diplomatic cable described "evidence that the political training of [Polish] officers has been increasingly deficient." See "O politicheskoi situatsii i nastroeniakh v voevodstvakh yuzhnogo regiona PNR (Politpis'mo)," Cable No. 179 (Secret), 12 November 1981, from G. Rudov, Soviet consul-general in Krakow, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 597, Ll. 13-22.

<sup>10</sup> Translator's Note: When the Szczecin and Gdansk accords were signed, the chief government negotiator (and deputy prime minister), Mieczyslaw Jagielski, promised that Solidarity would soon be given access to the mass media and would be permitted to have its own publications. In subsequent months the authorities repeatedly stalled in fulfilling these promises. Jagielski also pledged that by the end of November the government would propose legislation defining the "limits of censorship." The Soviet Politburo seems to be expressing disapproval of the notion of "limiting censorship," but it should be noted that this concept was less ambitious than the strikers' original goal of *eliminating* censorship. Solidarity was willing to put up with some censorship, so long as it was legally and openly regulated. In the past, censorship in Poland had been arbitrarily enforced in accordance with top-secret guidelines. See *Czarna*



— In these circumstances it is necessary to provide an elaborate definition of what is permissible, having openly declared that the law on the press forbids any statements against socialism.

— Adopt necessary measures to put an end to the wide circulation of anti-Communist publications, films, and television productions in the PPR, and to maintain strict control over the sources of information emanating from Poland, including the activity of bourgeois journalists.

Strengthen party control over the work of the central and local press, over the supervisors of editorial collectives, and particularly over all television and radio broadcasts.

Using the mass media, show that events in Poland have been caused not by any shortcomings of the socialist system *per se*, but by mistakes and oversights, and also by some objective factors (natural calamities, etc.). Through the mass media, actively and broadly counteract the anti-Polish and anti-Soviet attacks of hostile propaganda.

Objectively depict the economic advantages Poland derives from broad cooperation with the USSR and other fraternal countries. Refute the widely circulated slander that one of the reasons for the current difficulties in supplying the population of the PPR with consumer goods is the shipment of such goods to the other countries of socialism.<sup>11</sup>

\* \* \*

After expressing a number of points about the critical situation that has emerged in the PPR, we would like once again to draw the attention of our Polish friends to the recommendations and suggestions offered by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev during the discussions in the Crimea with E. Gierek both in 1979 and especially on 31 July 1980, as well as in his letter of 21 August 1980 addressed to the PZPR CC.<sup>12</sup>

---

*Księga Cenzury PRL* (London: Aneks, 1977-1978). See also Laszlo Revesz, *Pressrecht und Pressepraxis in Polen: ein Vergleich mit andern Ostblockstaaten* (Bern: Verlag SOI, 1988), esp. pp. 5-47.

<sup>11</sup> Translator's Note: Poland's economic ties with the Soviet Union had long been a source of popular resentment in Poland. From the 1940s on, Soviet diplomats and military officers in Poland heard endless complaints about the "high price Poland is obliged to pay for friendship with the USSR" and about the "treaty links with the Soviet Union that are forcing Poland to reject highly profitable arrangements [and] far more advantageous economic opportunities" in Western Europe. Quoted from "O nekotorykh nastroyeniakh v Pol'she po voprosu pol'sko-sovetskikh ekonomicheskikh otnoshenii," Memorandum from Lieutenant-General A. Okorokov, head of Political Directorate of the Northern Group of Forces, to M. A. Suslov, 19 March 1947 (Top Secret), in Rossiiskii Tsentri Khraneniya i Izucheniya Dokumentov Noveishei Istorii (RTsKhIDNI), F. 17, Op. 128, D. 284, Ll. 27-28, with cover note to M. A. Suslov.

<sup>12</sup> Translator's Note: During the Brezhnev era, it was common for East European leaders to hold bilateral talks in late July or August with Soviet Politburo members who were vacationing in the Crimea. Gierek's departure for the Crimea in July 1980 came amid a wave of strikes in Poland triggered by an announcement on 2 July of steep increases in food prices. Before Gierek left for the Soviet Union, he consulted with Kania and other senior Polish officials about the possibility of delaying or cancelling his trip, but they repeatedly assured him that everything would remain under control while he was gone. Numerous archival documents, including this one (see below) and the secret report distributed by the CPSU Politburo about the nature of Brezhnev's talks in the Crimea, indicate that Brezhnev and Gierek discussed

Of particular importance in today's situation are the following suggestions offered by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev on 31 July 1980:

— carry out, along a wide front, work aimed at fostering socialist internationalism, while decisively rebuffing all attempts to use nationalism in the propagation of anti-socialist and anti-Soviet sentiments, as well as all attempts to misrepresent the history of Soviet-Polish relations and the nature of cooperation between the USSR and the PPR,<sup>13</sup>

— launch relentless counterpropaganda against efforts to water down the class content of socialist patriotism under the slogan of “All Poles in the world are brothers,”<sup>14</sup> as well as the

---

the burgeoning crisis at some length during their meeting on 31 July. See, for example, "Informatsiya ob otklikakh sekretarei partiinykh komitetov Kompartii Litvy na itogi krymskikh vstrech General'nogo sekretarya TsK KPSS, Predsedatelya Prezidiuma Verkhovnogo Soveta SSR tov. Brezhneva L. I. s rukovoditelyami bratskikh partii sotsialisticheskikh stran v 1980 godu," Report No. 949s (Top Secret), 27 August 1980, in Lietuvos Visuomenes Organizaciju Archyvas (LVOA), Fondo (F.) 1771, Apyros (Apy.) 257, Bylo (B.) 193, Lapai (La.) 113-117. Curiously, though, the joint communique published on 1 August made no direct mention of the unrest. See "Druzheskaya vstrecha," *Pravda* (Moscow), 1 August 1980, p. 1. At a Warsaw Pact summit in early December 1980, Brezhnev harkened back to the 31 July meeting, claiming that he had "continually emphasized to Gierek that a resolute campaign against the anti-socialist elements is necessary. But all we heard in response [from Gierek] was: 'Nothing is going on, no opposition exists, the Polish government and party are in control of the situation.'" (This is indeed what Gierek had been hearing from his Polish colleagues.) Brezhnev went on to say that he could not be sure why Gierek would have made such claims, but that it might have stemmed from "foolishness or overconfidence [or] excessive ambition." Quoted from "Stenografische Niederschrift des Treffens fuhrender Repräsentanten der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 5. Dezember 1980 in Moskau," pp. 189-190. Brezhnev's letter of 21 August, which still pledged qualified support for Gierek, was raised briefly at a PZPR Politburo meeting the following day; see "Protokol Nr. 22 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 22 sierpnia 1980 r.," 22 August 1980 (Secret), reprinted in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, p. 51. See also Gierek's recollections in *Edward Gierek: Przerwana Dekada*, comp. by Janusz Rolicki (Warsaw: Fakt, 1990), p. 177. After sending the letter to the PZPR Central Committee on 21 August, Soviet leaders gradually lost all remaining faith in Gierek and decided that he would have to be replaced. They provided behind-the-scenes support to Kania, who was chosen as Gierek's successor at a Central Committee plenum on 6 September.

<sup>13</sup> Translator's Note: The unrest in mid-1980 rapidly brought to the surface long-suppressed demands in Poland for an accurate accounting of "blank spots" in Soviet-Polish relations, including the Russian-Polish war of 1919-20, the partition of Poland in September 1939, the Katyn Forest massacres in March 1940, the Soviet Army's failure to support the Warsaw uprising against German occupation forces in the summer of 1944, and the Soviet-Polish standoff in October 1956. Concerns in Moscow about "the use of nationalism in the propagation of anti-socialist and anti-Soviet sentiments" in Poland remained acute throughout the crisis. In a typical case in November 1981, Soviet intelligence sources reported that "information flowing in gives reason to believe that a sweeping explosion of chauvinistic sentiments is possible in Poland, which would be fraught with adverse consequences for attempts to overcome the political and economic crises in the PPR." Quoted from "Ob izmenenii politicheskoi situatsii v PNR," Memorandum No. 0231/3 (Secret), 11 November 1981, from V. Dobrik, first secretary of the UkrCP's oblast committee in L'viv, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2295, L. 35.

<sup>14</sup> Translator's Note: This slogan had taken on greater significance since 1978, when Cardinal Karol Wojtyla of Krakow was chosen to be the new Pope, under the name John Paul II. The Pope returned to Poland on a triumphal visit in June 1979, an event that greatly bolstered the role and prestige of the Church in his native land. Many Poles increasingly viewed the Church, under John Paul's leadership, as a repository of Polish nationalism and a rallying point for Poles around the world. Brezhnev's discussions with Gierek in the summer of 1979, which were mentioned earlier in this document, had focused on the need to counter the Church's newfound influence. The growing link between the Catholic Church and Polish nationalist traditions helps explain why Soviet leaders in 1980-81 were so wary of the Church and its ties with Solidarity.

efforts to idealize the pre-revolutionary past of Poland; and

— in the political struggle against anti-socialist elements, carry out appropriate attacks against them, rather than merely going on the defensive.

3 September 1980

[*Source: TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 66, D. 37.*]

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

29 October 1980

Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin,  
A. A. Gromyko, A. P. Kirilenko, A. Ya. Pel'she,  
M. A. Suslov, N. A. Tikhonov, D. F. Ustinov,  
K. U. Chernenko, P. N. Demichev, V. V. Kuznetsov,  
B. N. Ponomarev, M. S. Solomentsev, V. I. Dolgikh,  
M. V. Zimyanin, K. V. Rusakov.

I. Materials for a Friendly Working Visit to the USSR by Polish Leaders

BREZHNEV. Tomorrow the PZPR First Secretary, Cde. Kania, and the Chairman of the PPR Council of Ministers, Cde. Pinkowski, are coming here. The commission consisting of Cdes. Suslov, Gromyko, Andropov, Ustinov, Chernenko, Zimyanin, and Rusakov has provided materials for our discussions with the Polish leaders.<sup>15</sup> I closely read these materials. I believe the comrades have covered all the major issues. Perhaps one of you will have some sort of comments, and if so, please let's discuss this.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Translator's Note: One of the seven officials whom Brezhnev mentions here—Konstantin Rusakov—was not originally listed as a member of the Soviet Politburo's Commission on Poland, chaired by Mikhail Suslov. The Politburo resolution of 25 August 1980 specified a total of nine members, including Rusakov's main deputy, Oleg Rakhmanin, plus two other officials whom Brezhnev does not mention here: Leonid Zamyatin and Ivan Arkhipov. See "Vypiska iz protokola No. 210 zasedaniya Politbyuro TsK KPSS ot 25 avgusta 1980 goda: K voprosu o polozenii v Pol'skoi Narodnoi Respublike," No. P210/II (Top Secret), 25 August 1980, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 66, D. 1, L. 1. Because Rusakov himself was very closely involved in all decisions about Poland, it is clear that he became a member of the Politburo Commission early on. (Rakhmanin remained a member as well, though his role was increasingly overshadowed by Rusakov.)

<sup>16</sup> Translator's Note: The points raised by Brezhnev and his colleagues during this meeting were featured in a report approved by the CPSU Politburo at the end of September, which was distributed to lower-level party and government organizations throughout the Soviet Union. During the Soviet era, the Politburo regularly prepared and disseminated reports about important domestic and foreign issues to subordinate party and state bodies at all levels: to the central party apparatus, to the central government structures, and to the union-republic, regional, territorial, oblast, municipal, and district organizations all around the country. These lower-level organizations had to ensure that all party members and employees were apprised of the reports, which became the only acceptable position to espouse. The Politburo relied on the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department to monitor the dissemination of the

USTINOV. I also closely read the materials that were prepared. I think they are well done and touch on all matters. The most important thing is that all the issues here are raised very pointedly — precisely the way they should be raised with the Polish leaders.

BREZHNEV. In Poland there is in fact now a raging counterrevolution under way, but the Polish press and the Polish comrades are not speaking out about this and not speaking out about the enemies of the people. And in the meantime these enemies of the people, the accomplices of the counterrevolution, and the counterrevolutionaries themselves are speaking out against the people. How can this be?

ANDROPOV. A direct way of putting the question is that in Poland the Polish leaders are saying nothing about the counterrevolution either in the press or on radio or television.

GROMYKO. The mass media are also silent about this matter.

ANDROPOV. Instead of exposing the antisocialist elements, the Polish press is giving overwhelming emphasis to the shortcomings of the CC leadership, etc. We must speak directly about the enemies of the Polish socialist order. The antisocialist elements, like Walesa and Kuron, want to take power away from the workers. The Polish leaders should have spoken directly about this, but we don't see anything about it in the Polish press.

BREZHNEV. They're already beginning to choose the Sejm, and they say that the army supposedly stands on their side.<sup>17</sup> Walesa goes from one end of the country to the other, from

---

reports and the implementation of the Politburo's directives. At various stages of the 1980-81 crisis, the Politburo used this channel to transmit updates on the situation in Poland, ensuring a uniform outlook within the CPSU. The report in late September 1980, entitled "On the Development of Events in Poland" (*O razvitií sobytii v Pol'she*), discussed "the reasons for and class content of the crisis in Poland, the conclusions drawn by the CPSU Central Committee [Politburo], and the ways to surmount the crisis." For further information about the report and its dissemination, see the documents in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 77, D. 105, Ll. 1-54, particularly "TsK KPSS: O provodimoi rabote v svyazei s informatsiei TsK KPSS 'O razvitií sobytii v Pol'she'," Report No. 27908 (Top Secret), from I. Kapitonov, head of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, to the CPSU Politburo, 15 October 1980, *ibid.*, Ll. 1-9.

<sup>17</sup> Translator's Note: In both Moscow and Warsaw, Communist leaders were worried that Solidarity was "seeking to sow discord within the army and weaken the cohesion of military units." By the time of this CPSU Politburo meeting, Soviet leaders were already hearing from confidential sources in Poland that "some 60 to 70 percent of the army is leaning toward Solidarity" (see annotation no. 9 above). Even those Polish officials who initially disagreed with this assessment began changing their minds in early 1981. The head of a Polish delegation, Stanislaw Wronski, reported in mid-January 1981 that "the situation in the army has changed. It is now impossible to rely on the army completely, as would have been possible two months ago. Back then, the army was ready to act. Although the officer corps is still reliable, there is great turmoil among rank-and-file soldiers. The army could still use violent force against anti-social elements, but only half the soldiers, at most, would use firearms against the counterrevolution. The other half would remain neutral." Quoted from "O besede s chlenom TsK PORP t. Vron'skim," Memorandum No. 398/58 (Secret), 19 January 1981, from A. Merkulov, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Department for Foreign Ties, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2294, Ll. 26-28. Over the next few months, Soviet leaders were dismayed to learn that "the Solidarity organizing committee in Bydgoszcz prepared a special appeal to the Pomeranian Military District outlining the 'peaceful' nature of the movement and calling on [Polish] soldiers not to take part in repressive measures against the organization." By mid-1981, Soviet diplomats and intelligence officials were reporting that "no one on the Polish command staff can confidently say on whose side the army and navy will be if tensions reach the breaking point." Quoted from "O

city to city, and everywhere they accord him honors. But the Polish leaders are silent, and so is the press, and the television doesn't carry anything opposing the antisocialist elements. Perhaps it will indeed be necessary to introduce martial law.<sup>18</sup>

ANDROPOV. I believe the facts attest to the Polish leadership's failure to grasp the full seriousness of the emerging situation.

USTINOV. I absolutely agree with the text of the materials that the comrades prepared. Our Polish friends have had many conversations, but nothing has come of it. Things have reached the point where Walesa and his acolytes have occupied the radio station in Wroclaw.<sup>19</sup> Our Polish friends essentially are operating in the same style that Gierek did.<sup>20</sup> They aren't taking action against anyone or punishing any of the enemies of the working class.

BREZHNEV. In Yugoslavia not long ago there was a small strike, but they treated it very seriously: 300 people were arrested and thrown into jail.<sup>21</sup>

---

nastroeniyakh sredi soldatov i ofitserov podrazdelenii Voiska Pol'skogo i VMF PNR, dislotsiruyushchikhsya na Gdan'skom poberezh'e," Cable No. 183 (Top Secret), 14 June 1981, from V. Zelenov, Soviet consul-general in Gdansk, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 611, Ll. 17-19. To counter Solidarity's influence in the armed forces, Jaruzelski authorized the chief of the army's Main Political Directorate, General Jozef Baryla, to publish frequent attacks against the union in the three main military publications: the daily *Zolnierz Wolnosci*, the weekly *Zolnierz Polski*, and the monthly *Wojsko Ludowe*. See, for example, Baryla's "Sprawie partii i narodu zolnierze oddani sa calym sercem," *Wojsko Ludowe* (Warsaw), No. 12 (December 1980), pp. 13-15.

<sup>18</sup> Translator's Note: On 22 October 1980, a week before this CPSU Politburo meeting, the Polish authorities took two important steps to prepare for the eventual imposition of martial law. First, the deputy chief of the Secretariat of the Homeland Defense Committee (*Komitet obrony kraju*, or KOK), Colonel Tadeusz Malicki, completed a draft of preliminary guidelines for military rule. This draft, which initially had been authorized by the Party-Government Crisis Staff (see annotation no. 3 above), was reworked slightly by the chief of the KOK Secretariat, Division-General Mieczyslaw Debicki, and signed on 23 October by the Secretary of KOK, General Tadeusz Tuczapski. See "Propozycje w przedmiocie trybu wprowadzenia stanu wojennego ze wzgledu na bezpieczenstwo panstwa oraz okreslenia skutkow wprowadzenia tego stanu," No. 2171/IV, 22 October 1980 (Top Secret), and No. 2177/IV, 23 October 1980 (Top Secret), in Centralne Archiwum Wojskowe (CAW), Sygn. 1806, T. 38, Stronicy (Ss.) 214-220. The other important step on 22 October was a directive issued by Jaruzelski in his capacity as national defense minister. The directive was designed to go beyond the initial planning for martial law, which since August had been under the jurisdiction of the Party-Government Crisis Staff and the *Lato-80* task force at the Internal Affairs Ministry. Jaruzelski ordered the Polish General Staff to undertake comprehensive, accelerated preparations for the introduction of military rule. The chief of the General Staff, General Florian Siwicki, who had long been one of Jaruzelski's closest friends and advisers, was placed in charge of the whole effort. Siwicki's deputies handled specific military aspects of the planning, in conjunction with the Internal Affairs Ministry.

<sup>19</sup> Translator's Note: The incident to which Ustinov is referring here was connected with the hunger strikes conducted by members of the Railway Workers' Committee in Wroclaw since 21 October. The strikes had provoked minatory comments in Moscow and other Warsaw Pact capitals because of the strategic importance of the Wroclaw-Gdansk railway. At the Warsaw Pact meeting in early December 1980, Brezhnev specifically warned that prolonged strikes on the railways would be "intolerable." See "Stenografische Niederschrift des Treffens fuhrender Repräsentanten der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 5. Dezember 1980 in Moskau," p. 193.

<sup>20</sup> Translator's Note: During the nearly ten years in which Edward Gierek was First Secretary of the PZPR (from December 1970 to September 1980), corruption in Poland reached new heights and the country ran up huge debts and began a sharp economic decline. Gierek's regime was forced to give in to worker protests in June 1976 (though the alleged "ringleaders" of the protests were later harshly punished) and again in the summer of 1980.

<sup>21</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev presumably is referring to a strike in October 1980 involving some 3,000 workers at a tire factory in the Serbian city of Pirot. The strike, which was sparked by a 5-percent reduction in wages, lasted only

USTINOV. If they don't introduce martial law, the matter will be very complicated and will become still more serious. In the army there is a good deal of vacillation. But we've prepared the Northern Group of Forces, which is in full combat readiness.<sup>22</sup>

GROMYKO. We must speak to the Polish comrades firmly and sharply. They must first say all this to the people, so that the people will understand the full magnitude of the situation. But now they are criticizing Gierek, the CC, and the Party, while the antisocialist elements, who are literally operating without restraint, are giving them freedom.

As concerns Cde. Jaruzelski, he of course is a reliable man, but is now beginning to speak without any real conviction. He even has said that the troops will not act against the workers.<sup>23</sup> In general I think the Poles must speak about all this and very pointedly.

BREZHNEV. When Jaruzelski was speaking with Kania about who should serve in the top spot, he flatly refused to be First Secretary and suggested that Kania serve in the post. That also says something.

GROMYKO. I believe that all major issues were well covered in the materials that were prepared. As concerns the introduction of a state of emergency in Poland, this must be kept in reserve as a measure to protect socialist gains. Of course, perhaps, it doesn't have to be done immediately, and particularly not right after the return of Kania and Pinkowski from Moscow.<sup>24</sup> Some time should elapse. But we should steer them toward that and fortify their

---

a day. It is worth noting that in Yugoslavia, unlike in other Communist countries, strikes had long been officially tolerated and even reported in the press. As many as 300-400 strikes and work stoppages occurred each year.

<sup>22</sup> Translator's Note: This is one of several statements by Ustinov which suggest that he was one of the early proponents of Soviet military intervention in Poland if attempts to achieve an "internal" solution failed.

<sup>23</sup> Translator's Note: Valuable corroboration of Gromyko's statement here is provided by a document from the former East German military archive, which recounts a briefing given by Marshal Viktor Kulikov, the Commander-in-Chief of the Warsaw Pact's Joint Armed Forces, to high-ranking East German military officials in early April 1981. According to the document, Kulikov told the East German officers that "half a year ago [i.e., in October 1980], Comrade Jaruzelski announced at a meeting of [Polish] military commanders that he would not issue any orders for the deployment of the army against [Polish] workers." The East German document also notes that "Kulikov made it clear to [Jaruzelski] that the [Polish] army would not have to be used against the working class. The troops would be used only against the counterrevolution and enemies of the working class as well as against violent criminals and bandits." Kulikov reported that Jaruzelski "declined to offer any concrete response to these points." Quoted from "Bericht über ein vertrauliches Gespräch mit dem Oberkommandierenden der Vereinten Streitkräfte der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 07.04.1981 in LEGNICA (VP Polen) nach der Auswertung der gemeinsamen operativ-strategischen Kommandostabsübung 'SOJUS 81,'" Report No. A-142888 (Top Secret), 9 April 1981, in Militarisches Zwischenarchiv-Potsdam (MZA-P), Archivzugangsnummer (AZN) 32642, Blatt (Bl.) 54. Jaruzelski's comment in October 1980 about the use of the army against Polish workers harkens back to something he was rumored to have said during the 1976 crisis in Poland, namely, that "Polish soldiers will not fire at Polish workers." There is no solid evidence, however, that Jaruzelski ever said such a thing in 1976. (Western citations of the statement have proven untraceable.) Even if Jaruzelski did say it, he may well have meant it in a disapproving tone, rather than as something for which the army should be lauded.

<sup>24</sup> Translator's Note: Gromyko's statement here reflects an awareness of the delicate timing of the Kania-Pinkowski visit. On 31 October, the day after Kania and Pinkowski were due to stop in Moscow, Pinkowski was supposed to hold talks in Warsaw with the leaders of Solidarity about numerous issues, including the union's access to the mass media, its right to publish an unofficial newspaper, and its right to import printing and publishing equipment. Gromyko

resolve. We simply cannot lose Poland. During the battle with the Hitlerites to liberate Poland, the Soviet Union lost 600 thousand of its soldiers and officers, and we cannot permit a counterrevolution.

Of course, Cdes. Kania, Jaruzelski, and Pinkowski are honorable and committed comrades. When I spoke with them in Warsaw, they were very much disturbed by what we've been talking about. Kania even was literally at loose ends. At the same time he enjoys great confidence within the Party.

BREZHNEV. The antisocialist elements are so unrestrained that they have rejected the ruling of the Warsaw provincial court regarding the provisions it issued during the registration of the "Solidarity trade union."<sup>25</sup> And now they are even threatening to recall deputies from the Sejm. What else will happen?

SUSLOV. In my view the materials are well prepared, and everything is well thought out. The current leaders of the PPR are not sufficiently strong, but they are honest and are the best among the leading core. True, Olszanski is working poorly, and Moczar is pursuing his own ends and can do a lot of harm.<sup>26</sup> They must go on the counteroffensive rather than occupying a defensive position. This position, it so happens, is also reflected in the materials we are considering today.

---

obviously realized that a sudden clampdown in Poland, at a time when the government had pledged to negotiate, would appear to be effected solely at Moscow's bidding.

<sup>25</sup> Translator's Note: On 24 September 1980, Solidarity formally applied for registration as a legal entity. A month later, on 24 October, the Warsaw provincial court tentatively approved the registration, but ordered that several crucial changes be made in the union's proposed statutes: the deletion of a provision on the right to strike; the insertion of an explicit endorsement of the leading role of the Communist party; and the insertion of a pledge not to alter or impair Poland's international commitments. (Solidarity officials argued that provisions on the leading role of the party and on Poland's international commitments had already been included in the Gdansk accord, and therefore did not need to be reiterated in the statutes. They also pointed out that until the mid-1970s the Polish constitution had contained no mention of either the Communist party or the Soviet Union. In 1975 Gierek proposed that the leading role of the PZPR and the inviolability of the Soviet-Polish military alliance be formally enshrined in the constitution. When this suggestion stirred public protests from thousands of intellectuals—most of whom had been docile since 1968—and other citizens, as well as criticism from the Catholic church, the authorities accepted a somewhat toned-down version of the amendments.) The Warsaw court's unexpected ruling, which Solidarity promptly challenged in an appeal to the Polish Supreme Court, sparked a 17-day "registration crisis." The crisis was still very much under way at the time of this CPSU Politburo meeting on 29 October. Emergency negotiations between Solidarity and the Polish government were slated to be held on 31 October, the day after Kania and Pinkowski were due in Moscow. The timing of the Kania-Pinkowski visit, therefore, was widely perceived to be linked with the upcoming decisions about Solidarity's status. (Pinkowski's talks with Solidarity on 31 October led to a fragile compromise, but within two days the government reneged on most of its promises. Although the authorities sought, through a combination of minatory and conciliatory statements, to deter mass protests, Solidarity began preparing for a general strike on 12 November, two days after the Polish Supreme Court was due to rule on the appeal. The "strike alert" ultimately was called off, however, when the Supreme Court largely vindicated Solidarity's position. The lower court's proposed changes to the statutes were annulled. Although the Supreme Court stipulated that the first seven points of the Gdansk accord, including a provision about the leading role of the party, should be featured in an appendix, these were counterbalanced by a second appendix reaffirming Articles 87 and 98 of the International Labor Organization, which guaranteed trade-union and collective bargaining rights. In light of the Supreme Court's ruling, the Polish government reluctantly agreed to register Solidarity as a legal organization—a step that Soviet leaders viewed with dismay.)

<sup>26</sup> Translator's Note: Suslov's reference here should be to Stefan Olszowski, not Olszanski.



BREZHNEV. They must have self-defense detachments.

ANDROPOV, SUSLOV, and USTINOV say that this measure is necessary. Defense detachments must be created and must be set up even in barracks, and perhaps also armed in due course.<sup>27</sup>

SUSLOV. We at one point wrote a letter to Gomulka about how he should refrain from ordering firearms to be used against the workers, but in actuality he didn't heed us then, and firearms were used.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev explicitly raised this issue during his talks with Kania and Pinkowski on 30 October, suggesting that special units be set up in factories and mass media outlets. At the Warsaw Pact summit on 5 December 1980, Kania pledged that "we will create separate groups of the most trustworthy party members who, if necessary, will be given weapons. We have already chosen 19,000 of these party members and plan to have roughly 30,000 of them in place by the end of December." Quoted from "Stenografische Niederschrift des Treffens fuhrender Repräsentanten der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 5. Dezember 1980 in Moskau," pp. 147-148. At a meeting of the PZPR Politburo the following day (6 December), Kania won support for a proposal to "create groups of [party members] who are trustworthy, with the possibility of arming them if such a need should arise." Quoted from "Protokol Nr. 53 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 6 grudnia 1980 r.," 6 December 1980 (Secret), reprinted in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, p. 189. This matter was included in the landmark "Prospective Guidelines for the Introduction of Martial Law on Polish Territory for Reasons of National Security," which was approved by the Homeland Defense Committee (*Komitet obrony kraju*, or KOK) in late March 1981 at Jaruzelski's behest and signed by Kania on 27 March. The document called for "the arming of the most reliable and trustworthy volunteers who are determined, through complete sacrifice and devotion, to defend socialism." See "Mysl przewodnia wprowadzenia na terytorium PRL stanu wojennego ze wzgledu na bezpieczenstwo panstwa," 27 March 1981 (Top Secret), in Centralne Archiwum Ministerstwa Spraw Wewnetrznych (CAMSW), Sygn. 1813/92/1. Lists of those who were to form this new "party guard" (*gardia partyjna*) were compiled by the Polish Internal Affairs Ministry and approved by high-level authorities on 10 September and 5 October 1981. Only 7,768 names appeared on the final list, well short of the 30,000 that Kania had mentioned in December 1980. These guards were not actually armed until after the imposition of martial law, when they were equipped with a total of nearly 50,000 firearms and 7 million rounds of ammunition, making them a formidable paramilitary unit. See "Posiedzenie Kierownictwa MSW 15 XII 1981 r.," 15 December 1981 (Top Secret), and "Posiedzenie Sztabu MSW, 8.1.1982 r.," 8 January 1982 (Top Secret), both in CAMSW, Sygn. 251/1 and Sygn. 2309/IV, T. 2, respectively.

<sup>28</sup> Translator's Note: Suslov is referring to the workers' protests along the Baltic coast of Poland in December 1970, which ultimately led to Gomulka's downfall. Some 55 protesters were killed and nearly 1,200 were wounded. At the time, Jaruzelski was the Polish national defense minister. In that capacity he supported and helped implement the decision by Gomulka and prime minister Jozef Cyrankiewicz to use deadly force against the unarmed strikers. Suslov is correct in saying that the Soviet Union counseled against the use of force. Soviet leaders were in touch with the Polish authorities as early as 14 December, the day the strikes began. On 17 December, Brezhnev called Gomulka to express grave concern about the situation. The following day, the CPSU Politburo sent a letter to the PZPR Central Committee urging that the crisis be defused through political means, without further violence. Contrary to what Suslov says, the letter was addressed to the full PZPR Central Committee, not to Gomulka personally. This was important because it signaled the end of Moscow's support for Gomulka, paving the way for a change of leadership. For relevant documentation and first-hand accounts, see "List do czlonkow Komitetu Centralnego Polskiej Zjednoczonej Partii Robotniczej," 27 March 1971 (Top Secret), from Gomulka to the PZPR Central Committee, in Jakub Andrzejewski (pseud.), ed., *Gomulka i inni: Dokumenty z archiwum KC 1948-1982* (London: Aneks, 1987), pp. 233-234; the interview with a PZPR Politburo member in 1970-71, Jozef Tejchma, in "Czego Gierek nie zrozumial," in *Reporter* (Warsaw), No. 5 (1990), p. 13; and *Edward Gierek: Przerwana dekada*, p. 57. See also the very similar recollections of a CPSU Politburo member during the Brezhnev era, V. V. Grishin, *Ot Khrushcheva do Gorbacheva: Politicheskije portrety pyati Gensekov i A. N. Kosygina* (Moscow: ASPOL, 1996), pp. 54-55.

PONOMAREV. The documents prepared for the discussions with the Polish leaders are logical, and everything here is realistic. The materials strongly emphasize our alarm. We must convey this alarm to the Polish leaders.

GROMYKO. Perhaps we should give these materials to the Polish leaders.

ANDROPOV. If we hand over the materials, we can't rule out the possibility that they'll be passed on to the Americans.<sup>29</sup>

BREZHNEV. This may very well be.

RUSAKOV. Let them listen closely to Leonid Il'ich and take notes.

GRISHIN. Leonid Il'ich, you must begin the discussion and express our anxiety. Let them respond. The documents that have been prepared are good.

TIKHONOV. Of course, Leonid Il'ich, you must begin by speaking about these matters and set forth everything that is written here. We are inviting them to come here to express our alarm at the situation unfolding in Poland. The materials deal with all these issues very well. The actions of counterrevolutionary elements are unmistakable in Poland now. Let them say why they are permitting this, let them explain it. Communists are leaving the Party, fearing the antisocialist elements. That's how far things have gone.

RUSAKOV. I believe the document covers everything, but Kania might raise some other questions that are not covered in these materials. One such question is the matter of

---

<sup>29</sup> Translator's Note: It is unclear precisely what Andropov had in mind here. One possibility is that he was referring to a potential leak by a PZPR Politburo member or by some other senior Polish official (see the reported comment to this effect by Kania in Document No. 3 below). Colonel Kuklinski later recalled that even within the top levels of the Polish military, information about martial law planning was very tightly held in 1980-81 because "in the view of the military leadership, some members of the Homeland Defense Committee . . . were unreliable and were favorably disposed to the notion of restructuring the PPR's political system." (Quoted from "Wojna z narodem widziana od srodka," pp. 18-19.) Similarly, a hardline member of the PZPR Central Committee, Zdzislaw Drewniowski, told Soviet officials "in the strictest confidence" that "the heads of [Polish] state security organs at the wojewodztwo level have received instructions not to send special messages in writing to the first secretaries of the PZPR's wojewodztwo committees because of the possible leak of information from them to various branches of Solidarity." Quoted from "Informatsiya o nekotorykh sobyitiyakh v Pol'skoi Narodnoi Respublike," Report No. 0242/1 (Secret), 2 December 1981, from V. Dobrik, first secretary of the L'viv oblast committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party (UkrCP), in *Tsentral'nyi Derzhavnyi Arkhiv Hromadnykh Obednan' Ukrainy (TsDAHOU)*, F. 1, Op. 25, Spravka (Spr.) 2235, L. 41. It is also possible that Andropov was alluding to the risks of foreign espionage in Poland, an issue to which he, as head of the KGB, was particularly sensitive. Events over the next year — with the discovery that Kuklinski had been working for the CIA — amply confirmed Andropov's suspicions. The defection of two high-ranking Polish military intelligence officers, Colonel Jerzy Suminski and Colonel Witold Ostaszewicz, to the West in the autumn of 1981 compounded the damage. See the comments by General Czeslaw Kiszczak, who in 1980-81 served as head of Polish military intelligence and then as minister of internal affairs, in Witold Beres and Jerzy Skoczylas, eds., *General Kiszczak mowi: Prawie wszystko* (Warsaw: BGW, 1991), pp. 65, 173, 178-180. Most of the intelligence that Kuklinski, Suminski, and Ostaszewicz passed on, however, pertained to military affairs and national security. The sort of disclosure to which Andropov is referring seems to be of a broader political nature. Hence, it seems more likely that he was referring to an unauthorized leak by a disgruntled PZPR Politburo member who was hoping to discredit Kania.

personnel. In particular, they will apparently raise the question of removing Jablonski, Werblan, Kowalczyk, and Kruczek from the Politburo. Even though, one must say, Kruczek serves a useful purpose; he is an authoritative comrade and in the past was a trade union official.<sup>30</sup>

The second question that Cde. Kania might raise is about multilateral assistance to Poland from the other socialist countries. The point is that Kania is against such assistance. I have in mind here that Cde. Baibakov in the materials had referred to internationalist assistance to Poland, and the Polish comrades said that the situation in their country is not the same as in Hungary or in Czechoslovakia.<sup>31</sup>

One further question might arise. Poland's relations are not particularly good with some neighboring socialist countries, for example, with the GDR. Earlier the Poles had a so-called visa-free regime with the GDR. Exploiting this, Polish citizens would travel to the GDR and buy up all the groceries and consumer goods. The German comrades believe it is necessary to end the visa-free procedure for crossing the border, and the Poles of course are against ending it.<sup>32</sup> What should we do? I think we should not interfere in this matter; let them sort out the question among themselves. Everything else in the document is well done.

CHERNENKO. The materials prepared by the commission are comprehensive. They define all the major issues to which we should draw the attention of the Polish comrades, and the questions are raised very pointedly. The materials speak directly about the difficult situation and about the necessity of taking decisive measures against the antisocialist elements.

KIRILENKO. It's been three months since the strikes started and the danger has failed to subside. We have done a great deal for Poland; we've provided everything and recommended how to resolve matters properly. So far, they are not enlisting the military in the struggle against antisocialist elements and, as the comrades correctly pointed out, are not even exposing them for what they are. The situation with young people there is bad. There is no Communist youth league in reality. There are no detachments made up of young people. Perhaps they must disguise the soldiers and let them into the working mass. Undoubtedly one must first of all mobilize the Communists. The strange inaction on Kania's part is all the more

---

<sup>30</sup> Translator's Note: Wladyslaw Kruczek, an aging official who played an important role during the Stalin era in setting up Communist-dominated unions, was a notorious hardliner. From the outset, he had opposed negotiations with the MKS and had called for a violent crackdown.

<sup>31</sup> Translator's Note: Rusakov's statements here are far from clear-cut, but he seems to be speaking about the prospect of Soviet military intervention in Poland, akin to what happened in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. It is possible that Nikolai Baibakov, the head of state planning, was simply referring to multilateral economic assistance, and that the Polish authorities mistakenly thought he was alluding to military aid. Kania's memoirs, and documents from the time, shed no further light on the matter.

<sup>32</sup> Translator's Note: No visas had been required for travel between the GDR and Poland since 1972, but on 28 October 1980, the day before this CPSU Politburo meeting, the East German authorities announced that restrictions would be reimposed on travel to and from Poland as of the end of the month. The visa requirements were to remain in effect until there was substantial "progress toward stabilizing the situation in People's Poland and bolstering the socialist workers' and peasants' regime."

incomprehensible to the leaders of the other socialist countries.<sup>33</sup> For example, when I spoke with Husak and other Czech comrades, they expressed surprise at such behavior. The Czech comrades cited examples of when they had acted decisively against the ringleaders of a strike at a certain enterprise. This had yielded results.<sup>34</sup>

GORBACHEV. I believe the Politburo has acted very properly by inviting the Polish leaders to Moscow for a discussion. We must speak to the Polish friends frankly and resolutely. So far, they are taking no appropriate measures and are merely in some sort of defensive position. Even this defensive position they haven't really been upholding for a long time now; they're being dislodged from it.

You should begin the discussion, Leonid Il'ich. The text, in my view, is very good, and I have no comments to add. It contains all the ideas that must be conveyed to the Polish friends. Then after your discussion we can hear what they have to say. At that point, perhaps, some points will come up that are worth discussing and exchanging views about.

BAIBAKOV. If Kania and Pinkowski raise economic questions during the discussion, we must tell them that we received a letter from the Polish side about this matter. We have given instructions to the appropriate comrades, and we are drafting recommendations for the provision of economic assistance. What can we provide? We can of course promise to extend existing credits of 280 million rubles, and then give them new credits of 150 million rubles. This is a short-term credit, which they now need to pay off a percentage of what they've borrowed. We must also say that we can substantially increase deliveries of fuel in 1981, for example, by 500 million rubles. Perhaps we can also agree to reduce imports of goods from Poland by roughly 250 million rubles, and in general all this will mean we can provide them with assistance of nearly 1 billion rubles. I think that perhaps we must nonetheless draft letters to the other fraternal Parties. We already drafted letters about how in the coming year we would have to supply them with a substantially smaller quantity of oil and oil products, and then we'd sell these oil products and turn over the money we receive to the Polish People's Republic so that the Poles can buy what they need. We have to divert

---

<sup>33</sup> Translator's Note: This was especially true in Czechoslovakia (as Kirilenko indicates) and East Germany. During a meeting on 27 October 1980 between a top-ranking East German official, Joachim Herrmann, and his Soviet counterpart, Mikhail Zimyanin, Herrmann conveyed the SED Politburo's view that "the situation in Poland is now worse than in Czechoslovakia in 1968, worse than under Dubcek." Zimyanin did not directly challenge this assertion, but he responded that it was still necessary to "be patient and take a cautious and discreet position *vis-a-vis* the Polish people and the Polish leadership." He also argued that the Warsaw Pact states "must not be provoked by our enemies, who are claiming that the Soviet Union will intervene with military force." Quoted from "Information uber die Gesprache zwischen Genossen Joachim Herrmann und Genossen M. V. Zimjanin am 27. und 31. Oktober 1981," 4 November 1980 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/2/A-2361; reproduced in Kubina and Wilke, eds., *"Hart und kompromisslos durchgreifen"*, pp. 96-97.

<sup>34</sup> Translator's Note: Evidently, the Czechoslovak Communist leader, Gustav Husak, was referring to a short-lived strike organized in Prague in August 1978 to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. This protest was quickly suppressed. The crackdown was typical of the hardline policies of Husak's regime, which was just as vehemently opposed to Solidarity as the East German authorities were. A recurrent theme in Czechoslovak press coverage of events in Poland in 1980-81 was the alleged parallel with the aborted "counterrevolution" in Czechoslovakia in 1968. Czechoslovak newspapers also frequently emphasized the "threat" that strikes in Poland posed to the Warsaw Pact.

deliveries of oil from all countries except Cuba, Mongolia, and Vietnam.<sup>35</sup> As far as grain is concerned, we already decided on 500,000 tons and can give no more. Perhaps we can provide cotton and diesel fuel and add 200,000 tons. In addition, we must obviously tell them that our economists will help the Polish organizations in working out an agricultural plan to get out of the plight in which Poland now finds itself. That is, they will indicate what internal measures must be adopted to facilitate this transition. We will appeal to the other socialist countries about a certain reduction in deliveries of oil products in connection with the events in Poland. Of course they will all object to this, that's for certain. Well, what can be done? We have no other option, and we must obviously do this.

BREZHNEV. What's the value now of oil on the world market?

BAIBAKOV. The value of a ton of oil is 150 rubles, and a ton of gasoline and a ton of diesel fuel are 190 rubles each.<sup>36</sup>

ARKHIPOV. The note deals with economic questions. I think that in the discussion with Kania on these matters, things should be kept general. We are preparing a document; today I went over a draft, and we'll work on it a bit more and show it to N. A. Tikhonov. But it seems to me that it doesn't make sense for us to give them oil and oil products, since they can't use it properly.<sup>37</sup> They have strikes at plants and factories, and they squander fuel. Hence we'd be better off selling it and giving Poland the money.

RUSAKOV. There was a letter from Cde. Kania on economic questions. They request the formulation of an economic approach to the further development of the Polish economy and the extraction of it from its plight. I think that you, Leonid Il'ich, will respond to Kania that our comrades are working on these materials and will provide such assistance.

\* \* \*

BREZHNEV. Clearly, we should endorse the materials presented here and consider it worthwhile to be guided by our delegation in negotiations with the Polish friends.

---

<sup>35</sup> Translator's Note: Cuba, Mongolia, and Vietnam were members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), an organization formed in January 1949 by the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania. Albania joined CMEA in February 1949 (but withdrew in 1961), and East Germany was admitted in September 1950. After the Sino-Soviet split emerged in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the Soviet Union began seeking to extend CMEA into the Third World: Mongolia was admitted in July 1962, Cuba joined in July 1972, and Vietnam was admitted in June 1978. Their membership entitled them to receive energy supplies and other crucial goods from the Soviet Union.

<sup>36</sup> Translator's Note: The world price of oil had gone up precipitously within the past year-and-a-half (from around \$18.50/barrel to more than \$34.00/barrel) because of the Iranian revolution in 1979 and the outbreak of the Iran-Iraq war in September 1980. Pricing within CMEA was based on a five-year sliding scale of world prices, which meant that the impact of the recent price increases had not really been felt yet by the CMEA recipients. For the Soviet Union, however, the opportunity cost of supplying oil to CMEA countries seemed greater than ever.

<sup>37</sup> Translator's Note: Of all the members of the CPSU Politburo's Commission on Poland, Arkhipov was perhaps the most skeptical about the wisdom of providing large-scale economic aid to Poland. As the first deputy prime minister, he was broadly responsible for economic affairs, and he was one of the main proponents of a shift in Soviet-East European economic relations along lines more favorable to the Soviet Union.

EVERYONE. Correct.

[*Source: TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 31*]

Top Secret  
Single Copy  
(Working Notes)

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

31 October 1980

Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin,  
A. A. Gromyko, A. P. Kirilenko, A. Ya. Pel'she,  
M. A. Suslov, N. A. Tikhonov, D. F. Ustinov,  
K. U. Chernenko, T. Ya. Kiselev, V. V. Kuznetsov,  
B. N. Ponomarev, M. S. Solomentsev, I. V. Kapitonov,  
V. I. Dolgikh, M. V. Zimyanin, K. V. Rusakov.

....

2. On the Results of a Visit to the USSR by the First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party, Cde. S. Kania, and the Chairman of the PPR Council of Ministers, Cde. J. Pinkowski

BREZHNEV. With full assuredness we can say that our meeting with the new Polish leaders was timely.<sup>38</sup> Events in Poland have deteriorated so far by now that if we let time slip away and do not correct the position of the Polish comrades, we will — before you know it — be faced with a critical situation that will necessitate extraordinary and, one might even say, painful decisions.

The Polish comrades did not conceal their alarm at the stepped-up activity of the

---

<sup>38</sup> Translator's Note: For Kania's own perspective on the visit, as recounted to the PZPR Politburo on the same day as this CPSU Politburo meeting, see "Protokol Nr. 42 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 31 października 1980 r.," 31 October 1981 (Secret), reprinted in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, esp. pp. 151-153. Kania gave a generally upbeat assessment of the meeting, though he acknowledged that Soviet leaders were still "deeply concerned" about events in Poland. Kania said he had assured Brezhnev that the Poles could "resolve the situation on [their] own, using [their] own means." He also reported that Brezhnev had promised, on behalf of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries, to give increased economic assistance to Poland. At the same time, Kania acknowledged that Brezhnev and other Soviet leaders had urged him to wage a more vigorous struggle against Solidarity and to retain strict party control over the mass media. This latter "recommendation" (which was not mentioned in Soviet accounts of the talks) was important because it was one of the main issues that Polish prime minister Pinkowski was supposed to be discussing with the leaders of Solidarity at their emergency meeting on 31 October.

antisocialist forces. But when the discussion turned to measures for combatting the counterrevolution, their statements seemed to lack resolve.

They declared that Poland is completely immersed in debt. All imports from the West, which are needed for many enterprises to function as well as for the internal market, are obtained now on credit. The economy of Poland is directly dependent on the West. In such circumstances, the Polish comrades believe, any deterioration of the country's situation might provide a basis for the capitalists to refuse any further extension of credits.<sup>39</sup> In that case Poland, according to Kania, will be brought to its knees.

We directly asked Kania whether the Party had a plan for an emergency situation in which an open threat would arise to people's rule. He said that there is such a plan, and that they know who should be arrested and how to use the army.<sup>40</sup> But judging by everything, they are not yet prepared to take such a step and have put it off until the indefinite future.

I won't rehash the entire content of our discussions. Notes from the talks were sent around, and the comrades can read through these if they haven't done so already.

As we said at the previous session, the goal of the meeting with the Polish comrades was twofold: on the one hand, to help them understand the full depth of the danger and to spur them into taking more decisive actions; and on the other hand, to lift up their spirits and increase their confidence in their strengths and capabilities. I think that the negotiations were useful in both respects.

---

<sup>39</sup> Translator's Note: To the extent that Kania was being sincere about this point, it provides intriguing evidence of the leverage that the West gained over Poland's internal affairs from the loans made in the 1970s. Brezhnev raised this issue in an acerbic way with Kania and Jaruzelski later on: "It is essential that everyone in Poland understand that credits provided by Western banks and governments are in no way a gift, but a commercial transaction. For Poland, this amounts to servitude." See Document No. 16 below.

<sup>40</sup> Translator's Note: Kania's statement, as reported by Brezhnev, is corroborated by newly released documents from the Polish internal affairs ministry archive, which show that planning for mass arrests of Solidarity's leaders and the "isolation" of dissident intellectuals had begun as early as 15 October. Kania's statement is also corroborated by the testimony of Ryszard Kuklinski ("Wojna z narodem widziana od srodka," pp. 17-18), who recalled that the planning for martial law proceeded rapidly after the Polish General Staff began its preparations on 22 October. By early November 1980, the planners had compiled an arrest list of some 4,500 opposition figures who were to be rounded up *en masse* just hours before the imposition of military rule. By late December 1980 the number to be arrested had increased to 12,900, and by late February 1981 it had grown to 13,600. The full list (which was periodically updated) was codified on 26 February 1981 in Directive No. J-0045/81/M, which specified arrest quotas for police forces in each wojewodztwo. From February to September 1981, the mass-arrest operation was codenamed "Wiosna" (Spring). In September, after the Polish authorities learned that Solidarity had somehow found out about the "Wiosna" planning, the codename was changed to "Wrzos" (Heather). In early October 1981 the plans for mass arrests were incorporated into the broader, two-stage "Jodlo" (Pine) operation, which was to begin upon receipt of a signal known as "Brzos-81" (Birch-81). See "Komenda Stoieczna: Plany przedswiezec dotyczacych drugiego etapu akcji 'Jodla'," October 1981 (Secret), in Archiwum Ministerstwa Spraw Wewnetrznych (AMSW), Sygn. Spis 156, Pozycja (Poz.) 81, T. IV. That signal was transmitted, and the "Jodlo" operation was launched, on the night of 12-13 December 1981, with remarkable success. By the time the PZPR Politburo met on the morning of 13 December, the arrest operation was more than 70 percent complete. See "Protokol Nr. 19 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR w dniu 13.XII.1981 r.," 13 December 1981 (Top Secret), in Archiwum Akt Nowych (AAN), T. 2343, Dok. 8, S. 1.



Kania, as I already said, showed distinct hesitation only on the question of introducing a state of emergency. With regard to the other measures recommended by us, he declared that he agrees with them. We achieved complete understanding also in evaluating the reasons for the crisis and the magnitude of the counterrevolutionary threat.

Kania assured us that upon his return to Warsaw he would convey our point of view to the PZPR CC Politburo.<sup>41</sup> He carefully took down everything we said. To be sure, Kania expressed reservations about fully informing certain members of the Politburo, since there was a danger that the information would be leaked to the West.<sup>42</sup> And for the Polish leaders it is essential to forestall any hints that they are acting at the behest of Moscow.<sup>43</sup>

As far as Kania and Pinkowski personally are concerned, they made a good impression on me and evidently on the other comrades who took part in the negotiations. These are serious and thoughtful people. It's clear that they are worth their salts as political leaders; we will judge them only by their deeds.

No doubt, the comrades agree that at present we have done everything on the Polish question that has been demanded of us. But of course we must remain on guard because the situation in Poland is still dangerously explosive.

It would be worth moving quickly to lend all possible economic assistance to enable the Poles to make it through this trying time. No matter how burdensome it will be for us, we should do it. Let's agree that at the next session of the Politburo all necessary recommendations should be presented.

Perhaps Nikolai Aleksandrovich and other comrades wish to add something to what I've said?

If not, let's approve the results of the negotiations.

ANDROPOV, SUSLOV, KIRILENKO, CHERNENKO, and TIKHONOV say that the invitation to the leaders of Poland for a discussion at the CPSU CC was timely and absolutely essential.

---

<sup>41</sup> Translator's Note: Kania promptly followed through; see my first annotation to this document.

<sup>42</sup> Translator's Note: This is an extremely important passage because it helps explain why Kania and Jaruzelski were very discreet and reticent in their comments to the PZPR Politburo. They did not want to reveal the full extent of Soviet pressure on them. (This is evident from a perusal of the items in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*.) Evidently, Kania suspected that one or more of his Politburo colleagues might leak the information, perhaps to undercut Kania's position. It is not clear which of the Politburo members Kania had in mind, or what the rationale for the disclosure would be. A comment by Yuri Andropov at the CPSU Politburo meeting on 29 October (see Document No. 2 above) implied that concerns existed in Moscow about high-level espionage in Poland, but it seems unlikely that Kania was referring here to the presence of a full-fledged spy. Not until late 1980 did suspicions begin to emerge that a high-ranking official (Kuklinski) was working for U.S. intelligence. (Those suspicions greatly increased in the spring of 1981 when Solidarity began referring publicly to the secret codenames of components of the martial law operation.)

<sup>43</sup> Translator's Note: See Gromyko's similar comments about this point at the CPSU Politburo meeting on 29 October 1980 (Document No. 2 *supra*).

BREZHNEV. The proposal is to approve the discussion.

EVERYONE. Correct.

TIKHONOV. The economic situation in Poland is very difficult. They are deeply indebted. They must now pay off debts of roughly 500 million dollars. Moreover, they are now requesting 150 million dollars to be rolled over. We are preparing recommendations.

BREZHNEV. Can you have these recommendations ready for the next session of the Politburo?

TIKHONOV. Fine.

ARKHIPOV. Along with the proposals for lending assistance to Poland, we will also prepare an appeal for your signature, Leonid Il'ich, that will go to the leaders of the other fraternal countries.<sup>44</sup>

BREZHNEV. I think these things shouldn't be linked. The appeal should be sent out sooner.

GROMYKO. I strongly believe they should not be linked. Incidentally, I'll mention several things about the negotiations. During the negotiations, Cdes. Kania and Pinkowski said nothing about the earlier policy, the policy of Gierk. They spoke only about what is going on now and what they must do.

ANDROPOV. Thanks to this discussion, the Polish comrades have begun to understand their own situation better. After arriving back in Warsaw, Cde. Kania said at the airport that he was very satisfied with the meeting with Leonid Il'ich and that Leonid Il'ich displayed exceptional attention to the needs of Poland.

BREZHNEV. They're afraid to use the word "counterrevolutionary." So listen to what Cde. Semyonov reports from Bonn. It so happens that he's reporting on a conversation with one of the Polish officials. Here, as you see, the official is speaking directly about an armed uprising in the PPR. How is it that the Polish comrades cannot understand the simple truth that a counterrevolution is fully under way in their country?

ANDROPOV. This, indeed, is a serious point, and it warrants detailed confirmation.

USTINOV. In any case we will have to be highly vigilant.

CHERNENKO. The discussion with the Polish comrades helped them face up to the true situation in Poland and to give a proper evaluation of the way things develop from the Party's

---

<sup>44</sup> Translator's Note: See Document No. 4 below.

perspective. This will help them, of course, to be more energetic in carrying out measures designed to combat antisocialist elements and protect the gains of the socialist order.

[*Source: TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 35*]

DOCUMENT No. 4

Secret

Dear Erich!<sup>45</sup>

After discussing matters in the Politburo, we decided to turn to you and Comrades G. Husak, J. Kadar, and T. Zhivkov on an important and, in some sense, extremely urgent matter.

Not long ago, as you know, we received Cdes. Kania and Pinkowski in Moscow.<sup>46</sup> The situation they face is, one might say, exceptionally onerous. An urgent necessity has arisen for all of us together to help Poland make it through the current crisis.

You are well aware of the political situation in the PPR. The counterrevolution is on the attack and has practically seized the party by the throat. At the recent meeting we conveyed to the Poles our views about the need to halt the course of events and launch an attack against the counterrevolutionary forces, and we are informing you about this separately.<sup>47</sup> In these circumstances, the situation in the economy acquires enormous significance and is now close to a catastrophe. A further deterioration of the situation in Poland threatens to inflict enormous damage on the entire socialist commonwealth. For that reason it is our common internationalist and.— I would even say — our class duty to do everything we can to prevent this.

Let me emphasize that we ourselves will assume the main burden in this matter. Despite our own economic problems, which I described to you, we believe it is necessary to give Poland significant financial and economic assistance by extending hard-currency grants and extra shipments of a number of goods.

However, it will be impossible to provide this assistance without a certain degree of participation by the other fraternal countries.<sup>48</sup> In raising this question, we of course are very

---

<sup>46</sup> Translator's Note: Kania and Jaruzelski were in Moscow on 30 October. See Documents No. 2 and 3 above.

<sup>47</sup> Translator's Note: See "O peregovorakh tov. L. I. Brezhneva s pol'skimi rukovoditelyami," 4 November 1980 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV, 2/202-550. This brief document, which was distributed to the leaders of all the Warsaw Pact countries (other than Poland), was promptly translated into German ("Information der KPdSU Führung") for Honecker, who ordered a senior SED Politburo member responsible for ideology, Kurt Hager, to disseminate the report to other members of the SED Politburo. The Soviet document recounted the highlights of the meeting, including Brezhnev's insistence that the Polish authorities would have to use both "peaceful and non-peaceful means" to restore order. Brezhnev noted that Kania had pledged "not to retreat further" and to prepare for "other options," including "severe measures," if political efforts to defuse the crisis proved unsuccessful.

<sup>48</sup> Translator's Note: This same point had been stressed by a high-ranking CPSU official, Mikhail Zimyanin, in a meeting with his East German counterpart, Joachim Herrmann, on 31 October 1980. See "Information über die Gespräche zwischen Genossen Joachim Herrmann und Genossen M. V. Zimjanin am 27. und 31. Oktober 1981," pp. 98-99.

well aware that it is not simple. For that reason, we have tried to find an approach that would have only a minimal effect on internal plans and would not be something beyond your means.

Concretely, here's what I have in mind. We propose to reduce oil shipments somewhat to a number of countries in the socialist commonwealth. This oil will be sold on the capitalist market and the hard-currency revenues will be transmitted to Poland in the name of the corresponding countries. This will enable Poland to alleviate its critical financial situation and to purchase certain vitally necessary products and other goods.

As far as the GDR is concerned, the volume of oil shipments from the Soviet Union in 1981 will, with your consent, be reduced by 600,000-650,000 tons of the designated amount, without affecting the level of shipments of German goods to the Soviet Union.<sup>49</sup>

I request, Erich, that you look upon this suggestion with understanding.<sup>50</sup> I am certain that our display of fraternal solidarity will help our Polish comrades withstand what for them is a trying hour.

With Communist greetings

[signed]  
L. BREZHNEV

4 November 1980

[Source: SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/202-550]

---

<sup>49</sup> Translator's Note: According to official data from the GDR, the Soviet Union shipped 19.01 million tons of oil to East Germany in 1980. See "Ausfuhr und Einfuhr ausgewahlter Erzeugnisse nach Landern," in Staatliche Zentralverwaltung fur Statistik, *Statistisches Jahrbuch 1986 der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* (East Berlin: Staatsverlag der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1986), p. 257. Hence, the reduction that Brezhnev was proposing at this point would have come to about 3.1 to 3.4 percent of the total. In the fall of 1981, however, the CPSU leadership informed the East European states that further reductions would be needed in Soviet oil exports to Eastern Europe (see Document No. 20 below), a move that Honecker bitterly opposed. In the end, Soviet oil shipments to the GDR fell to 17.05 million tons in 1981 and remained at roughly that level in succeeding years (17.07 million in 1982 and 17.08 million in 1983). See *ibid.*, p. 257. Document No. 20 below shows how strongly—though unsuccessfully—Honecker resisted these changes.

<sup>50</sup> Translator's Note: For Honecker's private sentiments about this matter, see Manfred Wilke *et al.*, *SED-Politburo und polnische Krise 1980-82: Aus den Protokollen des Politburos des ZK der SED zu Polen, den innerdeutschen Beziehungen und der Wirtschaftskrise der DDR*, Working Paper No. 3 (Berlin: Forschungverbund SED-Staat, 1993), p. 411.

ST-239/36gs from 28.XI.1980<sup>51</sup>

TOP SECRET

DIRECTIVE

of the CC Secretariat of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

---

---

On a Temporary Reduction in Tourist Exchanges Between the USSR and the PPR

1. To accept a proposal from the Main Directorate on Foreign Tourism under the USSR Council of Ministers, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, and the CC of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League for a temporary reduction in tourist exchanges between the USSR and the PPR.<sup>52</sup>

2. To instruct Glavintourist, the VTsSPS, and the VLKSM CC to hold negotiations with tourist organizations in the PPR to make appropriate changes in the protocol on tourist exchanges.

---

Results of the vote:<sup>53</sup>

---

6430 Extracts to Cdes.: Kapitonov, Rusakov, Nikitin, Shibaev, Pastukhov, and Pegov<sup>54</sup>

---

24. Nov. 1980

---

Distributed: 28/XI.80 received<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Translator's Note: The alphanumeric code of the directive and the date were filled in by hand.

<sup>52</sup> Translator's Note: In the original, the acronyms VTsSPS and Central Committee VLKSM are used instead of the full names All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and the Central Committee of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League, respectively. For the sake of clarity, the two names have been written out in full here. In the remainder of this document the appropriate acronyms will be used.

<sup>53</sup> Translator's Note: To the right of this heading, just below the line, all the CPSU Central Committee Secretaries, beginning with Mikhail Suslov, signed "in favor" of the directive. The directive also was signed, just above the line, by five officials who prepared the attached materials (see below).

<sup>54</sup> Translator's Note: These surnames were added in handwriting.

<sup>55</sup> Translator's Note: The date and the word "received" were added in handwriting.

---

---

Secret

C P S U   C C

On a Temporary Reduction in Tourist Exchanges  
Between the USSR and PPR

In accordance with instructions issued by the CPSU CC on 4 November 1980, the Main Directorate on Foreign Tourism under the USSR Council of Ministers (the head of Glavintourist, Cde. Nikitin), the VTsSPS (the chairman, Cde. Shibaev), and the VLKSM CC (the secretary, Cde. Pastukhov) have proposed a temporary reduction in Soviet-Polish tourism.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Translator's Note: The CPSU Central Committee directive on this matter was issued roughly a week after the East German, Czechoslovak, and Bulgarian authorities had taken steps to curb tourism between their countries and Poland. Concern about Soviet-Polish tourism had been building in Moscow since the very start of the crisis in mid-1980. In late July and early August 1980, Soviet party and KGB officials in the republics bordering Poland were ordered to tighten their monitoring of all tourists going to and coming out of Poland. They also were ordered to report back to Moscow on their findings. A massive and often redundant effort got under way to keep close track of Polish tourists who were visiting the Soviet Union and to determine what sort of reception Soviet tourists were encountering in Poland. Many of the reports sent back to Moscow came as a jolt to the CPSU leadership. A typical report, from senior officials in Ukraine, found that "when Soviet tour groups have recently been in the PPR, the group leaders have detected unfriendly behavior toward the Soviet tourists as well as anti-Soviet sentiments on the part of wide segments of the local population." The report noted that food shortages and other problems in Poland were being blamed on the Soviet Union, and that many Poles were voicing "hostile and anti-Soviet slogans" and claiming that the Polish Communist regime was "maintained only through Russian bayonets." Quoted from "Informatsiya o nekotorykh vyskazaniyakh, imeyushchikh mesto so storony pol'skikh grazhdan pri vstrechakh s sovetskimi turistami, a takzhe vo vremya prebyvaniya v Ukrainskoi SSR po linii Byuro mezhdunarodnogo molodezhnogo turizma 'Sputnik'," Report No. 24-s (Secret), 3 September 1980, from G. Naumenko, chairman of the "Sputnik" Bureau of International Youth Tourism of the Ukrainian Komsomol, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2138, Ll. 138-142. Similarly, in L'viv, which was one of the major rail transit points for Polish tourists arriving in the Soviet Union, the head of the UkrCP oblast committee expressed alarm about the "flagrant abuses and anti-Soviet statements by Polish tourists." He said he would "adopt necessary measures to strengthen political-educational work with Polish tourists, to think more carefully about their programs of stay in L'viv, to train the interpreters and tour guides more thoroughly, and to focus the Polish tourists' special attention during their trips on propaganda highlighting the advantages of the socialist way of life." Quoted from "Informatsiya o reagirovanii pol'skikh turistov na sobytiya v PNR," Report No. 0585 (Secret), 26 August 1980, from V. Svyatotskii, first secretary of the UkrCP oblast committee in L'viv, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2138, Ll. 66-71. These sorts of reports increased over the next two months, prompting the CPSU leadership to approve this sharp reduction in tourism both to and from Poland. Soviet leaders coordinated the whole effort with the Czechoslovak, Hungarian, East German, and Bulgarian authorities. Tourists from these countries visiting the Soviet Union were

It is proposed that Soviet tourist visits to the PPR for the remainder of 1980 be reduced from 4,900 persons to 3,200 (a 36 percent reduction), and that in the first half of 1981 they be reduced from 45,400 persons, as envisaged in the plans, to 24,500 (a 44 percent reduction).<sup>57</sup>

It is proposed that the reduction in Soviet tourism be accomplished primarily through the elimination of trips by tourist groups and vacation tours involving prolonged stays in the PPR. On the whole, trips by special tour groups under the auspices of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries<sup>58</sup> and in connection with twin cities, scholarly tourism, and combined tours, including visits to 2-3 countries with a brief (4- to 8-day) stay in the PPR, will not be affected during this period.<sup>59</sup>

It is also proposed that in the first half of 1981 the number of Polish tourists visiting the USSR be reduced from 105,000 persons, as envisaged in the plans, to 66,000 (a 37 percent reduction).<sup>60</sup>

---

constantly monitored by Soviet tour guides and interpreters to gauge their views about the situation in Poland. The Soviet guides were instructed to "explain to [the tourists] that the countries of the socialist commonwealth will not leave the Polish people in the lurch." Quoted from "O vyskazivaniyakh inostrannykh turistov po povodu sobytii v PNR," Memorandum No. 318-s (Top Secret), 26 August 1980, from Yu. Il'nyts'kyi, first secretary of the UkrCP Transcarpathian oblast committee, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2138, Ll. 51-53. See also Il'nyts'kyi's follow-up report, "O prodolzhayushchikhsya vyskazivaniyakh inostrannykh turistov po povodu sobytii v Pol'she," Memorandum No. 330-s (Top Secret), 5 September 1980, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2138, Ll. 60-63.

<sup>57</sup> Translator's Note: In Communist countries, tourism, like almost all other activities, was pervasively controlled by the state. Rather than being determined by market forces and the desires of individuals, tourism in the Eastern bloc was carefully planned out years in advance by state and Communist party agencies and coordinated among the different countries' five-year plans.

<sup>58</sup> Translator's Note: In the original, the acronym SSOD was used here rather than the full name of the organization. From here on, the acronym will be used.

<sup>59</sup> Translator's Note: It should also be noted that the reductions did not affect the party-to-party contacts authorized by the CPSU Secretariat's directive on "stepping up political and ideological cooperation with the PZPR" (*Ob aktivizatsii politicheskogo i ideologicheskogo sotrudnichestva s PORP*) and the earlier directive (St-192/7s, issued on 11 January 1980) laying out a "plan for the CPSU's ties with Communist and workers' parties of socialist countries" (*O plane svyazei KPSS s kommunisticheskimi i rabochimi partiyami sotsialisticheskikh stran*). Of particular importance were party-to-party contacts involving delegations from Soviet republics adjacent to Poland. From Belorussia alone, some 17 groups of party workers and activists, 15 agitation-propaganda lecturers, 12 groups of trade union and Komsomol workers, 48 economic specialists, and 15 groups of workers and enterprise managers, artists, and sport teams — more than 2,000 people in all — were sent to meet with Polish provincial officials in 1980. See "Informatsiya o rabote po osushchestvleniyu druzhestvennykh svyazei obkomov KP Belorussii s partiinymi komitetami BKP, SEPG, PORP, i KPCh v 1980 godu," Memorandum No. 0315 (Secret), 18 February 1981, from T. Kiselev, First Secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 85, Ll. 8-15. The number of contacts from Belorussia, Lithuania, and Ukraine increased still further in 1981. In mid-April 1981, the CPSU Politburo's Commission on Poland (the "Suslov Commission") specifically recommended that Soviet trade union officials, regional party secretaries, and local authorities be instructed to meet more frequently with their Polish counterparts. See "Plan meropriyatii po okazaniyu pomoshchi rukovodstvu PORP v organizatsionnom i ideologicheskome ukreplenii partii," 16 April 1981 (Top Secret), attachment to "Vypiska iz protokola No. 7 zasedaniya Politbyuro TsK KPSS ot 23 aprelya 1981 goda: O razvitiy v Pol'she i nekotorykh shagakh s nashei storony," No. P7/VII (Top Secret/Special Dossier), 23 April 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 66, D. 3, Ll. 9-11.

<sup>60</sup> Translator's Note: If these aggregate numbers are correct, it is unclear whether the proposed cuts were ever implemented. Indeed, some of the figures now available about the actual number of Polish tourists who visited the USSR in 1981 are higher than the figure of 105,000 listed here as the starting point (not to mention the reduced level



In addition, in accordance with the CPSU CC directive issued on 4 November 1980, measures are to be taken to improve the selection, preparation, and training of Soviet citizens traveling as tourists to the PPR, as well as to improve the work involved in receiving and accommodating Polish tourist groups.<sup>61</sup>

We believe it would be worthwhile to accept the proposal for a temporary reduction in Soviet-Polish tourism, regarding it as a temporary measure necessitated by the political situation in the PPR, and to authorize Glavintourist, the VTsSPS, and the VLKSM CC to hold negotiations with PPR tourist organizations to make appropriate changes in the protocols on tourist exchanges.

---

of 66,000). A secret report drafted in early June 1981 noted that in just the first five months of 1981, "more than 110,000 citizens of the PPR" traveled through Chernivtsi oblast in western Ukraine on their way to other parts of the Soviet Union. This total was in addition to the "200 per day" who came initially to L'viv, plus the thousands of others who entered the Soviet Union through other routes. Clearly, something about these figures does not square with the data in the resolution. For the Chernivtsi data, see "O nepravil'nom povedenii grazhdan PNR, sleduyushchikh tranzitom cherez Chernovitskuyu oblast'," Report No. 224/7s-3 (Secret), 10 June 1981, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2287, Ll. 8-10. For the L'viv data, see "Informatsiya o reagirovanii pol'skikh turistov na sobytiya v PNR," L. 66.

<sup>61</sup> Translator's Note: As with the proposed numerical cuts, it is unclear whether these recommendations were fully implemented. Complaints about tourism, both to and from Poland, continued to filter into Moscow over the next several months. In late November 1980, the head of the UkrCP's oblast committee in Vynnytsya reported that a Soviet youth group touring Poland had encountered a "hostile and unfriendly" reception, and had been turned down for various meetings it requested, without any convincing explanation. See "Informatsiya o nekotorykh vyskazaniyakh pol'skikh grazhdan sovet'skim turistam v PNR iz Vinnitskoi oblasti," Ll. 47-49. A few months later, the head of the Latvian KGB, Boris Pugo, complained that "recently there have been instances when tourists from the PPR, under the auspices of BMMT 'Sputnik,' have been received here without due preparation. At meetings organized for these tourists with young people from Latvia, they [the Poles] have been trying to exert an ideologically harmful influence on the [Latvian] young people by tendentiously characterizing the process of renewal of social life now under way in the PPR." Pugo also noted that a systematic check of "mail correspondence from PPR citizens with their relatives and friends in the Latvian SSR" had uncovered "anti-socialist depictions of the events in Poland" and "exhortations for nationalist elements in the [Latvian] republic to follow the example of the so-called free trade unions in Poland." Pugo said that the number of "organized exchanges of tourist and student groups has remained high up to now and is in need of significant correction to conform with the changing situation." He offered a number of recommendations that largely reiterated what should already have been implemented after the CPSU Secretariat issued its directive in November 1980. See "Dokladnaya zapiska o vremennom ogranichenii turistscheskogo i studencheskogo obmena s PNR," Memorandum No. 5/1598 (Top Secret), 9 March 1981, in Latvijas Valsts Arhivs (LVA), Fonds (F.) 101, Apridos (Apr.) 47, Lietas (Li.) 141, Lapa (La.) 48-49. Two months later, an equally gloomy report was drafted by three leading officials from Ukraine, who expressed dismay that many of the Polish tourists in Ukraine "evaluate the situation [in Poland] from an anti-socialist perspective, speak pejoratively about the countries of the socialist commonwealth, and are ready to defend all types of counterrevolutionary elements." The three officials averred that many of the Polish tourists were "seeking to lay territorial claims to western Ukraine" and were "equating Communists with fascists." See "O reagirovanii trudyashchikhsya respubliki, a takzhe zarubezhnykh grazhdan, nakhodyashchikhsya na Ukraine, na sobytiya v Pol'she," Memorandum No. 1810/44 (Secret), 12 May 1981, from G. Kryuchkov, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, L. Kravchuk, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Propaganda and Agitation Department, and A. Merkulov, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Department for Foreign Ties, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2295, Ll. 1-4. These sorts of complaints, as well as accusations that "Polish tourists are trying to smuggle ideologically hostile literature into our country" and are "stirring up anti-Soviet sentiments" in the western Soviet republics, continued throughout 1981. (Quoted from "Informatsiya o nepravil'nom povedenii grazhdan PNR, sleduyushchikh tranzitom cherez Chernovitskuyu oblast'," L. 8.)

Coordinated with the USSR Foreign Ministry (the deputy minister, Cde. Mal'tsev).<sup>62</sup>

A draft directive of the CPSU CC is attached.

Deputy Head of the CPSU  
CC Department for Work  
with Cadres Abroad and  
for Travel Abroad

(V. Bazovskii)

Deputy Head of the CPSU  
CC Department for Organi-  
zational-Party Work

(N. Petrovichev)

Deputy Head of the CPSU  
CC Department for Ties  
with Communist and  
Workers' Parties of  
Socialist Countries

(O. Rakhmanin)<sup>63</sup>

24 November 1980

---

---

---

Secret<sup>64</sup>  
Copy No. 1

C P S U C C

In accordance with instructions issued by the CPSU CC on 4 November 1980, we report the following:

According to protocols signed by tourist organizations of the USSR and PPR, the Soviet Union will be visited by 20,120 Polish tourists in November-December 1980. Of these, 13,000 will be traveling under the auspices of Intourist, and 7,120 will be traveling under the auspices of the "Sputnik" Tourist Bureau.<sup>65</sup> During this same period, it is planned to send 4,870 Soviet tourists to the PPR. Of these, 2,870 will be traveling under the auspices of Intourist, and 2,000 under the auspices of BMMT "Sputnik." Tourist exchanges with the PPR under auspices of the VTsSPS's Central Council for Tourist Excursions<sup>66</sup> have already been completed for 1980.

---

<sup>62</sup> Translator's Note: Actually, Viktor Mal'tsev was one of two first deputy foreign ministers, not just a deputy minister.

<sup>63</sup> Translator's Note: All three of the officials who signed the document — Vladimir Bazovskii, Nikolai Petrovichev, and Oleg Rakhmanin — were actually first deputy heads of their departments, not just deputy heads.

<sup>64</sup> Translator's Note: This document had a cover note (No. 31329) attached, with a date of 14.XI.80. The cover note reads as follows: "To Cdes. V. N. Bazovskii, N. A. Petrovichev, and O. B. Rakhmanin: I request that you draft a proposal. K. Rusakov."

<sup>65</sup> Translator's Note: In the original, the appellation BMMT "Sputnik" is used here instead of the full name. From here on, the abridged form (as in the original) will be used in the translation.

<sup>66</sup> Translator's Note: In the original, the acronym TsSTE is used here instead of the full name of the Central Council for Tourist Excursions. From here on, the acronym will be used.

For the period 1981-1985 an Agreement on Tourist Exchanges signed by Glavintourist envisages annual growth of tourism between the Soviet Union and Poland on a scale that would lead to a 25% increase by the end of 1985 as compared with the previous five-year period.

The volume of tourism for 1981 is specified in protocols signed by Intourist, the VTsSPS TsSTE, and BMMT "Sputnik" with the Polish travel bureau. These protocols stipulate that in the coming year 209,180 Polish tourists will visit the Soviet Union and 90,900 Soviet tourists will travel to the PPR, including 155,000 and 53,000 under the auspices of Intourist, 52,000 and 36,000 under the auspices of BMMT "Sputnik," and 2,180 and 1,900 under the auspices of VTsSPS TsSTE, respectively.

Taking account of the current situation in the PPR, we believe it would be advisable to make a temporary reduction in the volume of Soviet tourism in the PPR, focusing this reduction on such types of travel as prolonged fixed trips and vacation tours and specialized groups whose itineraries include visits to industrial enterprises, official establishments, and households. At the same time it should be possible to maintain visits organized by SSOD as well as visits connected with twin cities, scholarly tourism, and so-called combined tours that include visits to 2-3 countries with only a brief (4- to 8-day) stay in the PPR.

To bolster our ideological influence on citizens of the PPR via foreign tourism, we believe it would also be worthwhile, when considering how to reduce the volume of Polish tourism in the USSR for the coming year, to preserve the kinds of tourist trips from the PPR that are most politically effective: friendship trains and aircraft, trips by activists of the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society and activist veterans of the PZPR and World War II, trips to twin cities and provinces, cruises along the Volga and Dniepr, and some fixed vacations and tours.<sup>67</sup>

For these sorts of trips, the itineraries of Polish tourists should include the widest possible range of stop-off points and ceremonies that will familiarize them with the history and culture of the peoples of our country and the internal and foreign policies of the CPSU and Soviet government.

Based on the above for 1980, it is proposed that 1,190 of the 2,870 tourists still slated for this year under Intourist's auspices be sent to the PPR, and that 2,000 tourists be sent under the auspices of BMMT "Sputnik." In the first half of 1981, trips by Soviet tourists should be reduced as follows: to 18,000 under the auspices of Intourist, to 500 under the auspices of VTsSPS TsSTE, and to 6,000 under the auspices of BMMT "Sputnik"; trips by Polish tourists should be reduced as follows: to 58,000 under the auspices of Intourist, to 600 under the auspices of VTsSPS TsSTE, and to 7,000 under the auspices of BMMT "Sputnik."

---

<sup>67</sup> Translator's Note: This recommendation was adopted, as is evident in the hundreds of pages of declassified documents in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 85. See also "O besede s delegatsiei Obshchestva pol'sko-sovetskoi druzhby," Memorandum No. 360/42 (Secret), 15 January 1981, from A. Kapto, UkrCP Central Committee Secretary, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2294, Ll. 23-25; "TsK Kompartii Ukrainy," Memorandum No. 3863/58 (Secret), 23 October 1981, from A. Merkulov, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Department for Foreign Ties, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2294, Ll. 8-9.

Should it prove necessary, the plans of cooperation between the tourist organizations of the USSR and PPR for the second half of 1981 will be adjusted as well.

We believe it would be worthwhile to instruct Intourist, the VTsSPS TsSTE, and BMMT "Sputnik," in coordination with the Soviet embassy, to hold negotiations with their partner organizations in the PPR to make appropriate changes in the plans for travel by Soviet and Polish tourists in 1980-1981.

We request your consideration.

A draft Directive from the CPSU CC on this matter is attached.

Attachment: secret, 1 page, Printed No. 2346.

Head of the Main Directorate on  
Foreign Tourism under the  
USSR Council of Ministers

Chairman  
VTsSPS

1st Secretary  
VLKSM CC

S. S. Nikitin

A. I. Shibaev

B. N. Pastukhov

Mem. No. 8/2345

14.11.80

[Source: *TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 46, D. 67*]

Top Secret  
Single Copy  
(Working Notes)

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

11 December 1980

Cde. M. A. SUSLOV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, V. V. Grishin, A. P. Kirilenko,  
A. Ya. Pel'she, N. A. Tikhonov, D. F. Ustinov,  
P. N. Demichev, V. V. Kuznetsov, B. N. Ponomarev,  
M. S. Solomentsev, I. V. Kapitonov, V. I. Dolgikh,  
M. V. Zimyanin, K. V. Rusakov.

I. On the Results of a Meeting Among Leading Officials of the Warsaw Pact  
Member-States, in Moscow, 5 December 1980

SUSLOV.<sup>68</sup> All the comrades have read the communiqué that was published in the press.<sup>69</sup> I must say that the decision to hold a meeting among leading officials from the

---

<sup>68</sup> Translator's Note: Suslov was chairing this session because Brezhnev at the time had been on an official visit to India, accompanied by foreign minister Gromyko and two other members of the Suslov Commission, Leonid Zamyatin and Ivan Arkhipov. The delegation returned to Moscow late on the 11th, and Gromyko evidently arrived at the Politburo session in time to make a brief comment. (He is not listed among the participants in the meeting, but he is recorded toward the end as having made a quick comment. If that comment is recorded accurately, it suggests he must have stopped in briefly at the end. It is also possible, of course, that the transcript incorrectly attributes the remark to Gromyko.)

<sup>69</sup> Translator's Note: See "Spotkanie przywódców państw członkowskich Układu Warszawskiego," *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 6-7 December 1980, pp. 1-2. This communique from the 5 December meeting of the Warsaw Pact's Political Consultative Committee was also published in Moscow *Pravda* and other major newspapers in the Warsaw Pact countries. Soviet leaders prepared the text of the communique in advance of the meeting, and the Pact's seven member-states endorsed its publication. That was the only decision actually approved at the session on 5 December. A full, declassified transcript of the formal part of the meeting is available in "Stenografische Niederschrift des Treffens führender Repräsentanten der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 5. Dezember 1980 in Moskau" (cited in annotation no. 9 *supra*), pp. 140-196. It consists mainly of speeches by all seven leaders, beginning with Kania and ending with Brezhnev. These speeches were intended as a form of collective pressure on the Polish authorities, letting them know that they must resolve the crisis as soon as possible. Kania's and Jaruzelski's memoirs reveal that important talks with Soviet leaders also occurred outside the formal proceedings. Jaruzelski met with the Soviet defense minister, Marshal Dmitrii Ustinov, and Kania met with Brezhnev. The Polish leader emphasized to his Soviet counterpart that the Poles could defuse the crisis on their own, and that outside intervention would have disastrous consequences. Brezhnev evidently was willing to accept these assurances, at least for the time being. See Stanislaw Kania, *Zatrzymac*

Warsaw Pact member-states was extremely timely. The meeting featured a very thorough exchange of views. Representatives of the states — that is, the first secretaries of the Communist and workers' parties — offered thorough presentations. I should say that the speech by Cde. Kania was impressive overall. Of course he might have dealt with certain matters a bit more pointedly. However, if you generally compare the speech by Cde. Kania with the statement he made to his Politburo and at the plenum back in Poland, he was more self-critical, more vibrant, and more incisive. The most important thing is that the Polish comrades understand the great danger hanging over Poland, and that they are aware of the great damage done by antisocialist elements and the grave threat posed to the socialist gains of the Polish people.<sup>70</sup> Cde. Kania is offering a more sober evaluation now of the economic situation in Poland, of the country's indebtedness to capitalist countries, and of the possibilities for assistance.<sup>71</sup>

It is worth noting that Cde. Kania indicated in his speech that he would be carrying out a more resolute offensive against the antisocialist elements, and he noted that there will be no sorts of concessions to or accommodation with the antisocialist elements. Along with this, he noted that the Polish United Workers' Party, the Polish people, and the nation's healthy forces, armed forces, and state security organs and police, who support the PZPR, are able to use their own forces to rectify the situation and normalize it.

The speeches of all the other comrades contained advice for the Polish friends on what to do and how to launch a decisive attack against the antisocialist elements. Cde. Husak, for example, cited numerous examples from the experience of 1968, when the KSC CC had to launch a fierce struggle against rightist elements.<sup>72</sup> Cde. Kadar likewise spoke about the activities of counterrevolutionary elements in 1956 in Hungary, when he had to use harsh administrative measures to crush the counterrevolution.<sup>73</sup> Cde. Ceausescu, true to his own

---

*konfrontacje* (Warsaw: BGW, 1992), pp. 82-97; and Wojciech Jaruzelski, *Les Chaines et le Refuge* (Paris: Jean-Claude Lattes, 1992), pp. 239-242.

<sup>70</sup> Translator's Note: For Kania's own brief assessment of the formal part of the Warsaw Pact meeting, as presented to the PZPR Politburo on 6 December, see "Protokol Nr. 53 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 6 grudnia 1980 r.," 6 December 1980 (Secret), reprinted in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, esp. pp. 188-189. Kania told his Polish colleagues that he did not always agree with what the other Warsaw Pact leaders had said at the meeting, but that "our situation is affecting things in the other fraternal countries, and therefore they have a right to view the situation in Poland very critically." Kania added that the allied states ultimately had approved of the Polish regime's efforts to resolve the crisis. The implication of his comments was that the meeting had been largely routine. His retrospective account of the meeting, in *Zatrzymac konfrontacje*, pp. 82-97, is much more jaundiced.

<sup>71</sup> Translator's Note: Kania dealt with all these matters in both his formal speech and his informal conversation with Brezhnev. See "Stenografische Niederschrift des Treffens fuhrender Repräsentanten der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 5. Dezember 1980 in Moskau," pp. 141-152.

<sup>72</sup> Translator's Note: Gustav Husak was the last of the East European leaders to speak, coming just before Brezhnev's concluding speech. As expected, he likened the situation in Poland to the "crisis of 1968/69 in Czechoslovakia," when "imperialist forces, internal reactionaries, and anti-socialist forces had conspired to undermine the socialist order." Husak called for "extraordinary measures" to be implemented to "crush the opportunist, counterrevolutionary, and revanchist forces." See *ibid.*, pp. 178-187.

<sup>73</sup> Translator's Note: Janos Kadar spoke third at the meeting, having been preceded by Kania and the Bulgarian leader, Todor Zhivkov. Kadar was not as vitriolic as Husak and Honecker were, but he spoke harshly about recent events in Poland and affirmed that outside (i.e., Soviet and Warsaw Pact) assistance might be necessary if certain "dangers" in

tradition, spoke more about independence, sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, etc.<sup>74</sup>

The keynote speech by L. I. Brezhnev was received with great interest and attention.<sup>75</sup> It was very well thought-out, with all the necessary instructions for the PZPR and the Polish comrades; and, as the Polish comrades themselves said, Leonid Il'ich's speech was an inspiration for them. The leaders and representatives of the other parties also offered high praise for the speech by Cde. Brezhnev.

In a word, I believe we should approve the results of the meeting among leading officials of the Warsaw Pact member-states, as well as the activity of the delegation from the Soviet Union headed by L. I. Brezhnev.

ANDROPOV. This meeting was held at a very high level. Of course the most important thing was the speech by Leonid Il'ich, which set the tone for the whole meeting.

USTINOV. The speech by Leonid Il'ich covered every issue. On each question it was clear what should be done and how the Polish comrades should act.

GROMYKO. In my view, both the Polish comrades and the other participants in the meeting left feeling very satisfied with the results. They received a necessary infusion of energy and instructions on all matters connected with the situation in Poland.

This same matter was addressed by other Politburo members — Cdes. Grishin, Kirilenko, and Pel'she — and by a CPSU CC Secretary, Cde. Rusakov.

They agreed to approve the activity of the delegation from the USSR at the meeting of leading officials and Warsaw Pact member-states headed by the CPSU CC General Secretary and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Cde. L. I. Brezhnev.

SUSLOV. I believe we should publish the decree in the press endorsing the results of the meeting.

Cde. Suslov reads a draft of the decree: to endorse the results of the meeting among leading officials of the Warsaw Pact member-states and also the activity at this meeting of the delegation from the Soviet Union headed by Cde. L. I. Brezhnev.

---

Poland could not be removed by "peaceful means." In 1956, he recalled, "our foreign comrades helped us; above all, the Soviet comrades helped us." See *ibid.*, pp. 158-166.

<sup>74</sup> Translator's Note: Ceausescu spoke forcefully against Solidarity, but he also warned that "intervention [in Poland] from outside would pose a great danger to socialism in general and to the policy of detente and the policy of peace." As Suslov indicates, Ceausescu was considerably more guarded than the other speakers. See *ibid.*, pp.171-178.

<sup>75</sup> Translator's Note: Suslov does not mention the speeches by Erich Honecker and Todor Zhivkov, both of whom (especially the former) urged that the Warsaw Pact take all necessary steps "to help the Polish comrades win out over the counterrevolution." See *ibid.*, pp. 153-157 and 166-171.

EVERYONE. Correct, we agree.

SUSLOV. Then I recommend we publish this decree tomorrow in the press.<sup>76</sup>

[Source: *TsKhSD*, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 59]

---

<sup>76</sup> Translator's Note: The brief "Central Committee decree" (actually a Politburo decree) was published exactly as Suslov phrased it here. See "V Tsentral'nom Komitete KPSS: Ob itogakh vstrechi rukovodyashchikh deyatelei gosudarstv-uchastnikov Varshavskogo Dogovora, sostoyavsheisya v Moskve 5 dekabrya 1980 g.," *Pravda* (Moscow), 12 December 1980, p. 1



Top Secret

DIRECTIVE OF THE CPSU CC SECRETARIAT<sup>77</sup>

On Instructions to the Soviet Ambassador in Italy Regarding Lech Walesa's Visit to Italy

1. To affirm the text of instructions to the Soviet ambassador in Italy (attached).<sup>78</sup>
2. To make a copy of the appeal to the Italian Communist Party leadership and send it to the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party.

CC SECRETARY

Cdes. Suslov, Kirilenko, Chernenko, Gorbachev, Ponomarev, Kapitonov,  
Zimyanin, and Rusakov vote "yes" (see materials)

Distributed to Cdes. Gromyko, Ponomarev, and Rusakov<sup>79</sup>

231  
14 January 1981

---

---

---

<sup>77</sup> Translator's Note: Just below the "Top Secret" classification, the typed word "Draft" was crossed out by hand. The draft was going to be a "Directive of the CPSU Central Committee," but the word "Secretariat" was added by hand in the revised text. In the upper lefthand corner of the revised document, the decree number "246/1gs" was added by hand.

<sup>78</sup> Translator's Note: The Soviet ambassador in Italy at the time was Nikolai Lun'kov, who had been appointed only two months earlier.

<sup>79</sup> Translator's Note: These two lists of names at the bottom were written in by hand.

R O M E

SOVIET AMBASSADOR

Meet with Cde. Berlinguer or one of his deputies, and say the following:

(For Warsaw — Transmit to Cde. Kania or a person designated by him the text of the following telegram, which was sent to Rome)

“In connection with the visit that is about to begin by Lech Walesa, the leader of the Polish trade union 'Solidarity,' the CPSU CC would like to share the following ideas.

“At present, the leaders of 'Solidarity' and those who back them are seeking to exacerbate the social situation in Poland and to step up their pressure on the PZPR leadership and government, having gained support for their platform from all those who are hoping to weaken the position of the Party and its leading role in the country. It is precisely in this connection that 'Solidarity' has been demanding the introduction of a five-day work week, seeking to use it as a way of openly confronting the position of the PZPR.<sup>81</sup> This confirms our evaluation, which you already know from the CPSU CC's appeal to the ICP leadership, that the activity of 'Solidarity' is more and more focused on vigorously attacking the very foundations of socialism in the PPR.

“The political intrigues and actions of 'Solidarity' are constantly felt, leading to a further

---

<sup>80</sup> Translator's Note: Just below these lines, the phrase "To pt. 1 of Dec. No. 246" was added by hand.

<sup>81</sup> Translator's Note: This refers to a highly controversial issue at the time. For many years the average work week in Poland, as in most other Communist countries, had been 46 hours long, spread over 6 days: 8 hours a day Monday through Friday, and 6 hours on Saturday. In 1971, Edward Gierek had pledged to reduce the work week to five days (i.e., 40 hours), but this promise, like many others Gierek made, was never fulfilled. From the very start of the labor unrest in mid-1980, Polish workers had demanded "work-free Saturdays." (This, in particular, was one of the chief demands raised by striking railway workers in Lublin.) The Jastrzebie agreement, signed by the government and the Inter-Factory Strike Committee on 3 September 1980, had promised that "all Saturdays and Sundays will be free of work starting in January 1981." A five-day work week had already been introduced in Hungary and East Germany, but it would have been a major change for Poland at a time of great economic hardship. In the last few months of 1980, the government tried to back away from the Jastrzebie agreement, arguing (with some justification) that it should apply only to Silesian coal miners. The authorities maintained that Poland's economic crisis would permit no more than two free Saturdays a month. The government offered to adopt a five-day week if each workday were lengthened to 8.5 hours, but Solidarity rejected that proposal. In late December 1980 the authorities suddenly announced, without consulting Solidarity, that only two Saturdays a month would be work-free. The government's failure to take account of Solidarity's views caused the issue to become a focal point of discontent. Under Solidarity's auspices, hundreds of thousand of workers around the country refused to work on Saturdays in January 1981, and the government responded by threatening to withhold pay or exact other reprisals. Finally, on 30 January the two sides reached a compromise whereby one Saturday each month would be an 8-hour workday, making an average of 42 hours a week.

deterioration of the economic situation in Poland and an erosion of the bases of socialist society. It is well known that Poland's economic situation is extremely grave. In these circumstances, a steady increase of demands that do not take account of the urgent state of the economy, and even more the work stoppages, can have only one result: the continued disintegration of economic life in the country. It is characteristic that government officials sought to explain to the leaders of 'Solidarity' that an immediate full transition to a five-day work week, instead of the government's plans for a gradual transition to such an arrangement, could lead to a reduction of living standards by 8-9 percent and could result in a significant decrease in industrial production, including the production of consumer goods.<sup>82</sup> The fact that 'Solidarity' has ignored this warning and tried, on the contrary, to organize a general strike demanding the immediate introduction of a five-day week, indicates that the leaders of this organization are not seeking the improvement of the situation of the working class and of all laborers and the defense of their basic interests. Instead, they are seeking the further weakening of the Party's position and the emergence of a situation fraught with dangers of a stepped-up conflict.

“This union at present is a force to be reckoned with. Moreover, it is not a unified organization, either ideologically or politically. It encompasses serious disagreements among individual leaders and regional groups, a number of which have openly dissociated themselves from the activity of the antisocialist elements that have established a strong position in the central leadership of 'Solidarity.’<sup>83</sup>

“Walesa's delegation includes representatives of the so-called KOR ('Committee for Workers' Defense'), a patently antisocialist organization: Gwiazda, Walentynowicz, and Modzelewski, who are notorious for their openly anti-Communist and anti-Soviet sentiments.<sup>84</sup> It is absolutely certain that these people are trying to use Walesa's trip to Italy

---

<sup>82</sup> Translator's Note: The first part of this sentence was amended by hand. The original sentence began: "It is characteristic that the leaders of 'Solidarity' were warned by government officials that a full transition to a five-day work week could lead to a reduction . . ."

<sup>83</sup> Translator's Note: This statement indicates that Soviet leaders were aware of the broad spectrum of views within Solidarity. Although Soviet public commentators often depicted Solidarity as a uniform whole, Soviet officials were not oblivious to the diverse make-up of the trade union.

<sup>84</sup> Translator's Note: The Committee for Workers' Defense (*Komitet Obrony Robotnikow*) was formed in September 1976 by a group of prominent intellectuals. They were protesting the arrest and harsh punishment of workers who had organized strikes and demonstrations in a number of Polish cities in June 1976 after the government suddenly announced increases in food prices. Over the next few years, KOR sought to forge an alliance of workers and intellectuals to press for greater political freedom. The success of KOR prompted the formation of a host of other dissident groups, including some calling for independent labor organizations. A valuable collection of KOR's documents was recently published: Andrzej Jastrzebski, ed., *Dokumenty Komitetu Obrony Robotnikow i Komitetu Samoobrony Spolecznej "KOR"* (London: Aneks, 1994). For varying perspectives on KOR and its role in the emergence of Solidarity, see Michael H. Bernhard, *The Origins of Democratization in Poland: Workers, Intellectuals, and Oppositional Politics, 1976-1980* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993); Robert Zuzowski, *Political Dissent and Opposition in Poland: The Workers' Defense Committee "KOR"* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1992); Roman Laba, *The Roots of Solidarity: A Political Sociology of Poland's Working-Class Democratization* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991); and Lawrence Goodwyn, *Breaking the Barrier: The Rise of Solidarity in Poland* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991). Also indispensable is the first-hand account and analysis by one of the founders of KOR, Jan Jozef Lipski, *Komitet Obrony Robotnikow KOR: Komitet Samoobrony Spolecznej*, 2 vols. (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo CDN, 1983).

not only to promote 'Solidarity' and its own views, but also to undertake new attacks against socialism in Poland, relying, so to speak, on 'international support.'

“We would like to draw your attention to the fact that the complexity of the ideological and political situation in Poland has been heightened, in particular, by the contrasting interpretations that the different forces have of the slogan 'renewal.’<sup>85</sup> Some, notably the PZPR and its allies, understand this as a reaffirmation of the principles of socialism and the reestablishment of Leninist norms of Party life, whereas others understand it as the erosion and dissipation of the socialist order. These contrasting views of the nature of the slogan 'renewal' are being exploited by the enemies of the Party to conceal their underlying goals and schemes.

“Based on the above, it is obvious that the interests of the Polish people and the interests of the PZPR and its line of socialist renewal would be best served if you countered the attempts by Walesa and his entourage to exploit the trip to Italy for anti-Communist, antisocialist, and anti-Soviet purposes.

“Right now, support for the current political line of the leadership of the 'Solidarity' trade union, which is operating legally in Poland and, in the process, is seeking to disrupt the country's constitutional order, would be tantamount to support for its struggle against the PZPR.

“Taking account of these circumstances, we consider it our duty to inform the ICP leadership of this.”

Confirm by telegram.

---

---

---

---

<sup>85</sup> Translator's Note: The Polish word *odnowa* (renewal) was widely used in Poland during the events of October 1956, and it became a nearly ubiquitous slogan in 1980-81. Kania and other leaders of the PZPR sought to coopt the term by referring to "socialist renewal." (Hard-line PZPR officials generally tried to avoid using the term at all.) Solidarity and the Catholic Church preferred to talk about "national renewal" or "Polish renewal." The confusion surrounding these various terms tended, if anything, to increase in 1981, as one Soviet official noted in June 1981: "The term 'socialist renewal' encompasses many different political forces of a directly contradictory nature. . . . It often happens that the slogan of 'renewal' is used by those who are waging a struggle against the socialist order and are acting at the behest of the extremist wing of Solidarity." See "O polozhenii v Bydgoskchskom voevodstve Pol'skoi narodnoi respubliky," Memorandum No. 4-2/370 (Secret), 16 June 1981 from I. Lutak, first secretary of the UkrCP's Cherkasy oblast committee, in TsDAHOU, f. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2295, Ll. 54-60.

C P S U   C C

On Instructions to the Soviet Ambassador in Italy Regarding Lech Walesa's Visit to Italy

A delegation from Solidarity (18 people), headed by L. Wałęsa, will be in Italy from 14 to 18 January 1981 at the invitation of local trade unions. The delegation also includes representatives of the antisocialist political opposition (Ciph. Tel. from Warsaw, Spec. No. 15, 7 January 1981).

According to available information, the bourgeois parties and mass media intend to make wide use of the trip by this delegation to discredit the socialist order in the Polish People's Republic (PPR) and to support the line of eroding and eventually eliminating socialist gains in Poland. To this end, plans are under way to organize a reception for the members of the delegation by high-level trade union and political figures. In addition to a meeting with the Pope in the Vatican, there are plans for L. Walesa and his delegation to be welcomed by the leadership of the United Trade Union Federation VIKT-IKPT-IST, and for meetings to be organized with workers' groups. Despite a preliminary decision to avoid meeting with L. Walesa, the ICP leadership so far has been wavering in its position and has not ruled out the possibility of some sort of contacts with him.

We believe it would be worthwhile to alert the leadership of the Italian Communist Party, which is well-positioned within the Italian trade union movement and has substantial influence on political circles in the country.<sup>87</sup>

In this connection it would be best to give instructions to the Soviet ambassador in Italy to meet with E. Berlinguer or one of his deputies and to draw the attention of the ICP leadership to the necessity of taking all possible steps to ensure that L. Walesa's trip to Italy

---

<sup>86</sup> Translator's Note: In the upper lefthand corner of this attachment, the words "To the Central Committee Secretariat" were written in by Mikhail Suslov. Suslov, Konstantin Rusakov, and Andrei Kirilenko signed the document just below Suslov's instruction. In the upper righthand corner (just above the "Secret" classification), Suslov wrote the word "Urgent" (*Srochnoe*).

<sup>87</sup> Translator's Note: It is not clear whose idea this was, but the Soviet leadership's hopes of enlisting the Italian Communist Party against Solidarity were probably doomed from the start. Enrico Berlinguer and other top ICP officials had been openly enthusiastic about Solidarity's efforts to promote "democracy and participation" in place of the "hierarchical and totalitarian" system created by the PZPR. Italian Communist leaders also had been warning, both publicly and privately, that "outside military intervention in Poland" would have "extremely grave consequences." Yet, despite the ICP's strong support for Solidarity, it was not until mid-February 1981—when Berlinguer indicated that he would not be attending the CPSU's 26th Congress—that Soviet leaders realized there was little point in trying to work with the Italian party on the Polish issue. For a Soviet evaluation of the ICP shortly before Walesa's visit, see G. P. Smirnov, "Ital'yanskaya Kommunisticheskaya Partiya: K 60-letiyu so dnya osnovaniya," *Voprosy istorii KPSS* (Moscow), No. 1 (February 1981), pp. 95-98.

does not result in support for the line of the antisocialist political opposition.

It would be worth transmitting to the PZPR CC a copy of the appeal to the ICP leadership.

A draft directive of the CPSU CC is attached.<sup>88</sup>

13 January 1981

18-S-62

[*Source: TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 49*]

---

<sup>88</sup> Translator's Note: The amended draft (see above) was issued in the name of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat the following day, the same day that Walesa and his entourage arrived in Italy. The term "CPSU Central Committee" was almost always short-hand for either the Secretariat or the Politburo, which de facto were the supreme party organs.

DOCUMENT No. 8

Top Secret  
Single Copy  
(Working Notes)

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO  
22 January 1981

Cde. M. A. SUSLOV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, V. V. Grishin, A. A. Gromyko,  
A. P. Kirilenko, A. Ya. Pel'she, N. A. Tikhonov,  
D. F. Ustinov, K. U. Chernenko, P. N. Demichev,  
V. V. Kuznetsov, B. N. Ponomarev, I. V. Kapitonov,  
V. I. Dolgikh, M. V. Zimyanin, K. V. Rusakov.

....

8. On the Trip to Poland by a Delegation of CPSU Party Officials Headed by Cde. L. M. Zamyatin<sup>89</sup>

ZAMYATIN. A gradual process is under way now in Poland whereby the party organizations are increasing their activity. Faith in the strength of the party organizations is growing. The party has withstood the first tests of this process, but it has not yet faced the most serious tests. There is talk now about so-called "work-free Saturdays" and about Rural Solidarity.<sup>90</sup> These questions naturally are the subject of very intense debate. It is important to note that the PZPR has an understanding with the United Peasants' Party on these matters. The complexity of the situation in Poland stems from the fact that activities are carried out by the enemy, against which a decisive struggle is necessary, and that under the pressure of past

---

<sup>89</sup> Translator's Note: A delegation of officials from the CPSU Central Committee apparatus, headed by the chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Information Department, Leonid Zamyatin, was in Poland from the 13th to the 20th of January 1981. The trip was covered in a brief report, "Mezhpartiinye kontakty," *Pravda* (Moscow), 21 January 1981, p. 4. For the declassified Polish notes of Zamyatin's meetings with a PZPR hardliner, Andrzej Zabinski, in Katowice on 16 January, see "Notatka z pobytu w Katowicach grupy radzieckiej z towarzyszem L. M. Zamiatinem w dniu 16.I.1981 r.," 16 January 1981 (Secret), in AAN, T. 2258, Ss. 20-25.

<sup>90</sup> Translator's Note: Zamyatin is referring here to two of the most controversial issues in Poland in early 1981. The first, which was of particular concern to Solidarity, is discussed in the fifth annotation in Document No. 7 above. The question of Rural Solidarity also had intensified in January 1981. Soon after the Gdansk accords were signed, a growing number of private farmers sought to establish their own branch of Solidarity. A formal application was made in September 1980 for the recognition of Rural Solidarity, but the request was turned down the following month. With strong backing from Solidarity and the Catholic Church, the farmers appealed the ruling and began a series of meetings and rallies to exert pressure on the government. A large rally was held in Warsaw in mid-December and another in late December, but the government remained averse to the notion of condoning a private farmers' organization. In early January, farmers in southeastern Poland had begun prolonged sit-in strikes demanding recognition of Rural Solidarity (see the annotation below). The sit-ins, which were endorsed by Solidarity, continued until the latter half of February 1981 when the government finally pledged that it would recognize Rural Solidarity. (The formal seal of recognition did not actually come until mid-May, however, after further prodding by Cardinal Wyszynski and Solidarity.)

mistakes the party has lost its creative ties with the people. The working class has many reasons for dissatisfaction. This is especially true of young workers, who have not yet suffered hardships. They are being exploited by Solidarity.

Now the Polish comrades have come up with a slogan about the renewal of socialist life, that is, a return to Leninist norms in the Party and state.

As far as Solidarity is concerned, it is heterogeneous in its composition. By the way, I should say that it is a fundamental movement with which the PZPR must come to terms.<sup>91</sup> According to Walesa, he now has ten million people in Solidarity. The PZPR CC believes he has six million.<sup>92</sup> The counterrevolutionary forces are grouped in the Committee for Workers' Defense, the so-called KOR. These include Kuron, Michnik, Gwiazda, Lis, and Walentyowicz — in all, around 40 people. Solidarity is now essentially a political party, which is openly hostile to the PZPR and the state.<sup>93</sup>

Moreover, the group around Walesa, backed by the Church, wields great strength. If we look at the situation in Poland now, it is characterized by a certain increase in the role of the Party and its concrete activities. This of course is leading in turn to a growth of tensions, since the counterrevolutionary forces have their plans and aspire to power, but see that opposition from the PZPR will not enable them to fulfill their plans.

Poland now has branch trade unions numbering about 6.5 million people.<sup>94</sup> The friends envisage uniting these into a federation and, through political methods, reducing the role of the militant wing of Solidarity to a minimum. What they have in mind is to sever KOR from Solidarity. The PZPR CC at present is busy forming a third trade union, the so-called autonomous trade union. Of course this effort in the first instance is being carried out at Party organizations and enterprises where Solidarity is firmly entrenched. The PZPR is doggedly seeking to restore trust among the masses.

---

<sup>91</sup> Translator's Note: Zamyatin's comments here provide further evidence that Soviet leaders were cognizant of the heterogeneity of, and public support for, Solidarity. This explains why the CPSU Politburo's Commission on Poland recommended to the Polish authorities that they "strike at the enemies of socialism without impying that Solidarity as a whole is identical to the hostile forces that exist within the organization." Quoted from "O razvitii obstanovki v Pol'she i nekotorykh shagakh s nashei storony," 16 April 1981 (Top Secret/Special Dossier), supplement to "Vypiska iz protokola No. 7 zasedaniya Politbyuro TsK KPSS ot 23 aprelya 1981 goda," No. P7/VII, 23 April 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 66, D. 3, L. 5.

<sup>92</sup> Translator's Note: The figure of 10 million was approximately correct. On the disparate estimates, see Jacek Kurczewski, "W oczach opinii publicznej," *Kultura* (Warsaw), Vol. XIX, No. 9 (1 March 1981), p. 9.

<sup>93</sup> Translator's Note: This comment echoes the findings of a classified report prepared by the PZPR Central Committee apparatus for a Polish hardliner, Tadeusz Grabski, on 20 January 1981, the last day of Zamyatin's visit. See "Zamierzenia oraz przewidywane kierunki dzialan NSZZ 'Solidarnosc' w roku 1981," 20 January 1981 (Secret), in AAN, T. 2258, Ss. 406-415. Grabski's report was discussed by the PZPR Politburo the following day. See "Protokol Nr. 63 posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 21 stycznia 1981 r.," 21 January 1981 (Secret), reproduced in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, pp. 232-241, esp. 234-235.

<sup>94</sup> Translator's Note: Throughout the crisis, the PZPR leadership tried to promote official "branch" trade unions (i.e., unions demarcated by sector, profession, or line of work) as compared to Solidarity's regional basis of organization. The idea was to foster sectoral and professional cleavages within the labor force, thus undercutting Solidarity's influence. The number of genuine members in the branch unions was probably no more than 3 million.



As far as young people are concerned, the independent youth league includes about 13 percent of them.<sup>95</sup> Endless discussions are under way among young people. The lack of training in Marxist-Leninist sciences in secondary school is taking its toll.

With regard to the mass media, their current status does not correspond to what is needed. The Party is taking steps to restore order and reestablish control. But even that will still leave things far from normal. The majority of newspapers are not under the control of the Party. Things are especially bad with television. Ideological erosion stemming from the decline of Party-educational work among the masses, and the neglect of this work in the mass media, define the current situation in Poland. Thus, for example, even when the heads of television and radio were replaced, the vast majority of employees—that is, those who are directly responsible for preparing materials for broadcast — sympathize with Solidarity.<sup>96</sup> The country is in a state of permanent discussion both in the Party organizations and at the enterprises. This discussion is also being conducted in the mass media, where one often finds debates about the Polish model of socialist society, about liberalization, about the need to revise Marxism-Leninism, about pluralism in political life, and so forth.

---

<sup>95</sup> Translator's Note: A reference to the Independent Students' Union (*Niezależny Związek Studentów*, or NZS), which numbered as many as 80,000 university students (more than 25 percent of the country's total) at its height. In 1973, Gierek ordered all student organizations to be forcibly unified into a Communist-dominated structure, a move that deeply antagonized many young people. In early 1980, well before the emergence of Solidarity, students in Krakow demanded that they be allowed to form an independent organization. The NZS took shape soon after the Szczecin and Gdansk accords were signed (and particularly after the start of the new school year in October), but was not officially registered until several months later, in mid-February 1981. The registration of the group came only after numerous protests and demonstrations by students, including a prolonged demonstration in Lodz, which was supported by many thousands of students around the country. In subsequent months, several other independent youth groups emerged in Poland without prior approval from the PZPR. Most of these groups were closely affiliated with Solidarity. One official estimate was that "upwards of 80 percent of the members of Solidarity are young people aged 36 or less." See "O besede s delegatsiei Obshchestva pol'sko-sovetskoi družby," Cable 360/42 (Secret), 15 January 1981, from A. Kopto, UkrCP Secretary, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2294, Ll. 23-25. A secret report prepared in August 1981 by the PZPR Central Committee apparatus claimed that the NZS "aligns itself with the extremist forces of Solidarity" and seeks to "inflame anti-Soviet passions, distribute anti-state publications, and organize street demonstrations and marches." At the same time, the report described NZS as "the weakest link of the opposition" and recommended a preemptive blow against the NZS to "do away with the extremist student forces." See "Progniza przewidywanych nastrojow społecznych oraz konfliktow z NSZZ 'Solidarnosc' i innymi ugrupowaniami wrogimi politycznie, na najbliższe miesiące opracowana w/g stanu na 17.08. 1981 r.: Wnioski i propozycje przeciwdziałania," 18 August 1981 (Secret), prepared by the PZPR Central Committee Social-Vocational Department, in AAN, Pacz. 2113, T. 80, Ss. 95-107. Because of the growing clout of NZS, the CPSU Politburo in mid-April 1981 ordered "the CPSU Komsomol Central Committee to prepare a set of measures no later than 5 May 1981 on ways to strengthen our influence within the youth movement in Poland." Quoted from "Plan meropriyatii po okazaniyu pomoshchi rukovodstvu PORP v organizatsionnom i ideologicheskom ukreplenii partii," L. 10. Although attempts to penetrate and compromise the youth movement in Poland proved largely unsuccessful, the Soviet Union kept up its efforts throughout 1981.

<sup>96</sup> Translator's Note: In the late summer of 1980, the heads of the party and state bodies overseeing the Polish mass media were replaced. In September 1980, Kazimierz Rokoszewski was removed as head of the PZPR Central Committee Department for the Press, Radio, and Television, a post he had held since June 1975. Soon thereafter, Jozef Klasa was appointed the new head of the department. (Klasa stayed in that post until mid-1981, when he was replaced by Leslaw Tokarski.) In August 1980, Maciej Szczepanski was removed as chairman of the state Committee on Radio and Television amid reports of corruption and other abuses. Zdzislaw Balicki was named the new chairman. Balicki held that post until July 1981 when he was replaced by Wladyslaw Loranc.

What sorts of measures are needed to restore order in the PPR? In our view, the firm pressure on the Party and the instructions that were given to the Polish friends are forcing them to increase their efforts, including their efforts with regard to the mass media. There is increased understanding that if the Party lets the media slip completely out of its control, it will not win the struggle for influence on public opinion in the country.

I had a discussion with Cde. Kania. He spoke about the situation in the country. The friends believe that there is now no need to rush in holding a Party congress. In our view we shouldn't now be sending a large number of delegations to Poland, but should instead send highly qualified comrades in the form of a delegation who could answer questions that would reflect the viewpoint of the CPSU CC.<sup>97</sup> Overall the leadership is increasingly aware that it must display firmness in struggling against the enemy, though so far only in the political sphere. It would be wrong to say that there is not complete unity about this and that the leadership is divided. Everyone is working under the auspicious influence of the first test of the strength of the ongoing changes. The wave of demands to "settle accounts" with the previous leadership has been put to rest.<sup>98</sup> The Polish friends assured us that they are

---

<sup>97</sup> Translator's Note: On the groups of Soviet officials who traveled to Poland, see the annotations in Document No. 5 above. In addition to sending delegations to Poland, the Soviet Union hosted groups of "leading PZPR officials," who came to Moscow for several weeks of intense "political education" at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and the Higher Party School. By November 1981, nearly 120 PZPR officials from the central organs in Warsaw and from local party organizations were attending the two CPSU academies for six-week-long courses. They were the latest in a series of groups from Poland. See "O pribytii na uchebu v Moskvu gruppy rabotnikov mestnykh organov PORP," Memorandum No. 01-18 (Secret) 11 August 1981, to the CPSU Secretariat from N. Perun, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, and "Ob uchebe rukovodyashchikh rabotnikov PORP v sovetskikh partiinykh uchebnykh zavedeniyakh," Memorandum No. 6278 (Secret), 24 November 1981, to the CPSU Secretariat from N. Perun and G. Shakhnazarov, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Department for Ties with Communist and Workers' Parties of Socialist Countries, both in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 86, Ll. 5-12 and 13-14, respectively.

<sup>98</sup> Translator's Note: This statement was inaccurate. In late 1980, according to a Soviet memorandum, "workers' collectives at various industrial enterprises [in Poland] categorically demanded that the guilty individuals be brought to account, [including] E. Gierek and P. Jarosiewicz personally." Cited in "O vyskazyvaniyakh turistov iz PNR v svyazi s resheniyami VII Plenuma TsK PORP i vstrechei partiinykh i gosudarstvennykh deyatelei stran-uchastnits Varshavskogo Dogovora," Memorandum No. 135-S (Secret), 9 December 1980, from V. Dobrotvor, head of the Ukrainian SSR's Main Directorate for Foreign Tourism, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2138, Ll. 170-172. In late April 1981, a Soviet intelligence official reported that "at the behest of Solidarity, the Polish procurator over the past three days has arrested 102 people, including four former ministers, deputy ministers, and other high-ranking officials ostensibly for abuse of power." Other former officials, he added, "are greatly anxious about their own future." Quoted from "Spravka," Dispatch No. 640 (Top Secret), 30 April 1981, from Colonel I. P. Popenko, head of the Ukrainian KGB's 7th Border Detachment for Intelligence, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2235, L. 32. Demands for the "settling of accounts" (*rozliczenie*) with the Gierek era, including the systematic replacement of officials associated with the Gierek regime, persisted within the PZPR throughout the first half of 1981, especially in the leadup to the Extraordinary Ninth Party Congress in mid-July. (The persistence of these demands is striking if one bears in mind that a massive turnover of high-ranking officials had already been effected in the last few months of 1980. By the start of 1981 only seven of the nineteen members of the last Gierek-era Politburo and only one of the eight members of the last Gierek-era Secretariat, elected in February 1980, were still in office.) At the Ninth Congress, Gierek and several former top aides were expelled from the Party. In addition to the drive within the PZPR for *rozliczenie*, Solidarity continued to demand the "full accountability of those responsible for bringing the country to ruin." This included not only officials from the Gierek regime, but all those "responsible for the shootings of workers in Poznan in [June] 1956 and in the [Baltic] coastal region in [December] 1970" as well as those "responsible for the militia's brutal actions against students in 1968 and against the people of Radom and Ursus in 1976." This demand, and a demand for legal action against "the

sufficiently resolved to combat their enemies and will not back down any further. Cde. Kania requested that we convey his deep gratitude to L. I. Brezhnev and all the members of the Politburo for the help that the Soviet Union has given to Poland. It is worth noting that our ambassador in the PPR, Cde. Aristov, is carrying out extensive work and is keeping the Central Committee accurately informed about what is going on there.

GROMYKO. We should have a more detailed exchange of views about the situation in Poland. We need some sort of steps to pursue. We must ensure that our influence will not abate. Further meetings with the Polish friends are perhaps necessary. As for where these meetings should take place, we need to think about that. It's impossible to overstate the danger posed by Solidarity. Solidarity is a political party with an antisocialist bent. We must continually remind the Polish leadership of this point. Their efforts to keep secret the issues they discuss are especially poor. Everything that comes up at their Politburo is known by the next day to a very large segment of the population.<sup>99</sup> The Polish friends, despite our recommendations, do not want to adopt emergency measures; they've essentially abandoned this idea altogether. For example, when they decided to reclaim the sites of trade union organizations occupied by representatives of Solidarity, the secretary of the PZPR provincial committee refused to fulfill this directive of the PZPR and declined to return the sites.<sup>100</sup>

ZAMYATIN. This, Andrei Andreevich, occurred in two provincial committees.

ANDROPOV. Today we received a telegram from Warsaw indicating that the reaction to Cde. Zamyatin's trip to Poland was positive. The trip was useful, and the delegation did a good job. I think we should instruct Cdes. Rusakov and Zamyatin to prepare recommendations that could then be considered by the Commission on Poland.

RUSAKOV. We are exerting great influence on the Polish friends. I'd note that almost every week Leonid Il'ich is speaking with Kania about all these matters. It seems to me that this is the most important thing because in the discussions Leonid Il'ich tactfully raises all the questions and seriously indicates to Cde. Kania what he should do. It follows that our organizations—the Foreign Ministry, the KGB, and the Defense Ministry — should designate officials who can constantly keep track of and decide questions about Poland.<sup>101</sup>

---

perpetrators of the Bydgoszcz provocation," were formally approved by Solidarity at its first national congress in September-October 1981. All such actions provoked hostility in Moscow, where leaders denounced the "hunt for scapegoats in the Polish party."

<sup>99</sup> Translator's Note: This comment echoes the statements by Andropov in Document No. 2 and Brezhnev (citing Kania) in Document No. 3 above. See the relevant annotations in those documents.

<sup>100</sup> Translator's Note: Gromyko is referring to the ongoing sit-in strike at the former Provisional Council of Trade Unions building in Rzeszow, a town in southeastern Poland. On 2 January a group of around 350 workers and private farmers occupied the building and demanded that Rural Solidarity be officially registered. They remained there until the latter half of February. Meanwhile, on 12 January private farmers in Ustrzyki Dolne (a small town near the border with Soviet Ukraine, about 100 km southeast of Rzeszow) occupied administrative buildings and demanded the registration of Rural Solidarity (as well as raising a number of local issues). The authorities used force to reclaim the buildings in Ustrzyki Dolne, but ultimately both protests led to compromise settlements favorable to Solidarity.

<sup>101</sup> Translator's Note: Rusakov is proposing here the formation of a "Working Group" under the auspices of the CPSU Politburo's Commission on Poland (the Suslov Commission). As indicated below, the idea was approved by the full Politburo.

KIRILENKO. It seems to me there is not yet a serious revival of the PZPR.<sup>102</sup> Perhaps this is only the beginning.

ZAMYATIN. When I was speaking about a revival of the PZPR's activity, I had in mind the trips by Party organizers to localities, discussions in workers' collectives, etc.<sup>103</sup>

USTINOV. Cde. Kulikov was in the PPR not long ago.<sup>104</sup> Cde. Kulikov's impression was that there is not yet any serious turnaround in Poland's situation. We need to apply constant pressure on the Polish leadership and constantly get after them. We intend to hold maneuvers in Poland in March. It seems to me that these maneuvers should be boosted somewhat — in other words, that we should make clear we have forces ready to act.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Translator's Note: Kirilenko's statement was amply corroborated by diplomatic and intelligence cables at the time; see, for example, "Informatsiya o rabote po osushchestvleniyu druzhestvennykh svyazei obkomov KP Belorussii s partiinymi komitetami BKP, SEPG, PORP, i KPCh v 1980 g." (cited above), esp. Ll. 14-15.

<sup>103</sup> Translator's Note: Zamyatin and the head of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, Ivan Kapitonov, were responsible for liaison with PZPR officials about these activities. See, for example, TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, Dd. 74, 75, and 76.

<sup>104</sup> Translator's Note: Marshal Viktor Kulikov, the commander-in-chief of the Warsaw Pact's Joint Armed Forces, was in Poland on 13 January. He met with Kania, with Polish prime minister Jozef Pinkowski, and with an array of high-ranking Polish military officials, including Jaruzelski. Kulikov served as a top-level envoy throughout the crisis, traveling more than twenty times between Poland and Moscow. During a few of these trips (for example, in March-April 1981 and December 1981), he spent several weeks in Poland. His personal adjutant, Lieutenant-General Viktor Anoshkin, kept notebooks with records of Kulikov's visits, which now provide an invaluable source for those studying the 1980-81 crisis. For more on this point, see my article "Jaruzelski, the Soviet Union, and the Imposition of Martial Law in Poland: New Light on the Mystery of December 1981" in Issue No. 11 of the CWIHP *Bulletin*.

<sup>105</sup> Translator's Note: At the time of this Politburo meeting, the Warsaw Pact's Soyuz-80 strategic command-staff exercises in Poland (which began secretly on 8 December 1980, but involved no actual troop maneuvers within Polish borders) were still under way, having been extended far beyond their scheduled completion date of 21 December. To maintain pressure on the Polish authorities, Soviet leaders prolonged Soyuz-80 until March 1981 without any public announcement that the exercises were even being held. At the beginning of March, Ustinov ordered Warsaw Pact commanders in Legnica (the headquarters of the Soviet Union's Northern Group of Forces) to begin winding down the Soyuz-80 exercises, which had long before ceased to be of any military value. Not until late April, however, did Ustinov finally give an order for the Warsaw Pact command apparatus in Legnica to be dismantled. See Army-General A. I. Gribkov, "'Doktrina Brezhneva' i pol'skii krizis nachala 80-kh godov," *Voenna-istoricheskii zhurnal*, No. 9 (September 1992), pp. 53-55. (Gribkov was the first deputy commander-in-chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces from 1976 to 1989.) See also the comments about the presence of Soviet/Warsaw Pact officers in Poland in "Bericht uber ein vertrauliches Gespräch mit dem Oberkommandierenden der Vereinten Streitkräfte der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 07.04.1981 in LEGNICA," Bl. 53, 54. The exercises to which Ustinov is referring here are the Soyuz-81 command-staff exercises, which were due to begin in Poland on 17 March 1981, effectively becoming a continuation of the prolonged Soyuz-80 exercises. Soyuz-81 was under the direct command of Marshal Viktor Kulikov, the commander-in-chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces. Unlike Soyuz-80, which was held in secret, the Soyuz-81 exercises were given wide publicity. Soyuz-81 originally was supposed to last only six days, finishing on 22 March; but because of the Polish crisis, the exercises were extended until 7 April. The notion of prolonging the exercises until April may be what Ustinov had in mind when he remarked that "these maneuvers should be boosted somewhat" (*sleduet eti manevery neskol'ko pripodnyat'*). He may also have been implying that Soyuz-81 should be expanded to include large-scale troop maneuvers, which presumably could lay additional groundwork for allied military intervention in Poland. Alternatively, Ustinov may simply have been recommending that Soviet, East German, and Czechoslovak troops be moved nearer to Poland's borders during the exercises, which is in fact what happened. (The CIA detected "unusual" Soviet and Warsaw Pact troop movements around Poland's borders and heightened states of readiness among some Soviet forces in the western USSR in late March and early April.) Even though Soyuz-81

SUSLOV. Of course, the main task first of all is to support the leadership of Poland in the measures it is carrying out and, in addition, to apply necessary pressure. Through Cde. Zamyatin's trip, we've now seriously indicated to the Polish friends what they should do with the mass media. That's their weakest point, and we need to help them. We also need to monitor how they are preparing for the Party congress, what sort of changes will be made in the Party statutes, and what sort of economic questions they'll be considering.<sup>106</sup> We should send only sensible people to the PPR.

A decision was adopted: to approve the trip to Poland by the CPSU delegation headed by Cde. Zamyatin; and to instruct various CC Departments, the Foreign Ministry, the KGB, and the Defense Ministry to draft proposals for consideration by the Commission on Poland, taking account of the exchange of views at the Politburo session.<sup>107</sup>

[Source: *TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 36*]

---

remained only a command-staff exercise, the remark here by Ustinov is a further indication that he and perhaps others were still inclined, at least at this stage, to contemplate providing "fraternal military assistance" to Poland.

<sup>106</sup> Translator's Note: On 19 January 1981, three days before this CPSU Politburo meeting, the CPSU Secretariat ordered the Soviet state planning agency (Gosplan) to coordinate an interdepartmental study of the Polish government's newly published "Basic Directions of Economic Reform and to report back within a month to the CPSU leadership. See "Postanovlenie Sekretariata TsK KPSS Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soyuz: O khozyaistvennoi reforme v Pol'she," St-246/79gs (Top Secret), 19 January 1981, in *TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 43, D. 51, Ll. 1-2*.

<sup>107</sup> Translator's Note: This proposal led to the formation of a Working Group under the auspices of the Suslov Commission. The Working Group consisted of senior officials (mostly at the deputy minister level) from the CPSU Central Committee apparatus, the KGB, the Soviet General Staff, and the Soviet foreign ministry. Among the members were Vladimir Kryuchkov, deputy chairman of the KGB and head of foreign intelligence, and Georgii Shakhnazarov, a high-level official in the Central Committee apparatus. The Working Group completed a report in February 1981 that called for a sharp increase in Soviet and East-bloc pressure on the Polish authorities through a variety of political and military channels. The report was approved, along with a "Program for the Consolidation of Socialism in Poland," by the full Suslov Commission in mid-February 1981, and was then endorsed by the full Politburo. According to a former senior official in the Polish section of the CPSU Central Committee department for intra-bloc relations, Vladimir Voronkov, the Working Group's report "served as the basis for the Soviet foreign policy line toward 'People's Poland'" during the rest of the crisis. See V. I. Voronkov, "Sobytiya 1980-1981 gg. v Pol'she: Vzgl'yad so Staroi ploshchadi," *Voprosy Istorii* (Moscow), No. 10 (October 1995), pp. 104-105. Voronkov's first-hand account was corroborated by Shakhnazarov in an interview in Providence, Rhode Island, on 8 May 1998.

Top Secret  
Single Copy  
(Working Notes)

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

12 March 1981

Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin, A. A. Gromyko,  
A. P. Kirilenko, A. Ya. Pel'she, N. A. Tikhonov,  
D. F. Ustinov, K. U. Chernenko, P. N. Demichev,  
V. V. Kuznetsov, B. N. Ponomarev, M. S. Solomentsev,  
V. I. Dolgikh, M. V. Zimyanin, K. V. Rusakov.

.....

5. On the Discussion Between Cde. L. I. Brezhnev and Cde. E. Honecker

BREZHNEV. Notes from the discussion with Cde. Honecker were distributed, and you've had a chance to read them. The discussion was brief, but for Cde. Honecker it had great significance. I started out by welcoming Cde. Honecker and thanking him for taking part in the congress.<sup>108</sup> In addition, I sought Cde. Honecker's views on how the congress was going and how the delegates were receiving it. He responded that the delegates to the congress are speaking about many things, referring not only to successes, but also to difficulties and shortcomings.

In addition, Cde. Honecker's alarm at the situation in Poland was very much in evidence during the conversation. I said to him that the situation in Poland disturbs us, too. I noted that Cde. Honecker had had a meeting with Cde. Kania, which of course was useful.<sup>109</sup> All of

---

<sup>108</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev is referring here to the CPSU's 26th Congress, which had recently taken place in Moscow. All the East European leaders attended the congress, and Brezhnev held a brief one-on-one discussion with each of them. See Honecker's handwritten notes about his meeting with Brezhnev, dated 9 March 1981, in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/202-550; reproduced in Kubina and Wilke, eds., *"Hart und kompromisslos durchgreifen"*, pp. 254-255.

<sup>109</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev is referring to a meeting that Honecker had with Kania in Hubertusstock, the official East German guest house, on 17 February 1981. For detailed East German accounts of this meeting, one by the SED International Department and the other by Honecker, see "Ausserungen der Genossen E. Honecker und St. Kania waehrend der Fahrt am 17.2.1981 nach und von Hubertusstock," 18 February 1981 (Top Secret), and "Niederschrift ueber das Gesprach des Generalsekretars des ZK der SED und Vorsitzenden des Staatsrates der DDR, Genossen Erich

us clearly are united in believing that the Polish comrades must begin taking more forceful measures to restore order in the country and to provide stability. The government is now headed by Cde. Jaruzelski — a good, intelligent comrade who wields great authority.<sup>110</sup>

I said that Cde. Honecker, during his meeting with Cde. Kania, should also insist that the Polish comrades resort to more decisive measures aimed at restoring order in the country. Cde. Honecker thanked me for the discussion and expressed his eagerness for me to lead a CPSU delegation to the congress. I thanked him for the invitation and said that the Politburo would be deciding who would lead the delegation.<sup>111</sup>

GROMYKO. Poland, of course, is of concern to everyone, above all Cde. Honecker. That's fully understandable. It seems to me that Honecker was right in being firm when he raised all the matters with Kania, and that Cde. Husak also very firmly raised all these matters.<sup>112</sup>

RUSAKOV. If we refer to the discussions that Leonid Il'ich had, it's evident that the question of Poland was raised by all the comrades.<sup>113</sup> Of course everyone is worried about the

---

Honecker, mit dem Ersten Sekretar des ZK der PVAP, Genossen Stanislaw Kania, am 17. Februar 1981 in Hubertusstock," 17 February 1981 (Top Secret), both in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/2/A-2384, which are reproduced in Kubina and Wilke, *"Hart und kompromisslos durchgreifen"*, pp. 221-227 and 227-250, respectively. Kania presented a brief summary of the meeting to the PZPR Politburo on 18 February; see "Protokol Nr. 74 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 18 lutego 1980 r.," 18 February 1981 (Secret), reprinted in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, pp. 275-278, esp. 277-278.

<sup>110</sup> Translator's Note: Jaruzelski had taken over as prime minister a month earlier, replacing Jozef Pinkowski on 12 February. Under the Polish constitution, this new appointment entitled Jaruzelski to serve as chairman of the Homeland Defense Committee (*Komitet obrony kraju*, or KOK), a powerful body of which he, as national defense minister, had long been deputy chairman. (Jaruzelski retained the national defense portfolio even after he became prime minister, and thus he held both of KOK's top posts.) As the head of government, Jaruzelski attended the 26th Soviet Party Congress along with Kania, and he met on 3 March with Soviet prime minister Nikolai Tikhonov. The ostensible purpose of the meeting (as outlined in a brief press communique) was to discuss bilateral relations and "common tasks." The real purpose of the meeting, however, was to give Jaruzelski an opportunity to brief Tikhonov and other Soviet officials on a "Report About the Status of the Country's Preparations for the Introduction of Martial Law" (*Informacja o stanie przygotowan panstwa do wprowadzenia stanu wojennego*). Jaruzelski assured Tikhonov that the Polish authorities were "determined to resort to this measure [martial law] to defend the homeland against counterrevolution." The nature of the Jaruzelski-Tikhonov meeting was first disclosed by Ryszard Kuklinski in "Wojna z narodem widziana od srodka," pp. 29-30. See also Jaruzelski, *Les chaines et le refuge*, pp. 247-248; and Jaruzelski, *Stan wojenny dlaczego*, pp. 52-53. Kania met with Brezhnev on the same day, as described in his *Zatrzymac konfrontacje*, pp. 114-117.

<sup>111</sup> Translator's Note: The reference here is to the SED's upcoming Tenth Congress, scheduled for 11-14 April 1981. In an earlier portion of this CPSU Politburo meeting (a portion not translated here), Brezhnev had indicated that it "would be too difficult [for him] to lead delegations to all the congresses" in Eastern Europe in 1981, so he decided to go to only one—the Sixteenth Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, which was due to be held from 6 to 10 April. The Soviet Politburo quickly endorsed this decision. Hence, Brezhnev's reply to Honecker was tantamount to a polite brush-off. The Soviet delegation to the East German party congress was instead headed by Mikhail Suslov.

<sup>112</sup> Translator's Note: Gustav Husak met with Kania in Prague on 15 February, two days before Kania's discussions with Honecker. The Polish leader presented a summary of his talks with Husak at the same meeting of the PZPR Politburo on 18 February, as cited above.

<sup>113</sup> Translator's Note: The very cursory summaries of Brezhnev's other bilateral discussions during the 26th CPSU Congress (with Kadar, Zhivkov, etc.), as provided in earlier sections of this transcript, do not refer explicitly to the situation in Poland.

situation in Poland. I think these concerns are shared by the Polish comrades. They must address these concerns by adopting more decisive measures. However, even after the highly publicized conference of the leaders of the fraternal countries, the Polish friends still have not grasped the necessity of carrying out fundamental measures to restore order in the country.<sup>114</sup>

This same question was addressed by Cdes. Chernenko, Gorbachev, and Grishin.

A decision was adopted to approve the discussion held by Cde. L. I. Brezhnev with Cde. E. Honecker.

[Source: *TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 37*]

---

<sup>114</sup> Translator's Note: Rusakov is referring to the meeting on 5 December 1980 of the Warsaw Pact's Political Consultative Committee (see Document No. 6 above), which Soviet and East European leaders had hoped would spur the Polish authorities to take stronger action.



SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

26 March 1981

Cde. K. U. CHERNENKO presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin,  
A. A. Gromyko, A. P. Kirilenko, D. F. Ustinov,  
P. N. Demichev, V. V. Kuznetsov, B. N. Ponomarev,  
I. V. Kapitonov, V. I. Dolgikh, M. V. Zimyanin

....

5. On the Results of Negotiations with a Delegation from the Polish People's Republic

CHERNENKO. Cdes. Baibakov, Garbuzov, Arkhipov, and Alkhimov held negotiations with the PPR Deputy Prime Minister, Cde. Jagielski.<sup>115</sup> The Polish side put forth a request for deliveries of raw materials for light industry and for additional deliveries of oil, metal, cellulose, and other goods. A recommendation is made to agree to provide the PPR with additional supplies in 1981 of chrome ore, woodchip slabs, asbestos, and other materials, and also a certain quantity of cotton and barley.<sup>116</sup>

ARKHIPOV. We're giving Poland a limited quantity of raw materials, because we're simply unable to give a larger quantity. In particular, we're not yet able to give a positive response about the processing of Soviet raw materials in Poland.

With regard to the economic situation in Poland, Cde. Jagielski informed us that the plan for 1981 will be some 20 percent lower than the plan for the preceding year, 1980. The Poles are having particular difficulties with coal production. Coal, as you know, is designated for export and is a means of earning hard currency. Instead of 180 million tons, as envisaged in

---

<sup>115</sup> Translator's Note: On Jagielski's visit to Moscow, see "Protokol Nr. 83 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 27 marca 1981 r.," 27 March 1981 (Secret), in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, pp. 317-321, esp. 321.

<sup>116</sup> Translator's Note: Specific agreements providing for extra shipments of these products were signed by Polish and Soviet officials later in the year. In the case of cotton, for example, the Soviet Union agreed to supply 6,000 tons in addition to the 105,000 already planned. The increased Soviet supplies of cotton were needed to offset a sharp reduction in Poland's import of cotton from the United States. Similar arrangements applied to the other products mentioned.

the plan, they will produce at best 170 million tons.<sup>117</sup> The production of meat is falling by 25 percent, and sugar by 1.5 times. Instead of 1.5 million tons, they'll end up with a maximum of 950 thousand tons.<sup>118</sup>

Right now in Poland a question has arisen about setting rates for supplies of bread and flour.

With regard to the financial situation, the indebtedness of Poland, particularly to capitalist countries, is 23 billion dollars, of which 9 billion was received through guarantees from the states involved. The remaining credits were provided to the Poles by private banks. All told there are 400 banks involved. Right now the Poles are faced with a situation in which they have to purchase different goods abroad for roughly 9.5 billion dollars. All of this will have to be done on credit. Exports will come to a total of 8.5 billion. Western countries are doing all they can to put off a decision on whether to extend new credits to Poland. Right now the Poles need to pay off 1.5 billion dollars. This applies mainly to interest on previous debts. They're requesting 700 million dollars from us. Of course we can't possibly come up with such a sum. Without any delay, however, we are now providing Poland with oil, natural gas, iron ore, etc.

During the discussion, the Polish friends asked whether they should abide by a moratorium on credits or enter the International Monetary Fund and request additional credits from Western countries.<sup>119</sup> Of course in either case it will be a concession to the Western countries and will not provide any sort of economic boost. The Poles themselves are divided on this matter. They're asking us to give them additional cotton and artificial fiber.<sup>120</sup>

GROMYKO. The Polish comrades emphasized how serious the situation is with imported goods, because they suffer from being so dependent on these goods. But it's worth noting that they don't attach much importance to the supplies of raw materials from the Soviet Union. They consider that question to be merely a trifle. Whereas in fact what they're

---

<sup>117</sup> Translator's Note: The actual level of Polish coal production in 1981 was 163 million metric tons of anthracite and bituminous coal and 35.6 million metric tons of brown coal and lignite. See U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, *Handbook of Economic Statistics, 1983*, CPAS-83-10006, September 1983, pp. 123-124. Presumably, Arkhipov's forecast referred only to hard coal production (i.e., anthracite and bituminous coal).

<sup>118</sup> Translator's Note: The actual drop in Poland's meat production in 1981 was around 18.5 percent (from 3.148 million metric tons to 2.561 million metric tons); see CIA, *Handbook of Economic Statistics, 1983*, p. 186. Contrary to Arkhipov's assertion, sugar production in Poland rose by 50 percent in 1981 (though it had declined sharply in both 1979 and 1980, so the output for 1981 was still well below the levels of the mid- to late 1970s). See *ibid.*, p. 182.

<sup>119</sup> Translator's Note: Poland was one of the founding members of the International Monetary Fund in July 1944 and remained a member until 1950, when it abruptly left at Moscow's behest. After the Polish "renewal" in October 1956, the question of rejoining the IMF was raised, and it came up again numerous times — though without concrete results — in the 1960s and especially the 1970s. During the 1980-81 crisis, Polish officials began actively considering reentry into the IMF, if only in the hope of obtaining new hard-currency loans. Soviet leaders made clear throughout the crisis that they were opposed to such a step. In early November 1981, however, the Polish authorities formally decided to seek renewed membership in the IMF, and talks on the matter commenced soon thereafter.

<sup>120</sup> Translator's Note: See the second annotation in this document, pertaining to Soviet cotton shipments.

receiving, the cotton, should be ours, and the ore is also ours, and the oil.<sup>121</sup>

ARKHIPOV. We are supplying 13 million tons of oil to Poland at 90 rubles a ton. If you bear in mind that the world price for a ton is 170 rubles, that means we are subsidizing the Poles at 80 rubles for every ton.<sup>122</sup> We could have sold all this oil for hard currency, and our earnings would have been enormous.

On this matter, Cdes. Andropov, Ustinov, Kirilenko, and Grishin also spoke.

A decree is adopted.

[*Source: TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 38*]

---

<sup>121</sup> Translator's Note: Gromyko's comments here reflect a general frustration in Moscow that Soviet economic leverage was unable to produce changes in Polish policy. Soviet leaders were well aware that a full-fledged attempt to use economic coercion would merely exacerbate the situation in Poland and perhaps spark social unrest.

<sup>122</sup> Translator's Note: The price given here for a "ton of oil"—170 rubles—is presumably the average of the prices cited earlier by the Soviet state planning director, Nikolai Baibakov (see Document No. 2), for a ton of oil (150 rubles) and a ton of gasoline or diesel fuel (190 rubles). Alternatively, it may just be that Arkhipov's figure reflected the growth in world prices between October 1980 and March 1981.

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

2 April 1981

Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin,  
A. A. Gromyko, A. P. Kirilenko, N. A. Tikhonov,  
D. F. Ustinov, P. N. Demichev, V. V. Kuznetsov,  
M. S. Solomentsev, I. V. Kapitonov, V. I. Dolgikh,  
K. V. Rusakov

. . . .

5. On the Matter of the Situation in Poland

BREZHNEV. All of us are deeply alarmed by the further course of events in Poland. What's worst of all is that the friends listen and agree with our recommendations, but in practice do nothing. In the meantime the counterrevolution is on the march all over.

The members of the Politburo are familiar with the content of all the previous discussions with the Polish leaders. I will speak briefly about my most recent telephone conversation with Kania, which was on the 30th of March.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> Translator's Note: In addition to this phone call on 30 March, Brezhnev had spoken by phone with Kania on 27 March and had transmitted an oral message to Kania on 25 March. In both of these earlier contacts, Brezhnev had concentrated on the Bydgoszcz crisis. (For an explanation of the Bydgoszcz crisis, see my annotations later on in this document.) The Soviet leader had demanded that the Polish authorities use the crisis as a pretext for a wider crackdown, and he warned that some bloodshed might be unavoidable. See "Protokol Nr. 83 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 27 marca 1981 r.," 27 March 1981 (Secret), in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, p. 320. Kania, for his part, was able to report that on 27 March he and Jaruzelski had signed three important planning documents that laid the groundwork for martial law: "Mysl przewodnia wprowadzenia na terytorium PRL stanu wojennego ze wzgledu na bezpieczenstwo panstwa," "Centralny plan dzialania organow politycznych wladzy i administracji panstwowej na wypadek koniecznosci wprowadzenia w PRL stanu wojennego," and "Ramowy plan dzialania sil zbrojnych," 27 March 1981 (Top Secret), all in CAW, 1813/92, Sygn. 2304/IV. Drafts of these planning documents had been thoroughly tested a month earlier by 45 Polish General Staff officers and Internal Affairs Ministry officials (as well as two specialists from the PZPR Central Committee Propaganda Department) who took part in staff games at a heavily guarded building operated by one of the country's elite security branches, the Internal Defense Forces. The staff games, conducted in extreme secrecy beginning on 16 February, demonstrated that complete surprise would be required to neutralize Solidarity and round up thousands of opposition figures. The participants concluded that the

Kania described the recent plenum of the PZPR CC and, in so doing, complained that they had been roundly criticized at the plenum.<sup>124</sup> I then said to him: “They were right in doing so. They shouldn't have just criticized you; they should have raised a truncheon against you. Then, perhaps, you would understand.” These were literally my words.

Cde. Kania acknowledged that they are acting too leniently and need to be more forceful.

At that point I said to him: “Well, how many times have we insisted to you that you need to take decisive measures, and that you can't keep making endless concessions to 'Solidarity.' You always speak about a peaceful path, but you don't understand (or at least don't wish to understand) that a 'peaceful path' of the sort you're after is likely to cost you blood.<sup>125</sup> That's why it's important that you draw the right conclusions from the criticism at the plenum.”

The friends succeeded in preventing a general strike. But at what price? The price of a subsequent capitulation to the opposition.<sup>126</sup> Kania himself acknowledged in a conversation

---

best time to act would be late at night on a weekend, preferably between Saturday and Sunday (or between Friday and a work-free Saturday). The games also helped clarify the division of responsibilities between the Polish army and Internal Affairs Ministry. (The army was designated mainly for support and administrative roles, whereas the security units and riot police were supposed to enforce the crackdown.) The results of the staff games were presented on 20 February to Jaruzelski, who made minor revisions in a summary report and approved it the following day. He briefed Soviet officials on the report when he was in Moscow in early March for the 26th CPSU Congress. On 27 March, two high-level Soviet delegations—one consisting of top military officers led by Marshal Kulikov and General Gribkov, and the other comprising senior KGB officials led by Vladimir Kryuchkov, deputy chairman of the KGB—were in Warsaw to review the preparations and pore over the three initial planning documents. (A third group of Soviet officials, led by Nikolai Baibakov, the chairman of Gosplan, arrived soon thereafter.) Once Kulikov, Gribkov, and Kryuchkov modified and endorsed the documents, Kania and Jaruzelski signed them. The three items, along with another document completed in early April on a "Framework of Economic Measures" (*Ramowy plan przedsięwzięć gospodarczych*), brought an end to the conceptual stage of the martial law preparations.

<sup>124</sup> Translator's Note: The "plenum" cited here is the PZPR Central Committee's Ninth Plenum, held on 29 March 1981, the day before Brezhnev spoke with Kania. The plenum was convened because of widespread dissatisfaction within the PZPR about the Politburo's handling of the Bydgoszcz incident over the previous ten days (see my subsequent annotations in this document). Brezhnev implies here that the complaints came solely from those who believed that Kania was being too lenient, but in fact much of the criticism was voiced by officials who thought the Politburo and government had been heavy-handed. Indeed, the plenum marked a temporary victory for the more conciliatory elements over those who favored a hard line.

<sup>125</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev is implying here that if a "peaceful solution" were to leave Solidarity extant, that would give free rein to anti-socialist forces, who would then carry out reprisals against "true Communists."

<sup>126</sup> Translator's Note: In the wake of the Bydgoszcz incident (see annotation below), Solidarity had indicated that it would sponsor a four-hour warning strike on 27 March and a general strike on 31 March unless the authorities acknowledged their mistakes and complied with other demands. A deadlock between the two sides ensued, and the warning strike was held as planned, with the whole country brought to a halt for four hours on 27 March. The prospect that a general strike on the 31st would vitiate any hope of reaching a broader compromise induced the two sides to give renewed emphasis to negotiations. As the deadline neared, the negotiations finally paid off, and the general strike was canceled. A Joint Declaration issued on 30 March by Solidarity's leadership and the Polish government satisfied most of Solidarity's demands, but it came under sharp criticism from a number of Solidarity officials, who believed it was unwise to call off the general strike at a time when millions of workers were poised to go ahead with it. (These criticisms proved correct in the sense that Solidarity was never again able to achieve the near-universal mobilization that it attained in late March.) The Joint Declaration also came under attack within the PZPR, especially from hardliners like Tadeusz Grabski and Stefan Olszowski, who believed that the government had conceded too much. Brezhnev was

with the ambassador that this new compromise was a huge mistake.

At this point, much depends on the way events over the next several days turn out. In particular, will the friends manage to carry out the measures they arranged with us when they hold the Sejm, which, according to today's report, will be from the 2nd to the 6th of April? Will all these measures be adopted? Will the leadership be resolute and strong enough to implement the measures in practice?

We of course must continue working with the friends and searching for new ways of influencing the situation in Poland.

In particular, I think it would be worthwhile to act in accordance with the wishes of the friends by permitting Cdes. Andropov and Ustinov to go to Brest for a meeting with Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski.<sup>127</sup> This will allow for a more detailed assessment of the situation in the country, enabling us to gauge the intentions of our friends and again letting them know our position.

If that doesn't work we could still seek a meeting of the Seven at the highest level to discuss the Polish question.<sup>128</sup>

We have a Commission on Poland. Perhaps the comrades from the Commission, who are following events in that country, wish to say something?

ANDROPOV. I believe the proposal offered by Leonid Il'ich regarding our next steps *vis-a-vis* Poland and his assessment of the situation there are absolutely correct. Indeed, what we're trying to find now is some way of exerting greater influence and greater pressure on the leadership of our friends. I believe the proposal for me to travel with Cde. Ustinov for a meeting with Kania and Jaruzelski is appropriate. Based on the exchange of views at the Politburo, and on the decisions adopted earlier by the Politburo and also the conversations that Leonid Il'ich had with Kania, we will perform the necessary function and tell Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski all our demands, proposals, advice, etc.

USTINOV. It seems to me that we indeed must meet with Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski, particularly because Cde. Kania and Cde. Jaruzelski themselves requested this meeting. We must convey to them all our demands and offer advice in accordance with the discussions that Leonid Il'ich had with Kania.

---

expressing that same complaint here. To offset the criticism voiced by Polish hardliners, Jaruzelski distributed to members of the PZPR Politburo and Secretariat a classified document that purported to show — with a certain degree of verbal legerdemain and obfuscation — how few concessions the government had made. See "Komentarz do wspólnego oświadczenia Komitetu Rady Ministrów d/s Związków Zawodowych oraz delegacji KKP NSZZ 'Solidarność' z dnia 30. III. 1981 r.," 1 April 1981 (Secret), in AAN, Paczka (Pa.) 207, T. 4, Ss. 16-21. This report, however, failed to allay the concerns of Soviet leaders and Polish hardliners.

<sup>127</sup> Translator's Note: For the results of this meeting, see Document No. 12 below.

<sup>128</sup> Translator's Note: The "Seven" to which Brezhnev refers here are the seven member-states of the Warsaw Pact. Such a meeting would be unusual because Romania was excluded from most (though not all) allied deliberations during the crisis.

Leonid Il'ich is right in mentioning in his recommendations that we should keep as a fall-back option the possibility of convening the seven member-states of the Warsaw Pact. For now, all necessary measures must be adopted to ensure that the Polish friends act of their own accord.

GROMYKO. Let me briefly inform you about something we received through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A huge amount of information about Poland is coming in. However, it is worth noting that in the USA, in the FRG, and in other countries they're closely following the situation in Poland and greatly distorting the true state of affairs. Of course both the American and the West European information regarding events in Poland is tendentious. They talk about the "just" demands of Solidarity and the antisocialist forces in Poland and the inability of the Polish leadership to resolve internal problems. In addition, they speak a great deal about the Soviet Union, as though warning us that the Soviet Union must not use its armed forces to interfere in Poland's affairs.<sup>129</sup> But the whole matter is clear; bourgeois propaganda always comes forth with hostile positions about the Soviet Union and is now purveying this information, as I already mentioned, in a tendentious manner.

I want to say that things with Kania and Jaruzelski are not particularly good. There are even hints that Jaruzelski is completely worn out and does not know what to do next.<sup>130</sup> This,

---

<sup>129</sup> Translator's Note: Gromyko is right in suggesting that concerns about this matter were widely shared within the U.S. government. On 27 March 1981, an intelligence dispatch from the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), based on information from a well-connected Polish military source (evidently a Polish military officer stationed in Bonn), warned that martial law—and, if necessary, Soviet military intervention—appeared imminent: "[The source] felt that this weekend [i.e., 28-29 March] would be the time for the Polish army to assume control with whatever support was needed from the Soviets, Czechoslovakia and GDR elements. Without question, if no compromise is reached, use of forces are [sic] inevitable, first by the Polish themselves and then by the Russians if necessary." The DIA cable also noted that "[the source] said that there was a marked change in attitude among the Soviet officials, wherein previously they had always stated that the Polish could sort out the problems alone without force, they are now saying that it might be necessary for the Soviets to assist in stopping this counter revolutionary movement in Poland." See DIA, "Weekend of 28-29 March Ominous for Poland," INFO Report 1138Z, 27 March 1981 (sanitized), in National Archives (NA), Record Group (RG) 330, Box 4. The implications of this dispatch (and others like it) were noted in the memoirs of several former U.S. officials. Robert Gates, a senior U.S. intelligence specialist in 1981 who later became director of the CIA, recalled that in 1981 "the first moment of truth seemed to be coming on the weekend of March 28-29. As tensions mounted in Poland at the end of that week, including a four-hour general strike on Friday, we began to get both technical and human intelligence of the kind that makes an intelligence officer's blood run cold — preparations for military action. . . . [A] series of reports came in, none conclusive, pointing to the likelihood of major developments in Poland during the next weekend (the 28th-29th). There was a general belief in both the U.S. intelligence and policy communities that martial law would be imposed that weekend, possibly involving Soviet military intervention." See Robert M. Gates, *From the Shadows: The Ultimate Insider's Story of Five Presidents and How They Won the Cold War* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), p. 230. Similarly, the U.S. Secretary of State in 1981, Alexander Haig, wrote in his memoirs that on 3 April 1981 "in the State Department operations center, we asked ourselves the obvious questions: Were the Russians moving in? Were they raising the level of intimidation? Was this a prelude to a declaration of martial law by the Polish government?" Quoted from Alexander M. Haig, Jr., *Caveat: Realism, Reagan, and Foreign Policy* (New York: Macmillan, 1984), p. 244. The concerns that Haig and other U.S. officials had about Soviet intentions were widely reflected in Western press coverage.

<sup>130</sup> Translator's Note: Concerns about Jaruzelski's health and mental stability were also raised at this time by Marshal Kulikov, who had been in Poland since early March 1981 to confer with Polish political and military leaders about the Soyuz-81 exercises and other matters. According to the top-secret East German notes from a conversation that Kulikov

of course, is deplorable. During the negotiations with Solidarity, the PPR leaders went back on their word in what they had promised us. That, too, is deplorable. Even the Polish leaders themselves say that the latest agreement with Solidarity was a mistake of the Polish leadership.<sup>131</sup>

With regard to the agreement with Rural Solidarity, it essentially is already ratified. If the matter is turned over for review to the Sejm committee headed by Szczepanski, a deputy who is not a party member, we can certainly expect that the decisions will of course be to the advantage of Rural Solidarity. How are we to assess the situation in Poland in the aftermath of the CC plenum? I think we won't be mistaken if we say that no improvements at all have occurred. On the contrary, things have gotten still worse because the leadership is moving steadily backward. But as Leonid Il'ich already said, Kania is raising the question about having our comrades Andropov and Ustinov go to Brest for an exchange of views with Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski. I believe we should go ahead with this meeting, particularly because it will allow us to convey everything to the Polish friends on a personal basis. This meeting, in my view, is an intermediate type of step, and we should use it to the full. If, as they say, they are going to resort to the partial introduction of emergency measures, one must ask whether they are sure that the army, internal affairs ministry, and state security organs will be on their side. I think it would be appropriate for our military personnel to conduct a far-reaching analysis of how things stand in the Polish armed forces and whether the army is the main force and can be relied upon.<sup>132</sup>

---

had on 7 April with leading East German military officials, the Soviet marshal believed that "Jaruzelski is physically and mentally exhausted" and is "not always in control of himself." Kulikov went so far as to claim that the reason Jaruzelski "always wears darkened eyeglasses, even on official occasions," is that he "wants to conceal his nervous eye movements." (This last statement, it is worth noting, is spurious. The real reason that Jaruzelski wore darkened eyeglasses is that he suffered optical damage in his youth when he was exiled with his family to Soviet Siberia. His eyes were extremely sensitive to light from that time on.) For the East German account of Kulikov's remarks, see "Bericht uber ein vertrauliches Gespräch mit dem Oberkommandierenden der Vereinten Streitkräfte der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 07.04.1981 in LEGNICA," Bl. 53, 54.

<sup>131</sup> Translator's Note: Again, this is a reference to the Joint Declaration of 30 March.

<sup>132</sup> Translator's Note: Gromyko was raising a key concern here, which Marshal Kulikov had been exploring during his talks with Kania and Jaruzelski in late March and early April 1981. A top-secret East German account of Kulikov's findings indicates that, as of early April 1981, Polish military commanders were voicing serious reservations about the prospects of using the Polish army to impose martial law. According to the report, this pessimism was shared "even by the generals and commanders who had previously assured [Kulikov] that they and their troops would obey any order from the party and state leadership. They now [in early April 1981] averred that they could not be confident about the reliability of at least 50-60 percent of their conscript soldiers and non-commissioned officers." Although Kulikov seemed to imply that these statements may have been "coached" somewhat by Kania and Jaruzelski to suit their own diffident outlook, the report left a distinctly gloomy impression about the feasibility of using the Polish army and security forces to implement a crackdown. (Quoted from "Bericht uber ein vertrauliches Gespräch mit dem Oberkommandierenden der Vereinten Streitkräfte der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 07.04.1981 in LEGNICA," Bl. 54.) This assessment was in line with Soviet intelligence reports, which by late April and early May 1981 were increasingly pessimistic about the reliability of Polish troops for internal missions. Lieutenant-Colonel O. P. Donchak, the deputy head of the Ukrainian KGB's 7th Border Detachment for Intelligence, warned that "Solidarity officials are currently engaged in a systematic effort to lure soldiers from the [Polish] border guards and the Polish Army into their own organization." The consequences, he added, were grave: "The view has spread within the [Polish] border guards and the Polish Army that the PZPR Central Committee and PPR government do not have as much real power in the country as Solidarity does. . . . The Polish Army is currently being permeated by all the political currents in the country and is taking a neutral position, whereby it will carry out only the orders given by people who exercise real



The CPSU CC Politburo must be clear in its understanding of the current state of forces in the PPR. We must know what it is. The Polish High Command says that the army will fulfill its duty.<sup>133</sup> But is that really so? In any case we must be sure to emphasize to the Polish comrades the necessity of adopting harsher — I would say extraordinary — measures to restore order, and to emphasize that further concessions are simply intolerable. It would be impossible to back down any further.

---

power." Quoted from "Spravka," Dispatch No. 637 (Top Secret), 22 April 1981, and "Spravka," Dispatch No. 676 (Top Secret), 6 May 1981, both in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2235, Ll. 27 and 33, respectively. Ustinov's comments at this CPSU Politburo meeting make clear that Soviet military intelligence (GRU) officers, army commanders, and diplomats would be keeping a close eye on the morale and outlook of Polish troops. Over the next several months, Soviet officials in Poland prepared a large number of assessments of the loyalty and reliability of the Polish army. See, for example, "O nastroyeniakh sredi soldatov i ofitserov podrazdelenii Voiska Pol'skogo i VMF PNR, dislotsiruyushchikhsya na Gdan'skom poberezh'e," Cable No. 183 (Top Secret), 14 June 1981, from V. Zelenov, Soviet consul-general in Gdansk, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 611, Ll. 17-19; and "Vypiska iz protokola No. 37 zasedaniya Politbyuro TsK KPSS ot 21 noyabrya 1981 goda: O prieme v SSSR partiino-gosudarstvennoi delegatsii PNR i ustnom poslanii t. Brezhneva L. I. t. V. Yaruzel'skomu," No. P37/21 (Top Secret), 21 November 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 27, L. 6; and "Polozhenie v PORP posle IX S'ezda," Cable No. 596 (Top Secret), 4 November 1981, from B. I. Aristov, Soviet ambassador in Poland, to K. I. Rusakov, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 596, Ll. 35-53.

<sup>133</sup> Translator's Note: Gromyko evidently is referring here to the assurances that a delegation of eighteen Soviet generals, led by the first deputy commander-in-chief of the Warsaw Pact's Joint Armed Forces, Army-General Anatolii Gribkov, received when they conducted an extraordinary tour of Polish military bases, command staffs, naval facilities, and defense industrial plants in early 1981. Ostensibly, the Soviet generals were monitoring the combat readiness of Polish units that were due to take part in the Soyuz-81 exercises scheduled for late March and early April 1981. In reality, their mission was to determine the willingness of senior Polish commanders to "perform their duty against counterrevolution." The first public revelation that such a tour had taken place came in 1987 in an interview with Ryszard Kuklinski, "Wojna z narodem widziana od srodka," p. 33. Kuklinski revealed, among other things, that one of the Soviet officers on the tour, Army-General Afanasii Shcheglov, who served as special representative of the Warsaw Pact in Poland, had asked the commander of a Polish regiment what his unit would "do if it becomes necessary to remove striking workers from an enterprise or factory by force." Further details about this tour were provided by General Gribkov in an important article he wrote in 1992, "Doktrina Brezhneva' i pol'skii krizis nachala 80-kh godov," pp. 55, 56. Gribkov indicated that he led the tour during a lull in the artificially prolonged Soyuz-80 exercises. According to Gribkov, the tour confirmed that the Polish High Command consisted of "healthy forces" who were "carrying out their functions in the interests of the state" (p. 56). This upbeat assessment was very much at odds with the gloomy comments that Kulikov heard from Kania and Jaruzelski less than two months later, in early April 1981 (see my preceding annotation). The discrepancy was primarily a matter of timing. The East German account of Kulikov's conversations with Kania and Jaruzelski emphasizes that a fundamental shift occurred after the 9th plenum of the PZPR Central Committee on 29 March 1981, amidst the furor surrounding the Bydgoszcz affair. "Until the 9th Plenum," according to Kulikov, "Comrade Kania and Comrade Jaruzelski had always agreed with [Moscow's] view that the Polish armed forces and security organs were prepared to carry out any assignment they were given by the party and state leadership. After the 9th Plenum, however, Comrade Kania insisted that they could not rely on the [Polish] army and security organs and could not be certain that [the army and security forces] would support the party and state leadership if the situation reached a critical point." Kulikov added that he "tried to dissuade Comrade Kania from this view" by emphasizing that "the Soviet comrades [up to now] have been convinced that the [Polish] army and security organs were prepared to end the counterrevolution when ordered to do so by the party and government leadership." Even as Kulikov spoke, however, he realized that "Comrade Kania did not share [Kulikov's] optimism." Worst of all from Kulikov's perspective, "Comrade Jaruzelski the next day echoed [Kania's] view that the [Polish] army and security forces were unsuitable for internal deployments, and that [the PZPR] could not fully rely on them." (Quoted from "Bericht uber ein vertrauliches Gespräch mit dem Oberkommandierenden der Vereinten Streitkräfte der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 07.04.1981 in LEGNICA," Bl. 53, 54.) Thus, even though Gribkov's optimistic impressions were valid earlier in the year, the outlook in Warsaw seems to have changed markedly by early April.

USTINOV. In the military sphere things stand as follows. Today at 8:00 p.m. the military leadership is meeting with Cdes. Kulikov and Kryuchkov and other of our comrades. As far as the Polish army is concerned, it is, as Cde. Jaruzelski declares, ready to perform its duty.<sup>134</sup> But if we're candid about the matter, we have to recognize that Kania and Jaruzelski are scarcely inclined to pursue a confrontation, bearing in mind the conflict in Bydgoszcz.<sup>135</sup> The results of this conflict showed that even if just two people from Solidarity are somehow injured, the whole country will literally be up in arms, and that Solidarity was able to mobilize its forces quickly. Of course there is now still some hope that the army, state security organs, and police will put up a united front, but the further things have gone in recent days, the worse they have become. I think that bloodshed can't be avoided; it will occur. And if they're afraid of that, they'll have to keep relinquishing one position after another. In the process, all the gains of socialism could be lost.

I'm thinking also about another question, whether we won't have to take certain economic measures. How do the Polish friends now view this matter? We're helping them, we're taking things from ourselves and from our other friends and giving them to Poland, yet the Polish people know nothing about this.<sup>136</sup> None of the Poles has any idea that Poland is receiving from us full shipments of oil, cotton, and so forth. If in fact they were to take account of all

---

<sup>134</sup> Translator's Note: Here again, Ustinov's assessment is at variance with the comments that Kulikov reportedly heard from Kania, Jaruzelski, and Polish military commanders later that day. The discrepancy may have arisen for the same reason indicated in my preceding annotation. Ustinov himself presented a much less optimistic view further on in this paragraph, which suggests that he already had some inkling of the change of mood in Warsaw.

<sup>135</sup> Translator's Note: Ustinov is referring to a controversial event in Bydgoszcz on the evening of 19 March 1981, which was the first real instance of violence during the entire crisis. Earlier that day a few dozen members of Solidarity, who had been denied a chance to speak at the local People's Council meeting, stayed in the Council building to negotiate informally with individual Council members. Over the next several hours the authorities tried unsuccessfully to persuade the Solidarity activists to leave. Eventually, around 200 uniformed police (*Milicja Obywatelska*, or MO) were sent to the building. The police requested the conferees to leave, but the Solidarity delegates refused. The police initially refrained from taking action, but later in the evening, after numerous other requests for Solidarity to depart had gone unheeded, the police moved in. The Solidarity members were removed from the building without injury. Once the activists were outside, however, a group of security personnel in civilian clothing surrounded and beat three of them, including the regional union leader, Jan Rulewski. The three were seriously injured. News of the incident quickly spread through Poland, giving rise to exaggerated rumors about the scale of the violence. The leaders of Solidarity correctly surmised that the incident had been a provocation. Andrzej Paczkowski has marshaled impressive documentary evidence (in his contribution to *Kancelaria Sejmu, O stanie wojennym*, pp. 143-144) about the role of hard-line forces at the Polish Internal Affairs Ministry (MSW), who may have been acting at the behest (or at least with the knowledge) of high-level political authorities. It is also possible that the MSW hardliners were acting without proper authorization. If so, they may have been seeking to undercut Kania and Jaruzelski, give a boost to diehard opponents of Solidarity like Grabski, and create a pretext for the immediate introduction of martial law. Whatever the case may be, the incident developed into a full-fledged crisis by 22 March when the PZPR Politburo released a statement claiming that the "organs of public order in Bydgoszcz" had "acted in accordance with law and order." The highly charged atmosphere that followed led to a four-hour warning strike under Solidarity's auspices on 27 March (see above) and to plans for a general strike on 31 March. The general strike was narrowly averted when the government hastily acceded to most of Solidarity's demands. Despite this last-minute resolution of the crisis, the whole episode provided a valuable lesson to officials at the Polish Internal Affairs Ministry about the prospects of "creating a suitable pretext" for a broad crackdown against Solidarity. See the comments of General Wladyslaw Pozoga in "Posiedzenie Kierownictwa MSW, 2.IV.1981 r.," 2 April 1981 (Top Secret), in CAMSW, Sygn. 251/1.

<sup>136</sup> Translator's Note: See Document No. 4 above. Explicit Soviet subsidies to Poland greatly increased during the 1980-81 crisis.

this and see what help the Soviet Union is providing to the Poles, and if they described this help on television, on radio, and in the press, the Polish people, I believe, would understand from whom they are receiving the major portion of their economic assistance. But not a single Polish leader has gone out among the workers and discussed this assistance.

With regard to the Polish leaders, I believe it's difficult to say which of them is best. Earlier we regarded Cde. Jaruzelski as a stalwart figure, but now he has proven to be weak.

BREZHNEV. That's why we must clarify everything for ourselves: to determine what the situation is within their Politburo and to determine who is capable of doing something.<sup>137</sup>

ANDROPOV. I completely agree with you, Leonid Il'ich, in the analysis you provided of the situation in Poland. We find that Solidarity is seizing one position after another. If an extraordinary congress is convened, we can't rule out the possibility that it will be completely dominated by representatives of Solidarity, and that they will then be able to stage a bloodless

---

<sup>137</sup> Translator's Note: This comment by Brezhnev is somewhat cryptic, but, combined with the highly negative remarks voiced here about Kania and Jaruzelski, it suggests that Soviet leaders were contemplating the formation of an alternative group of hardline PZPR officials (the so-called "healthy forces" or "real Communists") who could, if necessary, displace Kania and Jaruzelski and impose martial law with ruthless force. This presumably would have been arranged via back channels, similar to the contacts that Soviet leaders clandestinely maintained in 1968 with staunchly pro-Soviet hardliners in Czechoslovakia. In recent years, several former high-ranking Polish officials, including Kuklinski, Jaruzelski, Kania, and Siwicki, have argued that Moscow was secretly fostering an alternative regime in Poland in 1981, which could have been installed if necessary. See "Wojna z narodem widziana od srodka," pp. 4-5; *Stan wojenny dlaczego*, pp. 252-253; Kania, *Zatrzymac konfrontacje*, pp. 154-158; and Wojciech Zaluska, "Strach generalow: Siwicki przed Komisja Odpowiedzialnosci Konstytucyjnej," *Gazeta wyborcza* (Warsaw), 13 May 1994, p. 2. The documentation currently available in Warsaw and Moscow does not permit any conclusive judgments about this matter, but items stored in the former East German archives lend a good deal of credence to the Polish claims. In particular, several documents from the SED archive (cited in my second annotation to Document No. 15 below) strongly suggest that Soviet leaders supported efforts by Polish hardliners to dislodge Kania in early June 1981. Those efforts did not succeed, but numerous other documents indicate that Soviet, East German, and Czechoslovak officials remained secretly in touch with the Polish hardliners. When Brezhnev and Erich Honecker met in the Crimea in early August 1981, the Soviet leader seemed pleased that "the real Communists [in Poland] have regained self-confidence and have seen that they can rely fully on us." Although Brezhnev and Honecker reluctantly conceded that they would "be forced to put up with Kania for a certain while longer," the East German leader emphasized to Brezhnev that "the CPSU, the KSC, the SED, and other fraternal parties should, in close cooperation with one another, continue to promote the formation of a reliable, combat-ready, Marxist-Leninist leadership in the PZPR. We will use all our contacts toward this end." The specific phrasing used by Honecker—indicating that they must "continue" (*weiterhin*) to promote the formation of an alternative leadership—strongly implies that efforts along these lines had been under way for some time. After Honecker offered this suggestion, Brezhnev asked him for his view on "a delicate question: Can Kania gain control of the situation? Do you personally have confidence in him?" Honecker's reply was blunt: "No, I don't have any confidence in him. He has repeatedly let us down, and he has never made good on his promises. Only recently, when the [PZPR] Politburo met with the first secretaries of the [Polish] wojewodztwa, most of them chided Kania for his failure to resort to decisive measures." Honecker proposed that the Soviet Union convene a meeting of Warsaw Pact leaders to exert pressure on Kania (perhaps paving the way for his removal), and Brezhnev agreed that such a step might soon prove desirable. See "Niederschrift uber das Treffen zwischen Genossen L. I. Breznev und Genossen E. Honecker am 3. August 1981 auf der Krim," notes by Bruno Mahlow, deputy head of the SED Central Committee International Department, 3 August 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/2/A-2419, Bl. 336. This does not necessarily mean that Soviet leaders were seeking to establish a full-fledged "shadow Politburo" in Poland (even if Honecker may have wanted to form one), but the evidence does imply that they were leaving their options open.

coup.<sup>138</sup> We need to meet again personally with the Polish leaders, as Leonid Il'ich indicated here, so that we can urge them to adopt severe measures and not to be afraid of what might result, possibly even bloodshed. Instead of taking severe measures, they are proposing to us so-called "political management." We've told them to adopt military measures, administrative measures, and judicial measures, but they invariably limit themselves solely to political measures.<sup>139</sup>

In addition, we must seriously ask the Polish friends whether they will hold Solidarity accountable for what's going on in Poland. How do things stand now? Economic chaos, confusion, and all manner of shortcomings in the supply of consumer goods and other things can be attributed to the strikes sponsored by Solidarity, but it's the government that's being held accountable for this. An absurd situation has emerged. Yet none of the members of the Politburo, and no one from the PPR leadership, is speaking out and telling the workers that the leaders of Solidarity are chiefly responsible for the shortcomings and economic devastation. With regard to the PZPR Politburo, we must advise Cde. Kania to unite the stalwart members of the Politburo and rely on them.

BREZHNEV. We must tell them this means the introduction of martial law and explain it all very plainly.

ANDROPOV. That's right, we must tell them precisely that the introduction of martial law means the establishment of a curfew, limitations on movement along city streets, and stepped-up protection for state and Party institutions, enterprises, etc. Under pressure from the leaders of Solidarity, Jaruzelski has gone soft, and Kania recently has begun to drink more and more excessively.<sup>140</sup> This is a very pathetic situation. I think we have plenty of reasons to hold a meeting with Kania and Jaruzelski. Obviously we need to listen to what they have to say.

In addition, I want to say that the Polish events are influencing the situation in the western provinces of our country, particularly in Belorussia. Many villages there are listening

---

<sup>138</sup> Translator's Note: This is analogous to what Soviet leaders feared would happen in Czechoslovakia in 1968. The Extraordinary Fourteenth Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, scheduled for September, was going to be dominated by ardently reform-minded delegates. The Soviet invasion on 20-21 August was intended in part to prevent the Fourteenth Congress from taking place. (An emergency congress managed to convene shortly after the invasion, but its results were annulled under the Moscow Protocol, the agreement signed by the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia on 26 August 1968, which forced the Czechoslovak authorities to undo many of the reforms adopted during the Prague Spring.)

<sup>139</sup> Translator's Note: This comment is identical to what Marshal Kulikov concluded after his meetings with Kania and Jaruzelski in early April 1981. According to the East German summary of his findings, Kulikov claimed that "unfortunately, the leading Polish comrades believe that they can solve all their problems through political means in the hope that everything will resolve itself on its own. . . . The distinct impression one gets is that Comrade Kania and Comrade Jaruzelski want to avoid the use of force so that they can remain 'pure' Poles." Quoted from "Bericht uber ein vertrauliches Gespräch mit dem Oberkommandierenden der Vereinten Streitkräfte der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 07.04.1981 in LEGNICA," Bl. 56.

<sup>140</sup> Translator's Note: By all accounts, this latter criticism was well-founded. Kania had long been known for his fondness of alcohol, and he evidently was prone to excessive drinking on numerous occasions during the 1980-81 crisis.

in to Polish-language radio and television.<sup>141</sup> I might add that in certain other regions, especially in Georgia, we have had wild demonstrations. As in Tbilisi not long ago, groups of loudmouths have been gathering on the streets, proclaiming anti-Soviet slogans, etc. Here we, too, must adopt severe measures internally.<sup>142</sup>

USTINOV. With regard to the army, the situation in their country has substantially deteriorated. This is because they replaced a large segment of old recruits with new inductees, the majority of whom sympathize with Solidarity. Hence the army is being weakened. We believe the old recruits must be kept in the Polish army; it would be undesirable to discharge them.<sup>143</sup> However, the Poles don't want to keep them. Obviously, we need to talk about this with them.

GRISHIN. I believe the proposals offered by Leonid Il'ich are absolutely correct and that we should adopt them, authorizing Cdes. Ustinov and Andropov to go to Brest.

USTINOV. The meeting can be on the border, either on our side or on the Polish side. Let's play it by ear. The most militant members of the PZPR Politburo, it seems to me, are Cdes. Olszowski, Grabski, and Barcikowski, but they're being kept at bay.

ANDROPOV. I think we should not yet expand the group taking part in the meeting and should instead limit it, as they said, to just Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski.

BREZHNEV. When should we inform them of this decision?

ANDROPOV. I think we should inform them about it today.

BREZHNEV. Fine. Then we'll consider that this proposal has been adopted.

EVERYONE. Correct.

\* \* \*

---

<sup>141</sup> Translator's Note: Andropov's comment here is fully borne out by the first-hand retrospective comments of Efrem Sokolov, the first secretary of the Brest oblast party committee in western Belorussia: "Many residents of Brest are linked by family ties with the citizens of Poland. We must bear in mind that a large number of the region's inhabitants can watch Polish television broadcasts. Until martial law was introduced in Poland, some of the broadcasts were anti-Communist in nature. These broadcasts crippled the Poles in their struggle for the ideals of the working class and failed to give a class-based analysis of the right-wing leaders of the Solidarity trade union and their KOS-KOR advisers. The broadcasts often distorted historical facts and launched unfriendly attacks against our country. The lack of political vigilance and the insouciance that characterized some Polish leaders could not help but upset the region's inhabitants." Quoted from E. Sokolov, "Za klassovuyu zorkost'," *Kommunist* (Moscow), No. 4 (April 1984), p. 31.

<sup>142</sup> Translator's Note: This whole paragraph provides valuable evidence that the KGB and the highest party officials were well aware of the political spillover from Poland into the USSR.

<sup>143</sup> Translator's Note: This strongly suggests that Jaruzelski's decision in October 1981 to extend the term of military duty by two months was inspired, at least in part, by Soviet "comradely advice." Under the new arrangement (as explained below), conscripts who were due to leave the army in October 1981 were instead required to serve until the end of 1981.

A decision is adopted:

1. To endorse the recommendations offered at the Politburo session by Cde. L. I. Brezhnev regarding the situation in Poland.
2. To take into account the information provided by Cdes. Gromyko, Andropov, and Ustinov about the situation in Poland and the measures adopted by the Foreign Ministry, KGB, and Defense Ministry in connection with events in Poland.
3. To approve the request of the Polish comrades to hold a meeting between Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski and Cdes. Andropov and Ustinov in Brest.

[Source: *TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 39*]

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

9 April 1981

Cde. K. U. CHERNENKO presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin,  
A. A. Gromyko, A. P. Kirilenko, M. A. Suslov,  
D. F. Ustinov, P. N. Demichev, V. V. Kuznetsov,  
M. S. Solomentsev, I. V. Kapitonov, V. I. Dolgikh,  
M. V. Zimyanin

....

3. On the Results of the Meeting Held by Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov and D. F. Ustinov  
with the Polish Friends

CHERNENKO. In accordance with the Politburo's decision, Comrades Andropov and Ustinov met with Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski. Let's listen to what the comrades have to say.

ANDROPOV. Cde. D. F. Ustinov and I, as we agreed with the Polish comrades, traveled to Brest and held a meeting there in a train car right near Brest. The meeting began at 9:00 p.m. and ended at 3:00 a.m. so that no one would discover that the Polish comrades had gone off somewhere.<sup>144</sup>

The task we faced was to listen closely to the Polish comrades and to offer appropriate explanations, as we arranged at the Politburo session.

The general impression from our meeting with the comrades was that they were very tense and nervous, and it was obvious that they were worn out.<sup>145</sup> Cde. Kania said candidly

---

<sup>144</sup> Translator's Note: For Kania's and Jaruzelski's retrospective accounts of the Brest meeting, see Kania, *Zatrzymac konfrontacje*, pp. 121-122; and Wojciech Jaruzelski, *Stan wojenny dlaczego* (Warsaw: BGW, 1992), pp. 95-101.

<sup>145</sup> Translator's Note: This observation tallies well with the recollections of Army-General Anatolii Gribkov, who accompanied Kania and Jaruzelski to the airport as they were about to fly to Brest. In his 1992 article ("Doktrina Brezhneva' i pol'skii krizis nachala 80-kh godov," p. 50) Gribkov wrote that when he "was speaking with S. Kania and W. Jaruzelski just before their flight I could sense their great agitation. Their mood, frankly speaking, was very depressed. Their faces were tense, and their glances seemed distrustful. . . . It seemed to me that they had doubts about how soon they might be allowed to return home [from Brest]. When we approached the boarding stairs of the aircraft,

that it's very difficult for them to conduct their business under constant pressure from Solidarity and the antisocialist forces. Despite that, they declared that in the wake of the CPSU's 26th Congress, the situation in Poland is beginning to stabilize. Kania said that they had held electoral conferences in the majority of the primary party organizations, and that typically not a single person belonging to Solidarity had been included among the delegates.<sup>146</sup>

That is, our candidates were chosen for the congress. But then Cde. Kania felt compelled to say that recent events, particularly the warning strike and the events in Bydgoszcz, had shown that the counterrevolution is stronger than we are. They were especially frightened by the warning strike and, even more, by the prospect of a general strike.<sup>147</sup> They were doing everything possible to prevent a general strike.

In discussing the tasks still before them, Cde. Kania said that above all they had to restore the people's trust in the Party, improve economic life, and eliminate strikes and work stoppages at enterprises. Of course the Polish comrades have no experience in struggling against these negative phenomena, and therefore they don't currently know what methods to use. They are lurching from side to side. With regard to the introduction of troops, they flatly said that this is absolutely impossible, just as it is also impossible to introduce martial law.<sup>148</sup> They say they won't understand it and will be powerless to do anything.<sup>149</sup> The comrades

---

. . . W. Jaruzelski asked me to board the plane with him, evidently because he had some sort of doubts about what he would find there." Perhaps, Jaruzelski had in mind what happened in Budapest in November 1956, both before and after Soviet troops invaded Hungary. On 3 November, a Hungarian military delegation led by the national defense minister, Pal Maleter, was due to hold negotiations with Soviet officials about the withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Hungary. But instead of holding negotiations, Soviet KGB and military officers arrested the Hungarian delegates. After the invasion, the leader of Hungary, Imre Nagy, fled with several aides to the Yugoslav embassy for sanctuary. Soviet and Hungarian officials persuaded Nagy and the others to emerge from the embassy on 22 November, with promises that they would not be harmed. But as soon as Nagy's group left the embassy, they were arrested by Soviet KGB troops and transported to Romania as prisoners.

<sup>146</sup> Translator's Note: Actually, about 20 percent of the delegates to the PZPR's Extraordinary 9th Congress (held on 14-20 July) were members of Solidarity. The proportion would have been much higher except that the large majority of Solidarity members spurned all activities connected with the Party.

<sup>147</sup> Translator's Note: See the annotations in Document No. 11 above. This issue also came up during Kulikov's discussions with Kania and Jaruzelski in Warsaw just before the Brest meeting. In a conversation with East German military officials on 7 April, Kulikov said he had "tried to make it clear to Comrades Kania and Jaruzelski that they don't need to fear a general strike." He emphasized to the Polish leaders that "because Solidarity's members know that the party and state leadership of the People's Republic of Poland are afraid there will be a general strike, they are able to take advantage of this to exert pressure and get their demands fulfilled." Kulikov insisted that any such strike should be forcibly suppressed, "just as the capitalists always respond to strikes." Quoted from "Bericht uber ein vertrauliches Gespräch mit dem Oberkommandierenden der Vereinten Streitkräfte der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 07.04.1981 in LEGNICA," Bl. 55.

<sup>148</sup> Translator's Note: This corresponds precisely with what Marshal Kulikov reportedly heard during his conversations with Kania and Jaruzelski in early April 1981. According to the top-secret East German account of Kulikov's findings, Kania and Jaruzelski "subtly indicated to [Kulikov] that if there were an invasion [of Poland] by other Warsaw Pact forces, it is conceivable that some units [of the Polish army] would rebel." Quoted from "Bericht uber ein vertrauliches Gespräch mit dem Oberkommandierenden der Vereinten Streitkräfte der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 07.04.1981 in LEGNICA," Bl. 54.

<sup>149</sup> Translator's Note: No doubt, Soviet leaders took these warnings seriously after the experience with Czechoslovakia in 1968. Hard-line forces in the Czechoslovak Communist Party had assured the CPSU Politburo that they would be able to seize power and restore order quickly once Soviet troops arrived. But when the invasion occurred, the pro-Moscow group proved utterly "powerless to do anything." See Mark Kramer, "The Czechoslovak Crisis and the



emphasized in the conversation that they will restore order by their own means. They have in mind that the 9th Congress, for which they are now preparing, will not enable Solidarity to field its own candidates as delegates. In the party organizations they are selecting good workers as delegates for the congress.<sup>150</sup>

During the discussion, Cde. Kania also noted that the Polish people are very sensitive to truthful messages. For example, the leadership spoke about the congress, then began to hint that the congress might be postponed, and then again said that the congress would be held. This sort of wavering about the schedule for the congress took a heavy toll on the atmosphere in the country in the sense that trust in the party eroded even further. In turn we said firmly to the Polish comrades that the enemy is attacking you while you still have advantages, but you just make concessions and have ended up losing precious time. In September 1980 it would have been possible to put up a serious fight against the enemy. But you didn't do anything; you took no sorts of measures, neither political nor, even more, administrative. We especially emphasized that it's impossible to trade off military-administrative measures for political measures. They must all be pursued together.

With regard to martial law, it would have been possible to introduce it long ago. You know what the introduction of martial law would mean. It would help them smash the onslaught of the counterrevolutionary forces and other rowdy forces, and put an end once and for all to the strikes and anarchy in economic life. A draft document on the introduction of martial law has been prepared with the help of our comrades, and these documents must be signed.<sup>151</sup> The Polish comrades say: But how can we sign these documents, when they

---

Brezhnev Doctrine," in Carole Fink, Dietlef Junker, and Philipp Gassert, eds., 1968: *The World Transformed* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 156-159.

<sup>150</sup> Translator's Note: Actually, only about 20 percent of the delegates to the Ninth Congress were workers.

<sup>151</sup> Translator's Note: All key planning documents prepared by the Polish General Staff and Internal Affairs Ministry were closely supervised by Soviet military and KGB officials. In April 1981, Marshal Kulikov informed East German military leaders that "the entire array of documentation for martial law [in Poland] was prepared in close cooperation by Soviet and Polish comrades." (Quoted from "Bericht über ein vertrauliches Gespräch mit dem Oberkommandierenden der Vereinten Streitkräfte der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 07.04.1981 in LEGNICA," Bl. 54.) The same point was stressed in 1992 by General Gribkov, who recalled that "at the request of the Polish leadership, a number of [Soviet] officers and generals from the staff of the Joint Armed Forces [of the Warsaw Pact] took part in the planning work [for martial law]." A similar role was accorded to Soviet KGB officials in 1980-81, as described by Kuklinski, Kania, and Vitalii Pavlov, the KGB station chief in Warsaw. A high-ranking Soviet military delegation headed by Gribkov, and a senior KGB delegation led by Vladimir Kryuchkov, traveled to Poland in mid-February 1981 to oversee staff games at the Polish Internal Defense Forces headquarters, which tested the draft planning documents. A large number of Soviet military and KGB officers, including Kulikov, Gribkov, and Kryuchkov, were back in Warsaw in late March 1981 to supervise the completion of the initial planning materials. Once the Soviet officials had given their consent, Kania and Jaruzelski felt free to sign the three documents. See Gribkov, "Doktrina Brezhneva' i pol'skii krizis nachala 80-kh godov," pp. 48-49; "Wojna z narodem widziana od srodka," pp. 21-22, 31-32; Kania, *Zatrzymac konfrontacje*, pp. 117-120; Vitalii Pavlov, *Bylem rezydentem w Polsce* (Warsaw: BGW, 1994), pp. 257-258; and Jaruzelski, *Stan wojenny dlaczego*, pp. 88-91. Andropov is referring here to implementation directives that would have turned the planning documents into action. Soviet efforts to get Kania and Jaruzelski to sign the directives were aimed at forcing them to set a date for the introduction of martial law. Blanks in the documents were to be filled in with dates when the two leaders affixed their signatures. Soviet officials evidently believed that if Kania and Jaruzelski formally pledged in writing to impose martial law by a specific date, it would be a "credible commitment" that would give the Polish leaders little choice but to proceed with a crackdown. On earlier Soviet efforts to seek "credible commitments" during Soviet-East European crises, see Mark Kramer, "Ukraine and the 1968 Soviet-

haven't yet been approved by the Sejm, etc. We say that there's no need to submit them to the Sejm, and that these documents will specify what they must do when they introduce martial law. We say that now you personally, Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski, must sign the documents so that we can be sure you agree with them and will know what must be done during martial law. When it comes time to introduce martial law, there'll be no time then to work out the measures for doing so; you must work them out beforehand. That's the point of all this.

Then, after our explanation, Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski said that on 11 April they'll look over and sign this document.<sup>152</sup>

We then asked what Cde. Jaruzelski would say in his speech to the Sejm. Jaruzelski spoke a lot, but indistinctly. He explained that he will speak about a ban on strikes for two months.<sup>153</sup> We ask: And what's the significance of two months? What will happen after these two months? Two months will pass quickly, and then strikes will start all over again. You gave many promises to your workers, but you didn't fulfill them, and you're just creating an even greater basis for a lack of trust in the government and the PZPR.

Now an especially urgent question must be addressed about carrying out broad political measures. By way of explaining this question, consider the shortages of bread and other products in your country. Why does this occur? Because the constant strikes are disorienting the whole economy, no more no less. Billions and billions of zlotys are being lost with each strike, but workers don't realize that, and the blame for the whole situation falls upon the government. The government, the Party's Central Committee, and the Politburo are blamed, and the ringleaders and organizers of the strikes stand to the side and appear to be the defenders of workers' interests. But, we say, you know that those who are really to blame for all these economic hardships are Solidarity and the organizers of the strikes. Hence, why is it not possible to bring all this to the attention of the workers?

There's a good deal of talk in your country about the creation of a Front of National Salvation for Poland. Such conversations are taking place in numerous regions. This proposed Front of National Salvation for Poland would include veterans of the revolutionary

---

Czechoslovak Crisis (Part 1): New Evidence from the Diary of Petro Shelest," *Cold War International History Project Bulletin*, Issue No. 10 (March 1998), pp. 239-243.

<sup>152</sup> Translator's Note: On 11 April, Kania and Jaruzelski continued to avoid signing the documents. Jaruzelski put off a meeting with Marshal Kulikov for two days; and even when the two men finally met on 13 April, the Polish leader declined to set a date for martial law or to sign the documents. See Jaruzelski, *Stan wojenny dlaczego*, pp. 93-95; and Jaruzelski, *Les chaines et le refuge*, pp. 255-256. Not until several months later (by which time Jaruzelski had succeeded Kania as PZPR First Secretary) was a date for martial law finally set.

<sup>153</sup> Translator's Note: On 12 February 1981, just after taking over as prime minister, Jaruzelski had given a speech at the Sejm in which he called for a three-month moratorium on strikes to allow for "the introduction of a program of economic stabilization" and "a sweeping reform of the economy." That appeal went unheeded, as strikes continued in many parts of the country. But Jaruzelski's appeal on 10 April for "a suspension of strikes and the threat of strikes for two months" met with greater success. Although Solidarity indicated that it still reserved the right to strike if its fundamental interests were at stake, Walesa and others left little doubt that they would try to discourage strikes. The *de facto* strike moratorium lasted until early July.

movement, military commanders such as, for example, Rola-Zymierski, and others.<sup>154</sup> This, too, might be noted. Or consider, for example, that in the Federal Republic of Germany now there's talk about taking Silesia and Gdansk as territories, which are now part of Poland, and giving them back to the FRG.<sup>155</sup> Why isn't this question being played up? I think that the people might unite around such matters. You need to do something to boost people's spirits.

We said that no one in your country is objecting to the creation of a National Front of Salvation for Poland. But this front must not be a substitute for the Party and government.

An especially critical matter is the struggle for unity within the Party and unity of the nation. A good deal has been said about the unity of the Party. We want to encourage you still more to take all necessary measures to unite the Party and create unity within the nation. As far as what measures should be adopted, you yourselves should know that better. But there are many questions. We already mentioned things to you around which it would be possible to unite the nation and create unity within the Party. The Polish comrades spoke about bringing three workers into the Politburo. They got this idea from Lenin, who proposed bringing workers into the Politburo. We said that the situation in our country was such that we didn't need to bring workers into the Politburo.<sup>156</sup> But if you now generally have such a demand, you might bring some workers into the Politburo — though not necessarily three, but perhaps only one. You might select a certain additional number of workers for the Central Committee; these are all measures that could promote the cohesion and unity of the Party. For example, you're now talking about bringing workers into the Central Control Commission. That's not a bad idea. Of course, you'd have to implement it.

In addition, the unity of the Party might also be facilitated by the adoption of measures such as speeches given at Party assemblies by well-qualified, well-prepared comrades. We

---

<sup>154</sup> Translator's Note: Michal Zymierski fought in the Polish Legions during World War I and was soon afterwards made a general. He was one of the commanders of loyalist forces against Marshal Jozef Pilsudski during the *coup d'etat* in Poland in May 1926. Zymierski was imprisoned for five years and then forced to live abroad. In World War II he first served as the top military adviser to the staff of the Soviet-sponsored People's Guard and then, under the *nom de guerre* "Rola," he commanded the Polish People's Army. In 1945, Rola-Zymierski became the Commander-in-Chief of the integrated Polish Army under Soviet auspices and was promoted to the rank of marshal. He served as the nominal minister of national defense until 1949. Rola-Zymierski was arrested during the Stalinist purges, but was never tried. He was rehabilitated in 1956 and was appointed to several honorary posts thereafter. At the PZPR's Ninth Congress in July 1981, he was elected to the PZPR Central Committee at the age of 91.

<sup>155</sup> Translator's Note: As part of the settlement in Europe at the end of World War II, Poland was given jurisdiction over regions of Silesia and Pomerania that had previously been under German control. These westward territorial adjustments were intended, in part, to compensate for territory in the east that Poland lost in 1945 to the Soviet Union. To ensure firm control over the new territories, the Polish government ordered the expulsion of some 3 million ethnic Germans. Extensive analyses of this matter, based on new archival sources, are featured in a forthcoming book edited by Philipp Ther and Ana Siljak, *Expulsion, Resettlement, and Integration: Forced Migration and Ethnic Cleansing in East-Central Europe, 1945-1956* (Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999). Throughout the postwar era, some of the Germans who had been expelled from Silesia and Pomerania formed lobbying groups in West Germany that called for those territories to be returned to German rule. Although the West German authorities declined to support this demand, the German government did not formally renounce all claims to Polish Silesia and Pomerania until 1990.

<sup>156</sup> Translator's Note: The Soviet authorities had long been accustomed to including a handful of blue-collar workers on the CPSU Central Committee, but that was mainly because the Central Committee was little more than a figurehead organ. Real power rested with the CPSU Politburo.

cited examples from our own experience in which we, right up to the members of the Politburo, have spoken at Party assemblies. They agreed with those recommendations.

We also said that it's not necessary for you, comrades, to burden yourselves with grand, far-flung programs; just adopt moderate programs, but be sure to fulfill them. All the members of the Politburo must speak at large enterprises. Cde. Kania, for example, is going now to Gdansk.<sup>157</sup> And not only Cde. Kania, but also Cde. Jaruzelski and all the other members and candidate members of the Politburo are traveling to different cities to speak at enterprises among workers, that is, to speak against organized Solidarity, juxtaposing their own real solidarity. What makes Solidarity strong? It's strong because of its demagoguery. It demagogically promises increased pay to the workers, and it succeeded in this, as you see. It has also succeeded in defending workers, and its authority has reached the point where a strike is declared when you arrest some workers or other officials of Solidarity.

We directly said to Kania that every day you keep backing down and backing down. You must take action; you must proceed with military measures and emergency measures.

A crucial question has arisen about the complexion of the Sejm. What is Solidarity doing? It is now busy trying to cultivate every member of the Sejm. It is suggesting to workers who are members of the Sejm that they speak at the Sejm and concretely denounce the PZPR and the socialist order. You must thwart these plans of Solidarity. Why, for example, haven't all the deputies of the Sejm been called together and prepared for the session by members of the Politburo, who should say that they are accountable for these deputies? That's where things should go. For example, a worker who is a member of the PZPR plenum received a telegram telling him that he must speak at the plenum in accordance with the instructions he was given. The speech of this worker at the plenum was delayed; that is, he didn't want to speak. He received another telegram which said: "Why didn't we hear you speak?" The worker again didn't deliver a speech, and the plenum ended. He received yet another telegram: "There's no turning back." You see that here Solidarity is terrorizing this worker and intimidating him. That's how Solidarity operates.

With regard to the base of the Politburo and on whom it might rely, their army numbers 400,000 soldiers, the internal affairs ministry 100,000, and the reservists 300,000 — that is, 800,000 in all. Kania said that tensions have now diminished somewhat, and they have succeeded in preventing a general strike. But whether that will be enough to alleviate the situation is difficult to say.

What are they doing after our meeting? Well, they're doing a few things. For example, Kania is traveling to Gdansk. Cde. Jaruzelski is recasting his speech for the Sejm. But we should note that there are many differences of view between Kania and Jaruzelski on individual matters. Cde. Jaruzelski has again requested that he be released from his post as prime minister. We explained to him that it's essential for him to remain in that post and continue his worthy performance in the duties facing him. We emphasized that the enemy is

---

<sup>157</sup>Translator's Note: It turned out, however, that Kania spent almost his entire trip in Gdansk enduring angry criticism at the Lenin Shipyard from Party members sympathetic to Solidarity. The meeting lasted some seven hours.

preparing its forces to seize power.

On the other hand, other members of the Politburo, such as Cdes. Olszowski and Grabski, have embraced a somewhat different position — a position firmer than that of the leadership.<sup>158</sup> We must work with them. In particular, they are proposing to form an underground Politburo and carry out their work.<sup>159</sup> It turns out that they got this idea from advice given to them by Cde. Zhivkov. I don't know whether this is true or not, but they say that Cde. Zhivkov gave them such advice. We, too, must conclude from this that if the leaders of other fraternal parties are going to offer the Polish friends such advice, we of course will gain nothing from it and will only lose by it.

SUSLOV. Perhaps we must prepare information for the other fraternal parties.

GROMYKO. If so, we should definitely not mention that a meeting took place.

ANDROPOV. Yes, it's absolutely impossible to refer to the meeting.<sup>160</sup>

USTINOV. Yu. V. Andropov discussed everything very well, and therefore I just briefly

---

<sup>158</sup> Translator's Note: This comment was echoed a week later in a report prepared by the CPSU Politburo's Commission on Poland, which affirmed that some high-ranking Polish Communists, "such as Grabski, Zabinski, Olszowski, Kociolek, and others, have adopted positions in the ideological sphere that are closest to our own. They express the sentiments of party members who consistently support socialism and friendship with the Soviet Union, and who oppose revisionist excesses and demand resolute action against Solidarity. . . . Unfortunately, representatives of this viewpoint are now far from a majority." The report distinguished the Grabski-Olszowski-Zabinski faction from both the "rightists" within the PZPR ("revisionist officials such as Fiszbach, Werblan, Rakowski, and Jablonski, who are ideologically close to some of the leaders of Solidarity") and the party's centrists (Kania and Jaruzelski, who "have behaved passively and hesitantly, making numerous concessions in favor of Solidarity" and who have "displayed insufficient firmness and steadfastness in the struggle against the counterrevolutionary forces"). Quoted from "O razvitii obstanovki v Pol'she i nekotorykh shagakh s nashei storony," L. 3. See also "Ob ideino-politicheskikh kontseptsyakh 'reformatorskogo kryla' v PORP (Spravka)," Cable No. 531 (Secret), from V. Muts'kii, first secretary at the Soviet embassy in Poland, 22 June 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 598, Ll. 116-121.

<sup>159</sup> Translator's Note: Subsequently, organizations like the Grunwald Patriotic Union and the Katowice Party Forum emerged as hard-line (and often openly anti-Semitic) critics of the regime, but these groups, despite having ties with Olszowski and Grabski, did not function as a full-fledged "underground Politburo." Unlike in 1968, when Soviet leaders secretly encouraged the "healthy forces" in Czechoslovakia (i.e., the pro-Soviet hardliners) to set up an alternative regime that could replace Alexander Dubcek, the Soviet authorities in 1981 preferred to rely on the existing leader, Jaruzelski, for as long as possible. Although the CPSU Politburo's special Commission on Poland (led by Suslov) approved a report in mid-February 1981 that called for links to be established with the PZPR's "healthy forces," this did not imply that an "underground Politburo" should be formed. (See Voronkov, "Sobytiya 1980-1981 gg. v Pol'she," p. 106.) Andropov's statement that "we must work with" the "healthy forces" indicates that the option of replacing Jaruzelski with Olszowski, Grabski, Andrzej Zabinski, or some other hardline civilian or military official was always present (see my annotations in Document No. 11 above), but this option would have been pursued only if Jaruzelski had explicitly refused to prepare for (and then implement) martial law. Evidently, one of the reasons that Soviet leaders were leery of encouraging the formation of an alternative PZPR Politburo is that, at least in the spring of 1981, the hardliners in Poland "were convinced that the situation could not be rectified without the introduction of Soviet troops." Quoted from "O razvitii obstanovki v Pol'she i nekotorykh shagakh s nashei storony," L. 3.

<sup>160</sup> Translator's Note: Later on, however, Soviet leaders did discuss the Brest meeting with their East European colleagues. See, for example, "Vermerk über das Treffen der Genossen Leonid Il'ic Breznev, Erich Honecker und Gustav Husak am 16. Mai 1981 im Kreml in Moskau," 18 May 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, vorl. SED 41599.

want to mention the following. First, that we were really struck by the dejected condition of our interlocutors. Even so, it seems to me that we still need this pair — Kania and Jaruzelski — to stick together and strengthen their relations. There are indeed disagreements within their Politburo. These of course are caused most of all by the strikes, which they're very afraid of. We asked why they had changed their decision on Bydgoszcz. As you know, they didn't want to back down on the Bydgoszcz conflict, but then they did back down. They asserted that the threat of a general strike was hanging over them.<sup>161</sup> We also asked them why they were paying workers during strikes. They say that Solidarity has demanded this. We responded that this meant they were just adopting Solidarity's own line. On the question of Rural Solidarity, they have not yet reached a final decision, but they have already recognized the de facto existence of this organization.<sup>162</sup>

Yurii Vladimirovich and I gave particular emphasis to the need for unity within the Politburo. There is no need to bring three workers into the Politburo, as they said they were intending to do. This will not strengthen the Politburo. With regard to the Central Committee, there you can bring in workers, but only if it is done in the standard and regular manner, in accordance with the Party statutes. It's especially necessary, we said to the Polish friends, to work properly with the deputies of the Sejm. They are holding so-called selection conferences. These essentially are open telephone conversations. Everything that is said becomes known instantly to a wide circle, including officials of Solidarity. What about the procedure for these conferences? We cited the example of Leonid Il'ich's constant discussions with the secretaries of provincial and territorial CPSU committees and with the secretaries of Central Committees of the union-republic parties. With each he speaks concretely, discussing matters relevant to the particular area.

To diminish their aversion to the introduction of emergency rule or martial law, we cited the example of many countries in which emergency rule or martial law was introduced as soon as there was even a hint of an uprising or the start of some sort of disorder. Take Yugoslavia: When demonstrations were held in Kosovo, they introduced martial law and no one said a word about it.<sup>163</sup> It's simply incomprehensible to us why the Poles are afraid to introduce emergency rule.

Yurii Vladimirovich spoke well about the plans for introducing martial law. We said that it is necessary to sign the plan drafted by our comrades.

I then directly asked them, as we arranged at the Politburo, what will happen in Poland, what sort of economic state will it be in, if you botch things up there? At the moment Poland

---

<sup>161</sup> Translator's Note: See the annotations in Document No. 11 above.

<sup>162</sup> Translator's Note: See the relevant annotation in Document No. 8 above.

<sup>163</sup> Translator's Note: Large-scale unrest had erupted among ethnic Albanians in Kosovo in March 1981, provoking a swift (though not entirely successful) crackdown by the Yugoslav authorities. This was the first serious turmoil in Yugoslavia since Tito's death in May 1980. A U.S. military intelligence report in early April 1981, drawing on statements by the head of Yugoslav military intelligence, discussed the unrest in Kosovo and its link with the Polish crisis. (Unfortunately, all comments about Kosovo were sanitized in the declassified version of this document.) See "[sanitized name] Comments on Poland and Kosovo," INFO Report 1348Z, 7 April 1981, in National Security Archive, Flashpoints Collection.

is receiving all its oil for about half-price from the Soviet Union. It is also receiving cotton, iron ore, and many other goods. And if it doesn't receive these goods, what will happen? Why isn't this fact being explained and brought to the attention of the workers?<sup>164</sup> It could be a powerful weapon. You must speak about this to the workers, you must also speak about it to Solidarity. Right now Solidarity has entrenched itself at the largest factories. These factories must be taken away from Solidarity. You have good factories where the directors stand behind the leadership. For example, the television factory. You can and must support the branch trade unions and conduct active work with them. Jaruzelski then said to me again that he isn't able to do such work and no longer has any strength, and he urged that he be released from his post.

ZIMYANIN. Being in Bulgaria at the congress, we met with Grabski.<sup>165</sup> Notes from this conversation were distributed, and the comrades have been able to read through them. From this meeting it is clear that the situation within their Politburo is very difficult. There is no unity, and Yurii Vladimirovich and Dmitrii Fyodorovich correctly said that they must work on fostering unity within the Politburo.

They ordered:

1. That the discussions held by Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov and D. F. Ustinov with the PZPR CC First Secretary, Cde. S. Kania, and the Chairman of the PPR Council of Ministers and Minister of National Defense, Cde. W. Jaruzelski, be approved.

2. That the CC Politburo Commission on Poland be instructed to keep close track of the developing situation in the PPR and, in case of necessity, to draft appropriate recommendations.

[Source: *TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 40*]

---

<sup>164</sup> Translator's Note: This same point was frequently raised by hardline members of the PZPR. Zdzislaw Drewniowski informed Soviet officials that "when the government of the USSR approved a decision to ship 36,000 [actually 30,000—M.K.] tons of meat to the PPR, Polish television featured a broadcast that said 'today 100 tons of meat arrived at the border station from the USSR,' and then added a bit later that '10,000 packages of consumer goods have arrived from Western countries' (while neglecting to mention that each package weighs only 1-2 kilograms)." Quoted from "Informatsiya o nekotorykh sobytyakh v Pol'skoi Narodnoi Respublike," L. 42.

<sup>165</sup> Translator's Note: The reference here is to the recent Twelfth Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party, which Zimyanin and others had attended in lieu of Brezhnev. Tadeusz Grabksi was among the Polish officers who attended.

Top Secret  
Single Copy  
(Working Notes)

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

16 April 1981

Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin,  
A. A. Gromyko, N. A. Tikhonov, D. F. Ustinov,  
K. U. Chernenko, P. N. Demichev, V. V. Kuznetsov,  
M. S. Solomentsev, I. V. Kapitonov, M. V. Zimyanin,  
K. V. Rusakov

....

2. On Cde. L. I. Brezhnev's Discussion with the PZPR CC First Secretary, Cde. S. Kania (by telephone)

BREZHNEV. Yesterday I spoke by phone with Kania.<sup>166</sup> Notes from the discussion were distributed. The comrades have already looked through them, so I will be brief.

From the conversation with Kania it was clear that after the Sejm the friends were in a more upbeat mood. They had greater self-confidence. This in itself is no small thing.

But it would be impossible to overlook the fact that the situation, as before, remains extremely difficult. The current lull is clearly only a short-term phenomenon. It was in this spirit that I, as you could see, spoke with Kania.

In general it's very important that we now maintain the right tone in our relations with our friends. On the one hand, we shouldn't badger them without need, and we should avoid making them so nervous that they throw up their hands in despair. On the other hand, we should exert constant pressure and tactfully draw their attention to the errors and weaknesses in their policy, and we should offer comradely advice about what they should do.

---

<sup>166</sup> Translator's Note: Kania recounted this telephone call at a meeting of the PZPR Politburo two days later, "Protokol Nr. 88 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 20 kwietnia 1981 r.," 18 April 1981 (Secret), in AAN, Protokoly z posiedzen Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 1981r., T.4, which for some reason is not featured in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne dokumenty Biura Politycznego*.



Comrades Andropov and Ustinov had a highly productive meeting with Kania and Jaruzelski. This sort of practice, it would seem, should be continued until the crisis begins to subside. Perhaps we should think about holding a similar confidential meeting in the near future with the participation this time of Cdes. Suslov and Rusakov.<sup>167</sup>

Our Commission, I realize, is constantly meeting and considering what should be done. They promised that they will soon offer some ideas and proposals.<sup>168</sup>

Along with this very important work, we must also continue preparing a broader — one might say strategic — analysis, which will permit us to stand back from the daily flow of events and take a longer-term perspective on the course of events in Poland and around it.<sup>169</sup>

And one final thing. I wanted to ask the comrades whether it's worth informing our closest friends about the discussion that took place.<sup>170</sup> They are very alarmed by the situation in Poland, and for them it will be important to know about the actions we have taken.

If there are no objections, that's what we'll do.<sup>171</sup>

ANDROPOV. The discussion was very rich in content.

CHERNENKO. During this discussion, clear and precise instructions were given to the comrades representing the PZPR leadership, and, moreover, Leonid Il'ich spoke approvingly about certain of their measures. That's very good.

USTINOV. The Polish friends received exhaustive instructions.

---

<sup>167</sup> Translator's Note: This statement implies that there were differences of view—even if only minor ones—among the members of the Suslov Commission. Without reading too much into Brezhnev's remarks, one might infer that his proposal to have Suslov and Rusakov conduct the next meeting was motivated in part by a desire to take account of disparate positions within the CPSU leadership and the Commission. A substantial amount of evidence suggests, for example, that Ustinov on the one hand and Suslov on the other approached the Polish crisis in very different ways (i.e., Suslov emphasized an "internal" solution, whereas Ustinov was more willing to consider external options). Brezhnev's apparent effort to solicit different viewpoints was in line with the way he handled the crisis in Czechoslovakia in 1968, when he permitted and even encouraged other members of the Politburo to express disagreements with one another. In 1968, of course, Brezhnev was a good deal younger and much more vigorous than in 1981, and in 1968 he still had to conform, at least to some degree, with the norms of collective leadership. Nevertheless, his style of crisis management after 1968 may have remained largely the same in this respect.

<sup>168</sup> Translator's Note: Even as Brezhnev spoke, two major reports drafted by the Suslov Commission were being put into final form for submission to the CPSU Politburo. The documents, "O razvitii obstanovki v Pol'she i nekotorykh shagakh s nashei storony" and "Plan meropriyatii po okazaniyu pomoshchi rukovodstvu PORP v orgazatsionnom i ideologicheskome ukreplenii partii" (both cited above), were approved by the Politburo at its next session on 23 April 1981.

<sup>169</sup> Translator's Note: To some extent, the first report prepared by the Suslov Commission, "O razvitii obstanovki v Pol'she i nekotorykh shagakh s nashei storony," took a broader and more long-term view.

<sup>170</sup> Translator's Note: The phrase "our closest friends" refers to the other Warsaw Pact leaders: Erich Honecker, Gustav Husak, Todor Zhivkov, Janos Kadar, and—to a lesser extent—Nicolae Ceausescu.

<sup>171</sup> Translator's Note: This indeed is what was done. See "Vermerk uber ein Telefongesprach des Generalsekretars des ZK der KPdSU, Genossen Leonid Il'ic Breznev, mit dem Ersten Sekretar des ZK der PVAP, Genossen Stanislaw Kania, am 15.4.1981," 18 April 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/202/551.

TIKHONOV. Now it's important that they correctly follow these instructions.

BREZHNEV. I definitely think we should inform the leaders of the other fraternal parties about this conversation with the Polish leaders.

The members of the Politburo support that proposal.

\* \* \*

A decision is adopted:

1. To approve the telephone conversation that the CPSU CC General Secretary, Cde. Brezhnev, had with the PZPR CC First Secretary, S. Kania.
2. To consider it worthwhile to inform the leaders of other fraternal parties about the content of the discussion, taking account of the exchange of views at the session of the CPSU CC Politburo.
3. To instruct the CC Department to prepare an informational document about this question.

[*Source: TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 41*]

Top Secret  
Single Copy  
(Working Notes)

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

30 April 1981

Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin,  
A. A. Gromyko, M. A. Suslov, N. A. Tikhonov,  
D. F. Ustinov, K. U. Chernenko, P. N. Demichev,  
V. V. Kuznetsov, B. N. Ponomarev, M. S. Solomentsev,  
I. V. Kapitonov, V. I. Dolgikh, M. V. Zimyanin,  
K. V. Rusakov

....

2. On the Results of Negotiations Between a CPSU Delegation and the PZPR  
Leadership

BREZHNEV. As you know, in accordance with our decision, Cdes. Suslov and Rusakov traveled to Warsaw several days ago.<sup>172</sup> The USSR ambassador in Poland, Cde. Aristov, also was in the delegation.

In accordance with our instructions, the CPSU delegation held a discussion in which members and candidate members of the PZPR Politburo and members of the PZPR Secretariat took part for the Polish side.

I think the first conclusion that emerges from the comrades' information is that we were right in sending such a delegation to Warsaw at this time, when the Polish comrades are preparing for a plenum and congress.

I think that in the future, too, we should not exclude the possibility that individual

---

<sup>172</sup> Translator's Note: The visit took place on 23-24 April. See Kania's detailed comments about his first round of talks with Suslov and Rusakov, as well as the remarks by other Polish leaders, in "Protokol Nr. 89 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 23 kwietnia 1981 r.," 23 April 1981 (Secret), in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, pp. 347-350. For another useful summary of these talks, as conveyed by Soviet leaders to the SED Politburo, see "Information uber die Gesprache der Delegation der KPdSU mit der Fuhung der PVAP in Warschau, 23./24.4.1981" (Top Secret), 6 May 1981, in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/202-505.

members of the Politburo or a group of members of the Politburo might travel there, or have a meeting somewhere outside Warsaw and outside Moscow as Cdes. Andropov and Ustinov did. The benefit of such measures is indisputable.

And now let's give the floor to Cde. M. A. Suslov, who will inform us about the results of the discussion with the Polish comrades.

SUSLOV. Our negotiations with the PZPR leadership showed that the Politburo's decision regarding our delegation's trip to Poland was very beneficial and timely. L. I. Brezhnev's discussions with Kania played a big role in helping to stabilize the situation in Poland, as did the discussions that Cdes. Andropov and Ustinov had during their meeting with Kania and Jaruzelski in Brest.<sup>173</sup> For our part, we sharply criticized the actions of the Polish leadership vis-a-vis Solidarity and the antisocialist elements. We attacked their indecisiveness and their efforts somehow to smooth over the situation without confronting the main questions. We also expressed criticism of the so-called "horizontal structures."<sup>174</sup> We especially emphasized the necessity of a resolute struggle against Solidarity and its reactionary right wing headed by KOR, which openly wants to convert Solidarity into a political party.

ANDROPOV. The Polish friends, in particular Cde. Kania, support the "horizontal structures," and this is leading, as you know, to the disintegration of the party.<sup>175</sup>

---

<sup>173</sup> Translator's Note: See Documents No. 12 and 13 above.

<sup>174</sup> Translator's Note: The reference here is to the "horizontal movement" within the PZPR, which wanted to make the structure and procedures of the Party more democratic. The movement had its main origins in the city of Torun, where the first secretary of the Party committee at the Towimor marine engineering plant, Zbigniew Iwanow, established a coordinating commission with other primary Party organizations in early September 1980. This horizontal structure was set up without any approval from higher Party authorities, thus breaking with the entrenched Leninist norm of "democratic centralism" (a euphemism for the highly centralized and rigidly hierarchical procedures of the Communist Party). Iwanow and his partners called for sweeping changes in the Party statutes that would allow them to decide their own affairs without waiting for directives from above and would permit free and open elections for all Party offices. The horizontal movement quickly spread to other cities and regions, despite stiff resistance by top PZPR officials. An attempt to expel Iwanow from the PZPR failed when the Towimor Party committee voted to retain him as first secretary. In mid-April 1981—two weeks before this CPSU Politburo meeting—some 750 members of the horizontal movement from 14 of Poland's 49 provinces gathered at a major conference in Torun, co-sponsored by the Towimor plant and Torun University. This meeting, or "Forum for Party Accord" as it was called, marked the high point of the horizontal movement. Over the next several months the movement gradually petered out—in part because most members of Solidarity wanted nothing to do with the Party (even with the horizontal structures), and in part because the PZPR leadership did its best to coopt the message of the horizontalists.

<sup>175</sup> Translator's Note: The CPSU Politburo's Commission on Poland had warned in mid-April that the horizontal movement was inspired by "opposition forces who, having realized that Poland's geopolitical situation prevents them from obstructing the country's participation in the Warsaw Treaty Organization or encroaching on the principle of the leading role of the Communist party, have clearly decided to undermine the PZPR from within." Quoted from "O razvitiu obstanovki v Pol'she i nekotorykh shagakh s nashei storony," LI. 1-8. Over the next several months, high-ranking Soviet officials continued to emphasize the "severe damage" caused by the horizontal movement. In their view, the PZPR leadership had "made an immense concession to counterrevolutionary forces by letting the activities of the so-called horizontal movement go unpunished." They insisted that "the change of procedures for party elections," notably during the Ninth Congress in July, had allowed "people with immature ideologies and . . . even alien views" to gain ascendancy in the PZPR. See "Polozhenie v PORP posle IX S"ezda," Cable No. 857 (Top Secret), 4 November 1981 from B. Aristov to the CPSU Secretariat, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 596, LI. 35-53, esp. 37.

SUSLOV. Unquestionably, the “horizontal structures” are creating total disorder in the organizational structure of the PZPR and are completely at odds with Leninist organizational principles for the structure of a Marxist-Leninist party. Taking part in the discussions were Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski, members of the Politburo, and also the secretaries of the Gdansk and Katowice provincial committees. All of them thanked the CPSU CC and especially L. I. Brezhnev for their constant concern and assistance.

BREZHNEV. Their plenum, as far as I know, is now under way.

SUSLOV. Their plenum ended today — early this morning.<sup>176</sup> With regard to our advice that that they not exclude Olszowski, Grabski, and other comrades from the plenum, they heeded it. Our criticism is having a definite influence on the Polish leadership, particularly on matters connected with preparations for the congress and on other matters.<sup>177</sup> Of course, the Polish leadership must have a distinct degree of trust in us, and we, too, must have a certain degree of trust in them. To be sure, it's impossible to have much faith in what they promise they'll do, but even so we must somehow, on certain matters, support and encourage them.

BREZHNEV. In general there can be little trust in them because even though they listen to us, they don't do what we recommend.

RUSAKOV. I must say that L. I. Brezhnev's meeting with the Polish friends was of exceptionally great importance. Likewise, the meeting and discussions involving Cdes. Andropov and Ustinov played a big role, as did the series of telephone conversations with Kania. All of these played a positive role. I'm certain that the situation in Poland would be significantly worse if these discussions had not taken place. Their plenum finished today at 5:00 a.m. Very harsh criticism was directed at the leadership, in particular at Cde. Kania. After the plenum, at a conference of provincial committee secretaries, Cde. Kania was subject to further harsh criticism.

BREZHNEV. If the comrades have no other proposals, it should be possible to adopt

---

<sup>176</sup> Translator's Note: Suslov is referring to the PZPR Central Committee's Tenth Plenum, which began the previous day (29 April). The plenum set a date of 14 July for the opening of the PZPR's Extraordinary Ninth Congress. In addition, two workers—Zygmunt Wronski and Gerard Gabrys—were appointed to the PZPR Politburo.

<sup>177</sup> Translator's Note: Soviet efforts to shape the nature of the PZPR's Ninth Congress took more direct forms as well. On 23 April 1981 the CPSU Politburo approved the Suslov Commission's recommendations to "dispatch a working group from the CPSU Organizational-Party Work Department to Poland in May and June 1981 for consultations on matters concerning preparations for the PZPR's Extraordinary Ninth Congress" and to order three CPSU Central Committee departments to "analyze the draft theses for the PZPR Congress, the draft PZPR statutes, and the drafts of other [Polish] documents, as well as the status of organizational preparations for the Congress, and relay appropriate recommendations [about these matters] to the CPSU Central Committee." The CPSU Politburo also approved the Commission's recommendation to bring a large number of Polish officials to the Soviet Union in the spring of 1981 for further consultations and "joint work" in the leadup to the PZPR Congress. See "Plan meropriyatii po okazaniyu rukovodstvu PORP v organizatsionnom i ideologicheskom ukreplenii partii," Ll. 9-11. Evidently, Soviet leaders wanted to establish tighter control over the PZPR by reviewing (and, if necessary, modifying or rewriting) all key documents for the party congress and other activities. Their intention presumably was to devise an arrangement similar to the planning for martial law in Poland, which was being closely monitored and supervised by high-ranking Soviet officials.

the following proposals.

First, to approve our delegation's activities during its visit in Warsaw.

Second, to instruct the Commission on Poland to continue actively following events in the PPR and occasionally to inform the CC Politburo. If necessary, the Commission should submit appropriate recommendations on these events.<sup>178</sup>

Third, Cdes. Suslov and Rusakov recommend that we support the request by Cde. Kania and Cde. Jaruzelski to employ the unutilized capacity of PPR enterprises. I think we should instruct the USSR Council of Ministers to examine this question.

And finally it is suggested that we inform leaders of the fraternal parties of the countries of the socialist commonwealth about the negotiations that were held in Warsaw and prepare an informational update for the party aktiv of the CPSU.<sup>179</sup>

EVERYONE. Agreed.

The decree is adopted.

[*Source: TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 42*]

---

<sup>178</sup> Translator's Note: Further recommendations by the Suslov Commission were intended as follow-ups to the two reports submitted to the CPSU Politburo on 16 April 1981 and approved by the Politburo a week later (see annotation in Document No. 13 *supra*).

<sup>179</sup> Translator's Note: This report, "Informatsiya TsK KPSS o sobytiyakh v Pol'she," 2 May 1981 (Top Secret), is covered in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 77, D. 107.

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

18 June 1981

Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin,  
A. A. Gromyko, A. P. Kirilenko, A. Ya. Pel'she,  
M. A. Suslov, N. A. Tikhonov, D. F. Ustinov,  
K. U. Chernenko, P. N. Demichev, V. V. Kuznetsov,  
B. N. Ponomarev, I. V. Kapitonov, V. I. Dolgikh,  
K. V. Rusakov

.....

12. On Cde L. I. Brezhnev's Information About His Discussion with Cde. S. Kania

BREZHNEV. As you know, for a long time I didn't want to speak with Kania, but he was determined to have a conversation. From Friday until Monday he was calling every day. Then, on Tuesday, the 16th of June, I couldn't any longer avoid having a conversation, so I linked up with him, as had been arranged with the members of the CPSU CC Politburo. I had a conversation with him about matters that were discussed with the members of the Politburo.<sup>180</sup>

After mutual greetings, Kania began expressing his gratitude for the letter sent by the CPSU CC to the PZPR CC.<sup>181</sup> He said that they value this letter as a new token of the CPSU

---

<sup>180</sup> Translator's Note: For a summary of Kania's version of the phone call, as presented to the PZPR Politburo on the same day as this CPSU Politburo meeting, see "Protokol Nr. 100 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 18 czerwca 1981 r.," 18 June 1981 (Secret), reprinted in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, esp. pp. 406-407.

<sup>181</sup> Translator's Note: The reference here is to a letter dated 5 June 1981, which claimed that "S. Kania, W. Jaruzelski, and other Polish comrades" were still pursuing a "policy of capitulation and compromise." The letter warned that the Soviet Union "will not leave fraternal, socialist Poland in the lurch." See "List Komitetu Centralnego KPZR do Komitetu Centralnego PZPR," *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 6-7 June 1981, pp. 1, 6. For more on the Polish leadership's reactions to the letter, see "Protokol Nr. 97 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 6 czerwca 1981 r.," 6 June 1981 (Secret), reprinted in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, pp. 381-396. See also Kania's and Jaruzelski's accounts in *Zatrzymac konfrontacje*, pp. 154-169; and *Stan wojenny dlaczego*, pp. 152-156, respectively. The CPSU Politburo ordered lower-level party and state organizations throughout the Soviet Union to apprise all party

CC's concern about the fate of socialism in Poland and about our relations. According to Kania, this letter is highly influential and useful.

Kania then described the plenum and the decisions adopted there.<sup>182</sup> And he again emphasized the influence of our letter on the mood of the participants in the plenum. He himself, that is, Kania, declared at the plenum that the CPSU CC has every right to react this way, and that there is sufficient reason to react in precisely this fashion.

With regard to the plenum, it, according to Kania, featured a lot of criticism. The discussion at the plenum was heated and far-reaching. All the speakers at the plenum endorsed the letter from the CPSU CC. Criticism of the PZPR Politburo and leadership overall was extensive. A question was even raised about a vote of confidence.<sup>183</sup> The plenum voted by a majority not to make any changes in the leadership until the Party congress. Kania assured me that he and the comrades who spoke at the plenum are determined to ensure that the congress is conducted as a congress of a Marxist party should be. Further efforts are under way to mobilize and energize PZPR members in the struggle against antisocialist forces.

Kania also briefly recounted the speech Jaruzelski had delivered at the Sejm. He emphasized that the speech had promised a firmer rebuff to the counterrevolution.

At this point I couldn't restrain myself and said to him: Comrade Kania, how many times have I spoken with you about such things since the very start of this long, drawn-out affair? The whole time I told you what must be done and said that you couldn't respond to counterrevolutionary activities through words alone.<sup>184</sup>

---

members and state workers of the letter's contents, and to report back to Moscow on the reactions they encountered. The informational meetings and reports from subordinate bodies were completed by mid-June, and from then on the letter was a definitive codification of Soviet concerns and objectives. See the important documents about this process in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 76, Ll. 1-39.

<sup>182</sup> Translator's Note: The PZPR Central Committee's Eleventh Plenum on 9-10 June was convened specifically to discuss the CPSU Central Committee's letter.

<sup>183</sup> Translator's Note: A hard-line member of the PZPR Politburo, Tadeusz Grabski, tried to use the Soviet letter as a pretext to get rid of Kania. Grabski's effort to orchestrate a vote of no-confidence in Kania was ultimately rebuffed, but Kania had to expend a good deal of political capital to survive. The maneuvering by Grabski and other Polish hard-liners raised questions about the Soviet leadership's motives for sending the letter. Some observers concluded that the letter, with its harsh criticism of Kania's and Jaruzelski's performance, was part of a deliberate—albeit unsuccessful—attempt by Moscow to help the PZPR's "healthy forces" undermine their moderate colleagues before the Ninth Party Congress. Among those who now subscribe to this view are both Kania and Jaruzelski; see *Zatrzymac konfrontacje*, pp. 154-169; and *Stan wojenny dlaszego*, pp. 152-156. Substantial documentation is available to support their conclusions. See, for example, "Vermerk über das Treffen der Genossen Leonid Il'ic Breznev, Erich Honecker und Gustav Husak am 16. Mai 1981 im Kreml in Moskau," 18 May 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, vorl. SED 41599; "Fernschreiben Honeckers an die I. Sekretare der Bezirksleitungen der SED vom 6. Juni 1981," 6 June 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/2/A-2403; and "Arbeitsprotokoll Nr. 7/81 der Politburo-sitzung vom 9.6.1981," 9 June 1981 (Top Secret), in *ibid.* See also Voronkov, "Sobytiya 1980-1981 gg. v Pol'she," pp. 106-107.

<sup>184</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev's comments here echo the sentiments expressed in a Soviet diplomatic cable to the CPSU Politburo in late May: "We consider it imperative to inform you of dire reports coming in from highly reliable and trustworthy sources, who request that we convey to you how grave the situation in [Poland] has become, so grave indeed that it might bring about the destruction of the socialist order in Poland. Attacks against the MO [Public Police] and SB [Security Service] have reached a decisive phase. . . . We must frankly report that the current leaders of the



Kania agreed with this. He noted that after the plenum there had been fewer hostile actions and fewer provocative incidents. Even Walesa had said they must pursue a different strategy.

In short, Kania believes that conditions for the Party's struggle have improved, and that now the main thing is to restore order in the mass media. They approved a decision to dismiss the head of the CC Department for the Press, Radio, and Television, Klasa.<sup>185</sup> A decision also was approved to dismiss the chairman of the Committee on Television and several editors.<sup>186</sup> There will be other decisions as well. They are beginning to hold a trial for Moczulski.<sup>187</sup>

---

party and government [in Poland] do not want to resort to any decisive measures and are unwilling to do anything concrete to put an end to the patently anti-socialist, anti-Soviet actions of right-wing forces. Malicious anti-Sovietism is waxing ever larger. . . . The creation of Solidarity branches in the MO is the beginning of the political end of People's Poland. It should be underscored that in the coming 2-3 weeks, all will be decided: Either there will be a turnaround in the policy adopted by the leadership of the [Polish] party, or events similar to those at other times in Hungary and Czechoslovakia will be repeated here." Quoted from "O trevoznykh faktakh dal'neishego davleniya na organy Narodnoi militsii (MO)," Cable No. 94 (Top Secret), 27 May 1981, from G. Rudov, Soviet consul-general in Krakow, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 611, Ll. 2-3. According to Georgii Shakhnazarov (in an interview in Providence, RI, 7 May 1998), this cable was widely circulated within the central CPSU apparatus because of its crucial timing and its revelations about potential turmoil in the Polish police and security forces. Rudov followed up on the cable by transmitting documents to Moscow showing the "profound influence that Solidarity is exerting at every level of the MO."

In Krakow, Katowice, Nowa Huta, and numerous other cities, he argued, "the police are under the full control of the new, independent unions." See Cable No. 101 (Secret), 16 June 1981, plus the accompanying documents, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 611, Ll. 4-16. His reports confirmed an earlier Soviet assessment, based on high-level sources in Warsaw, that "the situation in the [Polish] state security forces" had "changed a good deal" and that "only half of the forces would be willing to use weapons against the counterrevolution. The other half would remain neutral." Quoted from "O besede s chlenom TsK PORP t. Vron'skim," Ll. 27-28.

<sup>185</sup> Translator's Note: On the dismissal of Jozef Klasa, see "Protokol Nr. 100 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 18 czerwca 1981 r.," p. 414. As is evident in numerous PZPR Politburo protocols collected in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, Klasa had been coming under sharp criticism for the past several months from Stefan Olszowski and Tadeusz Grabski, who were broadly responsible for ideological affairs. Yet ironically, it was Klasa who had publicly warned on 4 December 1980, at a time of acute tension with the Soviet Union, that if "socialism were to be endangered" and "authority were to pass from the hands of democracy [i.e., the PZPR] into the hands of antisocialist elements, Polish Communists would have both the right and the duty to ask for assistance from the Soviet Union and other [Warsaw Pact] countries." Klasa's post as head of the Central Committee department was taken over by Leslaw Tokarski, a close ally of Olszowski. Tokarski shifted the department back to a much more orthodox approach.

<sup>186</sup> Translator's Note: A new chairman of the State Committee on Radio and Television, Wladyslaw Loranc, was appointed in July 1981. He had long been a hardline party loyalist.

<sup>187</sup> Translator's Note: Leszek Moczulski, a radical political dissident and former journalist, was one of the founders of the Movement for the Defense of Human and Civil Rights (ROPCiO) in March 1977 and the Confederation for an Independent Poland (KPN) in September 1979. Under his leadership, KPN emerged as one of the boldest anti-Communist groups in Poland in 1980. He was arrested in August 1980 along with several prominent members of KOR for encouraging "anti-state actions" (i.e., the strikes), but he was temporarily released in accordance with the Gdansk agreement. On 24 September 1980, Moczulski was re-arrested on charges of "slandering the dignity of the Polish People's Republic" because of an interview he gave to *Der Spiegel* in which he affirmed that KPN's goal was to establish a multiparty system, overthrow Communism, and free Poland of Soviet domination. The KOR dissidents had all been released, but Moczulski and three other KPN officials were kept in prison. On 5 June 1981, the same day that the PZPR Central Committee received a stern letter from the Soviet authorities, the Polish Supreme Court ruled that Moczulski and his colleagues should be released pending trial. As it turned out, Moczulski remained in prison for the next two years despite not having been convicted of anything. In October 1982 he and three other KPN leaders were

On the question of Moczulski, I said to him: Comrade Kania, you've been bothering with Moczulski for so long, and then you had him under arrest and decided to release him.<sup>188</sup> Now you're beginning a trial again. What's next?

Next, said Kania, we will try him according to the law and send him again to prison. He will receive what he deserves.

According to Kania, their conferences have now begun to proceed better and in a healthier atmosphere. The influence of the plenum and of the letter from the CPSU CC is evident. In particular, the party conference in Krakow passed off well.

They also will be rectifying the matter of workers' representation at the congress to ensure that the congress is Marxist-Leninist.<sup>189</sup> A course has been adopted toward strengthening discipline in the Party and state institutions and toward bolstering unity.

I said to him that this is very good. Everything that we want to say to you about the situation in Poland and about our alarm over the fate of the PZPR and the cause of socialism — all this is expressed in the letter from the CPSU CC. I see no need to return anew to this. You yourself, no doubt, understand this. I will, I continued, say only one thing: The policy of endless concessions to the counterrevolution has proven utterly bankrupt.<sup>190</sup>

If you don't succeed in achieving a turnaround in the political situation by the time of the Party Congress, you will ruin both the congress and the Party itself, giving power with your own hands to the enemy. That's where matters stand now. And it's time, finally, for you to understand that. I say this to you as a comrade.

Kania fully agreed with this.

I then said to him the following: At the plenum there was no shortage of proper words.

---

finally convicted of having sought to overthrow the Communist system by force and were sentenced to seven years in prison.

<sup>188</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev is referring here to the provision in the Gdansk accord requiring the release of Moczulski and other dissidents who had been arrested during the strikes.

<sup>189</sup> Translator's Note: The reluctance of blue-collar workers to seek election as delegates to the Ninth Party Congress had caused dismay within the PZPR. The vast majority of workers were pinning their hopes on Solidarity rather than the Party, and thus they eschewed all activities connected with the PZPR. When it turned out that only 20 percent (393 of 1,964) of the delegates to the Congress were blue-collar workers, PZPR officials called for new steps to ensure that workers would no longer "feel like strangers in the Party's ranks." See "Nie ma partii robotniczej bez wladzy robotnikow," *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 26 June 1981, p. 3.

<sup>190</sup> Translator's Note: This message was reiterated over the next few days in the Soviet press. On 21 June, the main Soviet military newspaper, *Krasnaya zvezda*, featured a lengthy article by Marshal Kulikov ("Obuzdat' sily agressii," p. 2), which cited the CPSU Central Committee letter and reaffirmed the Warsaw Pact's determination to suppress "counterrevolutionary forces in Poland who are striving to tear this country out of the socialist commonwealth." Two days later, the CPSU daily *Pravda* carried a TASS dispatch ("Otchetno-vybornaya kampaniya v PORP," p. 4) warning that any change in "Poland's status as a socialist country" would endanger "the security of [the USSR's] borders and the independence and sovereignty of the Polish People's Republic."

There were many such words in the plenum's resolution, too. However, the main thing now is not words, but action and practical work. You yourself, Stanislaw, declared that you must begin acting right away, beginning the very next day.<sup>191</sup> Let's see what will come of this. It was time for you to take action long ago.

In my view, I said to him, an important question has arisen in connection with the plenum. There were, according to what I was told, many speeches there at various levels expressing criticism of the Politburo for its indecisiveness in the struggle against antisocialist forces. Was this so, I ask?

It was, Leonid Il'ich, Kania answers. There was very serious criticism.

Well, now, Comrade Kania, this is a serious symptom that evidently reflects the mood of a substantial portion of the Party membership, and it would be exceedingly dangerous if someone or other on this basis were to try to settle personal scores.

With the congress so near, I said, it's especially important to maintain the combat readiness of the Politburo as a collective entity, which serves as the headquarters of the party and which operates on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles. That's what I wanted to say to you in response. It's necessary to preserve unity within the Politburo. And then, I again repeat to you, it would be very dangerous if someone on this basis were to try to settle personal accounts.<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>191</sup> Translator's Note: Fittingly enough, the Polish authorities did take an important step the day after this CPSU Politburo meeting. On 19 June, Jaruzelski convened a meeting of the KOK to review legislation and other items that had been compiled over the previous few months, including drafts of directives for "the protection of state security and public order," regulations for a legal system under martial law, parliamentary resolutions, State Council decrees, and a number of press releases and public announcements. The Committee approved the drafts and ordered further work to be done, which was largely completed by the end of August. The KOK also affirmed its "normative-organizational" readiness to impose martial law within 48 hours after the final political decision was made. See "Protokol z posiedzenia Komitetu Obrony Kraju w dniu 19.6.1981," 19 June 1981 (Top Secret), in CAW, Teczka Sygn. 38.

<sup>192</sup> Translator's Note: The phrase "settling of accounts" (*rozliczenie*) was used frequently within the PZPR in late 1980 and 1981 to refer to the need for reprisals against the former Gierek regime and against officials responsible for violent crackdowns in June 1956, March 1968, and December 1970 (see the ninth annotation in Document No. 8 above). In this case, however, Brezhnev is referring to the possibility of a broader settling of accounts at the PZPR's Extraordinary Ninth Congress in mid-July. The Soviet leader was concerned that Kania might retaliate against Grabski and others who had tried to oust him at the recently-concluded Central Committee plenum. Brezhnev's insistence that "unity within the [PZPR] Politburo must be preserved"—an ironic position considering that the CPSU Central Committee's own letter had heightened the disunity among top Polish officials—was a signal to Kania that he should not seek to punish (or even remove) his hard-line critics. The same point was made by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko during a visit to Warsaw in early July 1981. Gromyko reported that "during the talks in Warsaw [he] warned Kania not to choose the path of revenge against comrades who, at Central Committee plenums and on other occasions, criticized the current PZPR leadership's tendency to make endless concessions to the anti-socialist forces." Quoted from "Information uber Gespräche des Mitgliedes des Politburos des ZK der KPdSU, Ministers für Auswärtige Angelegenheiten der UdSSR, Gen. A. A. Gromyko mit der Führung der PVAP in Warschau am 3.-5. Juli 1981," 10 July 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPDMB, ZPA, DY 30/J IV 2/202/550, Bl. 35. In the end, Kania largely complied with Brezhnev's and Gromyko's wishes, despite the upheaval caused by the PZPR's new election procedures. The PZPR Politburo experienced a huge turnover at the Congress (only 4 of 15 members were retained) and two prominent hard-liners (Grabski and Andrzej Zabinski) were dismissed, but Stefan Olszowski (another notorious hard-liner) retained his post; and the new Politburo, as proposed by Kania and approved by the Central Committee, included two additional hard-liners: Mirosław Milewski

At that point Kania said: “Leonid Il’ich, I don't fully understand what you mean.”

Once again I repeated to him, using the same words, that it would be unacceptable to settle personal accounts. After that, Kania said he understood and had made note of it, and he said they all would act according to what he had been told.

Kania assured me that he would do everything in his power to fulfill our wishes, to which I replied: Time will tell. On that note we said goodbye.

As you see, the discussion did not take very long, but it was long on content. No doubt that was necessary. Let the comrades think it over. I think on one thing Kania is right, namely, that the letter from the CPSU CC positively influenced the healthy forces in the Party and brought a certain improvement in the whole atmosphere. Perhaps in the end they will think things over and begin to act more decisively. As they say, we shall see.

Do the comrades have any sorts of questions or comments? If not, let's approve this discussion.

EVERYONE. Agreed.

[*Source: TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 44*]

---

and Albin Siwak. (Siwak, in particular, had been an ultra hard-line critic of Kania's leadership.) Moreover, two key moderates on the earlier Politburo, Tadeusz Fiszbach and Mieczyslaw Jagielski, were among those who lost their jobs. On balance, then, the composition of the new PZPR Politburo, from Moscow's perspective, was no worse—and in many respects better—than it had been previously.

DOCUMENT No. 16

INFORMATION  
ABOUT CDE. L. I. BREZHNEV'S MEETING WITH CDES. S. KANIA  
AND W. JARUZELSKI<sup>193</sup>

On 14 August 1981 a meeting took place in the Crimea between the CPSU CC General Secretary and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Cde. L. I. Brezhnev, and the PZPR CC First Secretary, S. Kania, and the PZPR CC Politburo member and Chairman of the PPR Council of Ministers, W. Jaruzelski.<sup>194</sup> Also taking part in the discussion were Cdes. A. A. Gromyko, K. U. Chernenko, and K. V. Rusakov.

The CPSU CC attached great significance to this meeting with the Polish leaders.

At the outset of the discussion, Cde. L. I. Brezhnev expressed great anxiety about where Poland is heading. You hoped, he said to Cdes. S. Kania and W. Jaruzelski, that events would begin to turn around in some definite way after the Congress.<sup>195</sup> But in actuality the situation has continued to deteriorate, and the counterrevolution is stepping up its onslaught.

---

<sup>193</sup> Translator's Note: This document from the former SED archive is undated, but a handwritten note by Erich Honecker in the upper right-hand corner of the first page gives the date of 22 August 1981.

<sup>194</sup> Translator's Note: This session was the final time that Brezhnev met with Kania before Kania was removed as PZPR First Secretary in October 1981. On 18 August, Kania and Jaruzelski provided a detailed account of their meeting with Brezhnev to the rest of the PZPR Politburo. Their summary of the talks is very similar to this Soviet transcript, but it makes a useful complement insofar as it mentions a separate meeting with Andrei Gromyko and gives a greater indication of what Kania and Jaruzelski each said to Brezhnev. (The Soviet transcript usually lumps the two together.) See "Protokol Nr. 3 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 18 sierpnia 1981 r.," 18 August 1981 (Secret), in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, esp. pp. 455-459. For Jaruzelski's and Kania's retrospective accounts of the talks, see Jaruzelski, *Stan wojenny dlaczego*, pp. 231-246; and Kania, *Zatrzymac konfrontacje*, pp. 189-198.

<sup>195</sup> Translator's Note: The "Congress" to which Brezhnev is referring is the Extraordinary Ninth Congress of the PZPR, held on 14-20 July 1981. For the proceedings, see *IX Nadzwyczajny Zjazd PZPR 14-20 lipca 1981 r.* (Warsaw: KiW, 1981). As noted above (in my final annotation to Document No. 15), the Congress was lively and boisterous, but in the end it gave Kania most of what he had sought. Brezhnev spoke by phone with Kania on 21 July, the day after the Congress ended. The Soviet leader maintained that "the Congress was a serious test of strength for both the PZPR and you [Kania] personally," and that it "highlighted the danger posed by opportunist forces." He warned Kania that "the counterrevolutionaries do not intend to relent in their attack," and he urged the Polish leader to take "decisive and consistent action to resolve the crisis and stabilize the situation. . . . You must yield no more ground." Brezhnev added that "the nature of Soviet-Polish economic, political, and other relations will depend on how things shape up in Poland," a thinly-veiled hint that Soviet economic largesse might not continue indefinitely. Kania assured Brezhnev that he would "do [his] best to overcome these difficulties" and to "seize the counterrevolution by the throat." For the time being, Brezhnev was willing to accept those assurances. See "Vermerk uber ein Telefongesprach des Generalsekretars des ZK der KPdSU, Genossen Leonid Il'ic Breznev, mit dem Ersten Sekretar des ZK der PVAP, Genossen Stanislaw Kania, am 21.7.1981," 21 July 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/202-550. A copy of the transcript is also available in the Hungarian National Archive (Magyar Orszagos Leveltar), F. 5/832 o.e., ol. 20-24.

All the steps taken by the CPSU and the Soviet Union throughout the Polish crisis were dictated exclusively by concern about the interests of socialist Poland. Cde. L. I. Brezhnev proposed in complete candor, as befits Communists, to speak about Polish affairs.

Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski described the situation in the country and the party in substantial detail. They acknowledged that there is ample basis for the alarm that the leaders of the CPSU and other fraternal parties have expressed about the fate of socialism in Poland.

The Polish comrades emphasized the positive influence of the Extraordinary 9th Congress of the PZPR, after which, in their view, "the party can act more decisively." The PZPR leaders described the new composition of the Central Committee as "manageable." "A process of consolidation is currently under way in the PZPR. . . . An example of this can be seen in the 2nd plenum of the party's Central Committee, where the speeches were notable for their high quality, principled stances, and feeling of certainty," noted Cde. S. Kania.<sup>196</sup>

Referring to the PZPR's struggle to find a way out of the crisis, Cde. S. Kania declared in particular: "Today no one will say that the party does not see any way to overcome the crisis. The PZPR has a program, and today it is seizing the initiative."

Cdes. S. Kania and W. Jaruzelski strove to show that the line they have chosen is in complete accord with the specifics of the Polish situation and is giving a basis for speaking about initial successes on the road to political stabilization. As evidence that the situation is beginning to turn around, they cited the work of the 2nd Plenum of the PZPR Central Committee, the agreements with Solidarity at the LOT airline,<sup>197</sup> the prevention of street disturbances in Warsaw, and other such things.<sup>198</sup>

---

<sup>196</sup> Translator's Note: The 2nd Plenum of the PZPR Central Committee was held on 11-12 August 1981 amidst a wave of public protests and strikes, which were threatening to elude the authorities' control. In his opening speech at the plenum, Kania denounced "adventurist groups in Solidarity's leading organs" who were driving the country inexorably toward a "bloody confrontation" and the "greatest national tragedy." He vowed that the party would "combat anti-socialist forces" and "find a way to ensure that the streets remain quiet." Other members of the PZPR Politburo joined in the condemnation of Solidarity for its "counterrevolutionary statements" and "betrayal of workers' interests." The Central Committee as a whole urged the government to take "resolute action" to curb "disorder" and "anarchy." Quoted from *II Plenum Komitetu Centralnego PZPR 11/12 sierpnia 1981 r* (Warsaw: KiW, 1981), pp. 35, 161.

<sup>197</sup> Translator's Note: Acute tensions emerged at Poland's LOT airline in the spring of 1981 when the government decided to install an Air Force general as LOT's new managing director, rather than accept a civilian candidate proposed by the airline's employees. Negotiations on the matter proved fruitless. On 9 July several thousand LOT employees staged a four-hour strike and threatened to walk out for the full day on 24 July unless the government met their demands. As the 24th drew near, the government finally agreed to resume talks, and Solidarity responded by urging the airline workers to postpone the strike. By early August, a tentative settlement had been reached that provided for a restructuring of the LOT administration, with input from workers regarding the appointment of a managing director. Although tensions at the airline persisted, Kania and Jaruzelski were largely justified in depicting the outcome favorably.

<sup>198</sup> Translator's Note: Kania's and Jaruzelski's comments about these matters reflected their guarded optimism in the wake of a highly publicized meeting in Gdansk of Solidarity's National Coordinating Commission (*Krajowa Komisja Porozumiewawcza*, or KKP) on 10-12 August 1981. Although the union leaders had bitterly criticized the authorities for renegeing on promises and for trying to blame Solidarity for all of Poland's economic woes, the resolutions and statements adopted at the meeting were construed by senior PZPR officials as an indication that "the KKP is returning to realistic thinking" and "is genuinely concerned about finding ways to overcome the crisis." Even so, it is difficult to

The Polish leaders affirmed that every direct attack against the people's regime will be dealt a formidable rebuff. However, their statements obviously do not imply that they will immediately pursue a decisive, no-holds-barred confrontation with the political adversary and with the counterrevolution. Cde. S. Kania said: "We constantly intend to use the most decisive measures against the counterrevolution. But this will be possible only when popular support is guaranteed."

Cde. S. Kania spoke with satisfaction about the situation in the state security organs and the army, which "despite certain difficulties are both in very good shape."<sup>199</sup> Referring to

---

see how Kania and Jaruzelski could have legitimately claimed that they had "prevented street disturbances in Warsaw." Turmoil had spread through Poland in late July and early August after government officials announced on 23 July that prices for food and other consumer goods would be increased, and that meat rations would be reduced by nearly 20 percent in August and September. This announcement provoked a wave of "hunger marches" in Warsaw and other cities, as protesters denounced the government's action and demanded "living standards appropriate for a civilized country." Emergency talks between Solidarity and the government on 25 and 27 July brought a repeal of the cut in meat rations for September and some movement on other issues, but the limited agreement between the two sides was not enough to forestall a fresh round of protests and hunger marches. Talks between Solidarity and the government resumed on 3 August, albeit without any progress. On that same day, a strike alert was declared by 240 enterprises in Piotrkow Trybunalski wojewodztwo and by 56 enterprises in Radom wojewodztwo to protest food shortages and meat rationing. The renewed talks between Solidarity and the government on 3 August were further impeded by a large protest rally in Warsaw. The streets of the capital were nearly paralyzed on 3-4 August by a long column of trucks, buses, and municipal workers who were denouncing shortages of food and other staple goods. When the police barred the demonstrators from moving past the PZPR's headquarters near the intersection of Marszalkowska Street and Jerolimskie Avenue, traffic came to a halt and a tense standoff ensued. Solidarity and the government broke off their negotiations, but returned to the table on 6 August amidst threats of widespread strikes. After the two sides were still unable to reach agreement, the Polish government released a statement on 7 August that "expressed profound concern about the street demonstrations organized by some local Solidarity branches, which threaten the state's security and public order." The authorities warned that "any further organization of street demonstrations, especially suicidal strikes," would pose a "grave danger." Although Kania and Jaruzelski may have hoped that an "Appeal" issued by Solidarity on 12 August would induce rank-and-file workers to eschew mass protests, there was no assurance of that by the time the Polish leaders conferred with Brezhnev on 14 August. The only thing of which they could be certain was that Solidarity's national organization had encouraged union branches in Warsaw, Gdansk, Katowice, Wroclaw, Bialystok, and Bydgoszcz to refrain from taking part in a "Star March" (*Marsz gwiazdzisty*) on 17 August, which was being organized by the Committee for the Defense of Prisoners of Conscience (RKOUP) to demand the "release of all political prisoners" in Poland, including Leszek Moczulski. (The Star March was so named because RKOUP activists were planning to march toward Warsaw from various directions, forming a starlike pattern that would converge in the capital on 22 August.) Solidarity's decision not to support the Star March helped avert what might have become a direct confrontation with the authorities.

<sup>199</sup> Translator's Note: This represented a notable change from what Kania had been saying to Marshal Kulikov a few months earlier (see my annotations in Documents No. 11 and 12). It also was at odds with intelligence reports from senior KGB officials, who by late April 1981 were reporting that "the police organs have established ties with the Solidarity organization and are informing Solidarity about certain aspects of their activities as well as organizing joint efforts. . . . As a result of the work carried out by Solidarity, the activity of the [Polish] state security organs in the police has been curtailed." The same KGB official claimed that "Solidarity has been actively spreading propaganda among the population to discredit the state security organs and the citizens' police, which has disrupted their activities." Quoted from "Spravka," Dispatch No. 638 (Top Secret), 24 April 1981, and "Spravka," Dispatch No. 639 (Top Secret), 25 April 1981, from Lieutenant-Colonel O. P. Donchak, deputy head of the Ukrainian KGB's 7th Border Detachment for Intelligence, both in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2235, Ll. 28-29 and 30, respectively. A high-level Soviet military delegation led by Kulikov and General Gribkov arrived in Warsaw on 8 August to confer with Jaruzelski and Siwicki about the "combat readiness of the Polish armed forces." See "Spotkanie W. Jaruzelskiego z W. Kulikowem," *Trybuna*

Solidarity, Cde. Kania declared that “society and the working class are beginning to move away from Solidarity, and its leaders do not want [the union] to be perceived as a destructive force.”

Solidarity called on [its members] not to permit strikes for two months and to agree to work on eight free Saturdays.<sup>200</sup> It is known, however, that Solidarity intends to take the output produced on these Saturdays and allocate it through its own channels.<sup>201</sup>

After speaking about the difficult situation in the mass media, Cdes. S. Kania and W. Jaruzelski discussed a number of organizational measures and personnel changes intended to improve the situation in the press. It is known that “*Zolnierz Wolnosci*” is the only newspaper up to now that has adhered to a staunch position.<sup>202</sup> Even “*Trybuna Ludu*” has been tolerant of ideological wavering.

Cdes. S. Kania and W. Jaruzelski gave particular emphasis to Poland's difficult economic situation. In their view, this is precisely the issue that accounts for the prolonged nature of the political crisis.

They acknowledged that difficulties in the economy are caused above all by [Poland's] indebtedness to the West and by the destructive activity of extremists from Solidarity. “Poland's foreign debt,” said S. Kania, “has grown astronomically. . . . They don't give us

---

*Ludu* (Warsaw), 10 August 1981, p. 1. In light of the earlier reports from Kulikov and from KGB sources, Soviet leaders were increasingly concerned that Polish military units and security forces might prove unreliable “if the situation reaches a critical point.” Soviet diplomats, intelligence officials, and military commanders in Poland were ordered to keep a close watch on the Polish army and security organs. See, for example, “O nekotorykh aspektakh raboty Pol'skikh organov gosbezopasnosti po presecheniyu podryvnoi deyatelnosti oppozitsii (Informatsiya na osnove besed s rabotnikami gosbezopasnosti PNR),” Cable No. 931 (Top Secret), 30 November 1981, from A. Kovalev, first secretary at the Soviet embassy in Warsaw, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 611, Ll. 29-31; “O nastroeniyakh sredi soldatov i ofitserov podrazdelenii Voiska Pol'skogo i VMF PNR, dislotsiruyushchikhsya na Gdan'skom poberezh'e,” Cable No. 183 (Top Secret), 14 June 1981, from V. Zelenov, Soviet consul-general in Gdansk, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 611, Ll. 17-19; “O politicheskoi situatsii i nastroeniyakh v voevodstvakh yuzhnogo regiona PNR (Politpis'mo),” Cable No. 179 (Top Secret), 12 November 1981, from G. Rudov, Soviet consul-general in Krakow, to the CPSU Secretariat, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 597, Ll. 13-22; and “O trevozhnykh faktakh dal'neishego davleniya na organy Narodnoi militsii (MO),” Cable No. 94 (Secret), 27 May 1981, from G. Rudov, Soviet consul-general in Krakow, to the CPSU Secretariat, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 611, Ll. 2-3.

<sup>200</sup> Translator's Note: Kania is referring here to specific parts of the “Appeal” issued by Solidarity's KKP on 12 August to rank-and-file members and the broader society (“*Apel do czlonkow zwiazku i calego spoleczenstwa*”). The KKP cited the deepening economic crisis as a reason to forgo mass protest actions for the time being and to encourage union members to work (for full pay) on eight Saturdays that had earlier been designated work-free (*wolne od pracy*).

<sup>201</sup> Translator's Note: The KKP's Appeal of 12 August suggested that “self-governing committees” (*komitety samorzadow*) and “factory commissions” (*komisje zakladowe*) should exercise control over the output from work on Saturdays to ensure that it was “entirely devoted to rectifying the most acute shortages.” Even earlier, on 5 August 1981, Solidarity declared its right to control food production and supplies, and called for an immediate shift to “genuine workers' self-management.” This statement came a day after prime minister Jaruzelski had formed an Anti-Crisis Committee under one of his deputies, Janusz Obodowski. Jaruzelski had indicated that this committee would oversee food distribution and fuel supplies, a position that Solidarity wanted to challenge.

<sup>202</sup> Translator's Note: The main daily newspaper of the Polish armed forces, *Zolnierz Wolnosci* (“Soldier of Freedom”), was under the direct control of General Jozef Baryla, the head of the Polish army's Main Political Directorate. Baryla, a long-time ally of Jaruzelski, vigorously supported the Polish leader's efforts throughout the crisis.



loans as a gift. Credits are extended to us at very high interest rates of up to 20 percent.”<sup>203</sup>

During the discussion, Cde. L. I. Brezhnev cited a broad array of facts and comprehensively highlighted the rapidly growing danger posed by the situation in Poland. He focused the attention of the Polish leaders on the threat to the Polish people's socialist gains. Recent meetings with the leaders of a number of fraternal parties in the Crimea confirmed that all of us are alarmed about where Poland is heading.<sup>204</sup> The ranks of the party are depleted. Its leading role has been greatly enervated. Solidarity is in control at a majority of large enterprises and is putting forth outrageous political demands. Anti-socialist forces who are preparing to storm the positions of the PZPR are showing increased signs of aggressiveness.

The economy is being strangled under the burden of debts. Instead of a well-tuned rhythm of production, one finds work stoppages, protest meetings, and strikes.<sup>205</sup> As a result of all of this, the living standard of workers is on the decline. They are dragging the economy to the bottom, labor discipline is collapsing, no clear economic program is at hand, and the economic life of the country is being disrupted by Solidarity.

---

<sup>203</sup> Translator's Note: Negotiations were under way at this time between the U.S. and Polish governments to restructure Poland's huge foreign debt. On 27 August the two countries signed an agreement to defer repayment for 5-8 years of 90 percent of the debt owed by Polish institutions in 1981.

<sup>204</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev's meetings with East European leaders in late July and August 1981 were summarized in a secret report distributed in late August 1981 by the CPSU Politburo to lower-level party and state organs throughout the Soviet Union, "Informatsiya TsK KPSS ob itogakh vstrech tovarishcha L. I. Brezhneva s rukovoditelyami bratskikh partii sotsialisticheskikh stran v Krymu v iyule-avguste 1981 goda." The lower-level bodies were required to disseminate the Politburo's findings to all party members and employees. An assessment of this process, and of the response from local party members, was sent to the CPSU Politburo on 11 September by Evgenii Razumov, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, "Ob oznakomlenii partiinogo aktiva s Informatsiei TsK KPSS ob itogakh vstrech tovarishcha L. I. Brezhneva s rukovoditelyami bratskikh partii sotsialisticheskikh stran v Krymu v iyule-avguste 1981 goda," No. P-1714 (Top Secret). See also Memoranda Nos. 33364 and 33387 from Razumov to the CPSU Secretariat, 21 September 1981 (Secret), in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 76, L. 48. For further information pertaining to these documents, see earlier portions of TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 76. Other valuable information about Brezhnev's meetings and the reaction inside the USSR can be found in archives of the former Soviet republics outside Russia. See, for example, "Informatsiya ob otklikakh partiinogo aktiva na itogi krymskikh vstrech General'nogo sekretarya TsK KPSS, Predsedatelya Prezidiuma Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR tovarishcha L. I. Brezhneva s rukovoditelyami bratskikh partii i sotsialisticheskikh stran v 1981 godu," No. 1/94 (Top Secret), 2 September 1981, from V. Shcherbytskyi, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2208, Ll. 44-50.

<sup>205</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev's statements about the effects of unrest in Poland tally well with assessments prepared by senior Polish officials. One such assessment, completed on 10 August, claimed that in the first eight days of August alone, Poland had lost more than \$12.5 million in potential export revenues because of protests and work stoppages by coalminers. The protests, according to the report, had meant a loss of 207,000 tons of coal, including 145,000 tons during a warning strike by miners on 7 August. The report also alleged that strikes were having deleterious effects in many other sectors of the economy, including construction (the purported loss of 100 apartment buildings), transportation (the diversion of 2,400 vehicles), metallurgy (the estimated loss of 30,000 tons of steel and 300 tons of sheet zinc), engineering (the loss of 15 kilometers of steel pipes), chemical production (the suspension of ammonium nitrate production), and light industry (the suspension of pharmaceutical production). Similar findings were given in a secret report prepared by the PZPR Central Committee apparatus in mid-August 1981, which lamented the "continuously deteriorating supply of basic goods" and predicted that "over the longer run a [violent] confrontation with the extremist elements of Solidarity seems inevitable." See "Prognoza przewidywanych nastrojow spolecznych oraz konfliktow z NSZZ 'Solidarnosc' i innymi ugrupowaniami wrogimi politycznie," Ss. 95, 107.

In the ideological sphere the enemies of socialism are acting with impunity and are casting aspersions on the PZPR, the national state, and socialism.

On the basis of information expressed by the Polish leaders during the discussion, Cde. L. I. Brezhnev dwelt at length, in an acute and precise manner, on the political meaning of recent events in Poland. He especially emphasized that the danger threatening the PZPR is a right-wing danger. Reliable Communists and Marxist-Leninists, who are currently out of office, are an important reserve of the party and must be defended.<sup>206</sup> One's view of this question, emphasized Cde. L. I. Brezhnev, in contemporary circumstances is a criterion of party spirit.

Overall, he said, no matter how one evaluates the results of the 9th Congress, one thing is clear: The Congress in and of itself did not bring radical changes in the course of events. The adversary retained the initiative and actually increased the force of its attack, whereas the party and the people's regime continue to retreat.

It is impossible to stop the adversary without a struggle. There have been enough concessions; there is nowhere left to retreat. Simultaneously you must declare as loudly as possible to the whole nation that the main reason for the current hardships in Poland is the criminal activity of the bosses of Solidarity. Why do you not just flatly say that they are precisely the ones who bear responsibility for the current onerous situation in productive output?

The Polish comrades, said Cde. L. I. Brezhnev, are not ready for a confrontation. By speaking about it as nothing other than "bloodshed," they end up wanting to avoid it all costs. We, though, are speaking about a political confrontation, which is already under way. It is being waged by the adversary. As far as a bloody confrontation is concerned, one might indeed occur if you don't pursue the political confrontation to its logical end and restore the leading role of the PZPR.

Events are already spilling out onto the streets.<sup>207</sup> It could very well happen that in such circumstances blood will flow no matter what. And perhaps there will be even greater bloodshed than there would be if you take preventive measures and forceful administrative measures. There has never been a case when revolution triumphed over counterrevolution

---

<sup>206</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev presumably is referring to Gierek and other senior PZPR officials who had been removed from their posts over the previous year. Brezhnev's effort to ensure that these "reliable Communists" would be "defended" was at odds with a key finding in a secret report prepared by the PZPR Central Committee apparatus on 18 August 1981: "It will be extremely difficult for the government to regain credibility unless the authorities openly acknowledge their mistakes and settle accounts with those responsible for [the country's] current plight." See "Prognoza przewidywanych nastrojow społecznych oraz konfliktow z NSZZ 'Solidarnosc' i innymi ugrupowaniami wrogimi politycznie," S. 95.

<sup>207</sup> Translator's Note: Presumably, Brezhnev is referring to traffic blockades and a large-scale protest march in Warsaw in early August 1981, which coincided with a short-lived resumption of talks between Solidarity and the government. Protests and strikes in cities outside the capital— among them, Lodz, Krakow, Wroclaw, Lublin, Gdansk, Gdynia, Katowice, Poznan, Kielce, Olsztyn, Bielsko Biala, Piotrkow Trybunalski, Zielona Gora, Jelenia Gora, Chelm, and Czestochowa—also had caused serious problems for public transportation. These disruptions were often cited by the government to illustrate the effect of strikes on the national economy.

without a battle and without the use of force.

No one is opposed to acting reasonably. But the anti-socialist forces are not at all inclined to respond in a similar manner. All evidence suggests that they are launching a new frontal attack against the party and socialism. That is why any hope of defending socialism by means of persuasion, without resorting to other means at your disposal, is an illusion. Sooner or later, the Communists will have to square off directly against the enemy.

However, this had better not occur too late: The class enemy is now trying to penetrate the army and state security organs and to deprive you of all your support.<sup>208</sup> Avoiding a confrontation now would mean playing into the hands of your enemies and giving them the opportunity to strengthen their positions even further. Now, in the wake of the Congress, a more or less propitious moment has arisen for you, but it can't last long.

The insidious schemes of the anti-socialist forces have emerged with sufficient clarity. Through strikes or threats of strikes, these forces are keeping the party and government in constant tension, denying any opportunity to stabilize the situation. At the same time, they are giving their main emphasis to the demand for worker self-management, which is of an anarcho-syndicalist nature, going so far as "group responsibility" for the enterprise and the means of production.<sup>209</sup>

---

<sup>208</sup> Translator's Note: Since the late spring of 1981, Soviet leaders had been receiving diplomatic and intelligence reports about Solidarity's attempts to set up branches in the Polish army, police, and security forces. (See my annotations in Document No. 15 *supra*, as well as my earlier annotation in this document.) Soviet officials in Poland warned that "the establishment of these Solidarity branches in [the army, police, and security forces] means the beginning of the political end of People's Poland." Quoted from "O trevozhnykh faktakh dal'neishego davleniya na organy Narodnoi militsii," L. 3.

<sup>209</sup> Translator's Note: In the leadup to Solidarity's first National Congress in early September 1981, union leaders had been demanding the establishment of "worker self-management" in all industrial enterprises. The first round of the Congress, from 5 to 10 September, proposed to abolish the party's *nomenklatura* system (which had long enabled the PZPR to control the appointment of all enterprise managers) and to replace it with a genuine system of self-management that would give "workers' councils" the right to hire and fire enterprise directors. After the first round of the Congress, Solidarity officials met with government representatives to work out a compromise, which allowed for self-management in the majority of enterprises, but left managers at key plants under government control (albeit joint control with the workers' councils). Landmark legislation to this effect was approved by the Sejm on 25 September 1981 and formally implemented on 1 October. See "Ustawa z dnia 25 wrzesnia 1981 r. o przedsiębiorstwach państwowych," *Dziennik Ustaw Polskiej Rzeczypospolitej Ludowej* (Warsaw), No. 24 (30 September 1981), Item 122. High-ranking Soviet officials in Poland regarded the legislation with great hostility, claiming that it "presented a special danger because it will allow Solidarity to consolidate its positions in the majority of enterprises. The full introduction of the reforms would be justified only when the PZPR again controls the situation in the economy." Quoted from "Polozhenie v PORP posle IX S"ezda," Cable No. 857 (Top Secret), 4 November 1981, from B. Aristov, the Soviet ambassador in Poland, to the CPSU Politburo, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 596, L. 52. Thus, the advent of "worker self-management" in Poland reinforced the perception in Moscow that only a limited amount of time was still left before the situation in Poland became irretrievable. Within Solidarity, too, the new legislation encountered fierce opposition, albeit for a very different reason. Even though the two laws had been strongly endorsed by Solidarity representatives who negotiated with members of the Sejm subcommittee, many of the delegates at the second half of Solidarity's National Congress (from 26 September to 7 October) complained that the union's decision to accept a compromise was adopted "improperly," "without regard for democratic procedures," and "under the excessive influence of experts." Although the Congress did not reject the laws outright, it called for a nationwide referendum to be held in industrial enterprises to consider possible amendments. The Congress instructed "Solidarity's National Committee to present the results of the referendum to the

A concession on this issue would mean the destruction of the economic foundation of socialism. We are talking here about “self-management,” which might take the form of a variety of current paths of capitalist development. And in parallel the political system is being undermined. They are demanding that elections to the Sejm and the People's Councils be moved up and are threatening to create a so-called party of labor.<sup>210</sup>

Now, as far as we understand, said Cde. L. I. Brezhnev, there is still an opportunity to mobilize all the supporters of socialism and to rebuff the counterrevolution. But to do this you will need to end your faintheartedness.<sup>211</sup> The Polish comrades themselves have emphasized, on numerous occasions, that an extraordinary situation has emerged. Doesn't it follow that measures to deal with the situation must be of the same caliber — that is, “extraordinary”?

---

Sejm along with a motion demanding appropriate amendments." The Congress exhorted workers in the meantime "to establish genuine organs of industrial self-management in all enterprises as originally proposed by the union." The formation of workers' councils proceeded somewhat haphazardly in October and November 1981, and was somewhat behind schedule by the time martial law was imposed in December 1981. The Polish martial law authorities sharply restricted the powers of the newly-formed workers' councils, but Polish workers had gained a foothold for a greater say in the operation of their enterprises. That foothold proved important at the end of the decade, when the Communist regime was finally dislodged.

<sup>210</sup> Translator's Note: From the late 1940s on, all candidates in elections for the Polish Sejm (the national parliament) and People's Councils (local government organs) had to be members of the PZPR or the National Unity Front, a Communist-sponsored umbrella organization encompassing the PZPR and its subordinate parties. The "Appeal" issued by Solidarity's leadership on 12 August 1981 openly challenged both the scheduling and the procedures for new elections to the Sejm and the People's Councils, which had been slated for December 1981. The KKP declared that "the concept of self-governance must not be confined solely to the operation of enterprises. The reforms should also . . . transform the People's Councils and the Sejm into bodies that are genuinely representative of the whole society," rather than being mere extensions of the PZPR. The KKP called for multi-candidate elections on a truly competitive basis within the next two months, and urged that "the powers of the [newly-elected] Sejm and People's Councils be expanded relative to other administrative bodies," including the PZPR. These proposals were reaffirmed a month later by Solidarity's First National Congress, which adopted a resolution on 10 September calling for free elections in the near future that would give Solidarity and other groups "the right to put forward [their own] candidates." A Soviet TASS dispatch on 23 September 1981 responded to Solidarity's demand for free and open elections by claiming that "counterrevolutionaries" were "seeking to achieve the dissolution of the Sejm." Soviet leaders were alarmed that Solidarity might gain control of the People's Councils, and they warned Jaruzelski that "the class enemies are exploiting their current influence among the masses to establish a huge advantage in the upcoming elections for the People's Councils, thus continuing their path toward the legal seizure of power in the country. . . . The elections for the local organs of power will risk the [Communist] party's destruction." Quoted from "O prieme v SSSR partiino-gosudarstvennyoi delegatsii PNR i ustnom poslanii L. Brezhneva V. Yaruzel'skomu," L. 4.

<sup>211</sup> Translator's Note: Some of Kania's and Jaruzelski's colleagues on the PZPR Politburo were privately expressing grave doubts to the Soviet leadership about this matter. Just a few days before Kania and Jaruzelski traveled to the Crimea, one of the members of the PZPR Politburo, Zbigniew Messner, relayed his view that "in the [Polish] Politburo and government there is no conception of how to get out of the crisis, and it has not been established what the adversary might do if a state of emergency is introduced, and how the authorities should respond. Cde. S. Kania fears a repetition of the events of December 1970, and Cde. W. Jaruzelski is unsteady and inconsistent." Messner urged Brezhnev to "have a stern talk with [Kania and Jaruzelski] in the Crimea" and to "impress on them the necessity of adopting harsh measures *vis-a-vis* Solidarity." Quoted from "Spravka o soderzhanii besedy s general'nym konsulom PNR v g. Kieve t. L. Kotarboi 10 avgusta 1981 goda," Memorandum No. 253 (Secret), 10 August 1981, by A. Merkulov, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Department on Foreign Ties, with a cover note from A. Kapto, a UkrCP Central Committee Secretary, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2294, Ll. 1-4.

Cde. L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that when the Polish friends resort to decisive actions, they have every reason to count on sufficiently broad support from the population, which is tired of anarchy and chaos and is afraid that Solidarity might plunge the country into a national catastrophe.

During the discussion, other thoughts were raised about how to gain control of the situation in the country, including the need to work actively with the branch trade unions, to exert influence on public opinion about the necessity of economic measures, to carry out appropriate work to counter the Solidarity congress, etc.

Referring to the economic situation, Cde. L. I. Brezhnev expressed the conviction that the crisis in Poland is above all of a political nature, and that it is precisely in the political sphere and in the struggle against the enemies of socialism that the key to stabilization of the economic situation lies. You know, he said, how to reestablish your positions in political life, how to bring the mass media back under your control, and how to reaffirm the authority of the regime. Gradual movement toward improving other spheres of Soviet-Polish relations, emphasized Cde. L. I. Brezhnev, will depend on the further course of events in the PPR. Will Poland be socialist, will relations be internationalist, will it move along a different path, will the nature of relations become something different along state, political, and economic lines?<sup>212</sup> It is important that all of this be well understood not only by political officials, but also by the broad Polish public. Naturally, we assume that the Polish Communists will do everything possible to prevent the class enemy from shifting the country over to the capitalist camp.

With regard to the consideration of possible measures during the upcoming period, Cde. L. I. Brezhnev said: "What precisely is done in the near future must of course be decided by the Polish leadership itself." But we are convinced: The time has come to begin fighting as boldly as possible. To this end, you must mobilize the entire party, rallying it around a Marxist-Leninist platform. Among the concrete steps cited by Cde. L. I. Brezhnev were stern measures against the ringleaders of street demonstrations and disorders and a campaign aimed at making every Pole aware that the country has been driven to chaos, ruin, and hunger not because of the PZPR's mistakes, but because of the subversive work of Solidarity and the leaders of the counterrevolution, which has stemmed mainly from strikes. Obviously, you must categorically reject the demand for a transfer of enterprises to the property of individual collectives; nor must you in any way permit the creation of new parties or go along with early elections for the Sejm.<sup>213</sup> You must finish the trial of Moczulski and sentence him for his hostile activity.

This is the minimum course of action dictated by current conditions. I have spoken to

---

<sup>212</sup> Translator's Note: These are precisely the questions raised in a recent dispatch to the CPSU Politburo from the Soviet ambassador in Poland, Boris Aristov, "Vneshnyaya politika PNR na nyneshnem etape (Politpis'mo)," Cable No. 595 (Top Secret), 9 July 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 596, Ll. 21-34.

<sup>213</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev is referring here to two controversial issues that emerged in the late summer and early fall of 1981, as discussed in annotations above: (1) worker self-management, and (2) the scheduling of parliamentary and local council elections.

you numerous times about additional measures on a wider plane. All of these, without doubt, are just as necessary now as when I spoke about them earlier.

Cde. L. I. Brezhnev drew the attention of the Polish leaders especially to the fact that imperialist reaction, in cahoots with Beijing, is seeking to turn the PPR into a source of additional tension in the international situation. To this end, they are voicing speculation about the threat of Soviet intervention and are presenting themselves as champions of Polish independence.<sup>214</sup> One must decisively struggle against this line and explain to the Polish nation that the real danger to its national existence comes from imperialism — our common enemy. In particular, it is essential that everyone in Poland understand that credits lent by Western banks and governments are in no way a gift, but a commercial transaction, for which enormous rates of interest must be paid. For Poland this amounts to servitude.

The discussion touched upon bilateral economic relations between the USSR and the PPR. Referring to the grave economic situation in Poland, Cde. L. I. Brezhnev reported to the Polish comrades that the CPSU CC and the USSR Government approved a decision to defer Poland's repayment of debts for earlier loans until the next five-year plan, to supply the PPR with additional raw materials for light industry as well as certain consumer goods, and to facilitate the fuller exploitation of Poland's industrial potential.<sup>215</sup>

---

<sup>214</sup> Translator's Note: Western concerns about Soviet intentions grew sharply over the next few weeks. On 4 September, the day before Solidarity opened its first National Congress in Gdansk, the Warsaw Pact countries began their "Zapad-81" joint exercises, which continued until 12 September. These exercises, involving ground, air, and naval forces throughout the northwestern USSR and the Baltic Sea (including a concentration of naval power in the Bay of Gdansk), were among the largest Soviet military maneuvers since World War II. Although the main purpose of "Zapad-81" was to test recent changes in Soviet military command-and-control procedures, the maneuvers also were useful in generating pressure on Solidarity and the Polish authorities. A report prepared by the CPSU Politburo's Commission on Poland declared that "the main reason the opposition [in Poland] has not yet seized power is that they fear Soviet troops would be introduced." Quoted from "O razvitii obstanovki v Pol'she i nekotorykh shagakh s nashei story," L. 3. In addition to the effect that the exercises had within Poland, it is now clear, from recently declassified materials, that Soviet leaders also believed Zapad-81 would have a salutary impact on Western policy. To the extent that the exercises increased fears in the West about a Soviet invasion, they were seen as inducing Western governments to urge greater caution upon Solidarity: "Under no circumstances will Poland be given up. . . . U.S. officials understand this, which is the only reason they exert a restraining influence on Solidarity. They fear our military intervention. . . . The current exercises in the Belorussian SSR, the Baltic states, and Ukraine . . . will enable leaders in the United States to see what they are confronting and the risks they are taking." Quoted from "Gesprach des Generalsekretars des ZK der SED und Vorsitzenden des Staatsrates der DDR, Genossen Erich Honecker, anlässlich seines Aufenthaltes in Kuba mit dem Ersten Sekretar des ZK der KP Kubas und Vorsitzenden des Staatsrates und des Ministerrates der Republik Kuba, Fidel Castro, am 13. September 1981 in Havanna," notes by Joachim Hermann, 15 September 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/2/A-2426. Taking account of these factors, the CPSU Politburo's Commission on Poland urged that "as a deterrent to counterrevolution, [the Soviet authorities] should maximally exploit the fears of internal reactionaries and international imperialism that the Soviet Union will send its troops into Poland." Quoted from "O razvitii obstanovki v Pol'she i nekotorykh shagakh s nashei storony," L. 5.

<sup>215</sup> Translator's Note: Actually, the decision to defer repayment of Poland's debts to the Soviet Union was not formally approved until two days later, on 16 August 1981, by the CPSU Politburo (No. P23/14) and then ratified by the USSR Council of Ministers that same day. See "Spravka o sovetskoi pomoshchi PNR v svobodno konvertiruemoi valyute v 1980-1981 gg.," No. 2931 (Top Secret/Special Dossier), 23 September 1982, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 66, D. 9, L. 2. This decision encompassed more than \$4 billion in Soviet loans that were coming due in 1981. On 17 August, the Soviet government publicly announced that it would allow Poland to defer repayment of those loans until 1986. This deferral was the latest in a series of decisions by the Soviet Union in 1980-81 to allow Poland to defer settling its debts to Moscow. Most recently, the Soviet Union and several East European countries, which had been shipping additional

At the same time, Cde. L. I. Brezhnev reminded them that the USSR and other fraternal countries are doing a great deal to help People's Poland get out of its current plight. For our part, we have provided economic aid to Poland of nearly 4 billion dollars in just the last few months.<sup>216</sup> Unfortunately, however, the economic situation in the PPR continues to deteriorate. This has taken its toll on the Polish side's fulfillment of its obligations to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which has had a detrimental effect on our economic working groups who are operating specially in cooperation with the PPR.<sup>217</sup>

During the discussion, Cde. L. I. Brezhnev said with particularly forceful emphasis: All of us now have no greater hope than that socialist Poland will soon eliminate the threat of counterrevolution, recover from its devastating illness, and return to normal life. I want to hope, declared L. I. Brezhnev, that Comrades Kania and Jaruzelski will do everything necessary to achieve these goals. He expressed the desire that the Polish comrades would match their words with deeds. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the PZPR leaders and Communists will always be given firm support. We will always remain allies and brothers in the future.

Comrades S. Kania and W. Jaruzelski thanked the CPSU CC General Secretary for his advice, his thorough analysis of the situation, and his fraternal help. The Polish leaders expressed the view that their course "is a line of seeking agreement, but also a line of struggle." "We will do everything necessary," they declared, "to preserve socialism in Poland."

Among the concrete issues raised by the Polish leaders was a request for us to send to Poland a group of officials from USSR Gosplan headed by Cde. Baibakov.<sup>218</sup> Agreement was

---

food and consumer goods to Poland, had agreed to postpone repayment for those deliveries (worth roughly \$100 million at official exchange rates) until 1989.

<sup>216</sup> Translator's Note: The figure of "\$4 billion in just the last few months" is nearly identical to a figure of \$4.2 billion cited by Polish officials in mid-June 1981 when they were describing the volume of credits extended by the Soviet Union to Poland between August 1980 and June 1981. See "Posiedzenie Rady Panstwa," *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 20-21 June 1981, p. 1. These figures, however, are a good deal higher than the amount mentioned in a secret memorandum compiled by the Soviet Politburo's Commission on Poland in September 1982, which reported that "Soviet assistance to Poland in freely convertible currency in 1980-81" was worth \$2.934 billion. See "Spravka o sovetskoi pomoshchi PNR v svobodno konvertiruemoi valyute v 1980-1981 gg.," Ll. 1-2. One possible explanation of the discrepancy is that the Politburo Commission's memorandum was dealing only with aid provided in hard currency, whereas the figures of \$4 billion and \$4.2 billion encompassed all forms of aid, including subsidies and loans that were left out of the Commission's listings. (Some evidence supporting this notion comes in Document No. 21 below, which records a statement by the head of the Soviet state planning agency, Nikolai Baibakov, that the Soviet Union had provided "a total of 4.4 billion rubles of assistance to Poland." At official exchange rates, this would amount to roughly \$7 billion.) It is also conceivable that variations arose with the exchange rates and the period covered, or that the amounts cited by Brezhnev and the Polish government were overstated.

<sup>217</sup> Translator's Note: This comment echoes countless other complaints about the effect of the crisis on Poland's economic relations with East-bloc countries. See, for example, the comments recorded by Boris Aristov in "Vneshnyaya politika PNR na nyneshnem etape," Ll. 21-34.

<sup>218</sup> Translator's Note: Nikolai Baibakov, the head of the Soviet state planning agency, was a frequent visitor to Poland in 1981 to handle the economic aspects of the crisis and arrangements for Soviet economic aid. At the PZPR Politburo meeting on 18 August 1981 ("Protokol Nr. 3 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 18 sierpnia 1981 r.," p. 456),

reached on this matter. The Polish leaders raised the idea of convening a special session of CMEA to consider measures of joint assistance to Poland. They were told that this matter should be referred to CMEA.<sup>219</sup>

The CPSU CC Politburo completely endorsed the results of Cde. L. I. Brezhnev's discussion with Cdes. S. Kania and W. Jaruzelski. In accordance with the approach to the Polish crisis that has been coordinated with the other fraternal parties, the CPSU regards this new, large-scale political action as a contribution to our common efforts aimed at turning around the situation in Poland to the benefit of socialism.

[Source: SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/202-550]

---

Kania indicated that he wanted to meet with Baibakov to request further economic support and to discuss the possibility of Poland's reentry into the International Monetary Fund. The deputy head of the Polish state planning commission, Stanislaw Dlugosz, traveled to Moscow on 9 September to prepare for Baibakov's visit. Dlugosz sent an encrypted cable back to Warsaw on 10 September reporting that in his initial talks with "Soviet experts" (*eksperci radzieccy*) he had been informed that, beginning in 1982, Soviet trade with Poland would have to be conducted on the basis of a "full balance of payments" (*pełnego zbilansowania płatniczego*), which would mean a "drastic reduction of [Polish] imports from the USSR, declining from 4.4 billion rubles to 2.7 billion rubles, that is, a reduction of 1.7 billion rubles." The effect, he added, would be especially pronounced in "the whole range of goods that are vital for Poland," including oil, natural gas, foodstuffs, and consumer goods. Dlugosz noted that the Soviet authorities had cited economic justifications for the decision (including the need to adjust the balance of payments for all the socialist countries), but had also "emphasized that their position was motivated as well by the intensifying anti-Soviet campaign in Poland." Dlugosz indicated that "a final decision about this matter will be made during Baibakov's visit to Poland," which, he said, would take place on 20-26 September. Quoted from "Szyfrogram Nr. 2634/III z Moskwy," 10 September 1981 (Secret), in CAMSW, Sygn. 228/16, Ss. 1-2. As it turned out, Baibakov's visit to Poland ran from 22 to 26 September. See "Wizyta delegacji ZSRR w Polsce: Polsko-radziecka współpraca gospodarcza," *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 23 September 1981, p. 1; and the subsequent daily reports through "Delegacja radziecka zakonczyła wizyte w Polsce: Kierunki i mozliwosci dalszego wspoldzialania i kooperacji przemyslowej," *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 28 September 1981, pp. 1-2. One crucial thing that had changed between 9 September, when Dlugosz visited Moscow, and 22 September, when Baibakov came to Warsaw, is that the KOK had met on 13 September and approved Jaruzelski's proposal to implement martial law.

<sup>219</sup> **Translator's Note:** No special meeting of the CMEA Council was convened in 1981. The 35th Session of the CMEA Council took place in Sofia the previous month, on 2-4 July. Polish representatives at the meeting had hoped to receive pledges of stepped-up financial support from the other CMEA countries, but their hopes were only partly met. The participants did not agree on any joint program of economic aid for Poland.



Top Secret  
Single Copy  
(Working Notes)

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

10 September 1981

Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin, A. A. Gromyko,  
N. A. Tikhonov, K. U. Chernenko, P. N. Demichev,  
M. S. Solomentsev, I. V. Kapitonov, V. I. Dolgikh,  
M. V. Zimyanin

.....

9. Exchange of Opinions on the Polish Question

BREZHNEV. Yesterday I familiarized myself with the "Appeal to the Peoples of Eastern Europe," which was adopted by the Congress of Polish Solidarity.<sup>220</sup> It's a dangerous and provocative document. It contains few words, but all of them are aimed at the same thing. The authors of the appeal would like to create confusion in the socialist countries and stir up groups of different types of turncoats.

I think we should not restrain ourselves at all in our condemnation of this insolent stunt. How about having collectives from our large enterprises — say, the Kirov factory, the Magnitka, Kamaz, etc. — give a rebuff to these demagogues? No doubt, it will be difficult to ignore letters from them addressed to the Solidarity congress, particularly because we'll feature these letters prominently in our mass media.<sup>221</sup>

---

<sup>220</sup> Translator's Note: The reference here is to "Poslanie do ludzi pracy w Europie Wschodniej," *Tygodnik Solidarnosc* (Warsaw), No. 25 (18 September 1981), p. 6. The appeal, adopted on 8 September by Solidarity's first National Congress, offered support for "workers in Eastern Europe" and "all the nations of the Soviet Union" who were seeking to establish their own independent trade unions. Despite the importance of the statement, there was no debate about it before it was approved.

<sup>221</sup> Translator's Note: This suggestion was promptly implemented. See, for example, "Pis'mo kollektiva rabochikh Moskovskogo avtozavoda im. Likhacheva pol'skim rabochim," *Pravda* (Moscow), 12 September 1981, p. 4; "Pis'mo kollektiva rabochikh Leningradskogo proizvodstvennogo ob"edineniya 'Kirovskii zavod'," *Pravda* (Moscow), 13 September 1981, p. 4; "Pis'mo kollektiva rabochikh kievskogo zavoda 'Arsenal' imeni V. I. Lenina pol'skim rabochim," *Pravda* (Moscow), 19 September 1981, p. 4; "Pis'mo kollektiva rabochikh Manitogorskogo metallurgicheskogo

If the comrades agree, we'll instruct the Polish commission to approach three or four factory collectives and help them, as needed, prepare a rebuff to "Solidarity."

GROMYKO. The situation is getting worse all the time. One might even say that little now remains of the regime. The position of the PZPR CC and the Council of Ministers is diminishing every day. With regard to a face-to-face conversation with Cde. Kania, it's now perhaps not worth speaking with him, since there already was a conversation not long ago.<sup>222</sup>

With regard to leverage from a telephone conversation, that should be pursued, since it is a good way of exerting pressure.

BREZHNEV. To be frank, I myself don't have any great desire to speak right now with Cde. Kania, since nothing will come of it.

CHERNENKO. Conversations were held earlier, sound instructions were issued, and a discussion was held in the Kremlin. But to what end? Cdes. Kania and Jaruzelski are doing everything as they please.

GRISHIN. Now they themselves no longer deny that they are relinquishing one position after another.

ZIMYANIN. I want to tell the Politburo what sorts of publications are planned in connection with the Solidarity congress.<sup>223</sup> We will say that the congress demonstrates a

---

kombinata imeni V. I. Lenina pol'skim rabochim," *Pravda* (Moscow), 24 September 1981, p. 4; and "Pis'mo kollektiva rabochikh moskovskogo zavoda 'Serp i molot' pol'skim rabochim," *Pravda* (Moscow), 22 September 1981, p. 4. These letters, supposedly written by collectives of Soviet workers, were actually composed by the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department. Because Solidarity's "Appeal to the Working-Class People of Eastern Europe" was never published or broadcast in the Soviet Union, it would have been impossible for ordinary workers to have drafted letters of their own referring to it (if they had been so inclined). This consideration, however, was of little importance in the large-scale propaganda effort that unfolded.

<sup>222</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev's final face-to-face meeting with Kania was in the Crimea on 14 August 1981 (see Document No. 16 *supra*). Gromyko, too, met with Kania and Jaruzelski in the Crimea. (Gromyko also had met with them in Poland six weeks earlier, on 3-4 July.) Presumably, Gromyko is referring here to a phone conversation that Brezhnev had with Kania on 3 September.

<sup>223</sup> Translator's Note: These materials were prepared jointly by the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department and the CPSU Central Committee Department for Ties with Communist and Workers' Parties of Socialist Countries. Solidarity's Congress was divided into two parts, the first of which (5-10 September 1981) ended on the day of this CPSU Politburo meeting. The second part lasted from 26 September until 7 October. Groups of PZPR regional officials were sent to the Soviet Union shortly before, during, and after each round of the Congress to receive briefings on the need for "harsh measures against the enemies of Poland." See "Tsentralny'nyi Komitet Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soyuz," Memorandum No. 245s (Secret) from V. Mikulich, first secretary of the Minsk oblast party committee, 28 August 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 85, Ll. 16-18; "Informatsiya o poseshchenii Cherkasskoi oblasti gruppoi partiinykh rabotnikov Pil'skogo voevodskogo komiteta PORP," Memorandum No. 4-2/561 (Top Secret), from I. Lutak, first secretary of the Cherkassk obast party committee, 9 October 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 85, Ll. 44-47; "Informatsiya o prebyvanii v Kostromskoi oblasti delegatsii Petrkovskogo voevodskogo komiteta PORP," Memorandum No. 707/2 (Secret), from Yu. Balandin, first secretary of the Kostroma oblast committee, 13 November 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 85, Ll. 165-169; and "Otchet o rabote Yaroslavskogo obkoma KPSS po

further worsening of the situation in Poland. As you know, they appealed to the parliaments and peoples of certain countries, including the socialist countries, with their program of “renewal.”<sup>224</sup> Hence, our press and TASS are now preparing appropriate materials in response. These materials will expose the activities of the Solidarity trade union. I fully support the proposal by Leonid Il'ich to have the collectives of major large enterprises offer statements. This, too, we will try to prepare.

TIKHONOV. Nonetheless we will still need to react — and by that I mean react concretely — to the stunts of hooligan elements now active in Poland, whom the government has not taken any measures to combat.<sup>225</sup> What's going on there now is that they're defacing the monuments to our soldiers, they're drawing hostile cartoons of the leaders of our Party and government, they're insulting the Soviet Union in every possible manner, etc. In other words, they're mocking us. It seems to me that we can't remain silent any longer, and that we must, either along state lines or through some other channel, issue a protest to the Polish government about this. A failure to react, in my view, would be unacceptable.

GROMYKO. We must think this over carefully. We're talking here about a country that is friendly to us.

GORBACHEV. I believe that Leonid Il'ich was completely right in proposing that the collectives of large enterprises speak out and that the activities of Solidarity be exposed in our press.

GRISHIN. Both in “Pravda” and in other newspapers we must organize statements of this sort. We will do what is needed for collectives at “Zil,” “Serp i Molot,” and other large factories to issue statements.<sup>226</sup>

BREZHNEV. I think we should instruct the USSR Foreign Ministry and the CC Department to prepare a draft for presentation to the government of the Polish republic about the hooliganistic stunts of Solidarity officials against the Soviet Union.<sup>227</sup> Simultaneously, as

---

osushchestvleniyu druzhestvennykh svyazei s Brashovskoi uezdnoi organizatsii RKP i Radomskoi voevodskoi organizatsii PORP v 1980-1981 godakh,” Memorandum No. 0774 (Secret) from V. Gorulev, first secretary of the CPSU's Yaroslavl oblast committee, 27 October 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 85, Ll. 302-306.

<sup>224</sup> Translator's Note: See “Uchwala programowa I Krajowego Zjazdu NSZZ ‘Solidarnosc’,” *Tygodnik Solidarnosc* (Warsaw), Vol. 1, No. 26 (25 September 1981), pp. 3, 6.

<sup>225</sup> Translator's Note: This was not entirely true. Two weeks earlier, on 25-26 August, the Polish authorities had finally decided it was time to proceed with the publication, at KGB printing facilities in the Soviet Union, of “announcements concerning the introduction of martial law” in Poland. Quoted from “Notatka z 27 VIII 1981 r.,” 27 August 1981 (Top Secret), in CAMSW, Sygn. 2304/IV. The printing of these announcements was to be completed by 4 September to allow ample time for them to be transported back to Poland. The reason the announcements were printed in the Soviet Union rather than Poland is that the use of printing presses in Poland would have risked leaks by sympathetic workers to Solidarity.

<sup>226</sup> Translator's Note: See the items adduced above in my first annotation to this document.

<sup>227</sup> Translator's Note: This letter was presented to Kania and Jaruzelski a week later by the Soviet ambassador in Poland, Boris Aristov. See “Oswiadczenie KC KPZR i rządu ZSRR przedstawione kierownictwu KC PZPR i rządu PRL,” *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 18 September 1981, p. 1. See also “Protiv antisovetizma v Pol'she,” *Pravda* (Moscow), 19 September 1981, p. 4. Aristov had met with Kania on 10 September as well—see “St. Kania przyjal

the comrades here already mentioned, we should feature a series of items in the press exposing the activities of Solidarity and the decisions of its Congress.<sup>228</sup>

[Source: *TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 46*]

---

ambasadora ZSRR w Polsce," *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 11 September 1981, p. 1—and this has led some Western scholars astray. Nicholas G. Andrews, for example, erroneously claims, in *Poland 1980-81: Solidarity versus the Party* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1985), p. 290, that the Soviet letter was presented to Kania and Jaruzelski on 10 September. Aristov actually gave it to them on 17 September.

<sup>228</sup> Translator's Note: These articles began appearing the very next day. See "Gdan'skii s"ezd — antisotsialisticheskoe sborishche," *Pravda* (Moscow), 11 September 1981, p. 5.

TOP SECRET

INFORMATION ABOUT Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV'S TELEPHONE  
CONVERSATION WITH Cde. S. KANIA<sup>229</sup>

“Hello, Stanislaw! They told me that you want to speak with me. Please go ahead.”

(After S. Kania's information)<sup>230</sup>

“I listened to your remarks. It seems to me that you're still under the sway of certain illusions.

“I discussed the situation in Poland with you and Wojciech in the Crimea roughly a month ago. At that point there was already more than enough basis for disquiet. Since then, in our view, the situation has become even more alarming. I'll say this candidly: you should wake up again and think about who is controlling the situation in Poland. Has the fulcrum of power there already changed? The leaders of Solidarity are acting so brazenly that you cannot help but ask yourself this question.

“Solidarity's congress and the whole atmosphere around it attest that Solidarity openly aspires to the role of a political party, a party with an anti-Communist bent.<sup>231</sup> The results of the first round of the Congress, in our view, amounted to a declaration of war against the PZPR and the socialist regime.

“Of course this in no way was a congress of workers. Even according to Solidarity's own information, only 25 percent of the delegates were workers. More than a quarter of the delegates were representatives of the counterrevolutionary organizations KSS-KOR and Confederation for an Independent Poland. And it was not the interests of the working class that preoccupied the participants in this gathering. Instead they focused on how to humiliate the PZPR and the government and force them to their knees.

---

<sup>229</sup> Translator's Note: This document from the former East German party archives provides only Brezhnev's side of the conversation, which took place on 11 September 1981. For informational purposes, the transcript of Brezhnev's remarks was distributed to Erich Honecker and other East European leaders. Presumably, a full transcript of the conversation (with Kania's comments included) exists in the Russian Presidential Archive, but if so, it has not yet been released. The document given to Honecker is undated, but a handwritten notation by the East German leader in the upper right-hand corner of the first page gives the date of 15 September 1981. For Kania's recollection of this phone conversation, see Kania, *Zatrzymac konfrontacje* (Warsaw: BGW, 1992), pp. 221-224.

<sup>230</sup> Translator's Note: This appears in the original.

<sup>231</sup> Translator's Note: The first phase of Solidarity's Congress had been adjourned a few days earlier, on 10 September.

“At the Congress, as you know, the question was raised about possibly removing from Solidarity's statutes the provisions about the leading role of the party and recognition of Poland's international alliances.<sup>232</sup> These are provisions in your Constitution. This means that attacks have begun against the constitutional bases of society.

“Solidarity has decided not to confine itself solely to Poland. It is attempting to impose its subversive ideas on neighboring states and to interfere in their internal affairs. That's the only way one can view the 'Appeal to the Peoples of Eastern Europe,' which was adopted by Solidarity's Congress.<sup>233</sup> There aren't many words in that document, but they all make the same point. The authors of the document would like to foment disturbances in the socialist countries and stir up groups of various renegades. I don't know what you've decided to do about this provocative escapade, but we believe it is essential to give it the rebuff it deserves.

“Solidarity is not limiting itself to slogans and appeals. It is in fact making preparations, including military preparations, to seize power. According to reports filtering in from the West, Solidarity is creating 'combat groups,' whose task is to terrorize Communists and patriots.<sup>234</sup> This is just what fascists do in creating brigades of stormtroopers. According to the same reports, Solidarity is initiating courses for new draftees in the Polish Army. How can this be tolerated? If fresh troops come in imbued with anti-socialist and anti-Soviet preconceptions, you might quickly find that the army disintegrates.<sup>235</sup>

---

<sup>232</sup> Translator's Note: These provisions, which had been included in the Gdansk accords, were among the chief issues at stake during the two-week "registration crisis" in late October and early November 1980. (For background, see my annotation in Document No. 2 above.) Under the Polish Supreme Court's ruling of 10 November 1980, the two provisions were included in an appendix to Solidarity's statutes. No final decision was made during the first round of Solidarity's Congress (in September 1981) on whether to amend the statutes by deleting the provisions in the appendix.

<sup>233</sup> Translator's Note: This again is a reference to "Poslanie do ludzi pracy w Europie Wschodniej," *Tygodnik Solidarnosc* (Warsaw), No. 25 (18 September 1981), p. 6. See my first annotation in Document No. 17 supra.

<sup>234</sup> Translator's Note: A senior U.S. intelligence official who was responsible for tracking the Soviet Union and Poland in 1980-81 (and who later became director of the CIA), Robert Gates, disclosed in his memoirs that as early as April 1981 the "CIA learned . . . that the [Polish] regime [had] received information that Solidarity 'extremist elements' had begun to prepare for a violent confrontation with the government—preparing Molotov cocktails and planning the occupation of government buildings and destruction of Communist Party offices around the country." See Gates, *From the Shadows*, p. 232. It turned out, however, that almost all the information the PZPR had received was fabricated by hardliners at the Polish MSW. During the martial law crackdown in December 1981, only two people were arrested for possessing illegal firearms. General Kiszczak urged his subordinates to "exploit this arrest immediately for propaganda purposes, perhaps by featuring it in the next edition of the television news." Similarly, on 13 December 1981, the first day under martial, Jaruzelski told the PZPR Politburo that "we must demonstrate that our decisions were right. By exploiting the materials we seized, we should underscore what we managed to avoid—a mortal danger was averted at the last moment." Despite these exhortations, no armed resistance groups were found to exist. For Kiszczak's comments, see "Posiedzenie Kierownictwa MSW, 17.XII.1981 r.," in CAMSW, Sygn. 251/1; for Jaruzelski's remarks, see "Protokol Nr. 19 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR w dniu 13.XII.1981 r.," Ss. 8-9.

<sup>235</sup> Translator's Note: Soviet concern about the potential unreliability of the Polish army had existed since the fall of 1980, but those concerns grew as the time for the induction of new draftees approached. Brezhnev's statement provides important evidence that Soviet leaders urged Kania and Jaruzelski to defer the call-up until after martial law had been imposed. Jaruzelski heeded this suggestion in late October 1981, when he extended the term of duty of existing conscripts by two months, until late December 1981. That was long enough for the martial law operation to be implemented without any fresh recruits.

“One position after another is being transferred to Solidarity's control. The legitimately appointed directors of enterprises are being removed without any prior arrangement. Solidarity is calling the shots at more than half of the large factories and is creating there what it calls 'organs of self-management.’<sup>236</sup>

“In rural areas there have been instances of the unauthorized seizure of state and cooperative farmland by private peasants.<sup>237</sup> Solidarity reacted viciously when the mass media featured criticism of its actions, and they are now seeking to take complete control of the media.

“It is painful to speak about the frenzy of anti-Sovietism that has now engulfed Poland. How can you let this go unpunished? How can you tolerate instances of psychological and physical terror against Communists and all others who want to work honestly? As an ultimatum, the opposition continually demands that the elections to the Sejm and the People's Councils be moved up.<sup>238</sup> Their ultimate goal is, through 'peaceful means,' to destroy the economic and political foundations of the socialist order.

“I will not refer to many other things, which are no less alarming. These things must be at least as well known to you as they are to us. It is understandable why at the recent plenums, including the third, many members of the newly formed Central Committee were speaking with great alarm about the situation.<sup>239</sup> They demanded not only bold words but decisive actions from the PZPR leadership.

“Their concerns are understandable. The impudent leaders of Solidarity openly declare that their organization is already the leading force in society.

“In general, everything suggests that the counterrevolution is seizing power from the PZPR.

“In the Crimea, you, Stanislaw, and Jaruzelski said that 'you are constantly determined to use the most decisive measures against the counterrevolution.’<sup>240</sup> But just where are these measures?

“You also said that you have an appropriate plan to introduce emergency or military rule.

---

<sup>236</sup> Translator's Note: This statement is largely accurate, though the process at this stage was still quite rudimentary. Under a compromise worked out by the government and Solidarity over the next several weeks, the workers' councils at most enterprises were given a much greater role in their own firms' management.

<sup>237</sup> Translator's Note: The Russian word *edinolichniki* is translated here as "private peasants," but if applied to the Soviet Union it would be better translated as "individual peasants." In Poland the overwhelming share of agriculture had been private since 1956, whereas in the Soviet Union there was no private farming aside from minuscule private plots permitted for individuals.

<sup>238</sup> Translator's Note: See my annotation about Solidarity's electoral demands in Document No. 16 *supra*.

<sup>239</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev is referring here to two recent plenums of the PZPR Central Committee that followed the 9th PZPR Congress: the 2nd Plenum on 11-12 August 1981 and the 3rd Plenum on 2-3 September.

<sup>240</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev is referring to the meetings he had with Kania and Jaruzelski in Crimea on 14 August 1981. See Document No. 16 *supra*.

When will even a part of this plan finally be implemented?<sup>241</sup>

“The growing activity and energy of the anti-socialist forces in the country are in stark contrast to the way the leaders of the party and government are behaving. How can you permit this?

“We request that you inform us, the leadership of a fraternal party, the CPSU, what you intend to do.

“In practical terms, we have nothing to add to the recommendations we already provided to you about how to get out of the crisis, including the recommendations in the letter of 5 June and during the meeting in the Crimea on 14 August.<sup>242</sup> These recommendations and advice remain in force.

“Both then and now we have been convinced that if you do nothing to offset the appeals of the insolent Solidarity, you will open the way to counterrevolution.<sup>243</sup> In our view, it is essential not to delay any further in gearing up the party for a decisive and uncompromising struggle against the counterrevolution. And when the very fate of socialism is at stake, you can't limit yourself to only one form or another of struggle.

“I believe it is important to emphasize, once again, that in today's complicated world situation, the course of events in Poland is forcing the socialist commonwealth to confront the ever thornier question of how to maintain security in the center of Europe. If Poland is ruled by Solidarity, who will guarantee the inviolability of the commonwealth's vital lines of communication that pass through the PPR, including strategic lines of communication?<sup>244</sup> How could we, the participants in the Warsaw Pact, ensure the preservation of the results of the Second World War, which were codified in well-known political and international legal

---

<sup>241</sup> Translator's Note: On 13 September, just two days after this phone conversation, Jaruzelski convened a fateful meeting of Poland's Homeland Defense Committee. The KOK, chaired by Jaruzelski, voted to approve the plans for martial law, though it did not set a specific date. Handwritten notes from that meeting, compiled by General Tadeusz Tuczapski, the secretary of KOK, were recently unearthed at the Polish military archive. See "Protokol No. 002/81 posiedzenia Komitetu Obrony Kraju z dnia wrzesnia 1981 r." 13 September 1981, in Centralne Archiwum Wojskowe (CAW), Materiały z posiedzen KOK, Tezka Sygn. 48. These notes are the only official record of the meeting. All other participants were prohibited from taking notes.

<sup>242</sup> Translator's Note: See Documents No. 15 and 16.

<sup>243</sup> Translator's Note: On 16 September, less than a week after this CPSU Politburo meeting, the PZPR Politburo approved a statement denouncing Solidarity's Congress. The statement was adapted for the official Polish press, which published it the following day. See "Oswiadczenie Biura Politycznego KC PZPR z 16 wrzesnia 1981 r.," 16 September 1981 (Secret), in CAMSW, Sygn. 228/16, Ss. 0034-0036.

<sup>244</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev's comments here and in the next paragraph, reflecting vehement alarm at the prospect that Solidarity might come to power in Poland, shed interesting light on statements by Yuri Andropov at the 10 December 1981 meeting of the CPSU Politburo, translated in Document No. 21 below. At that meeting, Andropov claimed that the Soviet Union must "not send in troops . . . even if Poland falls under the control of Solidarity." At the same time, Andropov did concede that the Soviet Union had to "do something to protect the lines of communication between the USSR and the GDR." Brezhnev, for his part, seemed to have little doubt that the lines of communication could not be safeguarded if Solidarity came to power. Hence, Andropov's statement may not be as much of an anomaly as it seems. So long as no final decision had to be taken, it was relatively easy to talk in the abstract about what the Soviet Union might do if Solidarity took power.



documents?<sup>245</sup>

“I want to emphasize, once again, Stanislaw, that the fate of socialism in Poland and the outcome of the political struggle in your country profoundly affect all the fraternal countries.

“In the emerging situation, on behalf of our Politburo, I request that the PZPR CC leadership respond to us about the matters I have raised, so that we can have a clear idea about your plan of action at least for the near future.

“What you have said is of definite interest [to me], but it does not change the general picture. I request that you pay greater heed to what I have reported to you today.”<sup>246</sup>

[Source: SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/202-550]

---

<sup>245</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev is referring here to bilateral Soviet-Polish agreements, the series of treaties concerning the two German states that were concluded in the early 1970s, and the Helsinki Accords (the Final Act on Security and Cooperation in Europe) signed in 1975.

<sup>246</sup> Translator's Note: On this note, the document ends.

Top Secret  
Single Copy  
(Working Notes)

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

17 September 1981

Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. M. S. Gorbachev, V. V. Grishin, M. A. Suslov,  
N. A. Tikhonov, D. F. Ustinov, P. N. Demichev,  
B. N. Ponomarev, M. S. Solomentsev, I. V. Kapitonov,  
V. I. Dolgikh, M. V. Zimyanin, K. V. Rusakov

.....

8. Telegram from the Soviet Ambassador in Berlin on 15 September 1981  
(Special No. 598)

BREZHNEV. After my telephone conversation with Cde. Kania on 11 September 1981, which we arranged at the previous session of the Politburo, I sent information about it to our ambassadors so that they could inform Cdes. Honecker, Kadar, Zhivkov, and Husak.<sup>247</sup>

The ambassadors performed this task and reported the results. The leaders of the fraternal parties fully and entirely agreed with what was said to Cde. Kania during the phone conversation, and they believe that Cde. Kania is displaying unacceptable liberalism and that we must apply strong pressure on him.<sup>248</sup>

---

<sup>247</sup> Translator's Note: For a transcript of Brezhnev's side of this phone conversation, which was distributed to the leaders of the East German, Hungarian, Czechoslovak, and Bulgarian Communist parties, see Document No. 18 *supra*. The phone call occurred two days before the KOK unanimously endorsed the plans for martial law at Jaruzelski's behest.

<sup>248</sup> Translator's Note: The East European leaders themselves conveyed this message directly to Kania. Even Janos Kadar, who had generally taken a less extreme position than his East German, Czechoslovak, and Bulgarian counterparts had, sent a pointed letter to the PZPR Central Committee on 17 September expressing alarm about the Polish leadership's failure to rebuff "the counterrevolutionary forces in Poland who are acting against the Polish working class and the vital national interests of the Polish people, and who are seeking to weaken our friendly relations, our multilateral cooperation, and our alliance system. Their continued activity will have a profound influence on the security of the entire commonwealth of socialist states. It is in our vital national interest, and the vital national interests of all European states, that Poland not become a flashpoint for international tension." These last remarks alluded to the possibility of joint military action. See "A Lengyel Egyesult Munkaspart Kozponti Vezetosege," No. 434 (Top Secret), from Janos Kadar, 17 September 1981, in Magyar Orszagos Leveltar, 288, F. 11/4400, o.e.

In a discussion with Cde. Abrasimov which, as you know, was described in a telegram, Cde. Honecker put forth the following proposal: to have the leaders of the fraternal parties assemble in Moscow and invite Cde. Kania, and then say to him that he has agreed to step down and that the proposed successor to him as PZPR CC First Secretary is Cde. Olszowski.<sup>249</sup>

In connection with this I would like to recommend what our stance should be. Of course, it is difficult for us at the moment to arrive at a simple decision on this matter. We don't yet know the opinion of the other comrades, the leaders of the other socialist countries. We need to think carefully about all of this.

Perhaps we should instruct the USSR Foreign Ministry, the Ministry of Defense, and the CC Department to examine the questions laid out in the telegram and, taking account of the exchange of opinions in the Politburo, to prepare and submit appropriate recommendations to the CC.

If there are no objections, then perhaps we'll adopt this motion.

The members of the Politburo and candidate members of the Politburo say that Leonid Il'ich's proposal is absolutely correct and should be adopted, except that the KGB should be included among the agencies instructed to examine these questions.

The proposal is adopted.

[Source: *TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 47*]

---

<sup>249</sup> Translator's Note: Pyotr Abrasimov, the Soviet ambassador in East Germany, met with Honecker on 15 September 1981. Honecker recounted the discussion later that day at a session of the SED Politburo; see "Protokoll Nr. 21/81 der Sitzung des Politburos des ZK der SED vom 15. September 1981," 15 September 1981 (Top Secret), in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/2-1910, Bl. 1-2.

Top Secret  
Single Copy  
(Working Notes)

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

29 October 1981

Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV presiding.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, M. S. Gorbachev, A. A. Gromyko,  
A. P. Kirilenko, A. Ya. Pel'she, M. A. Suslov,  
D. F. Ustinov, K. U. Chernenko, P. N. Demichev,  
V. V. Kuznetsov, B. N. Ponomarev, I. V. Kapitonov,  
M. V. Zimyanin, K. V. Rusakov

.....

2. On the Results of Cde. K. V. Rusakov's Trip to the GDR, Czechoslovakia,  
Hungary, and Bulgaria

BREZHNEV. It's known to all those here that at the instruction of the CPSU CC Politburo, Cde. Rusakov traveled to the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria to inform our friends about several matters, in particular about the measures we have adopted and will be adopting in connection with the Polish events.

Cde. Rusakov completed his travel to these countries and informed the Politburo about the results of the trip in a note, which you now have.<sup>250</sup>

Perhaps Konstantin Viktorovich has something to add to what he has written in the note. If so, then by all means.

RUSAKOV. I spoke with the leaders of the four fraternal states, as I was instructed by the Politburo. The negotiations concerned two matters: The first was the question of Poland. The note describes in detail my discussions with the leaders of the fraternal countries on the Polish question. I can attest that all the leaders of the fraternal parties are in complete agreement with us on the measures we have adopted toward Poland, and also toward the

---

<sup>250</sup> Translator's Note: A draft of the report is stored in the former CPSU Central Committee General Department archive, "TsK KPSS: Spravka ob itogakh poezdki v ChSSR, VNR, BNR, i GDR," 27 October 1981 (Top Secret), from K. V. Rusakov to the CPSU Politburo, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 603, Ll. 117-126.

situation now unfolding in Poland. In short, I can say that on this point there is complete unity of views.

During the negotiations, the leaders of the fraternal countries also raised economic questions. Chief among these was the question about reducing supplies of energy, above all oil.<sup>251</sup> Although Cdes. Kadar, Husak, and Zhivkov said that this would be difficult for them, all of them reacted with understanding to our proposal and our request, and said that they will find a way to cope with the situation and go along with what we proposed. To ensure that the matter was fully clarified, I asked each of the comrades the following question: Can I report to the Politburo that you agree with the point of view I expressed? The comrades responded that, yes, I could say that.

My conversation with Cde. Honecker, though, was different.<sup>252</sup> He immediately said that the GDR could not accept such a reduction in the supply of oil, that this would cause serious damage to the national economy and the GDR as a whole, that this would strike a heavy blow at the GDR's economy, and that we shouldn't proceed with it. He even declared that they simply cannot put up with it, and requested a written response from Cde. Brezhnev to two letters that they sent. Thus, the question proved to be very contentious, and it essentially was left unresolved. Cde. Honecker again cited as evidence the fact that they were supplying us with bismuth<sup>253</sup> and uranium, that they are providing upkeep for the Group of [Soviet] Forces, and that matters are especially complicated for them because the Polish People's Republic is not supplying the coal that we [East Germans] need. According to Honecker, this has led to a sharp decline in the living standards of the German population, and we [East Germans] don't know how we should explain it. They will have to reexamine all the preliminary drafts of their five-year plan.

BREZHNEV. I think we should approve the discussions that Cde. Rusakov had with Cdes. Honecker, Husak, Kadar, and Zhivkov. In our practical work in the future we should take account of the ideas expressed by the comrades about the Polish question.

---

<sup>251</sup> Translator's Note: On 28 November 1980, the CPSU Politburo decided (in P227/21) to reduce oil shipments to Hungary, Bulgaria, the GDR, and Czechoslovakia in order to provide at least 465 million dollars' worth of additional aid to Poland. See "Spravka o sovetsskoi pomoshchi PNR v svobodno konvertiruemoi valyute v 1980-1981 gg.," L. 2. In 1982 the Soviet Union imposed a further 10 percent across-the-board reduction in its deliveries of energy supplies to CMEA countries at intra-CMEA prices. (Intra-CMEA prices were based on a five-year sliding scale of world prices.) This latter cut was motivated primarily by a desire to earn increased hard currency from exports to Western countries, which grew by roughly 40 percent in 1982. For an analysis of the considerations that led to this abrupt change in Soviet-East European energy relations, see John P. Hardt, "Soviet Energy Policy in Eastern Europe," in Sarah Meiklejohn Terry, ed., *Soviet Policy in Eastern Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), pp. 189-220.

<sup>252</sup> Translator's Note: For the top-secret East German transcript of this discussion, see "Niederschrift uber das Gesprach des Generalsekretars des ZK der SED, Genossen Erich Honecker, mit dem Sekretar des ZK der KPdSU, Genossen Konstantin Viktorovic Rusakov, am 21. Oktober 1981," in SAPMDB, ZPA, J IV 2/2/A-2431; reprinted in Wilke *et al.*, eds., *Hart und kompromisslos durchgreifen*, pp. 377-382.

<sup>253</sup> Translator's Note: The transcript gives the Russian word "vismut" here, which would be translated in English as bismuth. However, it is possible that some confusion arose on the part of either the stenographer or Rusakov, and that Honecker actually had been referring to Wismut, the huge uranium mining complex in the Thuringian and Saxony regions of East Germany, which had been a vital source of uranium for the Soviet Union since the mid-1940s. The Wismut complex remained in operation until Germany was reunified in 1990.

As you know, we decided to reduce the supply of oil to our friends. All of them believed this would be onerous for them, and even now Cde. Honecker, for example, as you can see, is awaiting a response to the letters he sent us. The others are not awaiting a response, but deep down they naturally are hoping that we will somehow change our decision.

Perhaps it would be worthwhile at the next meeting with our friends to say, somehow, on this matter that we will be taking all measures needed to fulfill and overfulfill the plan on oil, and that we hope we will succeed. If so, we could make adjustments in the planned deliveries of energy supplies, though we should say this of course without letting them think that we are now backing away from our decision.

Obviously, Cde. Tikhonov must again closely examine this question and, if the slightest opportunity arises to alleviate matters, he should submit appropriate recommendations to the CC.

GROMYKO. With regard to Poland, I would like to say that I just had a conversation with the ambassador, Cde. Aristov. He informed me that the one-hour strike was highly instructive.<sup>254</sup> At many enterprises Solidarity has essentially taken over. Even those who want to work are unable to do so, because the Solidarity extremists are preventing them from working, threatening them in all possible ways, etc.

With regard to the plenum, Cde. Aristov reported that it proceeded normally and that they chose two additional Secretaries.<sup>255</sup> At the Sejm, which opens on 30 October, they will be considering limitations on strikes. What this law will consist of is still difficult to say, but in any event at least attempts are being made to limit strikes by means of the law.<sup>256</sup> Cde.

---

<sup>254</sup> Translator's Note: The one-hour strike to which Gromyko is referring was held on 28 October, the day before this CPSU Politburo meeting. In September and October, differences between Solidarity and the government had been growing on a number of issues, especially on the question of food supplies and public control over economic activities. When the government declined to hold meaningful negotiations to resolve these differences, Solidarity's National Commission voted on 23 October to hold a one-hour strike on the 28th. The strike was observed all around the country, despite Jaruzelski's claims to the contrary.

<sup>255</sup> Translator's Note: Gromyko is referring to the PZPR Central Committee's Fifth Plenum, held on 27-28 October 1981. This plenum was largely uneventful, voting mainly to continue the policies outlined at the Fourth Plenum ten days earlier. The Fourth Plenum was marked by vehement criticism of the Party leadership, culminating in Kania's decision to step down as First Secretary. Jaruzelski was chosen to succeed Kania by a vote of 180 to 4. In a closing resolution, the Fourth Plenum called for an end to strikes, voiced further criticism of the Party leadership, attacked Solidarity for its alleged violations of earlier agreements, demanded an end to "anti-Soviet propaganda" and a rebuff to antisocialist forces, approved the use of "full constitutional powers" to safeguard vital state interests, and designated several officials to prepare a long-range Party program. All these points were reaffirmed at the Fifth Plenum. The two new Secretaries chosen at the Fifth Plenum were Włodzimierz Mokrzyński (a candidate member of the PZPR Politburo and first secretary of the PZPR's Olsztyn committee) and Marian Orzechowski (from Wrocław University). The plenum also appointed General Florian Siwicki, the chief of the Polish General Staff, to be a candidate member of the PZPR Politburo.

<sup>256</sup> Translator's Note: In a speech to the Sejm on 30 October, Jaruzelski called for an outright ban on strikes and demanded "extraordinary powers" to defend state interests. On neither point did the parliament grant his requests. By a unanimous vote, the Sejm merely adopted a resolution appealing for an end to strikes (but not prohibiting them) and indicating that "further consideration" would be given to legal measures "appropriate to the situation."

Jaruzelski's speech at the plenum, I'd say, wasn't bad.

BREZHNEV. I don't believe that Cde. Jaruzelski did anything constructive. It seems to me that he is not a brave enough man.<sup>257</sup>

ANDROPOV. Jaruzelski essentially has done nothing new, even though a good deal of time has already elapsed. Barcikowski and Kubiak pose a big obstacle within the Politburo.<sup>258</sup>

There were discussions about this and advice was given to remove Barcikowski and Kubiak from the Politburo. However, Jaruzelski effectively refused to take this measure. He explains his inaction by saying that he has no cadres available to replace these people.

There is a good deal of controversy about who will be the premier of Poland.<sup>259</sup>

---

<sup>257</sup> Translator's Note: The complaints voiced at this meeting about Jaruzelski, whose tenure as PZPR First Secretary had barely begun, reflected the growing impatience in Moscow after expectations had been briefly raised by the removal of Kania. A congratulatory telephone call by Brezhnev to Jaruzelski on 19 October made clear that Soviet leaders had supported Jaruzelski for the top party post and expected him to move swiftly in "overcoming the severe ailments that afflict your country" and to "take decisive measures against the counterrevolution." Jaruzelski, for his part, said "I want to tell you [Brezhnev] frankly that I had some inner misgivings about accepting this post and agreed to do so only because I knew that you support me and that you were in favor of this decision. If this had not been so, I never would have agreed to it." Quoted from "Zapis' telefonnogo razgovora tov. L. I. Brezhneva s tov. V. Yaruzel'skim," No. P1942 (Secret), 19 October 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 66, D. 4, Ll. 2-5. A few weeks later, Brezhnev was much more disappointed when he emphasized to Jaruzelski that "we greeted your election as PZPR Central Committee First Secretary with great hope" and had seen "a direct link between the change of the First Secretary and the need for urgent measures to salvage socialism in Poland." Brezhnev said the CPSU Politburo was "aware that, at earlier stages of the struggle against the anti-socialist forces, you [Jaruzelski] were inhibited by the political indecisiveness of the party leadership [i.e., Kania]," and that Soviet officials had thought "this obstacle has finally been eliminated. . . . However, one gets the impression that a turnaround on this matter has not yet been achieved. The anti-socialist forces not only are gaining sway in many large industrial enterprises, but are also continuing to spread their influence among ever wider segments of the population. . . . The direct consequence of this hostile activity is a dangerous increase in anti-Sovietism in Poland." Brezhnev urged Jaruzelski to "resist the entreaties of those who want to continue the bankrupt course of Kania" and warned him "not to make any further concessions to the enemies of socialism." The Soviet leader called, once again, for "decisive actions against the sworn enemies of the people's order [and] an attack against the class enemy." Quoted from "Vypiska iz protokola No. 37 zasedaniya Polibyuro TsK KPSS ot 21 noyabrya 1981 goda: O prieme v SSSR partiino-gosudarstvennoi delegatsii PNR i ustnom poslanii t. Brezhneva L. I. t. V. Yaruzel'skomu," No. P37/21 (Top Secret), 21 November 1981, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 66, D. 5, Ll. 1-6. Hardline members of the PZPR Central Committee were voicing similar criticisms of Jaruzelski at this time. In a conversation with Soviet officials on 28 November 1981, Zdzislaw Drewniowski lamented that "the whole party and the entire nation had expected decisive measures from General W. Jaruzelski. Initially, our enemies feared him. But now it's obvious to everyone that in reality General W. Jaruzelski has turned out not to be a military commander-in-chief. Instead, he is the 'conciliator-in-chief' with the vile class enemies and views all the Polish troubles through the prism of his 'dark glasses.' It is not clear that W. Jaruzelski will firmly press the issue of defending socialism in the PPR. This has prompted our enemies to engage in outrageous actions without letup." Quoted from "O nekotorykh sobytiyakh v Pol'skoi Narodnoi Respublike," Ll. 38-39.

<sup>258</sup> Translator's Note: Soviet leaders had long viewed Barcikowski and Kubiak with suspicion, believing that they were too inclined to seek a compromise with Solidarity. Honecker viewed Kubiak with even greater mistrust, claiming that he was a furtive supporter of KOR.

<sup>259</sup> Translator's Note: For the time being, Jaruzelski was combining the posts of prime minister, PZPR First Secretary, and national defense minister. There were rumors in October 1981 that he might relinquish one or both of his ministerial positions, but those rumors proved to be unfounded. Jaruzelski continued to serve in all three capacities even after he took on additional duties as head of the Military Council for National Salvation (the chief martial-law organ) in December 1981.

Jaruzelski clearly is inclined to go with Olszowski and Rakowski. It's not possible, of course, for both of them to become premiers.

BREZHNEV. Schmidt even in one of the discussions blurted out that a very dangerous situation is emerging in Poland, and that this situation might complicate and affect my visit to the FRG, which might have to be called off.<sup>260</sup>

ANDROPOV. The Polish leaders are talking about military assistance from the fraternal countries. However, we need to adhere firmly to our line — that our troops will not be sent to Poland.

USTINOV. In general one might say that it would be impossible to send our troops to Poland. They, the Poles, are not ready to receive our troops. Right now in Poland a demobilization is under way of those whose terms of service have ended. The demobilized troops are sent home so that they can get their civilian clothes, and then they come back fresh and serve another two months.<sup>261</sup> But at this time they are susceptible to influence from "Solidarity." Jaruzelski, as we know, has organized a number of operational groups consisting of roughly three people each.<sup>262</sup> But these groups so far haven't done anything.

---

<sup>260</sup> Translator's Note: Brezhnev was due to leave for a 4-day trip to West Germany on 22 November. Despite the concerns he expressed here, the visit went off as planned, and it ended up focusing mainly on the prospects for limits on NATO and Warsaw Pact intermediate-range nuclear forces. See the secret report on the visit, distributed to all CPSU organizations in late November 1981, "Ob itogakh vizita General'nogo sekretarya TsK KPSS, Predsedatelya Prezidiuma Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR tovarishcha L. I. Brezhneva v FRG," 26 November 1981 (Secret) and the report prepared for the CPSU Politburo on party members' reactions to the visit, "Ob otklikah trudyashchikhsya na itogi vizita General'nogo sekretarya TsK KPSS, Predsedatelya Prezidiuma Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR tovarishcha L. I. Brezhneva v FRG," No. P2199 (Top Secret), 26 November 1981, as well as Memorandum No. 41189 and 41237 (Secret) from E. Razumov, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, 30 December 1981, all in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 76, Ll. 78-85. For the press coverage, see "Sovmestnoe kommyunike o prebyvanii General'noi Sekretarya TsK KPSS, Predsedatelya Prezidiuma Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR L. I. Brezhneva v Federativnoi Respublike Germanii" and "V interesakh mira i sotrudnichestva," both in *Pravda* (Moscow), 26 November 1981, pp. 1-2 and 2, respectively. See also the front-page coverage in *Pravda* on 24 and 25 November under the rubric "Vizit v Federativnuyu Respubliku Germanii," which made no mention of the Polish crisis.

<sup>261</sup> Translator's Note: This was a special arrangement devised by Jaruzelski in the leadup to martial law. Normally, Polish soldiers were required to serve only two years. But Jaruzelski knew that troops entering the army in the autumn of 1981 would have been exposed to Solidarity's influence for more than a year. Hence, in October 1981 the Polish leader ordered a two-month extension of service for soldiers whose two-year conscription period was about to end. This measure did not eliminate serious doubts about the viability of using conscripts to enforce martial law, but it did prevent a much worse situation from developing in the army and ensured that, at the very least, the army would not obstruct the introduction of martial law.

<sup>262</sup> Translator's Note: Ustinov is referring here to a step taken by Jaruzelski in late October after consulting with other members of the Polish National Defense Ministry's Military Council. Some 2,000 "local operational groups" (*terenowe grupy operacyjne*, or TGO), each consisting of four to six soldiers and non-commissioned officers whose tours of duty had just been extended, were sent to villages and towns around the country, where they established links with official youth organizations, veterans' organizations, and paramilitary units. Their proclaimed tasks were to assess "all negative developments," to "facilitate supply lines between the towns and rural areas," and to "support the mechanism of food shipment." In the process they were supposed to help maintain public order, eliminate waste and bottlenecks, and gather detailed information about local conditions, which proved valuable for the martial law operation. See "Terenowe grupy operacyjne przystapily do pracy," *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 27 October 1981, p. 1. On the Military Council's session, see "Posiedzenie Rady Wojskowej MON," *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 20 October 1981, p. 1. The military operational groups were withdrawn from the countryside in late November, ostensibly having achieved their mission. But shortly



Obviously we need a meeting with the leadership of Poland, in particular with Jaruzelski. But who should take part in the meeting is a different matter.

RUSAKOV. Tomorrow the Sejm opens, where the question will be taken up about granting the government extraordinary powers to decide a number of matters. Jaruzelski, I might add, would like to come to Moscow. In that regard, we must prepare well for it.

BREZHNEV. And who will prepare material for conversations with Jaruzelski?

RUSAKOV. I think the Commission on Poland should be instructed to prepare material for a possible discussion with Jaruzelski, if he so wishes.<sup>263</sup>

BREZHNEV. Did we send to Poland the meat we decided on, and did we tell Jaruzelski about it?

RUSAKOV. We told Jaruzelski about this; he cited a figure of 30 thousand tons.<sup>264</sup>

ARKHIPOV. We will be sending the meat to Poland from our state reserves.

BREZHNEV. Have there been any sorts of improvements in the receipt of meat in the union fund from the republics since I sent out my telegram?

ARKHIPOV. So far, Leonid Il'ich, there have been no improvements at all in the receipt of meat. True, not much time has passed yet. But I've spoken with all the republics and can report that everywhere measures are being taken to permit fulfillment of the planned deliveries of meat to the state. In particular, such measures have been worked out in Estonia, Belorussia, and Kazakhstan. The Ukrainians so far have not issued instructions to the provinces.

---

thereafter, similar groups were sent to large enterprises in urban areas. It is now clear that both sets of operational groups were intended primarily to aid the final preparations for martial law, especially through the gathering of intelligence. See, for example, the comments of General Florian Siwicki, the chief of the Polish General Staff, in "Protokol Nr. 18 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR 5 grudnia 1981 r.," 5 December 1981 (Secret), reprinted in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, p. 555. It is also now clear that Soviet officials had been promoting the deployment of TGOs; see, for example, the top-secret cable from B. Aristov, the Soviet ambassador in Poland, to the CPSU Secretariat, 18 November 1981, transmitting documents pertaining to the TGOs, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 611, Ll. 24-28.

<sup>263</sup> Translator's Note: It turned out that Jaruzelski did not end up coming to Moscow, but an important delegation of Soviet military and KGB officers visited Warsaw on 24-25 November 1981. See "W. Jaruzelski przyjal A. Kulikowa i A. Gribkova," *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 25 November 1981, p. 1. The delegation, headed by Marshal Kulikov and General Gribkov, closely inspected all the documents and preparations for the martial law operation, which had been hastily revised in the wake of Kuklinski's defection to the West on 7 November. The finishing touches were then put on the plans, and the necessary equipment and directives were distributed. By the time Kulikov left Warsaw on 25 November to brief Marshal Ustinov, the martial law crackdown was ready to be implemented.

<sup>264</sup> Translator's Note: Five days later, on 3 November 1981, Soviet and Polish foreign trade officials signed a contract for the prompt delivery of 30,000 tons of beef and pork to Poland. The meat was to be shipped in several installments in November and December. See the further discussion of the promised shipment of 30 thousand tons of meat at the 10 December 1981 meeting of the CPSU Politburo (next document below).

CHERNENKO. But we distributed our telegram to all the provinces in Ukraine.

ARKHIPOV. We'll have further data on Monday, and then we'll report where matters stand.

GORBACHEV. Leonid Il'ich, your telegram played a big role. Above all, the republics and provinces are all seriously considering measures to ensure that the plan is fulfilled. In any event, according to data that we have as a result of telephone conversations with the provincial committees, territorial committees, and CCs of the union-republic Communist Parties, this question is under scrutiny everywhere. On 1 January, we'll provide a report on the collection of meat.

BREZHNEV. I still think that although we gave 30 thousand tons of meat to Poland, our meat will scarcely be of help to the Poles. In any event, there is still no clear indication of what will happen with Poland in the future. Cde. Jaruzelski is not showing any sign of initiative. Perhaps we should prepare for a discussion with him.

As far as the discussions about the supply of oil are concerned, I'm especially worried about the GDR. In general I would say that the socialist countries are taking our proposal hard. Even if they don't say so directly, they are disgruntled about our decision. And some, as Cde. Rusakov indicated in his statement, are openly expressing dissatisfaction. Cde. Honecker is especially dissatisfied. He openly says that this decision is unacceptable for them, and he even is requesting a written response. What sort of decision we'll adopt about this, I simply don't know.

ANDROPOV, SUSLOV, and KIRILENKO say they must agree with what you have just said.

ARKHIPOV. We have further difficulties with fuel. The coal miners will fall short by 30 million tons of coal. How can we make up for it? The oil industry is not going to exceed its plan, which means we'll have to make up for these 30 million tons in some other way. Moreover, we're in need of 1.5 million tons of sugar and will have to buy it, and we also need 800 thousand tons of vegetable oil, which it will be impossible to do without.

As far as the response to Cde. Honecker is concerned, I think the recommendation offered by Cde. Rusakov is correct. We must emphasize that we cannot change the decision we conveyed to Cde. Honecker.

With regard to the delivery of uranium that Cde. Honecker mentioned, this uranium from the GDR does not solve any problems. It consists of only 20 percent of the total quantity of uranium we use.<sup>265</sup> Cde. Honecker also neglects to take account of the fact that we are

---

<sup>265</sup> Translator's Note: By the early 1980s the Soviet Union was using 16,000-17,000 metric tons of uranium a year, of which roughly 3,300-3,500 tons came from the GDR. Recent studies, based on newly available materials in the former GDR, suggest that between 1947 and 1990, one-third of the uranium consumed by the Soviet nuclear industry (for both

building nuclear plants for the GDR.<sup>266</sup> This is a big undertaking.

RUSAKOV. I also want to say that the Poles are requesting us to preserve the level of oil and gas we supplied this year.

ARKHIPOV. We're holding negotiations with the Poles about this, and we believe we should base our economic relations with them on the principle of the balancing of plans. Of course that will lead to a significant reduction in the delivery of oil insofar as they do not supply coal and other goods to us.<sup>267</sup> However, if everything is okay, we will set the

---

weapons and power generation) was obtained from the huge Wismut mining complex in the Saxony and Thuringian regions of eastern Germany. The shipment of this uranium was mandated under an agreement signed by the Soviet government and by German authorities in the Soviet Occupation Zone in 1946. (In subsequent years, the agreement was updated and renewed.) In the late 1940s, the fledgling Soviet nuclear weapons industry was heavily dependent on imports of uranium from Czechoslovakia and eastern Germany. Over the next few decades, as domestic production of uranium in the Soviet Union steadily increased, and as additional supplies became available in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Mongolia as well as Czechoslovakia, the share of uranium from the GDR diminished as a percentage of the Soviet Union's total consumption. (In absolute terms, however, the amount from the GDR remained very high. The GDR's share of the total declined only because Soviet consumption increased sharply between the mid-1940s and early 1980s.) Even at the lower level in 1981 of roughly 20 percent of total Soviet consumption, uranium exports from East Germany were of great significance to the Soviet economy. For further information about the Soviet-East German uranium relationship and the Wismut complex, see Reimar Paul, *Das Wismut Erbe: Geschichte und Folgen des Uranbergbaus in Thüringen und Sachsen* (Göttingen: Verlag Die Werkstatt, 1991); Rainer Karlsch, "Der Aufbau der Uranindustrien in der SBZ/DDR und CSR als Folge der sowjetischen 'Uranlucke'," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* (Berlin), Vol. 44, No. 1 (1996), pp. 5-24; Rainer Karlsch, "Ein Staat im Staate': Der Uranbergbau der Wismut AG in Sachsen und Thüringen," *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* (Bonn), No. 49-50/93 (3 December 1993), pp. 14-23; *Seilfahrt—Auf den Spuren des sächsischen Uranerzbergbaus* (Haltern: Bode Verlag, 1990); *Vor Ort—Der Uranerzbergbau in Thüringen* (Haltern: Bode Verlag, 1998); Andreas Heinemann-Gruder, *Die sowjetische Atombombe*, Working Paper No. 40 (Berlin: Berghof-Stiftung für Konfliktforschung, 1990), pp. 50-51; and Thomas B. Cochran, Robert S. Norris, and Oleg A. Bukharin, *Making the Russian Bomb: From Stalin to Yeltsin* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995), pp. 176-178. Two other sources that focus on the early years of the relationship are Norman M. Naimark, *The Russians in Germany: A History of the Soviet Zone of Occupation, 1945-1949* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), pp. 235-250; and Jonathan E. Helmreich, *Gathering Rare Ores: The Diplomacy of Uranium Acquisition, 1943-1954* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 42-75.

<sup>266</sup> Translator's Note: East Germany's nuclear power program, which accounted for 12 percent of the country's electricity in 1981, was based exclusively on Soviet designs and equipment. An initial small reactor had come on line at Rheinsburg in 1966, and another four 400-megawatt reactors were supplied by the Soviet Union for the Bruno Leuschner plant near Griefswald. The Soviet Union also was building two 1,000-megawatt reactors for the GDR at Stendal. (The four 440-megawatt reactors under construction at East Germany's Nord plant in the 1980s were due to be supplied by Czechoslovakia, which was the only CMEA country other than the USSR that was authorized to produce Soviet-designed reactors.) In addition, the GDR was one of several East European countries involved in a joint project to build a massive nuclear power station at Konstantinovka in the western USSR, which would be intended to supply electricity to the states that invested in the project. See Cam Hudson, "CMEA Joint Investments in Soviet Nuclear Power Stations," RAD Background Report No. 11 (Eastern Europe), Radio Free Europe Research, 20 January 1981.

<sup>267</sup> Translator's Note: When the deputy head of the Polish state planning commission, Stanislaw Dlugosz, traveled to Moscow in early September 1981, Soviet officials had made clear to him that they wanted to shift Soviet-Polish economic relations to the "full balancing of payments." (See my penultimate annotation to Document No. 16 *supra*.) This approach, if implemented, would have been similar to the tactics adopted by East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria, which had curtailed their economic ties with Poland after the Poles failed to provide scheduled deliveries of coal. See "Vneshnyaya politika PNR na nyneshnem etape (Politpis'mo)," Report No. 595 (Top Secret), 9 July 1981, from B. Aristov to the CPSU Politburo, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 596, Ll. 21-34. For the Polish economy, however, the Soviet Union was far more important than any of the other CMEA states were. In particular, Soviet energy shipments were critical for Poland. Despite serious constraints on the USSR's own economy, Soviet leaders eventually agreed not to insist on a far-reaching adjustment of the balance of payments for Poland. Soviet oil deliveries to Poland

deliveries at the same volume they are now.

BAIBAKOV. All the socialist countries are trying to feel us out. They're paying close attention to the GDR, watching how we act *vis-a-vis* the GDR. If Honecker succeeds in breaching our resolve, then they, too, will try the same. In any event no one has yet given a written response. I recently spoke with officials from the state planning agencies of all the socialist countries. All of them want to preserve the general quantity of deliveries of oil as planned for coming years. Some propose that other energy sources be substituted for oil.

\* \* \*

A decision is adopted:

1. To approve the discussions held by Cde. K. V. Rusakov with Cdes. Honecker, Husak, Kadar, and Zhivkov.
2. To request the Politburo's Commission on Poland to prepare necessary materials for a possible discussion with Cde. Jaruzelski.
3. To instruct Cdes. Tikhonov, Rusakov, and Baibakov to give additional attention to the question of oil deliveries to these countries, taking account of the exchange of views at the session of the CC Politburo.

[Source: *TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 48*]

---

remained at roughly the same level even after sharp cuts had been implemented in Soviet deliveries to East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria.

SESSION OF THE CPSU CC POLITBURO

10 December 1981

Presided over by Cde. L. I. BREZHNEV.

Also taking part: Cdes. Yu. V. Andropov, V. V. Grishin, A. A. Gromyko, A. P. Kirilenko, A. Ya. Pel'she, M. A. Suslov, D. F. Ustinov, K. U. Chernenko, P. N. Demichev, B. N. Ponomarev, M. S. Solomentsev, I. V. Kapitonov, V. I. Dolgikh, K. V. Rusakov.

1. On the Question of the Situation in Poland

BREZHNEV. This question is not listed on our agenda. But I think that the session of the Politburo should begin with this matter, since we have specially dispatched Cdes. Baibakov and Kulikov to Poland to meet with the Polish comrades and go over certain matters of the utmost urgency.<sup>268</sup> On 8 December, Cde. Kulikov provided us with information about the discussions he held in Warsaw, and yesterday, 9 December, Cde. Baibakov communicated from Warsaw that he had held a discussion with Cde. Jaruzelski. From these meetings and subsequent discussions held by Cde. Baibakov, it is apparent that the Polish comrades hope to receive roughly 1.5 billion dollars' worth of additional supplies and materials from the USSR and other socialist countries in the first quarter of the coming year.<sup>269</sup> This will include iron ore, non-ferrous metals, fertilizer, oil, tires, grain, etc.

---

<sup>268</sup> Translator's Note: For more on Kulikov's role at this point in the crisis, see my article on "Jaruzelski, the Soviet Union, and the Imposition of Martial Law in Poland: New Light on the Mystery of December 1981," in *CWIHP Bulletin 11* (Winter 1998/99).

<sup>269</sup> Translator's Note: In the leadup to martial law, economic considerations were very high on Jaruzelski's agenda. Through various channels, senior Polish officials repeatedly sought assurances from Moscow that Soviet economic aid to Poland would be forthcoming once Solidarity was crushed. Jaruzelski's talks with Soviet leaders earlier in the year certainly could have given him the impression—whether rightly or wrongly—that the two issues were linked. When Gromyko visited Warsaw in early July 1981, he told Kania and Jaruzelski that "the nature of Soviet-Polish economic, political, and other relations will depend on the way things shape up in Poland." Brezhnev used this same formulation when he spoke by phone with Kania on 21 July. (See "Information uber Gespräche des Mitgliedes des Politburos des ZK der KPdSU, Ministers fur Auswartige Angelegenheiten der UdSSR, Gen. A. A. Gromyko mit der Fuhung der PVAP in Warschau am 3.-5. Juli 1981," Bl. 35; and "Vermerk uber ein Telefongesprach des Generalsekretars des ZK der KPdSU, Genossen Leonid Il'ic Breznev, mit dem Ersten Sekretar des ZK der PVAP, Genossen Stanislaw Kania, am 21.7.1981," Bl. 21.) The following month, Brezhnev informed Honecker that the Soviet Union had let Kania and

In making this request, as you see, the Polish comrades are assuming that shipments of goods from the USSR to Poland in 1982 will be maintained at the level of 1981. Cde. Baibakov assured his interlocutors that all their requests would be considered in Moscow.

Perhaps it would behoove us now to instruct Cdes. Tikhonov, Kirilenko, Dolgikh, Skachkov, and Arkhipov to continue studying this matter, taking account of the exchange of opinions, but without waiting for a final agreement.

And now let's hear what Cde. Baibakov has to say.

BAIBAKOV. In accordance with the Politburo's instructions, I traveled to Warsaw. I met there with all the comrades whom it was necessary for me to see about the matters specified in my instructions.

First of all I had a discussion with the deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, Cde. Obodowski. During this discussion, the Polish comrades raised the question of economic assistance. I sent an encrypted cable back here outlining the Polish request.

It's worth noting that the list of goods included in the assistance from us to the PPR comes to 350 items worth some 1.4 billion rubles. This includes such goods as 2 million tons of grain, 25 thousand tons of meat, 625 thousand tons of iron ore, and many other goods. The requests made by the Polish comrades, combined with what we had already been thinking about giving to Poland in 1982, means that our total assistance to the Polish People's Republic will be approximately 4.4 billion rubles.<sup>270</sup>

The time is now approaching when Poland will have to pay for its credits from West European countries. For this, Poland will be required to pay a minimum of 2.8 million rubles'

---

Jaruzelski know that "our own economic situation is very strained, and . . . our willingness to help the Poles [economically] will depend on what [political and military] measures the Polish leaders take." (See "Niederschrift über das Treffen zwischen Genossen L. I. Breznev und Genossen E. Honecker am 3. August 1981 auf der Krim," Bl. 336.) The link between Soviet economic assistance and the Polish authorities' willingness to combat the "intensified anti-Soviet campaign in Poland" was also conveyed during the bilateral trade negotiations in September 1981. (See "Szyfrogram Nr. 2634/III z Moskwy," S. 2.) Jaruzelski thus had ample reason to expect that the successful imposition of martial law in Poland would be rewarded with stepped-up economic aid. To ensure that this would be the case, Jaruzelski raised the issue repeatedly in his talks with Aristov, Kulikov, and Baibakov between the 8th and 12th of December 1981. (See my translation of some of Jaruzelski's contacts with Kulikov in Issue No.11 of the *CWIHP Bulletin*.) Similarly, at the PZPR Politburo meeting on 13 December, hours after martial law had been imposed, Jaruzelski told his colleagues that "I received a phone call from Cde. Brezhnev, who expressed his warm feelings toward us and said we had effectively approached the fight against counterrevolution. . . . I was assured that we could now count on economic aid, a subject I strongly emphasized during the conversation." At Jaruzelski's behest, the PZPR Politburo authorized the Polish foreign minister, Jozef Czyrek, to "draft proposals regarding the economic aid we want to receive from our allies" and to "raise the question of food aid in talks with the allies." (Quoted from "Protokol Nr. 19 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR w dniu 13.XII.1981 r.," Ll. 8-9, 10.) Even if Soviet leaders themselves did not perceive a direct link between martial law and Soviet economic aid, they were well aware (as is evident from some of the comments below, especially those of Andropov) that Jaruzelski was firmly connecting the two.

<sup>270</sup> Translator's Note: On the valuation of Soviet aid to Poland, see my annotation in Document No. 16 *supra*.

worth of hard currency. When I was told by the Polish comrades that they are requesting the amount that all this assistance comes to, I raised the question of how to establish mutual economic ties on a balanced basis. Moreover, I noted that Polish industry is not even coming close to fulfilling its plan. The coal industry, which is the country's basic means of earning hard currency, has been severely disrupted, and remedial measures have not been implemented as strikes continue. And even now, when there are no strikes, the mining of coal remains at a very low level.

Or, for example, let's say that production is going on among the peasantry, with grain, meat products, vegetables, etc. But they aren't giving any of it to the state; they're just playing a waiting game.<sup>271</sup> At the private markets the level of agricultural trade is sufficiently high and is being carried out at very inflated prices.

I said directly to the Polish comrades that they must adopt more decisive measures if such a situation has arisen. Perhaps they can launch something in the nature of a requisitioning of farm produce.<sup>272</sup>

If we speak, for example, about reserves of grain, then Poland this year has accumulated more than 2 million tons. The population is not going hungry. Urban dwellers ride out to the markets and buy up all the products they need. And there are ample supplies of them.

As you know, in accordance with the Politburo's decision and at the request of the Polish

---

<sup>271</sup> Translator's Note: When economic hardships intensified in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Polish farmers were reluctant to sell grain because they suspected—with good reason—that they would not be adequately compensated, and that any money they did receive would be of little use because other goods were so scarce.

<sup>272</sup> Translator's Note: The term that Baibakov uses here, *prodrazverstka* (a contraction of *prodovol'stvennaya razverstka*), refers to the policy introduced in Soviet Russia by Lenin during the period of "War Communism," which forced peasants to turn over their produce to the state. The policy led to great bloodshed, upheaval, and starvation. In Poland, compulsory deliveries of livestock and agricultural produce to the state at highly controlled prices had been in effect for private farmers from the late 1940s until the beginning of the 1970s. The requirements were abolished after Polish workers successfully demanded the repeal of food price increases in late 1970 and early 1971. During the 1980-81 crisis, however, the issue resurfaced. At the PZPR Central Committee's 2nd Plenum on 11-12 August 1981, an ultraconservative member of the PZPR Politburo, Albin Siwak, demanded that private farmers be required to deliver a large fraction of their output to the state at concessionary prices. His comments provoked heated objections from Polish deputy prime minister Janusz Obodowski. At the PZPR Central Committee's Fourth Plenum in mid-October 1981, Siwak and a few other hardline officials again broached the possibility of compelling farmers to sacrifice their output. This proposal won little support within the Central Committee and was temporarily put aside, but it was briefly revived on 13 December 1981, the first day under martial law. At a PZPR Politburo meeting that day, Jaruzelski and another Politburo member, Zofia Grzyb, spoke about "ways to ensure that peasants will bring foodstuffs to purchasing points and will turn over their goods." Although Jaruzelski claimed that "we are not seeking compulsory deliveries," he added that farmers "must sell goods to the state" and should be "warned about the consequences of a reduction in supplies." Quoted from "Protokol Nr. 19 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR w dniu 13.XII.1981 r.," Ss. 1, 10-11. Soviet leaders, for their part, began publicly urging the Polish authorities to adopt "drastic measures" toward the peasantry. On 12 December 1981 the main CPSU newspaper denounced the "resurgence of kulak elements in rural areas [of Poland] who, at the direct behest of Solidarity, are hoarding agricultural output and refusing to sell it to the state even at prices higher than the prevailing level." The paper left no doubt that coercion would be required to prevent the "kulak elements" from "creating a situation of famine in the cities, fomenting mass discontent, and undermining popular trust in the organs of power." See "K polozheniyu v Pol'she," *Pravda* (Moscow), 12 December 1981, p. 4.

comrades, we are providing Poland with an aid shipment of 30 thousand tons of meat.<sup>273</sup> Of these promised 30 thousand tons, 15 thousand have already been shipped abroad. It should be added that the produce, in this case meat, is being delivered in dirty, unsanitary freight cars normally used to transport iron ore, making for an unpleasant sight. When the produce is being transported to the Polish stations, blatant sabotage has been taking place. Poles have been expressing highly obscene comments about the Soviet Union and the Soviet people, they've refused to clean out the freight cars, etc. One could not even begin to keep count of all the insults that have been directed against us.<sup>274</sup>

Viewing the situation from the standpoint of the balance of payments, the Poles want to introduce a moratorium on the payment of their debt to Western countries. If they declare a moratorium, all Polish vessels in the waters of other states or in harbor, and all other Polish property in the countries to which Poland owes debts, will be seized. For this reason the Poles have given instructions to the captains of ships to refrain from entering ports and to stay in neutral waters.

Now I will offer several words about my discussion with Cde. Jaruzelski. He reaffirmed the request made earlier by Obodowski regarding the delivery of goods. Then in the evening I again went to Jaruzelski's office, accompanied by our ambassador and Cde. Kulikov. Also taking part in this discussion were Obodowski and the PZPR CC secretary who handles these matters. Jaruzelski was in a highly agitated state. It seemed that he had been deeply disturbed by the letter from the head of the Polish Catholic Church, Archbishop Glemp, who, as is known, promised to declare a holy war against the Polish authorities.<sup>275</sup> True, Jaruzelski promptly responded that in the event of untoward activities by Solidarity, they will detain all hostile elements.

As far as the party organizations are concerned, they are ruined and inactive in the outlying regions. And with regard to the party as a whole, Jaruzelski said that in essence it no

---

<sup>273</sup> Translator's Note: This figure, originally proposed by Jaruzelski, was cited by Rusakov at the 29 October 1981 meeting of the CPSU Politburo (see Document No. 20 *supra*). An agreement providing for the phased shipment of 30,000 extra tons of beef and pork to Poland by the end of the year was signed on 3 November 1981.

<sup>274</sup> Translator's Note: Baibakov's observations about this matter were fully in accord with information provided by a hardline member of the PZPR Central Committee, Zdzislaw Drewniowski, who told Soviet officials "with consternation" on 28 November 1981 that "under the influence of Solidarity and the clergy, the railroad workers at Medyka station have begun systematically sabotaging the receipt and unloading of shipments from the USSR that are important for Poland. . . . The head of the Medyka station urged the workers to fix up the train cars after iron ore had been unloaded (by sweeping them and closing the lower hatches, as required by the transport equipment). But the workers refused to do this, and some of them cried out: 'Let the Soviet swines (i.e., Soviet workers) themselves take care of this matter if they need to. We don't need Soviet ore.' Earlier in the PPR there had been a wide propaganda effort in support of friendship with the Soviet nation, whereas now one can often hear the Poles use insulting terms like 'Russian bastards,' 'ignoramuses,' and 'scum' to refer to the Soviet peoples." Quoted from "Informatsiya o nekotorykh sobytiyakh v Pol'skoi Narodnoi Respublike," LI. 42-43.

<sup>275</sup> Translator's Note: Archbishop Glemp met with Lech Walesa on 5 December and then, two days later, sent separate letters to Jaruzelski, Walesa, all the deputies in the Sejm, and the National Students' Union. In the letters to Jaruzelski and Walesa, the primate called for the resumption of tripartite (government-Solidarity-Church) talks. In the letters to Sejm deputies, he urged that Jaruzelski not be granted "extraordinary powers." In his letter to the National Students' Union, Glemp called for an end to the recent spate of university strikes. In all four cases, these letters had only a modest impact.



longer exists. The country is being destroyed, and the outlying regions are not receiving any sort of reinforcement, because the Central Committee and government are not giving firm and clear-cut instructions. Jaruzelski himself has been transformed into a man who is extremely neurotic and diffident about his capacity to do anything.

RUSAKOV. Cde. Baibakov has correctly described the situation regarding the Polish economy. What, then, should we be doing now? It seems to me that we should deliver to Poland the goods provided for under the economic agreements, but that these deliveries should not exceed the quantity of goods we delivered in the first quarter of last year.

BREZHNEV. And are we able to give this much now?

BAIBAKOV. Leonid Il'ich, it can be given only by drawing on state reserves or at the expense of deliveries to the internal market.

RUSAKOV. The day before yesterday they had a conference of secretaries from the provincial committees.<sup>276</sup> As Cde. Aristov<sup>277</sup> reported, the secretaries of the provincial committees are completely baffled by Jaruzelski's speech, which did not present a clear, straightforward line. No one knows what will happen over the next few days. There was a conversation about "Operation X." At first, they said it would be on the night of 11-12 December, and then this was changed to the night of the 12th and 13th. And now they're already saying it won't be until around the 20th. What is envisaged is that the chairman of the State Council, Jablonski, will appear on radio and television and declare the introduction of martial law.<sup>278</sup> At the same time, Jaruzelski said that the law on the introduction of martial

---

<sup>276</sup> Translator's Note: The conference of PZPR regional party secretaries on 8 December 1981 was convened to prepare them in the leadup to martial law. See "Protokol z posiedzenia Pierwszych Sekretarzy KW PZPR w dn. 8.XII.1981 r.," 8 December 1981 (Top Secret), in Archiwum Akt Nowych (AAN), Tom (T.) 2260, Dokument (Dok.) 2.

<sup>277</sup> Translator's Note: Either because of a mistake by Rusakov or because of a typographical error, the Russian text gives Aristov's surname as Arestov.

<sup>278</sup> Translator's Note: Actually, it was Jaruzelski who proclaimed a "state of war" (*stan wojenny*) on 13 December in an address broadcast at 6:00 a.m. See "Przemowienie gen. armii W. Jaruzelskiego," *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 14 December 1981, p. 1. The State Council had met during the night of 12-13 December to approve a decree on the imposition of martial law, which ostensibly was designed to counter "a threat to the vital interests of the state and the nation." (Quoted from "Obwieszczenie Rady Panstwa," *ibid.*, pp. 1-2.) The head of the State Council, Henryk Jablonski, told the PZPR Politburo on 13 December that securing approval of the decree had been no easy matter: "Difficulties arose because no draft of the decree on martial law had been prepared, as is the case in every country, and instead had to be worked out. All members of the State Council spoke positively about this matter. But [Ryszard] Reiff did not concur with the proposal to adopt the decree on martial law. [Stanislaw] Marszalek-Mlynczyk was against it. The decree was adopted, but there was no formal vote." Quoted from "Protokol Nr. 19 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR w dniu 13.XII.1981 r.," S. 6. The Council's main decree, officially dated 12 December, suspended a large number of civil rights and liberties formerly guaranteed under the Polish constitution. That decree was supplemented by three other State Council resolutions on (1) Emergency Procedures for Dealing with Crimes and Misdemeanors under Martial Law, (2) Special Powers of Military Courts under Martial Law, and (3) Elimination of Prior Offenses. See "Uchwała Rady Panstwa o wprowadzeniu stanu wojennego," "Dekret o stanie wojennym," "Dekret o przekazaniu do wlasciwosci sadow wojskowych spraw o niektore przestępstwa oraz o zmianie ustroju sadow wojskowych i wojskowych jednostek organizacyjnych Prokuratury PRL w czasie obowiazywania stanu wojennego," "Dekret o postępowaniach szczególnych w sprawach o przestępstwa i wykroczenia w czasie obowiazywania stanu wojennego," "Powszechny akt laski przebaczenia i puszczenia w niepamięć niektórych przestępstw i wkrócen

law can be implemented only after it is considered by the Sejm, and the next session of the Sejm is not scheduled until 15 December.<sup>279</sup> Thus, everything has become very complicated. The agenda of the Sejm has already been published, and it makes no mention of the introduction of martial law. But even if the government does intend to introduce martial law, Solidarity knows this very well and, for its part, has been preparing all necessary measures to cope with that.<sup>280</sup>

Jaruzelski himself says that he intends to deliver an address to the Polish nation. But in his address he won't be speaking about the party. Instead he will appeal to Polish nationalist sentiments. Jaruzelski has talked about the need to proclaim a military dictatorship, of the sort that existed under Pilsudski.<sup>281</sup> He indicated that the Poles will accept this more readily than something else.

As far as officials like Olszowski are concerned, they recently have begun to act more decisively; and one might add that at the session of the Politburo where the decision was made to introduce martial law and adopt more resolute measures against extremist figures in Solidarity, the vote was unanimous and no one expressed a word of opposition.<sup>282</sup> At the

---

popelnionych," all in *Trybuna Ludu* (Warsaw), 14 December 1981 (special issue), pp. 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively. These four initial decrees were reinforced over the next few weeks by a large number of directives, decisions, and resolutions issued by the newly formed Military Council of National Salvation (*Wojskowa rada ocalenia narodowego*, or WRON), which Jaruzelski headed, as well as regulations issued by ministries and departments.

<sup>279</sup> Translator's Note: The next session of the Polish Sejm, as Rusakov notes here, was due to be held on 15 December 1981. However, the PZPR Politburo decided on 13 December to "postpone the session of the PPR Sejm" indefinitely. The postponement was publicly announced the following day. The Politburo also decided on 13 December that the WRON should issue a decree indicating that the provisions of the pending Teachers' Charter (*Karta nauczyciela*) would be implemented on an informal basis until the Charter could be formally adopted by the Sejm. (The Charter was designed to require vetting of teachers, instructors, and professors.) To facilitate the implementation of that decree, the Politburo approved an "extended vacation for schools and institutions of higher learning from 13 December 1981 to 3 January 1982." See "Protokol Nr. 19 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR w dniu 13.XII.1981 r.," S. 8. It turned out that the first session of the Sejm under martial law did not occur until 25-26 January 1982. On 25 January, the Sejm overwhelmingly passed a "Law on Special Legal Guidelines for Martial Law" (*Ustaw o szczególnej regulacji prawnej w okresie stanu wojennego*) which reaffirmed the four State Council decrees dated 12 December 1981 as well as all the other decrees and regulations issued after 12 December by the State Council, the WRON, and other bodies. (One member of the Sejm, Romuald Bukowski, voted against the law, and five abstained.) On 26 January, the Sejm passed the Teachers' Charter. See *Sprawozdanie stenograficzne Sejmu*, 8th Sejm, 3rd Sess., Warsaw, 25 and 26 January 1982.

<sup>280</sup> Translator's Note: Rusakov's comment here reflects a widely shared view in Moscow that all the plans for martial law had been passed on to Solidarity after Ryszard Kuklinski's escape to the West. It was precisely for this reason, according to Gribkov, that "the General Staff of the Polish Armed Forces had to act hurriedly to redo several components of the plans for the introduction of martial law and the implementation directives that were issued to the command staffs and troops." (See Gribkov, "Doktrina Brezhneva' i pol'skii krizis nachala 80-kh godov," p. 49.) Soviet officials tended to overestimate the extent of Solidarity's knowledge of the precise timing of Operation X.

<sup>281</sup> Translator's Note: Marshal Jozef Pilsudski, the legendary commander of Polish Legions in World War I, came to power in a military *coup d'etat* in May 1926. He remained in office until his death in May 1935, presiding over a regime that became increasingly authoritarian.

<sup>282</sup> Translator's Note: This reference to a "unanimous vote" by the PZPR Politburo in favor of martial law—a vote also cited by other Soviet officials below — is misleading. The lengthy meeting of the PZPR Politburo on 5 December 1981, which produced a general consensus in favor of martial law, was the final session of the Polish Politburo before martial law was imposed. Jaruzelski concluded the 5 December meeting by announcing that "at today's session of the Politburo we will not make any final decision" about the timing of martial law. ("Protokol Nr. 18 z posiedzenia Biura

same time, Jaruzelski intends to keep in close touch about this matter with his allies.<sup>283</sup> He says that if the Polish forces are unable to cope with the resistance put up by Solidarity, the Polish comrades hope to receive assistance from other countries, up to and including the introduction of armed forces on the territory of Poland. In expressing this hope, Jaruzelski has been citing remarks by Cde. Kulikov, who supposedly said that the USSR and other socialist countries would indeed give assistance to Poland with their armed forces.<sup>284</sup> However, as far as I know, Cde. Kulikov did not say this directly, but merely repeated the words voiced earlier by L. I. Brezhnev about our determination not to leave Poland in the lurch.

If we consider what is going on in the provinces, one must candidly say that the strength of the party organizations there has been completely dissipated. To a certain degree the administrative apparatus there is still functioning, but in effect all power has now been transferred to the hands of Solidarity. In his recent statements, Jaruzelski is apparently trying to pull the wool over our eyes, because his words fail to reflect a proper analysis. If the Polish comrades don't quickly get organized, prepare themselves, and resist the onslaught of Solidarity, they will have no success at all in improving the situation in Poland.

ANDROPOV. From the discussions with Jaruzelski it is clear that they have not yet

---

Politycznego KC PZPR 5 grudnia 1981 r.," in Wlodek, ed., *Tajne Dokumenty Biura Politycznego*, p. 568.) The question of a timetable was discussed by the Polish Council of Ministers (which Jaruzelski chaired) on 8 December, but no final decision was taken there, either. The final timetable for martial law was unanimously approved by the Polish military High Command, led by Jaruzelski, late in the evening of 9 December. The Russian word that Rusakov uses to describe the "unanimous" vote, *edinoglasno*, is stronger than another word, *edinodushno*, which also is translated as "unanimous." Rusakov's statement indicates that no abstentions or dissenting votes were cast. It should be noted, however, that most of the subsequent speakers (Andropov, Gromyko, etc.) used the word *edinodushno* when referring to the PZPR Politburo's vote, though Ustinov used *edinoglasno*.

<sup>283</sup> Translator's Note: At the PZPR Politburo meeting on 13 December, Jaruzelski indicated that "we are keeping in close touch with the Warsaw Pact headquarters and the [USSR's] Northern Group of Forces." Quoted from "Protokol Nr. 19 z posiedzenia Biura Politycznego KC PZPR w dniu 13.XII.1981 r.," S. 3.

<sup>284</sup> Translator's Note: It is not inconceivable that Kulikov did in fact say something to Jaruzelski at this point—if only inadvertently—that seemed to be a pledge of Soviet military assistance if the martial law operation collapsed. During at least one previous occasion when Kulikov was in Poland in 1981 he brought up this very matter with Jaruzelski. According to a briefing that Kulikov gave to East German military officials on 7 April 1981, he had indicated to Jaruzelski and Kania a few days earlier that "unless [the Polish authorities] used the Polish security organs and army [to impose martial law], outside support could not be expected because of the international complications that would arise." Kulikov said he "emphasized to the Polish comrades that they must first seek to resolve their problems on their own." However, he was careful to add that "if the Polish authorities tried to resolve these problems on their own and were unable to, and were then to ask [the Soviet Union] for assistance, that would be a very different situation from one in which [Soviet] troops had been deployed [to Poland] from the outset." (Quoted from "Bericht über ein vertrauliches Gespräch mit dem Oberkommandierenden der Vereinten Streitkräfte der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages am 07.04.1981 in LEGNICA," Bl. 54.) Kulikov probably did not intend these remarks to be an ironclad pledge of a Soviet military guarantee, but he certainly may have given Jaruzelski and Kania the *impression* (whether rightly or wrongly) that they could count on Soviet military help if the martial law operation went awry. Although there is nothing in General Anoshkin's notebook (which I have translated in Issue No. 11 of the *Cold War International History Project Bulletin*) to suggest that Kulikov repeated anything of the sort in December 1981, Jaruzelski may have construed some of Kulikov's statements at that time as a reaffirmation of what Kulikov had been saying earlier in the year. A misunderstanding in a tense situation like this would hardly be unusual. (Nor is it inconceivable that Kulikov mistakenly went beyond his brief in December 1981 and gave Jaruzelski the wrong idea about Soviet policy.)

reached a firm consensus about the introduction of martial law. Despite the unanimous vote by the PZPR CC Politburo on the need to introduce martial law, we still haven't seen concrete measures on the part of the leadership. The extremists in Solidarity are attacking the Polish leadership by the throat. The Church in recent days has also clearly expressed its position, which in essence is now completely supportive of "Solidarity."

Of course in these circumstances the Polish comrades must act swiftly in launching "Operation X" and carrying it out. At the same time, Jaruzelski declares that "we will resort to 'Operation X' when Solidarity forces us to do so." This is a very disturbing sign, particularly because the latest session of the PZPR CC Politburo and the decision it adopted to introduce martial law had suggested that the Politburo was beginning to act more decisively. All the members of the Politburo expressed support for resolute action. This decision put pressure on Jaruzelski, and he is now compelled to find some way of extricating himself. Yesterday I spoke with Milewski and asked him what measures they intended and when it would be done. He replied that he simply doesn't know about "Operation X" and about the concrete timeframe in which it would be carried out. Thus, it would seem that either Jaruzelski is concealing from his comrades the plan of concrete action, or he is simply abandoning the idea of carrying out this step.

I'd now like to mention that Jaruzelski has been more than persistent in setting forth economic demands from us and has made the implementation of "Operation X" contingent on our willingness to offer economic assistance; and I would say even more than that, he is raising the question, albeit indirectly, of receiving military assistance as well.

Now, if you look at the list of goods we are providing to the Polish comrades, we can candidly say that serious doubts arise about the necessity of supplying these products. For example, what is the connection between the success of "Operation X" and the delivery of fertilizer and certain other goods? In connection with this I would say that our position, as it was formulated earlier during the previous session of the Politburo and was expressed even earlier on several occasions by Leonid Il'ich, is entirely correct, and we must not depart from it at all.<sup>285</sup> In other words, we are taking a position of internationalist assistance, and we are alarmed by the situation unfolding in Poland; but as far as "Operation X" is concerned, that must entirely and unequivocally be decided by the Polish comrades themselves. Whatever they decide is what will be. We will not insist on any specific course, and we will not dissuade them from pursuing what they decide.

As far as economic assistance is concerned, it will of course be difficult for us to undertake anything of the scale and nature of what has been proposed. No doubt, something will have to give. But again I want to say that the mere posing of the question of the apportionment of goods supplied as economic assistance is an insolent way to approach things, and it is being done purely so that if we refrain from delivering something or other,

---

<sup>285</sup> Translator's Note: The transcript of "the previous session of the [CPSU] Politburo," apparently held on 8 December (see the reference to that date in Decision No. 2 at the end of this meeting), has not yet been released.

they'll be able to lay all the blame on us.<sup>286</sup> If Cde. Kulikov actually did speak about the introduction of troops, then I believe he did this incorrectly.<sup>287</sup> We can't risk such a step. We do not intend to introduce troops into Poland. That is the proper position, and we must adhere to it until the end. I don't know how things will turn out in Poland, but even if Poland falls under the control of Solidarity, that's the way it will be. And if the capitalist countries pounce on the Soviet Union, and you know they have already reached agreement on a variety of economic and political sanctions, that will be very burdensome for us. We must be concerned above all with our own country and about the strengthening of the Soviet Union. That is our main line.

In general, it seems to me that our position on the situation in Poland was formulated by Leonid Il'ich in several of his speeches and in the resolutions adopted earlier. Today, a very thorough exchange of opinions has taken place during the session of the Politburo. All of this must serve as the basis of the policy we must uphold vis-a-vis Poland.

As concerns the lines of communication between the Soviet Union and the GDR that run through Poland, we of course must do something to ensure that they are safeguarded.

GROMYKO. Today we've had a very intense discussion of the situation in Poland. I think you'll agree that previously we had not discussed it so intensely.<sup>288</sup> This is because we ourselves don't know at the moment what direction the events in Poland will take. The Polish leadership itself senses that power is slipping from its grasp. Kania and Jaruzelski, you know, counted on their ability to rely on the neutrals. But now there is no such opportunity, there are no longer any neutrals. The position is defined sufficiently clearly: Solidarity has proven to be a patently counterrevolutionary organization which aspires to come to power and which

---

<sup>286</sup> Translator's Note: The comments here by Gromyko and a similar remark below by Suslov indicate that Soviet leaders were well aware of Jaruzelski's desire to extract maximum pledges of economic support from Moscow before he proceeded with the martial law operation.

<sup>287</sup> Translator's Note: See annotation no. 282 *supra* about what Kulikov might or might not have said.

<sup>288</sup> Translator's Note: Gromyko's comment here about a "very intense discussion," and Andropov's earlier remark about "a very thorough exchange of opinions," imply that at least some of the Politburo members had been debating the matter earlier in the day, before the formal session. The lack of any overt disagreement regarding the question of Soviet military intervention at this formal session does not necessarily mean that the apparent consensus emerged easily or spontaneously. The transcript, as Gromyko's and Andropov's comments suggest, may not tell the full story. A number of former senior members of the CPSU Politburo—Egor Ligachev, Nikolai Ryzhkov, and Vadim Medvedev, among others—have recently disclosed that Soviet leaders sometimes gathered informally before Politburo sessions to iron out their different views of highly controversial issues. See the memoirs cited in footnote 42 of my article "Poland, 1980-81: Soviet Policy During the Polish Crisis," *Cold War International History Project Bulletin*, Issue No. 5 (Spring 1995), pp. 1, 116-127. As a rule, these informal meetings (referred to as "exchanges of opinions," the phrase used here by Andropov) were not included in the final transcripts of official Politburo sessions. Hence, it is conceivable that an unrecorded preliminary meeting on 10 December 1981 featured at least some give-and-take about Soviet military options in Poland. Yet even if that is the case, it does not change the basic fact that the consensus within the Politburo by the time of the formal session on 10 December was in favor of non-intervention. (It is worth noting, however, that this non-interventionist stance was not absolute. For example, Andropov acknowledged that "we must of course do something to ensure that the lines of communication between the Soviet Union and the GDR are safeguarded." It remains an open question what the Soviet Union would have done if the martial law operation had collapsed and widespread violent turmoil had erupted in Poland. It seems difficult to believe that Soviet leaders would have stood idly by, not least because of the presence of the Northern Group of Forces in Poland.)

has openly declared its intention to seize power. The Polish leadership must decide the question: Either it relinquishes its positions by failing to adopt decisive measures, or it adopts decisive measures by introducing martial law, detaining the extremists of Solidarity, and restoring public order. There is no other alternative.

What should our position be toward the Polish events? I fully agree with what was already said here by the comrades. We can say to the Poles that we view the Polish events with understanding. There is no basis whatsoever for us to alter this measured formulation in any way. At the same time we must somehow try to dispel the notions that Jaruzelski and other leaders in Poland have about the introduction of troops. There cannot be any introduction of troops into Poland. I think we can give instructions about this to our ambassador, asking him to visit Jaruzelski and communicate this to him.<sup>289</sup>

Despite the sufficiently unanimous vote of the PZPR CC Politburo with regard to the introduction of martial law, Jaruzelski is now back to his vacillating position. At first he had somewhat stiffened his spine, but now, once again, he's begun to soften. Everything is still in force that was said to them previously. If in the struggle against counterrevolution and afterwards they show any sign of wavering, nothing of socialist Poland will remain. The introduction of martial law, of course, would be the best way to convey the steadfastness of the Polish leadership to the counterrevolutionaries. And if the measures they intend to carry out are indeed implemented, I think we could expect positive results.

Now, with regard to the creation of a new party, as Jaruzelski proposed, I think we must directly say to Jaruzelski that there is no need to create any sort of new party, since this would merely signal a retreat on the part of the Polish leadership and an acknowledgment that the PZPR is in fact not a militant political organization, but simply an organization that has committed mistakes.<sup>290</sup> It would underscore the very weakness of the party and would play into the hands of the Solidarity extremists. Then even the population of Poland, which retains definite sympathy for the PZPR as a guiding force, would be completely disabused of such sentiments.

I believe that we must not now permit any sort of harsh instructions, which would force them to adopt one course or another. I think we have chosen the correct position here: The restoration of order in Poland is a matter for the Polish United Workers' Party, its Central Committee, and its Politburo. We already said to our Polish friends and will say again in the future that they must pursue a steadfast course without slackening in the least.

Of course, if the Poles deliver a blow to Solidarity, the West in all likelihood will not give them credits and will not offer any other kind of help. They are aware of this, and this

---

<sup>289</sup> **Translator's Note:** Aristov did indeed communicate this to Jaruzelski, as is evident from Anoshkin's notebook; see my translation in CWIHP Bulletin 11 (Winter 1998/1999).

<sup>290</sup> **Translator's Note:** If Jaruzelski's proposal to disband the PZPR and form a new Communist party had been implemented, it would have been similar to what was done in Hungary in October-November 1956, when the Hungarian Workers' Party was abolished and a new Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party was formed by Janos Kadar, whom the Soviet Union installed in power.

obviously is something that we, too, have to bear in mind.<sup>291</sup> For this reason, Leonid Il'ich was correct in proposing that we instruct a group of comrades to examine this question, taking account of our capabilities to extend substantial economic assistance to the PPR.

USTINOV. The situation in the PPR, of course, is very bad. The situation is worsening day by day. Among the leadership, especially in the Politburo, there is no firmness or unity. And all of this has taken its toll on the state of affairs. Only at the last session of the [Polish] Politburo was a decision unanimously approved to introduce martial law. And now all hopes are riding on Jaruzelski. How will he succeed in carrying out this decision? As yet, no one can openly speak about the actions of Jaruzelski. We just don't know. I had a conversation with Siwicki. He candidly said that even we [the Poles] don't know what the general is thinking. Thus, the man who has effectively been responsible for discharging the duties of the Polish defense minister doesn't know what will happen next and what sort of actions will be taken by the man who is Polish prime minister and defense minister.<sup>292</sup>

With regard to what Cde. Kulikov allegedly said about the introduction of troops into Poland, I can say in full responsibility that Kulikov never said this. He simply repeated what was said by us and by Leonid Il'ich that we would not leave Poland in the lurch. And he perfectly well knows that the Poles themselves requested us not to introduce troops.<sup>293</sup>

As far as our garrisons in Poland are concerned, we are fortifying them. I myself am also inclined to think that the Poles will not embark on a confrontation and only if, perhaps, Solidarity seizes them by the throat will they come forth.<sup>294</sup>

The problem is that the Polish leaders do not appear resolute. As was rightly said here by the comrades, we must not force them to adopt any specific decisions; we will simply carry out the policy on which we have agreed. For our part, we must be ready ourselves and must not display any sort of actions not provided for by our decisions.

SUSLOV. I believe, as is evident from the other comrades' speeches, that we all have the same view of the situation in Poland. During the whole prolonged stretch of events in Poland, we have displayed steadfastness and composure. Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev spoke about this at

---

<sup>291</sup> Translator's Note: Gromyko once again is drawing a clear link here between Soviet economic aid and the imposition of martial law in Poland.

<sup>292</sup> Translator's Note: Jaruzelski had been national defense minister since April 1968, but when he acquired many new duties as prime minister and PZPR First Secretary in 1981, he had to rely increasingly on his long-standing friend and aide, General Florian Siwicki, to handle many aspects of defense policy. Siwicki oversaw all the planning for the martial law operation, bringing together the military, political, and administrative components devised by the General Staff and the Internal Affairs Ministry. Siwicki also attended a meeting of the Warsaw Pact Council of Defense Ministers on 2-4 December 1981, a task that the minister (i.e., Jaruzelski) ordinarily would have performed. Siwicki's post as chief of the Polish General Staff would have been important anyway, but it was particularly important under these circumstances. He emerged as the second leading member (after Jaruzelski) of the Military Council for National Salvation.

<sup>293</sup> Translator's Note: Presumably, this statement refers to a few earlier occasions in 1980-81— notably in December 1980, February 1981, and April 1981—when Kania and Jaruzelski had warned Soviet leaders that a massive intervention by Soviet troops to crush Solidarity would be "disastrous" and would "cause events to spin out of control."

<sup>294</sup> Translator's Note: The antecedent for "they" in this sentence presumably is the "Soviet garrisons." If so, it is a further indication that the Soviet Union's non-interventionist stance was not absolute.

the plenum.<sup>295</sup> We said this in public to our people, and our people supported the policy of the Communist Party.

We've done a great deal of work for peace, and it is now impossible for us to change our position. World public opinion will not permit us to do so. We have carried out via the UN such momentous diplomatic actions to consolidate peace. What a great effect we have had from the visit of L. I. Brezhnev to the FRG and from many other peaceful actions we have undertaken.<sup>296</sup> This has enabled all peace-loving countries to understand that the Soviet Union staunchly and consistently upholds a policy of peace. That is why it is now impossible for us to change the position we have adopted vis-a-vis Poland since the very start of the Polish events. Let the Polish comrades themselves determine what actions they must pursue. It would be inappropriate for us to push them toward more decisive actions. But we will, as earlier, tell the Poles that we regard their actions with understanding.

It seems to me that Jaruzelski is displaying a certain degree of slyness. He wants to make excuses for himself by coming forth with requests to present to the Soviet Union. These requests, naturally, are beyond our physical capacity to fulfill, and Jaruzelski then says: well, look here, I turned to the Soviet Union and requested help, but didn't receive it.<sup>297</sup>

At the same time, the Poles say directly that they are opposed to the introduction of troops. If troops are introduced, that will be a catastrophe.<sup>298</sup> I think we have reached a unanimous view here on this matter, and there can be no consideration at all of introducing troops.

As far as the provision of assistance to Poland is concerned, we have given that country more than a billion rubles. Not long ago we adopted a decision to ship 30 thousand tons of meat to Poland, of which 16 thousand tons have already been delivered. I don't know whether we'll be able to ship the full 30 thousand tons, but in any event we apparently are obliged by

---

<sup>295</sup> Translator's Note: Suslov is referring to a CPSU Central Committee plenum held on 16 November 1981. The plenum was convened to discuss social and economic guidelines for the next five-year plan, and Brezhnev's main speech at the plenum, which was published at the time, focused on that topic. See "Plenum TsK KPSS, 16 noyabrya 1981 g.," in Vol. 14 (1980-1981) of *Kommunisticheskaya Partiya Sovetskogo Soyuza v rezolyutsiyakh i resheniyakh s"ezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK* (Moscow: Politizdat, 1982), pp. 519-532. In unpublished remarks after his main speech, Brezhnev spoke briefly about the situation in Poland. These comments can be found in the newly declassified plenum materials, "Plenum Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS—16 noyabrya 1981 g.," 16 November 1981 (Top Secret), in TsKhSD, F. 2, Op. 3, D. 547, Ll. 85-86.

<sup>296</sup> Translator's Note: Suslov is referring here to the massive campaign undertaken by the Soviet Union to prevent the deployment of NATO's Pershing-II and cruise missiles. Brezhnev's visit to West Germany in November 1981 focused largely on this issue. A top-secret plan adopted by the CPSU Secretariat in April 1980 called for "the use of long-planned ties and exchanges with the countries of Western Europe . . . to bolster the campaign against NATO's militarist designs as much as possible." See "O dopolnitelnykh meropriyatiyakh po aktivizatsii vystuplenii obshchestvennosti protiv resheniya NATO o proizvodstve i razmeshchenii novykh amerikanskikh raket v Zapadnoi Evrope: Postanovlenie Sekretariata TsK Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soyuza," 15 April 1980 (Top Secret), in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 39, D. 1, Ll. 1-4.

<sup>297</sup> Translator's Note: See the remark by Gromyko (above) at this same meeting, which makes the same point.

<sup>298</sup> Translator's Note: Presumably, this again is a reference to what Kania and Jaruzelski had been telling Soviet leaders in 1980 and earlier in 1981.



this decision to give a further definite number of tons of meat as assistance.<sup>299</sup>

With regard to the PZPR and the creation of a new party to replace it, I believe it would be inappropriate to disband the PZPR. Those who spoke here were correct in arguing that this would be a completely unhelpful action.

GRISHIN. The situation in Poland is getting steadily worse. The line of our party toward the Polish events is entirely correct. With respect to the proposal by Jaruzelski to disband the PZPR and create a new party, one cannot agree with that. There can be no talk at all of introducing troops. We will have to look at economic questions and at what can be given to the Poles.

SUSLOV. In the press we must expose the intrigues of Solidarity and other counterrevolutionary forces.<sup>300</sup>

CHERNENKO. I fully agree with what the comrades have said here. It is clear that the line of our party and of the CC Politburo vis-a-vis the Polish events, as formulated in the speeches of Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev and in the decisions of the Politburo, is entirely correct and in no need of change.

I believe that today we could adopt the following decision:

1. Take under advisement the information provided by Cde. Baibakov.
2. In our relations with the PPR in the future, abide by the general political line on this matter laid down by the CPSU CC, and also abide by the instructions from the CPSU CC Politburo on 8 December 1981 and the exchange of opinions that occurred at the CC Politburo's session on 10 December 1981.
3. Instruct Cdes. Tikhonov, Kirilenko, Dolgikh, Arkhipov, and Baibakov to continue studying questions of economic assistance to Poland, taking account of the exchange of opinions at the session of the CCPolitburo.

---

<sup>299</sup> Translator's Note: See Baibakov's comments (above) at this same meeting of the CPSU Politburo, as well as Rusakov's comments at the 29 October 1981 meeting of the Politburo (Document No. 20 *supra*).

<sup>300</sup> Translator's Note: Even as Suslov spoke, a fierce campaign in the Soviet press against Solidarity was already under way. Between 8 December and 13 December 1981, the main CPSU press organ, *Pravda*, featured daily stories under the headline "On the Situation in Poland" ("*K polozheniyu v Pol'she*"), which depicted a "mortal danger" in Poland posed by "broadly coordinated subversive actions of counterrevolutionary forces." The stories alleged that "the counterrevolutionary elements in Solidarity are making preparations for the outright seizure of power" and are pursuing an "anti-socialist conspiracy to overturn the existing order in Poland." The most extreme story of all appeared on 10 December, the very day of this CPSU Politburo meeting. That story claimed that "Solidarity organizations have begun establishing 'commando units' at enterprises" to launch "a furious counterrevolutionary blow against the existing order" and to "destroy the Communists altogether." It also alleged that Solidarity's leaders were "stepping up their demagogic demands for Poland to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact and CMEA" and were seeking to "exploit the lines of communication passing through Poland's territory to put pressure on Poland's allies." This last accusation was particularly significant if one bears in mind Andropov's statement (above) about the need to "ensure that the lines of communication between the Soviet Union and the GDR are safeguarded."

BREZHNEV. How do the comrades feel about this?

EVERYONE. Cde. Chernenko has very properly formulated all the proposals, and now it is time to adopt them.

The decree is adopted.

[*Source: TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 42, D. 6*]

DOCUMENT No. 22

OF SPECIAL IMPORTANCE  
SPECIAL DOSSIER

COMMITTEE  
ON STATE SECURITY OF THE USSR

13.04.82. No. 728-A/OV  
Moscow

To Comrade L. I. Brezhnev

Report on the Work of the Committee  
on State Security of the USSR for 1981<sup>301</sup>

The activities of the Committee on State Security were fully devoted to the task of faithfully carrying out the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and were pursued in strict accordance with the Constitution of the USSR and with Soviet laws.

.....

The [KGB's] foreign intelligence service has sought to thwart the crude interference by the USA and other NATO countries and their special services in the internal affairs of Poland and to ward off their encroachments on the foundations of socialism in the PPR.<sup>302</sup> The foreign intelligence service also has sought to discredit the counterrevolutionary forces in that

---

<sup>301</sup> Translator's Note: A two-line, handwritten note on the front reads: "To L. Brezhnev. K. Chernenko."

<sup>302</sup> Translator's Note: Throughout the crisis, Soviet foreign intelligence officials were kept on high alert to detect and thwart "outside interference" in the USSR. See, for example, "Spravka," Cable No. 1759/73 (Top Secret), 18 April 1981 from B. Ivasenko, commanding officer in the Ukrainian KGB foreign intelligence department, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2235, Ll. 25-26; "Spravka o sostoyavsheisya 20 oktyabrya 1981 goda vstreche s agentom 'Kharris'," 21 October 1981 (Top Secret), from Colonel S. Jankunas, deputy head of the Lithuanian KGB's 2nd Directorate, in Lietuvos Ypatingasis Archyvas (LYA), F. 1, Apy. 50, B. 7, La. 132-133; "TsK KPSS: Informatsiya o rabote, provodimoi v Litovskoi SSR v svyazi s sobytiyami v PNR," Memorandum No. 1074s (Top Secret), 1 October 1980, from P. Griskiavicius, Lithuanian CP First Secretary, in LVOA, F. 1771, Apy. 257, B. 193, La. 133-137; and "O prazdnovanii pervogo maya i godovshchiny so dnya prinyatiya konstitutsii 3 maya (Politicheskaya zapiska)," Cable No. 68 (Secret), 4 May 1981, from N. P. Ponomarev, Soviet consul-general Szczecin, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 84, D. 597, Ll. 6-12, esp. 9. See also Vitalii Pavlov, *Bylem rezydentem KGB w Polsce* (Warsaw: BGW, 1994), pp. 51-97, 115-138, and 230-260. Pavlov was the KGB station chief in Poland from 1973 to 1984.

country.<sup>303</sup> . . .

. . . .

More than 30 anti-Soviet and other politically hostile groups were uncovered. Attempts to form nationalist groups in Ukraine, the Baltic republics, Armenia, and certain other republics were crushed.<sup>304</sup> . . .

. . . .

More than 70 Solidarity activists, who were inciting strikes among Polish workers employed at construction sites in the Soviet Union, were discovered and expelled from the USSR.<sup>305</sup> A provocative strike action in Estonia, instigated from abroad, was broken up.<sup>306</sup>

---

<sup>303</sup> Translator's Note: This effort was conducted mainly by Service A (*Sluzhba A*) of the KGB's foreign intelligence directorate, which was responsible for "active measures." See the account by the former head of foreign intelligence, L. V. Shebarshin, *Iz zhizni nachal'nika razvedki* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, 1994), pp. 61-63.

<sup>304</sup> Translator's Note: Declassified materials from the Ukrainian, Baltic, and other archives shed additional light on this matter. See, for example, "Informatsiya o rabote, provodimoi v Litovskoi SSR v svyazi s sobyitiyami v PNR," Report No. 1074s (Secret), La. 133-137; "Informatsiya ob obstanovke v oblasti v svyazi s sobyitiyami v Pol'she," Memorandum No. 0247/2 (Secret), 14 December 1981, from V. Dobrik, first secretary of the UkrCP's L'viv oblast committee, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2295, Ll. 50-53; "Spravka ob informatsii, poluchenoii pri vstrechakh s sotrudnikom MVD PNR," Ll. 17-20; "O reagirovanii trudyashchikhsya respubliki, a takzhe zarubezhnykh grazhdan, nakhodyashchikhsya na Ukraine, na sobyitiya v Pol'she," Memorandum No. 1810/44 (Secret), 14 May 1981, from G. Kryuchkov, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, L. Kravchuk, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Propaganda and Agitation Department, and A. Merkulov, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Department for Foreign Ties, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2295, Ll. 1-4; "Informatsiya o sobyitiyakh v Pol'skoi Narodnoi Respublike," Ll. 37-50; "O besede s delegatsiei Obshchestva pol'sko-sovetskoi druzhby," Ll. 23-25; "Zapis' besedy s konsulom Genkonsul'stva PNR v Kieve Vatslavom Myshinskim," Memorandum No. 158 (Secret), 9 April 1981, from V. A. Kirik, first secretary of the Ukrainian foreign ministry, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2294, Ll. 19-21; "Spravka o faktakh i prichinakh politicheskii vrednykh proyavlenii so storony otdel'nykh voennosluzhashchikh, prizvannykh voenkomatami Litovskoi SSR," Dispatch No. 17-286s (Secret), 7 August 1982, from Major-General Ya. L. Zhuk, head of the Soviet KGB's military counterintelligence units (Special Department) in the Baltic Military District, in LVOA, F. 1771, Apy. 260, B. 182, La. 87-95; and "O nekotorykh merakh po uporyadochneniyu rasprostraneniya pol'skoi periodicheskoi pechati i literatury v respublike," Memorandum No. 4339/42 (Top Secret), 27 October 1980, from I. Sokolov, V. Fedorchuk, and Ya. Pogrebnyak, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2129, Ll. 60-61.

<sup>305</sup> Translator's Note: For more on these incidents, see "O rabote partiinykh organizatsii na promyshlennykh ob'ektakh respubliki, sooruzhaemykh pri uchastii grazhdan PNR," Memorandum No. 2029/45 (Secret), 27 March 1981, from L. Kravchuk, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Propaganda and Agitation Department, and A. Merkulov, head of the UkrCP Central Committee Department for Foreign Ties, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2287, Ll. 33-37; "Informatsiya o nepravil'nom povedenii grazhdan PNR, sleduyushchikh tranzitom cherez Chernovitskuyu oblast'," Memorandum No. 224/7s-3 (Secret), 10 June 1981, from N. Revenko, first secretary of the UkrCP's Chernivtsi oblast committee, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2287, Ll. 8-10; "Spravka ob informatsii, poluchenoii pri vstrechakh s sotrudnikom MVD PNR," L. 18. A similar incident arose in the GDR, where Solidarity activists in mid-1981, according to a Soviet memorandum, "tried to spread their ideas among the 23,000 Poles who work permanently at enterprises in the GDR and also among work collectives in the GDR, but these actions were decisively halted, and certain Poles were forcibly expelled from the GDR." Quoted from "O prebyvanii v GDR," Memorandum No. 160-S (Secret), 17 July 1981, from V. P. Osnach, chairman of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Friendship Society, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2298, Ll. 15-18.

<sup>306</sup> Translator's Note: This incident is discussed at greater length in "O nastroeniakh trudyashchikhsya Estonskoi SSR," Memorandum No. 137-s (Top Secret), 18 July 1981, from Marko Tibar, Estonian minister of internal affairs, with a

Chekist agencies provided active help to party organs and administrative bodies to prevent conflicts from growing in labor collectives, including at a number of defense enterprises.<sup>307</sup>

....

Mass subversive ideological actions, aimed at the personnel of Soviet military units in Poland and Afghanistan, were disrupted.<sup>308</sup> A number of attempts to form groups of servicemen around politically hostile aims were thwarted.

....

The leadership, Collegium, and Party Committee of the USSR KGB assure the CPSU

---

cover note to the CPSU Politburo from Karl Vaino, Estonian CP First Secretary, in Eesti Riigiarhiivi Filiaali, F. 129, Sailikut 2124, Toimikut 3, Dokument 11. In 1980 as well, a strike had occurred in Estonia at the Tartu agricultural equipment repair factory. This strike, too, seemed to have been inspired by the Polish events. See "TsK KPSS: Ob ot del'nykh negativnykh proyavleniyakh, svyazannykh s narusheniyami uslovii organizatsii i oplaty truda rabochikh i sluzhashchikh," Memorandum No. 27902 (Top Secret), 15 October 1980, from I.Kapitonov and V. Dolgikh, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 13, D. 37, L. 5. See also Jean Pennar, "Demonstrations and Dissent in Estonia," *Radio Free Europe-Radio Liberty Research*, No. 384/80 (17 October 1980). Similarly, in Lithuania in mid-1981, a strike by dozens of drivers brought an auto transport enterprise in the southeastern city of Salcininkai to a halt. See "Protokol No. 10 zasedaniya Byuro Tsentral'nogo Komiteta Kompartii Litvy ot 2 iyulya 1981 goda: 1. O fakte otkaza ot raboty voditelei Shal'chininskogo avtotransportnogo predpriyatiya," 2 July 1981 (Top Secret), LVOA, F. 1771, Apy. 259, B. 58, La. 1-3.

<sup>307</sup> Translator's Note: From the outset of the Polish crisis, Soviet leaders were deeply concerned that labor unrest in the Soviet Union would sharply increase via a spillover from Poland. See, for example, "Informatsiya o rabote, provodimoi v Litovskoi SSR v svyazi s sobyitiyami v PNR," La. 133-137; "TsK KPSS: O provodimoi rabote v svyazi s informatsiei TsK KPSS 'o razvitiu sobytii v Pol'she,'" Report No. 27908 (Secret), 15 October 1980, from I. Kapitonov, head of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department to the CPSU Secretariat, in TsKhSD, F. 5, Op. 77, D. 105, Ll. 1-9; "TsK KPSS: Ob otravke detskikh novogodnikh podarkov v PNR," Memorandum No. 1/257 (Top Secret), 29 December 1981, from V. Shcherbytskyi, UkrCP First Secretary, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2209, Ll. 96-97; "O reagirovaniu naseleniya oblasti na sobytiya v Pol'she," Memorandum No. 01/582-06 (Secret), 14 December 1981, from V. Kavun, first secretary of the UkrCP's Zhytomyr oblast committee, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2295, Ll. 10-11; "Informatsiya," Memorandum No. 4449/86 (Secret), 14 December 1981, from Yu. El'chenko, first secretary of the UkrCP's Kyiv municipal committee, in TsDAHOU, F. 1, Op. 25, Spr. 2295, Ll. 12-14; and "O rabote partiinykh organizatsii na promyshlennykh ob'ektakh respubliki, sooruzhaemykh pri uchastii grazhdan PNR," Ll. 33-37. Moscow's concerns about this matter had been spurred on by a surge of labor unrest in the Soviet Union in the summer and early fall of 1980, which evidently was inspired in part by the events in Poland. See "Postanovlenie Sekretariata TsK Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soyuzha: O nekotorykh negativnykh proyavleniyakh, svyazannykh s nedostatkami v organizatsii i oplate truda rabochikh i sluzhashchikh," No. St-233/8s (Top Secret), 24 October 1980, plus accompanying reports, in TsKhSD, F. 89, Op. 13, D. 37, Ll. 1-12.

<sup>308</sup> Translator's Note: On efforts by the Soviet KGB's military counterintelligence units to prevent an erosion of morale among Soviet troops, see the invaluable document "Spravka o faktakh i prichinakh politicheskii vrednykh proyavlenii so storony ot del'nykh voennosluzhashchikh, prizvannykh voenkomatami Litovskoi SSR," Dispatch No. 17-286s (Secret), 7 August 1982, from Major-General Ya. L. Zhuk, head of the Soviet KGB's military counterintelligence units (Special Department) in the Baltic Military District, in LVOA, F. 1771, Apy. 260, B. 182, La. 87-95. General Zhuk notes that "many Soviet servicemen [in the Baltic Military District] are displaying politically hostile and nationalist sentiments and, on this basis, are intending to commit treacherous and other hostile acts. . . . They approve of the subversive activity of Solidarity in the PPR."

Central Committee, the CC Politburo, and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev personally that the Chekists always will stand together with their native Leninist party and with their people. They will always play a worthy part in efforts to fulfill the grand program of Communist construction and the program to uphold peace and international security, as laid out by the XXVI Congress.

Chairman of the Committee

[signed] Yu. Andropov<sup>309</sup>

No. 289-op

[Source: *APRF, F. 81, Op. 3, D. 2556, No. 289-op*]

---

<sup>309</sup> Translator's Note: Andropov was still Chairman of the KGB at this point, but a month later he relinquished that post in connection with his appointment to the CPSU Secretariat.

## INDIVIDUALS MENTIONED IN THE DOCUMENTS

Unless otherwise indicated, positions listed for each person are those held during the 1980-81 crisis.

ABRASIMOV, Pyotr Andreevich: Soviet ambassador in East Germany

ALKHIMOV, Vladimir Sergeevich: chairman of the Soviet State Bank

ANDROPOV, Yurii Vladimirovich: chairman of the Soviet Committee on State Security (KGB); member of the CPSU Politburo; and member of the CPSU Politburo's commission on the Polish crisis

ARISTOV, Boris Ivanovich: Soviet ambassador in Poland

ARKHIPOV, Ivan Vasil'evich: Soviet first deputy prime minister; member of the CPSU Politburo's commission on the Polish crisis

BAIBAKOV, Nikolai Konstantinovich: head of the Soviet State Planning Agency (Gosplan)

BARCIKOWSKI, Kazimierz: member of the PZPR Politburo (from September 1980) and PZPR Secretariat (from October 1980); helped oversee purge of party organizations in 1982

BAZOVSKII, Vladimir Nikolaevich: first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Department for Work with Cadres Abroad and for Travel Abroad

BERLINGUER, Enrico: General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party

BREZHNEV, Leonid Il'ich: leader of the Soviet Union, October 1964-November 1982

CEAUSESCU, Nicolae: leader of Romania

CHERNENKO, Konstantin Ustinovich: member of the CPSU Politburo and CPSU Secretariat; head of the CPSU Central Committee General Department; long-time aide to Brezhnev; and member of the CPSU Politburo's commission on the Polish crisis

CZYREK, Jozef: Polish foreign minister; member of the PZPR Politburo and PZPR Secretariat from July 1981

DEMICHEV, Pyotr Nilovich: Soviet minister of culture; candidate member of the CPSU Politburo

DOLGIKH, Vladimir Ivanovich: member of the CPSU Secretariat; head of the CPSU Central Committee Heavy Industry Department

FISZBACH, Tadeusz: first secretary of the PZPR's Gdansk committee; candidate member of the PZPR Politburo, December 1980-July 1981; leading proponent of a compromise with Solidarity

GARBUZOV, Vasili Fedorovich: Soviet minister of finance; chairman of the CMEA Permanent Commission for Currency and Finance

GIEREK, Edward: leader of Poland, December 1970-September 1980

GLEMP, Archbishop Jozef: successor to Cardinal Wyszynski as Primate of Poland from May 1981

GOMULKA, Wladyslaw: leader of Poland, October 1956-December 1970

GORBACHEV, Mikhail Sergeevich: member of the CPSU Politburo and CPSU Secretariat

GRABSKI, Tadeusz: hardline candidate member of the PZPR Politburo, December 1980-July 1981

GRIBKOV, Anatolii Ivanovich: Soviet general; chief of staff of the Warsaw Pact

GRISHIN, Viktor Vasil'evich: head of the CPSU's Moscow committee; member of the CPSU Politburo

GROMYKO, Andrei Andreevich: Soviet foreign minister; member of the CPSU Politburo; and member of the CPSU Politburo's commission on the Polish crisis

GRZYB, Zofia: member of the PZPR Politburo from July 1981 (first woman ever selected for that position); also a member of Solidarity until October 1981, when she resigned in protest against resolutions adopted by Solidarity's national congress

GWIAZDA, Andrzej: one of the leaders of the Gdansk strikes; later a radical Solidarity activist who often challenged Walesa, Kuron, and other moderates

HONECKER, Erich: leader of the GDR

HUSAK, Gustav: leader of Czechoslovakia

JABLONSKI, Henryk: member of PZPR Politburo; chairman of the Council of State (a position formally equivalent to head of state)



JAGIELSKI, Mieczyslaw: Polish deputy prime minister until late July 1981; member of the PZPR Politburo until July 1981

JARUZELSKI, Wojciech: Polish general; minister of national defense from April 1968; prime minister from February 1981; and PZPR First Secretary from October 1981

KADAR, Janos: leader of Hungary

KANIA, Stanislaw: PZPR First Secretary, September 1980-October 1981

KAPITONOV, Ivan Vasil'evich: member of the CPSU Secretariat; head of the CPSU Central Committee Department for Party-Organizational Work

KIRILENKO, Andrei Pavlovich: member of the CPSU Politburo and CPSU Secretariat

KISZCZAK, Czeslaw: Polish general; former head of military intelligence; Polish minister of internal affairs from late July 1981

KLASA, Jozef: head of the PZPR Central Committee Department on the Press, Radio and Television, September 1980-June 1981

KOCIOLEK, Stanislaw: hardline first secretary of the PZPR's Warsaw committee from November 1980

KOWALCZYK, Stanislaw: hard-line member of the PZPR Politburo until December 1980

KRUCZEK, Wladyslaw: former head of Poland's official trade unions; removed from the PZPR Politburo in December 1980

KRYUCHKOV, Vladimir Aleksandrovich: deputy chairman of the Soviet KGB; head of the KGB's First Main Directorate (foreign intelligence)

KUBIAK, Hieronim: member of the PZPR Politburo and PZPR Secretariat from July 1981

KULIKOV, Viktor Georgievich: Soviet marshal; commander-in-chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces; frequent envoy to Poland during the 1980-81 crisis

KURON, Jacek: dissident and co-founder of KOR; leading Solidarity intellectual

KUZNETSOV, Vasili Vasil'evich: candidate member of the CPSU Politburo; first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet

LIS, Bogdan: one of the leaders of the August 1980 strikes in Gdansk; a prominent Solidarity organizer; also a PZPR member until October 1981, when he was expelled from the Party

MAL'TSEV, Viktor Fedorovich: Soviet first deputy foreign minister

MAZOWIECKI, Tadeusz: prominent Catholic journalist; first editor of *Tygodnik Solidarnosc*; and adviser to Solidarity

MICHNIK, Adam: dissident and co-founder of KOR; leading Solidarity intellectual

MILEWSKI, Miroslaw: Polish minister of internal affairs, October 1980-July 1981; member of the PZPR Politburo and PZPR Secretariat from July 1981

MOCZAR, Mieczyslaw: Polish general; former minister of internal affairs and leading ultranationalist rival of Gomulka; full member of the PZPR Politburo, December 1980-July 1981

MOCZULSKI, Leszek: radical dissident; founding leader of Confederation for an Independent Poland (KPN); arrested in August 1980, temporarily set free, and then re-arrested and imprisoned in September 1980

MODZELEWSKI, Karol: press spokesman for Solidarity, September 1980-March 1981; resigned after the Bydgoszcz incident to become one of the leaders of Solidarity's radical wing

NIKITIN, Sergei Sergeevich: head of the USSR Main Directorate on Foreign Tourism

OBODOWSKI, Janusz: Polish minister of wages, labor, and social affairs, November 1980-July 1981; deputy prime minister from July 1981 (replaced Mieczyslaw Jagielski)

OGARKOV, Nikolai Vasil'evich: Soviet marshal; first deputy defense minister; and chief of the Soviet General Staff

OLSZOWSKI, Stefan: hard-line member of the PZPR Politburo

PASTUKHOV, Boris Nikolaevich: First Secretary of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League (Komsomol); member of CPSU Central Committee; and member of the Presidium and chairman of Youth Affairs Commission of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions

PEGOV, Nikolai Mikhailovich: head of the CPSU Central Committee Department for Work with Cadres Abroad and for Travel Abroad

PEL'SHE, Arvids Yanovich: chairman of the CPSU Party Control Committee; member of the CPSU Politburo

PETROVICHEV, Nikolai Aleksandrovich: first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Department for Organizational-Party Work

PINKOWSKI, Jozef: Polish prime minister, September 1980-February 1981

PONOMAREV, Boris Nikolaevich: head of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; candidate member of the CPSU Politburo; and member of the CPSU Secretariat

RAKHMANNIN, Oleg Borisovich: first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Department for Ties with Communist and Workers' Parties of Socialist Countries; and member of the CPSU Politburo's commission on the Polish crisis

RAKOWSKI, Mieczyslaw: editor of *Polityka*; Polish deputy prime minister from February 1981

RULEWSKI, Jan: one of the most radical Solidarity activists; head of the union branch in Bydgoszcz

RUSAKOV, Konstantin Viktorovich: CPSU Secretary responsible for intra-bloc relations

SCHMIDT, Helmut: Chancellor of West Germany

SEMYONOV, Vladimir Semyonovich: Soviet ambassador in West Germany

SHCHEGLOV, Afanasii Fedorovich: Soviet general; official representative in Poland for the Warsaw Pact's Joint Command

SHIBAIEV, Aleksei Ivanovich: chairman of the Soviet All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions

SIWAK, Albin: hard-line member of the PZPR Politburo from July 1981

SIWICKI, Florian: Polish general of arms; chief of the Polish General Staff; candidate member of the PZPR Politburo from October 1981

SKACHKOV, Semyon Andreevich: chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations

SOLOMENTSEV, Mikhail Sergeevich: candidate member of the CPSU Politburo; prime minister of the Russian Republic

SUSLOV, Mikhail Andreevich: powerful senior member of the CPSU Politburo and CPSU Secretariat; chairman of the Politburo's commission on the Polish crisis

SZCZEPANSKI, Jan: deputy to the Polish Sejm; chairman of the Sejm's Extraordinary Committee for the Observance of Public Agreements; member of the State Council

TIKHONOV, Nikolai Aleksandrovich: member of CPSU Politburo; Soviet prime minister from October 1980 (replaced the dying Aleksei Kosygin)

USTINOV, Dmitrii Fyodorovich: Soviet defense minister; member of CPSU Politburo; and member of the CPSU Politburo's commission on the Polish crisis

WALENTYNOWICZ, Anna: radical Solidarity activist; a veteran independent labor organizer who helped lead the strikes in December 1970; her dismissal in August 1980 was one of the main catalysts for the Gdansk strikes

WERBLAN, Andrzej: promoter of the anti-Semitic campaign in 1968; hard-line member of the PZPR Politburo under Gierek; removed from the Politburo in December 1980

WYSZYNSKI, Cardinal Stefan: highest Catholic Church official in Poland until his death in May 1981

ZABINSKI, Andrzej: hardline first secretary of the PZPR's Katowice committee; member of the PZPR Politburo until July 1981

ZAMYATIN, Leonid Mitrofanovich: head of the CPSU Central Committee Department for International Information; member of the CPSU Politburo's commission on the Polish crisis

ZARUDIN, Yurii Fedorovich: Soviet general; commander of the Northern Group of Forces

ZHIVKOV, Todor: leader of Bulgaria

ZIMYANIN, Mikhail Vasil'evich: member of the CPSU Secretariat; and member of the CPSU Politburo's commission on the Polish crisis

### **About the Author**

Mark Kramer is the Director of the Harvard Project on Cold War Studies and a Senior Associate of the Davis Center for Russian Studies at Harvard University. He is a frequent contributor to the *Cold War International History Project Bulletin*.