necessity to prevent an arms race in space. What would be the consequences of such a situation?

Gromyko: The consequences would be extremely severe. The talks would be destroyed. We made such a warning to the American representatives. There is no choice and no middle way. Either you don't permit an arms race in space and keep it unmilitarized, or there will be an arms race. Then space will become a terrible arena for the deployment of weapon systems and present a huge threat for the very existence of mankind. When you speak about the so-called "Star Wars," a large-scale system of missile defense, then you are speaking about life or death. That is the question. We consider it our duty to tell the truth, not only to the United States of America, but to the whole world. Whatever strong words one chooses, they will be insufficient to express the whole danger with which the deployment of weapons in space and the relocation of the arms race to space would be connected.

Q: Where is the guarantee that Washington won't use the negotiations as a cover for the attempt to achieve military supremacy? Won't the talks end in a dead-end?

Gromyko: Starting from the spirit of your question, I would like to raise yet another important question. Their plans in respect to space, for a so-called large-scale missile defense, the American side is characterizing as defensive. In Geneva they often told us, especially in the beginning of the meeting: Now imagine what a defensive plan this is! We want to create such weapons which destroy missiles which have been launched against the United States. This is defense. They say that they fear a nuclear strike from the side of the Soviet Union, therefore they need a shield.

Let's say they succeed in building a shield. They say, this shield has a peaceloving character. It's designed to destroy missiles, so that these missiles don't reach their targets. The fact that from behind this shield, missiles will be directed against another country, against the Soviet Union in some extreme situation, doesn't mean anything from their standpoint. They are trying to convince us of that. They are telling us: The United States doesn't have any intention to strike against the Soviet Union. We say: That means that the Soviet Union must rely on your conscience? On the conscience of Washington?

First of all, we are not very convinced that Washington is so reserved. Second, we tell them: Let's imagine that we change places with you, the United States, then you must reason like we, the Soviet Union. In other words, if we were striving to create such a system, would you rely on our words, on our conscience? Would such assurances be sufficient for you?

The answer is silence. The fact that the American side named this system "defensive" doesn't change anything. There is absolutely nothing defensive about it. These are offensive weapons, and the whole plan, frankly speaking, is aggressive, I repeat, aggressive. We are resolutely against it, resolutely.

Will the Kremlin

by Rachel Douglas

European military specialists and politicians, concerned about potential Soviet military moves against Western Europe, are closely watching the situation in Poland. Moscow, they think, may use unrest resulting from the murder of the outspoken priest Jerzy Popieluszko or from impending food price hikes as a pretext to invade Poland.

Although two Soviet divisions are already stationed in Poland, a larger Soviet troop presence there would secure key routes into Western Europe.

Popieluszko's murder has already shaken both the regime and the Catholic Church in Poland and has led to an extraordinary open trial of government officials, which has been televised and covered in detail in the official press every day since Dec. 27 of last year.

The priest, kidnapped and brutally murdered near the town of Torun in October, was the victim of security police working under the Polish interior ministry. Four officers from the ministry are on trial for the killing.

The faction implicated in the priest's murder is in effect an arm of the Soviet KGB. One Italian politician, viewing the crime as a KGB operation start to finish, compared it to acts of terror that preceded the consolidation of a fascist regime in Italy during the 1920s and 1930s. The Soviets, he said, are not satisfied with the results achieved by three years of military rule in Poland. Army officers dominate in Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski's regime, which adds to Russian suspicions about "Catholic officers" who could not be counted on to do Moscow's bidding in a crisis.

Death penalty

In October, right after Popieluszko's body was dragged from a reservoir, Internal Affairs Minister Czeslaw Kiszczak assured the people in a nationally televised broadcast that the murderers would get the death penalty. Depending on the outcome of the Torun trial, keeping this promise could mean hanging several security police officials, up to the rank of general or deputy minister.

On Oct. 30, Polish authorities detained Col. Adam Pietruszka, Capt. Grzegorz Piotrowski, and two lieutenants from

30 International EIR January 29, 1985

move on Poland?

the interior ministry police force. These are the four charged in the Torun court.

Lieutenants Pekala and Chmielewski, who admitted to kidnapping and beating Popieluszko, have testified that they were told the orders came from "higher up." Ex-Captain Piotrowski insists that Colonel Pietruszka authorized the kidnapping and brutalization of Popieluszko and invoked higher officials as having cleared it: "I was certain that the idea could not have been that of only Adam Pietruszka. I was convinced right up to my arrest that a decision of this magnitude had to come from the top." According to the testimony of Chmielewski, "From what [Piotrowski] said, I understood that he got approval from the top for this operation and for the fact that the priest could die of a heart attack."

As of testimony on Jan. 15, Pietruszka has attempted to push the blame back onto his subordinates. But his denial of complicity is being undercut by evidence produced before the court that he issued a pass authorizing Piotrowski and the others to use a ministry car the night of the kidnapping and that this pass was altered afterwards in order to cover up Pietruszka's involvement.

Thus the possibility of his being convicted remains alive, in which case he could try to shift the blame to his superiors instead of his subordinates. Above Pietruszka in the chain of command are Gen. Zenon Platek, the head of the interior ministry's department for monitoring the church; Deputy Interior Minister Gen. Wladyslaw Ciaston; and Interior Minister Gen. Czeslaw Kiszczak, the close associate of Jaruzelski and the one who promised that the guilty parties would get the death penalty.

If Jaruzelski backed off from carrying out the promised penalty, he would risk popular outrage. To inflict it will spark fury among Moscow's friends in the interior ministry.

From this dilemma spring dire scenarios for Poland in the months ahead. "If Piotrowski tries to save himself from the death penalty by naming others, the whole structure of Poland's police control will have been split open," wrote the *Christian Science Monitor* on Jan. 8, before Piotrowski did exactly that. On Jan. 17, a column by Joseph Harsch in the

same paper anticipated an explosion that would bring the Soviets rolling in: "If . . . after the trial . . . there is wide-spread belief that higher authorities were protected, then there would undoubtedly be a revival of public demonstrations against the government. There is always the danger that demonstrations set off by deep emotions could plunge Poland into something close to civil war. And if matters came to such a point, how long would the Soviets keep out?"

The 'red fascists'

On Oct. 22, right after the kidnapping, a government source talking to UPI termed it "a blow directed straight at Jaruzelski." Even a leader of the banned Solidarnosc movement, for which Popieluszko ardently campaigned, alluded to a Soviet maneuver against the Polish government, with the remark, "There is no suggestion of blaming the government, because . . . most probably the kidnapping is the handiwork of other quarters."

French Radio on Oct. 31 aptly described the crime as perpetrated by "red fascists," Stalinists within the Polish security apparat, affiliated to Stalinists of the Soviet KGB. There was widespread speculation that Miroslaw Milewski, the former Internal Affairs minister who has supervised security affairs at the Communist Party Politburo level, engineered the crime in order to discredit Jaruzelski and his close associate General Kiszczak, the current Internal Affairs minister.

The ongoing political battles over the case are deadly serious, as was shown in November, when two Internal Affairs officers investigating the Popieluszko murder were killed near Torun when a truck crashed into their car.

Trouble for Glemp

In addition to rocking the party and government, the murder of the outspoken Popieluszko has rekindled grumbling from radical priests against Jozef Cardinal Glemp, the Roman Catholic Primate of Poland. Father Stanislaw Malkowski, a second target of the interior ministry group that killed Popieluszko, openly criticizes Glemp for compromising with the regime.

Since Popieluszko's death, Malkowski has preached even more fiery sermons. According to *The Times* of London, he said in church: "The Lord is calling upon us to abandon Moscow. Being in Solidarity means being obedient to Christ's own teaching to have nothing in common with Moscow. Burn this capital which is devoted to the devil."

Some worried Poles view such words as an invitation to the Russians to march into Poland. One exiled leader of Solidarnosc suggested that the official press was reporting Malkowski's sermons as more incendiary than they actually were, in order to justify a crackdown against him. But whether or not they were exaggerated in the reporting, the speeches of Malkowski and of Popieluszko before him were of concern to church authorities. Vatican sources report that after attacks on Popieluszko in the Soviet press in September, Polish-born

EIR January 29, 1985 International 31

Pope John Paul II wanted to get the priest out of Poland in order to avert a rift inside the Polish church and to remove him as a target for Soviet complaints and harassment. The Pope invited Popieluszko to study at a religious academy in Rome, they say, but this plan was preempted by his murder.

Yet to be satisfactorily investigated is the report published in France last December, that the pseudo-Catholic cult called Tradition, Family, and Property had become active in Poland. The French weekly *Actuel* wrote that TFP, the gnostic cult banned in Venezuela for kidnapping and brainwashing of youth, had begun to operate in Poland through something called the Organizacja Anty-Solidarnosc—"Anti-Solidarity Organization."

According to a Radio Free Europe research report, the Organizacja Anty-Solidarnośc (OAS) surfaced last spring in connection with kidnappings in the Torun area. A leaflet issued by the Solidarnośc underground quoted a communiqué from this OAS, which reads like a classic KGB provocation: "The incompetent Jaruzelski team and the bureaucratized security service have not managed to vanquish the cancer that is plaguing our society: conspiracy and the fashion for opposition. Solidarity is the cancer. Let us try to answer the question raised in the Apocalypse; we will fight the beast. The game has begun. We will strike wherever we are not expected. We will make our appearance under the banner of various institutions, maybe even under that of the TKK (Interim Coordinating Commission) of Solidarity. Beware. So far we have given only a sample of what we can do."

Actuel identified the Organizacja Anty-Solidarnosc with the party security honcho, Miroslaw Milewski, Foreign Minister Stefan Olszowski, and party official Albin Siwak, a construction worker turned party hack. All three are known as close to Moscow. Thus, elements of the explosive mix that blew up Poland in 1980—Soviet operatives with oligarchical factions in the orbit of the church—are still present.

Price hikes

The other fuse burning away in Poland is its wretched economy. In December, the United States lifted its objection to Poland's joining the International Monetary Fund. On Jan. 16, the "Paris Club" of creditor governments approved the rescheduling of Poland's debt payments for 1982-84; its debt to commercial banks has been rescheduled through 1987. These developments clear the way for Poland to rejoin the IMF later this year (it quit in 1950). The government is not waiting, however, to carry out the sort of austerity that the IMF is sure to demand and that has destroyed other indebted nations.

On Jan. 5, the Polish government announced across-the-board hikes in food prices effective March 1, of 15% on meat and as much as 80% on some other items. If these were met by bloody protest riots, giving the Soviets another excuse to move against Poland, IMF policies would once again have played into the hands of the U.S.S.R.

Who should not be Who





in the Reagan administration

EIR's newest special report is an essential reference work for anyone who wants to understand who's who in the ongoing faction fight within the Reagan administration over the President's strategic defense initiative.

It documents the activities of 47 administration officials and private citizens who must be purged from the Reagan administration to thwart their assault on the SDI, including:

- White House Chief of Staff James Baker III
- Secretary of State George Shultz
- Foreign policy advisor Henry A. Kissinger
- 19 think-tanks and other institutions

Sections on defense policy, international credit policy, foreign policy, and domestic policy document how key "eastern establishment" advisers are promoting the military hegemony of the Soviet Union to impose a global political and economic dictatorship which Henry Kissinger calls the "new order under the heavens."

Price \$100			
Enclosed please find \$ for copies of "Who Should Not Be Who."			=
Name			
Address			
City	State	Zip	
Mastercard/Visa #			·
Exp. Date Send to: CDI	Signature		

304 West 58th St. New York, N.Y. 10019 Att.: Editorial Office

32 International EIR January 29, 1985