

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. Zamyatin¹

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.² 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 mistakes the party has lost its creative ties with the people.

¹ 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.

² 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 Directive from the CPSU Secretariat, 14 January 1981, with Supporting Cables. 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.)

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.³ According to Walesa, he now has ten million people in Solidarity. The PZPR CC believes he has six million.⁴ The counterrevolutionary forces are grouped in the Committee for Workers' Defense, the so-called KOR. These include Kuron, Michnik, Gwiazda, Lis, and Walentynowicz — in all, around 40 people. Solidarity is now essentially a political party, which is openly hostile to the PZPR and the state.⁵

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.⁶ 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.

³ 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 implying 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.

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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.⁷ 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.⁸ 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

⁷ Translator's Note: A reference to the Independent Students' Union (*Niezalezny Zwiasek Studentow*, 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-sovetskoii družhby," Cable 360/42 (Secret), 15 January 1981, from A. Kapto, 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 "Prognoza przewidywanych nastrojow spolecznych oraz konfliktow z NSZZ 'Solidarnosc' i innymi ugrupowaniami wrogimi politycznie, na najblizsze miesiace opracowana w/g stanu na 17.08. 1981 r.: Wnioski i propozycje przeciwdzialania," 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.

⁸ 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.

of socialist society, about liberalization, about the need to revise Marxism-Leninism, about pluralism in political life, and so forth.

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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ The Polish friends assured

⁹ Translator's Note: On the groups of Soviet officials who traveled to Poland, see the annotations in Directive from the CPSU Secretariat, 14 November 1980, Reducing Tourist Exchanges with Poland. 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.

¹⁰ 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 buildup 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

us that they are 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.¹¹ 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.¹²

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.

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 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."

¹¹ Translator's Note: This comment echoes the statements by Andropov in Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 29 October 1980 and Brezhnev (citing Kania) in Transcript of the CPSU Politburo Session, 31 October 1980. See the relevant annotations in those documents.

¹² 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.

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.¹³

KIRILENKO. It seems to me there is not yet a serious revival of the PZPR.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵

USTINOV. Cde. Kulikov was in the PPR not long ago.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷

¹³ 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.

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ 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*.

¹⁷ 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," *Voenno-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

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.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹

officers in Poland in "Bericht über 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 manevry 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 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.

¹⁸ 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 Soyuza: 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.

¹⁹ 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.

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

Voronkov's first-hand account was corroborated by Shakhnazarov in an interview in Providence, Rhode Island, on 8 May 1998.