



True Voice from Poland

No. 001 • August 26 – September 8, 2022

www.knz24.pl

The narration

It seems obvious, that the present world is the world of narration. The world mass-media circulate the image of the world which influence the perception of events and happenings, of whole nations and of particular people

and about the decisions made by politicians and ordinary people. However, the dominant narrations in the world are not as unbiased and as reliable as they are presenting themselves. What is obvious for them is based on

accepted earlier ideologies and a certain view of the world. Moreover, their narrations are entwined in particular interests – political, economic and cultural, that would make any corrections either difficult or straight impossible.

That very often makes presented by them picture of Poland

distorted, caricaturized and thus disgusting, with its complete lack of knowledge of the history and culture of Poland and Central Europe. Therefore, the objective of the True Voice from Poland will be correction of the false image of Poland. According to our capabilities, we will be presenting information about present day

politics, economy, culture and history, both recent and distant. We intent on our pages to highlight Polish matters in a broader context of Central Europe and include the idea of Intermare.

We invite you to read the first edition.

Editorial Team

The Battle of Warsaw – part one

■ People in Poland in the 1980-ties were discovering historic black holes. During that time, in one of the still socialist TV-s, few noted communist historians were discussing the subject of the Battle of Warsaw from 1920. Somebody asked a question: what would happen, if the Poles lost the battle and the war?

ANDRZEJ
MANASTERSKI



One of the historians answered: „then we would neither have had bourgeois Poland, nor bourgeois Europe. In Europe, we would have had proletariat governance, which under the Bolshevik leadership would implement policies of the International Communist Party”. That was a simple, clear answer of the commie historian, who did not play with the historical meanders, like the other participants in that TV program. Obviously, TV producers did not cite the Bolshevik command from 2nd of July 1920, issued by the chief commander of the Western Front, Michail Tuchaczewski. Most likely it would have been known to the commie historians, as it was written by Norman Davis in the book published in London – “White Eagle – Red Star. Polish Soviet War”: *Over the dead body of the white Poland there is an enlightened road towards worldwide firestorm. We carry on our bayonet's happiness and peace for the humanity, full of pain. Towards the West! The hour of attack has come! Towards Wilno, Minsk, Warsaw! March forward!* The TV did not present either a fragment of the speech of Jozef Unszlicht, West Front War Revolutionary Council leader: *raising your spirit, teaching and enlightening Red Army military troops under your command, you should remember, that capturing Warsaw is not the final frontier, but a starting point towards the primary goal, which is the European Revolution, World Revolution!*

Between 1919 and 1920, the All-Russian Executive Committee gave a signal towards a “Red march on Europe”. The operational plan against resurgent

Poland, was prepared by colonel Borys Szaposznikow, former staff officer of the tsarist army and later Marshal of the Soviet Union. His main objectives were the basis of the Soviet war doctrine. One of its elements said: *Mobilization means a war and we do not understand it any other way.* This is also at present time a war doctrine of

sheviks have to review their military plans of attacking the army of Ukraine, but they had to withdraw. That time was used by Pilsudski to prepare calmly for further military operations, in which he had to take into account the fact, that the Polish army was outnumbered by the Bolsheviks by a wide margin. He also could not rely on the Ukrainians,

lensk, Warsaw, Berlin. The second one, south west, under the command of Aleksander Jegorow, was supposed to take over Galicia and Czechoslovakia, and march further on the Balkans. Just those plans show the scale of aggression Poland had to face. Taking into consideration big advantage Bolsheviks had in the number of troops,

cost, even sacrificing Poland. Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain, forced Wladyslaw Grabski to agree to the eastern border on the so-called Curzon Line, without Lviv and Wilno. That would make Poland a hull state, as the industrial base of Silesia and oil fields of Galicia would not be part of the country. Furthermore, British Prime Minister took into consideration other conditions dictated by the Soviets: reduction of the Polish army to 50 thousand troops, handover of all the arms and munitions to the Red Army and a free passage of all Soviet transports through Poland. In exchange, Lew Kamieniew, (his real name was Lew Rozenfeld), who was presiding over the talks with Lloyd George, agreed to acknowledge without any other conditions full independence of the Polish Republic. Those conditions were unacceptable, even for the most conciliatory politicians in Poland. Poland did not even reply to those proposals. That was in line with the Bolsheviks, who did not need peace with Poland to realize their plans to conquest Europe. Lenin acknowledged this in his letter to Stalin: *Poles did not come on the set date. This is ultra-convenient for us.* The Bolshevik's intentions were understood very well by Pilsudski. Any mediations for peace were consent to defeat. He wrote in his memoirs: *under the impression of the upcoming hail storm, the state was getting broken, characters were wavering and the hearts of soldiers were softening. The war front outside the country was joined by an upcoming warfront inside the country, which by the power of its historic force* ▶



Russia. In four months, till April of 1920, the armed forces of the Red Army on the western front grew five times and were three million strong. The actions of Józef Pilsudski, who decided to help Ukraine to fight for its freedom, and commanded to march towards Kyiv in April, were coming from his deep understanding of the political and strategic reality. Unprepared Bolshevik's military regiments, who were struck by the Polish army, were forced to action. Not only did the Bol-

as they did not position themselves to fight in alliance with Poland. Pilsudski took that into account and decided to withdraw from Kyiv and prepare for defense operations. The Bolsheviks regrouped and prepared to implement their original plans to attack, approved in March 1920. Those plans considered division of the western war front into different actions. The first one, under the command of Tuchaczewski, was supposed to strike on the western line of Smo-

the Poles decided to withdraw. Situation on the war front was also influencing political situation in the country. The government of Wladyslaw Grabski, appointed outside the parliament, was seeking solutions within the Entente countries, which prepared to mediate with the Soviets. We can only imagine the results of that mediation. European countries were not inclined to participate in a new conflict, these time with the Soviets. They were looking to end the war at any

► was a harbinger of defeat and the biggest condition not of the battles, but the whole war. When the Red Army was close to Warsaw on the 14th of August, the government sent a delegation to Tuchaczewski to negotiate the end of fight. Pilsudski did not hide his irritation: *I cannot call that other way than begging, as starting any talks about peace at the moment when the winning enemy is knocking at the door of our capital and is threatening to destroy the country before he even utters any words about peace.* Great Britain showed a submissive stance regarding the war and definitely unfriendly towards Poland. And other coun-

tries? After the Kamieniew proposals, governments of both France and USA declared help for Poland. But the road from a declaration to a real assistance was lengthy and full of turning points. Additionally, the Bolshevik propaganda was doing its own job. The III International Communist Congress established clearly: *that the task of the proletariat of all countries is to disturb the governments of England, France, America and Italy in implementing any support towards white Poland. Where the governments and capitalists' interests would not give in to the workers protests – we need to organize strikes and even rapes.*

Clear reluctance towards Poland showed Czech president, Tomasz Masaryk and foreign minister Edward Benesz. Both agreed to the takeover by the Soviets territories of Zakarpattia Oblast with Uzhhorod: *in the name of friendship, when the Bolsheviks will take over Eastern Galicia.* That gesture was supposed to stop the Bolshevik's invasion and save Czechoslovakia. The Germans showed extremely unfavorable stand towards Poland. They played on two fronts. They proposed to the Entente countries, that in exchange for the territories of Greater Poland (Wielkopolska) and Pomerania (Pomorze) as well as abolish-

ment of the Treaty of Versailles, they will deploy an army able to stop the Bolsheviks; at the same time, they were secretly negotiating with the Bolsheviks conditions of the partition of Poland. How important to the Bolsheviks was Germany, show the words of Tuchaczewski: *German workers openly protested against Entente, they were turning back transports with supplies and munitions, that France sent to Poland, and they prevented any unloading of French and English ships with munitions and arms in Gdansk, they also caused rail accidents etc. In other words, they were conducting a revolutionary fight benefitting the So-*

viet Russia. When we touched base with them in Eastern Prussia, we received thousands and hundreds of volunteers, Spartak's, and nonpartisan workers, who formed a German Rifle Brigade under the Red Army flag. To make it more interesting, the afore mentioned Gdansk strike was supported by the High Commissioner of the League of Nations, Reginald Tower. Only Hungary and Romania showed a will to help Poland. The Hungarian government of Bela Kuna offered to deliver munitions and declared readiness to send 30 thousand troops to the battle front. Romania showed a political support towards Poland.

Is Central-East European region in danger?

NERIJUS
BABINSKAS

■ An interview with Laurynas Kasčiūnas, the Lithuanian member of parliament.

Nerijus Babinskas: the first question would be in context of general trends. How did the war in Ukraine change the geopolitics of Lithuania, Poland and the region to which we belong, which I called the "exposed region", because it is not only Central and Eastern Europe, but includes at least the eastern coast of Scandinavia?

I would probably start with what we, feeling that change, tried to do, and it seems that we stuck to the issues at the NATO summit. The idea is to move to the preemptive defense. What does it mean? This is when we already have a chance to fight on the line, instead of waiting for reinforcements. Not „deterrence by punishment“, as it has been until now, but „deterrence by denial“. The direct consequence of the concept „deterrence by denial“: there would be NATO brigades here on the border. This is a fundamental point when it comes to the global geopolitical shift.

But, from my point of view, it is very important that we still have to move to the principle of total defense. We have 104 thousand people having military service experience, but only 24 thousand take part at the exercises. It must be expanded. A very important thing is the union with the structures of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, border guards, public security service, dignitary protection service officers. These are some four or five thousand who may have a role in the defense plans.

And, thirdly, involvement of society: involvement in the National Defense Volunteer Forces and the Riflemen's Union, which could find a place for ev-

eryone who wants to contribute, with or without a weapon.

Estimating the impact of the ongoing war on us, I would think that the statement that „the Ukrainians are fighting for us“ is very correct, because the losses they dealt to Russia will hold it back for at least 5 years. Since we still have Western sanctions, which are also a shackle for this empire to develop its military power, Russia cannot currently have a second war at the same time – it will need years to recover. Therefore, we have a little time to prepare. So briefly.

Does the whole of „Europe between“: from Finland to Romania take a similar position?

Some have already moved further. There is no question about NATO's defensibility and the preemptive defense principle: we all spoke with one voice. But when it comes to implementing the principles of total defense, not everyone has gone that far. Perhaps, the Estonians have gone the furthest. Estonians have „Kaitseliit“ since old times. Their involvement of society is higher than in Lithuania and Latvia. Maybe the Poles have gone very far too. If someone had asked a Pole before the occupation of Crimea who would defend Poland, he would have answered: NATO and maybe the army, and now they answer: NATO, the army and the whole nation. Within five years, Poland created a territorial defense force. Now there are 25 thousand and the plan is to have 50 thousand in a close future. Maybe these are not such huge numbers for Poland, but they are big. And this is an example of how to move forward. This is a very good princi-

ple, because the war in Ukraine shows that the establishment of the rear, territorial defense principle is extremely important. On the other hand, Latvians are only now starting to consider the return of conscripts.

Now let's look at it from another angle: in the context of the war in Ukraine, we clearly see differences of opinion within NATO and the EU. That "Europe between" sees it much differently than, say,



Western Europe or Southern Europe. What do Lithuania and Poland look like here?

Symbolically we can distinguish between „East point“ and „West point“. Kosciuszko built the „West point“ in America, and we, as a Western outpost, could see ourselves as the „East point“. Our mission is to be the front line of the West. At the strategic level, both countries (Lithuania and Poland) share the same view that it is necessary to defeat the Russians in Ukraine. This means that, in terms of conquests, at least Russia must have penetrated Ukraine less than be-

fore February 24, and this could possibly affect the regime of the Russian Federation itself.

Meanwhile, in the West, this attitude is more dominant: let's help, but you will still need to sit down and talk at the table with Russians. You can't push Russia into a corner, because then Russia starts threatening with a tactical nuclear weapon. This is essentially Kissingerian thinking. From this point of view, it is simply a peripheral conflict. So that it does not spread to the rest of Europe, spheres of influence must be shared. But the disappointment is enormous in terms of values: you trample on the right of Ukrainians to have an independent state. But, OK, that mindset exists.

The West has woken up a bit, but not in the way we imagine. I think that Putin is counting on the coming of that „fatigue“, which partially has already arrived, when the economy, inflation, all other things are already taking their toll. They will force the West to pressure Kiev to negotiate some new balance of power. Only peace can be bad. If you make such a peace that is favorable to the Russians, it programs a new war and it completely undermines independence of the Ukrainians. Meanwhile, the Ukrainians say: it is best to defeat the Russians here, give us weapons and we will defeat them. This is a different view of the Ukrainian conflict between our region and the Westerners.

And now let's return to the bilateral axis: relations between Ukraine and Lithuania, has the current war fundamentally changed something, or has it already been developing, say, since the annexation of Crimea?

These are deep traditions, programmed back in the Soviet era, stories from joint imprisonments (Sigitas Tamkevičius and others). The strongest armed resistance was also in Western Ukraine and Lithuania. There have been attempts by Ukrainians to contact: I have seen the proclamation of Ukrainian partisans, dated 1950, to Poles, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians. It prompted to continue the fight against communism. I think that brotherhood, that community has been programmed since those times, especially if we talk about the territories from Kiev to the West. And now everything has become actualized, strengthened, based on fresh emotions.

You anticipated my next question because you touched on the dimension of historical tradition. Yes, there was a lot in common in the 20th century: geopolitical threat, resistance. And if we look deeper – where are the sentiments of the past: the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, „mild occupation“? Do they mean something in the political and historical consciousness of Ukrainians and where are Lithuania and Poland?

From our point of view, the existence of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and then the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth allowed the formation of the Ukrainian ethnos and an independent nation. However, this is how we think, and do the Ukrainians themselves reflect this? I would be too romantic if I said that it is definitely so. Yes, their belonging to Western civilization is expressed through our common state. This is very important to them. But their his- ►

► torical memory is very multi-layered, so it is difficult to say: whether this is already the foundation of their identity, or some glitter, just a more interesting accent. Yes, it's close to them, but it is incomparable to Bandera with all his controversies.

The Kaliningrad transit problem has recently escalated in Lithuania. What do you think, does the escalation of that problem really increase the threat to Lithuania? Is it just a scare game? And how does Poland view this issue?

For the Western big ones, looking globally, the Kaliningrad issue is just some kind of additional irritating stimulus that should not be an obstacle. It does not affect the sanctions policy, so they propose to fix it.

Politically, this is bad: because the Russians escalated the issue and got a concession, it sets a precedent to continue doing so.

Meanwhile, from our point of view, we have to count whether we have the backing of the big

strategic partners. So that we could call at X hour, if ever, and they would answer right away. You need to calculate so that you are not alone. That's why we calculated. We have heard from the Poles political support for our strong position, but they also understand that we cannot stand alone.

Got it. Now a very relevant question for Lithuania and Poland in the context of the war in Ukraine: has the attitude towards the so-called Suwalki Corridor changed, how is it changing and whether, in your opinion, an adequate solution has already been reached?

The entire NATO community knows the Suwalki corridor. This is our relationship with NATO. Clearly, with the accession of Finland, the northern route of help becomes easier. We can say that our vulnerability is decreasing a little bit. But there is no need to calm down, because it still hasn't disappeared: Kaliningrad is milita-

rized, Belarus is losing its independence and becoming a Russian military outpost. The possibility of a quick connection scenario is not going away. Therefore, we constantly emphasize it. It would be good for Poland to see more than just up to the Suwalki Corridor.

Has this already turned into practical solutions? I don't think so, it's just that the perception has become even stronger that this space will need a special protection. We are doing the work, but of course we would like it to go faster.

Now, as in closing the entire conversation, let's return to a more general question: how does the entry of Finland and Sweden into NATO change the situation of what I call the „exposed region“?

Of course, this is a positive. Generally speaking: Russia wanted less NATO and got more NATO on its border. Overall positive, but not a panacea. We have gained more strategic depth, by combining capabilities, the Baltic

Sea can be turned into an inland sea with the ability to block the Russian fleet. Finns and Swedes are signaling that they want to contribute to the security of all 3 Baltic States: they have something to offer in air defense and the maritime domain. The Swedish navy is one of the strongest, maybe even stronger than the German. But, as I said, Kaliningrad and Belarus, which is losing its independence, remain a threat (“no-notice scenario”).

We often compare ourselves to Ukraine: in order to occupy Ukraine, Russia had to mobilize forces for a long time. We have seen everything because intelligence is now uniquely strong. We will continue to see. But Ukraine had strategic depth, and Lithuania does not have it, because Belarus is already 30 km away. They do not need such a large concentration to separate us from the Polish defense system. There is a fundamental difference here. Therefore, we must have as many NATO forces as possible on the border.

This is the answer regarding the accession of Finland and Sweden: the threat factors have not changed and our existential challenges have not disappeared.

Vilnius, Lithuania, July 25, 2022

SHORT BIOGRAPHY

Laurynas Kasčiūnas
Was born in Vilnius, in 1982.
Got BA (2004) and MA (2006) degrees in political science.
2007-2016 lecturer at the Institute of International Relations and Political Science (Vilnius University).
In 2012 defended doctoral dissertation Implications of EU Internal Integration for External Europeanisation: Case Studies of Ukraine and Russia.
2012-2016 was a director of the Eastern Europe Studies Centre.
From 2011 is a member of the party „Homeland Union — Lithuanian Christian Democrats“.
From 2016 is a member of Lithuanian parliament (Seimas)
From 2019 is a deputy chair, from 2020 – a chair of the Committee on National Security and Defense.

Russia, Poland and Ukraine in the geopolitical thought of Leon Wasilewski

■ Leon Wasilewski (1870 – 1936) belonged to the rebellious generation born after January Uprising of 1863 and became an adult in the 90-ties of XIX century. His generation took up again an active fight for the independence of Poland.



KRZYSZTOF
BRZEHCZYN

Coming of age

Wasilewski was born on 24th of August 1870 in Petersburg, but his ancestors were from Lithuania. Wasilewski's home cultivated the history of January Uprising and Leon was brought up in the Polish spirit. He published his first article in 1890 and achieved his financial independence through publishing and tutoring. After graduating from high school, Wasilewski decided to study in Lviv and personally learn national relations in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

At the age of 20, he described himself as “a conscious Pole, I wanted to work for Poland and for its people, and I felt being under the influence of my father as a definite democrat, and at the same time I sympathized a lot with Slavic movement, together with an absolute hatred of Russia and some sympathy for the Russian revolutionaries”. (Wasilewski, Memoirs, p. 46).

In September of 1893 he learned the Polish Socialist Party (PPS) program, containing a stipulation to restore independent and democratic Poland. Having read the program, he became a devoted socialist, although he did not sign in to PPS yet.

During his studies at the Jan Kazimierz University in Lviv, he maintained contacts with Ukrainian artists and political activists. He also traveled extensively, vis-

iting Central and South European countries inhabited by Slavic people.

Inside the ideology circle of Jozef Pilsudski

He became a member of the Polish Socialists Party in 1896. Two years later he became an editor in chief of a theoretical magazine of PPS “Daybreak” (Przedświt). The *Outline of the Polish Socialist Party*, which PPS established in November of 1892 in Paris, called for the fight for independent Poland in

pre-partition borders. They envisioned “a complete equality of all nations included in the republic on the basis of voluntary federation”.

That stipulation obliged PPS to create a detailed nationalistic program, which was written by Leon Wasilewski, as the most knowledgeable person in the party in the field of national relations. In an important from that point of view paragraph, he wrote: “Having written on our flag a demand for the independent Polish Republic, PPS is obliged to look in Russia for allies, who would also stand on a separatist ground. (...) We should find among the Finns, Baltic Germans, Estonians, Latvians, Ukrainians, Armenians and Georgians, such parties or groups which could accept proclaimed by us idea of political separation”. (L. Wasilews-

ki, “Ukrainophilia, the matter of Rus and Polish socialists”, Daybreak nr 10, 1896).

The young PPS members broke with the ‘old’ ones during 1905 revolution over their priorities, as they proposed setting aside the idea of gaining Polish independence and instead wanted to cooperate with the Russian revolutionary movement to abolish capitalism. The ‘old’ members were trying to transform economic protests into armed ones to gain independence.

Wasilewski stood with the ‘old ones’ around Jozef Pilsudski.

After Poland gained independence in 1918, Wasilewski became the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the first government of Jędrzej Moraczewski. From 1920 – till 1926 he held few important state functions. However, his life passion remained science. Two institutes were established thanks to his initiative: an Institute for Studies of the Newest History of Poland and an Institute for the Studies of National Affairs. At the end of 1920 he became active again in the PPS party. He died of influenza on December 10th 1936.

Russia, Poland and Ukraine in the geopolitical thought of Wasilewski

Wasilewski was not far from liberating and predicting geopolitical stage. According to his

predictions, although Russia was weakened after the I World War, it will never leave its imperial ambitions. How prophetic are Wasilewski's words written in 1918: “Backtracked in its development to the time of XIV-XV, Russia faces incredibly difficult conditions to grow and is drained of the most important sources of economic power, it is thrown away to the East, pushed back from the Baltic and the Black Sea. However, it will always be a power of tens of millions. And that power, after overcoming internal difficulties – will have to attempt to gain at least partially, what it lost during the war. The Russian danger to the frontier nations will not disappear. It will remain more serious, if the formation of independent statehood frontier nations, that were captured before into the Russian serfdom, will be slower and weaker.” (Wasilewski, ‘Abolition of the czar's frontier property’. Kultura Polski No 7, page 277, 1918).

According to him, the only guarantee against the anticipated Russian aggression is: “formation of a chain of independent nations, showing unified external front in defense of their own and common internal development. Their independent existence depends on whether there will be a possibility of forming such a protective chain

of independent nation-states”. (Wasilewski, ‘Abolition of the czar's frontier property’. Kultura Polski No 7, page 275, 1918).

And in that chain of non-Russian nations, due to the vast territory, wealth of natural resources and the number of population, the most important role will play Ukraine. According to Wasilewski, the Russian threat will be a sufficient premise to form a Polish-Ukrainian alliance, as the potential altercations between Poland and Ukraine are lesser than Polish-Russian and Ukrainian-Russian ones.

In an unpublished article, Wasilewski wrote: “It is desired by the Polish nation, to have the neighboring country of Ukraine reaching furthest to the north, east and south. That will become a guarantee of Russian's antagonism towards them, as they will always feel aggravated due to the loss of the Black Sea access and blocked expansion in that direction. (...) Russian-Ukrainian antagonisms will force Ukrainians to rely on the alliance with Poland. Only this can guarantee a serious assistance. Russian-Ukrainian antagonism is the most important factor justifying Polish-Ukrainian alliance”. (Polish politics towards the Ukrainian state, AAN, Leon Wasilewski's acts 390-73).

In another article, he predicted: “a futuristic view of ►

► *Ukraine as an independent nation, threatened in its existence by Russia, can be only backed by the West – hence Poland. Against the threat from the East, we, from our side, should try to have the Ukrainians look for our support with trust.* (Nasze zadania, s. 5. AAN, Leon Wasilewski's acts 390-73).

Predictions against reality

Wasilewski's predictions were justified in the first phase of World War II. A Hitler – Stalin pact from 1939, Soviet Union aggression on Poland, Lithua-

nia, Latvia and Estonia as well as the partition of Bessarabia, could be considered as a return to the imperialistic road of tsarist Russia. However, against the predictions and wishes of Wasilewski, the Ukrainian – Polish relations in the II Rzeczpospolita, were not going well. For different reasons, it was unrealistic to implement his policy of state assimilation, guaranteeing national minorities cultural and territorial autonomy, which would weaken centrifugal tendencies.

Again, this time in the soviet version, the Russian empire

has fallen in 1991, and the soviet Ukraine became an independent state. The foreseen by Wasilewski Polish – Ukrainian alliance did not happen. This was due to unsettled past of the World War II. It seems, that Ukraine, especially after 2014, was rather looking for its strategic partner in Germany, not Poland. The pro-German posture of the Ukrainian elites was strengthened by the activities of the German cultural foundations active in Ukraine. Developing German – Ukrainian alliance was easier than forming Polish – Ukrainian relations.

The main obstacle was the unsettled genocide during the World War II done on the Polish people in the frontier territories by the Ukrainian nationalists and – just after the Orange Revolution – the restoration of the cult of Bandera. Would the passive, to say the least, German posture towards the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, possibly sway the Ukrainian state elites to revise its foreign policy and start a real reconciliation with Poland? Only time will show, if the Wasilewski's predictions will have a chance to fulfill.

Editor's note:

Representatives of the Polish government were the first ones to visit Ukraine on March 15th after the invasion of Russia. Prime minister Mateusz Morawiecki and the chairman of the PiS party, Jarosław Kaczyński, initiated a trip to Kiev, together with the prime minister of Slovenia, Mr. Janez Jansza and the Czech Republic, Mr. Petr Fiala. Today, on August 23rd, the president of Poland Andrzej Duda, is – yet again - in Kiev, conducting talks with president Zelensky. It is the third visit of the Polish president to Ukraine since the start of the war. Perhaps that Leon Wasilewski's prediction is happening in front of our eyes.

What is there **not to understand?**

■ What would have happened, if the party Law and Order did not win the elections?

We certainly would not have had the Vistula Spit Canal, the Baltic pipeline, the border fence on the Belarus border, storages filled with gas, local roads funds, thirteenth and fourteenth pension, monthly benefits 500 Plus for all children, support for former oppositionists (thanks to whom we liberated ourselves from communism), excellent results of the state-owned companies, the increasing gold reserves of the National Bank of Poland. This is a dynamic development of Poland. South Korean shipyard started to build the third from eight gas transporting ships for PGNiG, which will ensure deliveries of 9 billion cubic meters of gas annually; taxed free income was increased from 3091 zlotys to 30,000; export increased by 86,5 percent. We could make that list longer. And it is all happening in the unfavorable international situation – two years of Covid pandemic, war in Ukraine. Every reasonable Polish person can see that, so he or she should understand and appreciate that Poland is developing in a good way. Why it is not so?

Donald Tusk and the opposition, through their media – majority of which are German funded and hence take the dictate of their principals – negate all

changes. When the German city of Mecklenburg is protesting against the development of the Swinoujscie port, Polish senate majority is against that development, as well as against building of the Central Communication Airport, and Mr. Tusk is criticizing the merger of Orlen and Lotos, as that is not good for Germany. His philosophy is reflected in the words he once spoke: *“Polishness induce inside me a rebellion – history, geography, timeless bad luck – it all jumped on my shoulders and Donald does not have any special will to carry this; better are excursions on the Polish land, specifically that that was lost, dirty and poor”*. Such Poland does not exist anymore. German newspaper Die Welt wrote: *“Poland is strong as ever, and the war in Ukraine made it a major player in the European politics”*.

Tusk forgot, that he wanted to sell the best Polish companies to the Russians. Just like he sold chemical factories Ciech for 619 million zlotys to the Polish millionaire Kulczyk. In the next two years the factories earned 940 million zlotys income.

When Poland was governed by the coalition of PO – PSL (present opposition Citizen's Platform – PO and Polish People's Party – PSL), there were

pathological political – family mafia like interconnections in the companies that belonged to the treasury. The destruction of those businesses was taking place for many years.

For his friend, former minister of Treasury, Aleksander Grad, Tusk formed a new company that was paying him 110,000 zlotys monthly (around \$30 K). Mr. Grad was supposed to develop a first nuclear power plant – that never happened. How do you call gigantic payments for a job that was never done, in a country that could not afford treating cancer sick children due to lack of funds?

Unfortunately, those supporting present opposition, Kolicja Obywatelska, are causing as much damage as they can. Not only inside the country, but on the international stage as well. The opposition is supporting in Brussels European Commission unlawful stopping of funds that are due to Poland (funds that were borrowed by EU for a reconstruction of economies after Covid 19 pandemic). President of the EU, Ursula von der Leyen, is interfering illegally in the areas of Poland that are not subject to any EU treaties or agreements, and is also supposed to steer Mr. Tusk into actions directed by Berlin. She

is not only compromising herself, but also EU. In her latest interview she announced that Poland will receive the funds if judges, suspended by a Disciplinary Chamber of High Court are brought back to the courts. Who are they? Judges suspended for causing an accident while driving under influence; or have adjudicated during communist times against anticommunists activists or were evidently corrupted or brutally raped a woman. An activist judge, Igor Tuleja, who as a judge cannot be involved in politics, but participates in a “defenders of constitution” movement and is often seen on TV, comes from a particular family. His mother Lucyna, from 1960-1971 worked in the socialist Citizens Militia in Lodz in the criminal department, and till 1988 was part of Security Services (Służba Bezpieczeństwa) with a pseudonym „Lucyna”. His father Witold worked in the Interior Ministry and was trained in Moscow. How fast and how often we forget about the shameful past.

Another one with the amnesia is European member of parliament, Marek Belka, who wrote on Tweeter on the day Poland was paying tribute to Warsaw Uprising: *through our capital is marching a l&js (PiS) vi-*

sion of the nation and of an ideal citizen. On the day of remembrance of the victims of freedom and equality, the streets of Warsaw are full of the demons of our history. He forgot, that those demons are his comrades from the Polish National Socialist Party: Leszek Miller, Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz and quite a few others.

Professor Andrzej Nowak, a renown historian, wrote: *Tusk made an alliance with rabble, with post – socialists' riffraff, who do not want to know anything about Polish European tradition, about culture and history, and who want to throw away our writers like Mickiewicz and Sienkiewicz. He did that to realize his political objectives.*

Polish opposition is anti-state – nowhere in the world exist a possibility that the political opposition in a democratic country would be against its own nation not only inside a country, but also outside. Such a horrible stance is unfortunately supported by our countryman inside our nation and abroad.

And what is Tusk's political aim? Gain power and shape Poland into a General Gu-bernia, just like during the II World War. Will the Poles allow for this to happen?

ALBERT
ŁYJAK



STILL VALID

– words by late Kornel Morawiecki

Balance

Judicial courts cannot be governed by politicians. But can the lawyers govern a state? Does the judicial power, which during the 28 years of democratic Poland did not gain public trust, have the authority to undermine the will of the Minister of Justice?



Does the law present a shield for the lawyers? Supreme Court is morally responsible for the unjust judgement in the common courts, for the harms done to simple people and the nation. The government and the parliament have the duty to change that organization. Lawyers have the duty to perform their great power with the respect of the balance of the authority. Because each power should be conducted as a service.

Kornel Morawiecki

True Voice from Poland

Editorial Board:

Albert Lyjak, Agnes Marczak, Krzysztof Brzechczyn

Typesetting:

Artur Waszkiewicz Company

Contact: + 48 517 938 909

Email:

kronikanaszegozycia@gmail.com

Publisher:

Fundacja Kronika Naszego Życia

www.knz24.pl

All rights reserved