

POLISH  
PATRIOTS★

MADE IN MOSCOW

by  
Aleksander  
Junosza Galecki

PUBLICATIONS OF THE  
LIBRARY OF FIGHTING POLAND

17, ROSSLYN HILL, LONDON, N.W.3.

- THE POLISH UNDERGROUND ARMY, by  
*Mark Valet*, with a foreword by *Waclaw  
Śledziński* ... .. 2/6
- POLISH TROOPS IN ITALY, by *Marian  
Czuchnowski* ... .. 2/6
- THE BIG FIVE, by *George Michael* ... .. 2/6
- WARSAW WAS A BEAUTIFUL CITY, by  
*Karol Zbyszewski* ... .. 3/6
- POLISH PATRIOTS MADE IN MOSCOW, by  
*Aleksander Junosza-Galecki* ... .. 2/6

*In preparation:*

- THE TRUTH ABOUT THE RUSSO-POLISH CON-  
FLICT, by *H. W. Henderson*
- POLISH WINGS OVER EUROPE,  
by *Mieczysław Pruszyński*
- OVERHEARD, by *Aleksander Janta*
- WHAT ARE POLAND'S AIMS?  
by *Waclaw Śledziński*
- EASTERN GALICIA, by *Dr. Stanisław Skrzypek*
- FROM MUNICH TO YALTA,  
by *Aleksander Junosza-Galecki*
- A HARVEST OF CRIME, by *Janusz Laskowski*
- WINSTON CHURCHILL SPEAKS ABOUT POLAND  
(1939-1945).
- DANZIG, BIG POWERS AND POLAND,  
by *Tadeusz Łada-Bieńkowski*
- OPOLE SILESIA, by *M. Kamil Dziewanowski*
- VIENNA APPEASEMENT,  
by *M. Kamil Dziewanowski*
- WILNO AND LWÓW, by *Waclaw Śledziński*

THE LIBRARY OF FIGHTING POLAND  
WACŁAW KRZYŻANOWSKI

# POLISH PATRIOTS MADE IN MOSCOW

by

**ALEKSANDER JUNOSZA-GALECKI**



THE LIBRARY OF FIGHTING POLAND  
LONDON

THE LIBRARY OF FIGHTING POLAND

Editor :

WACŁAW SLEDZIŃSKI

MARCH, 1945

1398306



Published by  
THE LIBRARY OF FIGHTING POLAND,  
17, Rosslyn Hill, London, N.W.3.

# POLISH PATRIOTS MADE IN MOSCOW

By **ALEKSANDER JUNOSZA-GALECKI**

“Russia the new Colossus”—as she is called by Marshal Smuts, is among the front line problems of international politics, not only as a country of immense territorial size, backed by the power of the Red Army, but as a country possessing the fundamental structure of a Communist state.

The problem of communism is not generally very well understood by the democratic world. It is known that it constitutes a threat—but its nature and origin are not fully appreciated. The hazy notion of communism weakens its adversaries and makes their struggles against it abortive. Their action is, therefore, spent on irrelevant, often imaginary, superficialities, striking with mere phraseology at something neither comprehended nor defeatable. Economic materialism is the foundation of communism. Although it is a real, striking force, an effective mechanism, far removed from pure theoretical practice, it is not seriously enough considered by politicians.

Some can fight communism, others can believe in it. Some can defend themselves against it, while others can propagate it. But no matter what our attitude to communism is, we should know something about it first. It is not enough to oppose it with hysterical irrationalism and platitudes. The assurance that communism means death, hunger, poverty and misery is not enough. It is essential to cut through all irrelevant matter and reach the basis of its structure, differentiating between its aims and its methods.

I do not wish to state that every politician should know Marx, Engels or Lenin by heart, or that every platform speaker should absorb himself in complicated philosophical and economic investigations, that he should know Plechanow, Mach, Avenarius; Berkeley, Hume and Ricardo, and the maxims that Hegel and Stalin have laid down.

I do not ask of everyone that they should inquire into the ideas which, developing out of each other through the ages, have led to the ultimate creation of the Soviet State. It is not necessary for all to read the thick volumes which preceded Marx's "Capital." However, it is vital for the chief defenders of the "status quo" to know that Marx based his theories on the analysis of economic social relationship, and this method gave him the notion of the social structure. In his "Capital" he has described the development and activities of only one social economic system, of the system of the distribution of wealth in capitalistic society. Lenin adapted Marxism to practical necessity, and taking under consideration the succession of changes, he has "developed" Marxism further, and—as the Soviet propaganda claims—he has improved on Marx. Taking Marxist economic conceptions and creating a political, administrative and executive super-structure—he left an heritage called Leninism.

This is how Stalin describes Leninism:

"Leninism represents Marxism as it was at the time of imperialism and the revolution of the proletariat. Leninism is the theory and strategy of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

If we remember this definition, as well as the fact that Stalin considers himself the successor of Leninism, and that he is taking advantage in the fullest possible way of Lenin's recommendation that "the strategy and tactics of the Communist party should be extremely flexible"—then many of the recent political moves of the Russians can be seen in a clearer light.

There is not much exaggeration in the saying of a certain American correspondent, that Stalin would even have himself crowned Tzar of Russia in order to achieve his main aim: the communisation of Europe. To be able to play a game with Stalin one should know how to differentiate between the methods of his actions and the essential aims to which these methods are but a means. Politicians are very much mistaken in thinking that Stalin has already abandoned the idea of creating and strengthening the socialist state, and that he has switched over to national-

imperialistic ideas. This is nonsense. People who think so lack knowledge of the basic principles of the policy of Communism. To think this means to swallow the bait thrown out for "statesmen," those unfortunate fools who believe that every pose of the Soviet dictator is a reflection of his real aims, and that all his moves and all the pretences made by the foreign policy of U.S.S.R. give a true picture of their real aims and intentions.

When Soviet Russia appears on the stage of international drama, disguised as a nationalistic State and a great Power ; when she "revives" history and digs up the names of Tzarist generals, adapting her national anthem to the conception expressed in the word "motherland"—many politicians—entirely misled, proclaim that Stalin has abandoned communism and reintroduced the ordinary imperialism of the Tzars. Their irresponsible statements and theories, supposed weapons against Stalin's policy, create chaos and cause the attention of the world to be diverted from the true and unchangeable basis of Soviet policy. They make it easier for Soviet propaganda to spread confusion and help to mask the main aims of Soviet international politics.

It is not the first time that the stupidity of platform bawlers and the "genius" of professional strategists have caused position of the Western Democracies to be weakened. "The infallible" and "certain" calculations of the first days of the Soviet-German war showed irrefutably that Russia would be defeated in six weeks. This was considered a certainty. This was the foundation upon which a rickety fabric of guesses was erected, and plans for the future were made. Brains failed as well as intuition and strategy. Russia has not fallen. On the contrary, she was able to create such strength that the German hordes were driven from the walls of Stalingrad to the gates of Warsaw.

Politicians and strategists have failed in their calculations because for 20 years they contemplated the embellishments of Soviet policy and not its real essence—they saw only the Red Army's paper tanks and single-shot rifles. They saw only what Soviet propaganda cared

to show them. They did not guess that enormous dumps of modern equipment and ammunition and innumerable factories were hidden away in the immensity of the Soviet plains.

They did not know of the existence of a well-trained army, capable of the hardest fighting, because they did not want to, or, they could not understand that Leninism is not a platitude, but that it is a great and far-reaching programme for the communisation of the world, a programme worked out in all its details and put into practice by Stalin in certain stages into which it has been divided.

When Lenin concluded that: "We, the Bolshevik Party, have taken Russia away from the wealthy in order to give her to the poor," he also pointed out the necessity of concentrating the entire productive effort on the defence of the new order, the necessity of sacrificing everything in order to build up a military power with which to fight the whole world, and all its capitalistic forces. Lenin not only started to arm, but he even described the means by which Russia would have to prepare for the future war. "When it is known"—he wrote—"that one's strength is inadequate, then the most suitable means of defence is to withdraw deep inside the country."

"In the period of the October Revolution—according to Soviet history—Lenin taught the Bolshevik Party how the attack should be carried out, only in the right circumstances. During the Brest-Litovsk treaty, Lenin taught the Party how to make an orderly withdrawal and how to prepare with the greatest energy for a new attack later on."

Just as a few years ago the politicians were misled into making miscalculations as to the military power of the Soviets—so now they are mistaken again in their estimate of Stalin's economic and political intentions. They are utterly wrong if they think that Stalin has returned to the old traditions of Russian Tzardom. They are wrong because they do not differentiate between his methods and his aims, because they do not understand that the Soviets to-day are in the position of having to assume the appearance of a Western democracy. Russia has to do it because she is the ally of capitalistic countries; and encroaching on



the soil of Central-Eastern Europe she knows that she must plant communism under many pretences and by many methods ; that she has to smuggle it in by misleading and hoodwinking the enemy.

The "Maximum Flexibility" of Lenin mainly concerns methods of action; he allows everything, even a "pact with the devil"; everything must be exploited, and nothing must be wasted. Watchwords and slogans are to be changed in accordance with varying conditions and circumstances.

Lenin centralised all his activities and schemes inside Russia, because he believed that socialism first had to be built up firmly in one country and that only then one could aim at the socialisation of the world. That is why Lenin put forward the watchword "Defence of the socialistic motherland," and this is why he spread the saying of Marx and Engels that "a country oppressing other nations cannot enjoy freedom."

If we look closer at the five years of Lenin's Government—we see that of all the elements characterising his rule the flexibility of the methods he applied appears to be the most important for us.

Perhaps Lenin is right in saying that the methods he applied to the Soviet republics "agree with the Russian mentality." Perhaps it is true that only with terror and ruthlessness, only with the most drastic measures could he make this "mentality" obey him. Possibly the highest discipline and an iron will were the only means for giving this mentality a new outlook. Every nation has its own mentality. Every country has its own methods, better or worse, but different.

I do not wish to analyse here the capitalist regime and underline the changes which this regime is undergoing. It is sufficient if I repeat that capitalism has already achieved its peak, and that its further "development" will be negation of its present state. Some people will call it progress, others will call it ruin and downfall—but the fact remains that various changes, stretching in various directions, will shake the foundations of the European countries, and that the mentalities of these countries will be exposed

to the methods brought about by these changes. These countries will accept only their own methods necessitated by the transformation. All the foreign extraneous methods will meet with categorical and ruthless opposition. They will be opposed by a natural self-defence mechanism actuated by their instinct of self-preservation and by their consciousness of nationality.

\* \* \*

It is difficult to say today what post-war Poland will be like. It is not quite certain what stage of metamorphosis the Polish nation has reached. It is possible that the ethics of the National Radicals are still spreading; that the racial ideas of the National Democrats are still holding strong, or that the economic organisation is being already taken as a basis factor in the construction of the State. No matter what has happened the structure of Poland will be built by the talents and efforts of her people. Poland will develop naturally.

This tendency to make it possible for Poland to manage her own affairs according to her needs by methods adapted to the Polish mentality is well understood, but it meets with grave difficulties because of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, or rather because of her guiding principles in connection with the Central-Eastern European countries.

I am not concerned only with the implanting of communism in these countries; I do not want to speak of communism as a "menace" or a "ruin" (from the point of view of the regime of a country); but I want to point out that there does exist the clear aim of introducing communism by conquest and by application of methods suited only to the Russian conditions.

The Red Army is already on Polish soil, accompanied by the machinery of conquest and directed by the skilful hand of Moscow. The Union of Polish Patriots in the U.S.S.R. provides the personal machinery and the channel through which the mixture of methods and ideology will flow, the mixture prepared by the Soviet propaganda.

The mission of the Union of Patriots does not absolve its members and does not diminish their responsibility to

the Polish Republic. It is known, however, that mere passivity and the providing of a name to cover up Soviet political moves would not give the Bolsheviks the advantages they want. The Union of Patriots is not only a common, worn out, showy screen, hiding the blatancy and cynicism of Bolshevik policy in relation to Poland. It is not only a tool and channel for Soviet influence. It works in close collaboration with Sooviet Russia, a collaboration whose aim is the seizure of the Eastern part of Poland and a forced change of organisation and regime in the remaining territory.

If the so-called "Patriots" did not collaborate with the Soviet propagandists the Polish cause would not have to undergo such depressing crises in the international forum; armed bands would not attack Polish citizens in Poland. The massacres in Volhynia would not have been possible. Were there no collaboration of the "Patriots" with the objects of Soviet policy there would not be so many unjust accusations against the legal Polish authorities.

In the columns of "Free Poland" the "Patriots" let themselves go, accusing the Polish Government in England of all possible crimes. The "Patriots'" contribution to the fight for a "free" and "democratic" Poland has been to instil poison and decay into the minds of a Polish community tired by five years of war. The "Patriots" want to poison this community; they want to force it into a terrific massacre in which Pole will murder Pole. "The Polish Government in London helps Hitler"—cries some fool in "Free Poland," and adds: "Let us not turn towards London, for ruin and not salvation, comes from there."

How ridiculous there words sound! The fact is that the ruin of the Polish Republic comes from the opposite direction; it comes from the same source, whence it always came. . . .

It is certainly not a coincidence that among the members and founders of the Polish Union of Patriots one sees only a few names of men well known in Poland—intelligent and talented men whose "left" orientation was also

“left” before September, 1939. They have joined the Union because they have found themselves on Soviet territory by their free will or deported forcibly, and—perhaps because they believed in the true patriotism of the Union. To-day it is too late for them to change their opinion. Because Soviet methods (giving such splendid results while applied to Russian mentality) do not allow anyone to turn back from his way. From this point of view Soviet “democracy” is very different from that which is operating in capitalist England.

Boleslaw Drobner, doctor of chemistry, a Jew by descent, who already in 1925 belonged to the Second International, whose son has been a communist for many years and lives in Russia, cannot be supposed to have joined the Union of Patriots from any other than idealistic reasons.

This is also the case with Stefan Jedrychowski (I remember him well), who clearly acquired more and more “red” ideas through the Z.P.M.D. (Polish Democratic Youth Association) and the Youth Legion.

The same is true of Stanislaw Skrzyszewski, a mathematician, assistant at the Jagiellonian University (and professor of pedagogy in Cracow), a fanatical communist, and his wife Bronislawa (née Mendelbaum).

But those are only exceptions. Wanda Wasilewska has already gone through her moments of “weakness.” In one such moment she wrote a pamphlet about Poland as a world-power, for the Military Institute of Science and Education. To-day as a member of the Ukrainian Communist Party she is fighting for . . . an “independent” Poland. The paradoxical situation appears even more ridiculous when one realises that Wanda Wasilewska does not recognise the Eastern frontiers of Poland as the same frontiers that were agreed upon at Riga in 1921, among others, by her own father Leon, then an eminent member of the Polish Socialist Party.

Wasilewska has obviously completely sacrificed her family feelings for her ideals, as her second husband, a bricklayer, Bogatko (her first husband, Roman Szymanski, died in 1931) was murdered by the Bolsheviki in September,

1939. This fact did not, however, prevent her from marrying Korniejczuk, after her short (also conjugal!) life with the actor Madalinski.

Since I am exposing certain eminent personages of the Union of Patriots—I feel I should also mention Andrzej Witos, the step-brother of Vincent. Andrzej Witos left the “Piastr” (branch of Peasant Party) for the B.B.W.R. (Government Party) which, presumably from gratitude, made him chairman of the Union of Settlers of South-Eastern Poland. Several times Andrzej Witos tried to get support from governing circles, always calculating what political attitude would be most advantageous for him. In September, 1939, he found himself under Soviet occupation and was deported into Russia. Accused of “pro-Polish” activities, he was tried and condemned to death. This sentence was later reduced to 20 years’ imprisonment. This, in turn, was commuted to an “assignment” to the Union of Patriots, or, strictly speaking, to an assignment to Soviet Propaganda. Because the “Patriots” are nothing but cogs in the enormous Bolshevik propaganda machine, they are the temporary cast of the drama that will be staged in Central-Eastern Europe—a drama “made in Moscow.”

It is possible that many of the politically “anonymous” names among the members of the Union of Patriots are people who do not themselves realise that their—sometimes truly patriotic intentions of work for the Polish cause—are part of the plans of the Soviet Union for Poland. They do not know that being at the moment useful to Soviet propaganda they are mere pawns in their hands, and have privileges assigned to them on this account. One day, however, their usefulness will end, and then they will perish by the sword they lived by. Then the methods they were applying will turn against them. The Soviet methods that “suit Russian mentality”—imply imprisonment and deportation for all those that have ceased to have a political usefulness.

But before this unavoidable future liquidates the Union of Patriots, before execution and death reduces the ranks of its unfortunate members, it is advisable to have a look

at this machine, this little factory of Polish "patriotism" and Polish "democracy" set up in Moscow.

The very creation of such a Union is a great injustice. It is an injustice done to the country and to its efforts in the fight for independence.

I do not wish to imply that every organisation acting on Soviet soil is an injustice, merely because it operates on Soviet soil. No. Nor would the Union of Polish Patriots be despicable if it were really Polish and patriotic, and if, in its activities, it did not serve the Soviet point of view on the "freedom, power and independence of the Polish Republic."

The question is a very simple one: Whom and what does this Union serve?

It is known that during the short Polish-Soviet idyll, which was the immediate outcome of the agreement of July, 1941, no one ever heard about the existence of any Polish "patriots" in Russia. It is well known, however, that concentration camps and prisons were filled with the "enemies of the people" brought from Eastern Poland in cattle waggons and dragged into the most uncivilised regions of Russia. As long as the idyll lasted—which means as long as the Soviet Government thought themselves able to force on Sikorski the cession of Eastern Poland and the dependence of Polish policy on Bolshevik influence—the reserve of the Soviet political strategy (Union of Patriots) was not to be put into action and its existence was—of course—not disclosed.

However, as soon as the Soviets realised that Sikorski would not accept any division of Polish territory—the various elements of the Union, so far kept in the dark, began to make themselves known, and proclaimed more and more forcibly the necessity of the "co-ordination" of Polish policy with Soviet demands.

Already on the 1st of December, 1941, that is during the Stalin-Sikorski talks, the conference in Saratow called by Wasilewska took place. Thus, only six months after the signature of the agreement with Poland the Soviets put into action the diverse forces, whose business was to be the

instruments of political sabotage. Their aim was to show clearly to Sikorski, at the time conversing with Stalin, that if he would not agree to put up with Russian demands the Bolsheviks would achieve their aims according to the old Russian tradition, without the agreement of the Polish Government and the legal Polish authorities.

This further stage of the Polish-Soviet collaboration (if one could call it a collaboration at all) was developing favourably for Wasilewska and for the members of the Conference of Saratow. The future "Patriots" increased in importance from day to day. The Soviet "re-armed" the political reserves which were to be put into action against Poland. At last, on the 1st of March, 1943, they were presented under the official name of the Union of Polish Patriots.

The "Patriots," who surprisingly enough were presided over by Soviet citizens—at once took up the previously planned action, the fight with the legal Polish Government in London, the slandering of everyone whom fate did not throw into the embrace of Soviet methods of life, behaviour and reasoning.

"Patriots" spreading chaos in the refugee and deportee centres, took the path of undermining the moral strength remaining in the ranks of the unhappy exiles; the path of destroying and weakening their moral unity, of taking advantage of hysterical feelings and disappointed sentiments.

The same Sikorski who, in 1941, talked with Stalin and was photographed in the Kremlin, having been received "as a friend," in 1943 had already "disappointed the expectations of many of his followers." ("Free Poland.")

Already, then, the Soviets were sure that they would never obtain Sikorski's consent for the Curzon Line, and they decided to break off diplomatic relations with Poland. Thus they started to prepare the ground for a new phase of the political offensive—a phase in which the Union of Patriots would take over the legal title of Polish Government and receive a "mandate" for the fight for a "free" Poland . . . from the hands of the Soviets.

From that moment onwards the hours of Polish-Soviet "collaboration" were numbered; the Soviet waited only for a pretext to take offence—and not for the first time in the history of Polish-Russian relations—to throw into the waste-paper basket a signed agreement. If there had been no Katyń, another reason would have been found.

Molotov said:

"The Soviet Government knows that this hostile campaign against the USSR (meaning the action of the Polish Government in connection with the Katyń slaughter) has been employed by the Polish Government only in order to extort from the Soviet Union territorial concessions at the expense of Soviet Ukraine, Soviet White Ruthenia and Soviet Lithuania, taking advantage of Hitler's slanderous lies."

Following this official statement of the Soviet Government—so candidly unmasking the real reason for the breaking off of relations with Poland—the Polish Government in London was exposed to violent attacks and expressions of "indignation" from the "Patriots."

As was stated by "Free Poland" on the 1st of May, 1943, the Government of Sikorski had committed a . . . treacherous act.

"The Polish nation—"Free Poland" wrote—did not elect, did not appoint nor give a mandate to the government of General Sikorski, which is unconstitutional."

What an ingenious discovery! The scribbler of "Free Poland" who wrote this nonsense rendered great service indeed to the Soviet Government! for he showed the Soviet Union in a very uncomfortable position. The Soviet Union had signed a treaty, a diplomatic document with an unconstitutional government! It remained legal only so long as it appeared pliable to Russian demands.

The unfortunate scribbler of "Free Poland" naively tried to camouflage and hide the real reason for the breaking off of the diplomatic relations with Poland by the Soviet Government. He also tried to give to Molotov's note a milder appearance, less direct and less explicit, wishing to hide the cynicism of his words under a heap of lies and phrases; the cynicism implied in his words: "The Polish Government has tried to exercise pressure on the Govern-



ment of the USSR in order to extort territorial concessions at the expense of Soviet Ukraine, Soviet White Ruthenia and Soviet Lithuania."

The very idea of 'extortion' applied by Poland to Russia must appear absurd, considering their relative size.

As the Union of Patriots had been created only to make it easier for the Soviet Government to carry out their policy towards Poland—the first attempt (impotent and naive) at camouflaging the real and obvious intentions of the Bolsheviks towards the Polish Republic had to be followed (in the columns of "Free Poland") by articles which would explicitly determine the "patriotic" point of view on our Eastern borders as opposed to the "hostile moves of the illegal government of Sikorski"!

For such serious tasks "important personalities" were needed, "important" in so far as their position in the Union of Patriots went. Thus it was quite natural that "Colonel" Wanda Wasilewska was the first one to express her opinion on the subject of "legality and justice"—legality in the ownership of land and justice in dividing it.

Referring to Sikorski's words that "the Polish-Russian frontier belt is indispensable for Poland because of its oil," Wasilewska writes:

"We need . . . —the Tzarist government used to say, and proceeded to grab foreign lands. We say that we need this or that, and for the sake of our needs we are prepared to spread the menace of war; to send millions of people to slaughter; to ruin towns and villages; to submerge millions in misery and unhappiness for years.

"Again we are trying to determine the question of frontiers from one point of view.

"We are constantly speaking of commonplaces, at the same time hiding not only naiveté and mental weakness, but common, brutal, voracious imperialism.

"At least the peoples who have gone through this most terrible of all world wars deserve that at the peace conference which will follow, the decisive factor in determining the question of frontiers should be the human being and not the strategic importance of terrain and oil. When you divide oil, it is oil that is being shed, when you cut coal, it is coal-dust flying, but when you cut lands and peoples—you shed blood. And if the maxim of 'needs' is to be accepted, Poland would have the worst of it."

Actually I am not surprised that Wasilewska wrote this. It is not surprising that she called this Polish defence of the status quo—"common, brutal and voracious imperialism." It is not surprising because Wasilewska is not a Polish, but a Soviet citizen, or strictly speaking she is a Ukrainian. Thus, to her duties belong the stubborn struggle for the enlargement of her motherland by all ways and means, including lies, slander, demagoguery, and . . . truth. Because it is true that "when you cut nations and lands apart blood is being shed."

Wasilewska had left the ranks of Polish citizens voluntarily. She passed over to the Soviet community in Poland's most tragic hour. She abandoned her mortally wounded Mother-country. She was free to do it, Poland has not suffered any loss because of it, but Poland knows and understands that a person who has acted as Wasilewska has—is not a friend of Poland, nor does she demand friendship from such a person. Everything would be understandable: the fact that Wasilewska took up the fight against Poland, the fact that she is applying the Soviet methods in this struggle—if only she would not try to camouflage her activities on behalf of the Soviet Union, if she did not act in the defence of Bolshevik interests under the pretence of a "fight for free Poland" and if she would not let herself be used for such a perfidious job.

"Again we are trying to determine the question of frontiers from one point of view"—she writes, and she is right, a hundred times right, because this "we" in her mouth is no one else but the Soviets; "we"—Soviet citizens; "we"—Bolshevik Russia.

The puppets used by the Bolsheviks in their trial of "settlement" of the frontiers with Poland cannot be treated seriously, the puppets that are pompously called the "Union of Patriots"—and lately 'government.' How ridiculous and ingenuous this Union looks when it is trying to become the "other side" and to seem the partner of the discussions about the frontier line of one country with another, determining various "Curzon lines" and at the same time referring to the mother country, the nation, and the happiness of its citizens.

Perhaps it is because they realise how ridiculous they seem that the Union of Patriots in Moscow so carelessly and lightheartedly solve the frontier problems. Perhaps this was the reason why "Free Poland" so easily discovered the "right place for Poland in Europe." In its April number we read:

"The Polish frontiers in 1918-21 were determined for a country that could not possibly be a bulwark of peace against German imperialism, but for a country that was to be a bulwark of imperialism against the Soviet Union. Our post-war frontiers cannot and should not be identical with our pre-war frontiers."

I do not know who the author of those words was, and what he did before he joined the Union of Patriots, but I can see that he must have been very far from Poland and her policy if he did not know that the Polish Republic in the years of 1921-38 was maintaining correct neighbourly relations with the Soviets, and that she repeatedly rejected all invitations for anti-Soviet agreements. And that Pilsudski proposed a preventive war against Germany as far back as 1933. This could surely not be treated as a sign of the "imperialistic" tendencies of the Polish nation against the U.S.S.R.

But all these facts do not concern "Free Poland" at all. Its task lies in advocating the necessity to abandon half of Poland to the Soviets, so after stating that the inviolability of the 1939 Polish frontiers is false—"Free Poland" writes as follows:

"Our Eastern frontiers, the frontiers traced in 1921 between Poland and the Soviet Union, weakened by the civil war and foreign intervention—do not exist, and the desire for recostitution is equal to the renewal of error in our past policy, and repetition of weaknesses of our country."

Thus the reconstitution of our frontiers of September, 1939, entails the repetition of our country's weakness—and it is also the repetition of the errors of our past policy, because the mistake of our policy was the settlement of frontiers with a Soviet Union weakened by civil war, while it is not an error of Soviet policy to demand the revision of these frontiers at a moment when Poland is hardly alive and ruined by her struggle against her occupants. (Katyn was not the only achievement of the barbarians!)

“Free Poland” does not see this contradiction. After stating once more that the frontiers of a newly reborn Polish State should be determined differently from those of her pre-war borders—“Free Poland” jumps from the East to the West, and continues:

“The future European peace should make it possible for Poland to keep Silesia as one of the arsenals of German imperialism. Polish language and customs should be restored in Silesia, Germanised for 600 years and Hitlerised by the use of violent measures in the course of the last few years. 600 years of planned German colonisation have left Lower Silesia practically entirely Germanised, and have left strong traces of German influence in Upper Silesia as well. The peasants, workmen, miners, smelters, all of them remained Polish in their hearts. After the demarcation of frontiers with Germany in 1921 there were over half a million Poles left in German Silesia, exposed to Germanisation.”

I do not want to argue with the Union of Patriots on the subject of the Western Frontiers. It is clear that certain lands now belonging to Germany will have to become Polish again, and any discussion on this subject is superfluous.

If I give here the Patriots' point of view on this subject it is only in order to ask where have they lost their objectivism, honesty and sense as applied to the settlement of all frontiers? How can they explain the extreme difference of the measures with which they treat the two problems—the Eastern and the Western? Where is their logic, if without hesitation they give half of Poland in the East to the Soviets, while in the West they defend our right with a solemn statement that half a million Poles were left on the other side of the frontier and that 600 years of German occupation failed to Germanise the Polish peasant worker and miner. And at the same time they forget that on the territories they so easily gave away in the East there are “only” 12 million Poles, and that these lands were exposed to Russianisation for a hundred years. . . .

This reasoning is, indeed, worthy of the Patriots “made in Moscow.”

The picture of “the position of Poland in Europe” would not be complete if we did not give the conclusions of

“Free Poland” in which the intention of cutting Poland in the East and patching her in the West is strikingly clear.

“If the talons of German imperialism are to be torn out, if the possibility of a new German aggression is to cease as a European menace, after the victory and peace they should be guarded by a powerful team of the democratic countries in the East; the team into which side by side with the Soviet Union, Poland and Czechoslovakia will enter. The strategic frontier of such a team, and the strategic frontier of Poland lies on the Oder River.

Let us not prematurely condemn the form which this safeguarding of peace on the Oder will take. We do not, however, doubt that a free, democratic Poland and the Soviet Union will find a method compatible with the security and honour of both countries.”

The Polish Patriots' Union did not need to forecast the forms of this safeguarding of peace on the Oder; it has been already done by the Soviets a long time before they existed. The Soviet Union has anticipated the form of this safeguarding of peace according to the assumptions of the international policy, and their ideas of expansion towards the West and South of Europe.

Today all sorts of unions are being used to humbug the public opinion of the world, and to appease those less educated and less intimately acquainted with political phraseology. The real aim of the Soviets is to let these elements wake up and see reality as it is only when the enormous machine of the Red Army has already performed the “safeguarding of peace on the Oder.” And behind this guard of the Soviet Army, according to the Union of Patriots, is to “flourish and develop” a “free, independent and democratic Poland.”

This notion of democracy, as understood by the Union of Patriots, is nothing new for those who know the history of the development of the communist regime in Russia. It is enough if one remembers that Lenin divided his fight with capitalism into stages, and that he defined democracy as the Government of the majority. Aiming thus at transferring power into the hands of the majority (i.e., into the hands of a proletariat in co-operation with peasantry), Lenin backed the capitalist revolution in order to change it, and,

in turn, into a revolution of the proletariat and thus to create a basis for the construction of the socialist State.

In Lenin's theory the dictatorship of the proletariat in co-operation with the peasantry means democracy, because the majority is in power. And because the majority always decides (being a majority) it follows that the majority dictates. Thus the dictatorship of the proletariat equals democracy—a logical feat of contortionism.

When we read the appeals of the Union of Patriots for the creation of a democratic Poland, and when we look at the aims of such a democracy, Lenin's theory of the means of founding a communist State appears very striking.

It is also striking to see the tendency of the "Patriots" to apply (in the future Poland) the methods which were applied by Lenin in Russia, which he described as the only ones agreeing with the Russian mentality: ruthlessness, terror and a pitiless strength.

In judging the drastic methods of Lenin one must not forget that he was building the first communist State; he was introducing a new regime and one fundamentally different from that which already existed. Moreover, he was introducing a regime made for a struggle with, and the destruction of, decadent capitalism; the important thing was that Lenin could not count on attracting the proletariat and peasants (in the name of whom, and for whom, he was introducing this regime) because he knew that the essence of communism lies in the economic and philosophical sphere, and thus its understanding is not accessible to the many. He had to spread maxims easily understood, and the creation of the regime had to be guaranteed by an "iron discipline."

Living 20 years abroad Lenin knew and understood the mentality of the West and Western civilisation. He had seen to what an extent this mentality and this civilisation differed from the Russian. Perhaps because of this he reached the conclusion that:

"The old Marxian and Engelsian doctrine held that it was possible to achieve a socialist victory through the simultaneous success of the proletarian revolution in all capitalist countries at once, whereas it was impossible to achieve it in one country only. This doctrine does not agree with modern conditions, and

has to be replaced by a new formula—that it is possible to achieve Socialist victory in one particular country while it is impossible to bring it about in all countries at once.”

Still the fact remains the same: Lenin has surrounded the first communist country with walls and ordered the “defence of the socialist motherland.” A motherland which after being strengthened and developed from inside was to become a base for communism and an example of the socialist regime. It was meant to “carry away” the proletariat and peasantry of the world, and in this way eventually to destroy capitalism.

The difficulties of Stalin lie now in the fact that communism has not “carried away” yet, either the workmen or the peasants. This paradox is a very vivid one if we remember that communism was meant to destroy the bourgeoisie and rescue from misery the exploited classes. By the word “communism” I understand here the effects of the communist regime and not merely its theory, because the theory of communism as I have mentioned above is not accessible to the intelligence of peasants and workers.

“Socialism, from the moment when it became a science—wrote Engels—had to be treated as a science, which meant that it had to be studied.”

“Modern socialist consciousness—states Kautsky—can only exist on the foundations of deep scientific knowledge. And it is not the proletariat who can teach it, but the intelligentsia.”

If there are any communists among the peoples of Europe they are always either “patriots” or true idealists, who are always educated people, they are the bourgeoisie, the people enraptured by it and attracted to it from the higher intellectual classes.

In such circumstances—after 25 years of governing Soviet Russia (Lenin governed it for 5 years)—Stalin had to consider the question of: Communism for Europe or the “construction of socialism in one country only”?

Tito, Berling, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic Countries, the Balkans, the Union of Patriots, the Kosciuszko League and many more political “moves” point directly to the fact that the victories of the Red Army are going to pave the way for Soviet economic and political expansion to the West and South.

“The safeguard of peace on the Oder” is not going to be the invention of some “patriot” or other, but it is going to mean the boundary of influences, and since Stalin cannot yet expect the voluntary passing over of the proletariat and peasantry to the side of communism the “safeguard of peace on the Oder” will have to be constituted by force. The methods of applying the force that Stalin is using are the same as those Lenin used twenty years ago; methods agreeing with the Russian mentality; because Stalin, as distinct from Lenin, lived always in Russia, and did not come across any mentalities, conditions and psychologies other than the Russian. He does not know the world he now-wants to master. Thus he goes to conquer the peoples of Europe, burdened with his one-sided mentality, so different, so fundamentally different from everything that lives and develops on the Western side of the Russian frontier. Lenin, signing the peace of Riga, knew that this line divided not only two countries, but also two different realities: European reality and Russian reality.

Soviet methods on the conquered Polish territories (1939-41) show how very far Stalin is from understanding these differences. The mass deportation of the Polish citizens, this chasing of hundreds of thousands into the plains—this ordinary common Russian method of deportation, which is an everyday occurrence in Soviet Russia (and which was also usual in Tzarist Russia)—all this in European language is ordinary crime and savagery.

When we realise that Stalin has applied such methods to the people whom he undoubtedly wanted to convert to communism and charm with its attractiveness—it is clear what an enormous mistake has been made by the U.S.S.R. It is so serious that even the official Russian propaganda does not try to explain it.

Even the “Patriots,” whose task it is to clear up the darkest patches of Moscow policy, relapse into silence, or stutter, when the matter of the mass deportations is being discussed.

Only once Wasilewska—forced by public opinion—murmured softly some hastily prepared “justifications.”



On the 16th of April in "Free Poland" we read:

"Many Poles were, indeed, deported into Soviet Union. We do not try to assert that the conditions in which the deportations took place were ideal, and that there were no mistakes and misunderstandings. They did occur, and there were many people injured by them, but the harm done has been rectified, and many of the deported people have come back. Only the outbreak of the war prevented the return of many more."

There were, as Wasilewska admits, "mistakes and misunderstandings."

It was a "mistake" that hundreds of thousands of miserable people were deported. That they were put into prison and taken to Siberia. The systematic extermination of a people is a "minor misunderstanding" for Wasilewska. It is a little thing, because it happened when Wasilewska was not yet a Polish "Patriot." Perhaps this is why she wrote about it with such salm, perhaps this was the reason why she could so naïvely (or so cynically) say that: "Many people have come back."

It cannot be argued that the first meeting of European peoples with the Russian mentality and Soviet methods has left anything but an unsavoury impression.

It is to the advantage of the Bolsheviks that the Red Army, which in the communist regime is the armed hand of communist propaganda, should be followed by some substitutes from the "native" armed forces entering the foreign territories. The task of these substitutes is to act as a camouflage and smoke screen for the structural transformation of the occupied country. The "native" armed forces will serve as a lure, and will become an anæsthetic, like a strong doze of morphia before an operation, after which the patient will never wake up. And they will give him the last illusion that the operation was performed by "his" doctor. In political language it means that a reshuffled community, thrown into the new economic and political framework, will "lick its own wounds" in the belief that they were inflicted by its own, and not foreign, methods of action. In the case of Poland, the entry of the Red Army into Polish territory was in itself rather dangerous, as far as the effects of propaganda were concerned. The popula-

tion remembered well by experience the first visit of the Red Army. All the adjectives used by this army were familiar: "liberating," "friendly." This is why the effect was just the opposite. So they had to enter Poland "shoulder to shoulder" with a Polish army, with an army that could perform the "safeguard of peace on the Oder," which did not care about the Eastern frontier, and which could play up to the hysterical sentiments of Poles. The leaders of this army could be found only among the ranks of "the patriots" made in Moscow. We are not concerned with the soldier drafted into the Kosciuszko division, who is not responsible for the policy the "Patriots" are serving—he is only, as he always is—a tool in their hands, and is being thrown there, where there is fighting to be done and where, instead of clichés and words, bullets are being used.

As soon as General Anders' Army left the Soviet Union the indignant voices of the "Patriots" could be heard, the voices of exasperation raised against those who had left the "hospitable Soviet soil," and the voices of encouragement for those who had to stay behind.

"The Polish Army has gone into disgraceful exile in Irak—shouted Wasilewska—we have nothing in common with the treacherous policy of Sikorski. It was conducted against us, and without us. We want to strangle with an iron hand traitors, wranglers, thieves and speculators."

"There is no Polish army on the Eastern front—wrote "Free Poland"—there is no Polish army in the U.S.S.R. There is no new contribution of Poland to this war."

After these apparently unco-ordinated outcries, which in reality were part of well-planned Soviet propaganda, after the pompous statement that "We will not give away the soil of our ancestors"—a man was found who "will mend the wrongs done to the Polish cause and to the Soviet Union," who, "oppressed and tortured by the 'fascists' and 'traitors,' will go shoulder to shoulder with the Red Army and will bring to Poland her long-desired freedom." From the columns of "Free Poland" General Berling emerged.

The whole difference between the army of Berling and the Polish Army fighting already for five years on all

possible fronts—lies in the fact that “shoulder to shoulder with the Soviets” does not mean to us (as it does to Berling) serving the plans of enforced communisation of Poland with the application of methods learnt in Moscow, but it means a purely military co-operation in the sphere of military operations only. There is a custom in the democratic countries that armies do not serve for the introduction of economic and political changes, and for the enforcement of regimes and foreign methods of government.

The basis on which the political structures of countries lying west of the Russian border were created are unknown to the Union of Patriots, just as objectivism and honesty in estimation of facts and events are unknown to them.

It is a well-known fact that when the Soviet authorities understood that the armies being formed on the soil of the U.S.S.R., and remaining under the command of the legal Polish authorities, would not become the armed hand of communist propaganda—their existence inside Soviet Russia became (for the plans of Soviet policy) superfluous. And even more—it became a burden.

The audacity of “colonel” Wasilewska is quite admirable when she states that: “The Polish government in London has sent abroad an army equipped and formed on the territories of Soviet Russia.”

It seems as if Wasilewska did not know that this evacuated army did not receive—contrary to the agreement—any equipment. Has she not heard of the Polish-Soviet agreement, and the exchange of Notes that followed it? It is true that at that time Wasilewska was not yet a “Patriot,” and perhaps the affairs of Poland did not interest her as much as they do to-day. Nevertheless, she certainly knew all the reasons for the departure of General Anders’ army from Russia. She knows them just as well as General Berling knows them.

It is known that the Polish-Soviet agreement of the 14th of August stipulated that the Soviets should equip the Polish Army with food and ammunition (uniforms were to be provided by England), and that the number of soldiers

was to depend on the amount of volunteers and possibilities of equipment.

It is known that when the number of volunteers reached 40,000—the Bolshevik authorities informed General Anders that they could not feed more than 30,000. And also that all requests for arms were fruitless.

After the Sikorski-Stalin talks (December, 1941), when it was stated that a Polish Army of 96,000 soldiers was to be formed—certain episodes occurred giving a full answer to the question why the Polish army had to leave Soviet Russia.

Has “ colonel ” Wasilewska forgotten Stalin’s statement of March, 1942, demanding the departure of 33,000 Polish soldiers from Russia, and the demand of the Soviet Government in August, 1942, for the departure of the remaining 44,000 ?

“ An army organised, but not for battle ”—as Berling said—speaking of the tens of thousands of beggars, who crawled from concentration camps hardly alive, and appeared in the Oranienburg district, and in Tataszczew, the centres for the formation of the Polish army. The “ general ” did not like the fact that these people deported “ by mistake,” and forced “ by mistake ” into hard labour, were not immediately sent to the front “ shoulder to shoulder ” with the Russians, that they first wanted to be cured and brought to civilisation, that they wanted to be armed and given some time to regain their strength.

Both the army of General Anders evacuated from Russia because of Russian orders, and these unfortunate deportees, who by other orders have been kept in U.S.S.R.—are Polish citizens.

Unfortunately, the fate of those Poles who were forcibly given Soviet citizenship and incorporated into the ranks of Soviet workers is not known to us. We only know that a part of them joined the army of Berling, a part of them has died out and that some others are still working somewhere in Russia.

“ Free Poland ” is much too pre-occupied by its fight against the Polish nation, and against the Polish Govern-

ment in London, to take pains to write about the life of those Polish deportees. The "Patriots" serve as the propaganda megaphones, shouting themselves hoarse; they fill up the columns of their newspapers underlining the necessity of curtailing our Eastern territories; they give a large space to describing Western Ukraine and Western White Ruthenia; they draw marvellous visions of a "democratic" Poland performing together with the "brotherly Soviet nation" the "safeguard of the peace on the Oder"; they throw the worst possible accusations at the Poles in Great Britain, accusing them of treason, pro-Hitlerism and co-operation with Germany. All that is being done by the "Patriots" "for the sake of the defence of the workers and the people, for the sake of improving the standard of living of the working masses, for the sake of the millions who suffer and wait for help."

And, strangely enough, Wasilewska, Grosz, Mirski, Lange or Stefanowski, all those who so loudly defend the oppressed, whose cries are filling the columns of "Free Poland"—are silent about those who suffer nearby. They are silent about the fate of the deportees, about the fate of Polish women, old people and children.

The social services of the Union of Patriots do not occupy an important place amongst its "activities." Very seldom are there in "Free Poland" short notes about the education of children. "Children are learning"—says this "patriotic" paper—"and preparing themselves for what awaits them." But what is awaiting them? What is to be their future? . . .

We remember that England and America have expressed a readiness to take all Polish children remaining in Soviet territories, and we also remember that Russia refused them permission to leave.

How strange and wonderful is this "care" of the Bolsheviks for Polish children. It is known that Anders' Army felt the lack of food very strongly. There was no food for several thousand soldiers, and there was food for many more children!

Wasilewska, the "Patriot," remarks in "Free Poland":

"I do not say that Polish children have an easy life here. But they are neither better nor worse off than all the others. They are leading a severe and hard life, thinking constantly of the front line. The White Ruthenian, Ukrainian and Russian children who have escaped from the territories occupied by Germany have not found luxuries and comfort behind the Urals. But nowhere could there be found such an attitude to children as in the Soviet Union."

The essence of the matter lies in the fact that we (Polish citizens), knowing how difficult it is for the Soviets to bear the burden of feeding Polish children, wanted to transfer this burden from Soviet on to British and American shoulders. We wanted these children deported from their homes, to stop thinking about the front line, to learn and develop not "behind the Urals" but in the atmosphere of the European nations.

I agree with Wasilewska that nowhere could there be found such an attitude to children as in Soviet Russia. And I think she will agree with me that this "attitude" is what we should worry about. We do not want this "attitude," while the "Patriots" not only want to see it applied to Polish children, but also want to see its mark left upon them for ever.

The attitude of the "Patriots" to children and to the population, or simply the intention of communising all European nations, has stretched beyond the Soviet frontiers. The Communist education of children according to the "Party Line" bears a striking similarity to the Nazi method of training Party members from childhood, if need be against the wish of the parents.

Professor Lange, chairman of the Kościusko League (created in Detroit), writes:

"We acknowledge the right of the Ukrainians and Ruthenians, who before the war remained inside the frontiers of Poland, to unite with their brothers in the Soviet Ukrainian and White Ruthenian Republics."

"Free Poland" is right in saying that Prof. Lange is "their" man. He looks at the "Eastern problem" with the

eyes of the "Patriots." He acknowledges the right of Ukrainians and White Ruthenians, "who before the war remained inside Poland" to unite with their brothers in the Soviet republics. But what does Prof. Lange intend to do with Poles who "before the war remained inside the Polish state" and lived on the territories which to-day are White Ruthenian and Ukrainian? Does the just professor refuse these Poles the right "of uniting with their brethren," these Poles of whom there are "only 12 millions?? And perhaps Mr. Lange and his companion, Father Orlemański, have already set out a plan for the mass deportation of those Poles into Russia? Perhaps Father Orlemański, since his return from Moscow has discovered that the strength of Poland lies in the forced deportation of millions of her citizens?

I do not know (because no one knows) who Father Orlemański is. But one thing I know for sure, that if he thinks that "celestial matters" and "Bolshevik matters" are equally easy to settle, he is wrong. He is also wrong if he believes that "his flock" will follow him as if they were a pack of sheep.

The shadow of these "Patriotic" movements falls also on England. There were attempts to create certain "Patriotic" organisations in Glasgow and Oxford—as the turning points of Soviet propaganda—but nothing came of it. The creation of some organisations of this type in London was more successful. They have different names and different appearances. It is worth mentioning the newly created "Polish Union." Whom this Union unites is not certain. They have published a paper called "Poland." There are many familiar accentuations, expressions and "patriotic" tendencies, expressed, however, most unconvincingly and in bad Polish; obviously, they also talk about the Eastern frontiers, but the terms they use are very hazy, vague and indefinite. They speak about settling the Eastern frontiers of Poland "according to the will of the people."

It would be a very well sounding phrase this "will of the people," if its background were not the will of the Red Army.

The "Patriots" made in Moscow, in order to become "Patriots" had, among other concessions to the Soviets, to deprive themselves of the power of free will. They had to sacrifice this freedom to the mercy of Soviet policy, and they renounced it in their own name and in the name of the Poland which they wished to build.

Poland has taken an important part in this war, her population goes on perishing, sometimes in fruitful battle, sometimes in vain. Poles fight in the air, on the land and underground, they risk their lives, they kill Germans, causing the most terrible reprisals—and they are doing all this because they do not wish to lose the most important prerogative of a community—freedom of choice and action.

Poland does not want to interfere with the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, but she also does not wish to be interfered with. Let Soviet Communism flourish and develop, let it give the maximum of happiness to the Bolsheviks—but do not let it creep into Poland insidiously and by force. If Poland should find herself in need of such changes as only the communist regime can provide—then Poland will become communist. But she will do it herself, with the application of her own methods and without any "help" from abroad.

Poland does not want any occupation: neither Soviet, nor English, nor American; because she has had enough of occupations no matter whether they were the outcome of war or of peace. Poland has her own Polish soul and does not wish to lose it.

Such is the Polish point of view. Today, at the moment of deadlock in the relations with the Soviets, at a moment when Leninism is being applied by Stalin, when Soviet policy based on the foundations created by Lenin is changing into the policy of expanding the communist regime, it is well worth while to recall some of the phrases and ideas that characterised Lenin's policy towards Poland.

The words that Lenin uttered about Poland have to be looked at from the point of view of the circumstances in



which they were spoken. We have to remember that it was in 1918-20, the years of the bloody and painful birth of communism in Russia, the years of great weakness and of exhaustion, that Lenin put forward the watchword about the "building of socialism in one country only," and the realisation of such'a watchword was followed by an appropriate international policy. One should never forget Lenin's political conception, the expression of which was his famous idea of "maximum flexibility in the strategy and tactics of the communist party."

On the 6th of March, 1920, at a conference of the Moscow Council of Delegates, Lenin said:

"In a most solemn way we have acknowledged the independence of the Polish State, giving to it a most definite expression."

And several days beforehand Lenin counter-signed a declaration of the Council of People's Commissars in which the following words were to be found:

"The Council declares that the policy of the FSRR towards Poland is not the expression of accidental and temporary military or diplomatic tactics, but that it springs from the unshakeable principle of the self-determination of nations. The sovereignty of the Polish Republic has been recognised from the first moment of the creation of the Polish State and it is taken as a basis for future relations with Poland."

Yet another of Lenin's declarations appeared in the proclamation of the Russian Central Executive Committee on the 2nd of February, 1920. Addressing the Polish nation, Lenin said:

"Your and our enemies try to deceive you when they say that the Soviet Government wants to introduce communism into Poland with the bayonets of Red Army soldiers. Russian communists now desire only to defend their own land, and to perform useful and creative work; they do not want to introduce communism by force into other countries."

I do not know what Lenin would say now if he were still alive. Would he take the path that is being followed by Stalin, or would he still take the point of view that "the Russian communists are aiming only at the defence of their

own land," and that "they do not aim and cannot aim at the introduction of communism by force into other countries"?

I do not know what methods Lenin would apply now to the problem of communisation of Europe, and in what way socialism would emanate from his country.

I know well, however, that our enemies are trying to deceive us when they say that the Soviet government does not want to introduce communism into Poland with the bayonets of the Red Army. They deceive us when they say this, while at the same time they try to hide those bayonets beneath the flag of the Polish Republic; while behind the back of the Polish soldier they try to introduce Soviet commissars, and the Soviet social and political regime. And they deceive us by using the "Patriots" made in Moscow for this purpose.

"We have hoisted the flag—said Berling—that has been abandoned by Anders and we have taken it to the battlefield. We are proud that we were able to wipe out with our blood the stain with which Anders had covered the honour of the Polish army."

When one reads these words full of hate and when one recalls the latest exploits of the soldiers of General Anders, who bled on the slopes of Cassino fighting alongside the 8th Army, then the flag of the Polish Republic, which from now on will always fly at Monte Cassino, as a symbol and emblem of our independence, seems to defy the slanderers damning them with their own words. The deeds of the loyal soldiers of Poland, fighting together with their British comrades at Falaise, Arnhem, Breda, and in the air, are more convincing than the lies of the servants of Moscow.

Printed by SUPERIOR PRINTERS, LTD. (T.U.), 11 & 13, New Road, E.1

Passed for Publication by Censor.

ALEKSANDER JUNOSZA-GAŁECKI, one of the best known young Polish journalists in exile, is widely appreciated for his independent views and for his sound judgement of international affairs.

A series of his publications edited in Great Britain contain many valuable observations and provide a clear, interesting and provocative analysis of modern politics.

His pamphlet "POLISH PATRIOTS MADE IN MOSCOW" is the first of a cycle which deals with relations between smaller and greater nations. Mr. JUNOSZA-GAŁECKI gives a particularly full treatment to the political-economic background of the present world conflict.

The next in the present cycle of A. JUNOSZA-GAŁECKI'S pamphlets entitled "FROM MUNICH TO YALTA" will appear in the near future.

Arch. Emigracji  
Biblioteka

Główna  
UMK Toruń

1378306

Biblioteka Główna UMK



300020873275

2'6