

Fitzgerald John J.  
P22720  
791053

# “HELP!”

A Shrill Call From The  
**ATLANTIC CHARTER**

In The Form Of An Open Letter  
**“TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN”**  
**WITH ADDENDA**

— BY —

**JOHN J. FITZGERALD**

PRICE 25 CENTS

For quantity prices see inside back cover

# FOREWORD

This open letter was never planned by me. It simply developed as the logical outcome of the campaign which opened with a simple letter of protest addressed to an official of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. That letter and this one were dictated by a zeal for the survival of the Atlantic Charter. They are in support of one of Mr. Churchill's more recent declarations that the Atlantic Charter is still "our main aim and purpose and base".

The Polish situation with which this letter deals is merely incidental. Nowhere herein do I seek to be considered as an authority on the Polish boundary issue nor on the matter of the internal affairs of Poland. The Polish crisis serves only as an example of how the Atlantic Charter is susceptible to betrayal.

My appeal made on behalf of the Atlantic Charter is for "Help!" The Atlantic Charter at this moment is being "smothered" to death by propaganda.

The rescue brigade exists in that same form as the organization that effected the rescue at Dunkirk. There was nothing "already organized" but every organization within reach leaped into action. This letter appeals to every individual, every organized body and every news medium under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes.

The Author.

The contents of this pamphlet are not copyrighted. They may be reproduced in full or in part ad. lib.

The Author.

## ***To Whom It May Concern:***

It concerns all and sundry to realize that a threat exists whereby we shall be faced with the dilemma of choosing between Russia and the Atlantic Charter. That in the course adopted to deal with the threat there is a danger that we might both abandon the Atlantic Charter and lose the co-operation of Russia.

The purpose of this letter is to establish how the responsibility for the ripening of that threat rests, not entirely on the mystifying antics of Russian officials and newspapers in connection with Russia's dispute with Poland, but in a definite degree and with more flagrant guilt, the responsibility may be laid at the door of elements under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes.

The purpose also is to appeal to those elements to change their tactics; to indicate how pressure may be brought to bear in order to induce them to do so and, finally, to explore the possibility of at least one formula as a contribution which will help avert the tragedy.

Without Russia there can be no United Nations and no Atlantic Charter, then, at all costs, outside of violation of principle or connivance at open treachery, we must hold Russia.

Without the Atlantic Charter, apart from saving our skins, there ceases to be any purpose for the United Nations, then we must save the Atlantic Charter.

### **Poland is the test.**

Let the United Nations fail to cooperate in unity with reference to Poland, then the organization becomes a myth.

Let the provisions of the Atlantic Charter be violated in regard to Poland, then the document becomes a scrap of paper.

These are clear-cut conclusions concerning which those whom it may concern will surely agree that there need be no confusion.

## **RUSSIA**

Of the United Nations, Russia is the center of this theme. Like a physician bent on removing a blemish I shall, in this letter, focus attention on an outgrowth in our Russian relations which mars what ought to be an appealing and fascinating outline. But it is only a blemish — it is not a birthmark. It is capable of responding to treatment.

Russian initiative is held to be responsible for the marring outgrowth, at the same time there are elements within the nations under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes who are contributing to its obstinacy. To this accessible contributing cause I propose to direct the treatment. It consists, principally, of doses of Public Opinion.

With that task before me it is in order that I should record to what extent I recognize all that is great in Russia, and in her history. Without that recognition there can be no sincere approach to proposals. Above all I subscribe to those many, many tributes couched in terms more precise and more eloquent than I command which have paid homage to Russia's courage, her capacity for endurance, her all-out support (inherent in the spirit of each of her citizens) to the militant defenders of her soil, her genius for organization, her intense love of the homeland setting ablaze that fire of patriotism which wins victories — victories indeed for Russia, victories that mean so very much to all the United Nations, victories that urge us to seek the support of her alliance and to offer her the



contribution of our own. It would be insane and immoral to gloss over the outrages — they can never be anything but outrages — imposed during the past quarter century in the name of the Soviet experiment. But I want to believe that the destructive phase is over, that we can find a basis for mutual understanding whereby we may navigate the shoals that lie ahead.

In whatever degree we must condemn phases of the Soviet experiment, we must at the same time confess we have a very great deal to learn from the legitimate part of the process whereby it achieves results. I welcome with great enthusiasm all the recent signs that "socio-cultural" forces in Russia are pushing toward a constructive course. Indeed we **do** want Russia as a full-fledged member of the United Nations whose presence will add to the lustre of us all.

Possessed of all these natural generous dispositions, should an issue arise where bedrock principle is involved and where we have reason to consider Russia as the nation assailing that principle; then, conscious of our own shortcomings and perhaps of our own past record, with no "holier than thou" attitude, but as earnest converts and sincere allies we must be persuasive, we must be hard boiled and we must make it clear that we cannot be partners with her in acts of unquestioned treachery. In face of such acts, in bitter disappointment, steeled to take the consequences, we must part company; which God forbid!

Nor let any one suggest that this attitude is conceived of Nazi propaganda. Such an attitude may please the Nazis but its dictation comes from that un-failing voice, which cannot be silenced, deep down in the conscience of every red-blooded citizen.

### THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

The Atlantic Charter is involved in this theme. It is the charter of Demo-

cracy in process of finding that integral expression which Democracy has never yet achieved.

Its dynamic inspiration may be found in the four freedoms: Freedom of Speech, Freedom from Want, Freedom from Fear and Freedom of Worship. Very wisely it sets forth provisions calculated to bring about a state of international stability without which there could be no hope of giving effect to its Four Freedoms. Two of those provisions stand out in this discussion. Like the Four Freedoms, they indicate inspiration for the sacrifices which war entails and objectives for the provisions which Peace demands. They are:

1. "To seek no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned."
2. "To see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Now, the Atlantic Charter is confined to "objectives".

Difficulties lie in the way of their achievement.

First the United Nations must win the war.

Then arise the problems of ideologies, boundaries, minorities, ethnological groups, etc.

### NOW ARE WE IN EARNEST ABOUT THE ATLANTIC CHARTER?

Certainly there is nothing under the sun about which we should be more in earnest. The "total war" we are waging is directed primarily to clearing the way so that its "objectives" may be achieved. The "difficulties" in the way sink into insignificance in face of those other difficulties that have been overcome since Dunkirk and Pearl Harbour.

Surely if we are not in earnest about the Atlantic Charter, then our whole

procedure is a sham, a mockery and a ruse.

The peoples of Europe know well what that Charter stands for in terms of their future.

The peoples of Europe long for its realization. But those same harassed peoples need so badly to be convinced that we are in earnest, that we are sincere, that we are determined, that they can have confidence in the “consequence” behind our formula!

The harassed peoples of Europe are not being given those reassurances by the rank and file of the peoples under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes. These are rather, in gullible fashion, giving reassurances to those elements who would wreck the Atlantic Charter.

Let me make it clear that I am not here entering into a discussion of “foreign policy” as such. I am dealing with the spontaneous popular response to all that the Atlantic Charter signifies.

Contrasted with the realm of “objectives” with which the Atlantic Charter deals there exist, in certain definite situations, treaties which make “actual” the more or less precise definition of how those “objectives” are to be interpreted. It does not follow that the present interpretation in those situations is by any means final yet, not for one moment can it be reasonably presumed that this distracting hour is the time to review that “actual” interpretation, set forth on an established and well defined basis, much less to disturb it without review.

To violate what is “actual” will certainly not inspire confidence in the good faith of our intention to make “real” what is set forth as the dynamic “objective” of Democracy.

The plain truth is that to proceed in that insane fashion would simply make a mockery of the Atlantic Charter.

## BRITISH-RUSSIAN ALLIANCE

Irrevocably bound up in the spirit and purpose of the Atlantic Charter is the treaty of Alliance between Great Britain and Russia signed by authorized representatives of both nations on May 26th, 1942. Indeed the preamble reaffirms the acceptance of that Declaration (the Atlantic Charter) by both parties. Article 5 of that treaty between Russia and Great Britain declares that:

“they will act in accordance with the **two principles** of not seeking territorial aggrandisement for themselves and of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states.” Let me repeat:

1. No territorial aggrandisement for themselves.
2. No interference in the internal affairs of other states.

## POLAND

Now Poland is in a definite situation, on the basis of existing treaties, which makes “actual” the more or less precise definition of how the “objectives” of the Atlantic Charter are to be interpreted.

Great Britain, the United States and Russia all three are committed. Whether in the form of treaties or of notes, or of recognition of treaties, or of solemn declarations; in virtue of provisions in each and all of these forms, Poland is entitled to feel secure in the recognition by the United Nations of no territorial changes as at August 1939. **Much less should Poland expect to be made the victim by the action of a member of the United Nations, of actual forceful acquisition of nearly half of her territory, so recognized.**

Some day the provisions of the Atlantic Charter may need to be invoked to establish what territorial changes in Poland would be in “accord with the **freely expressed** wishes of the

people concerned." Nothing but the craven counsels of dread and of fear and of appeasement in the face of threats and of force could pretend that the day is at hand to pursue such a course.

Moreover the alternative submitted to Poland involves no such reasonable procedure, it involves the possibility of unilateral decisions and actions on the part of Russia which the United Nations would be called upon either to condemn or to accept.

In the matter of territorial claims upon Poland what is involved is "bed-rock principle" and the threat of "open treachery".

Now I leave what concerns the "territory of Poland" and I come to the question of "interference in the internal affairs of Poland."

That interference is in actual process. It is aimed at the complete overthrow of the Polish Government-in-exile to be brought about on a basis dictated by Russia and through a procedure directed by Russia.

So the threat to Poland involves the "two principles" set forth in the treaty of Alliance between Great Britain and Russia in which is irrevocably bound up the spirit and purpose of the Atlantic Charter.

Should the threat be given effect the Atlantic Charter becomes a scrap of paper and, except to save our skins, there ceases to be any purpose for the United Nations.

With Russia as the nation assailing the principles involved we would be faced with that situation where, in honour bound, in bitter disappointment, steeled to accept the consequences, we would have to make it clear that the fatal hour had arrived when we must part company — once more; which God forbid!

## DEMOCRACY'S CONCERN

Please fix eyes on that picture while I now unburden to whom it may concern the central message of this letter:

The Atlantic Charter is primarily, by conception and by enunciation, the treasured formula of the Democracies. In the midst of dramatic circumstances it was proclaimed on August 14th, 1941, by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt, as the charter of our dynamic democracy. Later Russia simply "adhered to" its fundamental principles.

Surely then under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes there ought never to be any suggestion of toleration of the violation of its principles. The most vigilant of its champions ought to be the news-media which mould and reflect Public Opinion. Those whom it may concern may not have particularly focussed attention on what is taking place in this respect. Deep interest in the prospect of complete victory at arms, in the progress along the path that leads to the "unconditional surrender" of the Nazis, the straining of every muscle in support of the men and women of the armed forces; the impact of so many absorbing considerations has made us listless about concern for the "soul" within the purpose for which all these tremendous preoccupations are being enacted.

Let those whom it may concern be prepared to realize the extent and the consequences of their listlessness as they pause and, with thoughtful consideration of all that is involved, examine how, before their very eyes, hardly with their realization, certainly without any audible protest from them the Atlantic Charter is being undermined not by Russia but by those media under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes on whom we should be able to count as its ever unfaltering champions. Not only undermined; the proposal is to strip it of all its meaning!

At this point it is important to define the term "News Media". In this letter it includes editorials, news items, comments, newscasts, the voices of cinema narrators and kindred material produced by that vast, closely ranked army (which both moulds and reflects public opinion) made up of a variety of categories including the press, the radio, the cinema news, and greater and lesser publications.

## TWO EXHIBITS

To give those whom it may concern leisurely opportunity to examine what is in process I shall here submit two exhibits: One an editorial, one a news item. The former with reference to the principle of "territorial aggrandisement"; the latter with reference to the principle of "interference in internal affairs".

To multiply these exhibits those whom it may concern, be they near at hand or far away, will find themselves within reasonable reach of newspaper files or radio scripts which will reveal their counterpart again and again.

The editorial appeared in London, England. The news item in my local daily published less than 100 miles from this Northern Ontario town. On page 27 of the addenda to this letter is reproduced another editorial which appeared in Toronto. It brings into play both the "territorial" and "interference" principles. Unfortunately the mass of exhibits is not wanting.

During November 1943 I read the following, quoted from an editorial in the London Times:

"Russia claims no extension of the frontiers held by her when Hitler unleashed his invading hordes in June, 1941; and after all that she has endured and achieved in the last two years, any proposal to curtail them would be clearly resented as ill-conceived and ill-timed."

The London Times will hardly protest, even if others may, should I refer to it as the leading and most eminent newspaper in Great Britain.

That single editorial, in one medium of one category of media, of itself, and especially in the light of what has happened within the four or five months since it appeared, constitutes a major tragedy.

Russia is mentioned but in that editorial it is not Russia that indicates what "would be clearly resented as ill-conceived and ill-timed" nor is it "Red Star" nor "Izvestia", nor "Pravda" nor "Wolna Polska"; no it is Great Britain's leading and most eminent news medium which, within the sacred sanctuary of its editorial space, declares, in effect, that it would "be ill-conceived and ill-timed" to stand by the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Poland is not mentioned. Indeed Poland is only one of four nations that could be involved in those few sentences that sound so innocent.

**Their very suavity betrays a consciousness of their iniquity.**

But consider the ignominy and the transparent "malice aforethought" in these words: "When Hitler unleashed his invading hordes in June 1941." Never forget that September 1939 is the date — yes, earlier than that the hordes were unleashed! The "forethought" is prompted by a realization of the date when Russia "adhered to" the Atlantic Charter. It surely is a mockery and a resort to stupid cowardice to forestall an objection which would rule out what is proposed in the editorial, the objection being based on Russia's "adherence" to the Atlantic Charter. The editorial postulates that whatever territory was grabbed in the name of the Nazi onslaught prior to June 1941 does not come within the compass of the provisions of the At-

lantic Charter, and that the claimant to such territory is not bound by the Principles which are the essence of the Atlantic Charter.

The significance of this incident with relation to the purpose of this letter will appear later but now I leave it to those whom it may concern to pause and give thoughtful consideration to all that it involves.

## TWO FOLD THREAT

Before submitting exhibit two it will be well to recall pertinent facts, though most of them are familiar, to establish the two-fold threat to Poland, which involves the principles inherent in the Atlantic Charter. As I write it is yet but a threat; perhaps before this letter is published the threat, by happy united decisions, will have been removed. I pray that it will never, never be fully realized.

With reference to the territory of Poland the nature and extent of the threat can be briefly stated:

During the last week of November, 1943, Mr. Cordell Hull in reporting to Congress on the Moscow conference gave the assurance that Soviet Russia, Great Britain, the United States and China "have laid the foundation for a co-operative effort in the post-war world toward enabling all peace-loving nations, large and small, to live in peace and security, to preserve their liberties and rights of civilized existence, and to enjoy expanded opportunities and facilities for economic, social and spiritual progress."

That same week Mr. Constantine Oumansky, Soviet Ambassador to Mexico (formerly envoy at Washington) made a statement which indicated that Russia intended to keep the borders it established in Poland when, as an ally in the Nazi cause, it helped partition that country in 1939.

Passing over intervening incidents then came a declaration from Moscow fixing the Curzon Line as Russia's idea of a Polish frontier.

These demands suffice to establish the threat to the principle of: "territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned" as stated in the Atlantic Charter; and of "no territorial aggrandisement" as set forth in article 5 of the Treaty of Alliance between Great Britain and Russia.

Now for a glance at pertinent facts which establish the threat with reference to "non-interference in the internal affairs of Poland":

Exiled in London is the official Polish Government, so recognized by all the United Nations. That recognition includes Russia because it was with that Government-in-exile that Russia completed agreements and to it Russia directed notice of severance of relations. That Polish Government is in constant contact with an administration within Poland that operates secretly, and it does approximate an embodiment of the National will. That exiled Polish Government is more "representative" than most of the allied Governments in London.

It has made momentous decisions, all favourable to the cause which binds the United Nations.

It has organized within Poland and, most spectacularly, outside of Poland, legions of defenders of the cause of the United Nations on land, in the air and at sea.—Divisions of soldiers, organized by that exiled Polish Government, are to-day fighting side by side with Canadian and U. S. soldiers in Italy.

The Polish Government-in-exile in London is identified before the world. Its composition, its record, its activities, its internal and external difficul-



ties are as well known, or are competent to be as well known, as the composition, record, activities, internal and external difficulties of the Government of Great Britain or of any and all the Governments of the United Nations in or out of exile.

From what follows we shall see what the threat is that would constitute "interference" with the Polish Government-in-exile and with the internal affairs of Poland:

The Russian press tells us and in identical sentences our own correspondents repeat, that there exists in Russia a "Union of Polish Patriots". This "Union" is to be the sponsor for a "National Council" within Poland to supplant the Polish Government-in-exile. There are no signs of any other sponsors, notably no free agents, within Poland who seek to supplant, on a basis of patriotism, the Polish Government-in-exile. It is not an easy matter to establish the identity, the composition, the record, the activities, the external and internal difficulties of the so-called "Union of Polish Patriots".

But the following reference to its President and her husband makes clear at least one feature of Russian interference. It is quoted from an article by F. A. Voigt, formerly foreign editor of the Manchester Guardian:

"The President of the 'Union of Polish Patriots' is a female novelist named Wanda Wasilewska, who went over to the Russians in September, 1939. Her husband is a certain Korneichuk, another promoter of the anti-Polish campaign, who is Deputy Commissar for Foreign Affairs. That is to say, he is a Russian Government official. Wanda Wasilewska herself is a member of the Supreme Soviet and, therefore, of the Russian administration. **Neither of them** is a Polish subject. Both are Russian. She has been rewarded for her exploits in verbal warfare (her command of invective is prodigious) with the rank

of colonel in the Red Army — an honour denied even to the redoubtable Ludmilla Pavlichenko, who visited London recently and is alleged to have slain over a hundred Germans with her own hands."

Since the above was written Alexander Korneichuk has ceded the office of Russian Vice-Commissar of Foreign Affairs and is now Foreign Commissar of the Russian Ukraine. Russian dispatches make it clear that he is to co-operate with the "Union of Polish Patriots" to supplant the Polish Government-in-exile. Need one prophesy as to the sinister mission of those who would take its place?

The status of the "Union of Polish Patriots residing in the U.S.S.R." is somewhat of a poser. Consider the Soviet decree of November 1939, reaffirmed in December 1941 and applied to the Poles on January 16th, 1943, with the result that, by Russian decree, all former Poles "residing in the U.S.S.R." were turned into Russian subjects. Still, in all the world, only Russia insists that some mysterious group of these residents under Wanda Wasilewska are "Polish Patriots".

Incidentally, it is significant that the Soviets are denouncing the Polish government-in-exile for not instructing the Polish "underground" to co-operate with the advancing Soviet armies. This obviously means that the Polish-Government-in-exile is receiving the complete and wholehearted support of the Polish population, who look to it as their legitimate government.

And now there comes to Glorious Poland, where Hitler could find no Quislings, the unexampled privilege of setting up, so the Russian Ministry of Information advises, a "National Council" organized under the superb direction of two 'Polish patriots', Wanda Wasilewska and her husband who, at the same time, is Foreign Commissar of the Russian Ukraine.

"Non-interference" indeed!

## EXHIBIT TWO

At this point I submit exhibit two. It is an Associated Press dispatch. It appeared in the Sault Daily Star and, I suppose, in most of the dailies of Canada. No doubt its counterpart went to the United States:

MOSCOW, Feb. 22 (AP)—Wolna Polska, organ of the Union of Polish Patriots in Russia, has endorsed the formation of a national council inside Poland and describes it as a "crushing blow" to the "emigre Fascist clique" of the Polish government in London.

The current issue of Wolna Polska says the council, which claims complete rights to represent the Polish nation, was selected by "the most democratic methods" and is uniting all groups actively engaged in the fight against Germany.

Please recall the news items, the newscasts, the words of commentators dealing with the activities of "The Union of Polish Patriots resident in the U.S.S.R." or with the antics of Russian newspapers and Russian officials with reference to Polish territory and then please come to a realization of how suavely, just as in the Associated Press dispatch quoted above, the tenor of nearly all of these was calculated to leave the impression that the "Union" was God's answer to Poland's prayer and that Russian claims to Polish territory were more or less in line with a just solution of the Polish boundary problem.

Not the remotest impression could remain in the mind of the reader or listener that violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter was involved, nor even the terms of Article 5 of the Treaty of Alliance between Great Britain and Russia, nor of the other solemn treaties, notes, declarations, etc. nearly all of which reaffirm over and over again, the inviolability of Polish Territory as at August, 1939, nor that most of these were entered into with the very Government-in-exile which it is now proposed to supplant.

Once again it is not Russia nor Wolna Polska, nor any Russian medium that is thus forcing upon us these inferred interpretations of what the news involves. No, the news item above quoted was framed by our own correspondent, presumed to possess qualifications for a most important post, a servant, not of Leftists here nor in Russia, but of that great organization, the Associated Press. He serves the leading newspapers the country over. The responsibility for his being there and for that item rests with a whole succession of people whose enlightened contribution to the cause of the United Nations we are entitled to expect. Moreover the news items pass muster in every press office before they are permitted to reach the reader. Yet, in in paper after paper and in newscast after newscast, that item and many others like it were published with only a rare adequate editorial comment about the principles at stake.

I have never been a reporter much less aspired to the important assignment of correspondent at Moscow. Yet I venture to redraft that item in something like the form that a red-blooded press representative, possessed of the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, could be expected to frame it:

MOSCOW, Feb. 22 (AP)—Wolna Polska, organ of the 'Union of Polish Patriots in Russia' is working overtime to make it appear that the efforts of the 'Union' to undermine the Polish Government-in-exile is not Soviet-sponsored but rather that they are in support of a movement originating within Poland. It has endorsed, so its columns announce, the formation of a national council inside Poland and describes it as a 'crushing blow' to the 'emigre Fascist clique' of the Polish government in London.

The current issue of Wolna Polska says the council, which claims complete right to represent the Polish nation, was elected by 'the most democratic methods' and is uniting all groups actively engaged in the fight against Germany. British and U. S. diplomatic circles here are silent about evidence to support the claims made by Wolna Polska that the Council has complete right to re-

present the Polish nation and as to how the election by the most democratic methods was carried out."

Perhaps that dispatch would not have passed Russian censorship even though it concerns Polish affairs. In that case let the ravings of *Wolna Polska* be confined to its own readers rather than permit the A. P. correspondent to become an agent to spread its propaganda.

In other spheres of the war our correspondents well know how to make enlightened contributions to the cause of the United Nations. We would be aghast should we read a dispatch, say from Berne, something like this:

"BERNE, Feb. 22 (AP)—German radio reports heard here describe the safe landing at a Portugese port of the disabled hospital ship H.M.S. 'Mercy'. The report announces that the crew of a German submarine were forced to disable the ship because, as the result of observations 'made by the most scientific methods' they became aware that although clearly marked as a hospital ship it carried 'commandos and contraband likely to be landed in Norway'. Hitler is reported to have personally congratulated the members of the crew on the special precautions taken not to sink the vessel in the event that some disabled allied war victims might have been on board."

No correspondent would ever send such a message, yet, with a little exaggeration, it is, in its sphere, on a par with the spirit behind the published A. P. dispatch from Moscow on February 22nd.

There is something wrong!

At this stage let me be most dispassionate. In the crisis with which this letter deals the channels through which Public Opinion is moulded and reflected are, generally speaking, pursuing a course which will surely replace the present crisis by one far more intractable and in that course they are abandoning sacred principles. For those principles the people loyal to the Union Jack and to the Stars and Stripes sincerely believe this war is being waged. For the triumph of those principles

they pour out their blood and their treasure.

I recognize that all news media do not pursue this fatal course. The New York Times, for instance, endeavours to keep our thinking straight when its editorials interpret news involving the Russian-Polish crisis. All honour to it and to others who emulate that policy. (This is my only mention of a medium under the Stars and Stripes and it is in a positive role. I am maintaining a becoming silence in this respect but radio echoes convince me that there too it will be easy to unearth exhibits.)

All honour, too, to publications like the "Nineteenth Century and After" which in its issue of last June published an article by F. A. Voigt, formerly foreign editor of the Manchester Guardian, which has rendered a distinct service in the cause of a better understanding of the fundamental issues involved in Soviet Russia's attitude towards Poland and Western civilization. To Mr. Voigt's article I owe the inspiration for this letter and upon it I have relied for many of my factual statements. It is reproduced and published in the United States by the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, Incorporated, 105 East 22nd Street, New York.

What is wrong?

### NOT BY ACCIDENT

I confess I cannot put my finger on it. But I am convinced of this: A tremendous conspiracy is being enacted. As a result of widespread gullibility and of "absorbing preoccupations", to which I have previously referred, it is meeting with a great measure of success in smothering public consciousness of what is at stake and thereby curbing the spontaneous expression of Public Opinion.

What is happening, is happening, not by accident but by design.

Very few in the great army of those carrying out the design are involved in its conception and in the directing of its accomplishment. But behind it all, there is a design.

The symptoms prompt me to offer the following diagnosis, always subject to review by competent specialists. I invite those whom it may concern to find a more accurate outline:

1. The disbanded Comintern of the Soviet Internationale bequeathed to the nations under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes coterie of fanatic zealots who are not susceptible to conversion. These zealots, even more than Russia, want Communism everywhere. They decry Russia's constructive tendencies, yet they cling to Russian domination as the hope for the realization of their scheme. To that end they encourage Russia in a policy of discord with Poland and they have no inclination to permit the Atlantic Charter to influence Russia's ambitions.

It is in the throes of that coterie that the News Media seem to be clutched so far as their treatment of the Russian-Polish situation is concerned. Twenty clever Leftists, masters of subtlety and of the art of promoting mass psychology, who manage to succeed in insinuating themselves into dominating key positions would more than suffice — yes even ten or five! Then with scores of properly placed, so-called Liberals, steeped in varying degrees of, perhaps ordinarily harmless, Leftist tendencies they accomplish their design. The world-wide set up for the gathering of news and columnizing of opinions for all News Media, more particularly about Russia, seems to be unduly honey-combed with agents who, wittingly or unwittingly, are accomplices of the designing coterie.

2. Conscientious personnel in the press, radio and cinema are absorbed with the news of great world events, and exciting local issues. The dispatches, syndicated articles and columnists' contributions come to them ready for presentation. The very clever procedure outlined in (1) has already stamped its effect on those contributions. The justly favourable attitude towards Russia makes it easy for the innocent looking daily doses to go unchallenged. More difficult to account for (and it needs the attention of those responsible) are the decidedly Leftist editorials or comments, the authoritative voice of the medium or the expressed conviction of the commentator, which issue from time to time. These appear at intervals far enough apart not to arouse too much attention and their phrasing is calculated to "get by" and yet make some impenetration. There are, also, certain publishers and commentators who are the obvious confederates of the designing coterie.

3. It is most likely that directions from the British Foreign Office, the American State Department and the Canadian Department of External Affairs have rightly requested a great degree of tolerance in this crisis. This plays into the hands of the conspirators with the result that the response has overrun all dictates of prudence and of fidelity to the bedrock principles of our people. (Not for a single instant do I involve any of the Diplomatic Offices. Official declarations from London and Washington seem just right. I do not pretend to be qualified to criticize them. Sometimes I do shudder at the progressive tendency to make them less decisive. The Diplomatic Offices, however, are bound to succumb to the negative atmosphere that surrounds Public Opinion. Likewise they need the stimulant of its intelligent positive expression.)

If the diagnosis in Nos. 1, 2, 3, does not fit the actual case then, to account for the abnormal conditions, something else almost as mischievous must be

wrong. In other words if it is not "scarlet fever" it must be "measles"!

Whatever is wrong, in God's name let us apply ourselves to the task of putting it right!

## *A Call To Action*

Let the retinue of splendid, loyal men, truly devoted to the dynamics of Democracy who occupy responsible key positions in the huge network of News Media bestir themselves, review how the theme of this letter has actual application and set to work at the urgently needed shake-up.

Let the advertisers, who with their dollars, and the readers, who with their pennies, finance, not Russian propaganda, but the destructive antics of those elements under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes realize that a situation exists which needs their scrutiny.

Please keep in mind that while our task involves elements at home; Russia too will respond to Public Opinion when it is unmistakably manifest, virile and steadfast. Witness how Public Opinion, in non-Russian nations, induced Russia to call off its direct all-out attack on religion in 1932 and again in 1938.

Public Opinion makes itself felt in various ways:

A letter to the editor, a telephone call to a friend in a key position, a round-robin, a resolution moved at a Labour meeting, a Service Club luncheon, a Town Council, the organization of protest rallies, etc., etc. The distribution of pertinent constructive literature. Each of these and a combination of them all is needed. Every move characterized by the earnest, sincere, tenacious, fighting spirit which the exigency of the issue demands and worthy of citizens loyal to the Union Jack or the Stars and Stripes.

To illustrate what I have in mind there is an addenda to this letter setting forth the correspondence involved in a single-handed campaign waged in this cause, not spectacular nor characterized by any great degree of skill nor erudition but earnest, sincere and everlastingly bent on being effective. There was no idea that any such campaign would develop when I wrote the first letter of comment dated November 29th, 1943.

Similar campaigns, directed as circumstances dictate, can be waged with overwhelming support from the rank and file of every day citizens who, finally conscious of what is going on, apply themselves to straight thinking, straight writing, straight speaking and straight acting in this crisis. A series of campaigns waged from every county, town and city under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes, waged by individuals, by groups, by organizations and finally, by all whom it may concern.— It seems to me, such a series of campaigns would have consequential effect.

Let us rouse ourselves as individuals and as organizations.

I propose, not a campaign against Russia, but a campaign against the possibility of World War III. A campaign of protest and protest and protest against those elements, rabid Leftists and gullible indifferents, who would becloud the radiant promise of the provisions of the Atlantic Charter; not so much in the sentences of its formula but in the true, warm, sincere sentiments that have fired the unmeasured sacrifices of the peoples under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes.

Sentiments that make us work and fight and endure to achieve tranquility and security for ourselves and for all the world. Aspirations in whose realization, provided we reveal them in truth and in earnestness, no nation under the sun need hesitate to unite.

Does Russia hesitate now?

Then let the ardour of our devotion to the Atlantic Charter draw her, like a magnet, to that realistic state of mind which will make her an all-out sponsor for the promise that it holds for us, for Russia and for the world.

Let the News Media and every other medium ring out the praises of Russia. At the beginning of this letter I give sincere indication of the possibilities. Let there be heartfelt words of warm and true gratitude, let us becomingly seek her friendship. However when certain elements at home seek to turn these generous sentiments into an interpretation that would encourage Russia to expect us to support her in what we regard as treachery; when with fawning, mawkish adulation they expose us to the contempt of Russia, let us rise as one mighty force and strangle the efforts from whatever direction they may come.

### A FORMULA

At the outset of this letter in stating its purpose the last reference was: "To explore the possibility of at least one formula as a contribution which will help avert the tragedy." As the conclusion approaches I am forced to state that that formula is embodied in all the arguments, all the conclusions and all the exhortations that have gone before.

With these in mind the following is respectfully submitted:

Let all the United Nations realize that in the midst of the "turbulent atmosphere of conflict" there can be no sensible opportunity for permanent solutions as to boundaries nor as to determining "the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned."

That interference by one of the United Nations with the internal affairs of any other one is intolerable.

That where a situation arises demanding immediate action by one of the United Nations compelled to protest against the effect upon it of the internal administration of another of the United Nations then on the basis of a defined procedure, and in the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and pertinent treaties; a disinterested, impartial international agency embracing only the membership of the United Nations be set up to at once adjudicate the issue. The solution thus arrived at to hold good only till the Peace Conference and general adjustment of world problems.

That all realize that at this crucial hour unanimous decisions and cohesive plans concerning the prosecution of the war constitute the vital need to the exclusion of all others.

That in the presence of what has been revealed as such splendid results in meeting that vital need all must unite in making sure that no untoward incident nor incidents interfere with the fullest realization from such marvellous unity of effort, and that, certainly, no member of the United Nations make demands on others compromising their sovereignty and their honour.

### A FINAL APPEAL

Now to whom it may concern just one more plug to urge and press for an immediate, unmistakably manifest, virile, steadfast Public Opinion:

It has long since been revealed that when on March 7th, 1936 Hitler's troops marched into the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland, in flagrant violation of the Locarno Treaty, those troops had strict orders to retreat if the French army opposed them in any way. In that crisis the Foreign Office, the State Department, the Department of External Affairs failed. The decision was that France should not march. Instead it was decided to appeal to the League of Nations.

During March of the previous year Hitler had wiped out the military provisions of the Versailles Treaty by proclaiming the formation of a German conscript army.

Let us in all earnestness and with search of conscience realize that between the violation by Hitler in 1935 of the military provisions of the Versailles Treaty and the march of his troops on the Rhineland in March 1936, there intervened twelve months which witnessed the most ignoble collapse of right thinking, right writing, right speaking and right acting by the Foreign Office, the State Department, the Department of External Affairs; by the media which mould and reflect Public Opinion; and finally by Public Opinion itself.

When the state offices of diplomacy fail, when the news media fail; then Public Opinion must be ever alert and, of its own momentum, force the issue as a result of an ever virile, ever steadfast and unmistakably manifest stand.

Since that tragic collapse of the role of Public Opinion in 1935-1936 I know of no crisis wherein it could more effectively expiate that collapse than the one which unfolds itself at this hour. At this hour let Public Opinion avert what would be perhaps a worse catastrophe than the consequence of its failure in 1935-1936.

Even now, without for one moment relaxing its supreme contribution to the world struggle, Democracy looks to the days of Peace and realizes that the "status quo" of 1939 is gone forever. It realizes past deficiencies and seeks a system wherein the ideals of Democracy will find integral expression by pervading the whole structure of the social order including politics, economics and social institutions.

In 1935-36 the driving accomplishments of Hitler, Mussolini and — it must be said, of Stalin gripped the imagination of the world. Democracy was held up as decadent! Indeed we were

floundering; the soul of Democracy was groping for its integral expression.

Since then the world has witnessed Dunkirk, the Battle of Britain, the electrifying effect of Pearl Harbour, the miraculous overnight production of sinews of war for all our needs and the needs of all our allies, the great part Democracy has played in the accelerated march of the United Nations to supremacy in the air, on land and over the seven seas! Make no mistake: Democracy is in the saddle — its steed is headed, not to selfish ends, but to preserve all that it holds sacred and to bring to the world, and to each of its peace-loving nations; tranquility, security and freedom!

Democracy does not strut. In the spirit of Christian love it welcomes co-operation, it is flexible and seeks to adjust its procedure to conflicting situations such as the friendship of Russia is bound to provide. It has all the tolerance that strength and power impose.

Let Democracy carry on, nor let up for a single moment in its hastening pace, nor compromise any of its high ideals; then no power on earth nor in hell can stay the onward course which will spread its beneficent rays over the whole world, not by force nor by imposition but in response to the appeal of eager masses whose weakened bodies and famished souls cry out for deliverance. Let Public Opinion never hesitate for a moment to proclaim that glorious actuality. Nor let anything that is craven creep into that spirit which urges us in face of Might, to defend the Right.

My plea is to hold Russia as a worthy member of the family of the United Nations and, at the same time, to stand by the Atlantic Charter. Whatever course is most effective to hold the one, on the basis of respect and goodwill, is sure to be the course that will stand by the other. My real dread is that a course will be pursued calculated to forfeit both.

I realize here that it is not the document christened on the mid-Atlantic for which I plead. It is for the spirit which that document sought to define, and which existed long before the Atlantic Charter.

It is the heritage of Christian principles no matter how befogged they may have become; the off-shoot of the culture which Christianity has reared over the centuries; at the hour of our challenge it found itself devoted to love of Freedom and the sanctity of the fireside; it wavered when Hitler first flouted its protests.

But the moment Hitler's hordes violated one foot of Polish soil its outraged sense of Justice and of Right was set ablaze.

The sanctity of the soil of Poland was the touchstone of the challenge that let loose our righteous indignation out of which grew our righteous might. Our aroused interest in the sanctity of the soil of Poland embraces all that the Atlantic Charter tries to define.

When the carnage is over should one foot of that soil in the West, or in the East, be under the stranger's heel; then the crusade launched in response to the spirit which gave birth to the Atlantic Charter will not have met a full measure of success. The spectre of the failure will lurk with the welcoming crowds at the landing quay and on the street corner. Its white shroud will be the map of Poland and its dumb tongue: "the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned".

To whatever extent you may accept or dismiss all that has gone before heed the words I shall now write; they are those of a lady of charm and loveliness; reflected from her qualities of heart and mind.

On April 11th, 1943, Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth broadcast a message. Her Majesty announced at the outset: "It is because there is something that deep in my heart I know ought to be told you." From that message which brought to blistered spirits the refreshing effect of a soothing balm, I quote only one sentence uttered just before the close. It defines the formula and provides the key to the solution of all the world's problems:

**"IT IS THE CREATIVE AND DYNAMIC POWER OF CHRISTIANITY WHICH CAN HELP US CARRY THE MORAL RESPONSIBILITIES WHICH HISTORY IS PLACING UPON OUR SHOULDERS."**

As a Christian I write this letter aspiring to Faith, Hope and Charity; and above all to Charity: Charity towards Poland and towards Russia, and with malice toward none. In that spirit all Christians will concern themselves to unite in the words which are the one common heritage which a divided Christendom accepts undisturbed and unchanged. The words given to us first hand by Infinite Wisdom, which I presume to repeat:

"Our Father, Who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

As a Canadian citizen and a British Subject I write, conscious that this very letter testifies to the triumph within our realm of the First Freedom. That triumph gives us confidence for the final triumph of all Four Freedoms of the Atlantic Charter and of its provisions; "to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned" and "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."



In that spirit I quit the realm of controversy and of didactics in union with those under the Stars and Stripes I stand at attention to the strains of "The Star Spangled Banner" and next, with my own compatriots, as the least of His Majesty's subjects, I repeat the precious four words which unite us all in one purpose and one accord:

"God Save the King."

To Whom It May Concern, believe me to be,

Sincerely yours,

John J. Fitzgerald

Blind River, Ontario, Canada,

April 21, 1944.

Feast of St. Anselm, Bishop of Canterbury.

## ADDENDA

The following is submitted as the "illustration" referred to on page 11 of this pamphlet.

The weakness of this "illustration" is that it seems to wind up with nothing but a group of letters suspended in mid-air. Do not jump at that conclusion. I know beyond question that there have been results.

In spite of the confusion imposed on the mind of the man in the street by the conflict which arises between his enthusiasm for Russia's contribution to the defeat of Hitler and his apprehension at Russia's contribution (in its relations with Poland) to the defeat of Our Cause as defined in the Atlantic Charter, I am still convinced that millions under the Union Jack and Stars and Stripes are in accord with the general ideas and the conclusions set forth in the previous pages.

In the process of reading what follows please visualize the immediate and enduring effect that would have ensued provided that, of those millions, there had been ten, or a hundred, or a thousand, or ten thousand who, either themselves or through various organizations, as a logical consequence of that accord with those general ideas and conclusions, had taken steps similar to those described below. It is not inferred that all can devote the time for a continuing campaign-but each argument and each well founded protest dealt with below called for support in the thousands; sometimes from this source, sometimes from that; as a result Public Opinion would really make itself felt. As stated in note 2 on page 17, I am prepared to join with all and sundry who feel that organization is needed.

### THE FIRST LETTER OF COMMENT

Neil M. Morrison, Esq.,  
Supervisor of Talks & Public Affairs,  
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation,  
55 York Street,  
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Morrison:

I was sorry to learn from your letter of November the 25th, signed by your secretary, that copies of the speeches given at the Maple Leaf Gardens in connection with the big Russian celebration are not available.

You will recall that in June of this year we had a discussion by correspondence regarding the broadcast of one William Mandel. Certainly any protests made in connection with what Mr. Mandel had to say on that occasion ought to sink into insignificance in face of the altogether superlative, spurious and unconvincing eulogy expressed at Maple Leaf Gardens. I am not so greatly disturbed by the event because the boundless statements, I think, will reach

their proper level upon sober reflection by the listeners and the exaggerations will have the effect of making people realize that there must be some limit to the degree of superlative perfection in connection with everything that Soviet Russia has anything to do

The word "spurious" used above is strong. To substantiate it I simply refer Mr. Brockington and others to the report made by the Anglican Archbishop of York, Dr. Cyril Foster Garbitt, following his recent visit to Russia.

In his report he did his best, in all charity and in recognition of our present generous sentiments, to give Russia all possible credit about freedom of worship in Russia but nothing in the Archbishop's report confirms Mr. Brockington's eloquent but exaggerated remarks. I was anxious to secure a copy of his speech, it needed checking up on so many scores.

When the Reverend Father Ledit challenged His Excellency, Mr. Gousev, Soviet Envoy to Canada, on the charge that priests were still held in Russian jails he received no reply.

(See "Note 1" below.)

No criticism can, of course, be directed against you. There is no doubt that it was an outstanding national event and there was nothing for the C. B. C. to do but give the public service in connection with the event. It seems to me, however, that the C. B. C. went the limit. I believe it was the very next night that in connection with "Canadian Roundup" the Toronto speaker again exhausted the superlative in his description of the event. He did not confine himself to describing the event but gave out a whole lot of personal opinions which I, for one, do not accept. Then, there was a re-broadcast of the speech made by a former news correspondent whose name I forget but certainly he went the whole way in telling us that we must imitate Soviet Russia in every respect. Then a little later in the week the Toronto contribution to "Canadian Roundup" presented a young lady medical student describing some medical reunion which was taking place in Toronto. It is significant that she too seemed to want to talk more about the excellence of Russia than she did about any other features of the reunion. The manner in which she insisted upon talking about Russia did not appeal to me as a natural outcome of an every day medical student's observation in connection with the reunion. It seems to me that what she was saying was inspired either as the result of membership in some Communist organization or as the result of naive listening to some persons who are so con-

nected. JUST HOW DID IT HAPPEN THAT SHE WAS THE ONE SELECTED?

(See "Note 2" below.)

Now I do not think that there is a single informed Canadian who has not a great admiration for the Russian people at this hour and, at the same time, who does not recognize that we in Canada, and that the people of the world, owe a great debt to the Russian people for the sacrifices that they are making and for the wonderful feats that they have performed in contributing to the overthrow of world enemies. I want Canada and Canadians to do all that can be done in paying our share of that debt to Russia. But, since that is our real attitude and since we are sincere in our recognition of all that is good in connection with Soviet Russia, why do we have to be belaboured with all the rot that went on at the big meeting at the Gardens, and in connection with the other material that, from time to time, comes to us over the radio, especially from Toronto and Vancouver.

So far as our debt to Russia is concerned all the allied nations should be ready to recognize it and to pay it to the extent that it can be paid. But, never let it be said that any one of the allied nations or any nation subscribing to the Atlantic Charter is ready to pay Russia with territory that belongs to someone else. That is a thought I seldom hear expressed over C. B. C.

To realize that there are reasons for alarm in connection with Soviet Russia one only has to consider the following quotations from an editorial which appeared some weeks ago in the London Times:

**Note 1:** The speeches taken as a whole gave blanket approval to everything that has happened in Russia during the past 25 years. They eulogized by inference the results in atheistic education, the conception of the individual man which is at the root of our conflict with Russian ideology, insisted that freedom of religion exists, etc. The theme of the demonstration was to the effect that to approve everything Russia has ever done one only need know all about it.

I have never considered Mr. Brockington a Leftist but that very fact suited the Leftists all the more; when, in his unchecked display of demonstrative oratory, he pronounced a panegyric, exaggerated beyond all concept of normal license in such circumstances, which, to the thoughtful citizen, was nauseating, and, to the Leftists, a triumph.

**Note 2:** To anyone a bit familiar with Communist technique (now "Tim Buck Leftists") it was evident that during that entire week C.B.C. programs were paying the Leftists' piper.

Thousands of loyal and grateful Canadians had gathered in a huge demonstration organized under a name that at this time cannot but beckon all good men and true: The Council for Canadian Soviet Friendship.

That wholehearted tribute to Russia was spoiled by Leftists in the background (or perhaps in the foreground) who took advantage of the event to build up their propaganda. To be effective that propaganda must be repeated and repeated. The week following the demonstration in Maple Leaf Gardens was a Roman holiday for the Leftists.

(Note 2, continued next page)

(The letter then continues with several paragraphs devoted to the London Times editorial and the Oumansky incident referred to in previous pages of this pamphlet.)

The letter concludes as follows:

Now surely you will agree that it is in no spirit of "baiting" Russia nor no fanatical prejudice against the home of outrages imposed in the name of Communism that makes one stand in dismay in face of what is revealed in the above quotations.

May you look upon it as an expression of confidence in you that I once again place before you my conviction that there is subtle, organized propaganda behind all the hullabaloo about Soviet Russia and that the invisible or visible hands directing this propaganda are not thinking of the interests of Canada nor of the United Nations and certainly not of the Atlantic Charter. I think that some prominent Canadians are being made the dupes of these propagandists and not the least some people in C. B. C.

I am still looking forward to that proposed visit with you. In fact I've telephoned you a couple of times in Toronto but it was always after hours.

With kind regards,

Yours very truly,

John J. Fitzgerald.

Among others, copy of the above letter was sent to the Prime Minister with a covering letter under date of December 2nd, 1943, as follows:

"Dear Mr. King:

The attached letter to Mr. Neil Morrison, Supervisor of Talks and Public Affairs, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Toronto, is forwarded to you for purposes of record. Although it is addressed to you as Prime Minister I feel that you will find that it more likely pertains to matters which come under your direct control in your capacity as Minister of External Affairs.

This copy of the letter to Mr. Morrison is not sent with the object of securing any comment from you. Although I would appreciate the satisfaction of having you read the letter, yet I realize how busy you are and would suggest that, if you cannot give the entire letter consideration, that you, at least, glance at the few paragraphs which I have especially marked. Would you particularly note my conclusion in the last two paragraphs.

In the midst of the current laudable preparation of plans for men and women who will return from all branches of the services I hope that Canada, at least, will be prepared to take all the risks entailed in making sure that these men and women were not being mocked when we used the inspiration which

Note 2 (continued):

Couched in all the subtlety of which the Leftists are masters, an analysis will demonstrate how well the propaganda was directed to the development of that mass psychology which fits their two-fold purpose:

1. To secure world sanction, by approval or by connivance, of every act and move by Russia.
2. To set up that conflict in the mass mind with reference to the ideals of Christian Democracy and Atheistic Communism which paves the way for their "organized chaos" out of which they emerge as the saviors and impose their system.

Those are the two goals of Leftist propaganda today and the objectives which the innocent sounding sentences are working to effect.

In spite of Canadian complacency Leftists will never completely succeed in Canada, of that I am sure. I am equally sure that if we do not wake up we shall find that we have permitted the stage to be set for havoc, on a national scale and over a prolonged period, such as was experienced a few years ago, on

a limited scale and over a short period, in Winnipeg, Regina and Vancouver. Let us not wait for their "Pearl Harbour" inning to organize and effect their defeat. I am prepared to join with all and sundry in such an organization and would invite advice from those interested.

In the meantime Leftists are having a mystifying success, devastating and tragic, on a world-wide scale, in keeping dormant the outcry of public opinion against threatened and actual violations of the principles for which Democracy is in the war.

Their numbers are limited but their organization is perfect, their energy untiring. It is not their representation in parliament that matters—they only seek the odd propaganda speech in that arena—but what really counts is the number of confederates or "dupes" whom they can count upon in key positions to promote their mission and spread their propaganda. Let the man in the street stop and realize what is going on, then bestir himself ever so little; they could at this stage be swamped into complete impotence in the blink of an eyelash.

rests in the provisions of the Atlantic Charter to urge them on.

Believe me,

Yours respectfully,"

Under date of December 7th, an acknowledgment was received from Mr. W. H. Wrong, Under Secretary of State for External Affairs as follows:

Dear Sir:

Your letter of December 2nd addressed to the Prime Minister has been referred to this Department. I should like to thank you for forwarding a copy of your letter of November 29th to Mr. Morrison of the C. B. C.

Yours sincerely,"

One of those included in the reference "among others" above, sent me under date of December 3rd, 1943, a letter of thanks with comment which really set in motion the single handed campaign that is unfolded in the following exchange of correspondence.

That comment was:

"I think you will have to probe much further back than young Mr. Morrison to find the real niggers in the woodpile. One of the biggest is Richard Stanton Lambert, chief adviser to the CBC on talks and the like. He is an arrant Leftist, and is the new chairman of the 'Writers', Broadcasters' and Artists' War Council', five of whose seven branches were personally organized by a member of Tim Buck's national executive. I believe that investigation would show that the CBC staff was honeycombed with Leftists."

Before I leave this correspondent it will be well to record information received from him over two months later under date of February 7th. I had been sending him odd copies of some of the letters that follow and he was evidently prompted to spur me on. Please note the information that immediately follows was not in my possession prior to February 7th, 1944. It was not passed on by me at this time to the C. B. C. because I decided that if energetic action had followed my representations previous to February 7th, this information would soon be revealed to those concerned:

"There is one bit of background that you ought to know. One of the most aggressive and dangerous men in the Communist

Party of Canada is a young Russian named Davinsky. Under the name of "Roy Davis", he was a leader in the Young Communist League from about 1933 to 1939, and was the first editor of the Communist Youth publication, NEW ADVANCE. In 1939-41 he faded out temporarily, but re-emerged under a new name as 'Raymond Arthur Davies', contributing a flood of articles to the TORONTO DAILY STAR and even to such capitalistic papers as SATURDAY NIGHT. Ordinarily the change of name would be quite venial and even commendable; but in this instance it was obviously undertaken as camouflage. Aided by his vogue in these new journalistic circles, he took the main initiative in August 1942 in organizing in Toronto the united-front 'Writers', Broadcasters' and Artists' War Council', whose secretary he became and into which he brought such notorious Communists as Ed Yardash and A. A. McLeod. Next year, he made a trip through Western Canada, actually addressing Canadian Clubs, and organized five new branches of the 'War Council'. In 1943, he also published a villainous piece of propaganda, entitled THIS IS OUR LAND, in which he tried to whitewash the Ukrainian-Communist organization, the Ukrainian Labour-Farmer Temple Association. In the fall of 1943, friends in Toronto raised enough funds to send him to Moscow to cover the Moscow Conference and to stream-line propaganda for the Canadian public. And now, for the past month he has been quoted almost daily on the national news-summary of the CBC as the authority for vivid little items on Soviet achievement on the industrial front. (By the way, he was listed with his photograph, in the CANADIAN TRIBUNE for August 28, 1943, as a member of Tim Buck's new national executive.) The question is, how does a high ranking Communist have the inside track with the CBC? Why is his clever propaganda thrust daily into every Canadian home? The president of the War Council, of which Davies-Davinsky is secretary, is R. S. Lambert, chief adviser on talks to the C.B.C."

The information contained in the letter of December 3rd, about the "War Council" and its president made me feel that something must be done. Strangely enough I turned to the Minister of Finance. The reason is revealed in the letter to him under date of December 15th, 1943, to which was attached the quotation above recorded (the Dec. 3rd item, not Feb. 7th):

Blind River, Ontario,  
December 15th, 1943.

Hon. J. L. Ilsley, K.C., P.C.  
Minister of Finance,  
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Ilsley:

The subject matter of this letter does not pertain directly to your Department. My reasons for coming to you are:

1. The idea of Responsible Government makes each member of the Cabinet responsible for all Departments and all members of the Cabinet responsible for one.
2. I have complete confidence in you.
3. Apart from my capacity as Vice-President of a Company operating an essential war industry, my most direct contribution to the war effort and to the promotion of all the ideals which the United Nations profess is in the honour I have had of being the Local Chairman of every Victory Loan. That makes me an officer in your battalion — you are the one to whom I naturally turn, I hope, with some measure of title.

At the inception of the Fourth Victory Loan I forwarded to you under covering letter dated April 9th, 1943, copy of my letter of April 3rd, 1943, to Eric D. Scott, organizer of the Fourth Victory Loan for Sault Ste. Marie District.

From the contents of your cordial reply dated May 3rd, 1943, I realized that you had carefully read my letter sent to Mr. Scott and I was gratified at your assurance that my observations would be carefully considered.

At that time I outlined "serious considerations" under 4 headings. One of these was "Trifling with Communism". Perhaps a more appropriate reference in view of recent developments would be: "Trifling with Leftists".

Now I come to you, Mr. Ilsley, to ask you, in God's name, to act, in face of the responsibility of your position and the power which that position directly and indirectly vests in you, fortified by a very high degree of public confidence with all classes of citizens, I appeal to you not to rest until something is done to put a stop to the manner in which Canadian citizens are being abused as revealed herein.

Attached is copy of my letter to Mr. Neil Morrison, Supervisor of Talks and Public Affairs, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Toronto. That letter explains itself.

Attached also on a yellow sheet is extract from a written comment I have received. I have no personal knowledge of what is revealed in that comment but I am prepared to accept the authority of its author.

Mr. Ilsley, let me say I cannot see any excuse for our Government to permit such a state of affairs to exist. It impresses me as culpable betrayal to put the air waves under the control of men who are out to undermine everything for which the men and women in the services are fighting, and for which the entire population is straining every effort in their support.

I feel that is all I need to set before you in that regard.

Now, in my letter to Mr. Morrison, I include two quotations: one from an editorial in the London Times, another, a dispatch from Washington about the remarks of the Soviet envoy to Mexico.

Cynics may say that the antics of the Soviet envoy are just what to expect. But that such an editorial would appear in the London Times is tragic. That it passes with no official protest is sickening — it leaves a lump in my stomach which simply will not dissolve. That editorial makes a scrap of paper of the Atlantic Charter and nobody seems to give a damn!

I make this latter comment in passing, perhaps you can do something about that also.

But in the matter of the C. B. C. I know you can get quick results if you will put your heart to it, and I sincerely hope you will.

Believe me,

Yours faithfully,  
John J. Fitzgerald.

The reply under date of December 29th was as follows:

Dear Mr. Fitzgerald,

I duly received your letter of December 15 with enclosures, regarding the character of certain broadcasts over the CBC. You put it up to me very strongly "to act".

I have read with great interest your letter and its enclosures, but I must candidly say that I do not know how I, as Minister of Finance, or personally, can interfere with the operations of the CBC. The Minister in charge is, as you know, Major General LaFleche, but I am far from suggesting that he could do very much about these broadcasts as the whole question of interference

by the Government with the dissemination of views over the CBC, is one of great delicacy and difficulty.

I did not hear the broadcast to which you take exception. Indeed, your letter to Mr. Morrison seems to dwell much more on the attitude of the London Times and on the remarks in Mexico City of the Soviet Ambassador to Mexico, than it does on Canadian broadcasts.

I presume you have written Major General LaFleche, and I will be glad to have a word with him about the matter, although, as I have said, I do not know what steps it would be possible or desirable for the Government or a Minister to take.

Yours very truly,  
(Signed) J. L. Ilesley.

I consider this letter entirely satisfactory. Ministers must be exceedingly careful about what they put on record. I am satisfied Mr. Ilesley will do all that his many duties will permit. He did promptly confer with Major General LaFleche. Under date of January 5th, 1944, I received the following letter from the Minister of National War Services:

Dear Sir:

The Honourable J. L. Ilesley, Minister of Finance, to whom you wrote on the 15th of December, 1943, has communicated with me about the subject matter of your letter. I have taken note of your remarks and wish to point out that the policies governing broadcasts are made by the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and by no other person. This is according to a law which was passed by the Canadian Parliament.

Should you so desire, I would be very glad to pass on the contents of any communication you may indicate to the Board of Governors but I suggest you can save much time by dealing direct with them and therefore suggest that should you care to pursue the matter, that you address any further communications to the Secretary, Board of Governors, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Ottawa.

Some interest has been aroused in regard to the manner in which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation deals with what it terms controversial broadcasting. It is a very difficult problem because of the impossibility of pleasing every person. I may say that I am quite convinced that the members of the Board of Governors are good, solid, Canadian citizens whose only thought is to do the

best they possibly can in the Canadian interest. I am equally convinced that if you care to communicate with them, they will give most careful consideration to your point of view.

I could possibly save time by passing on the contents of your correspondence with Mr. Ilesley but do not care to do so because I am not certain that this would be pleasing to you.

Trusting this will be of some assistance to you, I am,

Yours faithfully,  
(Signed) L. R. LaFleche.

To this I replied:

Blind River, Ontario,  
January 11th, 1944.

Major General L. R. LaFleche,  
Minister of National War Services,  
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your letter of January 5th, sent to me as a result of communication with you by the Honourable J. L. Ilesley, Minister of Finance, regarding the subject matter of my letter to him of December 15th.

In my letter to Mr. Ilesley I appealed to him "not to rest" until something is done to put a stop to prevalent abuses in the C. B. C. The same letter constituted a covering letter for copies of other communications which dealt with the "abuses".

The abominable situation is disclosed in the following information sent to me by an erudite, reliable, well-informed Canadian:

- a. That Richard Stanton Lambert, chief adviser to the C. B. C. on talks and the like is an "arrant Leftist".
- b. The belief that "investigation would show that the C. B. C. staff is honey-combed with Leftists".
- c. That Richard Stanton Lambert is the new chairman of the "Writers', Broadcasters' and Artists' War Council."
- d. That five of the seven branches of that War Council were personally organized by a member of Tim Buck's national executive.

I mentioned to Mr. Ilesley that the above information is not within my personal knowledge but that I accept the authority of the one who sent it to me. The Department of Justice is in a position to promptly establish the facts.

I assure you, Sir, that I fully realize how hard pressed are all Ministers of the Crown at this time and I would never have troubled Mr. Ilsley did I not feel that the gravity of the situation warranted my appeal to him as a Minister of the Crown "not to rest" till something effective is done just as I, in my limited sphere, intend "not to rest" until I have exhausted every possible means to secure action.

That it is not my policy to impetuously rush off "a letter to the Minister" is indicated from the fact that my first gesture in these developments was to send a letter of protest to Mr. Neil M. Morrison, Supervisor of Talks and Public Affairs, C. B. C. Toronto. Of this I have received no acknowledgment, and I have concluded that Mr. Morrison has been instructed by some superior, perhaps Mr. Lambert, to ignore the protest. I had a previous satisfactory exchange of communications with Mr. Morrison which makes me feel that it would not be his personal policy to thus ignore my letter.

The succession of broadcasts which inspired my letter to Mr. Morrison are done and past. Their effect would never disturb me in the least as an isolated outcropping and the whole object of my letter was to put Mr. Morrison on guard.

Now I realize how naive I was to write such a letter in face of information received as a result of forwarding a copy of that letter to one whom I felt would be interested. This information I disclosed to Mr. Ilsley and I now have repeated to you.

The third paragraph of your letter of January 5th, refers to the "very difficult problem" involved in what is termed "controversial broadcasting" and refers to the impossibility of "pleasing every person".

The situation with which I am now dealing has no relation to that difficult problem. If I am not pleased with what a speaker on a controversial subject has to say and if my displeasure arouses me sufficiently I would probably write him but I would never blame the C. B. C.

My protest as one of His Majesty's subjects is against the use of the broadcasting facilities controlled by His Majesty's Government in Canada as an instrument to deliberately undermine the institutions symbolized by the Crown; especially at this hour when the blood and treasure of the nation is being poured out in defence of those institutions.

I admit that the agencies organized to thus undermine those institutions are very clever, sometimes very subtle, sometimes arrogant but always on the job. They often succeed in using prominent, would be loyal, Canadians as a front but the Government of Canada should not be so easily duped.

I do not feel that it would be consistent for me, at this stage, to write to the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation but I assure you that you may make any use of this letter or of my letters to Mr. Ilsley which you think might be effective.

I realize, Sir, that comment one way or another from a Minister in a situation of this nature is not always in order and, while I would appreciate an acknowledgment, I do not ask you to commit yourself on the merits of representations, my one desire is for action.

Believe me,

Yours respectfully.

Then under date of January 12th, 1944, Major General LaFlèche wrote:

Dear Sir:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of yesterday's date and as you have authorized me to make any use of your letter, I am bringing the contents of your communication to the attention of the Chairman, Board of Governors, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. There is nothing else for me to do except in such a general way that it would not have any immediate purpose.

Please accept my thanks for the interest you have displayed in radio broadcasting.

Yours faithfully,

On January 11th, I had written the following to the Honourable J. L. Ilsley:

Dear Mr. Ilsley:

While thanking you for your letter of December 29th, 1943, I wish also to advise you that Major General LaFlèche has written me as a result of your communication with him.

I attach a copy of my reply to him.

Please be assured, Mr. Ilsley, that no feature of the earnestness with which I approach this C.B.C. situation is more sincere than the confidence I have expressed in you.

It is therefore in no spirit of importuning that I repeat my appeal to you "not to rest" until the evil is cured.

Believe me,

Yours respectfully,



The following letter under date of January 31st, 1944, gives the contents of the last chapter in this episode but not the last in the whole campaign:

Major General L. R. LaFlèche, P.C.,  
Minister of National War Services,  
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

Under date of January 28th, I received a letter from Mr. Remi Morin, Chairman, Board of Governors, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, from which I quote as follows:

"The Honourable L. R. LaFlèche has handed me a copy of your letter to him, dated January 11th, 1944.

The information it contains and your comments were communicated informally to my colleagues of the Board and will no doubt be useful to them."

To this I have replied as follows:

"This is to thank you for your letter of January 28th. I appreciate its brevity from which I deduce that for once we shall have action rather than words

"I take the term 'no doubt' in its literal sense which means that when there is no doubt there is a certainty."

I am hoping for effective results and my determination "not to rest" is as firm as ever and my file is still open.

Yours very truly,  
John J. Fitzgerald.

What is revealed in the following exchange of letters is interesting in as much as it exposes the antics of the administrative office of the National Council for Canadian-Soviet Friendship in connection with providing me with a copy of Mr. Brockington's speech. It all arose as a result of the acknowledgment of my letter to Mr. Morrison sent on November 29th, 1943. That acknowledgment finally arrived under date of January 27th, 1944. It explains the delay:

CANADIAN BROADCASTING  
CORPORATION

55 York Street,  
Toronto, Ontario,  
January 27, 1944

Mr. John J. Fitzgerald,  
Blind River, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Fitzgerald:

I was going through a file yesterday and discovered to my chagrin that a letter you wrote me well over a month ago had not been answered. Apparently it came in when

I was away from town and was put away by mistake before I had a chance to reply to it on my return.

I hope you will pardon this discourtesy which I assure you was not intended.

Were you able to secure copies of Mr. Brockington's talk? Although we did not publish it I understand that the Council for Canadian-Soviet Friendship did.

I appreciate your concern about this question and I would like to thank you for your very stimulating letter. I certainly do not think we should attempt to whitewash the U.S.S.R. in the interests of United Nations unity. After all, in the long run that would only defeat its own purpose. However I do think it is important to try to arrive at some better mutual understanding, which is our purpose in presenting programmes of this kind. Actually we try to secure speakers with different points of view. For example, I remember one talk we had by Mr. Philip. Ottawa Correspondent for the New York Times, last summer which definitely presented the Polish side of the border dispute, and which opposed the Russian claims. Last week Mr. Wilson Woodside also dealt with this problem and also with the Pravda incident in a way which made some of the strongly Pro-Russian advocates (*see note 3*) very annoyed. We try not to allow ourselves to become dupes of any propagandists, although we are continually being accused of that by all sides on controversial questions of this kind.

I am sorry I have not been here when you phoned, but I hope you won't give up trying whenever you are in town.

Yours faithfully,  
(Signed) Neil M. Morrison,  
Supervisor of Talks & Public Affairs

Blind River, Ontario,  
January 28th, 1944

Neil M. Morrison, Esq.,  
Supervisor of Talks & Public Affairs,  
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation,  
55 York Street,  
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Morrison:

Thank you for your letter of the 27th instant and for the information as to where I might procure a copy of Mr. Brockington's speech. I have not the address of The Council for Canadian-Soviet Friendship but will find it.

---

Note 3: They are always on the job!

You are certainly forgiven for what appeared to be ignoring my letter. I had put the blame on some superior who might have so instructed you. This impression comes as a result of fairly reliable information that the C.B.C. is honeycombed with Leftists including fairly high officers. I know, from our earlier correspondence, that your policy would be to at least acknowledge the letter.

With kind regards,

Yours very truly,  
John J. Fitzgerald.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING  
CORPORATION

55 York St.,  
Toronto, Ont.,  
February 1, 1944.

Mr. John J. Fitzgerald,  
Blind River, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Fitzgerald:

In case you have had trouble finding the address of the Council for Canadian-Soviet Friendship, may I mention that Mr. Malcolm Ross is their organizer and that you can address him in care of the Council at the Star Building, King Street West, Toronto.

Please continue to write me about our programmes. We do our best to present a cross-section of Canadian opinion in our Talks and Public Affairs Programmes.

Some people write in as you do, saying that we tend to present a leftist point of view. Others say that we are too far to the right and thoroughly unprogressive!

We make every effort to see that the main bodies of opinion are represented and try to do this in all fairness.

Thanks again for your letter, and with all good wishes.

Yours faithfully,  
(Signed) Neil M. Morrison,  
Supervisor of Talks & Public Affairs

Blind River, Ontario,  
February 2nd, 1944.

Mr. Malcolm Ross,  
Council for Canadian-Soviet Friendship,  
Star Building, King Street West,  
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

I am informed that your organization very likely printed the principal speeches that were delivered on the occasion of the demonstration held under your auspices at the Maple Leaf Gardens during the month of November last, including the speech made by Mr. Brockington.

I would appreciate receiving 3 sets of these speeches if available and I shall remit promptly if you would send me an invoice for any charge in connection with these copies.

I would also appreciate having the address of Mr. Brockington if it happens to be convenient for you to send it to me.

Thanking you for your kind attention,

Yours very truly,  
John J. Fitzgerald.

About ten days later I sent a copy of the above to Mr. Morrison with a notation that I had received no reply then followed:

CANADIAN BROADCASTING  
CORPORATION

55 York St.,  
Toronto, Ont.,  
Feb. 16, 1944.

Mr. John J. Fitzgerald,  
Blind River, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Fitzgerald:

I am enclosing copy of letter sent to Mr. Malcolm Ross, Council for Canadian Soviet Friendship.

I hope Mr. Ross will either send you the printed address given by Mr. Brockington, or let you know the intentions of the Council in this regard.

With all good wishes.

Yours faithfully,  
NEIL M. MORRISON,  
Supervisor of Talks & Public Affairs

The enclosed copy:

55 York St.,  
Toronto, Ont.,  
Feb. 16, 1944

Mr. Malcolm Ross,  
Council for Canadian-Soviet Friendship,  
Star Building, King Street West,  
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Ross:

A note from Mr. John J. Fitzgerald of Blind River, tells me that he has not yet received the address given by Mr. Brockington at the Maple Leaf Gardens.

I understood that your organization was going to publish this address and send it to those people who wrote to the CBC for it.

Would you kindly write to Mr. Fitzgerald telling him of your intentions with regard to this matter.

Yours faithfully,  
Neil M. Morrison,  
Supervisor of Talks & Public Affairs.

Still nothing happened!

Finally one month later the following arrived:

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR CANADIAN-  
SOVIET FRIENDSHIP

2 Temperance Street, Toronto

March 15, 1944

Mr. John J. Fitzgerald,  
Blind River, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Fitzgerald,

May I apologize for the delay in answering your letter. In error, it was filed away before being answered.

The report of the Congress will consist of the four main speeches: Prof. E. Simmons. Dr. Vilhjalmur Stefansson, Dr. Max Yergan and Leonard Brockington. The pamphlet will sell for ten cents. The material is being mimeographed and should be ready by the end of the week.

We shall be pleased to know your requirements.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Helen Longman,  
Secretary.

I promptly forwarded a postal money order for 30 cents and requested 3 copies.

Nothing further happened until March 30th. Then I received an envelope postmarked at Toronto March 29th. Inside was a receipt dated March 20th. The form of receipt was not such as one would expect from a quasi-public organization. It was on a stock form such as may be procured in any stationery store. The receipt indicated "3 copies Congress Report". No intimation of when I might expect them.

Nothing further happened till Easter Monday, April 10.

On that date I was in Toronto. I decided to call for my copies!

My first letter to Mr. Ross had been sent to the Star Building but the reply came on a printed letterhead indicating 2 Temperance Street as the address. There I went. The elevator attendant duly directed me to the office of the "Council". The young lady and young man in attendance had evidently never heard of Mr. Brockington nor his speech but

when I mentioned the "Congress Report" the young lady said: "Oh, you want Dr. Ross in the Star Building." There I went and duly received my 3 copies! I want to say, in all fairness, that I do not believe the "reports" were actually in print much sooner than I received my copies. However the inefficiency or deliberate discourtesy disclosed in what happened between the date of my first letter to Dr. Ross, February 2, and the date I received the copies, April 10, is worthy of note.

Moreover I find it disturbing to consider what might be the significance of having the letterhead address at 2 Temperance St. and the administration headquarters in the "sanctum sanctorum" of the Toronto Daily Star! (The office is not in the tenants' section of the Star Building, but on the beautifully appointed Executive Floor. The "National Council" may be reached through the Star telephone.)

Does this mean that the official basis of the "Council" for promoting Canadian-Soviet Friendship is in accord with the pronouncements of the Toronto Daily Star? My interpretation of the Star's basis is that the way to promote friendship with Russia is to "second the motion" every time Russia makes a proposal but never to expect Russia to second any proposal from Canada particularly if it pertains to making effective the provisions of the Atlantic Charter.

On the back of the 2 Temperance Street letterhead is a long list of "patrons" probably 300 names including Lieutenant Governors, Prime Ministers and Chief Justices. I respectfully suggest that these "patrons" should not rest satisfied with absentee control.

I cede to no one in a heartfelt desire for Canadian-Soviet friendship. I would seek it on the basis of self-respect and goodwill wherein the citizens of one sovereign state seek friendship with the citizens of another sovereign state. I doubt that the National Council of Canadian Soviet Friendship is proceeding on that basis nor on any basis that its worthy name implies.

\* \* \*

My interest being thus focussed, I was prompted to write to the Globe and Mail on January 14th, 1944. This developed into a side campaign of its own:

THE TWO GLOBE AND MAIL EDITORIALS FROM THE ISSUE OF JANUARY 12th, 1944, AND THE UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF COMMENT:

### IT SEEMS SO LONG AGO

(Globe and Mail, Jan. 12, 1944)

It seems centuries ago. So much has happened in that time, so close did the world come to losing its freedom, it is hardly credible that it is only three and a half years since a little island first stood alone in the face of onrushing hordes that were so sure of world domination.

Mr. C. R. Stettinius' book "Lend-Lease, Weapon for Victory" recalls American aid to Britain after the fall of France. It was after the miracle of Dunkirk that the President of the United States had sent across the Atlantic half a million rifles, 900 75-mm. field guns, 80,000 field guns, and 130,000,000 rounds of ammunition for the rifles and other equipment.

Looking into a future now assured of victory, it is well to recall those days of gloom, of frustration, of retreats, of Nazi successes. In the days of the "phony war" it was going to be very easy. Just sit behind the Maginot Line, just blockade the Germans. They had no oil. They had no generals. They had nothing but a madman as leader. Victory was easy.

It was on April 9, 1940, that Germany invaded Norway and Denmark. The British people, the British House of Commons, so subject to forces of public opinion, debated Norway. On May 8 Mr. Chamberlain got a majority of 81 after a bitter division. Then on May 10 it came. Germany invaded Luxemburg, Belgium and the Netherlands.

"At last", sighed the waiting world, "It has come. Now we can meet it face to face. The waiting is over."

But, like the voice of doom, each new day boomed down on free men. Luxemburg gone. Holland gone. Belgium fallen. France tottering. Then to a world taught the greatness of Gamelin and his French armies, the impossible happened: France fell. Petain took over.

It was on June 3 that Dunkirk's evacuation was over. The Germans took possession but not before the British Army, without equipment, its transport left on the beaches, had reached the Isles.

Alone was Britain.

"We're in the finals anyway," said the little Cockney.

Russia remained aloof. The United States, with its heart in the right place but unprepared for war, was aghast. For if Britain fell there was scarce a chance for the rest of us. The wise men in the capitals of the world said: Britain's done. No equipment, no arms, nothing.

Meanwhile a man with the face of a wilful child, the heart of a St. George, the words of a master of his tongue rose. He rallied his people. He brought to the front all the fight, the determination that had made his nation great through the centuries. In Winston Churchill Britain found its leader and the world its hope. The world trembled, while old men, very young boys, drilled with staves, and the armies prepared for an invasion that they would have to repel with sticks, with little ammunition, with no tanks, with few planes.

It was in that fall that Goering sent his mighty air force to bomb Britain into submission. As the bombs fell, British spirit rose. The little people of the Isles held on. Tiny Union Jacks appeared, stuck into rubble that used to be their homes, their hospitals, their schools. Still the bombs fell. Still the people's determination grew. They would never surrender.

And those lads of the Royal Air Force, less than 500 aircrew members, flew their Spitfires again into the skies, into the formation of outnumbering Nazi squadrons. Boys flew again and again when they should have been resting. Tired, weary, sleepy-eyed, they fought on. It was they, those few pilots, who saved us all. Those pilots and the heart of Britain that would never buckle.

Alone, alone from June, 1940, until June 22, 1941, when Germany attacked Russia, the people of Britain braved the skies raining death. Not death of soldiers alone, but death for women, for old men, for little children as they played in the streets.

Now as we face the days when freedom seems sure of safety it is well to recall that solid year and those who saved that freedom.

It is only three and a half years since France fell. It does seem like ages.

### A FAIR PROPOSAL

(Globe and Mail, Jan. 12, 1944)

There has been an unexpectedly swift fulfilment of the recent prediction in these columns that the prospects of a solution of the problem of the Russo-Polish frontier which would leave Poland without serious grievance were by no means hopeless. A broadcast from Moscow by Tass, the official Russian news agency, which would not speak without the full authority of Stalin and his government, announces that Russia has offered Poland as her eastern frontier the "Curzon Line," so called because it was recommended in 1919 as the most equitable boundary by an impartial commission of experts nominated by the Marquis Curzon, then Britain's Foreign Secretary. By this offer Russia renounces her claim to part of the Polish territory which she occupied in 1939 as the result of her unfortunate pact with Germany. The "Curzon Line" is what is known as an ethnographic or racial frontier, because under it areas in which the Poles are in a clear majority would be assigned to Poland, and Russia would retain territory in which White Russians, Ukrainians or other races constituted the majority of the population. The total number of Poles left outside Poland would not be large, and the most important non-Polish minority in the debatable territory, the Ukrainians of Eastern Galicia, would achieve their desire to be united with the rest of their race under the Soviet system.

It is hardly to be expected that the Polish Government-in-exile will hasten to announce its enthusiastic acceptance of this offer, as it has stood out firmly for the restoration of the pre-war boundaries. But it would be well advised not to adopt a stiff-necked attitude. For one thing, there is no guarantee that it commands the allegiance of a majority of the Polish people. It is in disfavor with the Russian Government, which prefers to place its confidence in the more democratic group of Polish patriots now living in Russia, and has given official recognition to their organization. Very significantly the Tass broadcast contrasted the success of this latter group in organizing a Polish army corps, which is now fighting against the Germans with the Russian armies, and the proved incapacity of the Polish emigre Government in London to establish friendly relations with the Soviet Union and organize an active struggle against the German invaders in Poland itself.

This emigre Government will realize several things. First, it is today completely in

the power of the Russians to keep all the territory which they occupied in 1939. Secondly, it is folly to visualize any possibility of the United States and the British Commonwealth fighting Russia on this issue or even pressing her strongly. Thirdly, if this fresh offer is rejected the Russians might withdraw it or use their power to instal in Warsaw a Government which was prepared to accept it. So, if the Polish Government in London adopts a stiff attitude, it will alienate the sympathies of the people of the Western democracies, and might well bring complete discredit upon itself.

The Russian offer, of which the British and American Governments probably had full cognizance, has an element of generosity in it, and seems to be a valuable and hopeful contribution to the building of a better world. It indicates that Russia is not intent upon grabbing all the territory that she can lay her hands on, and is ready to show some consideration for the interests of other nations. Moreover, the Tass broadcast reveals a certain concern for the regeneration of Poland as a strong State. It suggests that Poland be given back those portions of East Prussia which were primordial Polish land before they were filched by the Germans. To place any large number of Germans under Polish rule would leave a dangerous open sore; but what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. The Nazis had no scruples about expelling ruthlessly the Polish population from territory which they incorporated in the Reich, and they have thus established a precedent for clearing the German population out of parts of Eastern Prussia whose incorporation in Poland would give her a needed outlet to the Baltic Sea.

### THE UNPUBLISHED LETTER

Blind River, Ontario,  
January 14th, 1944.

To the Editor,  
The Globe and Mail,  
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

Your issue of January 12th, 1944, carried two striking editorials; one under the title, "It seems so long ago"; timely and inspiring in the telling manner in which it gives a setting to that phrase "Alone was Britain". The other under the title "A fair proposal"; shocking in its appeal to that idea of appeasement the shame of which Britain expiated in that long, long night when she stood alone!

Sir, I do not claim competence as an arbiter as to what are the just boundaries of Poland but I do claim that the Atlantic Charter sets up the principles which ought to govern the approach to fixing those boundaries.

Your editorial scraps the idea of an approach based on the Atlantic Charter.

The most shocking part in your editorial is that in which you propose that the precedent established by the Nazis in Polish territory would justify a similar procedure by the United Nations in dealing with East Prussia. God forbid! God forgive you.

Among others I challenge and deny the following statements in your editorial:

1. "The Ukrainians of Eastern Galicia would achieve their desire to be united with the rest of their race under the Soviet system." — They have no such desire.

2. "The more democratic group of Polish patriots now living in Russia". The "Union of Polish Patriots" is not more democratic. The president of the Union, one Wanda Wasilewska, far from being a Polish patriot, is a Polish traitor. She went over to the Russians in 1939 when Russia was with Germany and when Poland, like Britain, stood alone. Her husband is Deputy Commissar for Foreign Affairs in the Soviet-regime.

In an article published in the June issue of "Nineteenth Century and After" Mr. F. A. Voigt, formerly Foreign Editor of the Manchester Guardian, forcefully outlines the Polish situation. After citing recent solemn treaties with Poland by Russia, Britain and the United States he concludes:

"It is, therefore, beyond dispute that Great Britain and Russia are pledged to assist Poland in securing her full independence within frontiers she held in 1939, that the annexation by either power of any territories within those frontiers is a clear violation of definite treaties, and that Great Britain is specifically pledged to help Poland in resisting any attempt, whether direct or indirect, open or covert, to interfere in Polish internal affairs."

Stalin, the realist, may welcome your editorial but he will despise the spirit that dictated it. While we admire Russian feats and are eternally grateful for them, let us

seek the respect of Russia rather than the contempt that comes from mawkish adulation.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed), John J. Fitzgerald.

On January 17th, the following letter was sent to Mr. W. H. Wrong, Under Secretary of State for External Affairs, Ottawa:

Dear Sir:

I wish to place on record with your Department the attached copy of letter under date of January 14th, 1944, written by me to the Editor of The Globe and Mail, Toronto.

Yours faithfully,

To this there was no acknowledgment.

The following letter was sent to Mr. E. R. Stettinius, Jr., The Under Secretary of State, Washington, D.C.:

"Dear Sir:

I listened intently to every word of your excellent presentation over N. B. C. on the program: The State Department Speaks.

How completely I share your esteem for our contemporary Mr. Cordell Hull.

Today I have sent to the Under Secretary of State for External Affairs in Canada, for purposes of record, a copy of a letter I wrote under date of January 14h, to The Editor, The Globe and Mail, Toronto. It has just occurred to me that my sentiments are echoed by legions of your own citizens, so I take the liberty of forwarding you a copy.

With sentiments of highest esteem, believe me,

Yours faithfully."

To this the following reply was received, under date of January 24th:

"Dear Mr. Fitzgerald,

Thank you for your letter of January 17 regarding the State Department's radio program and enclosing a copy of your letter to the editor of The Globe and Mail in Toronto. I deeply appreciate your writing me and I am glad to have this frank statement of your views.

With good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) E. R. Stettinius, Jr."

On February 3 I was en route to Montreal and read a typical dispatch. It seemed to offer an opportunity for The Globe and Mail to make amends for its regrettable editorial of January 12th and, from Sudbury, Ontario, I wired the Editor as follows:

"Refer my letter to you January 14th re editorial issue twelfth stop Canadian Press dispatch reported Sault Star announces Tass broadcast Alexander Korneichuck relieved as deputy commissar foreign affairs Soviet he is husband of Wanda Wasilewske president Polish Patriots untenable situation and bad faith obvious."

The wire was not acknowledged and though I did not see a copy of the Globe and Mail for several days I feel sure there was no response in its columns.

On February 14th I was at North Bay and early in the morning a dispatch greeted me on the front page of the Globe and Mail which prompted the following telegram:

RT. HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING  
OTTAWA, ONT.

CAN YOU NOT ARRANGE THAT TASS CORRESPONDENT WILL BE ABLE TO SEND A RINGING DISPATCH TO THE SOVIET TODAY FROM A PROTEST ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE FOR THE DASTARDLY USURPATION IN POLAND BY THE FORMER DEPUTY COMMISSAR OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN THE SOVIET STOP CONSULT MY LETTER TO GLOBE AND MAIL JANUARY FOURTEENTH SENT TO W H WRONG WITH COVERING LETTER DATED SEVENTEENTH.

This was ignored.

To Mr. Gordon Graydon, Leader of the Opposition, was sent the same telegram with this sentence inserted at the beginning:

"Have just sent following telegram to the Prime Minister quote."

Under date of February 15th, Mr. Graydon replied:

"Dear Mr. Fitzgerald:

I received your telegram yesterday and drew it to the attention of the Prime Minister."

The issue of the Globe and Mail of March 6th, reported the speech of Mr. George McCullagh, publisher, delivered at a staff dinner

on the evening of March 4th, in celebration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of The Globe. After reading that speech I was impelled to write Mr. McCullagh as follows: (please note the postscript, it both tempers and aggravates the trend of the body of the letter):

Blind River, Ontario,  
March 8th, 1944

George McCullagh, Esq.,  
Publisher, The Globe and Mail,  
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Mr. McCullagh:

I read with a great deal of interest the report of your speech last Saturday evening. Since, as a result, I am writing this letter, may I open with congratulations to the Globe and Mail, to you and to Mr. Wright.

This letter deals with the significance of the following quotation from the report of your speech:

"It is important that, if the editorial page is crusading for a certain policy, the news department recognizes its duty to publish in the news columns all utterances, to the contrary or otherwise, concerning that policy, so far as possible within space limitations. It is a debt we owe to the people that the unhampered, unaffected opinions appear in this journal . . ."

and:

"On the editorial page we express what we believe to be honest opinion; if this involves criticism, let that criticism be found in our news columns; if it involves praise, let that be found there, too."

I attach copy of a letter under date of January 14th, addressed to "The Editor, The Globe and Mail." That letter certainly "involved criticism" but it was never published. I did not complain; I do not now complain. I merely bring it to your attention.

There is another development in this connection. On March 3rd, I wrote as follows:

"To the Editor,  
The Globe and Mail,  
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

On January 14th, I addressed a letter to you making comment with reference to two editorials in your issue of January 12th, 1944. The editorials were under the titles "It Seems So Long Ago", and "A Fair Proposal".

For a reasonable period I watched your paper to see if the letter would be published and I never observed that it was published.

It may be that I shall be publishing some material which I am getting together in connection with the Polish situation. This would include a copy of the two editorials referred to and my unpublished letter. I would appreciate it if you would let me know that I am correct in saying that my letter of January 14th to you was never published. It may just be possible that I overlooked some issue. Addressed stamped envelope is enclosed.

Thanking you for your kind co-operation."

The stamped envelope has not been used and there has been no reply in any form. Perhaps the celebration of the 100th Anniversary has something to do with the delay that is if "delay" is all that is involved. A few words at the foot of my letter would have sufficed.

It would not be fair to draw general conclusions from my isolated experience but the decision with reference to whether or not my letter of January 14th, was to be published constitutes a superb test of policy as defined in the above quotation from your speech. Considering the nature of the issue involved I do not think there is any sound basis to possibly take refuge, in this instance, in making a distinction between "news columns" and "letters to the editor." The test of sincerity remains.

Now the intention is not to call your personal sincerity in question much less your executive capacity to make it effective. This incident illustrates how, in your difficult position, it is so important to make sure that the intensity of the one backed up by the thoroughness of the other would make it very difficult for a two barreled situation to arise such as I now bring to your attention.

The tenor of your speech makes me feel you would appreciate receiving a letter such as this and I hope you will accept it in the spirit with which it is written.

Yours very truly,  
John J. Fitzgerald.

P.S.—Since this letter was written the noon mail (Mar. 8) has brought a reply to mine of March 3, signed by H. V. Ferguson. I had not asked for an explanation but I am certainly not impressed with the "sincerity" of the one offered.

My letter dealt specifically with the editorial and was not on top of its publication.  
J.J.F.

The letter referred to in the postscript was as follows:

"Dear Sir:

Previous to receipt of your letter of Jan. 14 this paper gave prominence to letters by writers presenting both sides to the Polish boundaries question. These views having been published, other letters on the subject began to arrive. But there appeared little use in continuing a controversy on a subject of Polish concern on which divergent opinions were held by writers. As space conditions and pressure of other matter made impossible continuance of the discussion, these were not used.

Hoping you will understand newspaper difficulties in this respect. I remain,

Yours sincerely,"

The following three letters reveal a sample of Leftist courtesy:

Blind River, Ontario,  
January 20th, 1944.

F. Muszynski, Esq.,  
Secretary,  
Polish Central Committee of  
Greater Toronto,  
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Muszynski:

I was very pleased to see that the Globe and Mail published your letter in support of the Polish Government in London.

You will be interested in the attached copy of letter which, so far, has NOT been published!

I have had the advantage of reading the pamphlet "Poland, Russia and Great Britain" by F. A. Voigt, issued by the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent Inc., 105 East 22nd St., New York, also "Polish-Russian Relations" by Oscar Halecki, issued by The University Press, Notre Dame, Ind.

I believe your organizations should take every possible means to ensure a wide circulation of these booklets.

What would you think of having 100 Polish boys 15 to 18 with some sort of uniform or cap go from office to office selling these books in Toronto and every city in Canada and the United States? Also it would be well to see



that these pamphlets get into the hands of all editors, radio commentators and radio personnel.

Yours cordially,

John J. Fitzgerald.

Blind River, Ontario,  
January 20th, 1944.

The Editor,  
Polish Weekly Chronicle,  
165 Spadina Avenue,  
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

Will you kindly indicate the street address of Mr. F. Muszynski on the attached envelope and mail it.

I read his recent letter in the Toronto Globe and Mail and have sent him a copy of the attached which was not published.

Yours very truly,

John J. Fitzgerald.

Blind River, Ontario,  
March 11th, 1944

Hon. Louis S. St. Laurent, K.C.,  
Minister of Justice,  
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Mr. St. Laurent:

If consistent would you kindly pass on the attached for attention.

Under date of January 20th, I wrote to Mr. F. Muszynski, Secretary, Polish Central Committee of Greater Toronto, Ontario. I

did not have his street address but out of a directory I selected the address of "The Polish Weekly Chronicle" and forwarded the letter to their office. It was duly enclosed in a stamped envelope and completely addressed except for the street and number. Under pressure of various duties I neglected to pursue the matter further but yesterday it became important for me to know what happened to the letter so I managed to secure Mr. Muszynski on the telephone. He advises me that "The Polish Weekly Chronicle" is a rabid Leftist journal and that we could not expect them to render the service I had requested.

I am sure you will agree that this outfit has shown itself to be a very poor sport in the circumstances and I have been wondering if your Department has ever investigated its activity.

If it would not be entirely out of order I would appreciate it if a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or some representative of your Department in Toronto would find it convenient to investigate just what happened in connection with my letter. I realize that these people were under no obligation and were quite entitled to throw the whole business into the waste paper basket, but a representative from your Department in the course of rendering this private service might get some valuable information in the public interest.

Assuring you that I shall graciously abide by your decision in this matter.

Yours cordially,

John J. Fitzgerald.

THE ABOVE CAMPAIGN HAS PRODUCED RESULTS MORE COMPLETE THAN SOME OF THOSE INVOLVED WANT TO GIVE THE AUTHOR THE SATISFACTION OF KNOWING. LET THE RESULTS BE MULTIPLIED A THOUSAND FOLD!

## “EXTRA”

As this pamphlet goes to press there has come to the author's notice a "B. U.P." dispatch dated April 4, announcing the statement issued by Captain Victor A. Kravchenko on the occasion of his resignation from the position which he held with the Soviet Government in charge of the metals division of the Soviet Purchasing Commission at Washington. A few brief quotations from Captain Kravchenko's statement make far more apparent than anything this pamphlet contains the urgent demand that all elements within the Democracies rally to the support of the Atlantic Charter.

The following are quoted from the dispatch and from a full report in the New York Times of April 4:

"For many years I have worked loyally for the people of my country in the service of the Soviet Government and have followed closely the development of Soviet policy in its various stages. For the sake of the Soviet Union's interests and her people I tried hard to overlook many aspects of the situation which were repugnant and alarming. But I cannot keep silent any longer. . . ."

"I can no longer support the double-faced political manoeuvres directed at one and the same time toward collaboration with the United States and Britain while pursuing aims at variance with such collaboration. Collaboration with the democratic countries cannot be pursued while the Soviet Government and its leaders are in reality following a concealed policy of their own designed to accomplish purposes at variance with their public professions.

"The Soviet Government has dissolved the Communist International but only in form; in reality Moscow has continued to support its Communist party affiliates in many countries. The new democratic terminology being utilized by Moscow is only a manoeuver. Intelligent and informed people in Russia and abroad are not deceived by the new Soviet terminology of nationalism, the object of which is to conceal the substance and purpose of real Soviet policy. These purposes have guided also the formation of the All-Slav Committee in Moscow and of the so-called Union of Polish Patriots, with their alleged national programs.

"The latest manoeuvres directed toward the formation of a Polish Government that would be obedient to the Soviet Government have provoked consternation and protests,

which I fully share. The Soviet Government rightly objects to the interference of outsiders in the internal affairs of Russia. Why, then, do the Soviet rulers consider it proper to force their brand of "democracy" upon Poland . . . ."

"Officially the Soviet Government has proclaimed its desire to support establishment of democratic regimes in Italy, Austria and other countries. In reality, this is but another attempt to adapt its own aims to the purposes of the Allies and to promote the inclusion of Communists, obedient to the Kremlin, in the future Governments of these countries . . . ."

"While professing to seek the establishment of democracy in countries liberated from fascism, the Soviet Government at home has failed to take a single serious step toward granting elementary liberties to the Russian people.

The Russian people are subjected, as before, to unspeakable oppression and cruelties, while the NKVD (Soviet secret police), acting through its thousands of spies, continues to wield its unbridled domination over the peoples of Russia. In the territories cleared of the Nazi invaders, the Soviet Government is re-establishing its political regime of lawlessness and violence, while prisons and concentration camps continue to function as before.

The hopes of political and social reforms cherished by the Russian people at the beginning of the war have proved to be empty illusions . . . ."

"I confirmed my long suspicion that capitalist democracy as presented in the propaganda and teaching of the Soviet Government at home has no relation to the reality I found in the United States. You Americans cannot understand what it means to me never to have been asked for my passport by anyone in the entire seven months of my residence in this country. . . ."

"The Comintern continues to function but by different methods and in other forms. Haven't you noticed that the new political clothes donned by Browder bear a striking resemblance to those adopted by Stalin? And haven't you observed also that while the Comintern, official organ of the Communist International, has ceased publication, that its place has been taken by War and the Working Class, which now sets the tone and line for the policies and utterances of the Communist parties abroad? The Daily Worker in this country reflected fully the statements appearing in War and the Working Class on the factual fight in the American Labor party in New York and reflects also the attitude taken by the New Moscow organ on matters concerning labor in the United States. I cite these as only some examples for the guidance of my American friends."

## AN EASTERN MUNICH

I would further suggest study of an article, also lately brought to my notice, in The American Mercury for March 1944, entitled: Will Stalin Dictate An Eastern Munich? by William Henry Chamberlin, one of the foremost authorities on Russian history and politics.

Leftists have been accused of buying up all the copies of the March Mercury in certain centres but reference libraries should still have their issues (unless they have been "lifted"). Moreover I understand Mr. Chamberlin's article has been reproduced by permission of the publishers and is available at certain Polish Consulates and from some Polish organizations.

The article describes the "smear Poland" campaign as an insult to American intelligence and American fair play. In a few convincing paragraphs it knocks the wind out of certain glib commentators and media like New York P M., The Nation and the New Republic.

Let us try to fathom why it is that the facts revealed in articles such as the one here mentioned do not come to us, in the ordinary course, through the popular news media.

The contents of this pamphlet are not copyrighted. They may be reproduced in full or in part ad. lib.

The Author.

**Quantity Prices:** 5 copies, \$1.00; 12 copies, \$2.00; 50 copies, \$7.50; 100 copies, \$12.00; 500 copies, \$50.00. Copies will be mailed postpaid to submitted lists at a charge of 5 cents additional per name to cover postage, envelope and clerical work. For instance: for a list of 50 names remit \$7.50 plus \$2.50, a total of \$10.00. Please address orders and make remittances by mail or wire payable to:

**Atlantic Charter Committee, Blind River, Ontario, Canada**

(The name "Atlantic Charter Committee" is selected as a provisional name should an organization develop as a rallying agency for "Help!")



Cliffe Printing Company, Limited  
Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.