

PAGE BLURRED
PAGE BARBOUILLÉE

C221233

POINTS CONCERNING EASTERN POLAND.

Contrary to frequent remarks concerning "Poland's territorial claims against the USSR", Poland makes no such claims. But the advocates of the Soviet cause make claims to Polish territory. These claims to half of Poland are proffered on the grounds of "strategic reasons", in addition to ethnographic and historical considerations. Let us examine them one by one.

I. "STRATEGIC REASONS":

Eastern Poland has no strategic value to Russia.

(a) This was proved by the first few days of the German attack on the USSR. Hitler's armies pushed unimpeded through Eastern Poland which has no natural obstacles. After a few days the Soviets engaged the opponent some distance inside Russian territory. No major battle was fought between the two in Eastern Poland. Therefore, that region did not serve as a "soft cushion" to Russian safety.

(b) Poland is 54 times smaller than the USSR. Eastern Poland more than 100 times smaller than the USSR. The distance from Moscow to the Polish-Soviet frontier of September, 1939, is 425 miles. But the Molotov-Ribbentrop line of demarcation which Soviet sympathizers claim for the USSR would bring the nearest point of such a frontier just 50 miles from the Capital of Poland! Why should additional (doubtful) security for the enormous and strong USSR be made at the expense of the security of Poland? It would be offensive to the basic sense of justice to penalize an Ally (and the first Member of the United Nations) by carving out half of its territory in order to satisfy another Ally, already possessing the largest area in the World. The nations which help towards Victory, especially at such a cost as Poland, should receive compensation and reward - certainly not punishment.

(c) It would be equally offensive to the sense of justice if Poland, an Ally, should be treated on equal footing with Finland and Rumania, which are in the Axis camp, when advocating the amputation of parts of their lands. Surely allies must be treated differently from enemies and opponents. Even the case of these "satellites" could be considered with some leniency, in view of the intimidating pressure exercised by Germany. But Poland refused to be terrorized, was the first to fight and fought alone against her mighty invaders.

(d) Britain, with her sense of justice and equity, has never advanced claims against the territories of Denmark, Holland, Belgium and Northern France, for strategic or other reasons. Britain understands that she cannot wrong her allies in order to satisfy her own needs. It would be a most unpedagogical measure, and would turn the feelings of weaker and weakened countries against their stronger allies, no less than heretofore against our common enemy whose actions are prompted by lust for power and territorial aggrandizement. In the name of justice such acts should not even be recommended and launched to public opinion.

(e) Instead of trying to build up the resistance of Soviet Russia, at the expense of another Ally - to prevent Germany's "Drang nach Osten", is it not much wiser to weaken Germany so that there will be no danger of Drang nach Osten...and nach Westen. Why should we in the first place be so foolish as to leave Germany capable of another aggression? And why should the World be concerned only with a possible aggression of Germany against Russia? The Anglo-Saxon World, and the French, deserve at least as much consideration. Yet their object is to weaken Germany, instead of increasing their strategic position at the expense of their Allied neighbours.

(f) Poland has not staked everything to oppose totalitarian Germany (an Enemy) to become a victim of totalitarian Soviet Russia (an Ally). Are we not staking everything in order to bring about JUSTICE AND FREEDOM for all countries and all people? The Atlantic Charter is an expression of that belief.

(OVER)