

**Rafał Moczko**

(Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń)

ORCID: 0000-0003-1287-2888

## *Na Antenie* and *Wiadomości*: The Circumstances of the Beginnings and Termination of Cooperation

*Na Antenie*, a monthly magazine where the most important texts broadcast on Radio Free Europe were published, was as a supplement to the weekly *Wiadomości* from 1963 to 1969.<sup>1</sup> Jan Nowak-Jeziorański, recalling in the mid-1990s how *Na Antenie* was created and how the cooperation with *Wiadomości* was initiated, wrote:

It was my idea. It was to be the Polish equivalent of the English magazine *The Listener*, the press organ of the BBC, and was to feature our best political commentaries, radio plays, essays, as well as news from Poland, witness accounts, and documents. From the very beginning of RFE, at various times I asked the Americans for money and permission to publish it. [...] All my efforts went unanswered for a long time. It was not until the early 1960s that the new director of RFE, Rodney C. Smith, understood the need for such a magazine to compete with *Kultura* and *Wiadomości*, the two great émigré periodicals, and at the same time wanted it to be a magazine that reached a wide Polish audience in the world. So I proposed to Jerzy Giedroyc that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Later, the magazine was published independently for several years, then as a supplement to *Orzeł Biały*, and later as a supplement to *Dziennik Polski* i *Dziennik Żołnierza*.

magazine – by then the name *Na Antenie* had been coined – be published at RFE’s expense as a monthly supplement to *Kultura*. When Giedroyc refused, claiming to be concerned about the magazine’s dependence on an American institution, I turned to Mieczysław Grydzewski, who accepted the offer without hesitation and without any conditions.<sup>2</sup>

The magazine’s first editor, Zygmunt Jabłoński, disagrees with Nowak-Jeziorański’s account and credits the idea of creating the magazine to himself. As he recalled in 1985:

Back in early 1962, at a morning conference, I put forward a project to create a magazine (along the lines of the British *The Listener*) that would consist of our best broadcasts. Such a magazine, I argued, would be a showcase for our radio station, and editing it would not be too difficult, because, after all, all the materials were right there.

My idea did not receive a positive response from Nowak, who thought that only his own ideas were the best.

I was therefore surprised when, after a few months, Zupa<sup>3</sup> approached me saying that Nowak had come up with the idea of creating a monthly magazine consisting of a selection of our broadcasts, which would be published as a supplement to Mieczysław Grydzewski’s London-based *Wiadomości*. I told Zupa that the idea was excellent, but it was mine, not Nowak’s.

“I recall something,” Zawadzki replied, “and that’s why I’m asking you if you would take this job.”

I was pleased by this offer [...] So I said to Zupa: “Yes...”

I came up with the title *Na Antenie* and the subtitle *Mówi Rozgłośnia Polska Radia Wolna Europa* [This is the Polish Section of Radio Free Europe speaking].<sup>4</sup>

So which version of the events is true? Who came up with and who accepted this idea? Referring to Jabłoński’s memoirs, Nowak-Jeziorański stated: “Z. Jabłoński credited to himself the initiative for the creation of the monthly magazine. In fact, I came up with this project in a memo-

---

<sup>2</sup> J. Nowak-Jeziorański, “Nie tylko *Na Antenie*” [Not only *Na Antenie*], in: M. A. Supruniuk, ed., “*Wiadomości*” i okolice. *Szkice i wspomnienia* [*Wiadomości* and surroundings. Sketches and memoirs], vol. 2, Toruń 1996, pp. 159–160. If not indicated otherwise, all the emphases are mine – R. M.

<sup>3</sup> Tadeusz Zawadzki (actually Żenczykowski) – Jan Nowak-Jeziorański’s deputy at RFE.

<sup>4</sup> Z. Jabłoński, *Gabinet figur radiowych* [Cabinet of radio figures], Berlin 1985, pp. 99.

rial to the Americans, at the very beginning of our radio station.<sup>5</sup> The matter is not clear, and it gets even more complicated when one looks into Nowak-Jeziorański's correspondence with Giedroyć. In a letter dated March 20, 1962, Nowak-Jeziorański wrote to the editor of the Paris-based *Kultura*:

I am addressing you on a strictly confidential matter with a request for the utmost discretion.

During my recent stay in London, I received a proposal from *Dziennik Polski* to publish once a month, in the form of a free supplement, a collection of the most interesting broadcasts of our Radio that would be best suitable for printing. It would be the equivalent of the BBC's English weekly magazine *The Listener*, which contains the best opinion pieces and talks of the British radio. According to *Dziennik Polski's* proposal, the supplement would be eight pages long. [...]

This proposal in principle suits me, because the huge amount of material that is broadcast here is simply wasted. [...] It would be good if at least some of it could appear in print. [...]

Personally, I would prefer a thousand times that this kind of supplement could be published by *Kultura*. First of all, all of us here are all far closer to your way of looking at national issues. [...] I understand that you may have your own important and legitimate reasons why the proposal to publish such a Polish *The Listener* in the form of a free supplement might not suit you. I would only ask for a short message in this case. If, on the other hand, you would find this project interesting, please also let me know, if possible, with an approximate cost. I would have to receive this information before April 3, because on that day I am leaving for the United States, where this matter will be the subject of my discussions with the Committee's authorities.

Once again, I would like to point out that this supplement would be completely separate from *Kultura* and would be attached to it for distribution both to Poland and to subscribers and recipients in exile.<sup>6</sup>

So who was the originator of the new magazine associated with RFE? Nowak-Jeziorański, Jabłoński, or the editors of *Dziennik Polski*? If one ac-

---

<sup>5</sup> J. Nowak (Zdzisław Jeziorański), *Polska z oddali. Wojna w eterze - wspomnienia* [Poland from a distance. War on the air - memoirs], vol. 2, London 1988, p. 183.

<sup>6</sup> J. Nowak-Jeziorański, J. Giedroyć, *Listy 1952-1998* [Letters 1952-1998], selected, compiled, and introduction by D. Platt, Wrocław 2001, pp. 259-260.

cepts the version regarding the actual authorship of this idea, it is inaccurate in two important minor details.

The first is the magazine's title. In the published correspondence with Giedroyć and the surviving correspondence with Grydzewski, the magazine is placed under the heading "Polish *The Listener*" (in Grydzewski's case, the title is additionally translated, as will be discussed in a moment).

The second detail is Giedroyć's reasons for refusing to publish the magazine. It seems that, additionally, for fear that *Kultura* would become dependent on the institutions funding the magazine (the Free Europe Committee), Giedroyć was concerned about something else: how the supplement would be received by readers, or, to be more precise, to what extent their perception of *Kultura* and its political line would change when confronted with the texts published in the new monthly. In his letter to Nowak-Jeziorański dated March 31, 1962, he wrote:

I find the very idea of a "Polish *The Listener*" excellent. Such a *The Listener* could play a significant and versatile role. [...] On the other hand, I don't really see how I could undertake to publish it. [...] Although our views (i.e., yours and mine) are not very different, I can't say that about the American FE leadership, or about the semi-official political factors in general. The policy of *Kultura* is facing increasingly harsh criticism. [...]

I am writing about it because if I could undertake to publish *The Listener*, I would have to influence its editorial and political side. This is because I am not a normal publisher or owner of a printing house, interested only in the commercial side, and any publication by us or distributed by us will be considered an expression of *Kultura*'s views.

Besides, even if FE (which I doubt), agreed to entrust me with the editorial side, I would not be able to undertake it anyway. As you know, our team is invariably small and we are finding it increasingly difficult to cope with our work.

Personally, it seems to me that it would be best for *The Listener* to be published under the Polish section's own brand.<sup>7</sup>

Nowak, undeterred by Giedroyć's response and at the same time reluctant (due to differences in the political positions) to cooperate with *Dzien-*

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibidem, pp. 261–262.

*nik Polski i Dziennik Żołnierza*, immediately turned to Grydzewski. Closing the topic in his correspondence with Giedroyć, he wrote (in a letter dated April 25, 1962):

I understand the reasons for your refusal to publish *The Listener* and I do not resent you for this. Publishing such a supplement by *Kultura* would, of course, be the most ideal solution from our point of view. I am currently looking for others and hope that my project will eventually come to fruition.<sup>8</sup>

Grydzewski agreed to the proposal to publish the supplement to *Wiadomości*. Unfortunately, the archive collection of the London-based weekly does not contain Nowak-Jeziorański's letter initiating the talks. On the other hand, in the surviving correspondence one can find a copy of a letter addressed to him by Mieczysław Grydzewski, which was dated April 6, 1962. Grydzewski, famous for his puritanical approach to matters of purity of the mother tongue, writes in it – referring to Nowak's idea – about publishing a magazine under a title clearly referring to *The Listener*, i.e. a monthly... “Słuchacz” [“listener” in Polish]:

Thank you Dear Sir for the letter I received today. I think the idea is excellent and I will be happy to help. I agree that this “Słuchacz” would be something separate from *Wiadomości*, but it would be impossible to avoid responsibility also for formal reasons, because English law knows no exceptions and even a bookseller who sells a book containing “libel” can be held liable. Hence, theoretically, I would have to have the right to inspect the submitted material, although I do not suppose that my “veto” could ever “occur.” Since, as you know, Dear Sir, I take great care of the impeccability of the Polish language and the form of all utterances in *Wiadomości*, even advertisements, it is clear that I would have to correct this and that, naturally with the approval of the authors or your institution.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibidem, pp. 262–263.

<sup>9</sup> University Library in Toruń, Archives of Emigration (hereinafter AE), Archive of *Wiadomości*, ref. no. AE/AW/CCCLXXVIII, Editorial Correspondence of *Na Antenie*, copy of a letter from M. Grydzewski to J. Nowak-Jeziorański dated April 6, 1962. The following quoted letters related to the editing and publishing of *Na Antenie* – unless otherwise noted – are from this collection.

Nowak-Jeziorański agreed to these conditions. As he recalled years later:

*Na Antenie* was to be a magazine completely independent of the editors of *Wiadomości*. Grydzewski reserved his right to veto only texts that could expose him to a libel suit. We agreed to adhere to the terminology and spelling used by the editorial staff of *Wiadomości*. Grydzewski attached the greatest importance to that condition.<sup>10</sup>

Clearly, the independence of the two magazines concerned the issue of the views and opinions expressed. The editors of *Wiadomości* and, in particular, Mieczysław Grydzewski, combined them on the level of the style of language and the amount of work necessary. Giedroyć, rejected the proposal because he was concerned about the latter. Grydzewski also saw some difficulty associated with this. In the letter quoted above, he wrote about “all the editorial work, which will be considerable,” and a year later, just before the first issue of *Na Antenie* was published, he informed Nowak-Jeziorański that the planned financial outlay did not cover the costs, which were increasing because “I also have to remember about Mr. Grocholski, who will have extra work to do, not to mention myself.”<sup>11</sup> Of course – a large part of the work was carried out in Munich (which will be discussed in a moment), but *Na Antenie* brought additional burdens to Mieczysław Grydzewski’s already very busy work schedule. Although he himself never complained about it, the scale of the phenomenon was indirectly confirmed by his successor in the position of editor-in-chief – Michał Chmielowiec. In two surviving letters from 1967 (when Grydzewski, although ill, was still interested in the fate of the weekly magazine), Sambor wrote, among other things:

First of all, I want to apologize to you, Dear Editor, most sincerely that it has been so long since I visited you, which I will try to rectify any day. But if it weren’t for *Wiadomości*, I should go to bed – I have such a terrible cold. And at

---

<sup>10</sup> J. Nowak, *Polska z oddali* [Poland from a distance], p. 183.

<sup>11</sup> A copy of a letter from M. Grydzewski to J. Nowak-Jeziorański dated February 20, 1963.

the same time – *Na Antenie*, the competition, and so on. – I am swamped with work, with which, of course, I do not know how to cope as you do.<sup>12</sup>

I have always admired you immensely, but now that doing only a part of your work I am swamped with it – my admiration has become downright superstitious. When did you find time for all this?<sup>13</sup>

As can be assumed, by undertaking this additional work, Grydzewski hoped to improve the financial situation of *Wiadomości*, which was always ailing in this field. The declaration, contained in the letter to Giedroyć, that the magazine would be externally funded must have been repeated by Nowak-Jeziorański in his correspondence with Grydzewski, because immediately after deciding on his willingness to cooperate, he wrote in the already quoted letter of April 6, 1962:

Our own cost of such an 8-page supplement (printing, paper, possibly photographic films, folding, postage, etc.) would be about two hundred pounds. I must point out that we are working with a small printing company whose prices are competitively low and which has not raised its prices in years. Perhaps having learned that this is Free Europe's project, they will make some additional demands. In any case, the demands will not be too great, even if they occur.

The aforementioned sum does not include, of course, all the editorial work, which will be considerable.

Needless to say, I would be happy if, in connection with the "Słuchacz," New York would have the opportunity to demonstrate greater "generosity" than before in relation to *Wiadomości*, especially since, even with the demonstration of the greatest generosity, the budget of such a supplement will be more than modest in comparison with [illegible word] a separately edited magazine.

Similarly, in a letter preceding the publication of the first issue, he provided a full breakdown of costs and compared them to the amount he was to receive.

---

<sup>12</sup> AE, Archive of *Wiadomości*, ref. no. AE/AW/XXXIVa-b, Editorial Correspondence, a letter from M. Chmielowec to M. Grydzewski dated January 10, 1967.

<sup>13</sup> A letter from M. Chmielowec to M. Grydzewski, January 31, 1967.

According to your request, Dear Sir, I am giving you the cost of the 6- [illegible] 8-page supplement. Printing and paper 168.6.0, bindery 8.0.0, additional postage costs 8.0.0. Photographic film not included, number revision correction 5.0.0. 100 cop[ies] 5 p. each – 25.0.0 minus a 20 percent discount 20.0.0. Total £209.6.0 or 628 dollars. Since we are to receive 617 dollars [!] for the issue, it would be desirable for us to obtain additional purchase of copies with the supplement, as I also need to remember about Mr. Grocholski, who will have extra work to do, not to mention myself.

Nowak-Jeziorański managed to obtain exactly the amount Grydzewski indicated. Unfortunately, the real printing expenses – in this case, increased by the cost of duplication of photographs – turned out to be even higher. Nowak-Jeziorański wrote with concern to Grydzewski in a letter dated March 14, 1963:

I have a problem and I am asking you for advice. After our discussions and exchange of letters, I presented a detailed cost estimate to my American partners and obtained a transfer of the sum of £209.6.0 for each issue of *Na Antenie*.

Since the money for this purpose does not come from my radio budget, the allocation of this sum is like a contract between me and the Directorate. I hope to get more money from the Americans after the first issues, when they realize that the experiment has been successful. However, I am afraid that if I were to request now any additional sum, even a small one for photographs, I might spoil my chances for the future. [...] Is there any way out? I will be truly grateful to you for your help in this matter.<sup>14</sup>

It is difficult to determine today to what extent Grydzewski's cooperation with Nowak-Jeziorański improved the magazine's financial situation.<sup>15</sup> To some extent, it certainly did – the letters to the editorial office printed in the pages of *Wiadomości* testified to the lively interest in the magazine,

---

<sup>14</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Grydzewski dated March 14, 1963.

<sup>15</sup> Nowak-Jeziorański rather enigmatically mentions the “substantial subsidy” that *Wiadomości* was to receive from the Free Europe Committee by the early 1970s. As he points out, “it was not subject to any conditions,” and that he himself was the originator and initiator of this idea; see: J. Nowak-Jeziorański, “Nie tylko *Na Antenie*” [Not only *Na Antenie*], pp. 157–158.



which – of course – must have translated into increased sales. Nowak-Jeziorański mentioned that:

*Na Antenie*, which appeared once a month as an eight-page insert to the weekly in an identical format, with an identical typeface, illustrations, and layout, became successful very quickly, and Grydz was pleased to inform me that the number of subscribers to *Wiadomości* had increased.<sup>16</sup>

Zygmunt Jabłoński, too, believed that the parting of *Na Antenie* from *Wiadomości* after seven years of fruitful cooperation contributed indirectly to the latter's demise, because "the supplement *Na Antenie* [...] was a major financial boost for *Wiadomości*."<sup>17</sup>

However, it took a year before the idea came to fruition and regular cooperation with *Wiadomości* started. In the surviving correspondence from that time, this topic is not discussed again. It is only after Grydzewski's letter to Nowak-Jeziorański dated February 20, 1963, cited above, that things gained momentum. Referring to technical issues, the editor of *Wiadomości* wrote:

Of course, I would like to get the material as soon as possible. The issue must be dated April 7, i.e., it must be ready for printing on March 23, so there is little time left. I think that by now, Dear Sir, you know what will go for sure, and perhaps it is this "iron" part of the issue that you would kindly recommend to send at once. This shipment can be made in several installments.

Nowak responded to this in a letter dated February 23, 1963:

Thank you kindly for the submitted cost estimate [...].

Here is some information related to our project:

I entrusted the selection of the materials, their preparation and their sending to you to Editor Zygmunt Jabłoński, who accepted my proposal with great enthusiasm and eagerness.

We will start sending you materials within the next week. It is important for me to clarify that we can do this in installments – without waiting for the entirety to be completed. I understand that the postal costs include shipping

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibidem, p. 160.

<sup>17</sup> Z. Jabłoński, *Gabinet figur radiowych* [Cabinet of radio figures], p. 102.

one hundred copies of *Wiadomości* to Poland. Andrzej Stypułkowski also agreed to purchase a certain quantity. I will ask Adam Rudzki to do the same in New York.

We will make the greatest effort to finish sending out materials by March 10, except, however, for the "Review of national events" column, which would become out-of-date.

We would like to have this column sent by teletype by Kielanowski at the last minute to keep it as up-to-date as possible. Please let me know what day should be considered "last minute."<sup>18</sup>

At the same time, in the second letter sent on the same day (an attachment to the first?) the title of the new magazine was used for the first time. Nowak-Jeziorański wrote:

I attach three photographs from Poland: a crowd of pilgrims around Jasna Góra on August 26, 1962 for the first issue of *Na Antenie* [...].<sup>19</sup>  
P.S. As suggested, we will send the materials when they are ready.<sup>20</sup>

On the same day, a letter to the editorial office of *Wiadomości* was sent by Zygmunt M. Jabłoński, who was appointed as editor-in-chief. He wrote, among other things:

Mr. Dir[ector] Jan Nowak offered me the editorship of our Station's monthly magazine: *Na Antenie*. I accepted the proposal very gladly and have already set to work. Please consider this letter as a senior rifleman reporting to his colonel.

I will send you the first part of the materials next week – the whole no later than on March 10.

[...] I kindly ask that you send me your wishes as to the form of our cooperation. What I mean is technical issues, such as deadlines for sending scripts and photographs, proofreading (whether you will send a proof copy or not).

Also, I would appreciate information on how many typescript pages fit on a page in the format of *Wiadomości*.

---

<sup>18</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Grydzewski dated February 23, 1963.

<sup>19</sup> *Tłumy pobożnych na Jasnej Górze 26 sierpnia 1962* [Crowds of devotees on Jasna Góra on August 26, 1962] (photograph), *Na Antenie* 1963, no. 1, p. IV.

<sup>20</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Grydzewski dated February 23, 1963.

The next issue of the titles of the articles. Should I leave them to you or write them myself, or possibly provide the articles with provisional titles?

I will be extremely grateful for your response, and in the meantime, being confident that our cooperation will go smoothly I would like to pass my greetings and express my high regard.<sup>21</sup>

Jabłoński, as one might infer from the tone of this letter, hoped for a fair amount of independence in running and editing *Na Antenie* (the first item in Nowak-Jeziorański's letter cited above seemed to be confirmed in reality). However, it very quickly became clear that the reality was somewhat different. As he recalled years later:

I edited the magazine for seven years, but as early as after the first issue my dreams burst like a soap bubble. First of all, editing of *Na Antenie* did not relieve me of my regular prior duties. So I continued to do the same amount of work on "Panorama" and commissioned broadcasts. The effort was great, but the work was interesting in spite of Nowak's incessant meddling, who considered *Na Antenie* his private periodical.<sup>22</sup>

Similarly, Nowak-Jeziorański himself, looking back at the early days of the publishing of *Na Antenie*, stated that Jabłoński was only a "nominal" editor,<sup>23</sup> while he himself was the actual editor.

As he wrote in several places: "The selection of texts was done under my supervision, and I also made sure that there were no conflicts with Grydzewski";<sup>24</sup> "Zygmunt Jabłoński became the editor who made the selection of texts under my supervision."<sup>25</sup> Confirmation of this state of affairs can be found in correspondence to the editor of *Wiadomości* including that covering the period from February 23, 1963, that is, from the period of the declaration that Jabłoński would be in charge of "selecting materials, preparing them, and sending them," until April 7, the day the first issue

---

<sup>21</sup> A letter from Z. M. Jabłoński to M. Grydzewski dated February 23, 1963.

<sup>22</sup> Z. Jabłoński, *Gabinet figur radiowych* [Cabinet of radio figures], p. 100.

<sup>23</sup> J. Nowak-Jeziorański, "Nie tylko *Na Antenie*" [Not only *Na Antenie*], p. 160.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>25</sup> J. Nowak, *Polska z oddali* [Poland from a distance], p. 183.

of the magazine was published. In a letter dated March 1, 1963, Jabłoński wrote to Grydzewski:

As promised, I am sending the first parcel of typescripts for the *Na Antenie* supplement. I provided each article with a title as well as at the top of each script I gave the title of the cycle of which the article is a part – so that you will have no difficulty in locating it.

I also include three photographs and the contents of the monthly magazine's headline. I will send the next series of manuscripts the day after tomorrow.<sup>26</sup>

On the same day, Nowak-Jeziorański wrote to Grydzewski:

I included in the first issue of *Na Antenie* an article by Wiktor Trościanko titled "Kamienne dno czasu" [Stone bottom of time] along with photos.<sup>27</sup> I kindly ask you to choose for yourself the ones that are best suited to illustrate the column.

We will try to send most of the materials within the next week. Our biggest problem is the typing of copy-edited texts. Would legible corrections in ink suffice?<sup>28</sup>

On March 5, 1963, Jabłoński wrote to Grydzewski:

Here is the next handful of typescripts: the penultimate one. I will send you the rest on March 9.

I am also enclosing, for reference, a list of typescripts sent for the first issue of *Na Antenie* (including this parcel) by Mr. Nowak and by me.

For the front page I suggest: "Do Czytelnika" [To the reader] – by J. Nowak,<sup>29</sup> "Walka o model gospodarczy" [Struggle for the economic model] – by M. Górecki,<sup>30</sup> "Kodeks karny" [Criminal code] – by O. Stypułkowska

---

<sup>26</sup> A letter from Z. M. Jabłoński to M. Grydzewski dated March 1, 1963.

<sup>27</sup> W. Trościanko, "Kamienne dno czasu" [Stone bottom of time], *Na Antenie* 1963, no. 1, p. V.

<sup>28</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Grydzewski dated March 1, 1963.

<sup>29</sup> J. Nowak, "Do Czytelnika" [To the reader], *Na Antenie* 1963, no. 1, p. I.

<sup>30</sup> M. Górecki, "Walka o model gospodarczy" [Struggle for the economic model], *ibidem*, p. IV.

(I will send it in a few days),<sup>31</sup> “Utopia” – by M. Hemar<sup>32</sup> (sent to you by Kielanowski[]),<sup>33</sup> and “Paszkowskiego Polska i Europa w oczach studenta” [Poland and Europe in the eyes of a student] by J. Paszkowski.<sup>34</sup>

For the centerfold (due to the volume), I suggest the discussion “«Chamy i żydy»” [Boors and Jews].<sup>35</sup>

One more thing I noticed already after I sent you my previous letter, for which I want to sincerely apologize to you.

I put my name in the text of the title masthead without contacting you first. Only now did I realize that, having put so much editorial work into the *Na Antenie* supplement, you may have valid objections to it.

Of course, it is up to you whether to leave or delete my name on the title masthead and I apologize for my *faux pas*.<sup>36</sup>

Four days later he wrote again (and again on the same day Nowak-Jeziorański sent a letter to Grydzewski):

I am sending a third bundle of typescripts and three photographs. Except for one article and five photographs, which I will send you in two days – this is all the material for the first issue.

According to my calculations, this represents about two hundred typescript pages, which is slightly more than the acceptable number you specified.<sup>37</sup>

During that period, the group of people responsible for selecting and delivering materials to London was joined by Leopold Kielanowski<sup>38</sup> and

---

<sup>31</sup> A. Stypułkowska, “Projekt nowego kodeksu karnego i opinia publiczna” [Draft of the new criminal code and public opinion], *ibidem*, p. IV.

<sup>32</sup> M. Hemar, “Utopia,” *ibidem*, p. I.

<sup>33</sup> A letter from Z. Kielanowski to M. Grydzewski dated March 7, 1963.

<sup>34</sup> “Polska i Europa w oczach studenta z Warszawy” [Poland and Europe in the eyes of a student from Warsaw], an interview by J. Krok-Paszkowski, *Na Antenie* 1963, no. 1, p. III.

<sup>35</sup> “Możliwości polskiego Października. Dyskusja o artykule Witolda Jedlickiego” [The possibilities of the Polish October 1956. A discussion about Witold Jedlicki’s article], *Na Antenie* 1963, no. 1, pp. II. This concerns: W. Jedlicki, “«Chamy i żydy»” [Boors and Jews], *Kultura* 1962, no. 12 (182), pp. 3–41.

<sup>36</sup> A letter from Z. Kielanowski to M. Grydzewski dated March 5, 1963.

<sup>37</sup> A letter from Z. Kielanowski to M. Grydzewski dated March 9, 1963. Later in the letter, he suggested moving some of the material to the second issue.

<sup>38</sup> See: a letter from Z. Kielanowski to M. Grydzewski dated March 13, 1963.

Eugeniusz Romiszewski, who was Jabłoński's substitute during his leave for the first time in June 1963. Nowak informed Grydzewski of this fact indirectly in a letter dated June 15, 1963:

There is a "Bank Holiday" here on Monday. Not being able to communicate with Romiszewski, who is Jabłoński's substitute, I made the attached correction myself (very unprofessional) and I am sending the photo of Czerwińska.<sup>39</sup>

Romiszewski's assessment of his cooperation with Nowak-Jeziorański on the *Na Antenie* supplement was similar to Jabłoński's:

The February-March-April 1965 issues of *Na Antenie* were compiled by me in place of Zygmunt Jabłoński. Jabłoński is listed in the masthead of *Na Antenie* as editor, but the editor-in-chief is actually Nowak... Of course, working with Nowak is difficult, because he is an impulsive man, it takes little to make him attack you, and his constant flaw is issuing hasty, unspecified orders, sometimes contradictory.<sup>40</sup>

One could say that Nowak-Jeziorański governed the magazine with an iron hand. As he wrote about himself: "When it comes to some domestic issues, only I can decide on the selection, because all the information and propaganda material passes only through my hands."<sup>41</sup>

However, regardless of the divisions within the editorial board of the RFE, the disputes over competence, etc., the first issue of *Na Antenie* was eventually published with the date of April 7, 1963, and was attached to issue 14 (888) of *Wiadomości*. After more than a year's effort, the magazine began its intriguing life, although not without some obstacles.

---

<sup>39</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Grydzewski dated March 15, 1963. Nowak's letter, handwritten on translucent tissue paper (on both sides), is difficult to read. Grydzewski noted the following remark in the margin: "This kind of paper so that the postage doesn't cost too much. How can one live?" The letter concerned the following article: W. Budzyński, "Podwieczorek przy mikrofonie. Spowiedź satyryka" [Teatime at a microphone. The confession of a comedian], *Na Antenie* 1963, no. 4, p. 6 (the text contains, among other things, a photo of Jadwiga Czerwińska).

<sup>40</sup> Quote after: Z. Jabłoński, *Gabinet figur radiowych* [Cabinet of radio figures], p. 100.

<sup>41</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Grydzewski dated April 22, 1963.

\*\*\*

While the cooperation with *Wiadomości* did not start without perturbations, its end was very abrupt and full of tensions. When Mieczysław Grydzewski, who could no longer – starting in 1967 – edit the magazine on his own due to his illness, Michał Chmielowiec (the Deputy) joined in to help, soon followed by Stefania Kossowska.

The magazine's publisher, however, was Juliusz Sakowski, who, as will become clear in a moment, played an important role in the whole matter. The change in the position of the editor-in-chief entailed another change, namely that in the relationship between the editorial office of *Wiadomości* and RFE. As Nowak-Jeziorański recalled years later:

Cooperation with Grydzewski was perfect and the publication of our texts did not encounter the slightest problems. The situation changed radically when Juliusz Sakowski and Michał Chmielowiec took charge of *Wiadomości* after Grydzewski became ill.<sup>42</sup>

Determining who exactly edited successive issues (parts of them) of *Wiadomości* in 1967–1974 is a task that continues to have the status of a research postulate. It seems indispensable in underlining the issues similar to the London-based weekly's parting with its monthly supplement. In the first quarter of 1969, which is of particular interest to us, Stefania Kossowska took over the editorship of *Na Antenie* (after Michał Chmielowiec).<sup>43</sup> This probably took place as early as in January (the last surviving letter from Chmielowiec is dated January 3, 1969). In a letter to Leopold Kielanowski dated February 12, 1969, she wrote, among other things:

Please apologize in advance to Mr. Nowak for the “errors and distortions” he may find in my debut in *Na Antenie*. I would like to thank editor Jabłoński and all the authors for the careful preparation of the materials, as he was of great help to me.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> J. Nowak-Jeziorański, “Nie tylko *Na Antenie*” [Not only *Na Antenie*], p. 161.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. among others: a letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to S. Kossowska dated February 22, 1969 (the letter refers to the quality of the photos published in *Na Antenie*).

<sup>44</sup> A letter from S. Kossowska to L. Kielanowski dated February 12, 1969.

This excerpt, along with a letter dated January 10, 1969, in which Kossowska announced that “The next issue of *Na Antenie* will be included in the issue of *Wiadomości*, which will be released with the date of February 23,”<sup>45</sup> indicates that the first issue of *Na Antenie* edited by her was issue 70, which was published with the date of January 26, 1969. On March 8, Jan Nowak-Jeziorański wrote a letter to her, enclosing materials for the March issue of *Na Antenie*, for the “Za kulisami” [Behind the Scenes] column, and announcing the postponement of Maleszka’s note “Pożary na Ukrainie” [“Fires in Ukraine”] to the April issue.<sup>46</sup> On March 20, in a letter addressed to Leopold Kielanowski, the editor (most likely Michał Chmielowiec again) reported that “The next issue of *Na Antenie* will be published with the date of April 27 of this year.”<sup>47</sup> Nothing foreshadowed the coming storm.

The immediate “bone of contention” between the editors of *Wiadomości* and REW became the text authored by Józef Mackiewicz titled “List pasterski” [Pastoral letter], published in *Wiadomości* in issue 12 of March 23, 1969.<sup>48</sup> The author began his text by endorsing the criticism directed at the Polish episcopate, by Juliusz Mieroszewski in the January issue of *Kultura* (it was an assessment of the pastoral letter of Polish bishops of September 15, 1968, published on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the regained independence, which ended with the words “Our Lord, preserve our free homeland”).<sup>49</sup>

Mackiewicz then elaborated on this criticism, pointing out that Pope Paul VI’s subordination of the émigré clergy to the Primate of Poland, which resulted in Bishop Władysław Rubin becoming the spiritual guardian of the emigres, was a misguided move, as Bishop Rubin was acting in accordance with the expectations of the communist authorities, not those of emigres. Moreover, added the *Wiadomości* columnist – the decision was made by the Pope at the instigation of Primate Stefan Wyszyński. At the

---

<sup>45</sup> A letter from S. Kossowska to L. Kielanowski dated January 10, 1969.

<sup>46</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to S. Kossowska dated March 8, 1969.

<sup>47</sup> A letter from M. Chmielowiec [?] to L. Kielanowski dated March 20, 1969.

<sup>48</sup> J. Mackiewicz, “List pasterski” [Pastoral letter], *Wiadomości* 1969, no. 12 (1199), p. 1.

<sup>49</sup> Londoner (actually J. Mieroszewski), “Kronika angielska” [An English chronicle], *Kultura* 1969, no. 1/2 (256/257), pp. 105–112.



same time, he stressed that he did not understand why the head of the Church in Poland sought to take on this duty. He wrote:

It goes without saying that all emigres have always referred with deep reverence to the Primate and always with a deep understanding of the difficulties associated with his work in communist Poland. The harder it is to understand why he voluntarily increased those difficulties by burdening himself with the additional pastoral care of emigres, which immensely complicated his situation. We have no official explanation of why or how this happened.

Faithful Catholics must believe in the infallibility of the Pope in matters of faith. However, they are not obliged to believe in the infallibility of the Primate in matters of church organization. Therefore, it is permitted to express the belief that, from a *pro publico bono* point of view, Cardinal Wyszyński's decision was a mistake. It did not benefit the Church, the Polish episcopate, or the Polish emigres. ...]

Anyone who has read "List Episkopatu na 50-lecie niepodległości" [The Episcopate's letter for the 50th anniversary of independence], published in Cracow's *Tygodnik Powszechny* no. 46, dated November 17, 1968, in its entirety, gets the impression that, regardless of the letter's solemn content and tone, it rather puts a mark of equivalence between "Poland's freedom" and the Polish People's Republic. This is probably an important enough cause for concern.

Mackiewicz pointed out that while one can and should understand the compromises that the Polish episcopate and the Primate chose to make in the name of a higher good by making certain concessions to the communist authorities, Bishop Rubin's conduct in this regard is unacceptable. As an example, he cited the bishop's refusal to attend a "service for the souls of those murdered in Katyn" held in the free world of emigres. Similarly unacceptable, in his opinion, is the emigres' descent into malaise, a kind of dormant complacency, forgetting their duties and basic political obligations to the nation and the homeland. He concluded his argument by expressing his belief that, even though the words of the hymn "Boże coś Polskę" [God save Poland] changed by the episcopate are disturbing, the Polish people will persist in defying the imposed government.

The response to Mackiewicz's article was Nowak-Jeziorański's letter, written on March 28 and addressed to Juliusz Sakowski, the publisher of *Wiadomości*. In the letter, Nowak-Jeziorański wrote, among other things:

I am addressing this letter to you as the publisher and guardian of *Wiadomości*. In the 23rd issue of *Wiadomości*, on the front page, there was an article by Józef Mackiewicz titled “List pasterski” [Pastoral letter]. The author criticizes the conduct of the Primate and Bishops.

It is necessary to strictly distinguish between the content of the article and the person of the author. Public criticism of the Primate is not an easy thing to do and requires great tact and restraint, since it is addressed to a person who is deprived of any opportunity to respond publicly to the accusations made against him. Nevertheless, the émigré journalist cannot be denied the right to evaluate the actions and statements of Cardinal Wyszyński and Bishops. In this regard, there is certainly no difference of opinion between us. From the very beginning, I have considered the placing at the end of the “List pasterski” [Pastoral letter] the words “Our Lord, preserve our free homeland” to be a serious mistake. The same applies to the current appointment of Bishop Rubin as the spiritual guardian of the diaspora.

However, the main objection is to the person of Józef Mackiewicz as the author of the article. I would like to remind you that Mackiewicz was sentenced to death in 1942 for high treason by a Special Military Court acting on the basis of powers and statutes issued by the Supreme Commander.

On November 12, 1945, the Peer Tribunal of the Union of Polish Journalists, based in Rome at the time, sentenced Józef Mackiewicz to a reprimand for collaborating with the Lithuanian occupiers. In *Dziennik Polski* of January 8, 1948, the General Board of the Home Army Circle published a statement in which it accused Mackiewicz of collaboration with the German occupiers.<sup>50</sup> The same charge of collaboration with the enemy during the war was repeated in the Home Army Circle’s statement published in *Dziennik Polski* on December 22, 1961.<sup>51</sup> Mr. J. Mackiewicz was able to clear his name by filing a lawsuit in a British court. He did not take advantage of this possibility. He also waived his right to have the charges of treason considered by the Citizens’ Adjudication Committee at the Union. [...]

---

<sup>50</sup> “Oświadczenie Koła b. Żołnierzy AK” [Statement of the circle of former Home Army soldiers], *Dziennik Polski i Dziennik Żołnierza* 1948, no. 7, p. 2 (of January 8). The statement contained, among others, the following provisions: “During the Lithuanian occupation of Vilnius, Mr. J. Mackiewicz edited *Gazeta Codzienna*, a periodical that spoke out against Poland’s rights to Vilnius. During the period of German occupation, Mr. J. Mackiewicz cooperated in Vilnius with the rag *Goniec Codzienny*, published in Polish by the German propaganda, and published his articles in its pages.”

<sup>51</sup> “Oświadczenie Koła b. Żołnierzy AK” [Statement of the circle of former Home Army soldiers], *Dziennik Polski i Dziennik Żołnierza* 1961, no. 304, p. 2 (of December 22).

Given the above, Józef Mackiewicz's opinions about the conduct of the Primate and Bishops from the patriotic point of view must raise moral objections.

*Wiadomości* and *Na Antenie* cooperate with each other according to the principle of not interfering with the content of the two magazines. However, *Na Antenie* is published with the subtitle "Supplement to *Wiadomości*." As a result, our magazines cannot completely avoid a certain shared responsibility in matters of principle, especially in the eyes of the domestic reader.

For these reasons, I believe it is necessary to place on the front page of the next issue of *Na Antenie* a statement disassociating the magazine from the article by Józef Mackiewicz, citing the above facts.

Due to the United Kingdom's applicable law, I would like to state that everything contained in the statement can be proved in full in court based on existing documents and witnesses. On this account, I assume the sole and entire responsibility. At the same time, I am sending you the texts of documents and testimonies (collected in the appendix to Andrzej Pomian's unpublished booklet titled "The case of Józef Mackiewicz"). This is because I believe that as the publisher of *Wiadomości* you should be familiar with this material [...].

Please accept my expression of true respect and a hearty handshake

Jan Nowak<sup>52</sup>

Following that letter, Nowak-Jeziorański sent a second letter three days later, addressed to Michał Chmielowiec, in which he informed: "Dear Sir, I am enclosing the text that must appear on the front page of the April issue of *Na Antenie*."<sup>53</sup> The text itself, bearing the title "W sprawie artykułu Józefa Mackiewicza" [On Józef Mackiewicz's article], proclaimed, among other things:

In the issue of *Wiadomości* dated March 23 this year, on the front page there was an article by Józef Mackiewicz titled "List pasterski" [Pastoral letter]. The article criticizes the pastoral letter of Polish bishops for the 50th anniversary of Poland's independence and the Primate's decision to subordinate Bishop Rubin to his jurisdiction as the spiritual guardian of the diaspora. The allega-

---

<sup>52</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to J. Sakowski dated March 28, 1969; emphasis by J. N.-J.

<sup>53</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Chmielowiec dated March 31, 1969.

tions of Mr. J. Mackiewicz boil down to the Primate and the Episcopate accepting unnecessary and harmful compromises with the communist authorities.

The public statements and decisions of Cardinal Wyszyński and bishops are subject to criticism, and the émigré writer has the right to express his views freely. Thus, it is not about polemics with the substantive content of the article, but about the person of the author. On the other hand, it cannot be a matter of indifference who, from the patriotic point of view, reprimands the Polish Episcopate in the pages of an independence magazine.

Józef Mackiewicz, together with Czesław Anczewicz, were sentenced to death in 1942 for high treason by a Special Military Court acting on the basis of powers granted and the statutes issued by the Supreme Commander. The sentence imposed on Anczewicz has been carried out. Mr. Józef Mackiewicz has escaped punishment and went on exile. Immediately after his departure, on August 12, 1945, the Peer Tribunal of the Union of Polish Journalists sentenced Mackiewicz to a reprimand for his behavior during the Lithuanian occupation of Vilnius. At the hearing held in Rome, evidence of Józef Mackiewicz's collaboration with the Nazi occupiers was not yet available and known to the court.

The General Board of the Circle of former Home Army Soldiers submitted this evidence on April 22, 1948 to the Citizen's Adjudication Committee of the Polish Union in the United Kingdom, established specifically to deal with accusations of collaboration with the enemy during the war. This evidence consisted of numerous documents and the written testimony of more than ten witnesses including the former Chief of Staff of the Home Army and the former Deputy Delegate of the Government of the Republic of Poland for the Vilnius district. In a letter dated April 23, 1949, Józef Mackiewicz declined to participate in a consideration of the charge of treason by the Adjudicating Committee.

The charges against Mr. J. Mackiewicz were repeated twice in a statement by the Circle of former Home Army Soldiers published in *Dziennik Polski* on January 8, 1948 and on December 22, 1961. Mr. Józef Mackiewicz did not exercise his right to bring a case before a British court at the time.

In light of the facts cited above, a critical assessment of the patriotic stance of Cardinal Wyszyński and bishops in the mouth of a man who still faces charges of treason must raise moral objections. The Cardinal – like any human being – can be wrong. However, it must not be forgotten that for 20 years the Primate of Poland has carried the burden of fighting to defend the Church and the nation, and that for this reason he has become the victim of persecution, insults, and slander.

*Wiadomości* and *Na Antenie* cooperate with each other according to the principle of mutual non-interference with each other's editorial matters.

However, *Na Antenie* is published and distributed as a “supplement to *Wiadomości*” As a result, a reader, especially a domestic one, could mistakenly see the shared responsibility of the organ of Radio Free Europe’s Polish Service for Józef Mackiewicz’s article. This consideration has prompted us to present the above comments.

Jan Nowak<sup>54</sup>

Chmielowiec did not respond, while Sakowski sent a letter to Nowak-Jeziorański on April 3, 1969, which, while being a response to the letter dated March 28, at the same time referred to the allegations made in the text sent to the “Deputy.” It reads, among other things:

Thanking you for your detailed documented address to me in your letter of March 28 this year, I would like to clarify that, regardless of my personal view, which is known to you from the correspondence exchanged between us in the past (letters of November 10 and 15, 1961), I have decided to seek legal advice on the statement sent, which would appear in the next issue of *Na Antenie*.

I must say that the legal opinions on the printing of this statement were strongly negative. Our regular solicitor put it in typically English terms, saying that “no serious lawyer could advise printing, and everyone would have to advise against it.” You wrote that you accept sole and complete responsibility for everything contained in the submitted statement. I understand this as a possible financial liability for litigation costs, because, of course, nothing can absolve either the editor of the *Wiadomości* or the printer from legal liability. But wouldn’t you agree with me that simply pursuing the case in a British court – if it were to come to that – would be inappropriate and even scandalous?

For my part, I have always tried to avoid litigating purely Polish cases in British courts, even when the case, according to the lawyers, was certain, and settling it out of court would expose us to serious monetary losses.

I have carefully read the work of Andrzej Pomian that you sent me. If within 5 years of writing, it did not appear in print, I guess the considerations I mention here must have been at play. In light of the legal opinions I have gathered, it may be a good thing that it was not printed.

As for the article titled “List pasterski” [Pastoral letter] itself, the response it has generated was unexpectedly favorable. This was the first time that Bishop Rubin met with General Anders. Bishop Rubin agreed to give an interview

---

<sup>54</sup> A text attached to the referenced letter, emphasis by the author.

to *Dziennik Polski*, explaining certain aspects of the issues raised in *Kultura* and *Wiadomości*, without, of course, citing these magazines and authors.

Having learned today that you do not consider it possible to withdraw the printing of the statement on the Mackiewicz case, I am truly saddened to think that this unpleasant affair may negatively affect the fate of the monthly magazine *Na Antenie*. I believe that a delay in its publication would be a huge detriment to all of us and [illegible word] a treat for the regime. I'm afraid that without reliance on the distribution by *Wiadomości*, the monthly *Na Antenie* would lose a lot, if not in importance, then in reach. It would simply lose access to several thousand *Wiadomości* subscribers located around the world.

I can't help thinking that the publication of *Na Antenie* is incomparably more important than putting a struggling writer at a public whipping post, recalling today, in exile, a sentence issued in Poland 27 years ago and not executed there for reasons about which there are conflicting accounts.

Regardless of what anyone might think of Mackiewicz, it is hard to deny that he is one of our most outstanding writers, that his books published in exile have had an enduring readership, and that some of them, like the book on Katyn, have been translated into a number of languages. In addition, he is a member of the *Wiadomości* jury, elected to the so-called "academy" in a readers' poll, and is a winner of the Award of the Polish Writers' Union and other literary prizes.

Paul Morand, a 100 percent collaborator during the war, entered the French Academy that year, with de Gaulle's prior knowledge and approval, and Celine, threatened with the most severe punishment, returned from his forced exile to France before his death, his most audacious controversial books were published there, and until his death, his disgraceful behavior during the occupation was not mentioned.

Because of our always friendly personal relationship, I take the liberty of writing about what I think at the moment with all sincerity, and as an incorrigible optimist, I still hope that I can persuade you to change your decision. In this hope,

I send my regards and greetings

J. Sakowski<sup>55</sup>

Nowak-Jeziorański disagreed with Sakowski's argument, and a week later (on April 11, 1969) sent him another letter in which he tried to sep-

---

<sup>55</sup> A letter from J. Sakowski to J. Nowak-Jeziorański dated April 3, 1969.

arate relations and personal relationships from professional matters. He wrote, among other things:

In response to your letter of April 3 this year, I would like to start where you left off with your comments. I also value very much our friendly personal relations. I'll say more. I have a lot of sincere respect and appreciation for you. From our meetings and conversations so far, I got the impression that it was easy for us to find a common language and reach an agreement.

There is a fundamental difference of opinion between us about Józef Mackiewicz. I do not mean to convince you, I only ask you to be willing to understand my point of view properly. Most importantly, I'm concerned that our arguments don't conflate with each other.

I have never questioned Mackiewicz's writing qualities, and if *Wiadomości* had limited itself to publishing his literary works – there would have been no difficulties between us. I do not recognize the immunity of anyone in the press – not excluding the Primate – so I do not understand why immunity of this kind should be J. Mackiewicz's privilege. However, what I intend is not to “put him at a whipping post.” In my letter to you on May 2 of last year, I wrote: “For the sake of the cause, I accept from time to time, not without serious difficulties, the articles of Józef Mackiewicz published on the front page of *Wiadomości*.” And in a letter to Sambor [Michał Chmielowiec] dated November 25 of last year, a copy of which you received, you will find the sentence: “As a former Home Army soldier, I intend, along with my colleagues, to refrain from publicly disclosing facts and documents from Mr. Mackiewicz's past as long as he does not provoke us to do so by his statements.”

So much for my personal attitude towards J. Mackiewicz, which, by the way, is shared by people who survived the war and the Nazi occupation in the Underground Movement in Poland.<sup>56</sup>

Later in the letter, Nowak-Jeziorański explained that his desire to disassociate himself from the person and words of Mackiewicz is dictated by a desire to protect the interests of RFE, which is geared toward a domestic listener who, while remembering the occupation period, at the same time reacts very vigorously to the issue of collaboration with the Nazis. The idea, he explained, was to “protect our Radio Station and a monthly magazine from being discredited in the opinion of domestic listeners and

---

<sup>56</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to J. Sakowski dated April 11, 1969.

readers.” Emphasizing once again the “moderation” and “restraint” in his reactions to Mackiewicz’s past publications, Nowak noted that he hoped that the editors of *Wiadomości* would appreciate this attitude: “I believed that there would be no overstepping of the boundaries acceptable to us.” Unfortunately, he added, the publication of Mackiewicz’s text caused this balance between *Wiadomości* and *Na Antenie* to be upset. As he wrote:

You knew well from our conversations and correspondence my position and my requests and warnings not to cross the line. You must have realized that the “List pasterski” [Pastoral letter], not because of the content, I repeat, but because of the person of the author, must jeopardize the useful marriage between the two magazines.

And if this were to happen, then, referring to Sakowski’s remark in which he considered the consequences of ending the cooperation between the magazines, Nowak-Jeziorański also looked at the issue differently. As he wrote:

I fear [...] that the parting of the two magazines after five [?!] years of harmonious cooperation will have much worse effects for *Wiadomości* than for our monthly, for which the issue of circulation distributed in exile is essentially of secondary importance.

Such a clear-cut difference in views and assessments, as well as in the predictions about the consequences of a possible termination of cooperation, did not, however, as Nowak pointed out, rule out the chances of an agreement. This, however, depended on certain conditions. While expressing – to some extent – an understanding of the refusal to print the text of the prepared statement, he suggested some changes in this regard. It should be emphasized, however, that he did so just after the suggestion that *Wiadomości* used censorship practices:

In the conclusion of your letter, you express the hope that we will reverse our decision to disconnect the monthly magazine *Na Antenie* from *Wiadomości*. Your optimism will prove justified if the refusal to publish a statement in the pages of our monthly magazine concerning Mackiewicz’s article is dictated



solely by fear of the legal and financial consequences to *Wiadomości* and the printing house. In this case, I also do not lose hope that an accommodating solution can be found. On the other hand, any censorship going beyond legal considerations would be unacceptable to us as a violation of the agreement between Dr. Grydzewski and me.

As an accommodating solution, I propose a new text of the statement, which I am sending you enclosed. It is limited to repeating in quotation marks what was already published on J. Mackiewicz in *Dziennik Polski* 21 years ago and has so far received no response from Mr. J. Mackiewicz.

If you believe that the new version also threatens to be considered defamatory by a British court, I am ready to submit the text to our barrister for an expert review and possibly to incorporate any corrections or abridgments he requests. He is a regular consultant for one of the leading British daily newspapers and is regarded as a prominent expert on “libels.”

At the same time, Nowak-Jeziorański reckoned with the possibility of a refusal from Sakowski, as he stipulated:

In the event of a refusal – hopefully according to simple fair play rules – *Wiadomości* will allow us to notify readers of the termination of the agreement and inform them where and how they will be able to purchase the May issue of *Na Antenie*.

Sakowski once again sought the opinion of a London law firm Rees, Kon, Freeman & Co. After a series of conversations, he obtained a written expert report (dated April 18, 1969, prepared the day before), which reads, among other things:

We have no doubt that the publishing of Mr. Nowak’s comment would expose your weekly to a heavy liability for defamation under the Law of this Country, unless the alleged collaboration with the German occupant could be proved in full (which, we suspect, would be a very difficult and even more costly task after almost 30 years and the inaccessibility of the credible sources of evidence).

Even assuming that the fact of collaboration can be proved, the question arises and the Court would ask, whether or not the proposed application is a fair and bona fide comment, or whether such comment is accentuated by malice: bearing in mind the fact that Mr. J. Mackiewicz can be regarded as one of your Weekly’s permanent contributors and that you have been publishing

his articles periodically and without interruption since 1948 (the publication of the declaration in the *Polish Daily*), it is difficult to see how the above comment under review here may be regarded as bona fide comment by you. [...]

However, in advising you we must bear in mind our obligation to protect your Weekly and, where possible, to remove the possibility of legal action, which – even if successful – could prove quite costly to you under the legal system of this Country.

We have been asked to advise you on the legal aspects only and therefore refrain from commenting on the moral issue arising out your association with Mr. Mackiewicz through the past long years.<sup>57</sup>

Of course, after so clearly pointing out the risks associated with the publication proposed by Nowak-Jeziorański, Sakowski decided not to accept that proposal. In a succinct (compared to the previous one) letter dated April 21, he wrote:

Thanking you for your letter of April 11 of this year, I can only regret that you did not consider it possible to change your decision.

By the way, I enclose the opinion of the solicitor, a regular legal advisor to *Wiadomości*.<sup>58</sup>

Nowak-Jeziorański – contrary to his earlier declarations, in which he was ready to accept that the reason for the refusal could be “solely [...] fear of the legal and financial consequences to *Wiadomości*” – did not consider the expert report of British lawyers to be binding and made the final decision to end the cooperation between the magazines. He sent another letter on the matter two days later, but this time its addressee was not Sakowski, but Mieczysław Grydzewski. In the letter, he wrote, among other things:

At a time when, with the greatest regret, *Na Antenie* must part with *Wiadomości*, I consider it my duty, to give you my warmest thanks for the cooperation of the two magazines, which continued for nearly seven years. It was possible thanks to your kindness and friendly attitude to our institution and to me personally.

---

<sup>57</sup> The opinion from the law firm Rees, Kon, Freeman & Co addressed to: *Wiadomości*, Polish Literary Weekly; April 18, 1969.

<sup>58</sup> A letter from J. Sakowski to J. Nowak-Jeziorański dated April 21, 1969.

I also know how much additional work and hardship you have accepted by taking over the editorial and technical supervision of our monthly magazine in addition to *Wiadomości*. I think, not without emotion, that perhaps it was this great generosity of yours that unfortunately contributed to some extent to your illness.<sup>59</sup>

Interestingly, later in the letter Nowak-Jeziorański drew a picture in which the various accents were placed quite differently than in his correspondence with Sakowski. Most noteworthy here is the issue of the recipient of *Na Antenie* and the consequences that the termination of the cooperation will bring to both magazines, as well as the evaluation, given not explicitly, of the actions of Michał Chmielowiec (who, it seems, played a minor role in the whole affair) and Juliusz Sakowski; this assessment foreshadows what Nowak-Jeziorański would write about them years later, recalling the events described:

Thanks to you, many of our broadcasts were able to reach the emigre and domestic readers in the printed form. This made it possible to familiarize Polish readers abroad with the situation in Poland and with domestic issues at a time when the communist propaganda intended for the diaspora was greatly intensified.

I am parting with *Wiadomości* with real regret and with the full knowledge that this must have negative effects for both magazines. I firmly believe that if you were still sitting at the editor's desk today, we would come to an agreement together. It never occurred to me to impose anything on *Wiadomości*, much less to interfere with the content of the magazine or the selection of its contributors.

On the other hand, I also do not remember that ever in your time you allowed Józef Mackiewicz to appear in the pages of *Wiadomości* in the role of a mentor teaching patriotism and reprimanding others.

On the other hand, with direct reference to the essence of the dispute, that is, the text of Józef Mackiewicz and his person, he wrote, ignoring, as it were, the legal expert report sent to him by Sakowski:

---

<sup>59</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Grydzewski dated April 23, 1969.

For my part, I never had the slightest intention to use *Na Antenie* to attack Józef Mackiewicz, or to remind him of his wartime past. The purpose of our note was only to disassociate ourselves from any, even indirect, shared responsibility for the article not because of its content – but because of the person of the author. Since, according to our original agreement of April 2, 1962, “the supplement (*Na Antenie*) [...] is not a part of the weekly *Wiadomości*, but is something completely separate,” I did not anticipate any difficulties. If it was only a matter of risking a libel case – I offered my willingness to submit to the judgment of a British lawyer, who would make the necessary corrections to my text. However, I cannot agree with the censorship of a text published in the pages of our own periodical, if it is dictated by a difference of opinion and not by legal considerations. *Wiadomości* rightly assumes that no one – not excluding Primate Wyszyński – can enjoy the privilege of press immunity. So I am unable to understand why Mr. Józef Mackiewicz should be an exception in this regard.

I regret immensely that all my proposals for an accommodating settlement were rejected.

This letter, as well as the suggestions contained in it, did not go unanswered by the hitherto silent Mieczysław Grydzewski. The content of the letter written by him contradicts the diagnoses and assumptions put forward by Nowak-Jeziorański, but confirms the choices and decisions made by Juliusz Sakowski. In his letter, the editor of *Wiadomości* wrote, among other things:

I, too, regret the separation, for which there was actually no reason; it will only give pleasure to the agents we fought together.

As for my position, you know it, Captain, from your discussions with Mr. Sakowski.

As for the last article by Józef Mackiewicz, I do not share the opinion that he acted in it as a mentor, giving others lessons in patriotism; the article contained legitimate journalistic criticism. I can assure you that I would not hesitate to publish that article.

It has been, is and will continue to be the principle of *Wiadomości* to qualify articles on the basis of their value, without examining the biographies of their authors. We publish articles by prominent writers without dealing with their past, because that would be tantamount to keeping a file, which would be disgusting to all of us.

*Wiadomości* under my editorship always published Mackiewicz's articles, which sometimes were very controversial, and this did not prevent *Na Antenie* from appearing as a monthly supplement to *Wiadomości*. Therefore, I do not believe that anything has changed since the publication of Mackiewicz's last article, and I hope that you will consider it possible to change your position on this issue.

Of course, I consider it perfectly legitimate to disassociate myself in *Na Antenie* from the article that provoked your objection, even in harsh words, but without personal allusions to the person of the author, whom *Wiadomości* has published for a number of years and whose anti-communist position is uncompromising.<sup>60</sup>

Grydzewski's letter received an immediate response from Nowak-Jeziorański, who tried to put responsibility for the situation solely on the new editors of *Wiadomości*. He wrote, among other things:

It seems to me that I have done absolutely everything in my power to bring about some kind of compromise with *Wiadomości*.

I withdrew my original text and proposed a second one, which was much more restrained and limited to quotations from *Dziennik Polski* from 1948. In 1961 – back when the editorial board of *Dziennik* was managed by Mr. Sakowski – a similar thing was published. I proposed that both parties submit to the decision of our barrister, and I would also agree to a conciliator in the person of a jointly selected lawyer or another person. When this too was rejected – I put forward a third proposal limited to the following sentence: “The editors of *Na Antenie*, without entering into polemics with the content of the article, consider it necessary to express the conviction that, in our opinion, Mr. Józef Mackiewicz, due to his wartime past, is not called upon to issue a critical assessment of the patriotic attitude of others and especially of Primate Wyszyński.” This, too, turned out to be unacceptable.<sup>61</sup>

The last sentences of the quoted passage seem somewhat surprising. While the correspondence preserved in the editorial files of *Wiadomości* confirms the response to the first two proposals outlined here, there is

---

<sup>60</sup> A letter from M. Grydzewski to J. Nowak-Jeziorański dated April 28, 1969.

<sup>61</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Grydzewski dated April 29, 1969.

no information on the third. Nowak-Jeziorański presented its details in another letter to Grydzewski, dated May 8, 1969. In that letter, he wrote:

The final accommodating wording was submitted to Mr. J. Sakowski by Pawel Zaremba on April 28 this year. It read as follows:

“Without entering into polemics with the content of the article, we consider it necessary to express our conviction that Mr. Józef Mackiewicz is not the right author to issue judgments about the patriotic and civic attitude of anyone, especially of Cardinal Wyszyński, due to his own activity during the last war and his views expressed in the press published by the occupiers.”<sup>62</sup>

However, before this was clarified, Nowak-Jeziorański continued to repeat the wording and remarks about Józef Mackiewicz and the right to publish a statement about him in *Na Antenie* that were contained in his letter dated April 23. Also, he added an interesting passage about the relationship the two magazines would have after the collaboration ended:

I didn't want, even after we parted ways, the detachment of *Na Antenie* to adversely affect the circulation of *Wiadomości*. P. Zaremba suggested that readers who subscribe to your weekly on a permanent basis should have the privilege of subscribing to *Na Antenie* at a significantly reduced price. In this way, the reader would not be required to choose between *Wiadomości* and *Na Antenie*. This suggestion was also rejected without any justification.

In his reply given in a letter dated May 3, Grydzewski did not address the latter proposal.

Instead, he pointed out the anticipated consequences of publishing the text of the statement in the pages of *Na Antenie*, which could prompt Józef Mackiewicz to take legal action. He wrote, among other things:

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude for your willingness to deal with the matter in a consensual manner. Of course I completely share your opinion that *Na Antenie* is an independent magazine and that it cannot be subject to the censorship of *Wiadomości*. However, *Wiadomości* bears the same legal responsibility for everything that appears in *Na Antenie* as for what appears

---

<sup>62</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Grydzewski dated May 8, 1969.

in *Wiadomości*. The fact that Radio Free Europe or anyone else would pay the costs if Mackiewicz files a “libel” lawsuit does not resolve anything, because my good name as a “slanderer” would be forever burdened. A barrister’s advice would not have helped much, because English courts are always inclined to convict for “libel,” and besides, the natural order of things in “libel” cases is that the accused turns into the accuser, and my defense attorney would have to prove that the charges against Mackiewicz are correct, which for me would be unacceptable.<sup>63</sup>

However, referring to the essence of the dispute, that is, the wartime activities of Józef Mackiewicz, he wrote:

I can’t investigate Mackiewicz’s case and I don’t feel called to pass judgment, I know that he was convicted of collaboration, and I know that Sergiusz Piasecki refused to carry out the sentence, claiming it was unjust. There are other witnesses as well who claim that the charges against Mackiewicz were based on a tragic misunderstanding. [...]

I came across the accusations against Mackiewicz when the charge of going to Katyn at the invitation of the German authorities was made against him and Goettel, and the fact that I printed his articles was held against me. I met with Prime Minister Gen. Bór-Komorowski, who told me: “I would be the last to make accusations against him because of that, since thanks to that trip we obtained indisputable information about what was happening in Katyn.”

Thus, while disassociating himself from attempts to decide whether Mackiewicz was guilty of the acts alleged by Nowak-Jeziorański and others, Grydzewski also shied away from the charge of giving Mackiewicz special treatment and protecting him from press criticism:

Mackiewicz is no taboo: you recall that two of his articles against the Home Army were rejected by me, and I know that Mr. Chmielowiec also did not print everything that Mackiewicz sent in. To reproach Mackiewicz for the mistakes of the past would have to provoke his response and polemics, to the delight of our enemies, who would use the dispute against both sides. Is this what we need?

---

<sup>63</sup> A letter from M. Grydzewski to J. Nowak-Jeziorański dated May 3, 1969.

At the same time, believing that saving such a beneficial (to both sides) cooperation is possible, he proposed a fourth version of the statement:

However, if what you want is complete disassociation of *Na Antenie* from Mackiewicz's article, I suggest publishing the following statement:

"In order to avoid misunderstandings arising from the fact that *Na Antenie* is published as a supplement to *Wiadomości*, we hereby state that they are completely separate magazines and that the editorial staff of *Na Antenie* has no responsibility for, or influence over, the topics, selection of authors, and views expressed by them in the pages of *Wiadomości*."

Nowak did not accept this solution. In his response expressed in a letter dated May 8, he stated: "The formula that you proposed, Doctor, would not solve [...] our dispute."<sup>64</sup>

At the same time, he recalled the content of the third version – dated April 28 – of the statement (quoted above) and added that "This statement was the minimum I could agree to." After which he informed Grydzewski of the steps he had taken in connection with this issue, which ultimately prevented the possibility of further cooperation:

Despite the fact that our proposal was rejected right away, we waited three more days before signing a contract with the printing house and the distribution company<sup>65</sup> and before submitting for typesetting the material to fill the May issue. I couldn't delay it any longer for fear that it would not be possible to publish the May issue at all and there would be a two-month break in the publication of *Na Antenie*.

On the other hand, referring to Grydzewski's remarks, stipulating that he does not want to investigate Mackiewicz's past and, as far as he knows, the evidence against him is not incontrovertible, he noted:

The evidence of Jozef Mackiewicz's collaboration with the German occupiers is indisputable. These are the years' issues of *Goniec Codzienny* published in

---

<sup>64</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Grydzewski dated May 8, 1969.

<sup>65</sup> This means that the contract was signed on Friday, May 2, 1969, a day before Grydzewski sent the letter with the fourth statement proposal.



Vilnius by the Propagandaamt from 1941 to 1944, located and available in German wartime archives. Sergiusz Piasecki had absolutely nothing to do with the sentence on Mackiewicz. The execution of both Ancerewicz's and Mackiewicz's sentences was entrusted to Capt. Adam Boryczko. He is now in Poland, but immediately after the war he gave detailed testimony on the matter, which is kept at the Polish Union.

Thus the cooperation, initiated in 1962, was terminated. Before Nowak-Jeziorański informed Grydzewski of this fact in a letter dated May 8, two days earlier he had written to Michał Chmielowec, leaving not the slightest doubt as to the decisions that had been made. In that letter, he formulated the following request:

Enclosed I am sending our statement with a request to include it in the upcoming issue of *Wiadomości*. We have introduced its contents to Mr. J. Sakowski, who raised no objections. A second paragraph was added to the text he read, but I don't think it will encounter any opposition from *Wiadomości*.

I will be much obliged if you let me know in which issue of *Wiadomości* this statement will be published.<sup>66</sup>

In addition, Nowak posted a courtesy thank you for his cooperation with Sambor: "I would also like to take this opportunity, independent of the enclosure, to express my sincere thanks to you for your excellent cooperation and the great effort you put into *Na Antenie*."

Chmielowiec responded in a letter dated May 12, in which he wrote:

I received Your letter along with the statement on Saturday, May 10, at a time when the printing house was already working. I'm submitting the statement for typesetting today, on Monday, May 12, so that it can appear in the upcoming issue (1209) dated May 31 this year, which should go off the press on Wednesday, May 21. Of course, I will send a proof copy for proofreading. Thank you very much for your kind words about my participation in the cooperation between *Na Antenie* and *Wiadomości*. I have tried not to spare any effort to ensure that this valuable supplement would reach the reader in the most attractive form possible, and I have fond memories of more than two years

---

<sup>66</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Chmielowiec dated May 6, 1969.

of harmonious cooperation. As I regret the separation of our two magazines, I seek comfort in the thought that perhaps it will only be a temporary separation after all, and not a divorce.<sup>67</sup>

The statement referred to in the two letters was titled “Od Rozgłośni Polskiej R.W.E i Redakcji *Na Antenie*” [From the Polish Section of R.F.E. and the Editors of *Na Antenie*], and read – in the first edition – as follows:

The editors of *Na Antenie* notify readers with regret that the monthly magazine of the Polish Section of RFE has to part ways with the weekly *Wiadomości*. Starting in May, *Na Antenie* will be published as a separate magazine. Subscriptions can be ordered

-----

We consider it our duty to express our thanks to the publisher and editor of *Wiadomości* for their cooperation. Special gratitude is due to Dr. Mieczysław Grydzewski, who made it possible for the two magazines to appear together, sacrificially accepting the additional burden of the work involved in publishing *Na Antenie*. It is to the distinguished editor of *Wiadomości* and his boundless dedication that we owe seven years of cooperation, which, being a salt in the eye of the regime in Poland – not only, in our view, was in the interests of both magazines, but served well the Polish goal of independence.

Thanks to *Wiadomości*, selected broadcasts of our radio station, which are part of the writing and political output of the Polish emigres, could be recorded in print and reach multiple readers abroad and in Poland. Due to the regime’s intensified propaganda efforts directed at emigres, we placed special emphasis on news, articles, discussions, and documents related to domestic issues.

We also believe that *Na Antenie*, appearing as a free supplement to *Wiadomości*, provided support for the distinguished weekly.

The monthly magazine *Na Antenie*, henceforth published as a magazine independent of *Wiadomości*, will try to serve the same purposes as before.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> A letter from M. Chmielowiec to J. Nowak-Jeziorański dated May 12, 1969.

<sup>68</sup> *Od Rozgłośni Polskiej R.W.E i Redakcji “Na Antenie”* [From the Polish Section of RFE and the editors of *Na Antenie*]; the text is not dated. In the archives of *Wiadomości* there is another version of that statement, expanded by information about the authors: Zygmunt Jabłoński and Jan Nowak-Jeziorański.

According to Chmielowiec, the statement appeared in the 22nd issue (1209) of *Wiadomości* dated May 31, 1969.<sup>69</sup> Some changes were made to the original version sent by Nowak-Jeziorański.

First, the address and information about the subscription and the price of the magazine appeared in place of the dotted line.<sup>70</sup>

Second, a paragraph that Nowak-Jeziorański mentioned in his letter to Chmielowiec dated May 6 was added immediately afterwards. However, some modifications were made along the way to that paragraph as well. A proof copy found among the letters in the *Wiadomości* editorial file reads:

Regular subscribers to these Polish periodicals outside the Country, whose editors agree, will be able to pay for subscriptions to *Na Antenie* together with subscriptions to the relevant periodical and benefit from a 50% discount. So far, the editors of *Orzeł Biały* have given their consent.

In the proofread version, signed on May 16 by Paweł Zaremba, the last sentence was deleted<sup>71</sup> and eventually the relevant passage took the following form in print: “Regular subscribers to Polish periodicals outside the Country will be able to benefit from a 50% discount.” This seemingly minor change may be an interesting clue related to the later cooperation of *Na Antenie* with *Orzeł Biały*, although it does not directly relate to the events discussed herein.

Third, the penultimate paragraph was removed from the text printed in *Wiadomości*. In the referenced proofreading of the proof copy, which Zaremba made with a red pen, the passage was marked in black ink. An explanation of this decision can be found in a letter from Michał Chmielowiec to Paweł Zaremba dated May 19, 1969. In that letter, Sambor wrote, among other things:

---

<sup>69</sup> “Od Rozgłośni Polskiej R.W.E i Redakcji *Na Antenie*” [From the Polish Section of RFE and the editors of *Na Antenie*], *Wiadomości* 1969, no. 22 (1209), p. 4.

<sup>70</sup> “Subscriptions can be ordered from the SPK Bookstore – PCA Publications LTD, 16–20 Queen’s Gate Terrace, London SW7. Annual subscription £2.2.0 (or \$5.00, F. 25.00), price of a single issue 3/6 (or \$0.50, F. 2.50).”

<sup>71</sup> See: a letter from P. Zaremba to M. Chmielowiec dated May 16, 1969.

Only in the last revision, before the issue with your statement went to the printing machine, we noticed that the sentence: “We also believe that *Na Antenie*, appearing as a free supplement to *Wiadomości*, provided support for the distinguished weekly” is awkwardly phrased. The main problem is the word “support,” which brings unwanted connotations of “charity” or something similar.

Unfortunately, it was too late to inform you about this concern, so I decided, in consultation with Mr. Sakowski, to remove that sentence, especially since its absence does not change the essential flow of thought and tone of the statement. While I am sorry that this happened, I know that Mr. Nowak wanted to publish the statement as soon as possible, and discussing the change would have delayed its appearance by a whole week.<sup>72</sup>

Paweł Zaremba, like Chmielowiec who had so far stood somewhat on the sidelines of the whole conflict, responded with a letter whose tone shows the scale of emotion that accompanied the split between the two periodicals. In that letter, he wrote:

Dear Mr. Michał,

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 19th of this month, in which you inform me, unfortunately *ex post*, about the deletion of an entire sentence with the word “support” from the text of the statement signed by Director Nowak and editor Jabłoński.

I cannot take an authoritative position on this matter, as the letter was not signed by me. Nevertheless, I would like to remind you that its text was agreed upon with Mr. Sakowski. My personal understanding is that doubts about the word “support” itself did not require deleting the entire sentence. I admit that the delay in the publication of the statement was not advisable, but I think it would have been easier to resolve any doubts in a telephone conversation. Of course, I will report this matter to Director Nowak as soon as he returns from vacation.<sup>73</sup>

After the announced return, Nowak-Jeziorański reacted rather angrily. He wrote:

---

<sup>72</sup> A letter from M. Chmielowiec to P. Zaremba dated May 19, 1969.

<sup>73</sup> A letter from P. Zaremba to M. Chmielowiec dated May 23, 1969.

Upon my return from vacation, I was very unpleasantly surprised to learn that, without any attempt to communicate with us, the following very important sentence had been deleted from the statement signed by the Polish Section of RFE and the editors of *Na Antenie*:

“We also believe that *Na Antenie*, appearing as a free supplement to *Wiadomości*, provided support for the distinguished weekly.”

The text was read out in the presence of Dr. Kielanowski, Paweł Zaremba, and myself – Mr. Juliusz Sakowski declared that he had no objections to it. Therefore, the text was agreed between the two parties.

I find it difficult to accept that the subsequent doubts that emerged over the single word “support” justify changing the agreed statement without trying to communicate with the other party. One phone call to Mr. Zaremba or myself would have been enough to replace the word.

I am very sorry that our cooperation ends with yet another completely unnecessary and, as far as I am concerned, unexpected irritation.<sup>74</sup>

In response to these allegations, Chmielowiec tried to explain the circumstances of the decision, hoping for Nowak-Jeziorański’s understanding and suggesting a form of possible rectification as a way of settling the dispute:

My sincerest apologies for leaving this sentence out without reaching an agreement. I had to choose between the lesser and greater evil (which would be to move the message to the next issue). The doubt arose during the last revision, when the issue was already on the printing machine.<sup>75</sup> First of all, I had to communicate with Sakowski, which already took a long time. You were outside Munich at the time, and Mr. Paweł would probably have to communicate with you. The proposal for a change would, in turn, have to be presented to Mr. Juliusz. And one still has to keep in mind the difficulty of making the phone calls.

In the poor and inconvenient conditions of our editorial work that you know, and with the difficulties faced by the printing house – this kind of “downtime” would have been a real disaster. Besides: posting an awkwardly worded sentence could no longer be made up, while leaving it out would be

---

<sup>74</sup> A letter from J. Nowak-Jeziorański to M. Chmielowiec dated June 6, 1969.

<sup>75</sup> A partial confirmation of this is the layout of the text in *Wiadomości*. The noticeably increased spacing before the last paragraph, as well as after it (before the authors’ names), clearly indicates the fact that part of the text had been removed.

fixable in the form of a correction or addendum, which we would have time to agree on without haste.

Nowak-Jeziorański did not respond to the last letter. At the same time, even though the statement was reprinted in *Na Antenie* by his decision (as discussed further in this article), it did not include the problematic sentence.

Readers of both magazines, lacking insight into the details of the case, were only presented with the texts printed in both magazines. It is worth recalling that the last joint issue of *Na Antenie* appeared as a supplement to the London-based *Wiadomości* with a date of March 30 – April 6. Subsequently, the magazine became an independent, separate monthly. Its first issue (which retains continuous numbering – 73/74) was published with the date April – May 1969. The new monthly magazine, printed in a four times smaller format (28 × 21.5 cm), had 48 pages, which translated into a 30% increase in the magazine’s volume. It retained the current layout, and only from the stand-alone third issue (76) it introduced a modification in the form of color on the front page (the masthead and the table of contents of the issue).

According to Jan Nowak-Jeziorański:

The change in the publishing form of our monthly magazine entailed the need to reorganize our editorial work. Editor Zygmunt Jabłoński had already expressed his desire to resign from his position before the unfortunate split between *Na Antenie* and the *Wiadomości* weekly. And although Editor Jabłoński’s decision has nothing to do with the publishing changes, the Section could only now satisfy his wish.<sup>76</sup>

Thanking Jabłoński for his efforts and work in editing *Na Antenie*, Nowak emphasized twice that his resignation was due only to personal reasons and lack of time. In addition, he reported that “as of May 15, the

---

<sup>76</sup> J. Nowak-Jeziorański, “Podziękowanie Redaktorowi Jabłońskiemu” [Words of gratitude to Editor Jabłoński], *Na Antenie* 1969, no. 73/74, p. 3.

duties of the editor of *Na Antenie* were assigned to editor Paweł Zaremba,” whose name was noted in the editorial footer on page 48.<sup>77</sup>

“Podziękowanie Redaktorowi Jabłońskiemu” [Words of gratitude to Editor Jabłoński] were accompanied by a message signed by him and Jan Nowak-Jeziorański – the same message that was printed in *Wiadomości*.<sup>78</sup> The differences boiled down to its date, i.e. May 1, 1969, and to the fact that it included the information about discounts for subscribers to other émigré magazines in the previous form, i.e.: “Regular subscribers to these Polish periodicals outside the Country, whose editors agree, will be able to pay for subscriptions to *Na Antenie* together with subscriptions to the relevant periodical and benefit from a 50% discount.”

This statement was repeated in a leaflet attached to the magazine encouraging subscriptions to the monthly, which mentioned, among other things:

Starting in May 1969, the monthly magazine, which has so far appeared together with the *Wiadomości* weekly, will be published in the last week of each month as an independent magazine.

*Na Antenie* – is the most abundant magazine with information on Polish affairs covering both political and social issues, and economic and cultural problems. The magazine is illustrated.

*Na Antenie* – contains a selection of broadcasts, commentaries, documentaries and columns from each month of the radio programs of the Polish Radio Station RFE with a particular focus on domestic issues.

*Na Antenie* – publishes materials written by leading Polish writers and journalists. The regular “Behind the scenes” column provides insight into the current political, social, economic, and cultural situation in Poland.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> The seat of the editorial office remained in Munich, and administration was taken over by the SPK Bookstore (Veterans’ Bookstore) in London.

<sup>78</sup> “Od Rozgłośni Polskiej R.W.E i Redakcji *Na Antenie*” [From the Polish Section of RFE and the editors of *Na Antenie*], *Na Antenie* 1969, no. 73/74, p. 3.

<sup>79</sup> “Na antenie mówi Rozgłosnia Polska Radia Wolna Europa” [On the air speaks the Polish Section of Radio Free Europe] – a one-page insert to issue 73/74 of April–May 1969; emphasis by the author.

At the same time, however, Jan Nowak-Jeziorański decided to inform the readers of the monthly and, indirectly, probably also the readers of *Wiadomości* about the circumstances and reasons why the paths of the two magazines separated. Therefore, he announced – in addition to the two texts cited above – an “List otwarty” [Open letter] addressed to Juliusz Sakowski and dated May 17, 1969. The text largely amounted to a repetition of the remarks made in the correspondence exchanged with the publisher of *Wiadomości*. Nowak wrote, among other things:

I consider it my duty to summarize once again all my efforts to maintain, in the public interest, the existing cooperation between *Wiadomości* and the monthly *Na Antenie*.

Our dispute boils down to whether we can freely express our views in the pages of our own periodical even if they differ from the position taken by the editors of the *Wiadomości*.

In the April issue of our monthly magazine, a brief statement was to be published explaining that our Section and Editors bear no shared responsibility for Józef Mackiewicz’s article “List pasterski” [Pastoral letter], published on the front page of the *Wiadomości* issue of March 23. Without entering into polemics with the content of the article, we expressed our conviction that Mr. Józef Mackiewicz was not the right author to issue judgments about the patriotic and civic attitude of anyone, especially of Cardinal Wyszyński, due to his own activity during the last war and his views expressed in the press published by the occupiers.

The publication of that text was met with your refusal. It turned out that it is possible to criticize the current activities of Cardinal Wyszyński and the Polish bishops, but even in the *Na Antenie* supplement not a word is allowed about the former activities of Mr. J. Mackiewicz.

This position is all the more difficult to understand, because in January and February of this year, *Wiadomości* published several letters from readers protesting the self-rehabilitation of Mr. Marian Muszkat in the pages of the weekly precisely because of his past. *Wiadomości* also published readers’ objections against further publication of articles by Mr. Jan Rostworowski due to the fact that the writer, while still in exile, voluntarily accepted the citizenship of the Polish People’s Republic. Thus, it appears that you have granted press immunity only Mr. J. Mackiewicz.

We have indicated our willingness to accept amendments dictated by legal considerations. Aiming for an accommodating settlement of the matter, we submitted to you three versions of our statement. We submitted the last [?!] of



them on April 28, while suggesting inviting mediators. None of our proposals have received a positive response from you.

Having been forced to part ways with *Wiadomości*, we wanted to make it easier for Readers to use both magazines. Therefore, we made an offer of a substantial discount on subscriptions to *Na Antenie* for regular subscribers to *Wiadomości*. This proposal, too, was rejected by you.

Under these conditions, we cannot accept any responsibility for terminating the useful and, so far, harmonious cooperation that has lasted for nearly seven years.

Sakowski responded to that letter in the issue of *Wiadomości* dated June 15, 1969 with the text “Zamykam list otwarty” [I am closing the open letter],<sup>80</sup> in which he wrote, among other things:

[...] I think it is appropriate to inform the readers of *Wiadomości* about its [the parting of the two magazines – footnote by R. M.] real causes, so that they have a complete and not one-sided picture of them. [...]

“Our own periodical” is an emphasis that can, despite the author’s intentions, be misleading. Although the monthly supplement *Na Antenie* had separate editors and its own funds, *Wiadomości* had the same legal responsibility for everything that appeared in it as for what appeared in other pages. [...]

The lack of freedom in *Wiadomości* is a new thing. So far, if I have been reproached for anything, it is an exaggeratedly exuberant tolerance for other people’s opinions, excessive eclecticism in the views, and allowing others to “do as they please,” although not in their own house. Every reader knows this – except the author of the “open letter.” [...]

The successive three versions of the statement concerning Józef Mackiewicz that were presented for publication in *Na Antenie* had, according to the unanimous opinion of English lawyers, the hallmarks of the so-called “libel.”

*Wiadomości* could not and did not want to serve as a tool for the achievement of goals it did not support; it could not and did not want to become a convenient field for others’ games and personal scores that had nothing to do with the merits of the article it published.

It could not agree to that, not only for legal reasons, but also because of the prevailing common decency towards the author, whose articles it had been publishing for a number of years, and who, almost from the beginning

---

<sup>80</sup> J. Sakowski, “Zamykam list otwarty” [I am closing the open letter], *Wiadomości* 1969, no. 24 (1211), p. 2.

of its existence in exile, was one of its regular, outstanding, and most popular contributors. [...]

Thinking that the magazine *Na Antenie* is indeed concerned with dissociating itself from Mackiewicz's article (and not just discriminating against the author), editor Grydzewski suggested that a statement be placed in connection with the article, stating that "the editorial staff of *Na Antenie* has no responsibility for, or influence over, the topics, selection of authors, and views expressed by them in the pages of *Wiadomości*."

There was no response to that proposal. [...] There was no response – and it is clear why.

It turns out that it is more important [...] to discredit, condemn, and vilify an outstanding Polish writer, whose writings are his only subsistence and who is deprived of all other means of earning a living in the difficult conditions of life in exile. It is more important and urgent than anything else to force into silence a writer who may irritate others with the controversial nature of his statements, but is known for his uncompromising anti-communist stance. [...]

Convinced that the continued existence of the monthly magazine *Na Antenie* is in our mutual interest in exile, I cannot reproach myself for having unwittingly contributed to its liquidation.

Further in the text, Sakowski indicated that there is no risk of liquidation of *Na Antenie*, since the magazine is financed with external funds, and as for *Wiadomości*, he expressed his belief that the level and tradition of the magazine are a guarantee of its continued existence, since regular readers will certainly not leave it.

Nowak disagreed with Sakowski's argumentation and, in a text "Echa minionego okresu" [Echoes of a bygone period],<sup>81</sup> responded by saying that Sakowski's justifications and explanations were not convincing for two reasons. The first is that Sakowski's alleged defense of Józef Mackiewicz's interests, protecting him from, in Sakowski's words, "discreditation, condemnation, and vilification," is carried out inconsistently. As Nowak-Jeziorański emphasized, the newspaper *Dziennik Polski i Dziennik Żołnierza*, edited by Sakowski, twice reproached Mackiewicz for his infa-

---

<sup>81</sup> J. Nowak, "Echa minionego okresu. W sprawie oświadczenia p. Juliusza Sakowskiego" [Echoes of a bygone period. On the statement of Mr. Juliusz Sakowski], *Na Antenie* 1969, no. 76, pp. 21–22.

mous past by publishing, in the issues of January 8, 1948 and December 22, 1961, statements of the Circle of Former Home Army Soldiers, in which this issue was discussed. The second reason why Nowak-Jeziorański found Sakowski's explanations unconvincing was insufficient insight into the editors' correspondence (Nowak – Grydzewski), which shows that after Sakowski had rejected the different versions of the statement on Mackiewicz three times, Grydzewski exchanged letters with Nowak-Jeziorański on the matter, but his proposed amendments to the text made the statement largely enigmatic and imprecise, which Nowak-Jeziorański could not agree to. He considered the whole matter to be a manifestation of "bad customs in the Polish émigré press" and declared it to be closed.<sup>82</sup>

\*\*\*

The circumstances of the termination of the cooperation between *Wiadomości* and *Na Antenie* outlined above require an additional commentary. First of all, Nowak-Jeziorański angry response to Mackiewicz's "List pasterski" [Pastoral letter] may come as a surprise. The text certainly does not seem, and probably also did not seem at the time of publication, to be perceived as harassing and unreasonable, as Nowak-Jeziorański presented it. Of course, the author's views, expressed repeatedly in press and book publications, often aroused great controversy at the time, but in principle it is impossible to indicate why exactly that text by the *Wiadomości* columnist triggered such a vigorous reaction with far-reaching consequences.

One of the key arguments for expecting a much calmer response was that Mackiewicz's statement was an elaboration of the thoughts and opinions formulated by Juliusz Mieroszewski and, as such, did not seem particularly surprising.<sup>83</sup>

However, when one looks at the issue more broadly – most importantly by placing it in the context of the very bitter conflict between Józef Mac-

---

<sup>82</sup> Józef Mackiewicz addressed the matter, although not in the context of the termination of the cooperation between the two magazines, in the pamphlet "Mówi Rozgłośnia Polska Radia Wolna Europa" [This is the Polish Section of Radio Free Europe speaking] (1969).

<sup>83</sup> See: W. Bolecki, *Ptasznik z Wilna. O Józefie Mackiewiczzu (Zarys monograficzny)* [A fowler from Vilnius. About Józef Mackiewicz (a monographic outline)], Cracow 2007, p. 577.

kiewicz and Jan Nowak-Jeziorański<sup>84</sup> – it is hard to resist the impression that the latter, in demanding the right to print a statement dissociating the magazine’s editors from Mackiewicz and recalling the latter’s “infamous” past,<sup>85</sup> made a rather risky decision in the spring of 1969. Confident about the importance of his monthly supplement’s support for the London-based weekly, he put their cooperation on the line in an effort to involve the editors and publisher of *Wiadomości* in actions against Mackiewicz (intended to finally force him to shut his mouth and remove him from public life). The question that arises about the reasons for such a decision is answered by Mackiewicz’s biographers Włodzimierz Bolecki and Waclaw Lewandowski<sup>86</sup> who pointed out that the timing of Nowak’s reaction coincided with the preparation for publication of Mackiewicz’s novel *Nie trzeba głośno mówić* [There is no need to speak aloud]. As Nowak-Jeziorański assumed, it would contain “inconvenient” information about his work “in the German Commissariat for Secured Estates, an office that dealt with the administration of Jewish properties requisitioned by the occupation authorities.”<sup>87</sup> Fearing – wrongly, as it turned out – being discredited and compromised, Nowak-Jeziorański was looking for an excuse to play out another act in the “Mackiewicz case.” The “List pasterski” [Pastoral letter] became precisely such excuse. As Bolecki wrote:

Jan Nowak was not interested in a substantive discussion of the theses of Mackiewicz’s article. Years later – in 1988 – he admitted that I was right, af-

---

<sup>84</sup> Mackiewicz stated in his letters to Kossowska that Nowak-Jeziorański was “a guy with the level and mentality of a police non-commissioned officer” and called him “an American rascal”; see a letter from J. Mackiewicz to S. Kossowska dated March 19, 1969, in: J. Mackiewicz, B. Toporska, *Listy do redaktorów “Wiadomości”* [Letters to the editors of *Wiadomości*], compiled by W. Lewandowski, London 2010, p. 358. He also spoke in a similar vein about Radio Free Europe (*ibidem, passim*). Another thing is that it was not only about Nowak-Jeziorański that Mackiewicz made equally colorful and negative statements.

<sup>85</sup> The case of Mackiewicz and his “collaboration” with the German occupiers has been thoroughly exposed and analyzed by Włodzimierz Bolecki – see: J. Malewski [W. Bolecki], *Wyrok na Józefa Mackiewicza* [The judgment against Józef Mackiewicz], London 1991. Cf. W. Bolecki, *Ptasznik z Wilna* [The fowler from Vilnius].

<sup>86</sup> W. Lewandowski, *Józef Mackiewicz. Artyzm. Biografia. Recepcja* [Józef Mackiewicz. Artistry. Biography. Reception], London 2000.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 130–131.

ter all. The sole purpose of the statement of the author of the “List otwarty” [Open letter] was to publicly state that Józef Mackiewicz is not allowed to speak out on public issues.<sup>88</sup>

It is unclear how this case would have turned out if Juliusz Sakowski had yielded to Nowak’s pressure. Perhaps the cooperation would have continued and *Wiadomości* would have lost a valuable columnist. It is also unclear what the course of events would have been if Mackiewicz, instead of publishing his controversial text in the London-based *Wiadomości*, had printed it in the Paris-based *Kultura*, which, it turns out, he had sought to do. In the quoted letter dated April 11, 1969, Nowak wrote to Sakowski:

Teaching others a lesson in patriotism by a former collaborator with the Nazi occupiers is a grave insult to the feelings of people who lived through the war in Poland. This was undoubtedly what guided editor Giedroyć.

He himself saw it differently. As he wrote in one of his letters to Michał Chmielowiec:

[...] my article [?!] Giedroyć did not accept it, arguing (“although he agrees with it”) that he was concerned about falling into “Arguments”...<sup>89</sup> But the reason is different: there were quotes from *Wiadomości* (my wife’s).<sup>90</sup> I am more and more convinced that G. hates *Wiadomości*. Actually, I noticed it long ago. But I don’t know the essential reason.<sup>91</sup>

Perhaps the cooperation between *Na Antenie* and *Wiadomości* would have continued then, despite the highly unfriendly relationship between Mackiewicz and Nowak-Jeziorański. In any case, Jan Nowak-Jeziorański’s plan was not carried out. In view of Sakowski’s and Grydzewski’s firm

---

<sup>88</sup> W. Bolecki, *Ptasznik z Wilna* [The fowler from Vilnius], p. 576.

<sup>89</sup> Organ of the Association of Atheists and Free-Thinkers, issued in Warsaw in 1957–1990 (from 1969, organ of the Association for the Dissemination of Secular Culture).

<sup>90</sup> B. Toporska, *Z prośbą o odpowiedź* [With a request for an answer], *Wiadomości* 1966, no. 6 (1036), p. 1.

<sup>91</sup> A letter from J. Mackiewicz to M. Chmielowiec dated April 15, 1969, in: J. Mackiewicz, B. Toporska, *Listy do redaktorów “Wiadomości”* [Letters to the editors of *Wiadomości*], p. 361.

stance, he had no choice but to end in mid-1969 the cooperation initiated seven years earlier between the two editorial offices, which, among many other issues, differed in their approach to and assessment of the person of Józef Mackiewicz.

Original issue: "Archiwum Emigracji" 2015, no. 1-2 (22-23)

<https://apcz.umk.pl/AE/article/view/AE.2015.005>