

... Russia without any prejudice recognizes the self-rule and independence of the State of Lithuania with all the juridical consequences ... and for all times renounces with good will all the sovereignty rights of Russia, which it has had in regard to the Lithuanian nation or territory.

Peace Treaty with Russia  
Moscow, July 12, 1920



President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill:

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Atlantic Charter  
August 14, 1941

# LITHUANIAN BULLETIN

Published by the Lithuanian American Council

233 Broadway, New York 7, N. Y.

Vol. V

MARCH - APRIL, 1947

Nos. 3-4

## LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Nutarinas.

Lietuvos Taryba savo posėdyje vasario 16 d. 1918 m. vienu balsu nutarė kreiptis: į Rusijos, Vokietijos ir kitų valstybių vyriausybės šiuo pareiškimu:

Lietuvos Taryba, vienintelė lietuvių tautos atstovybė, remdamos pripažintą tautų apsisprendimo teisę ir lietuvių Vilniaus konferencijos nutarimu rugsėjo mėn. 18-23 d. 1917 metais, skelbia atstatanti nepriklausomą demokratiniais pamatais sutvarkytą Lietuvos valstybę su sostine Vilniuje ir tą valstybę atskirianti nuo visų valstybinių ryšių, kurie yra buvę su kitomis tautomis.

Drauge Lietuvos Taryba pareiškia, kad Lietuvos valstybės pamatus ir jos santykius su kitomis valstybėmis privalo galutinai nustatyti tiek galima graičiau susauktas steigiamasis seimas, demokratiniu būdu visų jos gyventojų išrinktas.

Lietuvos Taryba pranešdama apie tai .....  
vyriausybei, prašo pripažinti nepriklausomą Lietuvos valstybę.

Vilniuje, vasario 16 d. 1918 m.

*(Signatures of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence)*

Facsimile of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence



LITHUANIA, once a vast empire extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea, from the Western Bug to Mozhaik in Muscovy, had lost its political independence in 1795 after partitions engineered by the "Big Three" of that period—Royal Prussia, Imperial Russia and Imperial Austro-Hungary.

The former Lithuanian rule is gratefully remembered by descendants of the former subjects of Lithuania—the Latvians, Estonians, White Ruthenes, Ukrainians, Tatars and Jews—as the period of humane social order, of religious tolerance and of cultural and linguistic autonomy. For the Ukrainians and White Ruthenes, the period of Lithuanian domination and collaboration in State administration as "Lithuania, Ruś and Samagitia" (*Litva, Ruś i Zhomoyt*) was the only period during which these nationalities enjoyed considerable human freedom, impartial and efficient administration under the rule of law and individual security. The real—not geographic—boundary between Europe and Asia, between the Western and Oriental civilization, followed the eastern boundary of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania for decades since 1795. The Lithuanian rule was, to a considerable extent, responsible for the development of distinct Ukrainian and White Ruthene nationalities and types of men.

Following the partitions, the "Big Three" autocracies attempted to eradicate the Eastern European stronghold of enlightened liberalism and democracy, the "Jacobinism" of the inhabitants of the former Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania. Instead of elective officeholders and institutions of self-government, the autocracies imposed the domineering caste of the "obedient servants of the State." Instead of religious tolerance, the autocracies, especially Imperial Russia, attempted to impose the Russian Orthodox religion of Muscovy and decreed a forcible "reunion" of the Uniate Church. Instead of complete linguistic freedom, the Russian language was imposed and all printing in the Lithuanian language was banned for 40 years, 1864-1904. Severe conditions of slavery were imposed on the peasants, and former freemen were forced into serfdom.

The People of Lithuania, together with their former fellow citizens of Latvian, White Ruthene and Ukrainian nationalities, and the Poles, their political partners for several centuries, refused to accept their subjugation. Each generation in Lithuania took up arms against the brutal foreign rule and Oriental ways of life—in 1794, 1812, 1831, 1863-1864 and 1905. Each of these tragic mass upheavals of the freedom-loving people was followed by a series of unspeakably brutal repressions, a number of "Lidičes," forcible mass "re-settlements," mass executions, and mass deportations to Siberia. A semblance of tolerable legal order under the Russian rule existed only during the brief decade from 1905 to 1915.

In 1915, the Muscovites were driven out of Lithuania by the Germans—with Lithuanian manpower participating in both fighting forces, the Russian and the German armies and navies. The German military occupation regime replaced the Russian police-State administration. Masses of people were evacuated to Russia. Other masses were drafted by the Germans for labor in Germany. The country lay in ruins. The Ger-

mans, like the Russians before them, suppressed the Lithuanian language—for a time. All vestiges of local self-administration were completely eliminated. Only relief activities, on a limited and closely restricted scale, were tolerated.

In May 1916 representatives of the nationalities enslaved by Russia appealed to President Woodrow Wilson in the United States. A Congress of the Oppressed Nationalities was held in Switzerland in the same year, attended by a delegation of the Lithuanian Relief Committee. At this Congress the Lithuanians demanded full independence for their country.

After this unpleasant development, the German occupying authorities decided to organize their own representation of the Lithuanians in a *Vertrauensrat* (Confidential Council), subservient to Germany. However, they failed to enlist a single Lithuanian to serve in such a Council.

Meanwhile, on November 5, 1916, Germany and Austro-Hungary proclaimed the reconstitution of a Poland on the territories formerly held by Russia. The German-sponsored State Council of Poland (*Rada Regencyjna*) soon laid claims to Lithuania, and a group of Poles of Vilnius (Vilna, Wilno) also petitioned the Chancellor of Germany, in May 1917, to join all of Lithuania to Poland.

In July 1917 the Lithuanians addressed a memorandum to the Reichskanzler. They opposed Poland's annexationist claims and raised the issue of independence for Lithuania. Ethnographic boundaries were defined in the memorandum, and permission to convoke a conference to discuss political problems was asked.

The military authorities were loathe to permit any elections or political meetings. Without waiting for German permission, the Lithuanians managed to call a conference in Vilnius, attended by five urbanites and sixteen provincial representatives. The German military administration promptly issued a warning that it would not tolerate any clandestine political activities, unless the Lithuanians consented to a union with Germany.

The Organization Committee selected at the secret conference did not want to disrupt all political action and hinted that a collaboration with Germany might be possible. The Committee submitted a list of 264 delegates, representative of all political parties and classes from all of the counties.

On September 18, 1917, the Lithuanian National Conference assembled at Vilnius with 214 delegates in attendance. It sat in session four days. All attempts to communicate with the Lithuanians in Russia and in other Allied countries were blocked by the Germans. However, several observers from neutral countries were admitted to Lithuania.

The Conference, presided over by Dr. Jonas Basanavičius, declared the Lithuanian determination to reconstitute an independent State with a democratic representative form of Government, within ethnographic frontiers. A Constituent Assembly was to be convoked in Vilnius to adopt a State Constitution. In order to escape repression, a paragraph was added to the effect that, in the event Germany should recognize the State of Lithuania and succor its cause at the Peace Con-



ference, Lithuania might enter into close relations with Germany on terms to be subsequently agreed upon in untrammelled negotiations.

To carry out this program, a Council of Lithuania (*Lietuvos Taryba*) of twenty members was elected, to be supplemented by representatives of the national minorities (Jews, Poles and White Ruthenes). Soon the *Taryba* was complemented by Jewish and White Ruthene representatives.

Conferences of Lithuanian Americans and consultative Lithuanian refugees' meetings in Switzerland, Sweden, France and Russia, approved the idea of complete independence for Lithuania, without any political or economic ties with Germany, and advanced demands for the incorporation of Klaipėda-Memel and the Lithuanian section of East Prussia in the projected national State.

Having received approval of the idea of independence, the Council of Lithuania attempted to carry out its program. However, the German authorities did not permit the publication of the decisions of the Vilnius Conference, and sought to convert the Council into an advisory and subservient body.

In December 1917 a Lithuanian delegation was permitted to travel to Berlin. The Germans—the military, the Cabinet and the Reichstag—unanimously insisted that Lithuania enter into a sort of federation with the German Reich, bound by military conventions. Germany's annexationist appetite was much whetted after the bolshevik revolutionists of Russia had broken with the Allied Powers and entered into separate peace negotiations with Germany at Brest Litovsk.

The moment of the German-Soviet peace negotiations was most difficult in Lithuania. The Leftists (Social Democrats and Populists) refused to grant any concessions to Germany. The Rightists (Christian Democratic bloc and Nationalists) likewise realized that Germany's insistence on wringing a promise of Lithuanian collaboration was motivated solely by a desire to strengthen Germany's hand in dealing with Russia. The Council decided to play for time.

After some anxious moments, the Council on February 16, 1918, signed the *Declaration of Independence of Lithuania*.

In view of the considerable loose talk of Lithuania being "a creation of Versailles" (1919) or "the product of Berlin-Moscow," the declaration itself is very interesting (the facsimile is reproduced on the title page hereof).

#### "DECISION."

"The Council of Lithuania in its session held on the 16th day of February, 1918, unanimously decided to communicate to the governments of Russia, Germany and other states the following declaration:

*"The Council of Lithuania, as the only representative of the Lithuanian People, basing itself on the recognized right of nations to self-determination and on the resolution of the Lithuanian Conference held at Vilnius on the 18-23 days of September, 1917, declares the reconstitution of the independent State of Lithuania, ordered on the democratic foundations, with its Capital in Vilnius, and the severance of all ties which had formerly bound this State to any other nations.*

"At the same time, the Council of Lithuania declares that the State foundations of Lithuania and its relations with other States must be finally determined by the Constituent Assembly, elected in a democratic manner by all of its inhabitants and to be convoked as soon as possible.

"Communicating this declaration to the government of....., the Council of Lithuania asks for the recognition of the independent State of Lithuania.

"February 16th, 1918, at Vilnius.

/Signatures/

"Dr. J. Basanavičius, S. Banaitis, M. Biržiška, K. Bizauskas, Pr. Dovydaitis, S. Kairys, P. Klimas, Donatas Malinauskas, Vl. Mironas, S. Narutowicz, Alfonsas Petrulis, K. Šaulys, Dr. J. Šaulys, J. Šernas, J. Smilgevičius, J. Staugaitis, A. Stulginskis, J. Vailokaitis, J. Vileišis."

This declaration marked the end of the Lublin Pact of 1569 (creation of the confederated Commonwealth with Poland), and of the annexations.

The German occupying authorities, particularly Field Marshal Erich von Ludendorff, who was promoting a plan to colonize Lithuania and Latvia with discharged German veterans, refused to countenance the demand for complete independence—based on the enemy's "14 Points" and completely in opposition to Germany's ambitions advanced in the Soviet-German peace negotiations at the time (Brest Litovsk). The declaration was totally suppressed in Lithuania—but, nevertheless, through underground channels it received adequate publicity in Allied and neutral countries.

Soon thereafter, the Council changed its name to "The State Council of Lithuania" (*Lietuvos Valstybės Taryba*). Germany granted a limited "paper recognition" on March 23, 1918, and continued to ignore the Council. After much difficulty, the Council on November 11, 1918—Armistice Day on the Western Front—assumed the functions of a Parliament and constituted the Provisional Government, a coalition Cabinet under Prof. Augustinas Voldemaras.

Then followed the Wars for Independence—against the Russian Reds and Whites, and the mixed German-Russian corps—and the struggle with Poland over the Capital City and District of Vilnius.

Russia recognized the independence of Lithuania by the Peace Pact of July 12, 1920, signed in Moscow at the height of the Russian military successes against Poland. Soon thereafter Lithuania was recognized by Switzerland, Argentina, Mexico, Latvia and Estonia (the latter Baltic States enjoyed a *de jure* recognition, at that time, by 21 States). On September 22, 1921, Lithuania was admitted to membership in the League of Nations, over the opposition of Poland and Rumania. Finally, "the Versailles Powers" granted their *de jure* recognition: the United States of America on July 28, 1922; England, France, Italy and Japan on December 20, 1922. The latter four Powers inserted a condition to the effect that Lithuania was to accept the Versailles Pact's stipulations for the internationalization of the Nemunas River.



# Observance of Lithuania's Independence Day

## 1. LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

*Resolution relative to the observance of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania* (introduced by the Hon. DiDomenico in the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland, adopted on February 14, 1947).

Whereas, on February 16, 1918, a proclamation was issued declaring the independence of the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas, the United States recognized the Government of the Republic of Lithuania on July 28, 1922; and . . .

Whereas, notwithstanding the fact that this Republic has been incorporated into the Soviet Union of Russia, it is fitting that this anniversary day be commemorated; and

Whereas, next Sunday, February 16th, will be the twenty-ninth anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania; therefore

*Be it resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland,* That we, the members of the House of Delegates, hereby join with our fellow members of Lithuanian birth or descent in commemorating the founding of the Republic of Lithuania and express the hope that their motherland may be re-established as an independent Republic in the not distant future and we request that all persons and organizations of the State join in extending sympathy to those who have been deprived of their liberties.

## 2. GUBERNATORIAL PROCLAMATIONS

### Maryland

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND

### GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION "REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY" FEBRUARY 16TH, 1947

WHEREAS, in accordance with Joint Resolution No. 8, of the General Assembly of Maryland, the Governor is authorized to proclaim February 16th of each year as "Republic of Lithuania Day" to commemorate the founding of the Republic of Lithuania; and

WHEREAS, February 16, 1947, will mark the twenty-ninth anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Wm. Preston Lane, Jr., Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim Sunday, February 16, 1947, as

### "REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY"

and request that the flag of the United States be displayed on all Government buildings and urge that our people observe that day by appropriate ceremonies.

The Great Seal of the State of Maryland  
GIVEN Under My Hand And The Great Seal Of The State of Maryland At The City Of Annapolis, On This Seventh Day Of February, In The Year Of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Forty-Seven.

WM. PRESTON LANE, JR.  
Governor

JOHN B. FUNK  
Secretary of State

### Illinois

### PROCLAMATION

The Republic of Lithuania was one of the victims of World War II devastation in Europe. Although this brave little country is now under rule of military dictatorship, hope is in the hearts of thousands of Americans of Lithuanian origin that it will eventually be restored to its former place among the independent nations of the world.

February 16th, 1947, is the 29th Anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, and this anniversary is thus an occasion of importance to Americans of Lithuanian origin in the State of Illinois.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT H. GREEN, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim Sunday, February 16th, of the present year, as

### "REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY"

and commend the observance of the occasion to all interested groups, organizations and individuals.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed thereto.

DONE AT THE CAPITOL, IN THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, THIS TENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FORTY SEVEN, AND OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINTH.

DWIGHT H. GREEN  
Governor

### Pennsylvania

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE  
HARRISBURG

February 11, 1947

The Republic of Lithuania, proclaimed twenty-nine years ago, and crushed under the cruel tragedy of war, still lives in the hopes and aspirations of its courageous people who believe in liberty, justice and human dignity.

Americans of Lithuanian descent will observe February 16, 1947, as

### REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY,

honoring the struggle and sacrifice of Lithuania and commemorating the anniversary of her independence.

This important anniversary should be given widespread recognition in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which numbers among its people more citizens of Lithuanian origin than any other State of the Union. We are proud of their loyalty and devotion to the principles of Americanism. At the same time they retain a love for the homeland of their ancestors and look forward to a new Day of Independence when Lithuania will be restored to her rightful free and independent place among the Nations of the earth.

JAMES DUFF  
Governor



*Massachusetts*

Boston, February 14, 1947.

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I want to commend the Lithuanian Americans for their loyalty and devotion to our country on this 29th anniversary of the independence of their native land—an independence which is temporarily eclipsed.

Lithuanians have always been liberty-loving people. February 16 represents to them what the Fourth of July does for us—freedom. I, therefore, want to extend my sympathy to the Lithuanians, to commend them for the patience and fortitude with which they have borne their heavy burden, and to wish them well in their struggle for a free and independent republic.

I am confident that when the world acknowledges that right is might, Lithuania's plight will be given fair consideration and that she will be granted the freedom she so well deserves.

ROBERT F. BRADFORD  
Governor

*Ohio*

Columbus

PROCLAMATION  
Republic of Lithuania Day  
February 16, 1947

WHEREAS, the Republic of Lithuania was one of the victims of World War II and is now staging a gallant recovery, and,

WHEREAS, the independence of Lithuania is based on firm principles of American foreign policy, that all the peoples in the world shall have the right to elect their own Government and enact their own laws, and,

WHEREAS, the 16th day of February, 1947 is the Twenty-Ninth Anniversary of the establishment of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, and,

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Thomas J. Herbert, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby proclaim the 16th day of February, 1947 to be Republic of Lithuania Day and commend the observance of the occasion to all citizens.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and cause the Great Seal of the State of Ohio to be affixed at Columbus this 10th day of February, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred Forty-seven.

THOMAS J. HERBERT  
Governor

*Connecticut*

Hartford, Conn.  
February 15, 1947

Americans of Lithuanian origin throughout the United States commemorate the 29th Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania on February 16th. This day cannot be celebrated with festive and carefree ceremony with the stamp of brutal war so clearly imprinted with devastation and privation. It should, however, be set aside in tribute to a gallant people and splendid country. . . . Their country, the blood-drenched arena for the warring forces of their more powerful neighbors, the loyal Lithuanians gave their ground but never their spirit. Under the heel of military dictatorship, they neither faltered in their adherence to the principles of representative government nor lost their faith in the future.

All Americans join with the people of Lithuania in the hope that the independence of Lithuania may be restored. . . .

As Governor of Connecticut I call on our people to observe the anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania with appropriate tributes and ceremonies.

JAMES L. MCCONAUGHY  
Governor

### 3. IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

*Senate*

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, (New Hampshire), in the U. S. Senate, February 3, 1947:

Lest we succumb to a false optimism, let's get the picture back into focus. Half of Europe is still cut off from the life of the continent by a picket fence of Soviet bayonets. Three independent republics whose sovereignty is still recognized in Washington—*Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia*—have been swallowed whole by the Russian bear. Friendship for America and advocacy of American ideals are still punished as a high crime in countries which we helped to liberate from Hitlerism.

/The Congressional Record, vol. 93, No. 22, p. 775/

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER, (Maine), in the U. S. Senate on March 5, 1947:

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement dated July 23, 1940, entitled "The Basic Policy Declaration of the Government of the United States" regarding Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; a statement, under date of October 12, 1946, by the Honorable Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, which was the *basis of a statement by myself* at that time; and a further statement by the Honorable Carroll Reece, under date of February 12, 1947, dealing with Lithuania.

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 42, pp. 1743, A906-A907/

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS, (Illinois), in the U. S. Senate on February 17, 1947:

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, February 16, 1947, is the twenty-ninth anniversary of the signing of the declaration of independence by the once proud and prosperous country of Lithuania. For years the anniversary of this event was an occasion for annual celebration not only in Lithuania but throughout many parts of the world.

The tragic betrayal of Poland has been frequently presented, and I have always joined in every protest. The American people have been aroused and have constantly manifested their deep concern over Poland's distressing plight.

On this Lithuanian anniversary we are impelled to lay bare another victim of the same ruthless forces. Lithuania at one time had a population of approximately 3,000,000 people. They had their own language, their own culture and customs, and they were sovereign in spirit and in law. Lithuania was a proud member of the once League of Nations and engaged in treaty making with her neighbors, including Russia.

Today Lithuania is no longer an independent state. She is one of the victims of aggressions of Europe and the vacillating appeasing policy of the United States of America.

Russia in violation of a solemn treaty first took over the governmental affairs of Lithuania in 1940. Later the Germans liberated Lithuania from the Russians by invasion. Subsequently, with our help, the Russians liberated Lithuania from the Germans by invasion. Liberation by both Russia and Germany meant looting, rape, murder, deportation, imprisonment, and fear. The



people of Lithuania saw little or no difference in the liberation by either country. They want no more liberation—they want only liberty.

These thousands of American citizens of Lithuanian descent are asking about our foreign policy. They read and they believed the Atlantic Charter and the text of the United Nations Organization, and they ask that something be done to carry out the high-sounding principles of both declarations. The Atlantic Charter provided in part:

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights in self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Certainly Lithuania falls within the category of nations who have had their sovereign rights in self-government forcibly deprived of them.

The Atlantic Charter was the result of a conference at sea between the British Prime Minister and the President of the United States in August 1941. The world was informed that Russia adhered to the basic principles of the Charter on September 24, 1941.

I would like to review the fateful events between Russia and Lithuania. Russia recognized Lithuania as an independent sovereign state and solemnly agreed and covenanted that it would respect the sovereignty of the Republic of Lithuania. On September 28, 1926, a nonaggression treaty was entered into by the Republic of Lithuania and Soviet Russia. The language of certain articles of said pact is as follows:

ART. 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other.

ART. 3. Each of the two contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party.

ART. 5. Should a conflict arise, and if impossible to liquidate it in a diplomatic way, both contracting parties agree in such case to nominate conciliatory commissions.

This treaty was by its terms to be in effect until December 31, 1945.

On October 10, 1939, Lithuania and Russia entered into a mutual-assistance pact, article 7 of which reads:

The realization of this treaty must not infringe the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of their state, their economic and social systems, military instruments, and altogether the principles of nonintervention of one state in the internal affairs of another state.

Along with this pact, Soviet Russia demanded the right to Russian Army garrisons in Lithuania. Many political observers interpreted this Russian demand as the first step to sovietize Lithuania. On October 31, 1939, Mr. Molotov dismissed these speculations in the following words:

We stand for the conscientious and exact observation of the treaties concluded, on the principle of entire reciprocity, and declare the idle talk about the sovietization of the Baltic States to be profitable only to our common enemies and to all kinds of anti-Soviet provocateurs.

However, in June of 1940, Soviet Russia did occupy Lithuania—deposed its Government, and, under the supervision of the Russian Army, an election was held, with ballots containing only one set of names. The results of these so-called elections were announced in London fully 24 hours before the polls closed in Lithuania. The United States denounced the Soviet occupation and elections as being devious processes and predatory activities to deliberately annihilate the independence of the Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

On June 30, 1940, Mr. Molotov explained the Russian position as follows:

It would be unpardonable if the Soviet Union did not seize this opportunity, which may never recur. The leaders of the Soviet Union have decided to incorporate the Baltic States into the family of Soviet Republics.

The United States has never officially acceded to these Soviet claims. The State Department of the United States has continued to recognize and still recognizes the Lithuanian Minister to the United States. Its position in the matter is that Lithuania should be an independent nation.

Notwithstanding such solemn treaties, it is estimated that at least 200,000 of the people of Lithuania have been put to death, were deported, imprisoned, or are today existing as enforced laborers under the cruel domination of Russia.

In June 1941, Germany invaded Russia.

The Congress of the United States, having passed the Lend-Lease Act to provide munitions and supplies and other military aid to any country whose "defense is determined by the President to be vital to the defense of the United States," the late President dispatched his personal representative, the late Mr. Harry Hopkins, to meet with Generalissimo Stalin in Russia during July 1941. The German Army was moving fast and deep into Russian territory. Russia desperately needed assistance. Mr. Harry Hopkins, representing the President of the United States, promised, and we subsequently sent, tremendous amounts of military aid to help defend Russia, although we were not officially in the war. So far as anyone can learn, not one word was uttered at that meeting about the future liberation of the little country of Lithuania or the other Baltic states that had been so ruthlessly gobbled up by Russia a few months before.

In August 1941 the President and Prime Minister Churchill, meeting in great secrecy at sea, finally announced the laudatory declaration of principles of the Atlantic Charter. Everyone had a right to expect that the beneficiaries of the joint effort of the two great powers would include the little sovereign state of Lithuania, a tragic victim of this war.

In September 1941 Russia was still crying for greater assistance to help her beat back the German attack on Russian soil. Mr. Averell Harriman and Lord Beaverbrook proceeded to meet and confer with Generalissimo Stalin. Again Stalin was demanding tremendous amounts of war supplies from America. Most of his demands were granted and it was announced on September 24, 1941, that Russia, too, adhered to the basic principles of the Atlantic Charter, but, so far as we know, nothing was said about some day freeing these once independent little Baltic states, including Lithuania.

From that time on, supplies began to flow in ever-increasing amounts to aid giant Russia.

In June 1942 Russia was pleading for a second front and more and more supplies. Mr. Molotov, the people's Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, came to Washington to confer with the President, and became the President's guest and conferred with him. On the 11th of June the White House released the following statement:

In the course of the conversations full understanding was reached with regard to the urgent task of creating a second front in Europe in 1942. In addition, the measures for increasing and speeding up the supplies of planes, tanks, and other kinds of war materials from the United States to the Soviet Union were discussed. Also discussed were the fundamental problems of co-operation of the Soviet Union and the United States in safeguarding peace and security to the freedom-loving peoples after the war. Both sides stated with satisfaction the unity of their views on all these questions.

At the conclusion of the visit the President asked Mr. Molotov to inform Mr. Stalin on his behalf that he feels these conversations have been most useful in establishing a basis for fruitful and closer relations between the two Governments in pursuit of the coming objectives of the United Nations.

The next day the mutual-aid or lend-lease agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was announced and in the text of the agreement we find these words:

And whereas the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as signatories of the declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942, have subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration, known as the Atlantic Charter, made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the basic principles of which were adhered to by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on September 24, 1941.

But again, so far as anyone knows, nothing was said about the future liberation of the little Baltic States, including Lithuania.

In December 1943 President Roosevelt made a long trip to Tehran to meet Joe Stalin and continue to conduct our foreign policy personally. Again military plans were laid to relieve the heavy pressure from Russia. Again the continued announcement of agreements on the basis of high principles gave momentum to the growing impression that Stalin and Russia had reformed and that ultimate independence of Poland and the Baltic states



was assured. There were many who felt that there were some secret agreements at the Tehran Conference. The President finally denied these rumors in his report to the Congress on March 5, 1945, following his trip to Yalta, and I quote him:

At Tehran a little over a year ago there were long-range military plans laid by the Chiefs of Staff of the three most powerful nations. Among the civilian leaders at Tehran, however, at that time, there were only exchanges of views and expressions of opinion. No political arrangements were made and none were attempted.

So we see, once more Stalin got what he wanted in the way of help, but nothing was said about the future freedom of Poland or the Baltic states.

Then came the Yalta Conference early in 1945, and this time Joe Stalin and Russia really cashed in. Under lend-lease alone, billions of dollars worth of supplies had already been furnished to Russia, the second front had been opened, and now more plans were made to give Russia more supplies. With our help, the Russian troops had crossed Poland and our air power was reaching out ahead of the American troops to bomb strategic points to aid Russian troops in their advance on Berlin. Once more the declaration of the Conference at Yalta included a solemn affirmation of "faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter," but in the same document they carved up Poland, again to the direct benefit of Russia. In explaining this the President, in his speech to the Congress on March 1, 1945, said:

We met in the Crimea determined to settle this matter of liberated areas and I am happy to confirm to the Congress that we did arrive at a settlement—and incidentally, a unanimous settlement. The three most powerful nations have agreed that the political and economic problems of any area liberated from the Nazi conquest or of any former Nazi satellite are a joint responsibility of all three governments. They will join together during the temporary period of instability after hostilities, to help the people of any liberated area, or of any former satellite state, to solve their own problems through firmly established democratic processes. They will endeavor to see to it that interim governments—the people who carry on the interim governments between the occupation of Germany and the day of true independence—will be as representative as possible of all democratic elements in the population, and that free elections are held as soon as possible thereafter.

And later the President also said:

The new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity will be pledged to holding a free election as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and a secret ballot.

Again, I say this was represented to be a unanimous agreement and a solemn pledge between Russia and our Government. Recently it was reported and outlined in detail to the Members of Congress that our Government has three times since then protested Russia's failure to cooperate in granting free elections in Poland and that they have flagrantly violated their agreement entered into at Yalta. However, again nothing was said at the Yalta Conference about the future freedom and independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic States.

In his report to Congress, however, the President did say:

There were, of course, a number of smaller things I have not time to go into on which joint agreement was had. We hope things will straighten out.

Later we found that one of the smaller things upon which he had no time to report was the secret agreement entered into at Yalta whereby the President agreed that Russia should get the Kurile Islands from Japan. These islands are off northern Japan and were used by the Japanese as a spring board for their attacks on the Aleutian Islands in the recent war. The secret agreement also had reference to Soviet desires regarding Port Arthur and Dairen. More appeasement of Russia and no demonstration of a willingness to follow out the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

At Potsdam the agreements made at Yalta were continued. Again, more appeasement of Russia and no evidence of the slightest inclination to adhere to the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The friends of Lithuania and other little countries continue to ask about our foreign policy. They were informed that Russia had become a member of the United Nations. When these hundreds of thousands of American citizens of Lithuanian and other Baltic descendency ask where they can turn, they are told that they may properly turn to the United Nations Charter, article XIV, which sets forth a provision that might bring them hope:

Subject to the provisions of article XII the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any

situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations, including situations resulting from the violations of provisions of the present Charter, setting forth the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

It will be noted that this states that the General Assembly may recommend these measures, and so some of the members of the Friends of Lithuania addressed an inquiry to Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Her reply follows:

UNITED STATES DELEGATION  
TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS,

December 16, 1946.

Mr. P. J. Zuris

*American Friends of Lithuania,  
Lakewood, Ohio.*

Dear Mr. Zuris: Thank you for your generous words on behalf of the American Friends of Lithuania regarding my position on the question of refugees and displaced persons.

In answer to your request for my comments on the situation in the Baltic States, I am quite willing to express my personal views. It is my opinion that the Soviet Union's primary purpose in maintaining control of these countries is to provide an arsenal for the protection of her own boundaries. As the people in these Baltic countries win Soviet confidence, as the Soviet Union is convinced that they or their allies represent no threat to Soviet security, she will adopt a more friendly attitude toward them. This is a natural reaction among the people of all European nations who live in constant terror of invasion by their neighbors. One possible solution to this problem is to create a fringe of internationalized districts to divide these countries.

I reiterate that the foregoing represents my own thoughts on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

(Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.)

Mr. President, this would clearly indicate that if the American representative to the General Assembly of the United Nations feels that the people of these Baltic countries must win Soviet confidence before the Giant Bear will adopt a more friendly attitude toward them, this is indeed a sad day for Lithuania and all small countries behind Russia's iron curtain.

There was a time when we had much greater influence with a nation like Russia, who understands only brute force and power. That was when the Germans were deep into the lands of Russia. It was when our air power was greater than the combined air power of all the rest of the world. It was when our naval strength was greater than the combined naval strength of all the other countries of the earth. It was when we were geared to the production and prosecution of war. During that time we won our wars throughout the entire earth against the most vicious and highly trained enemies of history. We were successful because all of America was participating. The youth of America, the blood, the flesh, the brain, the brawn of America, the inventive genius, and the creative productive power, all combined for victory under the high ideals of the Atlantic Charter, but the ideals expressed in the Atlantic Charter made little or no advance in the world because the foreign policy of our country was kept within the control of one man, who felt that he alone knew how to bring the arrogant leader of Russia to collaborate honestly. It was written of him at the time:

Mr. Roosevelt, gambling for stakes as enormous as any statesman ever played for, has been betting that the Soviet Union needs peace and is willing to pay for it by collaborating with the west.

He gambled, and from all the evidence apparent now he lost, and humanity lost, and civilization will pay dearly for years to come. The people of Poland, of Lithuania, and the other Baltic States, and millions more behind the iron curtain will pay dearly. The American people realize now that we sent 350,000 boys to their graves, a million men will live on carrying the effects of their wounds and generations to come will carry the burden of a financial debt because of the help we sent to Russia and other countries who claimed that they would adhere to the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The last lend-lease report shows that more than \$11,000,000,000 of supplies were sent to Russia alone. The American people will pay the interest on that \$11,000,000,000 this year, while Russia, up until a few days ago, had refused or declined to discuss any settlement of that obligation.



As we wrestle with such purely domestic problems as balancing our budget, reducing the cost of Government, reducing taxes, paying something on our National debt, we find that \$5,000,000,000 each year must be paid in interest on our National debt and fifty billions of that debt was incurred by sending supplies to these nations who professed to believe in the Atlantic Charter. As we struggle through countless years to come we will pay the obligations incurred in the expenses, past, present, and future, resulting from this war. The tragedy is that representative government and freedom of the people have not been advanced.

This presents a tremendous challenge to our new Secretary of State, Gen. George Marshall, and to his associate, the Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Our Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Mr. Bedell Smith, was Chief of Staff to General Eisenhower. He knows the supplies we sent, the aid we gave, the losses we suffered, to aid Russia, as our forces advanced across France and Germany.

Now they have the responsibility of picking up the broken threads of diplomatic failures, to win for people everywhere who love freedom of worship, freedom of speech and press, freedom of choice and action, the real advancement of the principles of the Atlantic Charter for which so many died, so many suffered, so many worked and prayed.

These men must now have the support of the American people and they must stand steadfast for the American ideals and stop the eternal appeasement of the enemies of the liberties we hold so dear.

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 31, pp. 1122-1124/*

### *Restoration of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Independence—Letter from the Lithuanian-American Council, Inc.*

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the *Record* copy of a letter sent by the Lithuanian-American Council, Inc., of Chicago, Ill., to the Honorable Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State, requesting the Department of State to take proper steps for the restoration of the freedom and independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, whose neutrality has been violated by the Nazi-Soviet conspiracy in aggression.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

*Washington, D. C., March 11, 1947.*

The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,  
Acting Secretary of State,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The Government of the United States, in a statement of July 23, 1940, denounced the crime of aggression against Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia which had been planned and perpetrated in consequence of the Ribbentrop-Molotov deal. That statement left no doubt regarding the identity of the state guilty of predatory activities by devious processes directed against the political independence and territorial integrity of the Baltic States. President Truman, as well as his illustrious predecessor in office, faithfully adhered to the aforesaid policy declaration, regardless of the temptations in the exigencies of war to abandon its stand.

Since July 23, 1940, nothing has happened which would justify the deliberately planned and executed aggression by the powerful Soviet Union against its friendly neighbors. Russia cannot adduce any plausible excuse for continuing its occupation of the Baltic States. She has no security, ethnographic, historic, economic, cultural, or any other grounds of justification. The continuing armed resistance to the Russian terror refutes any pretensions at the alleged self-expression of the indigenous populations in July 1940.

Unfortunately, the United States, the country which more than any other member of the United Nations made the military victory over the Axis Powers possible, has failed to extend a positive or effective help to victims of Soviet aggression. Russian occupation authorities are, in effect, emboldened by the passivity of this country and of the Western Powers in the face of the Soviet attempt to enjoy the fruits of the Nazi-Soviet conspiracy against peace and humanity—even though Russia's former partners have been justly punished by the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg. The Soviets apply the ever harsher methods of op-

pression and annihilation of the indigenous Baltic populations and rob Russia's good Baltic neighbors of their material resources and manpower. Arrests, executions, and mass deportations for slave labor in Russia threaten to destroy the Baltic nations completely.

Under these circumstances, the mere denial of a juridical recognition of annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, when not accompanied by positive action by the United States to back its stand, cannot avert the catastrophe. The longer such a situation is tolerated, the harder will it be to correct the consequences of an international crime.

Wherefore, the Lithuanian-American Council most urgently requests the Government of the United States to demand in an international forum, when occasion arises or presents itself, that all consequences of the Ribbentrop-Molotov division of spoils be nullified and that legal international order be restored in the Baltic countries.

We respectfully submit that one such occasion arises in connection with the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers of the great powers.

Although the problem of restoration of the legal order in the neutral Baltic States is said to be not on the agenda of that conference, the problem will unavoidably arise during the discussion of Germany's frontiers. In delineating the eastern frontier of Germany and in disposing of the claims of several nations to territories which had been Germany's prior to 1939, it is impossible to avoid mentioning the Reich's immediate neighbor, Lithuania.

It is respectfully submitted that the Moscow conference offers an opportunity for the United States delegation to insist that Lithuania be treated as an independent nation whose sovereign rights must be restored, in accordance with the Atlantic Charter which has been subscribed to by all the members of the original United Nations.

At the same time, we express our concern over the plans formulated at the Potsdam conference regarding the disposition of the territories of East Prussia. The Soviet proposal, tentatively approved at Potsdam, to annex Königsberg and the adjacent territory to Russia, if effected, would gravely imperil the security and freedom of the nations lying to the north of that area, and of Lithuania in the first place.

That proposal disregards completely the principles of the Atlantic Charter, President Truman's 12 points, and all historical, ethnographic, security, and economic considerations. No indigenous Russian population had ever been existent in East Prussia. In fact, the northern section of East Prussia, claimed by Russia, has been known for centuries past under the name of Lithuania Minor or Prussian Lithuania, and its official administrative designation during the long period of German domination had been, until recently, Lithuanian district or Lithuanian County. This section of East Prussia still preserves many Lithuanian characteristics in its place names, in the names of the inhabitants, and, to some extent, in their language. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, the Lithuanian-speaking population of that area was numerous enough to elect its representatives to the Prussian Landtag and one deputy to the Reichstag. Königsberg, which lies just below the Lithuanian district, used to be the center of Lithuanian culture. In fact, the four hundredth anniversary of the first printed book in the Lithuanian language is observed this year; the Lithuanian Lutheran Catechism was published at Königsberg on January 8, 1547, for the use of the native population of East Prussia.

Consequently, Lithuania could have a more valid claim to the northern part of East Prussia which Russia claimed at Potsdam.

In the settlement of this problem, serious regard should be paid to historic, ethnographic, economic, and cultural considerations, the wishes of the indigenous inhabitants concerned, and the fundamental human rights. Some territorial adjustments in favor of the immediate neighbors might be justifiable, and some form of international status might be accorded to the port of Königsberg. But in no event should the East Prussian territory be allocated or annexed to Russia, which has assumed a treaty obligation to seek no self-aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

Most important of all, the rights and integrity of small and peaceful countries must be defended and restored. The long-suffering peoples of the neutral Baltic States still await their liberation, and it is our country's moral right and duty to insist on their liberation.

There is no reason why Lithuania and the other two Baltic Republics should be subjected, nearly 2 years after the cessation



of hostilities in Europe, to an unspeakably brutal alien regime maintained by the armed might of one of our former allies.

Furthermore, there is no reason why the legitimate spokesmen for Lithuania—the duly accredited Minister at Washington and the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation—and the respective legitimate spokesmen for Latvia and Estonia, are or should be excluded from presenting in full their views and aspirations before the peace conference on Germany.

We entreat you, Mr. Secretary of State, to give your undivided attention and sympathetic consideration of the views presented herein. We ask you to speak up on behalf of the Government of the United States and to take proper steps for hastening the restoration of freedom and independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, whose neutrality has been brutally violated by the Nazi-Soviet conspiracy in aggression.

Respectfully submitted.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, Inc.,

LEONARD SIMUTIS, *President*.

DR. PIUS GRIGAITIS, *Secretary*.

MICHAEL VAIDYLA, *Treasurer*.

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 47, pp. 2024-5/

Hon. IRVING M. IVES, (New York), in a statement released through Mr. Constantine R. Jurgėla, Director of the Lithuanian American Information Center:

Washington, D. C.

February 14, 1947

The independence and autonomy of small nations are inherent in the terms of the Atlantic Charter. Freedom and self determination for all peoples, moreover, are a part of basic American doctrine.

Naturally Americans everywhere have a deep sympathy for the people of Lithuania. More than this, Americans are determined that the rights of the Baltic states shall be recognized.

Fortunately, by the provisions of the United Nations' charter opportunity is afforded to procure for all peoples the freedom and independence to which they are entitled. In the circumstances, the duty of the United States is clear. Moreover, in the exercise of this duty, the government of the United States will be expressing the overwhelming sentiment of the American people.

IRVING M. IVES

Hon. HERBERT R. O'CONOR speaking in Baltimore on February 15, 1947:

This 1947 nationwide observance of Lithuanian Independence Day takes on special significance, and is of particularly vital importance at the moment, because it will serve to remind America of her pledges to the smaller nations of the world as set down in the Atlantic Charter. Certainly it would seem that the present unhappy situation of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors furnishes an example of the truth of the old saying that nothing is ever settled permanently until it is settled justly.

Friends of Lithuania in this country, (and there are thousands in our own State of Maryland who appreciate the splendid contribution made by Marylanders of Lithuanian birth and descent,) will never feel that the democratic nations of the world have fulfilled their oft announced obligations until Lithuania and other subject states are restored to the full privileges of sovereign independent states.

How many times were we told, in all sincerity, by our leaders and leaders of the United Nations generally, that World War II was being fought for the

broad principles of humanity and of justice to nations and freedom to individuals. No people fought more heroically in that vast struggle, first against enslavement by one despotic nation then against another threat to their national integrity. And no people have less cause for satisfaction with the outcome of this war for justice and humanity than the peoples of Lithuania, of Latvia and of Estonia.

Their homelands are occupied by a conquering army—their people, we are told by reliable authorities, have lost every vestige of national and individual freedom—their leaders are in exile, their economy, their very homes and firesides have been expropriated. No longer do they have the solace of their own language. There is grave danger, it would seem, that under present policies their very birthright of national life will be obliterated through replacement by foreigners in business, on their farms and in every walk of life.

Lithuania and other suffering nations have been caught in the vise of the struggle between freedom and democracy on the one hand and the ideology of the all-powerful state. In such a situation there can be no possible doubt of America's sympathy. May God grant that soon the opportunity may be offered, or created, where insistence can be placed upon the re-establishment of Lithuania and all nations in the same situation as a necessary requisite for any worldwide movement for peace.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, (Maryland), in the Senate, March 18:

It is likely that for some time to come the UN will be asked to consider a tremendous multitude of problems. . . .

There will be debate about Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, about the Polish territories and the Polish people, . . .

. . . Their proper settlement will conduce to the world peace we long for . . .

. . . Can the UN enforce its decrees on Russia so long as the Russians keep 10,000,000 men under arms and a great air force ever at their disposal? . . .

It is as plain as the nose on one's face that the great armed forces of our own country are being maintained principally for possible use against Russia, Britain, France, or China, since Germany and Japan are to be kept disarmed.

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 51, pp. 2264-5/

### House of Representatives

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, (Ohio), speaking in the House on February 17, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians all over this country and throughout the world remember that February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed free and independent. Many tragic things have happened in these nearly 30 years. Our Lithuanian friends want us to be aware at all times of the injustices done them during these years, but at this particular moment Americans of Lithuanian background ask that we turn our attention for a moment to a form of suffering in which we seem to be playing an unfortunate part. They ask that we familiarize ourselves with the problems created by the methods used in our American zone in Germany



for the screening of displaced Lithuanians and other Baltic peoples to determine if they qualify for DP rating with the consequent aid and privileges. They feel justified in asking us to rectify these injustices.

To bring this matter to you I am including in my remarks a letter . . . which gives something of the picture and which I hope you will read. This letter is as follows:

BALTIC DP CAMP, Augsburg, Hochfeld,  
Section 5, USFET Headquarters,  
Frankfurt, January 10, 1947.

On the basis of your permission . . . /*Editor's Note:*  
For the text—see *Lithuanian Bulletin*, vol. V, Nos. 1-2, January-February 1947, p. 32, columns 1-2./  
/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 31, pp. 1159-1160/

Hon. HOWARD H. BUFFETT, (Nebraska), in the House on March 18, 1947:

. . . It is tragic to have to confess that American blood and treasure were used to deliver into communistic tyranny the lands of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Hungary. . . . But it is true.

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 51, p. 2289/

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO, Jr., (Maryland), speaking in Baltimore, Md., on February 16, 1947:

Assembled here this evening is a representative group of Lithuanian-American people who believe that the freedom of small nations shall be retained—nations which, because of their size and location, have been and are now being used as buffer nations for the protection of warring nations.

Today the atomic bomb has indeed made obsolete the whole consideration of the buffer state. For no nation can be used as a protection against another in the atomic age and the only certain guaranty of peace is a general, firm, and fast agreement among the nations to keep the peace—a peace based on the fundamental rights of man.

Knowing the Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know no greater patriotic group of Americans, whether this be the land of their birth or the land of their adoption, who have steadfastly fought for independence.

No man can know a Lithuanian without discovering that a never-dying passion for the independence of his country is eating into his soul.

Out of the depths there comes a cry from this nation which for centuries has been forced to be inarticulate.

It is not a demand for privilege, for territory to which it might have only a historical claim; it is a cry for life, and if we really believe in our own profession, if the traditions of 1776 have not been effaced, if the definition of self-determination with which President Wilson sought to change the evil systems of lust and avarice in Europe and the rest of the world after the First World War, we Americans must listen to this cry from the core of the hearts of the Lithuanians.

We cannot close our ears to it.

It is argued that small nations are not able to develop a sound economy and a decent standard of living within the framework of national independence. A look at Lithuania's record of 20 years of postwar independence will prove the contrary. Lithuania organ-

ized a successful agricultural economy on a sound co-operative basis. Her budget was uniformly balanced. There was no unemployment.

The people are convinced that the restoration of national independence is the only adequate compensation for the suffering of the people and the only sure remedy to raise Lithuania from the ruins left by war and aggression. The Lithuanian people reject the Moscow-made liberations. They demand the termination of the present Soviet domination and they pray for the restoration of their country's independence. Lithuania bases her hopes for a happier future on moral law; she tenaciously clings to the idea that, after all, right and not might alone will rule the destinies of mankind.

I hope the day is not far away when Lithuania and the other smaller nations will find their place in the sun along with the leading nations of the world.

God bless America. God bless Lithuania.

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 40, p. A850/

Hon. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, (Massachusetts), in the House of Representatives, February 20, 1947:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *Record*, I wish to include a resolution passed at a mass meeting of Lithuanians, in my home city of Worcester, Mass., February 16, 1947, at which meeting I had the honor of speaking, as well as a newspaper clipping, which appeared in the *Worcester Telegram*, February 17, 1947.

The people of our country are fast coming to the conclusion that those gallant, but weaker, nations, under the sphere of Soviet influence, are presently the victims of as bold and cynical a diplomatic campaign as any big nation has ever waged against smaller, honorable neighbors.

Quite recently, the Under Secretary of State, appearing before the Senate Atomic Committee, took official notice that the present Soviet foreign policy is "aggressive and expanding."

A short while ago, our State Department declared that the United States Government firmly intends to maintain their interest in the welfare of smaller nations in the world.

Let us hope that this attitude carries the full meaning that practical measures, when necessary, will be undertaken by this Government to insure that the Soviet Nation, in cooperation with the United Nations, will be called upon to meet the full moral and humanitarian responsibility contained in the principle of political independence for all states enunciated in the declaration by United Nations and the Atlantic Charter.

It is evident by the aggressive and expanding present Soviet foreign policy that this principle in practicality is today a hollow mockery.

(Follows the resolution signed by Constantine A. Vasys and Irene C. Kersis.)

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 35, Feb. 21, 1947, pp. A702-3/

Hon. CHARLES A. EATON, (New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House) in a letter to Mr. Constantine R. Jurgela:

February 7, 1947

The ruthless absorption of Free Lithuania under Russian control constitutes one of the most tragic cases



of international injustice in all history, and I sincerely hope in due time the moral sense of the world, expressed through the United Nations Organization, will make restoration of their rightful liberties to the Lithuanian people possible.

CHARLES A. EATON, M.C.

Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, (Pennsylvania), speaking at Pittsburgh, Pa., on February 16, 1947 (in part):

On February 16, 1918, the *Taryba* meeting at Vilnius proclaimed the Lithuanian State to be free and independent.

Today, February 16, 1947, we commemorate—not gaily and festively—no, rather with grave concern, but with hope in our hearts,—the 29th birthday of that proclamation of freedom.

I say not gaily and festively—as a birthday is wont to be celebrated, because today we find that noble and courageous nation again lying stricken under the occupation of an alien power.

I say we commemorate it with hope in our hearts, because we know that through the centuries, through crushing invasion, cruel domination and struggle, her men and women have remained undefeated, bold and staunch and steadfast in their determination to achieve and hold on to independence and democracy.

Lithuania, as early as the 15th century, showed this determination. Her constant struggle to retain that status keeps bright and flourishing in the hearts of her friends the world over, hope for her ultimate success.

As individuals and even as groups, here in America, you may say, "We don't have much power to hold..." But I maintain:

Efforts during war years at home and on the fighting fronts—vigorous and gallant support of war to crush aggressive powers, etc.—in one instance, at least, evinced by the stated aims of the Lithuanian American Council in its call for a national conference to be held at Pittsburgh, early part of September 1943. It stated these aims:

1. To reaffirm the determination of the American citizens of the Lithuanian birth or extraction to support the war effort of the United States in order to speed the victory and the unconditional surrender of the enemy;

2. To discuss ways and means of achieving the war aims of the Western Democracies, especially as they pertain to the future of the smaller nations;

3. To consider the means by which Lithuanian Americans may aid in the liberation of Lithuania from the Nazi yoke, and her restitution as an independent nation;

4. To help Lithuanian refugees and to organize the assistance to Lithuania in the post-war reconstruction.

My friends, you have done much to speed the hour of victory and to earn the hope that is in your hearts today.

There is an old Lithuanian proverb which is to the effect that if one is in a hurry, it is wise to go slowly—patience is required of those who would move slowly and surely forward. But the Lithuanian is eminently fitted for this role in history. Time does not have a great significance if the true ends are eventually served.

We all know that Lithuania will never be content with a half victory—her victory must be complete. She must achieve full liberty. Her dogged determination is reason enough for belief that she will succeed.

From the day when the people of Lithuania first gained their independence and democratic forms of government, the people of the United States have watched with admiration their progress in self-government.

The Government of the United States has a deep and sympathetic interest in her progress. The policy of our Government toward Lithuania and her sister small nations is universally known—as was stated in the policy declaration by the Department of State on July 23, 1940. Our Government, along with Great Britain and forty-three other States, have never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the USSR, through the "elections" of 1940.

Our Government, under policy reaffirmed time after time, is opposed to predatory activities carried on by the use of force—or threat of force. It is opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state—however powerful—in the domestic affairs of any other state—however weak.

These principles constitute the very foundation upon which existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

Lithuania maintains legations and consulates in foreign countries, of which the United States is one.

President Roosevelt said on October 15, 1940, soon after the first Soviet occupation of Lithuania, to a Lithuanian delegation which went to him at Washington: "Lithuania has not lost her independence—it has been temporarily put aside—she will be free again"

President Truman said: "A permanent peace can be secured only through a mutual respect and consideration of the basic principles of justice and right, as they affect all nations—large and small, rich and poor."

In conclusion, I want to say—in keeping with the principles expressed by the outstanding world leaders—the breath of life and enjoyment of liberty, with God's help, will be once again assured to Lithuania.

There is much cause for hope—none for despair.

Hon. IVOR D. FENTON, (Pennsylvania), in the House of Representatives, March 11, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, in compliance with a request, and under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Federated Lithuanian Societies and Clubs of the Borough of Shenandoah, Pa., at a meeting in the Shenandoah High School, March 2, 1947. . . .

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 46, p. A1022/

Hon. AIME J. FORAND, (Rhode Island), in the House of Representatives on February 24, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, distressed by the treatment their fellow countrymen are receiving at the hands of the Russian-dominated Communist regime now in control of the Government of Lithuania, American Lithuanians of Rhode Island gathered at a meeting to commemorate the twenty-ninth anniversary of Lithuania's independence on February 16, 1947, and adopted a resolution which, in my opinion, merits our serious consideration. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this reso-



lution with the urgent request that every Member of Congress read it and give their support to the pleas for relief of this oppressed nation.

Resolution unanimously adopted by the Lithuanians of Providence, R. I., at their mass meeting held at St. Casimir's Parish Hall, on February 16, 1947

Whereas over 20 months passed since the end of hostilities in Europe and Lithuania is still held under the occupation of the Soviet Russian Army;

Whereas the Russian Government has illegally formed in Lithuania a Communist regime, which is forcing upon the people a Soviet system of government, abhorrent and alien to their convictions; and

Whereas the Communist administration, supported by the Russian Army and police, has deprived the Lithuanian people of all their individual and political rights and liberties, is cruelly persecuting them, arresting them, and subjecting them to long terms in prison and deporting them into the Soviet Union, while their properties are being turned over to colonists brought in from Russia: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That this meeting, gathered to commemorate the twenty-ninth anniversary of Lithuania's independence, register an emphatic protest against the illegal, arbitrary, and cruel Soviet conduct in Lithuania; and be it

*Resolved*, That this meeting of Lithuanian Americans of Providence appeals to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to demand, through diplomatic channels and international conferences, that Russia immediately withdraw her armed forces and secret police from Lithuanian territory and permit the Lithuanian people to choose their own government in a free and unfettered election; and further be it

*Resolved*, That this mass meeting appeals to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations at Lake Success, N. Y., through its chairman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, to protect the innocently suffering people of Lithuania from the terror and persecution by the Russians and their henchmen, and draw its attention to the horrible conditions described by the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation in a statement submitted to the United Nations by the Lithuanian Minister in Washington; and finally be it

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Rhode Island and published in the press.

EDWARD CIOCYS,  
Chairman.

B. STRAZNICKAS,  
Secretary.

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 36, p. A737/*

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON, (Pennsylvania), in a letter dated 6 March 1947:

I want to assure you that as a Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I am interested in the problems of the Baltic States.

Hon. BERTRAND W. GEARHART, (California), speaking in the House of Representatives on February 27, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday the American people were . . . gratified . . . to learn from what appeared in the public prints that Russia has gladly conceded the right of America to retain the Pacific islands.

Today we find that generous concession by the Russians was typically in line with their policy toward the United States; in other words, their consent . . . is upon condition. . . .

The plain implication of this is that Russia can keep us in hot water from now on, creating and fomenting trouble for us in the United Nations forever and anon. If this concession, or, rather, condition, is acceded to by the United States, it will mean that we will be constantly called upon to resist proposal upon proposal to . . . modify and change the status of these Pacific islands. This would be intolerable.

To read further from the Times Herald:

"Another /condition/ would pledge the United States to let the 48,000 natives on the island work toward independence as well as toward self government."

So the Russians speak piously of independence for the uncomplaining peoples of the mid-Pacific. Could they possibly have been thinking of the Poles, the Lithuanians, the Latvians, the Estonians, or, perhaps, of the Manchurians or Koreans when they concocted that? Or were they dreaming of the world revolution. . . ."

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 38, p. 1537/*

Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON, (California), in a statement dated January 24, 1947, on the occasion of Lithuanian Independence Day:

Scattering the freedoms of a people is like sowing the teeth of the dragon. The will to liberty and the pursuit of happiness cannot be chained to the arm of a tyrant, but will burst free and mutilate him who attempts to hold them captive. Where the men and women of the Baltic States have trod, liberty has flowered behind with their passage. No surgeon's knife can probe deeply enough to cut away the fundamental urge of man to walk with dignity and in charity to his fellow men.

Courage, fortitude and faith!

DONALD L. JACKSON, M.C.

Hon. MITCHELL JENKINS, (Pennsylvania), in the House of Representatives on February 18, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, when Lithuania won her freedom in 1917 the world had reason to believe that her subjection to Russia was a thing of the past never to be revived. The great rejoicing among Lithuanians in this country and everywhere was unclouded by any fear of a qualification upon the sovereignty of the new nation, surely not so soon as October 10, 1939.

Those who know history know that Lithuania was once the greatest power on the continent of Europe, her might extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea. When she joined with Poland it was not conquest which dictated the union, but a voluntary desire and a freely entered contract which arranged for the marriage between the two great liberty-loving states.

From the middle of the sixteenth century until the Russian conquest Lithuania maintained her individuality, culture, and national idealism. Throughout the period of Russian rule the beacon of freedom was never lost from view, and when freedom did come in 1917 Lithuanians in Russia and in this country greeted it eagerly. To them it meant the resurrection of the great state of Mindaugas, Gediminas, and Vytautas. Subsequently . . . troubles too filled the years of Lithuanian independence, but these were cheerfully borne and remedied. The important fact always was that Lithuania at last was free. She could choose her government and she could regulate her own affairs. Once again Lithuanians breathed the sweet air of political independence.

One of the most remarkable aspects of the period between 1918 and 1939 was the way in which the newly created Baltic states were able to establish themselves and set up independent and workable economics. Among these states Lithuania made a most outstanding record. Not only did she redistribute her agricultural land and set up an excellent agricultural system, but she made notable advances also in textiles and manufacturing generally. Trade and commerce flourished. Banking and currency regulations were enlightened and modern. The constitution worked.

In education Lithuanian institutions after 1917 contrasted sharply with the sketchiness of those under Czarist Russia. Welfare measures were modeled upon those of the Scandinavian countries and Lithuanian law and courts made notable progress. In short, Lithuania was making long strides forward in national independence and growth.

Lithuania, however, had one serious handicap—her geographical location on the borders of both Soviet Russia and Germany.



Thus, when these two powers in 1939 divided eastern Europe into spheres of influence, Lithuania was placed in the Soviet sphere, and in 1939 was forced to yield her national interest and welfare to Russian strategic interests. At first it was believed that occupation by a limited number of troops was all that Russia would require, but disillusionment was not long in coming. In June 1940 Russia sent her military forces and political agents into the country and converted it into a new Soviet Republic—the fourteenth.

As if its ensuing socialization of the principal forms of corporate wealth and property were not enough, there came in June 1941 the occupation of Lithuania by Nazi forces during which time Lithuania was included in the administrative area of Ostland. And on top of all this, as if the country had not already suffered enough, it was "liberated" by Russian forces who fought the Germans and drove them out of the land—but what a land. For 5 years fire and sword had been supplemented with mass transfer of Lithuanians—thousands to the interior of Russia, other thousands sent into forced labor in Germany. The ghastly story of these hardships can never be known in detail. The firing squad, the noose, the whip added their share to the tragedy. Hundreds of thousands perished or were lost. But even that is not the full tale of woe of this heroic country.

Today Russia and her agents are back again. The Lithuanian people and land are once again the fourteenth Soviet republic with Russian members in the cabinet. An iron curtain of press censorship shuts out all news of the national tragedy. Few Americans outside those of Lithuanian origin know this chapter of human suffering. It has been obscured by more dramatic and highly publicized suffering elsewhere.

But, let there be no mistake about where the United States stands. We have never condoned these acts. Sumner Welles said in 1940 that the "devious processes whereunder the political independence of the three small Baltic republics (was) deliberately annihilated" were opposed to our ideas of free government and the right of states, no matter how weak, to handle their own domestic affairs. That was our policy then. That is our policy now. Other Secretaries have said so more recently. We refuse to recognize the predatory destruction of Lithuanian independence as valid. We still regard Lithuania as an independent state. On this anniversary of Lithuanian freedom we look forward to the day when we shall see Lithuania resume her admirable progress in self-government.

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 32, pp. A625-626/*

Hon. MITCHELL JENKINS, of Pennsylvania, on February 26, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the Lithuanian Alliance of America, district 7, Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties, Pa.:

Whereas representatives of democratic nations will meet delegates of Soviet Russia at Moscow in March 1947 to discuss peace terms for the world; and

Whereas the Secretary of State, Gen. George Marshall, will represent the United States of America at this conference; and

Whereas as an exponent of democracy, we beseech the United States representatives to espouse the cause of freedom of all nations, large and small; and

Whereas the United States, Great Britain, and Russia gave to the world the Atlantic Charter but have failed to carry out the principles embodied herein: Therefore

We pray that the democratic representatives take up the cause of enslaved nations, the Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; that they demand and cause the removal of foreign armies from their soil; that persecution of their peoples cease; exile and enslavement be stopped and full independence be restored to these countries: Therefore be it

*Resolved and it is hereby resolved,* That this resolution be adopted and copies sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Committees of Foreign Affairs, United States Senators from Pennsylvania, and to the Congressman from Luzerne County, Pa.

Signed this 23rd day of February 1947.

MICHAEL KROPSNIC,  
President.  
JOSEPH MACEINA,  
Secretary.

Wilkes Barre, Pa.

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 37, p. A789/*

Hon. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY, (New York), in the House on March 6, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Committee of Amsterdam Lithuanian Organizations assembled at their mass meeting held at the American Lithuanian Hall in the City of Amsterdam, N. Y., on February 23, 1947:

*/signed by B. H. KROUP, Chairman,  
and ANNE BILLIS, Secretary./*

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 43, p. A935. The text is similar to the resolution inserted by Hon. AIME J. FORAND, supra./*

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, (New York), in the House of Representatives on February 24, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include below a copy of a resolution which I am today sending to the Secretary of State with the request that he advise what action is taken as the result of this protest. Free elections should be the right and heritage of a free people.

The resolution follows:

*(The text is similar to the resolution inserted by Hon. AIME J. FORAND, supra.)*

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 36, p. 738./*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, (Massachusetts), in the House of Representatives on February 19, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein my remarks before a Lithuanian group in Lyra Hall, Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, February 16, 1947:

This day—February 16—is dear to the hearts of all Lithuanians.

Twenty-nine years ago was the day when Lithuanian independence was proclaimed. One hundred and fifty years of suffering under a hostile, foreign rule were over. Lithuania stood forth as an independent and democratic republic.

We Americans rejoiced on that day. We looked forward confidently to her future. We knew that with this incentive, her ancient culture would flower again and develop in ways that would bring honor to Lithuania and contribute to the civilization of the world.

But on this February 16, in the year 1947, we meet to observe an independence which has been lost.

The bright star of her freedom has been clouded over by the storm of tyranny which has been sweeping the world.

Caught like other small nations between two powerful and ruthless enemies, she has been swallowed up by the victor.

As a sovereign nation, Lithuania has ceased to exist. And in that tragic event, is a lesson for the freedom-hungry peoples of this earth. Free nations must stand together, helping one another, or go down separately. Tyranny always waits in ambush for that unguarded moment when democracies are slow to awake to their peril and then it strikes. And for the sin of complacency, free men must die by the millions. They must expend billions in treasure which took years of patient effort to build up. In saving freedom for some countries, they must watch it destroyed in others, helpless to do otherwise.

We in the United States must bear some responsibility for this sin of complacency. During the years preceding 1939, when we might have joined with other peace-loving nations to build up a system of world law to outlaw aggression, we stood idly by. We tried to excuse ourselves by saying that what happened in Europe or elsewhere was no concern of ours.

But what a price we had to pay to learn the facts of life. Over a quarter of a million of our young men crucified by our neglect, a million more crippled for life, and a debt of over \$260,000,000,000 to burden us and our descendants for generations to come.

All this and more we paid to learn that no nation can live in selfish isolation. Because we shut our eyes to the storm warnings of the 1930's, we had to fight for our national existence. We survived, but sister democracies like Lithuania were crushed.

Today America is the last true democracy on earth. This



coming year we will spend to maintain our armed forces alone the staggering sum of \$11,000,000,000, a sum greater than the total cost of the Federal Government before the war.

We must spend, and go on spending, until we and other nations build a system of world security which will save all nations from the fate which befell Lithuania.

What we could have done with ease before, we must now do the hard way, because of our forgetfulness.

As friends of Lithuania, we come not to mourn her passing as a nation, though it grieves us to see her present enslavement. For, looking back through her history, we find grounds for believing that she will win her independence again. In the words of her ancient motto: "Be what may, Lithuania will always stay."

This is not the first time that she has been conquered by giant neighbors. Yet, even during centuries of oppression, she never lost sight of her goal. Deep in the heart of every Lithuanian, is that passion for liberty which never dies. Sooner or later the material power of aggression weakens. It cannot forever enslave people who are determined to be free.

A dozen times through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can wait out the temporary triumphs of gangster nations. The Christian faith which, in 1399, hurled back the invasion of the Tartars, and saved all of Europe from barbarism, is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship and win through to the inevitable victory of right over might.

All over the world Lithuanians are gathering to renew their vows to work for the independence of their homeland. Nourishing themselves with the remembrance of her proud and valiant past, they draw new strength to face the job ahead.

The robes of her nationhood are gone, but in time they can and will be replaced and then Lithuania will be numbered with the honored peoples who consistently fought for and won through to the goal of peace on earth, good will toward men.

In the meantime, the mind and heart and spirit of Lithuania live on. Through observances such as these, you keep the faith. You are proud of your religion, your language, and your culture, as you have every reason to be. I say to you, Keep them alive and flourishing in this God-given land of ours whose greatest wealth is what you and other peoples bring to it. Your ardent faith in and support of the cause of Lithuanian independence is also needed here in the United States. For it is giving to our democracy a vitality which will enable us to conquer whatever trials may lie ahead.

In your churches, your homes, and societies, do honor to the cherished customs and traditions of that land on the shores of the Baltic. To the youngsters in your homes, tell the stories of Lithuania's greatness, so that they may carry with them this priceless heritage for their own enrichment and that of mankind.

Take confidence this day in the knowledge that millions of your fellow Americans join with you in heart's desire for the liberation of your homeland.

In the past we have slept on our responsibilities. From now on we must be vigilant.

With this spirit I am confident that we shall meet on some other February the 16th to honor in fact as well as in faith the goal of Lithuanian independence, complete and secure for the rest of time.

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 33, p. A653/*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, (Massachusetts), on February 26, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the resolution that I have received from Mr. Matthew M. Stakionis, secretary, Lawrence Chapter of Lithuanian American Council, 29 Monmouth Street, Lawrence, Mass:

Resolution unanimously adopted by Lithuanian fraternal societies and cultural organizations which constitute the Lawrence Chapter of the Lithuanian-American Council, at their mass meeting held at the Lyra Hall, on February 16, 1947....

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 37, p. A786. The text is similar to the resolution inserted by Hon. AIME J. FORAND, supra./*

Hon. HENRY J. LATHAM, (New York), in the House of Representatives on March 11, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *Record*, I wish to include the following resolutions of the Lithuanian Council of Societies, meeting

on February 16, 1947, for the observance of the Bill of Rights Week and Lithuanian Independence Day:

Citizens of the city of New York, gathered under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council of Societies at Webster Hall on the 16th day of February 1947 for the observance of the Bill of Rights Week and Lithuanian Independence Day, after due deliberation on the international situation prevailing in Europe after the military victory, take note of the following:

"The Atlantic Charter and four freedoms held out the promise of freedom, happiness, and justice to the peoples of Nazi-enslaved Europe. This promise was eagerly accepted as a binding contract by the enslaved peoples. Anti-Nazi resistance movements were formed and the instructions of the radio voice of America were scrupulously followed and carried out by the underground, including the exceptionally well coordinated Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation.

"These principles were written into the initial declaration by United Nations of January 1942. Several declarations to liberated European peoples made jointly by the heads of state of the Big Three Powers seemed to carry out these promises.

"Following the military victory, however, the Asiatic peoples of the Philippines, India, Indonesia, Burma, Indochina, Syria, Lebanon, and Korea are the only beneficiaries of the Atlantic Charter which was originally intended for European peoples. The "liberated" peoples of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, and the Ukraine are, in fact, subjected to an enslavement which is more brutal than their former enslavement by Nazi Germany. The peoples of the Baltic States are subjected to systematic mass extermination and deportations of the indigenous Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian populations.

"At the same time, masses of political refugees from the Baltic States and Poland are subjected to a regime of moral and physical terror and oppression at the hands of the UNRRA with the assistance of the American occupation forces which are left unguided in consequence of the uncertainty, wavering, and continual confusion created by conflicting directives.

"While Russian and Russian-satellite delegates to United Nations debate and deride human rights, the victorious democracies lack the courage to look squarely at the facts and to demand the restoration of freedom to the Baltic peoples. Of all the war-ravaged countries, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were and are alone denied any and all relief and rehabilitation assistance by UNRRA which is paid for by the people of the United States. The principles of justice and the Atlantic Charter are absent from the so-called peace treaties dictated by Russia.

"Lithuania, the immediate neighbor of Germany, and Latvia and Estonia, likewise vitally interested in the settlement of peace for Germany, were thus far excluded from the preliminary negotiations regarding the peace treaty for Germany. The forthcoming Conference on Germany similarly excludes any and all representation for the Baltic peoples, although both the Democratic administration and the Republican Party are committed to the defense of the restoration of the political sovereignty and freedom for the Baltic States.

"Wherefore, we demand:

"That the President and the Secretary of State guide the foreign policy of this country back to the principles of justice and the Atlantic Charter;

"That the Moscow conference be limited to preliminary discussions with no commitments binding the United States;

"That the American delegation to Moscow and to all other international conferences affecting German settlement include Lithuanian American experts;

"That the United States demand forthwith the withdrawal of the Russian occupation armies, NKVD-MVD terrorist police and communist party forces from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and lend assistance to the peoples of the Baltic States, if requested by the accredited legitimate diplomatic agents of those countries, in restoring the political sovereignty and interim regimes of those countries.

"Finally, taking note of the 1-day hunger strike by Baltic political refugees on the opening day of the Moscow Conference on March 10, 1947, in order to remind the hardened consciences of today's masters of the world of their grave moral responsibility, we ask the United States Senate

"(a) to deny ratification of the Russian-dictated oppressive peace treaties signed in Paris on February 10, 1947, and

"(b) to refuse to join the proposed International Refugee Organization which embodies oppressive constitutional provisions. Baltic and Polish refugee communities are fully qualified to administer their affairs without the aid of any intermediary



agency infested with the agents of the Russian NKVD-MVD, and the aid by the American army of occupation may be rendered directly to the refugee communities.

"LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF SOCIETIES,

"STEPHEN BREDES, JR., *Chairman*.

"MARY M. KIZIS, *Secretary*."

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 47, p. A1046/*

Hon. WALTER A. LYNCH, (New York), on March 4, 1947:

PETITIONS, Etc.: 162. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Lithuanian American Council of Societies of New York, adopted by such societies during the Bill of Rights Week and Lithuanian Independence Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 41, p. 1735/*

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN, (Indiana), in the House of Representatives on February 28, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have called the attention of Congress to the unfortunate situation involving self-government for small European countries.

The people of Lithuanian descent in the great Calumet region of Indiana, along with the Americans who are familiar with the true situation, are justly protesting the present domination of Lithuania by outside influences. The principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" which were the great incentive for our fighting men are denied the people of Lithuania.

I wish to incorporate in my remarks a letter received from Albert G. Vinick and George M. Dubickas, chairman and secretary of the American Lithuanian Council of Lake County, which further elaborates upon the present position of that unfortunate country. Our Government should act through the United Nations Organization to rectify this injustice.

(The text is similar to the resolution incorporated by the Hon. HENRY J. LATHAM).

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 39, pp. A833-834/*

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, (Massachusetts), in a letter to Mr. Joseph Boley, National President of the Knights of Lithuania, Inc.:

Dear Mr. Boley:

I desire to acknowledge the receipt of your recent communication, the Resolutions adopted, and I am immediately conveying them to the Secretary of State for his information and attention. I am sure you are aware of the position I have consistently taken in support of the right of the people of Lithuania to possess their freedom, and to have the government of their own free choice. As you know, our government has never recognized the conquest of brave Lithuania by the Soviet Union, Communistic Russia. I am glad to receive your communication so that I can convey to you my position, which I assume you knew, as I have stated it publicly on a number of occasions, and a position I shall adhere to, that the people of Lithuania are entitled to their freedom again, and to determine for themselves, free from outside influence, the form of government they desire.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Hon. KARL MUNDT, (South Dakota), in a letter to Constantine R. Jurgela, Esq., for release on February 16, 1947:

On the occasion of the observance of the Lithuanian Independence Day on February 16th, I want to send you my greetings and encouragement in the work which you are undertaking.

Great numbers of freedom loving countries now being caught in the network of totalitarian philosophies of government are losing all the privileges which men have a right to expect in a free society. In many of these small nations, of which Lithuania is one, the dignity of man is being violated flagrantly. This suppression of individual freedom is a *crime against humanity* and it is the duty of all of us to help retrieve the golden chalice of liberty for those from whom it has been so ruthlessly snatched.

With every good wish, I am

Cordially yours,

KARL MUNDT, M.C.

Hon. ROBERT NODAR, Jr., (New York), in the House of Representatives on February 26, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *Record*, I include the following speech by Representative JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio, at the Labor Lyceum, Brooklyn, N. Y., on Lithuania Independence Day, February 16, 1947.

*/Printed below—The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 37, pp. A780-781/*

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, (Wisconsin), spoke extemporaneously at the Lithuanian Independence Day observance at Webster Hall, New York City, on February 16, 1947, and at the observance of the Lithuanian and Estonian Independence Days by the Scandinavian American Society at Washington, D.C., on February 22, 1947.

Hon. DONALD L. O'TOOLE, (New York), in the House on February 21, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *Record*, I include the following address by Hon. JAMES A. FARLEY, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the luncheon opening the 1947 campaign of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc., the Astor Gallery of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y., January 24, 1947:

We are gathered here today to open the 1947 campaign of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America. This organization, which, in the past, received most of its funds from the National War Fund, now embarks under its own power in search of aid from friends sympathetic to its cause.

This cause is not new or unusual. The aftermath of war has left millions of innocent war stricken men, women and children impoverished and unable to help themselves. Among them, and in great numbers, are the Lithuanians in Europe.

For centuries, this nation waged many battles for its freedom and heroically resisted all foreign attempts of occupation and oppression. It fought and defeated the Teutonic Knights. It resisted all attempts of denationalization by the Russians during their 120 years of occupation of Lithuania. Finally, the end of the first World War saw the return of complete independence to Lithuania and for 22 years it firmly established itself in the family of nations. It proved without doubt that Lithuanians, as free men, under a democratic system of government, rightfully deserved their hard-earned freedom.

The Second World War inflicted furious and unsparing havoc on this small nation. In proportion, it was one of the most afflicted. It suffered carnage of its population, destruction of its land and property and, worst of all, foreign military occupation.

A large percentage of its population was deported to slavery in strange and unfriendly lands. Others, seeking fundamental freedoms and human rights, left their homeland, and sought temporary refuge where they could.

To aid all these distressed Lithuanians is the chief aim of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America. During the



past 3 years, this humanitarian agency extended all the relief and aid it could summon and assemble. It drew upon the generosity of the American people with vigor and appeal and when distribution was made abroad it was always done in the name of the American people who so generously responded.

Want knows no religious, racial or physical boundaries. Under similar conditions, it affects all in equal degree and manner. Lithuanians in Europe share this common fate, a common fate of general want, of despair and uncertainty.

It is generally recognized and accepted that the people of Europe, and especially the refugees and the displaced persons, still need aid. To this end, international and voluntary relief agencies have worked unceasingly with force and sacrifice. However, international relief organizations alone cannot successfully meet this great and complex problem. Voluntary agencies, therefore, have been invited into this field to supply not only supplementary requirements and services, but also to provide the items of aid not coming within the scope of international bodies.

We are fully aware that lack of all things material is prevalent throughout Europe. This lack is all the more acute among the displaced persons. And what is most deplorable is the fact that these poor unfortunates have to depend on others for their food, clothing and medical supplies. None of these essentials are available to them in adequate amounts. They can only share in what we Americans can and do spare.

The plight of the Lithuanians, suffering the terrible consequences of the war, deserves the attention, the sympathetic understanding and support of every charity-minded American. Without this support, there is no other hope for their survival.

If, however, they do receive the help which the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America has obligated itself to provide them during 1947, their faith in true democracy will be further strengthened. The realization of this fact, too, shall bring them solace and consolation in their misery and want.

But material aid alone is not sufficient. The Lithuanian refugees, like the homeless of other countries who cannot return to their native lands, are seeking refuge in free lands of opportunity. They are sick to death of dependence upon others. They languish only in the hope of again living in freedom and self-sustenance. Let us not "close or narrow our gates" to them. They, like their relatives and friends here before them, will prove themselves worthy of our rich American heritage and prosperity, and become useful and valuable Americans.

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 35, p. A692/

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, (Mass.), in the House on March 18, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, if the United States is to assume responsibility for putting down communism and establishing stable, free governments throughout the world, we should at this time recognize and carefully weigh the implications of such a policy. . . .

This policy does not consider the tragic plight of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Finland, and other small nations, already by agreement heartlessly consigned to Communist domination as an accomplished fact, to which *the American people will never accede*. Nor does it alter our traditional practice of relieving hunger and starvation wherever we reasonably can.

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 51, p. A 1154/

Hon. LANSDALE G. SASSCER, (Maryland), in the House of Representatives on February 18, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the *Record* the attached resolution of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore.

I hope that our Government will wholeheartedly support the principles and objectives of this resolution, and that we will not only continue to recognize the sovereignty of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia but that we shall exert our effort and influence to the reestablishment of these Republics.

The resolution follows:

Resolution unanimously adopted at the twenty-ninth observance of the "Republic of Lithuania Independence Day," also State

of Maryland Governor's Proclamation held under the auspices of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore on February 16, 1947

Whereas the oppressed people of Lithuania are unable to express their grievances, defend their rights and voice their view in protest against the incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and

Whereas we, as citizens of the United States of America, are deeply concerned with the destiny of Lithuania and especially her right to be recognized as a free and independent nation: Now, therefore, be it and it is hereby

*Resolved*, That we urgently appeal to the Government of the United States for fulfillment of its policy declarations and in particular the following:

1. To continue to recognize the sovereignty of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;
2. To protect and assist Lithuanian refugees in Europe;
3. To insist that free and unfettered elections be held in Lithuania;
4. To adhere to the twelve points, as expressed by President Truman;
5. That Russia immediately withdraw her armed forces and secret police from Lithuanian territory.

ANTHONY J. MICEIKA,  
President.

VERA MIKUSAUCKAS,  
Secretary.

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 32, Feb. 18, 1947, p. A632/

Note: Also inserted in the *Record* at p. A628 by Hon. THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO, JR., of Maryland, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the U. S. Senate by Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland,—The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 40, p. 1756.

Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER, (Michigan), in the House on March 17, 1947:

If the new proposals (of President Truman) included a clearcut diplomatic break with Russia, an embargo on shipments to and from Sovietland, new demands that the Russians get out of Korea, China, Rumania, Bulgaria, Turkey, Finland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland and Greece, the American people then could debate the issue in all its clarity. But Truman's recommendations represent an oblique policy, that is neither clear nor decisive.

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 50, A1138/

Hon. FREDERICK C. SMITH, (Ohio), in the House on March 18, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, . . . I include the following speech which I broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System last Friday evening (March 14):

. . . The only thing we can be sure was accomplished in the last war was the creation of more communism than had theretofore existed. Your sons and daughters suffered and died in the last war to completely communize Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Finland, Poland. . . .

. . . It comes with poor grace now for the New Deal to set itself up as protector of liberty.

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 51, pp. A1173-4/

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, (Wisconsin), in the House on March 11, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Magazine of March 10 contains a most provocative article by the editor, Mr. Morris H. Rubin, which commands the serious and thoughtful consideration of every Member of this House. I include it as a part of my remarks:

*The Blind Leading The Broke . . .* It is vital for America, and for all small "d" democrats everywhere, to check Soviet expansion if we are to prevent the spread of the very totalitarianism we thought we had defeated in Germany. The Kremlin has a habit of pouting whenever anyone in this country refers to the



Soviet Union as an aggressive, expansionist power, but the official facts can't be sneered away.

As a result of World War II, the Soviets have acquired eastern Poland, Lithuania, eastern Finland, Latvia, Bessarabia, and Bukovina, Estonia, southern Sakhalin, Carpatho-Ukraine, East Prussia, and the Kurile Islands—more than 200,000 square miles of territory inhabited by 25,000,000 persons—and has established political sway over Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Finland, and Czechoslovakia, not to mention the Soviet-occupied areas of Germany, Austria, Korea, and, unofficially, China and Manchuria.

It is this Soviet imperialism that must be stopped. . . .  
/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 46, pp. A1017-8/

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, (Wisconsin), in the House on February 17, 1947:

Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding international authorities on United States foreign policies is John Foster Dulles, of New York City. He recently spoke to the Inland Daily Press Association in the city of Chicago. It was my privilege to have read his address before it was given, and it is my opinion that Mr. Dulles has made an important contribution to our thinking on this subject which is extremely helpful at this time. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including herewith his address in full:

. . . The four foreign policies I have described reflect the practical idealism of America. They are idealistic because inspired by a desire to promote justice, as we see it, and to preserve human liberty. They are practical because they recognize that our own freedom would be imperiled if there was only wind and water between us and militant dictatorship.

No doubt our Nation has at times been hypocritical. Some of our external exploits were ignoble. Some of our trade policies lacked enlightenment. We have not fully realized at home the human freedom and political equality of which we talk abroad. We have no call to be vainglorious. But we can humbly recognize that our foreign policies in their broad lines have reflected a great faith and a great tradition. As such, they are neither partisan nor sectarian. Republicans and Democrats, residents of seaboard and of interior, have joined together to make those policies and, when necessary, to write them with their blood—and that is the most indelible of all writings.

Today these policies face a serious challenge from the Soviet Union. The professed social goals of Soviet communism are not unlike our own; but Marxian communism is atheistic in conception and materialistic in its view of man. It does not admit of a Creator who establishes eternal principles of right and justice or who endows His creatures with inalienable rights. It denies the sacredness of the human personality and would force human beings into spiritual strait-jackets.

Those Soviet beliefs generate a will which is being projected into the world. Soviet Communists have long taught that their goals can be achieved only if, as Marshal Stalin put it, "the capitalistic encirclement is liquidated," and only if free societies give way everywhere to "the dictatorship of the proletariat."

. . . The military position of Russia, as the great land power next to Germany and Japan, gave Soviet leadership unique opportunities to bargain. With the

tacit consent or explicit approval of Hitler, part of Finland, all of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and large portions of Poland and Rumania were, in 1940, incorporated into the Soviet Union. That was the price of Soviet neutrality while Hitler was attacking in the West. When Hitler turned west to attack Russia, that made Russia an ally of Britain and soon of the United States. It was vital that the war unity of these three should be preserved and Soviet leadership relied on that to bargain at Teheran and Yalta. As a result, Soviet land power was further extended in Europe and in the Pacific. . . .

. . . Formerly Europe could have its wars without involving us. Now American blood, shed in two European wars, gives us the moral right to speak. . . .

We should begin to use the United Nations to mobilize world opinion against international injustice. Article 14 of the Charter was intended to make it possible to relieve injustices like those occurring in Poland. At the last assembly that article was invoked by India, with Soviet backing, in relation to discrimination against Indians in the Union of South Africa. The Soviet Union also proposed that the United Nations should call conferences of non-self-governing peoples, such as those of Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam, to promote their aspirations. It may be that *the time has come for the United States to ask the Assembly to concern itself with areas in Europe where purges and discrimination go on despite international pledges, and where aspirations for self-government are suppressed.*

Through such invigoration of our historic policies we can readily assume a leadership which will make us safe. We have the ideals, we have the "know-how," and we have the power. We should put all three to work in harness.

. . . During the Second World War, President Roosevelt with Prime Minister Churchill, proclaimed, as the Atlantic Charter, great goals of victory. Again, they reflected the traditional faith of America. The United Nations all endorsed them and, a second time, men died that those ideals might live. Now there is danger that the peace will reflect, not the high ideals of the Atlantic Charter, but the secret deals of Teheran and Yalta. . . .

/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 31, pp. A599-A601/

Hon. RICHARD B. VAIL, (Illinois), in the House on February 17, 1947:

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (MR. VAIL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### *Russia and the Baltic Provinces*

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Declaration of January 1, 1942, incorporating the principles of the Atlantic Charter, set forth the aims and purposes of World War II in the following words:

Complete victory over our enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in our own lands as well as in other lands.

The Atlantic Charter states:

Article I:

Our countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Article II:

We desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Article III:

We respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of gov-



ernment under which they will live; and we wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

#### Article VI:

After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, we hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

The foregoing are the principles for which we expended and still are spending billions of dollars; for which we drafted and dispatched to all fronts over 11,000,000 men and women; for which we suffered over 1,000,000 casualties, and lost over 300,000 lives.

True, we destroyed Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo. But was our lofty aim achieved? We fought and bled against aggression and tyranny—for liberty and independence for all nations, for human rights and justice in our own land as well as in other lands. Have we attained that? We have defeated three aggressors but we have not defeated aggression and tyranny. Acts of aggression and tyranny have been and are being committed and practiced by our ally and a signatory of the United Nations Declaration and Charter—Soviet Russia. A most flagrant violation of treaties and human rights was committed by Russia in the act of aggression against Lithuania and the other two Baltic States. This act was condemned by the Lithuanian Nation and by our Department of State on July 23, 1940. The statement of the State Department reads as follows:

During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors have been rapidly drawing to a conclusion. \* \* \*

The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by threat of force. \* \* \* They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any sovereign state, however weak. The United States will continue to stand by these principles.

*This statement, it goes without saying, is in complete accord with the stand of the people of the United States. In conformity therewith we have not recognized and do not recognize the illegal and usurpatory acts of Russia in the Baltic States. But is that enough? Not if we are to effectuate our high objectives. Our President and Secretary of State should state plainly and unequivocally that Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are victims of aggression and injustice, and that these acts are incompatible with the war aims and pledges, and contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter, and that the United States will not approve nor justify the act which is now legally—by the Nuernberg Court decision—determined as "the supreme international crime."*

Lithuania was a progressive and peace-loving country until Hitler and Stalin decided in 1939 to dismember and enslave her in violation of international treaties, agreements, and assurances. The Lithuanian-Soviet Russian Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920, explicitly provided that Soviet Russia recognize a free and independent Lithuania within its ethnographic boundaries, and renounced for all time sovereign rights over the Lithuanian people and their territory.

The Lithuanian-Soviet nonaggression pact of September 28, 1926, provided that both countries mutually undertake "to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other." Each of the two contracting parties agreed to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party. Lithuania fulfilled the terms of the treaty implicitly—Soviet Russia violated it by invading and occupying Lithuania in June of 1940, and still holds and rules it with tyrannical brutality.

*The case of Lithuania is identical with that of Austria and Czechoslovakia under Hitler Germany's occupation and regime. The mode of occupation and hegemony corresponds in every detail.*

*Austria was the first victim of Hitler's aggression; Lithuania is the first victim of Stalin's aggression. Austria's independence is being restored, Lithuania's independence is undetermined. Why so? Crime is a crime regardless of by whom it is committed.*

The aggression against Austria and Czechoslovakia was described by the Nuernberg tribunal as "a premeditated aggressive step in furthering the plan to wage aggressive wars against other countries." *The act of Russia versus Lithuania is identical*

*with that of Germany versus Austria and Czechoslovakia with the exception that, in addition to violation of international treaties, agreements, and assurances, there was a conspiracy made by and between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia on August 23 and September 29, 1939. The texts of those agreements read thusly:*

1. In the case of a politico-territorial change in the territories belonging to the Baltic States—Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—the northern frontier of Lithuania shall form also the demarcation of the spheres of interest between Germany and the USSR.

For the German Government, J. Ribbentrop.

On behalf of the Government of the USSR, V. Molotov.

Moscow, 23 August 1939.

Second additional secret protocol.

Point 1 of the secret additional protocol, signed on August 23, 1939, is hereby modified to the effect that the territory of the Lithuanian State becomes part of the sphere of interest of the USSR while the Province of Lublin and parts of the Province of Warsaw become part of the sphere of interest of Germany. As soon as the Government of the USSR takes special measures on Lithuanian territory for the purpose of safeguarding its interests, the present German-Lithuanian frontier shall be rectified for the purpose of a natural and simple delimitation of the frontier by giving to Germany the Lithuanian territory southwest of the line drawn on the appended map.

Moscow, September 28, 1939.

For the German Government, J. Ribbentrop.

On behalf of the Government of the USSR, V. Molotov.

*Let us rest the criminal case here.*

Now, I deem it appropriate to call your attention, gentlemen, to the fact that yesterday, Sunday, February 16, was the anniversary of the independence day of Lithuania, and that today Americans of Lithuanian descent are commemorating that day throughout the United States. Lithuanians in Lithuania, however, will not be privileged to celebrate their "Fourth of July." Such a celebration in Lithuania would mean arrest, imprisonment, and deportation to Siberia or some other remote place in Russia. It is alleged that over 300,000 Lithuanians have already been deported to Soviet Russia. A large number of the deportees have already died in exile because of malnutrition, exposure, and subjection to slave labor. About 100,000 Lithuanians were forced to flee from Lithuania into western Europe—about 40,000 of them are in the American zone in Germany. They dare not return to their homeland because of the foreign occupation and tyranny there.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this the thing we fought for? Can you or I, or anyone else, call it freedom and the assurance of dwelling in safety and freedom, as provided by the Atlantic Charter, within their own boundaries? Or can you call it the promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all human persons and nations, large and small, as provided in the United Nations Charter? *It is a mockery of the first degree. It is a blot upon Christian civilization and the principle of justice. It is a blot upon international law and treaty obligations.* It is the very thing that we condemned and fought against.

The Soviet scourge and injustice must be called to the attention of the peace-loving world. In the words of the editor of the magazine *Destiny*:

*We cannot remain silent while the terrible scourge of Soviet oppression afflicts helpless people. While Great Britain and the United States continue their policy of appeasement in an endeavor to placate Russia, we must protest or else by our own silence become a partner in the crimes being committed. Unless Great Britain and the United States rise in righteous indignation and demand justice and freedom for those who are oppressed, the wrath of Almighty God will rest upon our people.*

Indeed, if we do not condemn lawlessness by every peaceable means at our command, and if we continue condoning international crimes we shall become accomplices to those crimes, and will lose honor and prestige among peace-loving and peace-loving nations, and among upright and law-respecting peoples.

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 31, pp. 1169-1170/*

Hon. JOHN M. VORYS, (Ohio), speaking on February 16, 1947, at Brooklyn, N. Y.:

February 16, 1947, is celebrated as the twenty-ninth anniversary of Lithuania's independence. A student of Lithuanian history might say that we are celebrating the five hundred and eighteenth anniversary of Lithuanian independence, going back



to the first Lithuanian statute or constitution of 1529. Other students of Lithuanian history might choose even earlier dates. Lithuania has won, and lost, her independence many times during past centuries. There are those who say that she has again lost her independence, but the United States Government does not. The United States Government has not recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and continues to recognize the representative of an independent Lithuania accredited to this country. The celebration of the anniversary of Lithuania's independence is an event which is of significance, not only to Americans of Lithuanian descent but to all Americans. Shall the United States continue to support the rights of small nations to self-determination, the right to free and unfettered elections, the right to liberty and representative government? I do not have a drop of Lithuanian blood in my veins, but as an American I want my country to uphold these principles throughout the world, for these principles are fundamental to permanent peace and security of the United States itself.

No people have a stronger claim to the right of self-government and independence than do the 3,000,000 people of Lithuania. From the earliest times the Lithuanian people had developed their own language similar to the ancient Sanskrit, their own culture and traditions, their own government, their own nation. They are not related to the Russians or to any of the other Slavic peoples, but descended from an ancient people of a distinct nationality. It is therefore not surprising that they desire to retain independence and self-government as a means by which to preserve the ideals near and dear to them, their culture, language; in short, their way of life.

During its days of independence since the First World War, Lithuania demonstrated that it had a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. By its progress in its economic and cultural life it demonstrated that its people were qualified to assume and discharge the responsibilities of independence. It is apparent that on the basis of justice and right—on the basis of principles announced in the Atlantic Charter—no one should question Lithuania's right to independence. And yet, though everyone agrees that the rights of small nations must be protected in the postwar world, still there is hesitation on the part of certain American leaders to voice their public support of these principles as to the Republic of Lithuania. They say that Russia intends to and has in fact already incorporated Lithuania into the Soviet Union; therefore it is anti-Russian to maintain that Lithuania should be independent, and will hamper the peace program to touch on this question. Furthermore, they say, Lithuania was a part of Russia before the year 1918. Lithuania, they say, was torn away from Russia in the closing days of the last war when Russia was helpless because of internal revolution, and should therefore be returned to Russia.

Well, of course, it is not true that Lithuania belongs to Russia; any student of history knows that Lithuania's independence dates back to the fifteenth century when Lithuania was a nation with borders from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea. Some of Russia was then a part of Lithuania. It should not be a question of which was a part of what. The important consideration is that the Lithuanian people are a distinct people with a history, culture, language, and ideals, not related to that of other nations. Furthermore, it is not anti-Russian to maintain that Lithuania deserves to be an independent nation because Russia has itself said so, at a time when Russia was strong and completely free from internal or external pressure. Russia has heretofore solemnly agreed and covenanted that it would respect the sovereignty of the Republic of Lithuania.

Those agreements and treaties, I repeat, were made not at the time when Russia was helpless because of internal revolution but in the years when the Soviet Union had a strong government. On September 28, 1926, a nonaggression treaty, which is still in effect, was entered into between the Republic of Lithuania and Soviet Russia. The language of the following articles of said pact provided:

"ART. 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other.

"ART. 3. Each of the two contracting parties undertake to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party.

"ART. 5. Should a conflict arise, and if impossible to liquidate it in a diplomatic way, both contracting parties agree in such case to nominate conciliatory commission."

This treaty was by its terms to be in effect until December 31, 1945.

On October 10, 1939, Lithuania and Russia entered into a mutual assistance pact; article 7 reads:

"The realization of this Treaty must not infringe the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of their state, their economic and social systems, military instruments, and altogether the principles of nonintervention of one state in the internal affairs of another state."

Along with this pact Soviet Russia demanded the right to Russian Army garrisons in Lithuania. Many political observers interpreted this Russian demand as the first step to sovietize Lithuania. On October 31, 1939, Mr. Molotov dismissed these speculations in the following words:

"We stand for the conscientious and exact observation of the treaties concluded, on the principle of entire reciprocity, and declare the idle talk about the sovietization of the Baltic states to be profitable only to our common enemies and to all kinds of anti-Soviet provocateurs."

However, in June of 1940 Soviet Russia did occupy Lithuania—deposed its government, and under the supervision of the Russian Army, an election was held with ballots containing only one set of names. The United States denounced the Soviet occupation and elections as being "devious processes" and "predatory activities to deliberately annihilate the independence of the Baltic republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania."

On June 30, 1940, Mr. Molotov explained the Russian position as follows:

"It would be unpardonable if the Soviet Union did not seize this opportunity, which may never recur. The leaders of the Soviet Union have decided to incorporate the Baltic States into the family of Soviet republics."

The United States has never officially acceded to these Soviet claims. The State Department of the United States has continued to recognize and still recognizes the Lithuanian Minister to the United States. Its position in the matter is that Lithuania should be an independent nation.

As recently as October 19, 1945, United States Supreme Court Associate Justice Robert H. Jackson reaffirmed the policy of the United States in a communication to the Government of Soviet Russia wherein he stated:

"In the indictment of German war criminals signed today, reference is made to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and certain other territories as being within the area of the U.S.S.R.

"This language is proposed by Russia and is accepted to avoid delay which would be occasioned by insistence on an alteration in the text. The indictment is signed subject to this reservation and understanding.

"I have no authority either to admit or challenge on behalf of the United States Soviet claims to sovereignty over such territories.

"Nothing, therefore, in this indictment is to be construed as a recognition by the United States of such sovereignty or as indicating any attitude either on the part of the United States or on the part of the undersigned toward any claim to disposition of such sovereignty."

In our preoccupation with other questions, let us not forget that the actual lives of men and women and children are involved in the Lithuanian question. There has been so much suffering, bloodshed, and destruction in the last few years that there is a tendency to take for granted what has occurred. I am told that Lithuania's people have undergone and are undergoing such suffering as come to few people in the world. First, the Russian Army marched across their country. Then the Nazis battled on their soil to drive out the Russians. Then back came the Russians to fight the Nazis and expel them. Each time, Lithuania's people were in the middle of the terrible cross fire of invasion and battle—forced to serve the conqueror as prizes in victory and tortured by the vanquished in defeat. Thousands of Lithuanians perished in battles which would bring their country nothing but terror and subjugation regardless of who won. And now that the tides of battle which flowed and ebbed in Lithuanian blood have ceased, the survivors look once more to their only hope—establishment of the democratic principles pledged to them and all peoples of the world by the principles of the United Nations Charter.

The Soviet Union contributed immensely to the military defeat of the forces of fascism which were determined to undermine these very principles of nonaggression and self-determination. Now that the military victory has been won, it is a sacred obligation of the Soviet Union actively to embrace the very principles which the allies fought to uphold. It is true that the conduct of the Soviet Union toward Lithuania has not been consistent with these principles or with the treaties entered into



between these two nations. But now that the war is over and Russia's security from the west is no longer threatened, no further reason exists for the Soviet Union to occupy Lithuania. And again, it is now apparent that with the advent of the atomic bomb, Lithuania is no longer important to the Soviet Union as a buffer state to protect it from attack.

Thus there is no reason either in principle or expediency why the Soviet Union should not now be willing to permit the people of Lithuania freely to elect their own government from candidates of democratic parties without outside influence or pressure. It is certainly better policy for the nations of the world to discuss these matters frankly and openly now, rather than to permit grievances of aggression and oppression to ferment into causes of future strife. The cause of Lithuania's independence should be supported by our country because it is based upon American principles of representative government. The peoples of Europe who respect these principles and ideals, should be given the opportunity to embrace them and shape their way of life and choose their own form of government. The case of Lithuania is a symbol of one of the most important phases of American policy in striving to establish a sound and enduring peace for all peoples of the world.

The statement of policy and principle by our Government in 1940 concerning Lithuania, applies to all the world.

"The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the twenty-one sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved."

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 37, pp. A.780-781/*

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL, (Illinois), speaking in the House on "Bonus Funds for UNRRA" on February 26, 1947:

"I am glad to note that the President within the past two days has also taken the position that such relief in the future should be handled by the United States Government separate and apart from other nations. I hope now that he will go a step further, and I know Congress will approve this position, and urge that any relief distribution in foreign countries furnished by the United States shall be supervised solely by American citizens. I should like to go further and urge that in the occupied countries all civilian relief personnel be withdrawn and that the allocation and distribution and relief in occupied countries be handled solely by our army of occupation. . . .

Mr. Speaker, I want to support this request by reading a letter which will prove the wisdom of this proposal and which will prove how badly civilians have handled relief. I received this letter yesterday from the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc., signed by the national president of that organization, Rev. Dr. Joseph B. Koncius. This organization has its headquarters at 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City. The content of this letter is important. This is a real relief organization of high standing. On its honorary committee are such eminent names as Hon. John W. McCormack, our United States Congressman, former majority leader of the House and now the Democratic whip; His Eminence Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia; His Excellency Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston; Hon. James A. Farley; Hon. Dwight H.

Green, Governor of Illinois; William Green, president of American Federation of Labor; United States Senator Edward Martin, former Governor of Pennsylvania, and others. The letter is as follows:

February 24, 1947.

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,  
Member of Congress,  
The House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: I read with great interest your comments on UNRRA made in Congress and reported in the *New York Sun* of February 20.

Your observations and findings, as embodied in your eight questions, are very interesting and I hope that our Government will investigate your charges.

From January to October 1946, I made a wide tour of Lithuanian displaced persons' camps in Germany, Austria, Italy, and other Western European countries. During that tour I had contacts with UNRRA officials, especially in Munich, in the United States Zone of Germany, and in Rome, Italy. In both places and elsewhere I found that many UNRRA officials were not so much interested in doing humanitarian work as they were in spreading propaganda unfriendly to our democratic ideals.

About 80 percent of UNRRA employees in the United States zone of Germany were not American citizens, while, at the same time, our taxpayers were defraying about 80 percent of UNRRA expenses. Many honest and sincere humanitarian social workers among the UNRRA officials were idle, sitting around without assignment and drawing salaries.

For instance, Mr. R. H. A. Dales, an honest Hollander, from 12 Regenesselaan, Apeldoorn, Holland, stayed in Munich for over a month without an assignment, became thoroughly disappointed and dissatisfied with the UNRRA administration and system.

It is my sincere opinion that no international organization, UNRRA or IRO, can properly administer the care of displaced persons or refugees. The administration of relief should be delegated to the military authorities in each zone. International bodies only create confusion, unnecessary red tape, and cause conflict with the occupying military authorities.

Please accept my heartfelt congratulations for your humanitarian interest in suffering European people.

Respectfully yours,

REV. DR. JOSEPH B. KONCIUS,  
National President.

Mr. Speaker, this is a true and astounding indictment of the utter failure of UNRRA, when he says he found that many UNRRA officials in Italy, Munich, and other places were less interested in doing humanitarian work than they were in spreading propaganda unfriendly to our democratic ideals and our Nation. . . .

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentleman from Illinois is to be complimented for bringing this to the attention of the Members of Congress, as well as to the attention of the country at large. I am just a little bit puzzled as to who has the authority to set up these bonuses and these bonuses on top of bonuses.

*/The C. Record, vol. 93, No. 37, pp. 1527-8/*

## NON-CONGRESSIONAL STATEMENTS

### Editorial Comment

#### A NEW DEAL WITH RUSSIA: II

. . . 2. *Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania.* The short-lived independence of these Baltic states was ended by the Russo-German non-aggression treaty of 1939, when the Soviets occupied Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania. In anticipation of German aggression, the Russians signed a mutual-assistance pact with these countries. Under the terms of the pact Russia acquired rights of military garrison and the use of naval and air bases there. This led to the incorporation of these countries into the Soviet Union Republic (1940). With



Russia's victory over the Axis in the Baltic Area in 1945, she was able to re-establish her sovereignty over Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania.

Before their brief period of independence, the three Baltic states had long been part of Russia. Peter the Great had annexed Latvia and Estonia from Sweden under the Treaty of Nystadt (1721), while Catherine the Great had acquired Lithuania from Poland (?? Editors, *Lithuanian Bulletin*) in 1795. The Lithuanians, the Estonians and the Latvians are non-Slavic people. The Latvians and Lithuanians belong to the Baltic branch of the Indo-European Group and the Estonians are a branch of the Finno-Ugrian Group. However, all three countries have a considerable Russian minority. (Less than 2% in Lithuania—Editors, *Lith. Bulletin*.) During the period of Russian domination of the Baltic states, intensive Russification took place, bringing the native population closer to Russia in culture and religion. (The Balts are members of Western civilization and culture. The Lithuanians are 86% Roman Catholic, 14% Protestants, and 85% of all of the inhabitants of Lithuania are Roman Catholics. Only about 7,000 Russian families were permanently settled in Lithuania—Editors, *Lithuanian Bulletin*.)

### Unjustified Annexation

The basic industries of the three countries are agriculture, cattle breeding, paper and pulp. Except for lumber their natural resources are limited. The absorption of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania cannot be justified on racial or economic grounds. The historical basis for the action of Russia's allies after the First World War does not present a strong case for Russian annexation. Neither does Russia's right to this territory on the basis of the Russo-German non-aggression pact of 1939 justify Soviet action, since this treaty was signed with Germany at a time when the latter was already a common enemy of the Allied countries. In this instance, Soviet behavior is contrary to all the concepts embodied in the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration and Constitution of the United Nations.

*/New Republic, December 30, 1946, p. 903/*

### THE BALTIC STATES

The first clear though still incomplete picture of what is happening in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania since these three Baltic states disappeared behind Russia's iron curtain is provided in a report in *The Economist* of London. This report is based primarily on information furnished by the Russian press and radio themselves, and it appears in a reliable journal not unfriendly to the Soviets. It confirms the charges leveled against the Russian regime in these states by their surviving diplomatic representatives abroad and by Baltic organizations voicing despairing though little-heard pleas for help.

The *Economist's* report declares that the Russians are deporting increasing numbers of the native populations to the forced-labor camps in the Russian interior, and that they are importing tested Communist Russians to take their place. The national leaders and much of the intelligentsia of these states were killed off or deported during the first Russian invasion in 1940; the deportation of the larger populations, classified according to progressive degrees of "untrust-

worthiness," began after the Russians returned in 1944. Today not only the Communist but the Russian elements already predominate. All the principal officials are Russians, sometimes under assumed Baltic names, and Russian is the official language. Imported Russian peasants take over the holdings of the deportees, sometimes under the names of the former owners, and thousands of Russians are being settled in the cities. "If," says *The Economist's* report, "the present rate of deporting Balts and importing Russians is maintained for a few more years the national characteristics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania will disappear. This is probably what Moscow intends." Since the total population of the three states was only six million, this process will not take long.

The purpose of this drastic action, similar to that already carried through by both Russia and Poland in the German territories they annexed, is apparently to eliminate a population which fought and is still fighting in the underground for national independence, and to fortify Russia's new self-proclaimed borders with a human wall from the interior whose adherence to Moscow will be beyond doubt. But in the process three nations still recognized as independent by the United States and other countries are, as nations, being annihilated while the United Nations looks the other way.

*/The New York Times, February 6, 1947/*

### FATE OF THE BALTIC STATES

Among the innumerable anomalies of postwar Europe is certainly the fate of the three little Baltic republics: Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Reports that filter through only confirm those charges leveled against Russia by Baltic representatives abroad and by Americans of Baltic descent, as they voice despairing but little-heard pleas for assistance. Their accusations are unanimous on one point: the Soviet Government, contrary to the Atlantic Charter and other solemn declarations made during the war, is keeping these states in political slavery. To what degree the Russians have succeeded in enslaving the once free Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians, is indicated in a report which appeared in *The Economist* of London, a reliable journal not entirely unfriendly to the Soviets. The picture of what is happening in the Baltic states was presented on the basis of information provided for the most part by the Russian press and radio themselves. It seems that the Russians are deporting an ever-larger number of local Baltic inhabitants to forced-labor camps in the Soviet Union, and that loyal and proven Communists are imported to take the place of the former. All national leaders or persons who potentially might be such, and especially the intelligentsia of the Baltic nations, were killed off during the first Soviet occupation in 1940. But mass deportations of the populations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania began with the Second Soviet occupation in 1944. The details of deportation proceedings were meticulously worked out in the *Serov Instruction*, originating with the Ministry of State Security, Moscow. This official document was prefaced by the proposition that "deportation of anti-Soviet elements from the Baltic states is a task of great political importance." Classification of these "enemies of the state" is based upon progressive degrees of "untrustworthiness." Since all Balts are



against Soviet occupation, just as they were against that of the Nazis, all are considered "enemies" destined for extermination.

### *Big Three "realism"?*

Russian elements are now dominant in these Baltic countries. As in Poland or the Ukraine, administrative personnel are Russians, sometimes under assumed Baltic names, while Russian is the official language. The present rate of deporting the Balts and importing Russians is such that in a few years the national characteristics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania will completely disappear. Yet the United States, Great Britain and 34 other governments still recognize the Baltic republics as sovereign and independent nations. Former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes sent formal notes to the effect that our Government does not recognize the validity of legislative acts of the regimes functioning in the Baltic states. (cf. *The Baltic Review*, Nov., 1946, for texts). Yet the Russians continue to stay there, and none of the great Powers had made any demarche toward asking them to go. This reluctance or hesitance may be dictated by that amoral and cynical "realism" in politics which rests on the myth of the Big Three unity. The historical source of strength of Western democracies has always been their moral firmness and respect for principles of international law and order. They have yet to manifest either on the Baltic question.

*/America, New York, vol. LXXVI, No. 21, Feb. 22, 1947, p. 563/*

### LITHUANIA, THE REPUBLIC

Anyone who raises his voice in protest at the torment Lithuania now suffers, might well entitle his address—"I speak for the silent." For, Lithuania can no longer speak for herself. Brutal, ruthless and arbitrary though they are, the red Fascists were compelled to allow foreign observers to witness the farcical "elections" held in Poland on January 19. Poland may enjoy some morsel of comfort in knowing that the realities of her tragedy are common knowledge everywhere. But not Lithuania. No traveler returns from this Baltic republic to tell her story because no traveler is allowed to enter or leave.

The fact is that Lithuania's democratic institutions have been destroyed. "Elections" are held. But the result is predetermined. There is a press of sorts. But the papers print only what they are told to print. "Freedom of worship" is permitted. But here again, it's the same story. As Fr. Koncius pointed out so vividly in the article which *The Pilot* printed recently, "freedom of worship" is an unhallowed cheat. The religious schools have been closed or confiscated; all church property is taxed at such fantastic figures that an impoverished people simply cannot meet the bill...

But, for the record, let's observe from time to time that we know what has happened to Lithuania; that from our hearts we regret the evils that have befallen her and bewail our own helplessness.

Current among this people is the legend that once a huge iron wolf led the Grand Duke Gedinimas, grandfather of Vytautas the Great, to build the city of Vilnius. This gray, fabulous figure, monstrous and spectral in the twilight, is the symbol of a people's determination that they will not live as slaves. Thanks to her overwhelming size, not to any brilliance of her

commander, or any attraction for what she has to offer, Soviet Russia holds Lithuania in a vice. But, even so, the Bear fears the Iron Wolf, the invincible Lithuanian will for freedom.

Late in the day, slowly and reluctantly, the civilized nations of the West are learning that they sinned, not alone against injustice, but also against their own advantage, when by silence and inaction they consented to Soviet Russia's aggressions. Of the many crimes chargeable against the huge atheistic commonwealth, none is more heinous and cowardly than the engulfment of Lithuania.

*/The Pilot, Boston, Mass., Feb. 1, 1947, p. 4/*

### IN RETROSPECT

In April, 1945, the Bishops of the United States issued a statement on a world organization which would be called the "United Nations." They felt that it was not a Utopian dream. They said, too, that if any nation refused full support, or insisted on introducing into its charter provisions which would radically vitiate it, that "we shall witness the tragedy, so often recorded in history, of a glorious martial victory largely nullified by sheer political expediency."

The sickening realization intrudes this week that the UN is not consistent with its charter which pledged "human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." It has seldom raised its head above the level of "political expediency." Only in debate, not in decision, has UN become the guarantor of liberty throughout the world.

The Russian program of ruthless occupation and aggression has scarcely been mentioned. Gauging the social whirl of Soviet delegates at ball games, cocktail parties, and soirees, the impression grows that little matters, so long as some meddler does not suggest that here are the representatives of the most overt war against God since Nero and Diocletian. The massacres of Marshal Tito are pushed into the same category of nightmare. When the sun shines in New York it all must be considered a dream, and not really a revival of the blood baths of the Hitler era.

The suppression of the Lithuanian charges against the Reds is a typical example of sidestepping the crimes in Europe and the Middle East. The Lithuanian Red Cross complains that men are deported to Soviet Labor camps, families are broken up, children taken from their parents and placed in special institutions for the education of Communist youth. Lithuanian women are deported to do hard labor in the fisheries at the mouth of the river Lena. The deportees are literally starved and worked to death. More than 50 percent of the men have already died, among them Alexander Stulginskis, former President of Lithuania.

A report like this should have aroused world interest, such as in the case of the few Americans allegedly held in Yugoslavia's mines. But what happened in the office of Trygve Lie, secretary general of the United Nations? It acknowledged receipt of the protest which was referred to the Social Affairs Department of the Secretariat, which in turn, referred it to the Human Rights Division. The Human Rights Division, no doubt feeling that a few Lithuanians did not come under the heading of humanity, referred it back to Mr. Lie "without comment."



... Things cannot become much worse. The obvious violation of pledges will eventually provoke direct action against hypocrisy and political trickery. ... Smirking subservience to any nation because it is strong and war minded has never worked. It is time to act on essentials. Leave the accidentals to the social gatherings.

*/The Catholic Standard and Times, Philadelphia, Pa. Dec. 20 1943/*

## LITHUANIA THESE DAYS

Tomorrow marks the 29th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania, which will be observed after a fashion here in the United States, but, you may be sure, there will be no public exercises in what used to be Lithuania.

... The people in Lithuania won't celebrate the day for the plain reason there is nothing to celebrate and, because of the existing reign of terror in that land, there will hardly be any public day of prayer set aside for very good reasons which do not require any explanation.

The Republic of Lithuania ceased to exist as a political entity since 1940. But it does exist in the hearts and minds of all true Lithuanians and countless American citizens of Lithuanian extraction. These days that country is officially known as the Lithuanian Soviet Socialistic State, a part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

One rarely comes across any dispatches in the big newspapers concerning Lithuania. We don't think it is necessary to state why; it would be an insult to the intelligence of our readers.

Knowing this "holiday" was coming up, a week or so ago we were strongly tempted to drop a line to the Soviet Embassy at Washington and naively ask for some information on present-day conditions in Lithuania. But upon reflection, the idea was discarded.

Why go to all that trouble when we know quite well what the reply would be: a glowing report on the steady progress of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialistic State ... cities damaged during the war now being rebuilt ... a happy and contented citizenry ... freedom of worship ... political harmony and a pack of additional barefaced lies.

Along with our numerous readers who have strong Lithuanian ties, we happen to know the picture in Lithuania today is quite different than the Soviet Embassy would undoubtedly have us believe.

Letters have been coming into Shenandoah from Lithuania in a round-about way. They are coming from countries outside of the Soviet sphere of influence and, even so, the contents are couched in guarded terms. However, it is quite easy to read between the lines.

We know there are steady deportations of loyal Lithuanians to Siberia. Russian families are moving into Lithuania; even taking the names of families previously exiled. Opposition to the Red regime is not tolerated under any circumstances. The penalty is death and firing squads don't operate on any 40-hour week, either!

But there are any number of well-armed bands of patriots operating from the forests. They make sudden forays into villages and then vanish. Trains carrying provisions and ammunition to Russian soldiers

garrisoned in Lithuania are wrecked and looted.

There is an active Underground at work, day in and day out. Now and then, a number is caught and executed. But the work goes on, new recruits taking the places of those "liquidated." For that matter, the story is the same in Latvia and Estonia, which also were independent countries a few years back.

All this while, appeals asking true justice for Lithuania and the other Baltic States are going to Washington by responsible organizations at home and abroad. The United Nations officials are in receipt of these petitions and likewise our own agencies: the White House, Department of State, et al. Justice and mercy is asked for the oppressed and enslaved people of Lithuania. The official silence reigns supreme.

Dictatorships sometimes last a long time but history has a habit of repeating: there comes a time when something untoward happens. People revolt and a new order of things arises.

When will this come to happen behind the "iron curtain?" We don't know, of course. But we know it will come to pass. When this takes place, you may expect to see a restoration of the Republic of Lithuania and the other Baltic States. We trust this comes to pass in due time.

*/The Evening Herald, Shenandoah, Pa., Feb. 15, 1947/*

## "BROTHERHOOD" WEEK

Brotherhood Week is a splendid idea. Its objective is to spread good feeling, to encourage mankind to live in harmony, to banish hatred and to replace it by mutual respect. Any number of people, however, have called our attention to several widespread events which are, to say the least, confusing and add a note of ridicule to what should be a significant occasion. We note the following: ...

3. Sachs Quality Stores, in an advertisement in the New York "Daily News" on Feb. 13, carried one of the most pronounced tracts on racism we ever saw. The tract is a one-sided presentation of the displaced persons question which might well be included as a chapter in Hitler's "superior race" textbooks. The former Mayor LaGuardia discovers only 17% of the displaced persons are non-Christians—but then he maintains these should be made the objects of our Government's solicitude and at the expense of all others. The Poles and other displacees are dismissed with the tag of "collaborationist." The former Mayor puts out this vicious assault on some of these enslaved peoples: "It must be remembered that Poland and other countries were occupied by the Nazis; that many of the displaced persons collaborated with the occupying forces; and that following liberation, civil strife set in which gained the proportion of a civil war. This is particularly true also of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania."

Oh, yes, Mr. LaGuardia finds "the ruthlessness and the cruelty of the Nazis are unparalleled." The Communists who have seized Poland, all of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and who hold millions in concentration camps on account of their religion, draw not a mention from the former Mayor. Why Sachs or any publication would run such a racist advertisement—so insulting to millions of suffering Gentiles and their relatives—is stupidity of the first order. If this stuff transpires in "Brotherhood Week" we wonder what the other weeks of the year promise.



THE TABLET condemns all totalitarianism—whether it be Fascist or Communist; we repudiate anti-Semitism but along with it anti-Christianity; we believe there should be no social or religious test for displacees—the persecuted suffers whether he be Jew or Gentile.

*/The Tablet, Brooklyn, N. Y., Feb. 22, 1947/*

## THE BASIS OF PEACE

The contrary forces dominating the international situation at the moment are demonstrated anew by the latest developments . . .

. . . Every individual problem discussed does not stand alone but is an integral part of a fluid world in which pressure at one point is bound to produce dislocations and counter-pressure elsewhere.

Take the matter of disarmament. . . .

Or take the matter of territorial dispositions. Having annexed more than a dozen countries or territories . . . and having rewarded the smaller nations in her bloc with additional annexations at the expense not only of the vanquished but also of the interests of her allies. Russia now puts these vast territorial changes outside of all discussion and chides other countries for an alleged intent to do what she has already done. . . .

The Russians have taken what they wanted and done as they pleased within the reach of their domination. The Western Allies have waited to settle all problems in legal fashion by common international agreements. . . .

*/The New York Times, Nov. 13, 1946/*

## THE LAW AGAINST WAR

A task as noble as it is urgent has been proposed to the United Nations by President Truman . . . the drafting of a formal code of international criminal law . . . in particular, those principles and precedents dealing with the planning, preparation, initiation or waging of aggressive war. . . .

. . . The verdict of Nuremberg demands a revaluation of history and historic personages if the law it applies is to sink into the consciousness of mankind. That revaluation, and therewith the law itself, will be all the more effective if they are no longer tied up with the specific image of the Nazis alone, but are formally and visibly extended to embrace all men and all nations. . . .

*/The New York Times, Nov. 14, 1946/*

## A UNITED FOREIGN POLICY

. . . This policy . . . rests primarily on three basic considerations. The first represents our wartime principles, aiming at a free, peaceful and cooperative world. As Senator Vandenberg suggests, these principles have been violated, but we have not abandoned them . . . even at the risk of public disagreement with other Powers. . . .

. . . In the words of Senator Vandenberg, we plot no conquests, but we shall neither condone nor appease the conquests of others. . . .

*/The N. Y. Times, Jan. 13, 1947/*

## RUSSIA AND THE ISLANDS

. . . The Russian emphasis on the American role in the war against Japan suggests that Russia is attempting to put the American trusteeship proposal on a par

with her own sweeping annexations, which she justifies with her own sacrifices, thereby, in effect, welcoming the United States into a partnership of annexationists and participants in the spoils of victory. . . . Since such a thesis might well play a role in the forthcoming conference, it is necessary to reply to it at once.

There is no justification for this argument. The United States, which has just granted complete independence to the Philippines with 115,000 square miles and 16,000,000 people, . . . takes nothing belonging to any other nation, and asks for no territory now capable of independence. . . .

Russia, on the other hand, has undertaken to annex more than 250,000 square miles with nearly 25,000,000 people—all territory which belonged to other nations. In some quarters it is argued that this is really territory which was taken from Russia after the First World War, and that in fact Russia has recovered thus far less than she lost then. But this argument . . . applies to the other annexed territories with no greater validity than it applies to Poland or Finland, which also "belonged" to Russia prior to the First World War. The Soviet regime proclaimed after that war that the old frontiers of the Russian Empire had been formed by violence and crimes and had vanished with czarism, and that henceforth all nationalities had the right to self-determination and independence. The Russian Government has thus provided a measuring-rod for its own recent annexations.

*/The New York Times, Feb. 27, 1947/*

## WE TOOK THOSE ISLANDS . . .

If Russia can't feel at ease with our forces on the (Pacific) islands, that is just too bad. Neither can western Europe feel at ease with Russia in possession of the Baltic states and in control of most of the Balkans.

*/New York Sunday News, Feb. 23, 1947/*

## INDEPENDENT OPINIONS

1.

Brighton, Mass., February 7, 1947.

There is no doubt that ours is an age of universal confusion. Just as the whole world is yearning for some secure basis for lasting peace, Atheistic Communism wages its veritable war against Christianity and becomes an ever more real and fast-growing threat. . . .

So I sincerely urge you, my dear Lithuanians, to renew your zeal for Catholic Action. Always stand fast in the faith. "Put on the armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the Principalities and the Powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual forces of wickedness on high." . . . By spreading the Kingdom of Christ you will best help to regain the Independence and Freedom of the land of your forbears—Lithuania.

Faithfully yours in Christ

RICHARD J. CUSHING  
Archbishop of Boston

2.

Washington, D.C., Feb., 12, 1947.

On February 16, 1947, Americans of Lithuanian or-



igin throughout the United States commemorate the 29th Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania.

This anniversary is not a happy one, because, today Lithuania is not a free country. It is a victim of the devastation of World War II. Lithuania's people have undergone and are now undergoing such sufferings as comes to few people in the world.

First, in the year 1940 the Russian army marched across their country, then in 1941 the Nazis battled on their soil to drive out the Russians. Then, back came the Russians to fight the Nazis and expel them. Each time Lithuania's people were in the middle of the terrible cross-fire of invasion and battle—forced to serve the conqueror as prizes in victory and tortured by the vanquished in defeat.

Through all this terror under the rule of two military dictatorships, the people of Lithuania have remained loyal to the principles of representative government in their hopes for the restoration of the independence of Lithuania.

There is a special significance in this anniversary to all Americans, because the hope for independence of Lithuania is based on the same principles of justice and right which are close to the hearts of every freedom loving American—principles which involve the rights of all peoples to liberty and their own way of life and the rights of all nations to self-determination.

We Republicans support these principles, not only because they would bring happiness, security and freedom to the peoples of Europe, but because American security would be strengthened if American ideals of representative government are upheld throughout the world.

In this light it is appropriate that all Republicans join with Americans of Lithuanian origin in the commemoration of Lithuania's Independence Day.

CARROLL REECE,

*Chairman of the Republican National Committee*

3.

Columbia University

New York City, Feb. 14, 1947

Permanent peace depends on honesty and fair dealing. Lithuania and the other Baltic States are the touch stone of Democracy. They are the frontiers of civilization. They must under their own Democratic government enter the United Nations as former members of the League of Nations and the earliest victims of Red-Nazi totalitarianism.

PROF. CLARENCE A. MANNING.

4.

Washington, D. C., Feb. 15, 1947

On behalf of Polish American Congress representing over six million Americans of Polish extraction, we join you in your national hopes on the occasion of your observance of the Lithuanian Independence Day. We are confident that our common struggle for the freedom of all subjugated nations will achieve success.

CHARLES ROZMAREK.

*President, Polish American Congress*

5.

New York City, Feb. 15, 1947

On the 29th Anniversary of Independence, please accept our best wishes and strong hope that the Lithuanian People will soon recover their Liberty and Independence.

*Former Consul of Poland and Countess Krasicki*

6.

New York, Feb. 14, 1947

I wish at least in writing to convey my wish that the cause you are struggling for be crowned with real success. I am waiting for the day, as all Poles do, to see an independent and free Lithuania a neighbor of an equally free and independent Poland. I am sure we shall all see this happen.

ANTONI TARNOWSKI

## LITHUANIA LIVES

By DR. W. ELMER EKBLAW, *Clark University*

Yesterday, the twenty-ninth anniversary of the attainment of Lithuanian independence, every Lithuanian, wherever his domicile, whatever his condition, recalled the happy period of his people's liberty and reconsecrated himself to the cause of restoration of Lithuania's freedom and sovereignty over its own peoples and autonomy in its own jurisdiction and ancestral territory. He pledged himself, as every patriot should, to the task of regaining for Lithuania her just and proper place in the world's family of nations, a place that is hers by right of centuries of cultural adjustment to the attributes of a land that is rightfully hers, and by right of long and honorable participation in the affairs of Eastern and Central Europe. His heart will not again beat hopefully and peacefully until his beloved Lithuania may be restored to her people.

For Lithuania, for the time being, there is no longer any of the four freedoms, the freedoms for which the true democracies of the world struggled so long and so patiently during the last war, and for which their thousands of heroes died, or endured agonies worse than death. There is no freedom from dearth, or dread or despotism in Lithuania. There is no free conscience, no free speech, no free worship, no free enterprise in Lithuania. The Lithuanians may not sing their folksongs, enjoy their folk dances, tell their folk tales, till their soil, sail their boats on their streams or lakes, worship in their churches, as a free people may. They may not fly their flag, nor recount the deeds of their great men.

They are deported by the hundreds of thousands to Siberia and other wilderness frontiers to work in the mines and forests and public projects there, enslaved and debased, with no hope of return to their native acres, no hope of living again among their beloved hamlets and villages, no hope of solace in sickness or nearing death, no hope of decent burial when they succumb. Those that are left must serve the dictates of a tyranny as utterly absolute and ruthless as any that Egypt or Syracuse or Rome ever endured, and the whims of officials as base and bestial as the worst in history.

But Lithuania lives. Lithuania lives in the hearts of her sons and daughters who survive. Lithuania lives in the hearts of liberty loving folk the world over. Lithuania lives in her great literature, her splendid history and great traditions, her songs and dances, the deep religious faith of her people, in their burning devotion to the land of their ancestry. Lithuania will not perish as long as ideals of freedom and justice and righteousness prevail. Lithuania cannot be destroyed by perfidy and brutality and tyranny. There will always be a Lithuania—a Lithuania in the hearts of men, a Lithuania in the culture of the peoples, a Lithuania in the history of the world's struggle for freedom, and in due time a Lithuania at the conference table of the world's great family of nations.

For cruel enslavement of a people as devoted to freedom as the Lithuanians, as true to their faith as they, as implacable in their will to escape tyranny as they, is finally impossible. Even so great a despotism as Russia will fall of its own evil ways, its dependence upon force and injustice for its power and rule. "The mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small" and however coarse and base the grist, the meal will be justice and truth and honor.

Lithuania lives! Under the brutal tyranny of her alien conquerors Lithuania suffers a living death, but lives. Lithuania lives, and no power can destroy her. Lithuania lives, as freedom and justice live. Lithuania lives in her Christian faith and high cultural ideals. Lithuania lives!

*/Worcester Telegram, Worcester, Mass., Febr. 1947, and The Congressional Record, vol. 93, No. 35, p. A703/*



## CAN SOVIET RUSSIA BE TRUSTED?

... Americans, generally, believe they can trust their government most of the time (if not, we can turn the ... gentlemen out!) But Joe Stalin cannot be thrown out. Can he be trusted? *On the basis of available evidence, the answer is no!*

If you doubt me, ask the Poles! Ask the Balts, the Iranians! Ask the State Department about Yalta and Teheran and Potsdam! Ask the Japanese! Ask sober-minded people throughout the world what they think of Soviet dependability! From all sides you will hear the same answer: "*The Soviets cannot be trusted!*" During the last seven years the Soviet Union has established a record of duplicity startling in its blackness.

This is a strong statement. Former Ambassador to Moscow Joe Davies will categorically condemn it as disruptive "Red baiting." But the facts speak louder than Joe Davies.

Least excusable Soviet action was perhaps the infamous betrayal of the Baltic countries. Gullible Americans are prone to believe that in seizing and reincorporating the three little republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania into Mother Russia, Stalin merely was "righting" an intolerable injustice done the Soviet Union in 1918.

Actually, Russia conquered the three Baltic peoples by force, back in the 17th century. But she never succeeded in winning their loyalty or affection, nor in converting them into Russians. So that, when the 1917 Revolution offered them an opportunity to regain their liberty, they seized it.

The Allied and associated powers of 1919 thereafter recognized the desire of these peoples, along with the Finns and Poles, to be separated from their hated masters. This recognition may have been politically inexpedient, but it was morally justified. Russia's grab of those defenseless tiny countries in June 1940 (under cover of Hitler's invasion of France) and their incorporation into the Soviet Union in August of the same year constitute about as cynical a steal as history records.

It occurred in violation of Moscow's repeated pledges of friendship and non-intervention, the last of which was included in a speech by Molotov on March 29, 1940, *less than three months before the final seizure*. The shameless spectacle was so nauseating that American Minister John Wiley returned from Riga physically sickened by the experience.

/Edgar Ansel Mowrer, in *See, a monthly*, March 1947, pp. 8-10/

## The Refugee Problem in the British Parliament

### House of Lords, 19th December 1946

Lord BEVERIDGE: My Lords, I rise to move the Motion standing in my name on the Paper concerning the problem of displaced persons. I think your Lordships will agree that this problem is one of the most tragic legacies of the late war. ... Very roughly there are something like 400,000 Poles in the ex-enemy countries, 200,000 Baltic peoples, Lithuanians, Estonians and so on, 70,000 Yugoslavs, 100,000 Jews, 100,000 Ukrainians, and smaller groups. ...

... The question is, what to do about them now? ... Darwin defined the basis of human happiness as "work and the domestic affections." These people are cut off from both of those. Nearly all of them represent a grey mass of misery and frustration. They are people cut off from ordinary human life. I consider that it is not fanciful to think of the war as something like a mining disaster, which cuts off a number of people in a mine. Some get rescued and some are left behind. You may think of this 1,000,000 still displaced a year after the war as people still left in the bottom of the mine, cut off from ordinary human life and waiting for rescue. The real question is: What kind of rescue agencies are available for them? First of all there is UNRRA. ...

There is ... the Inter-Governmental Committee. ... It has always been a small affair. ... And I may say that at the moment Soviet Russia has withdrawn from that particular Committee.

Finally there is the United Nations Organization. Last February, the United Nations Assembly accepted a resolution for setting up an International Refugee Organization—the I.R.O.—for dealing with this problem. ... It is not certain that it will receive that amount of assent, and there are obvious difficulties ... because of the very definite differences ... as to its

framework, between the eastern and western views in Europe. ... It will be at least two years from the end of the war before it can start any kind of rescue work. Two years is not long in the life of a nation, but it is a very long time in the life of a displaced person who has already had five or six years of war.

Why are these million people still there? Why have they not, like the other 11,000,000, been repatriated? There are two different views on that. There is the simple view, put forward ... by Mr. Vyshinsky, on behalf of the Soviet Union. ... He contended that the overwhelming majority of these displaced persons are anxious to return to their native land. I am quite certain that that is true. Mr. Vyshinsky went on to say: "They are prevented from doing so by political pressure on the part of Fascist elements. ..." In other words, he says that the one thing which keeps these people in this miserable camp life, instead of returning to their homes, is the terrorism exercised on them in the camps. That is his argument, and from it follows the practical conclusion which Mr. Vyshinsky also drew—that those who refused to return to their native country, after having expressed their views should be debarred from help from this new organization, as war criminals and traitors are debarred from all help.

Against that there was the other view, put forward most admirably by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, the chief American delegate. The fact was, she said, that political changes in the countries of origin ... have created fears in the minds of the million people who remain. If you accept that view, it follows that those to whom return is a cause of fear should have a real opportunity of going elsewhere. That is the issue which has come up again and again during the many weary months of discussion in the Assembly—whether a person who



flies from his own country or dreads to return to it, is for that reason something like a criminal who ought to be sent back, or is a refugee from arbitrary power who should have asylum.

That is the issue, quite fairly joined. . . . I hope your Lordships will have no doubt as to which view and which course . . . is the right one. It is quite obvious that the suggestion that people longing to go home are kept in the camps by the terrorism of the people in the camps—is a little too ridiculous to deserve any discussion at all. What is certain, of course, is that the reason they do not go home is that they fear what they may find, in Soviet Russia and in Yugoslavia and, to a lesser extent, in Poland. Mr. Vyshinsky's argument is that these people at the bottom of the mine do not really need rescue. All they have to do (he says) is to walk into the cage and they will be taken to the top. Their doubt, I think, is whether, if they walk into the cage, they will not be left there. I saw some of these refugees when I was in Germany; they are part of the German problem. . . .

. . . . They were comfortable women, jolly women; to describe them as criminals is just foolishness. They said that they did not want to go back, because they did not know how they would be treated. It was simply fear which prevented them from returning to their country. In all this matter there is really the difference in the sense of human values. Mr. Vyshinsky's argument, and that of those who go with him is really one of regarding the individual as the property of the State. The Soviet citizen is the prisoner of the State. As against that, in the same debate I was very much interested to observe different points of view were put by the representatives of two small countries which I have visited—Belgium and Holland. The Belgian Delegate stated that his country considered the State to be the servant of the individual, whatever his political convictions may be, and that the community cannot withhold its support from human beings, even though they may express opinions hostile to those of the Government of the day. The Netherlands Delegate put in a similar way, that individuals have a higher destiny than merely being subordinated to the destiny of their people and their country.

Here is one of the big issues from which we should not shrink. We should express our attitude that those who flee from arbitrary power shall have the right of asylum from arbitrary power. That is and always has been one of our deepest traditions. This flight from arbitrary power is one of the things with which the United States began; they afforded the right of asylum to those people. I hope that the British Government is going to make a strong stand for the right of asylum when this International Refugee Organization gets to work. What is the right of asylum? It is no use blinking the fact that there are differences of view between the East and the West with regard to this matter. We hope that the East may come round to the view of the West. But it is of no use disagreeing with or arguing against the East. The question is: What does one do in practice? I suggest that what we have to do is to establish both in principle and in practice the right of asylum from arbitrary power.

What does that mean? It means, first, that there should be no compulsory repatriation. If, after considering the position, these people do not wish to go

back, they should not be forced to go back. . . . In any case, I suggest that *they are our responsibility and that of the United States. It was with our Armies that they took refuge.* Our Armies were in occupation when they became displaced persons. . . .

Of course, it is not enough to say that there is to be no compulsory repatriation, because you must, if you want to give the right of asylum, give a chance of resettlement in a normal life. I am glad to think that we in this country—and it is something for which we can take credit—have done a very great act in undertaking, as we have, responsibility for the resettlement of the Poles who came from Italy. But we are not exactly getting on with the job as quickly as one would like, because we all know that these Polish ex-soldiers are to a very large extent not being usefully employed in this country, and not to be usefully employed is bad for any man. It is bad for the feeling between them and the people of this country. At the same time, we know that in this country we have an extreme shortage of labor in agriculture, in mining and in many heavy industries. . . . Why are we keeping German prisoners here instead of using the Poles?

. . . At the present time we are doing a thing which is entirely wrong in this country—namely, we are keeping prisoners of war while we are refusing to use other people who might work here. . . . There are any number of *excellent and intelligent Baltic people*—they are most excellent agriculturists—whom we could bring over, and I hope that we might bring over some of them.

There are things which we can do ourselves, of course, but this business of resettlement is not in the main a thing which we can do ourselves, because although we could employ a lot more people in this country, and although we are still short of labor, there are many other countries with much more room. After all, for a million people to be absorbed in all the world is nothing. Taken as a world problem, it is a tiny thing. Taken as a human problem of suffering, it is immense. I am not in the least criticizing the Government. I am actually Chairman of a self-appointed body calling itself the Refugees' Defence Committee. The object of the Committee is merely to mobilize the support of what I believe to be the feeling of the people in this country in favor of the right of asylum. I hope, if the Government will carry out what is the great British tradition of working for the right of asylum, they will be grateful to me and not regard me as a critic.

May I also say that I am very glad to see that a very influential committee in the United States is in the process of being formed? That Committee will work with us, and I hope that in fact it will do a great deal more than we can possibly do, because the United States can do so much more than we can. I hope that the Government will give encouragement to all those people in Belgium, the Netherlands, the United States and in many lands who are working to ensure that a proper view is taken of this problem. . . . *The (IRO) constitution as it is drafted represents a battlefield scarred by compromises.* Some of these compromises are going to be rather difficult—the compromise, for example, between the view that a displaced person is a person to be helped and the view that he is a person to be hounded back to his own country whether he



likes it or not. There are those compromises. But if we stick to the Assembly resolution against compulsory repatriation I think we can get it working.

... Resettlement is going to cost. ... There are dangers of its (IRO) breaking down through disagreement. It has actually been carried against the opposition of the Soviet and of the nations that generally work with the Soviet, which may still create great difficulties in the working of it. If it does not get established, and if it does not work for the right of asylum, then I hope the Government of this country, at least, will make it plain that we propose to pursue the same rescue work by whatever other means may be available. It may be that an Inter-Governmental Committee will be the right agency. It may be ... that the International Red Cross should be used if we cannot make the United Nations agency do the work. At any rate, let us make it clear that the rescue work is going to go on by one agency or another. ...

There is this human problem of 1,000,000 people ... give them hope that the rescue party will come to them in time before their lives are altogether destroyed. This is a small problem for the world—1,000,000 people—but every one of those 1,000,000 is a suffering individual human being. The solution of this problem is a great opportunity for humanity to show that it is humane, and a great opportunity for the nations to work together for something which, whatever happens, whether it is successful or not, would make for a better peace and better feeling throughout the world. Finally, it is a great opportunity for those who believe in freedom and the value of the individual to show their faith by their acts. I beg to move for Papers.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, ... The attitude of mind which is sometimes described as the "right of asylum" is one of our oldest liberal traditions. It is not a liberal tradition, I am glad to say, in the mere narrow partisan sense. Though it derived from the Liberals, it has become a tradition which is inherited now by all thinking men in this country and by all parties, and I devoutly hope that ... we shall always adhere to that great tradition which our forefathers handed down to us. ...

I agree with the noble Lord that it is not a problem which can be solved by this country alone; it is a world problem. By precept, by example, we must do everything we can to show that we are going to take our share, but if I do not go further than that to-day it is because I am so anxious that the doctrine expressed in the words "Moab is my washpot"—which means to say, applying to this country, that everybody with a difficulty about refugees can hand them on to us—should not be applied. It really is not fair that this small country should be called upon to bear the entire burden. ... We shall do all we can, and we have done. I think the noble Lord recognizes that we have done a great deal towards solving this problem already.

So far as the number of displaced persons in the British zone of Germany is concerned, it is now estimated at nearly 400,000, and that figure is approximately half the figure that existed in October, 1945. ... I agree with the noble Lord's diagnosis of the problem of the difference between the Eastern and Western point of view. His Majesty's Government state

emphatically that on this matter they adhere to the Western point of view. There are undoubtedly a number of people who are apprehensive as to what would happen to them if they went back, and it would be quite wrong for us to make them go back to see whether their apprehensions were right or wrong. ...

I agree also with the noble Lord's diagnosis about the IRO. ... We must not, therefore, pin our faith exclusively to this organization; we must take such practical steps as are open to us in the meantime to try and deal with the problem and to get other nations to co-operate with us. Accordingly we have been doing so, and we have arranged that Missions should go over to Europe in order to see what contributions can be made. I expect your Lordships know that a Brazilian Mission has now reached Berlin. ... Then we have an Inter-Governmental Committee Mission which has arrived in the Argentine and which is discussing the matter with the immigration authorities. That mission is also going to visit Paraguay and Uruguay; a further mission will go to Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru, and a third mission will go to Chile, Colombia and Venezuela. The Argentine Government has now sent its own representative over to Europe to study resettlement problems. ...

LORD LLEWELLIN: May I interrupt to ask one question? Of whom do these Missions consist which are touring South America? Do they consist of representatives of the United States Government and our own, representing the occupation authorities?

The LORD CHANCELLOR: They are inter-governmental; they are not set up by any one Government. I could not tell the noble Lord the exact number of Governments supporting them but our own is certainly one.

Then we are proceeding to discuss this matter with our Canadian brothers. We hope that they will be able to take a certain number of Balts and Ukrainians. It is also a fact that some refugees will profit by the declared policy of the Canadian Government to allow the immigration of relatives of Canadian subjects. Further than that, we ourselves at home are arranging for the admission into this country of 2,000 Baltic women for hospital work in the United Kingdom, and we hope to extend that plan to make up for the great shortage of staff there is in those and similar public institutions. ... All these things in themselves seem small, but I am sure we are right to attack the problem from all these points of view.

... We shall try with patience, tolerance and exhortation, to see that these people are usefully employed because, heaven knows, there is a great need in this country for employable persons. So long as we do it with discretion and tact and do not rush at it, I am hopeful that we shall surmount and overcome these difficulties.

I would add that just as there is a duty on the part of the host towards the guest, so equally there is a correlative duty on the part of the guest towards the host. ... We must ask that all those who come to this country to show that they are going to prove worthy citizens of it.

That really is the substance of what I have to say ...

LORD LLEWELLIN: My Lords ... I must say I should think none of us who were at Atlantic City in 1943 contemplated that 18 months after the war in



Europe had terminated there would still be over 1,000,000 of these luckless people who were homeless. This is a great human problem. *These people have committed no crimes. Most of them are where they are because they left their own countries from fear of oppression, rightly or wrongly, and because they did not like living—let us be frank about it—under a Communist regime.*

That is why a lot of them came away from east to west, and why a great number of them do not wish to return. I am glad that the Lord Chancellor, in his speech to-day, realized that there was *no political issue between us, but we want the right of asylum—which is one of our great traditions in this country—to remain, and we want our views on it to bear fruit also in those countries where that tradition is not perhaps as strong as it is here.*

I was glad to hear about these Missions to certain countries which are under-populated, fertile lands... where these displaced persons not only can get new homes but can probably be of great benefit to the countries to which they go. . . .

. . . I was also glad to hear the Lord Chancellor say that for those who stayed here the policy of the Government was that they should be employed in useful work. That, I think, should have the assent of all of us. Where there is objection to these people in the trade union movement, I hope that those who leave will take the broad humanitarian point of view when looking at this problem. Practically wherever you go you find work of one sort or another held up in this country for the lack of the necessary labour. . . .

Here we have a great variety of persons. I am not for one moment advocating every one of them having a right to come here—certainly not. We must only take those who, we are pretty sure, will make themselves worthy citizens of this country, and I would not just fling the doors open wide to everybody, I think a lot of them will be just that. *I am told by those in Germany who have been looking after a lot of people who fled out of the Baltic States that they are extremely good types of citizens. Some of them are highly educated people, and most of them are of good character.* . . . Of the displaced persons in UNRRA camps there are no less than 50,591 Poles who are of farming stock. *Of the Balts there are 11,933 who are of farming type. Well, some of those might be extremely useful here.* We shall shortly be losing our German prisoners of war, and I would sooner see these free men come over here of their own free will and go to work on our land, where we want additional labour, rather than still keep prisoners of war after the war has been over for two or three years.

I come next to a category which many people in this country would thank the Government for bringing over, and that is the category of *domestic servants*. There are 10,913 Poles classed as domestic servants, and 6,787 Balts. *I am glad to think that the Government is bringing over 2,000 of those Balts—I think that this is the right word for them—as nurses. They will be most valuable additions to our hospitals.* My only complaint is not that the Government is doing the wrong thing, because I think it is the right thing, but I do not think they are doing enough of it. They are not bringing over as many of these people as we might well have in this country. I see that there are

1,249 Poles who are bricklayers, and it would not do any harm to have some of them. *There are 964 Balts who are carpenters, and they would be quite welcome, as well as 1,124 Polish electricians and 846 Balt electricians.* Not all, but quite a number of those people who are skilled men in those jobs where we are short of labour at the present time, could surely be brought over to this country, just as the 2,000 Balt nurses are being brought over by the Government.

Not so long ago I went to my tailor, having just the number of coupons left to get myself a new suit. I was told that I could have it in six months from the date I gave the order. When I asked why, he said there was *a great shortage of tailors and seamstresses. I see there are 8,089 of these amongst the Poles and 2,929 amongst the Balts,* and I feel that if we had a few of them in this country some of us would not have to wait six months or so for a suit of clothes. I believe that not only can we be doing a really good turn—and a good turn we ought to do—to a lot of these displaced persons, but we can also *help ourselves by bringing the good types of them to this country.* I do not believe that they will interfere with or turn people out of employment so far as we can visualize the position for some years ahead. That being the case, I think we should move rather faster than we are now doing.

*International bodies are a slow way of dealing with this matter.* What I find about these bodies is that they meet and discuss a matter, and when they find they cannot get complete unanimity they adjourn for three or six months to some suitable place, hoping that a little bit more work behind the scenes will have been done between one meeting and the next. The result is that if this organization under the United Nations which, unfortunately, started without complete unanimity, is the one that is going to have this task entrusted to it, I am afraid that these people are going still to be kept behind this barbed wire where we are feeding them and keeping them in idleness. . . . Are we doing all we can? I believe that by these practical steps you are going to do far more than these bodies, resounding though their names may be, set up under the United Nations. What we want to do is to take practical steps and say to the other countries, "We have done something, now will you not do something too." In that way, other countries may follow our lead, and we shall have done something to solve this very human problem that the war has left us.

LORD HAMPTON: My Lords, . . . this is a great tragedy. It is true, I suppose, to say it is a tragedy in little. It does not touch many lives in many corners of the world, but still it is a tragedy. I have not heard the *case of the young people mentioned.* I do not know what is the proportion in those camps, but, undoubtedly, there must be a very large number of them, including many babies who have been actually born in the camps since their parents have been there.

All I want to do to-night is to point out that *we should not make too much of the utilitarian side* either of the problem of emigration to South America or of bringing some of these poor people over here to work for us. *We should look equally, perhaps even more so, at the humanitarian side.* I do hope there will be no sort of discrimination against those who happen to have families in these camps, and that those who can work and are willing to work, and who otherwise ful-



fil the various considerations that may be put up for emigration, will be given every facility, if they have families, to bring their families over and settle them here too. *We can give these young people, who have had such a very sorry turn in life, some hope and some help for their future lives.* It may be, and it probably will be, that *in the future they will become the best citizens of their adopted country.*

The LORD BISHOP OF CHICHESTER: My Lords, the fidelity of the Allies to the principles which they hold is being tested at many points, and there is no point at which the test is sharper than in their treatment of the remaining displaced persons. I am sure everybody will have appreciated very much the Lord Chancellor's welcome insistence on the right of asylum as a firm British principle. The very large-scale task of general repatriation of displaced persons at the end of the war has already been mentioned. . . .

We have to face the million displaced persons that remain. . . . The outstanding fact is that, 19 months after the close of the war, they remain. Perhaps not quite enough has been said about the present condition under which the displaced persons now exist. They are not very good conditions, and their conditions are deteriorating. It is not only that they are full of alarm about the future, though this is perhaps a principal factor, but they tend to be regarded more and more as a nuisance, it being forgotten that they were the victims of the Nazis. There is *too frequent a change of personnel among the officials* in the British zone in Germany who are charged with their care; *too frequent shifting of the displaced persons from camp to camp*, and too little care for the older and the infirm people. Too little of the treatment which we give to our juvenile criminals has been given to the juvenile criminals who grow among the displaced persons there. But, as the noble Lord who introduced this subject so eloquently has pointed out, the great anxiety is with regard to the future. In the majority of cases, the States of origin are pressing for their return in order, as they put it, that they may share in the work of national recovery. And it is quite right that every facility, and indeed encouragement, should be given to those who wish to return, and it is very possible that quite a number more of these displaced persons out of the 1,000,000 will find their way back, though one must deprecate a form of bribery—60 days rations and the like—which is sometimes held out.

But when all is said, and when every allowance has been made for malingering, *there will be a very large number whom no power on earth will induce to go back to their countries of origin of their own free will*, and the point at which the fidelity of the Allies is being tested is whether or no they will force back to the country of their origin, either directly or indirectly by acquiescence, *men whom no free democratic court would convict of crime.* Of course we except from all these considerations war criminals who are, presumably, under proper control. But *I emphasize the fact that the men who refuse to go back with their families are the men who have either fought or suffered for principles which the Allies championed until their championship was crowned with victory.* The reason why they refuse to go back is that rightly or wrongly, they believe that if they cross the frontier to-day they will exchange freedom for tyranny. It is not for me to

say whether or not their beliefs are incontrovertibly true, but in trying to discover the reasons for their refusal it is necessary to find out what those views are which they believe to be facts. . . .

. . . I have first hand information of incidents which took place on the Carinthian frontier at the end of the war when British troops—*think of this, my Lords, because of the danger which will exist in a few months' time*—were ordered to arrest members of the Yugoslav National Army when they crossed the frontier from Yugoslavia to Austria and to disarm them. *The British troops were told to take those Yugoslavs into Austria, to be most careful not to tell them where they were taking them, or leading them, and then to work their way towards another part of the same frontier and hand them over to the Communists.* A soldier who was involved in that transaction had commented: "It hardly seemed to most of us to be in accordance with the best British principles of fair play." The recent trials of General Mihailovitch and Monsignor Stepinac, throw a lurid light on the fate that awaits such men. . . .

*The Baltic States have been mentioned. The citizens of those wonderful States, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia provide an illustration of another kind.* They did not, it is true, fight for the Allies. Some of them were compelled to fight for the Germans. But, *beyond all doubt, these peoples have suffered for the principles for which the Allies have fought.* I have some personal knowledge and I had some first-hand information in the early years of the war of the character of the first occupation of those three countries in June, 1940. I know something of the *deportations of hundreds of thousands of Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians far away to the East to a remote and incommunicable country*, and tales of a woeful character are told of their present condition or their fate. *Surely it is no wonder that very large numbers of citizens who fled out of those countries when they could, should consent to be displaced persons, and that they should be unwilling to return to their native land.* I have had letters from the heads of churches in Estonia and Latvia who are in special relationship with the Church of England and other churches represented in this country and I have seen letters written by Latvians to-day to other Latvians *who are in what they call a free world.*

There is much other testimony besides of the *grave character of conditions which prevail in those wonderful Baltic States, where the civilization is so intense, where humanity is so real, and where the treasures of culture are so many.* We can discount things that we hear or what men say, but *there is a sufficient reality behind such letters and such evidence to prevent one wondering why these displaced persons are unwilling to return.* There are others displaced, too, who will come to our minds. We must be concerned for their welfare now and for their resettlement, partly perhaps by some absorption in the European sphere (of the kind indicated by the noble Lord, Lord Llewellyn), and partly by emigration to the American continent and to other countries. I hope that in any plans for emigration the older people and the young children—but especially the older people—will not be forgotten. The qualification of who is a useful asset in the labour market will not, I trust, be the only one to



decide whether people are to be rescued or not.

The House obviously welcomed what . . . the Lord Chancellor, said about the Missions for South America, Canada and elsewhere. . . . It is a world problem, not only a British problem. Other countries have a very great contribution potentially to make. . . .

The one thing which I hope everyone will steadfastly hold to is that *all these displaced persons, of whatever nationality*, who not being war criminals decline to go back of their own free will, that is to say, *refugees* who have fled from their native land *on racial, political, or religious grounds—must not on any account be forced back by Allied power. The real remedy is the establishment of freedom in those countries* in such a way as to assure the exiles that they will be free from oppression and free from fear, and that the way to their own safety is open. We should appeal to the East and the West, to Russia and to the United States, to our own country and to France, and to the United Nations, to *co-operate to this end. And we must not rest until that task is fulfilled.*

In the meantime, while we are taking *precautions against malingering* or the possible abuse of sanctuary, it is not in accordance with the rule of law between the nations, or with the principles for which the Allies fought, or in accordance with British nature, tradition, history or sense of *fair play*, that we should compel those who have taken sanctuary in other lands—not being war criminals—to go back to the lands of their birth when they know that return to those countries under the present conditions will lead to their immediate attack and involve them, almost inevitably, in loss of liberty or life. If we were to do these things, what answer should we have to the sufferers, or to history, or to conscience, if we were asked: "*What have you, the Western democratic world, gained by your sacrifices, except to see the most elementary human rights betrayed before your own eyes?*"

The EARL OF IDDESLEIGH: My Lords, I listened with the greatest satisfaction to the reassuring statement . . . about the efforts that are being made to promote the migration. . . . In this connexion, there arises a point. . . . The point is the *preservation of the family unit* among displaced persons wherever it now exists. It is of course the tragedy of very many displaced persons that they have been torn from the bosoms of their families. There are many men who do not know whether their wives or their children or their parents are alive or not. There are some who have succeeded in bringing their families—or some portions of their families—with them, or who have exercised while displaced persons the fundamental human right which cannot possibly be denied them—the right to marry and found a family themselves.

I understand that from the point of view of the immediate and obvious interests of the receiving countries there is a preference for single persons, who constitute a labour force with obvious advantages. I remember that in a recent debate in this House a suggestion was made that the problem of our agricultural labour supply could be largely solved by the use of Polish resettlement corps labour—not only immediately, but in a year or two's time, when the crisis of manpower in agriculture will become acute. It was suggested that these Poles would live in camps, and would therefore not be competitors in the field of

rural housing.

On this suggestion, I would sound a note of warning. It is not practicable, and it is not desirable, to prevent displaced persons from contracting matrimonial alliances, and when planning for the importation of displaced person labour it is not desirable to ignore family units which already exist. It is the pursuance of the policy of giving preference to unmarried persons as labourers, indeed, that is responsible for the grave moral problem among resettlement elements. . . .

The EARL OF SELBORNE: My Lords, . . . my quarrel with the Government is not with what they are doing, but what they are not doing. They are doing good, but they are not moving nearly fast enough. . . .

I should like to suggest that the United Nations might, at any rate, *agree upon a formula* which would be a guide as to what number of displaced persons each country could take . . . to arrive at a formula by which you took the *square mileage of fertile land* in each of the United Nations and *divided it by the population*. That would give you the *density of the population in the fertile lands*. I am not suggesting that you should count areas like the deserts of Australia or other such parts, but merely the density of population in fertile lands. . . . It would then be found that a minute addition to that density of population would completely absorb these million displaced persons. If such a formula could be agreed upon, every country would know what was its fair share, and if we took our fair share under such a formula it would really not be more than the influx of persons we received in the years from 1937 to 1939, the people who were fleeing from Hitler's tyranny.

I am sure they could be absorbed into this country and they could be absorbed into other countries without dislocating labour conditions; on the contrary, very greatly helping all of us in our work of reconstruction after the war. . . . I submit that nothing less will really deal with the problem. What I dread is that we should continue, as we have been doing, during the last 18 months. *What is the use of bringing 2,000 Baltic ladies here and 5,000 people there?* The numbers are far too great for such nibbles: the migration must be tackled systematically and on a sufficiently big scale. *If we continue to do nothing we shall be allowing a festering sore to continue in the centre of Europe* that may have very dangerous results in the years to come, and in addition, as the right reverend Prelate has said, *we shall be betraying the principles for which we fought in this war*. I venture to submit that the *real testing time of the United Nations Organization is now*; these problems should be handled in time and handled adequately. We have the example of the League of Nations before us to teach what results from a policy of drift. . . .

. . . Of our Allies I do not think any one fought with greater gallantry or greater loyalty than the Poles. . . .

. . . Why are they being treated differently . . . they have been urged to return to Poland. Surely *they know what conditions are in Poland better than we do*. . . .

Now I am informed that they have been deprived of the better food rations of 3,000 calories a day . . . that the intention is to put them under paymasters appointed by the Communist Polish Government. That would mean that their names would be known



to the Warsaw Government and their relatives in Poland might suffer persecution if they continued to refuse to return.

I should like to read an extract from a letter from a high ranking Polish officer who rendered special service of the utmost importance to this country in Poland. He was one of the chief agents of the Western Allies in Poland during the German occupation and did magnificent work for years on end with reckless bravery. . . . This is what he writes:

"On my arrival in Germany I was placed in a prisoner of war camp though I had never been a prisoner of war even for an hour. . . . The treatment which the German population receives here is much better than that which the former Allied soldiers are given, for they have been even deprived of personal freedom to a great extent. I am sorry to write about these things but I think that after the Katyn crimes the greatest crime of the present time is the sufferings inflicted on the Polish prisoners of war. . . .

"Personally on the termination of this 'victorious' war I often went to bed hungry and without the certainty that my wife had any supper. I never asked for charity or for special assistance. However, I considered that since I have lost in the service of Great Britain, my Motherland, my health, my property, from a human point of view I should be granted the right of a free domicile at least in the country of the defeated enemy as well as some employment. . . . To-day after the 'victorious' war not only is access to the Atlantic Hotel forbidden me but I am not even allowed to go to Hamburg though my camp is one kilometre from that city."

I do not think we can read letters like that without a feeling of shame. . . .

The LORD CHANCELLOR: . . . Lord Llewellyn, asked what is going to happen when UNRRA comes to an end, as it will do in six months' time. I wish I knew. International negotiations are taking place now. . . . This country will do what it can, but I must warn your Lordships that the problem is a problem of food, and food in its turn is a problem of dollars; and it is perfectly idle to think that, with the best will in the world, we have the possibility of supplying the necessary dollars to provide the people of this country and all these people on the Continent of Europe with food. It cannot be done by this country. The most we can do is to do what we can; that is all I can say.

With regard to the question raised by . . . Lord Iddesleigh, I agree with him that the family unit is certainly something we should bear in mind. After all, *the whole foundation of our civilization is the family*. . . . As to the remarks . . . by . . . Lord Selborne . . . if I understood the noble Earl aright, and if the letter which he quotes says that after the crime of Katyn, *whoever may have been responsible* for that, the next greatest crime in this war is the treatment by the British of the Poles, then I say it is a monstrous perversion and that the statement ought never to have been made or read to this House.

LORD BEVERIDGE: . . . When I was in Belgium, which also has a great shortage of miners, I did not find people there thinking that they would rather be short of coal than employ people who were not Belgians. I hope we shall get on with these other employments. Domestic service, for instance, is not a luxury of the rich; it is a necessary service for old people and parents with young children. Not to meet that need because we will not import many more than these 2,000 people from abroad is a cruelty to people in this country. . . .

I want to welcome the action of the Government in not waiting for the setting up of the International

Refugee Organization and in taking up all the schemes through the Missions for replacement and resettlement. . . .

Motion for Papers, by leave, withdrawn.

/Hansard, Lords, vol. 144, No. 18, 19th Dec. 1946, cols. 1164-1194/

## 12 February 1947:

The EARL OF PERTH: Will the noble Lord forgive me for one moment? I think he has forgotten the very large numbers of *Balts* who did not fight on the German side but who do not want to go back to their country as at present constituted.

LORD STRABOLGI: I have not forgotten the *Balts*. They are described to me as admirable people. But of course a good many of them, if they did not fight on the German side, worked on the German side, and worked very well, and were political adherents of Hitler. I agree with the noble Lord, Lord Cherwell . . . that it is not very easy in a totalitarian State to oppose the regime, but there is less excuse for foreigners who voluntarily support a regime of such a horrible nature as the Hitler tyranny, which many of these people did. It is said over and over again that these displaced persons can make up for our manpower shortage. Well it could be done, and we certainly are short of manpower. But it is taking a long time to settle the Poles. . . . Most of them were our Allies, but a few fought on Hitler's side. We are having great difficulty in getting them settled into civilian life in this country. . . .

. . . I am not suggesting that we are keeping them as a kind of Foreign Legion. . . .

LORD HOLDEN: . . . A suggestion which I had in mind to make has already been made in the course of the debate: that is that it would be a great advantage if we could put our enforced labour system on to a voluntary basis by endeavouring to get over here displaced people. . . . They need not only be Poles; there are, I understand, others ready to work, *Lithuanians* and *Jugoslavs* among them. We could then let the Germans who want to go back return to their country. . . . I do not think that the political views of any of these people, however reactionary they may be, would be a danger to our democracy, nor am I in the least frightened about the mixture of blood which might result. As a student of history, I know that in the past there have been many mixings of blood which have been very beneficial to this country. . . .

The LORD BISHOP OF CHICHESTER: . . . I entirely accept the need for differentiating between the anti-Nazis, the violent offenders, and the pro-Nazis. . . .

/Hansard, Lords, vol. 145, No. 29, 12 Feb. 1947, cols. 584-5, 592, 607/

## House of Commons:

### 28th January 1947:

Oral Answers—*European Displaced Persons*

25. MR. M. LINDSAY asked the Minister of Labour whether the Government will invite suitable displaced persons in Europe to work in those British industries which are short of manpower.

MR. ISAACS: In addition to the existing arrangements for bringing *women* displaced persons to this country for *domestic work in hospitals*, I am considering, with other Departments concerned, the possibil-



ities of meeting current manpower shortages by the recruitment of displaced persons.

MR. LINDSAY: But is it not a bit late for the Minister to consider this matter now? Ought not this to have been considered at least 12 months ago?

MR. ISAACS: What we are considering is an *extension of the arrangements* which have already been made. *No publicity has been given to them, although, as the hon. Member has put down a Question, I can refer to it. We have already brought in for purely domestic work in private households over 7,000 people, but the Question of getting the men over for these other schemes must be taken into consideration with other factors.*

SIR ARTHUR SALTER: Has the Minister already taken steps to see that the displaced persons are classified according to their different skills and eligibility for the work which is required to be done?

MR. ISAACS: Yes, Sir. I would not like to be too specific about all the camps, but we have had officers of the Ministry of Labour in many of the camps classifying these people and finding out their capabilities, especially the women workers. *Well over 1,000 women displaced persons who have come here to work in institutions and hospitals have given the greatest satisfaction, and are an excellent type of person.*

*/Hansard, Commons, vol. 432, No. 35, 28 Jan. 1947, cols. 750-751/*

### 5th February 1947:

Oral Answers—*Displaced Persons (Germany and Austria)*

36. AIR-COMMODORE HARVEY asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster how many displaced persons were in the British zones in Germany and Austria at the latest convenient date, and what are their nationalities.

THE CHANCELLOR of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Hynd): In January, 1947, there were approximately 269,000 non-German displaced persons in the British zone of Germany and 68,000 in the British zone of Austria. Of those in Germany the majority are Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians and Yugoslavs. In Austria the majority are Yugoslavs, Poles and Hungarians.

... MR. SYDNEY SILVERMAN: With regard to those displaced persons who are non-repatriable, is it not the case that the International Refugee Organisation made inquiries of all countries in the world for places of refuge for them, with very disappointing results?

MR. HYND: It is certainly true that the results so far are disappointing, but some results are beginning to show, and we already have resettlement missions in Germany examining the possibilities of moving large numbers of these people.

*/Hansard, Commons, vol. 432, No. 41, 5 Feb. 1947, cols. 1764-5/*

### Debate on Conditions in Germany:

MR. BYERS: ... I want to say a word, however, about the problem of displaced persons in Germany, because that is a very big problem and I cannot do justice to it in the 3 minutes which I propose to devote to it. There are 269,000 displaced people in the British zone. They are not all potential foreign labour. Some of them constitute a social security problem—the older

people, the widows and the orphans. Some of them must be an educational problem—the young children and so forth. I should like to see from this Government a little more drive, a little more initiative in getting these people settled. ...

MR. STOKES (Ipswich): ... I should like to show him some of the displaced persons camps and so-called concentration camps. We might then get along more quickly with these vital human problems. ... I know something about those displaced persons ... in my opinion the vast majority of them—and by that I mean 80 or 90 per cent—would be an asset to any nation? They are first-class people, and I agree that something ought to be done to obtain a large number of them. We want labour in this country. ...

With regard to UNRRA, I hope the Minister may give us an assurance that the rumours which are rife that another, independent authority is to take over, and precede the authority of the Central Commission in Germany, are untrue. My understanding of the position is that when UNRRA goes, displaced persons' camps will come under the Control Commission who, in turn, will act as agents for the international body. ...

... I find it difficult to talk ... without harking back to Yalta and Potsdam, those two thoroughly bad eggs which were laid by the right hon. Member for Woodford (Mr. Churchill). I agree that we ought to have gone to Potsdam and smashed them. ...

... I do not believe that the Potsdam position could have arisen without the evil background of Teheran and Yalta. ...

There is a second, and even worse, vilely insane policy which sprang up at Potsdam and which showed itself in those appalling expulsions ... of eight million extra souls who have been turned out of their homesteads. If we add the Russian zone figures, I think the total will come to about 18 millions. ... When the Foreign Secretary goes to Moscow, I hope he will stick to what was obviously the intention ... at Potsdam, that the western frontier of Poland had not been settled. ... The whole of the Potsdam arrangements involving the acquisition of land by Russia and Poland was contrary to the principles of the *Atlantic Charter*. ...

SIR A. SALTER: ... about displaced persons. I do not think that the number of people eligible for immigration to a country like this is as high ... but undoubtedly there are a great number of displaced persons ... who would make an admirable and valuable addition to the manpower of this country, and of other countries also, ... First, there would be the humanitarian advantage of relieving the individuals concerned, and preventing the demoralisation of good human material. Secondly, we should be saving the expense of keeping them in their present positions. Thirdly, we should be relieving, in the best possible way, our own manpower deficiency.

... Even if they cannot be immediately transported and absorbed they would ... at least have a better chance of keeping their moral under the difficult conditions under which they have been living there for so long. ... I have seen many of these persons, and I am quite sure we could be doing great good to our own country as well as solving their problem, and also be helping to solve the difficulty of our problem in Germany if we put real drive into this matter, ...

MR. KENNETH LINDSAY: ... I really think we



ought to know before long *what is to happen to the quarter of a million refugees from Communism—let us state exactly what they are, and not beat about the bush—when UNRRA closes down.* There are many of them, *especially the Balts, and others* who are now going to the Belgian mines in exchange for prisoners of war, *who would make excellent citizens of this or any other country.* It is wrong to talk about emigration when we know perfectly well that the Dominions are not even prepared yet to take British immigrants on any scale that matters. . . .

SIR RALPH GLYN: . . . I want to ask the Minister whether he cannot really *make a desperate effort now to do something to help these poor people* who are worthy of assistance, *and especially these Balts* of whom there are quite a number. As far as I know, *they cannot possibly go back whence they came.* At one time, *there were 92,000 in the British zone, and only four of them had been repatriated.* The Balts are *hard-working people* but they do not speak the German language. The Estonians and the Latvians are *very good at agricultural work*, and I recognize that we here are in need of labour on the land and to help our internal economy. . . .

*Here are these Balts longing to come to England, many of them trained agriculturists, who would be assimilated here very well—far better than Germans—and who are anxious to give what assistance they can.* I believe that *they would settle down very well with our own people.* . . .

. . . From every point of view, I think the time has come to beg the Government to consider if it is not possible to *bring some of these Balts here to work on the land and get them out of the camps in Germany and settled in this country, and, in exchange, return those Germans who, I still say, we have no business to keep any longer.* In many of the camps, *we are treating them almost the same as we are treating the incarcerated Germans who are accused of being Nazis.* I do not think it is right, and, although I am afraid some hon. Members will not agree, *how can we expect Europe to settle down again if we are to perpetuate those views which are going to create a feeling of Nazism again? These people are not allowed any occupation and hardly any recreation; they are smouldering in these camps, and becoming more and more bitter.* Is it our policy to keep them in these camps for ever? Would it not be better to send them back to do some really useful work, and thus reduce the number of people in Germany *longing to get out, and whom we are keeping there.* I ask the Chancellor to realise—he may be bored with this matter of displaced persons—that *it is utterly wrong to permit any organisation, other than the official British organisation, to have anything to do with these camps, and I beg of him not to permit some sort of international organisation, some sort of UNRRA, to carry on this business.* Dual control and double responsibility have been proved to be great failures. . . .

/Hansard, Commons, vol. 432, No. 41, 5th Feb. 1947, cols. 1829-1831, 1834-36, 1839, 1848-49, 1867-68, 1889-1891/

14th February 1947:

Debate on Displaced Persons—Europe

MR. STOKES: . . . I want to talk about the whole question of displaced persons, of whom there are approximately 269,000 in the British zone in Germany.

There are others in Italy and Austria, about whom I do not know the details so well, and approximately 450,000 in the American and French zones. They have been forced out of their homes, and we have now got to the state where those who would otherwise be willing to be repatriated will not go back for fear they will be persecuted by Poland— . . .

It is the responsibility of the chief Allied Powers to see that these displaced persons receive fair treatment. Unfortunately, it is so common in this country for people to like dirty news that displaced persons, as a whole, have a bad reputation here, and are constantly being referred to as vagabonds and thieves. That is not the case. It is true that there is a small minority, who were let loose from prisons in Poland and elsewhere, who have been a nuisance, but they would be a nuisance wherever they went. But the vast majority are first-class people who, if let into this country, would be of great benefit to our stock, would help to raise the standard of living, and would be of immense use anywhere where there was a labor shortage. . . .

There is one beastliness to which I must refer. There is a nasty game of "body snatching" going on amongst the Powers. I came across it while travelling on the Continent. The authorities have had instructions that they are to uproot children, whatever the conditions in which they are living, and force them to go back to their so-called country of origin. I wish to raise a protest about that. There are roughly four categories. There are the children with parents, who have no interest in Germany, and are not Germans—and no one can complain that they should be transferred to institutions in their so-called country of origin.

There are also children, who . . . were transplanted at the age of six or seven into German camps. They are now between the ages of 12 and 13, and many of them have parents still alive. They are at an age when they should be allowed to decide for themselves whether they want to go back. Any child whose parents are alive should be sent back to its parents. There are younger children whose parents are known, and they should go back to them. . . .

The fourth category is the worst of all. Some children were planted out by the Germans when only one or two years old. They had no knowledge of what life was about, and the existence of their parents was not known. The origin of the children is known, however. It is wrong, where those children are safely living in families with whom they are happy and well looked after, with the only parents of whom they have any knowledge, that they should be forcibly taken away, out of the happy family to an institution in what is to them an entirely foreign country. . . .

I ask that this matter of displaced persons should be treated with the urgency which it deserves. I do not want to get into a quarrel with the United Nations or the IRO, but whether the people are Poles, Ukrainians or Jews, *we are responsible. We have a greater responsibility for getting those people resettled where they can enjoy a reasonably safe and happy life.* If the three nations, the United States, France and ourselves, really set about it, there is no reason whatever why they should not be able to do it. *Russia always claims that she has no displaced person problem, I understand. She has 1,500,000 displaced persons—nearly one*



million Poles—forcibly taken away to Russia, and Latvians, Estonians, etc. . . .

MR. PAGET: The hon. Member has raised a serious question, . . .

. . . We found accommodation for 2,000,000 Americans, and we can do this today if there is the heart and spirit. We can do this job, but we can only do it if we take the decision now when the time is appropriate for decision.

I urge very much that this thing be dealt with. After all, *these are people who are enduring and have endured with great constancy appalling and hopeless conditions for a number of years because their love of freedom was so intense that they preferred any conditions under the aegis of a free government to returning to conditions which were not free.* Surely that is the spirit and the stuff of which we can make Britons.

MR. MARTIN LINDSAY: I rise to support as strongly as possible the plea to which the House has just listened from the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Stokes) and the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Paget). I cannot understand why the Government are so hesitant upon this particular subject. . . .

. . . I cannot understand how it is that the Government are so reluctant to take *these skilled men, Lithuanians, Letts, Estonians, Poles, Yugoslavs, Czechs, or whatever they are,* in these displaced persons camps in Germany. The action of the Belgian Government in taking 15,000 to 20,000 skilled miners into the Belgian mining industry was an extremely sensible decision, and I wish this Government would do likewise. . . .

MR. SKEFFINGTON-LODGE: . . . Recently UNRRA carried out an occupational survey . . . it covered no fewer than 140 separately listed occupations. Figures for a few of the most important categories are as follows: fully trained miners, 850; bricklayers, 1,808; carpenters, 5,569; electricians, 3,467; plumbers—and we could do with them just now—530; textile workers, 2,220; and nurses, of whom we are particularly short, 3,891. . . .

The LORD PRIVY SEAL (MR. ARTHUR GREENWOOD): . . . I welcome very much this unity

of feeling on what in my younger days used to be a very controversial problem about emigrants into this country. . . . As to forcible repatriation, no one has ever charged us with being guilty of that. Indeed, we could not in any circumstances force people to go back to their own country if conditions there are repugnant and dangerous to them.

. . . This country has always offered asylum to people who have suffered from political or religious persecution. Reference was made to the Huguenots. Now, we are faced with the problem of directly recruiting people, if we can, from countries abroad. I am not so sure that I share the view of my hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Stokes), that we should not bother the rest of the world, and that the problem ought to be dealt with by us, France and the United States of America. Of the three nations, believe me, we seem to get the heavier end of the stick. . . .

. . . . It is not without interest that the National Union of Mine Workers have agreed and are prepared to accept Poles. Other unions are coming into line. . . .

/Hansard, Commons, vol. 433, No. 48, 14 Feb. 1947, cols. 752, 755-6, 758-761, 765-7/

### 24th February 1947:

#### Written Answers

MR. J. MORRISON asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster the *total of displaced persons from the Baltic States*; how many are agricultural workers and how many are forestry workers; and if the latter are not categorised, if he will classify them and publish the total.

MR. J. HYND: I assume the hon. Member is referring to the numbers in the British zones of Germany and Austria. These are:

	Number Recorded	Agricultural Workers	Forestry Workers
British zone of Germany..	82,000	23,800	290
British zone of Austria....	1,025	55	5
	83,025	23,855	295

/Hansard, Commons, vol. 433, No. 54, 24 Feb. 1947, cols. 250-251/

## "To Remind the Hardened Consciences of Today's Masters of the World..."

### 1. D.P.s Protest Reds in Baltic

HERFORD, Germany, March 11 (AP)—Displaced persons quietly boycotted the mess halls in their camps throughout the British zone today, an UNRRA official said, in a demonstration against Russian annexation of the Baltic States of Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia.

/The N. Y. Herald Tribune, March 12, 1947, p. 10-L, col. 6/

### 2 Report Baltic D.P.s On Hunger Strike

LONDON, March 10 (INS)—Reuters quoted the Frankfurt radio as saying tonight that 10,000 Baltic displaced persons in the American occupation zone of Germany have launched a mass hunger strike.

The broadcast said the hunger strike, which coincided with opening of the Moscow Conference, was called to protest Russia's annexation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

/N. Y. Daily Mirror, March 11, 1947, p. 3/

### 3. Baltic D.P.s Fear Soviet Rule

Protest Any Approval of Annexation of Homelands—Join in Hunger Strike—by GAULT MACGOWAN.

HEIDELBERG, March 12.—Exiles from the Baltic States are protesting against the possible Moscow conference recognition of the Soviet annexation of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia and are drawing rapid denunciatory fire from the Soviet-controlled press in the Russian zone and from the Moscow radio.



BLP(LKA)1331  
1947, Nr. 3-4

The 100,000 Baltic D.P.s who fled when Soviet troops overran their country are described as "non-German Nazis who fear to return to their own country."

UNRRA-sponsored students at the university here are called the least intellectual survivors of the fugitive European reaction, being bunched together as Baltic barons, Yugoslav Chetniks who fought against Tito and Poles from Anders's army, all united in hating democracy.

### Screening Pretty Tough

According to UNRRA headquarters here, the Baltic students at the university number 200 and all were screened by United States military authorities before admission. And I was told "as you know, the Army screening system, especially for university kids, is pretty tough."

Following the Europe-wide hunger strike called by the Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian governments-in-exile in Switzerland (?—*Lith. Bulletin*), the Baltic D.P.s in UNRRA camps throughout the American zone gave up their midday meals yesterday and Heidelberg University Baltics fasted throughout the whole day.

The students said their strike was directed solely against annexation of their homelands which, had the Nazis done it, would have been outlawed, they said, as a crime against humanity. Threats also to call a work strike to emphasize the exiles' demands for the restoration of their homelands did not mature and the students attended classes as usual.

### Offspring of Simple Folk

The fasting Baltic students have sent a manifesto to the Allied Control Council in Berlin protesting that in Baltic States and other Eastern countries, principles of the Atlantic Charter have not been realized, and appealing to "the conscience of political and spiritual leaders of the world."

Investigating the backgrounds of the Baltic students, I learned here today that of 200 in all, 120 are women, and that not one, man or woman, is the child of a baron, the majority being the offspring of simple folk. Among those interrogated were sons of village school teachers, petty municipal officials and artisans. One student was the Chicago-born son of a Lithuanian ironworker. All desire to return home when the Baltic States' sovereignty is restored.

A Latvian girl, when told of the allegation that the UNRRA students were the lowest intellectual survivors of European reactionaries, said: "That's very funny. Yesterday happened to be examination day for me, and though I ate nothing, I passed by chemistry paper with top honors. I was delighted about it."

The university semester ends this week, reopening in April.

/The N. Y. Sun, March 12, 1947, p. 4, cols. 3-4/

### 4. Lithuanian Exiles Demonstrated Against Soviet Occupation

(PAT)—On March 4th, the St. Casimir's Day, Lithuanian exiles resident in the camps in the area of

Meppen, organized a demonstration of liberation of Lithuania from the Soviet occupation.

At 5 A.M. several hundred residents (in excess of 500) of the Gross Hesepe Camp, settled by the Lithuanians and Balts, marched out with their National Colors and placards.

The demonstrators went to the office of the British regional commander. A British Colonel came out to meet the crowd in front of the headquarters. Delegates of the demonstrators presented to him a declaration and protest against the occupation of Lithuania by the Soviet troops. The Lithuanians stated in their declaration that they are prepared at any moment to return to their country as soon as the homeland will regain its freedom and independence.

In reply to the delegates' statements, the British Colonel assured the gathering that no one would be repatriated forcibly and that the decision to remain in exile or to return home depends on the exiles exclusively.

Lithuanian demonstrators then proceeded to the headquarters of the 1st Polish Armored Division and the delegates approached Gen. Rudnicki. They presented to him a statement thanking the Polish Army for the solicitude over the camps of involuntary exiles and expressing the exiles' gratitude. Gen. Rudnicki in cordial words thanked the delegation for its touching declaration. In compliance with the delegates' request, Gen. Rudnicki reviewed the parade of the demonstrators.

A spokesman of the demonstrators stated that similar demonstrations were to take place on St. Casimir's day in all centers of Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian exiles in Germany.

/Dziennik Polski i Dziennik Żołnierza, London, March 12, 1947/

### 5. Telegram of Pittsburgh Citizens to President Truman

Citizens of Western Pennsylvania . . . appeal to you to guide this country's foreign policy back to the principles of Justice proclaimed in Atlantic Charter and your own Twelve Points. With malice toward none, with charity for all, we demand that Moscow conference be limited to preliminary conversations, that no commitments be made regarding Germany's eastern frontier, . . . that the United States take firm initiative in demanding restoration of sovereignty and human freedom of the Baltic States and that Russia immediately withdraw occupation armies and terrorist police forces. Lithuanian Americans will join one day hunger strike by Baltic political refugees on opening day of Moscow Conference, March 10th, a day of fasting and prayer in appeal to the hardened consciences of today's masters of the world in behalf of justice for the Baltic Peoples.

Pittsburgh, Pa., February 16, 1947.

J. B. Tamkevičius, Chairman  
S. Bakanas, Secretary

1740