

9. KIOR, N. (2010) Literaturna imaholohiia: vyvchennia obraziv nashykh etnokultur u natsionalnii literaturi. *Pytannia literaturoznavstva*, 79, 290–299.
10. KRASNYKH, V.V. (2002) *Etnopsiholingvistika i lingvokulturologiia*. Moscow: Gnozis.
11. LE GOFF, ZH. (1992) *Tsivilizatsiia srednevekovogo Zapada*. Moscow: Izdatelskaya gruppa "Progress", Progress Akademiia.
12. MILOSLAVSKAIA, S.K. (2012) *Russkii yazyk kak inostrannyi v istorii stanovleniia evropeiskogo obraza Rossii*. Moscow: FLINTA, Nauka.
13. NALYVAIKO, D.S. (2005) Literaturoznavcha imaholohiia: Predmet i stratehii. *Literaturna komparatyvistyka*, 1, 27–44.
14. NALYVAIKO, D.S. (1998) *Ochyma Zakhodu: Retseptsii Ukrainy v Zakhidni Evropi XI–XVIII st.* Kyiv: Osnovy.
15. OSHCHEPKOV, A.R. (2010) Imagologiya. *Znanie. Ponimanie. Umenie*, 1, 251–253.
16. OSHCHEPKOV, A.R. (2010) Imagologiya v kurse "Teoriya kultury". In: *Vyshee obrazovanie dlya XXI veka. Materialy VII Mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii (18–20 November, 2010, Moscow)*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo humanitarnogo universiteta, pp. 53–59.
17. PAPILOVA, E.V. (2011) Imagologiya kak humanitarnaia distsiplina. *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo humanitarnogo universiteta im. M. A. Sholokhova. Seriya: Filologicheskie nauki*, 4, 31–40.
18. PORSHNEVA, O.S. (2014) Istoricheskaia imagologiya v sovremennoi rossiiskoi istoriografii. In: *Ural industrialnyi. Bakuninskie chteniia: Industrialnaia modernizatsiia Urala v XVIII–XXI vv. XII Vserossiiskaia nauchnaia konferentsiia, posviashchennaia 90-letiiu Zasluzhennogo deiatelia nauki Rossii, doktora istoricheskikh nauk, professora Aleksandra Vasilevicha Bakunina (4–5 December, 2014, Ekaterinburg)*. Vol. 1. Ekaterinburg: Uralskii Federalnyi Universitet, pp. 126–129.
19. REPINA, L.P. (2012) "Natsionalnyi kharakter" i "obraz drugogo". *Dialog so vremenem*, 39, 9–19.
20. SENIAVSKAIA, E.S. (2006) *Protivniki Rossii v voinah XX veka: Evoliutsiia "obraza vruga" v soznanii armii i obshchestva*. Moscow: Rossiiskaia politicheskaiia entsiklopediia.
21. SENIAVSKII, A.S., SENIAVSKAIA, E.S. (2006) Istoricheskaia imagologiya i problema formirovaniia "obraza vruga" (na materialakh rossiiskoi istorii XX veka). *Vestnik Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov*, 2 (6), 54–72.
22. SENIAVSKII, A.S. (2001) Problema "svoi – chuzhoi" v istoricheskom soznanii: teoretiko-metodologicheskii aspekt. In: *"Nashi" i*

"chuzhie" v rossiiskom istoricheskom soznanii. *Mezhdunarodnaia nauchnaia konferentsiia (24–25 May, 2001, Saint-Petersburg)*. Saint-Petersburg: Nestor, pp. 13–15.

23. BLOCH, M. (1990) *L'Étrange Défaite: Témoignage écrit en 1940*. Paris: Gallimard Folio Histoire.

24. DYSERINCK, H. (2003) Imagology and the Problem of Ethnic Identity. *Intercultural Studies: Scholarly Review of the IAIS* [Online]. 1 (Spring). Available from: <http://www.intercultural-studies.org/ICS1/Dyserinck.shtml>. [Accessed: 30 November 2015]

25. DYSERINCK, H. (1982) Komparatistische Imagologie jenseits von "Werkimmanenz" und "Werktranszendenz". *Synthesis. Bulletin du Comité National de Littérature Comparée de la République Socialiste de Roumanie*, 9, 27–40.

26. DYSERINCK, H. (1988) Komparatistische Imagologie. Zur politischen Tragweite einer europäischen Wissenschaft von der Literatur. In: H. Dyserinck, K. U. Syndram, eds. *Europa und das nationale Selbstverständnis: Imagologische Probleme in Literatur, Kunst und Kultur des 19 und 20. Jahrhunderts [Symposium in Luxembourg, 1984 Sept.]*. Bonn: Bouvier, pp. 13–33.

27. FEBVRE, L. (1954) Les lumières de clío. *Le Nouveau Monde et l'Europe*, 9, 11–29.

28. GORDOA, V. (2007) *El Poder de la Imagen Pública*. México: Random House Mondadori.

29. BELLER M., LEERSSEN J. (eds.) (2007) *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters: a Critical Survey*. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi.

30. LEERSSEN, J. (n. d.) National identity and national stereotype. *Imagologica – Images* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.imagologica.eu/leerssen>. [Accessed: 30 November 2015]

31. LIPPMMANN, W. (1922) *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and company.

32. McCLINTOCK, A., ELLIS, R. (1993) *Teoría y práctica de la comunicación humana*. Barcelona: Paidós.

33. SWIDERSKA, M. (2013) Comparativist Imagology and the Phenomenon of Strangeness. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* [Online]. Vol. 15.7. Available from: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2387&context=clcweb>. [Accessed: 30 November 2015].

Надійшла до редколегії 28.10.15

S. Kotova, postgraduate student
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

"THE IMAGE OF A STRANGER" AND "THE IMAGE OF AN ENEMY", "IMAGOGY" IN MODERN INTERDISCIPLINARY AND HUMANE STUDIES

The article deals with genesis and meaning of "imagology" qua a novel interdisciplinary approach. It was made an overview of major socio-humanistic author papers. It should be considered, that the definition "imagology" is rather new and is used stepwise in academy lexis. Since it is interpreted quite differently and involves in conceptual confusions. Our objective was to study different definitions of "imagology" in Ukrainian and international historiography. The novel academic designs of "imagology" are highlighted in sociological, comparative approaches, and qua the school of historical anthropology and mentalities' studies. The durable formation of national images and ethnic habits are analyzed in current techniques. It could be concluded that there are a lot of differences "imagology" definitions in novel Ukrainian and international historiography discourses.

Key words: Imagology, Modern foreign historiography, Modern national historiography, the history and theory of historiography.

UDC 94(438):355.257.7(=162.1) "1939/1940"

Marius Pečiulis
Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas IX Fort Museum, Lithuania

THE RETURN OF POLISH SOLDIERS HELD CAPTIVE IN GERMANY TO LITHUANIA IN 1939–1940

Following the agreement between Lithuania and the Soviet Union signed on October 10, 1939, Vilnius region was transferred to Lithuania. Lithuanian government officials had to resolve many political, economic, and social problems, as well as the problem of returning Polish soldiers mobilized from Vilnius region and held captive by Germany. In December, 1939, after the agreement with Germany had been reached, Lithuanian government officials prepared to return the soldiers to Lithuania. First, the war prisoners whose national identification question did not pose any doubts had to return to Lithuania. Later, the permission was given to the soldiers who conformed to the conditions necessary to obtain the Lithuanian citizenship, which were approved in 1939. During the process of returning war prisoners to Lithuania, 2,148 persons were asked to be returned. However, only one fifth of them, i.e. 463, returned until July, 1940. On August 2, 1940, after more than one month had passed after the occupation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, Lithuanian leaders suspended the process of returning Polish soldiers.

Key words: war, war prisoners, Vilnius region, occupation, national identity.

The question of ceding Vilnius city and its region from Poland was considered to be one of the priorities in the interwar Lithuanian Republic. When Germany and the Soviet Union deleted the state of Poland from the European political map in September, 1939, Lithuania had real possibilities of regaining the historical capital. The hopes cherished for 20 years were fulfilled on October 10,

1939, when the Article of Transfer of Vilnius and Vilnius region to the Republic of Lithuania and Soviet-Lithuanian Mutual Assistance Treaty was signed.

However, with the new territories ceded, Lithuania also inherited various political, economic, and social problems. One of them was Polish soldiers mobilized from Vilnius region and held captive in Germany, while after signing the

Treaty they laid claims to become Lithuanian citizens. Therefore, at the end of 1939, Lithuanian officials had to resolve the problem of national identification and liberation of these soldiers.

In Lithuanian historiography, this topic has not attracted a more considerable scholars' interest. More attention has been devoted to the problematics of Polish soldiers interned in Lithuania. Dr. Gintautas Surgailis has published a monograph on this issue [39]; also, in 2007, Simonas Strelcovas defended his Ph.D. thesis at Vytautas Magnus University [40]. An attempt is made to compensate the lack of information by published sources, i.e. memoirs. The present research has focused on the memoirs of Lithuanian government officials, who worked at that time and had a direct contact with the issues discussed in the present research: Juozas Urbšys, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania [43, 44], envoy to Germany Kazys Škirpa [41], Commander-in-Chief of the army Stasys Raštikis [37], Edvardas Turauskas, the Policy Department Director of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs [42], and Leon Mitkiewicz, the Polish military envoy to Lithuania [36]. Unfortunately, considering the political context of the time period, the attention of these officials was concentrated on the tense international situation and the attempts of Lithuania to maneuver in it; therefore, the issues of the present investigation were not mentioned in the memoirs of the above-mentioned persons.

One more source of information is Lithuanian periodicals. An attempt was made to find the necessary information in the nationalist semi-official newspaper *Lietuvos aidas*, the newspapers *Lietuvos žinios* and *Vyriausybės žinios*, as well as *Vilniaus balsas*, the newspaper published since 1939 for Vilnius region. The periodicals provided the possibility to deepen knowledge about the events and the discussion of the problem under the present analysis in society.

The main sources for the present research are authentic documents preserved at the Office of the Chief Archivist of Lithuania (subsequently, OCAL), i.e. the files of the following funds: Government Representative to Vilnius City and Region (F. 317), Ministry of the Interior of Lithuania (F. 377), Ministry of National Defence of Lithuania (F. 384), and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (F. 383). The files of the Fund of Ministry of Foreign Affairs have been the most useful to the present research.

On the basis of the above-mentioned information sources, the present article aims at analyzing the process of returning the Polish soldiers, originating from Vilnius region and held captive in Germany, to Lithuania. In order to reach the aim, the following objectives have been formulated:

- to discuss the reasons which influenced the Government of the Republic of Lithuania to return Polish soldiers held captive in Germany to Lithuania;
- to analyse the negotiations of Lithuanian and German officials about returning the captive Polish soldiers to Lithuania;
- to analyse the processes of compiling soldiers' lists and their returning to Lithuania.

The objectives posed determine the structure of the research. The analysis is composed of three chapters: Initial Stage of the Process, which discusses the reasons of returning Polish soldiers held captive in Germany and the negotiations of implementing this process; Compilation of the List of War Prisoners to Be Returned, which focuses on the selection of war prisoners and the compilation of the list of persons to be returned to Lithuania; Return of War

Prisoners to Lithuania, which analyses the details of war prisoners' return to Lithuania.

It should be noted that the present paper does not aim at a complete research. A possibility remains to correct or complement the research with new or already existing facts, which are not known to the author of the present paper because of objective reasons.

1. Initial Stage of the Process

On October 10, 1939, the Article of Transfer of Vilnius and Vilnius region to the Republic of Lithuania and Soviet-Lithuanian Mutual Assistance Treaty was signed [26, p. 1]. In accordance with this Treaty, Vilnius city and its region became an integral part of the Republic of Lithuania [27, p. 640]. However, when the euphoria after regaining the historical capital passed, the necessity to resolve various problems arose. The situation is well-illustrated by Povilas Žadeikis's, the Lithuanian envoy to the USA, observation: "We've regained Vilnius, but it has to be washed intensively and for a long time with Lithuanian soap" [11, p. 28]. Vilnius area was regained with residents; Lithuanians did not form majority among them. Lithuanian government officials had to resolve not only economic but also social problems of integrating the new territories into a common system of the country and creating a homogeneous society.

Lithuanian government officials could not wait. Most of them understood that the war could not last forever, and after its end, the Republic of Poland would be reestablished and would make claims to Vilnius region. A similar scenario unfolded after WWI, during the Paris Peace Conference. Lithuania had to use the situation and create a suitable sociopolitical background. Lithuanian envoy to Great Britain Bronius Kazys Balutis suggested a detailed resident census of Vilnius region. This material was expected to be used at the peace conference after the war as a means of propaganda against the interests of Poland in Vilnius region. According to Balutis, this way, the processes of ethnic and social integration would also be accelerated.

In order to define the status of the new residents, Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania approved "The Anticipatory Law on Managing Vilnius City and its Region" on October 27, 1939 [28, p. 667]. For the present research, Article 3 is the most topical as it states that "The residents of Vilnius city and its area who were regarded as Lithuanian citizens on July 12, 1920, when the Soviet-Lithuanian Peace Treaty was signed and the ratification documents were exchanged, and had a place of residence in Vilnius city or its area on the enforcement day of this law, are considered to be the citizens of Lithuania" [28, p. 667]. Thus, in order to define the present status of Vilnius region residents, the agreement signed 20 years ago was treated as the main document. Article 6 of the agreement with the Soviet Union signed on July 12, 1920, distinguished four main aspects on the basis of which the Lithuanian citizenship could be granted:

1. The people who lived in the territory of contemporary Lithuania on August 6, 1920 and were 18 years old;
2. If the person lived in the territory of contemporary Lithuania on August 6, 1920 and were under 18, the citizenship was given according to the citizenship of the father or mother;
3. The people who originated from other territories of the former Russian empire but from January 1, 1904 to January 1, 1914 were living in the territory of contemporary

Lithuania and had a permanent job and lived there on August 6, 1920;

4. The people who originated from the territory of contemporary Lithuania but permanently lived in other areas of the Russian empire could become the citizens of Lithuania only if they had opted for the Lithuanian citizenship [30, p. 4].

When adapting this law to the situation, the clauses of the above-mentioned Article were extended by indicating that the same order was applied on October 27, 1939. The conformity to the above-mentioned criteria had to be justified by specific documents indicated in the Change of Passport Regulations approved on November 20, 1939 [29, p. 719]. In accordance with this document, the citizenship of the Republic of Lithuania was granted and passports were given to the residents of Vilnius and its area who could prove their citizenship by specific documents: acts of civil status, documents of entering a village, town, or estate community, as well as official documents which proved the time of residence in Vilnius region. In accordance with this order, a part of Polish soldiers mobilized from Vilnius region and held captive in Germany could lay claim to Lithuanian citizenship.

A question arises what reasons influenced the Lithuanian government officials' care of soldiers in a foreign country because Lithuania already had many acute problems. During the period of 1938-1939, Lithuania experienced many events and fell into a complicated international political situation: ultimatums of Poland and Germany, loss of Klaipėda region, dislocation of Soviet military troops in Lithuania, and large numbers of war refugees. According to the data of the USA Red Cross, when the war between Germany and Poland started, in total 23,749 refugees were registered in Lithuania by January 8, 1940 [31, p. 5]. Such numbers of civil refugees and interned soldiers became a heavy burden to the small country. The situation could be even worsened by the return of former Polish soldiers, originating from Vilnius region.

There was one important reason which influenced Lithuanian government officials to develop this process. After Vilnius was ceded, the Lithuanian army found a destabilized society in Vilnius. City residents were lacking food products because of irregular supply during the war. There were huge queues at the shops which were still open; many of them were already closed. The zloty was devalued and was exchanged to litas at the rate 5 to 1 [45, p. 80]. The situation was even worsened by a politically active and anti-Lithuanian part of Polish residents, which identified Lithuania with a new occupation government [45, p. 66-67]. Dissatisfaction sometimes gave rise to a larger-scale unrest. For instance, society dissatisfaction about the increased bread prices led to pogroms of Jews on October 31 – November 2 [45, p. 110]. The Lithuanian government had to devote all possible efforts in order to stabilize the situation so that this unrest would not move to the rest of the country.

One more cause of unrest could become families whose members were serving in the Polish army and were held in captive in Germany. At the beginning of the war, 14,500 residents from Vilnius region were serving in the Polish army [45, p. 47]. In many cases, the soldier mobilized to the Polish army was the main breadwinner and the financial supporter of the family. After his mobilization, anxiety about the future arouse among family members. For example, the application to liberate her husband, who was mobilized to the Polish army in August, 1939, was sent to the Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

by Vilnius resident Ina Solomonovienė on December 5. It was argued that no one could take care of the family business [2, p. 155]. After two days, Juozas Brėdikis, the secretary of the Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, sent the following reply: "Concerning your application received on December 5, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs reports that the agreement with the German government about war prisoners in Germany has not been reached; therefore, at the moment no steps can be made in order to return your husband Aleksandras Solomonovas" [3, p. 154]. Viktoras Čečeta, the Government Commissioner to Vilnius city and area and the Head of the Department of Social Affairs, observed in his report to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that until the middle of December, there were 1,500 applications about war prisoners held in foreign countries [6, p. 164]. Making efforts to return these people, the Lithuanian government officials could demonstrate their good intentions and contribute to lighten up the mood in society and make it more favourable to the state. These ideas were also expressed by Kazys Škirpa, the Lithuanian envoy to Germany, in the middle of November: "To my mind, we need to help our countrymen as quickly as possible, and we cannot postpone their liberation; otherwise, this might cause society dissatisfaction in our Vilnius region" [1, p. 256].

It was impossible to start the soldiers' return process without an official agreement with Germany. On the basis of information sources, November 14, 1939 could be considered to be the beginning of negotiations, when Škirpa met with Ernst Woermann, the Head of the Policy Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany. During the meeting, Škirpa directed attention to the fact that in war prisoners' camps in Germany, there were many people of Lithuanian nationality among Polish soldiers, and the Lithuanian legation received many applications to return them to Lithuania [1, p. 256].

Some concrete results were achieved in December. On December 15, 1939, German envoy Erich Zechlin visited the Lithuanian Minister of Foreign Affairs Juozas Urbšys. The envoy informed Urbšys that Germany agrees to transfer the war prisoners to Lithuania who originate from Lithuania (Vilnius region). The priority was given to the soldiers of Lithuanian origin. Later, other former Vilnius region residents had to be transferred, who could be acknowledged to be Lithuanian citizens in accordance with the new order. The analysis of the sources has not revealed any data that an official written agreement was signed with Germany, concerning the return of Polish soldiers [18, p. 210]. The main person responsible for the return of Lithuanians was the Lithuanian military attaché in Germany, General Staff Colonel Kazys Grinius. He had to communicate with German military authorities directly on this question [5, p. 243].

After the verbal agreement with the German officials, an action plan had to be devised quickly on the implementation of this process. First, the persons who were being returned had to be identified nationally. This was impossible without the personal data of the person. It was impossible for the Lithuanian legation employees to go to all prisoners' camps with potential Lithuanian citizens and talk to each of them individually who wanted to return to Lithuania. The necessary information had to be obtained in a simpler way.

Lithuanian envoy to Germany Škirpa suggested the following action plan in his report to Urbšys: first, the responsible German officials had to be introduced to the

Citizenship Law of Lithuania; in accordance with the Law and taking into consideration the applications of the people in war prisoners' camps, they would make the lists of people who met the conditions of getting the citizenship of Lithuania and transmit it to the legation; Lithuanian officials then would prepare questionnaires in order to identify the person and send them to everyone willing to get the Lithuanian citizenship; the Lithuanian legation would send the completed questionnaires to the Ministry of the Interior (henceforth, MI), which would consider if the Lithuanian citizenship should be given or not; after MI's permission, the legation in Germany would issue passports to war prisoners and would submit a request to the German institutions to liberate new Lithuanian citizens [1, p. 256].

A more concrete plan was provided by Lithuanian Consul in Tilžė Juozas Sruoga. He supported the idea of the questionnaire only partly. Sruoga claimed that Lithuanian military attaché in Germany Grinius has to contact war prisoners' camps with Lithuanians and distribute papers with questions there. The contents had to be agreed upon by the MI and MFA officials [4, p. 251]. The questions had to be concrete, clear, and leading to such an answer which would help identifying not only the person, but also his national identity [22, p. 253]. The authenticity of the data would be checked by such institutions as police or district administration from which war prisoners originate. On the basis of recommendations of these institutions, the MI could compile the final lists of soldiers to be returned. In addition, several disadvantages of the above-mentioned plan were discussed. First, this method of personal and national identification required at least minimal education of the respondents. Taking into consideration a comparatively low literacy level, a conclusion could be drawn that some persons would not be able to fill in the questionnaire, as well as would not have the possibility to find out about it. Lithuanian officials remembered the experience of WWI. At that time, the Lithuanians held captive in Germany got jobs at local farmers and after the war did not return home because, being illiterate and unable to read, did not know about this possibility [4, p. 252].

At this point, one more reason against the questionnaire method might be discussed. When Germany started the war in Europe and mobilized much workforce, its lack was significantly felt, especially in agriculture. One of the alternatives tested during many years was the use of war prisoners in agriculture. German farmers had already employed some Polish soldiers. For instance, at the beginning of 1940, the Lithuanian MFA was contacted by Kazimieras Čebarkas's relatives, who asked to liberate him. It was claimed that he and eight other people of Lithuanian nationality were working on a farm near Marienburg (at present, Malbork, Poland) [10, p. 167]. Apparently, farmers did not want to lose workers and might not have informed war prisoners about the possibilities to return to the home country.

In order to avoid such problems, Sruoga suggested organizing the beginning of the return process differently than in Škirpa's report. Preliminary lists of the soldiers to be returned had to be prepared by Lithuanian rather than German officials. The main role had to be played by chiefs of small rural districts or heads of local police offices as they could collect significantly more accurate information than the officials at higher administrative levels. All information collected had to be grounded by specific documents or witnesses' testimonies [4, p. 252].

From the subsequent events, one can observe that the project of returning war prisoners was realized by combining the suggestions by Škirpa and Sruoga. At the beginning of January, 1940, an announcement was prepared at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which had to be hung up in all war prisoners' camps [8, p. 236]. In addition, the information was collected in the areas where the soldiers had lived before mobilization and, this way, the list of persons to be returned was compiled.

2. Compilation of the List of War Prisoners to be Returned

On December 22, 1939, Turauskas sent the first list of soldiers to be returned to the legation in Germany [7, p. 280]. There were only 15 surnames on the list [23, p. 279]. The Director of the Policy Department at the MFA observed that the list was compiled taking into consideration relatives' requests and additional documents attached which proved the Lithuanian origin of the former Polish soldiers. The requests reached the institutions following the above-mentioned method. First, relatives addressed the closest state administration officials, i.e. chiefs of small rural districts. Then, the requests reached the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or the Office of the Government Commissioner in Vilnius city [7, p. 280].

The first list of the soldiers to be returned was compiled and sent in a seven-day period after reaching the agreement with Germany. A conclusion can be made that Lithuanian government officials were working intensively. On the other hand, the analysis of residents' requests has revealed that the intensity was not always that high. For instance, the request already mentioned in the present article by Solomonovienė to return her husband Aleksandras had been received on December 5, 1939, while its consideration started only on April 30, 1940. The Head of the Foreigners' Department of Vilnius city asked the Chief of the 4th police station of Vilnius city to clarify where war prisoner Solomonovas was at that time [13, p. 167]. The reply with his location was received only after a few days, i.e. on May 8 [14, p. 166]. However, even after that the situation did not change. On June 6, the Lithuanian MFA resent Grigorijus Solomonovas's request to grant the Lithuanian citizenship to his brother and to return him to Lithuania [16, p. 194].

In order to accelerate the process of returning their family members to native places, some people did not hesitate to address the relatives who had a higher status in society. For example, brother-in-law rabbi dr. Elhanan Golomb, living in the USA, took care of the liberation of his Jewish relative dr. Hirsh Dlugi. On January 7, 1940, his request was delivered to Lithuanian envoy in the USA Povilas Žadeikis [24, p. 6]. Golombas received a reply after more than three months, on April 17, 1940. He was informed that the case of returning Hirsh Dlugi to Lithuania had been started; however, this would be done only after confirming his right to get the Lithuanian citizenship [25, p. 4].

The process of list compilation and sending was also comparatively complicated and had several stages; therefore, this research required special attention. Taking into consideration the status of war prisoners, three categories of soldiers' lists to be returned can be distinguished. The lists with persons of Lithuanian nationality form the first category. In total, this list, which contained 20 surnames, was sent to the legation in Germany. More detailed information is presented in Table 1:

Table 1. The first category lists of soldiers

List number	Date of sending	Number of surnames on the list
1	1939.12.22	15
2	1940.01.02	6
3	1940.01.09	6
4	1940.01.11	10
5	1940.01.20	9
6	1940.01.31	32
7	1940.02.10	25
8	1940.02.13	37
9	1940.02.22	20
10	1940.02.27	19
11	1940.03.05	15
12	1940.03.12	36
13	1940.04.10	18
14	1940.04.17	12
15	1940.04.22	41
16	1940.04.24	25
17	1940.04.30	15
18	1940.05.17	13
19	(no date provided)	14
20	1940.06.17	8
		In total: 376

The total number provided in Table 1 contradicts the results of other archival documents, which indicate 378 surnames [23, p. 279]. The analysis of different lists has revealed that some war prisoners were asked to be returned twice. For instance, attention was directed to two persons in List 8: Juozas Palšauskas and Antanas Šarkus (Antoni Szarko) [12, p. 156]. The officials of the MFA of Lithuania received the lists of war prisoners from Colonel Grinius, compared them to the ones already sent and noticed the inaccuracies, while these surnames included twice remained in the final numbers. One more assumption about different numbers might be the ability of the soldiers to liberate themselves from the war prisoners' camps. In List 12 of the soldiers to be returned, 34 surnames in total were included; however, next to Juzef Dudo's surname, a remark was written in pencil that this person had run away from the war prisoners' camp [23, p. 308].

As can be seen from the data provided, from the beginning of January to February, the lists of the soldiers to

be returned were sent to the legation in Germany almost every week. A slightly slower tempo can be observed only in March and May. April was exceptional as even 111 persons in total were asked to be returned to Lithuania (almost one third of all persons from the first group). Possibly, this was influenced by the spreading information about the possibilities to return relatives. On the other hand, as many requests were obtained from the countryside, an assumption can be made that spring and, consequently, busy season influenced the residents to take care of the return of their breadwinners more actively.

The people of the second category were the ones who had the Lithuanian citizenship as the residents of Vilnius region or its area. The compilation of these lists started significantly later. The first list was sent only on April 3, 1940 [19, p. 1]. In addition, attention should be drawn to the fact that in contrast to the lists of the first category, these ones were sent after the occupation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940.

Table 2. The second category lists of soldiers

List number	Date of sending	Number of surnames on the list
1	1940.04.03	24
2	1940.04.11	18
3	1940.04.22	15
4	1940.04.23	10
5	1940.05.01	6
6	1940.05.01	3
7	1940.05.08	32
8	1940.05.17	6
9	1940.05.17	8
10	1940.05.20	39
11	1940.05.28	69
12	1940.06.03	64
13	1940.06.06	30
14	1940.06.08	73
15	1940.06.09	30
16	1940.06.19	143
17	1940.06.20	160
18	1940.06.25	119
19	1940.06.27	46
20	1940.06.28	32
21	1940.07.05	278
22	1940.07.06	56
23	1940.07.09	123
24	1940.07.12	144
25	1940.07.16	73
26	1940.07.20	47
27	1940.07.24	43
28	1940.07.26	76
29	1940.07.31	5
		In total: 1772

As can be seen in Table 2, the second category lists are significantly more numerous compared to the first category. Larger numbers are observed since May, and they especially increased in June. Colonel Grinius observed that "It seems that the possibility to liberate from captivity reached all camps. For some time, war prisoners wrote a number of various requests. Mainly they ask for freedom. In order to illustrate this, I report that only during two days of May, 15 and 16, I read, marked, and sent nearly 60 requests" [15, p. 223]. Under these circumstances, Colonel Grinius had to admit that he could not cope with this excessive workload; therefore, he asked to send him an assistant [15, p. 223].

In the lists of this category, slight inaccuracies in numbers can also be observed. In the final data summaries, 1,768 surnames are indicated in the sources [19, p. 1]; however, counting the surnames provided in the lists, the number indicated in Table 2 is obtained. For instance, in List 3, sent on April 22, 1940, the surnames of 15 persons are included, while in the final list, only 14 are counted. The surname of Jan Duduzc is crossed out with a pen. In contrast to the first category list, this time no commentary is provided, which would explain the reason of crossing out the surname and the fact if this soldier was not included into the final lists later [21, p. 79]. In another case, in List 18, 119 surnames are provided instead of 117. Here one surname is also crossed out and again without any commentary. Taking this into consideration, it is more difficult to formulate the assumptions about the reasons of inaccurate numbers.

As has already been mentioned, there were third category lists as well. The soldiers whose national identity question raised most doubts were included into this group. Therefore, the questionnaire method was used in selection. Grinius resent the requests that he received from the soldiers kept at prisoners' camps to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It made new lists after adding the requests of Vilnius region residents, which lacked the necessary data in order to identify the persons, and sent them back to the legation in Germany with questionnaires. The legation had to take care that the questionnaires would reach the soldiers in war prisoners' camps [18, p. 211]. The completed questionnaires were sent back to the MFA via Colonel Grinius, and the Ministry had to make the decision on granting citizenship or not. In total, from January to May, 1940, five lists of the third category were sent to the legation [19, p. 2]. Unfortunately, the author of this paper was not able to find accurate data about the number of persons in this category. The sources demonstrate that Colonel Grinius had sent around 1,000 questionnaires in order to check identity by May 17, 1940, and around 700 of them were received completed [15, p. 223]. Sending and checking the questionnaires took very much time, while the Ministry had enough work with the compilation of the lists of persons who already were granted the Lithuanian citizenship. It is highly probable that the question of the third category soldiers to be returned was postponed for later times, which actually did not come [19, p. 2].

Thus, if we add all numbers, we can see that in total 2,148 persons were granted the Lithuanian citizenship and had to be returned to Lithuania during the period from December, 1939, to July, 1940. Undoubtedly, if the Soviet

occupation had not started, this number would have been significantly higher. Colonel Grinius stated at the end of spring, 1940, evaluating the scope of list compilation: "It seems that the number of soldiers to be returned will reach two or three thousands" [15, p. 223].

3. Return of war prisoners to Lithuania

After sending the lists, the last step of the process followed, i. e. the return of soldiers to Lithuania. Colonel Grinius was trying to create conditions as favourable as possible. In his opinion, Lithuanian officials had to take full responsibility for these soldiers from the moment when they crossed the Lithuanian border: to supply food while they were waiting for a train to Vilnius region; to pay for train tickets; to allocate cash for small expenses; to provide new clothes; to provide the necessary medical help. All these activities had to help implementing far-reaching goals. Apparently, Lithuanian officials were anxious that former Polish soldiers could return having anti-Lithuanian attitude and could use their citizenship as a possibility to liberate from captivity. All these small details had to form the image of generous and welcoming Lithuania. This logical conclusion can be made analysing Colonel Grinius's thoughts: "It is important for us that the repatriated people would feel a contrast and a warm and caring attitude" [9, p. 230]. Unfortunately, the information available does not provide any proof if these recommendations were fulfilled. Possibly, a part of these suggestions were taken into account. On February 20, 1940, the legation in Germany received a report from the MFA of Lithuania. It indicated that in accordance with the decision of the Council of Ministers of Lithuania, the head of train station at Virbalis was obliged to provide free tickets to the war prisoners from Germany from the Lithuanian border to the train station in their place of residence [12, p. 227].

Even though the lists were sent at the end of December, 1939, the first 84 soldiers returned only on April 7, 1940 [20, p. 1]. The Lithuanian press of that time devoted very little attention for this event. The main focus was on the expansion of Germany to Scandinavia. A short message can be found on the last page of the newspaper Vilniaus balsas: "The night before yesterday, some Lithuanians war prisoners came back to Vilnius from Germany, 84 persons in total (...). The war prisoners Lithuanians returned excited, singing Lithuanian songs. In Kybartai, they were met by riflemen, while in Vilnius – by a temporary committee of refugee affairs and Vilnius citizens" [33, p. 6]. The semi-official Nationalists' newspaper Lietuvos aidas did not devote more attention to this news. It claimed that the war refugees were welcomed by a large group of Kybartai residents, while all people were greeted by the town burgomaster. Former Polish soldiers had lunch in Kybartai train station hall and told about their experiences [34, p. 10]. The information was even scarcer in the newspaper XX amžius [32, p. 1]. The above-mentioned newspapers emphasized the patriotic and pro-Lithuanian attitude of the former Polish soldiers, this way showing that the Lithuanians who had experienced two decades of "the Polish oppression" managed to maintain their national identity. In total, six trains managed to come back to Lithuania with new citizens of Lithuania.

Table 3. Lists of soldiers who returned to Lithuania

Number of the list	Date of return	Number of soldiers
1	1940.04.07	84
2	1940.05.10	94
3	1940.06.01	45
4	1940.06.14	116
5	1940.06.26	35
6	1940.07.30	89
		In total: 463

The last group of war prisoners returned after more than one month after the occupation of Lithuania. The soldiers were selected from both the first and the second

category. More detailed information about the numbers of soldiers is provided in Table 4.

Table 4. The number of soldiers to be returned and having returned upon request of MFA

The first category soldiers' lists				The second category soldiers' lists			
List number	Date of sending	Number of requests	Number of soldiers returned	List number	Date of sending	Number of requests	Number of soldiers returned
1	1939.12.22	15	12	1	1940.04.03	24	22
2	1940.01.02	6	6	2	1940.04.11	19	19
3	1940.01.09	6	4	3	1940.04.22	14	7
4	1940.01.11	10	6	4	1940.04.23	10	8
5	1940.01.20	9	9	5	1940.05.01	6	4
6	1940.01.31	32	24	6	1940.05.01	3	3
7	1940.02.10	25	17	7	1940.05.08	32	29
8	1940.02.13	37	29	8	1940.05.17	6	3
9	1940.02.22	20	16	9	1940.05.17	8	6
10	1940.02.27	19	19	10	1940.05.20	39	29
11	1940.03.05	15	12	11	1940.05.28	69	1
12	1940.03.12	36	25	12	1940.06.03	64	39
13	1940.04.10	18	15	13	1940.06.06	30	1
14	1940.04.17	12	9	14	1940.06.08	73	
15	1940.04.22	41	34	15	1940.06.09	30	
16	1940.04.24	25	24	16	1940.06.19	143	
17	1940.04.30	15	10	17	1940.06.20	160	
18	1940.05.17	13	7	18	1940.06.25	117	
19	(no date provided)	14		19	1940.06.27	46	
20	1940.06.17	8		20	1940.06.28	32	
				21	1940.07.05	278	
				22	1940.07.06	56	
				23	1940.07.09	123	
				24	1940.07.12	144	
				25	1940.07.16	73	
				26	1940.07.20	47	
				27	1940.07.24	43	
				28	1940.07.26	76	
				29	1940.07.31	5	
		In total: 376	In total: 278			In total: 1772	In total: 171

The data in Table 4 demonstrate that 449 soldiers returned to Lithuania, while 2,148 first and second category requests were sent out. Again, a discrepancy with the final number can be observed, i.e. 463. However, the first number is obtained from the registration of the soldiers who returned; therefore, there is no basis for distrusting it [23, p. 17-19]. On the other hand, the specificity of list compilation and data discrepancies have already been discussed in the present paper.

Only a small number of soldiers (21 %), who were given this right, had time to return to Lithuania. On June 15, 1940, the occupation of Lithuania started. President of the Republic of Lithuania Antanas Smetona withdrew abroad [46, p. 60]. On June 17, Prime-Minister Antanas Merkys, who served as the President of the Republic of Lithuania instead of Antanas Smetona, transferred authority to Justas Paleckis, a person loyal to the occupation authorities. He immediately formed a new puppet government headed by Vincas Krėvė Mickevičius. Merkys himself resigned immediately, this way finishing the history of independent interwar Lithuanian state [46, p. 68]. There is no need to analyse in greater detail the gradual loss of Lithuania's independence and its incorporation into the Soviet Union, as it is widely discussed in Lithuanian historiography.

The compilation of soldiers' lists and the return of persons lasted for almost two months; during this time, two trains with 124 soldiers had a chance to return. It might be observed that the further process and its end directly correlated with the Lithuanian internal and foreign policy which was gradually more and more restricted. After Soviet repressions started, more famous society and policy actors started withdrawing from Lithuania, and the people who

coordinated the return of war prisoners from Germany were among them. On June 15, Turauskas, the Head of the Policy Department of MFA left Lithuania [42, p. 341]. With the changing internal situation in Lithuania, its relationship with its legations in foreign countries, including Germany, which was tackling all questions related to war prisoners' return, was also changing. Head of the legation Škirpa was gradually having more conflicts with the new government of Lithuania and ignored its orders. On July 25, Juozas Kajeckas, an advisor at the legation in Germany, received an encoded telegram from General Secretary at MFA Pijus Glovackis. The telegram informed that Škirpa was dismissed from his office [41, p. 436]. On August 1, one of the main officials who took care of war prisoners' return to Lithuania Colonel Grinius was also dismissed from his office as he refused to return to Lithuania [47, p. 226]. After one day, a logical outcome followed: on August 2, the legation in Germany was sent a decision of the Lithuanian puppet government to terminate the return of war prisoners [17, p. 216]. The people who had already received permissions were prohibited to return. Even though requests to liberate relatives reached Lithuanian institutions in the autumn of 1940 as well, the officials of the "new" Soviet Lithuania were not interested in continuing the policy of the former authorities because of obvious reasons. This way, the process of returning war prisoners, which lasted for more than half a year, was terminated.

Conclusions

The process of returning former Polish soldiers to Lithuania, who were held captive in Germany, lasted from December, 1939 to August, 1940. The officials of the Policy

Department of the MFA of Lithuania and the Lithuanian legation in Germany contributed the most to this process. One of the main reasons for resolving this problem was the attempt to contribute to the stabilization of the complicated situation in Vilnius region and to form public opinion by showing to the residents that the new government took care of its future citizens who were held captive abroad.

A verbal agreement with Germany, which was changed into a written agreement, on the return of war prisoners was reached in December, 1939. In accordance with this agreement, first, the Polish soldiers whose national identification did not cause additional doubts had to be returned to Lithuania. Later, permissions were given to the Polish soldiers who met the conditions of getting Lithuanian citizenship approved newly in 1939. Taking this into consideration, three-category lists of soldiers to be returned were compiled: the soldiers who could immediately be identified as Lithuanians were ascribed to the first category; the persons who were granted citizenship in accordance with the new order were ascribed to the second category; the soldiers whose national identification and citizenship were the most problematic were included into the lists of the third category.

During the process of returning war prisoners to Lithuania, in total, 21 first-category lists with 376 surnames and 29 second-category lists with 1,772 surnames were sent. The lack of authentic sources hindered a more detailed analysis of compiling third-category lists. Possibly, the compilation and sending the lists of this category were not developed enough because of lack of time of responsible officials. In total, 2,148 soldiers of the first and second category were asked to be returned. However, only one fifth of them, 463, returned until July, 1940. Such small number was mainly influenced by a large number of soldiers who wanted to return to Lithuania and a small number of officials working on this issue. In more than one month after the occupation of Lithuania, the Lithuanian puppet government terminated the process of returning Polish soldiers to Lithuania on August 2, 1940.

References

1. Lietuvos centrinis valstybės archyvas (LCVA), f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (1939.11.14. K. Škirpos pranešimas užsienio reikalų ministru).
2. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2351 (1939.12.05. I. Solomonovienės prašymas).
3. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2351 (1939.12.07. J. Brėdikio atskymas I. Solomonovienei).
4. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (1939.12.14. J. Sruogos pro memoria).
5. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (1939.12.16. J. Urbšio pro memoria).
6. LCVA, f. 317, ap. 1, b. 1 (1939.12.18. V. Četetos pranešimas Užsienio reikalų ministerijai).
7. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2379 (1939.12.22. Konfidencialus E. Turausko pranešimas pasiuntinybei Vokietijoje).
8. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (1940.01.04. J. Brėdikio pro memoria).
9. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (1940.01.20. K. Griniaus pranešimas Šaulių sąjungos vadui).
10. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (1940.02.03. Konfidencialus J. Brėdikio pranešimas pasiuntinybei Vokietijoje).
11. LCVA, f. 656, ap. 1, b. 235 (1940.02.05. P. Žadeikio laiškas dr. J. Waluk).

12. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (1940.02.20. J. Brėdikio pranešimas Lietuvos pasiuntinybei Vokietijoje).
13. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2351 (1940.04.30. Vilniaus miesto ir apskrities Svetimšalių skyriaus vedėjo kreipimasis į Vilniaus miesto policijos 4 nuovados viršininką).
14. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2351 (1940.05.08. Vilniaus miesto policijos 4 nuovados viršininko raportas Vilniaus miesto ir apskrities viršininkui).
15. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (1940.05.17. Plk. K. Griniaus pranešimas kariuomenės štabo II skyriaus viršininkui).
16. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2351 (1940.06.06. G. Solomonovo prašymas Užsienio reikalų ministerijai).
17. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (1940.08.02. URM generalinio sekretoriaus Pijaus Glovackio pranešimas Lietuvos pasiuntinybei Vokietijoje).
18. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (1940.08.16. Memorandumas).
19. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (1940(?). Paaikškinimasis raštas, Vilniaus krašto gyventojų, karo belaisvių grąžinimo reikalui).
20. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2379 (1940(?). Iš Vokietijos grįžusių karių sąrašas).
21. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2379 (Vilniaus srities gyventojų, buv. Lenkijos karių, kuriems V. R. M-ja jau pripažino Lietuvos pilietybės teises sąrašas Nr. D).
22. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2346 (Apklauso lapas).
23. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2379 (Informacija apie grąžintinių karių sąrašus).
24. LCVA, f. 317, ap. 1, b. 3 (Dr. Elhanan H. Golomb prašymas).
25. LCVA, f. 317, ap. 1, b. 3 (Vyriausybės įgaliojimo Vilniaus miestui ir sričiai informacinis pranešimas).
26. Vakar Maskvoje pasirašyta Lietuvos-Sov. Rusijos sutartis (1939) *Lietuvos žinios*, 11 Oct., nr. 231, p. 1.
27. Vilniaus ir Vilniaus srities Lietuvos Respublikai perdavimo ir Lietuvos – Sovietų Sąjungos savitarpės pagalbos sutartis (1939) *Vyriausybės žinios*, 17 Oct., nr. 669, p. 640.
28. Vilniaus miesto ir jo srities tvarkymo įvedamasis įstatymas (1939) *Vyriausybės žinios*, 27 Oct., nr. 671, p. 667.
29. Pasų įstatų pakeitimas (1939) *Vyriausybės žinios*, 24 Nov., nr. 679, p. 719.
30. Kas turi teisę gauti Lietuvos pilietybę (1939) *Vilniaus balsas*, 27 Dec., nr. 49, p. 4.
31. Jau įregistruota apie 24 000 šelpiamų atbėgėlių (1940) *Vilniaus balsas*, 11 Jan., nr. 8, p. 5.
32. AŽUOLAS, P. Vilniaus likimas – visos Lietuvos likimas (1940) *XX amžius*, 8 Apr., nr. 78, p. 1.
33. Iš Vokietijos grįžo belaisviai lietuviai (1940) *Vilniaus balsas*, 9 Apr., nr. 81, p. 6.
34. Iš vokiečių nelaisvės grįžo apie 80 vilniečių lietuvių (1940) *Lietuvos aidas*, 9 Apr., nr. 162, p. 19.
35. EIDINTAS, A. (2002) *Žydai, lietuviai ir holokaustas*. Vilnius: Vaga.
36. MITKIEWICZ, L. (2002) *Kauno atsiminimai 1938–1939*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
37. RAŠTIKIS, S. (1990) *Kovose dėl Lietuvos*. Vol. 2. Vilnius: Lituania.
38. SKIRIUS, J. (2001) *Lietuvių visuomenininkas ir diplomatas ir diplomatas Bronius Kazys Balutis*. Vilnius: Vaga.
39. SURGAILIS, G. (2005) Antrojo pasaulinio karo pabėgėliai ir internuoti Lenkijos kariai Lietuvoje 1939–1940. Vilnius: Generolo Jono Žemaičio Lietuvos karo akademija.
40. STRELCOVAS, S. (2010) *Antrojo pasaulinio karo pabėgėliai Lietuvoje 1939–1940 metais*. Šiauliai: Šiaulių universiteto leidykla.
41. ŠKIRPA, K. (1996) *Lietuvos Nepriklausomybės sutemos (1938–1940). Atsiminimai ir dokumentai*. Chicago, Vilnius: Vilsa.
42. TURAUSKAS, E. (1990) *Lietuvos Nepriklausomybės netenkant*. Kaunas: Šviesa.
43. URBŠYS, J. (1990) *Atsiminimai*. Kaunas: Sindulys.
44. URBŠYS, J. (1988) *Lietuva lemtingaisiais 1939–1940 metais*. Vilnius: Mintis.
45. ŽEPKAITĖ, R. (1990) *Vilniaus istorijos atkarpa: 1939 m. spalio 27 d. – 1940 m. birželio 15 d.* Vilnius: Mokslas.
46. ANUŠAUSKAS, A. (ed.) (2005) *Lietuva 1940–1990: okupuotos Lietuvos istorija*. Vilnius: Lietuvos Gyventojų Genocido ir Rezistencijos Tyrimo Centras.
47. GUDIENĖ, D. (ed.) (2003) *Lietuvos kariuomenės karininkai 1918–1953*, Vol. 3. Vilnius: Spauda.

Надійшла до редколегії 05.11.15

M. Пячюліс

Каунаський університет ім. Вітаутаса Великого, Музей "IX Форт", Каунас (Литва)

ПОВЕРНЕННЯ ПОЛЬСЬКИХ СОЛДАТ З НІМЕЦЬКОГО ПОЛОНУ ДО ЛИТВИ У 1939–1940 РР.

Згідно з дооговором між Литвою та СРСР, підписаним 10 жовтня 1939 р., Вільнюський край було передано Литві. Литовський уряд мусив вирішувати низку політичних, соціальних та економічних проблем, а також проблему повернення польських солдат, яких було мобілізовано з Вільнюського краю та взято у полон Німеччиною. У грудні 1939 р., після заключення дооговору з Німеччиною, литовські урядовці готувалися до повернення солдат до Литви. Спочатку повинні були повернутися військовополонені, чия національна ідентифікація не викликала сумнівів. Потім, дозвіл було надано солдатам, які відповідали умовам, необхідним для отримання литовського громадянства, затвердженого у 1939 р. Під час процесу повернення військовополонених до Литви було подано запити на 2148 осіб. Тим не менш, тільки одна п'ята з них, а саме 463 особи, повернулося до липня 1940 р. 2 серпня 1940 р., після того як більш ніж місяць минує з моменту окупації Литви СРСР, литовське керівництво призупинило процес повернення польських солдат.

Ключові слова: війна, військовополонені, Вільнюський край, окупація, національна ідентифікація.