



УДК 94(474.5)

REPRESENTATION OF LITHUANIA IN THE KLAIPĖDA REGION, 1920-1923

GRIGARAVIČIŪTĖ S.,
Ph.D., Associate
Professor,
Faculty of History,
Centre of History
Didactics,
Lithuanian University
of Educational
Sciences

Based on sources and historiography, the article reveals the establishment and activities of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region in 1920–1923. The study pays special attention to the activities of Jonas Žilius in political and economic spheres in 1922. It is the first study in Lithuanian historiography which points out the major highlights of incorporation of the Klaipėda Region into Lithuania and discusses the aspects of legal evaluation of the Klaipėda Revolt.

Keywords: Klaipėda, Klaipėda Region, Military Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region, Lithuania, France, Dominique Odry, Gabriel Petisné, Leopoldas Dymša, Jonas Žilius.

Introduction

In 2013 Lithuania celebrates the 90th anniversary of recovery of the Klaipėda Region (Memel Territory). Seminars¹, conferences² and publications are dedicated to mark this occasion. Hence, I came up with an idea to systemise and evaluate Lithuanian historiography and French historiography available in the Lithuanian language, which make mention of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region and the representatives working in it in some respect, to supplement it with new information from archival documents and to point out the major highlights, which are greatly lacking in the present-day works of historians engaged in Lithuanian diplomacy. Nevertheless, the strongest stimulus to write an article on this topic was the quotation used in the dissertation of historian Vilma Bukaitė³: “It is the sole case when a tiny nation with the population of barely 2.5 million people tried

to break through, in violation of every principle of the international law and without any pretext whatsoever, into the territory taken by the four major powers, which together formed the most powerful force in the world, and imagined to have defeated those powers⁷⁴. The historian refrained from giving a commentary on the quotation in her dissertation, though a professional commentary on it is absolutely necessary.

It was not a common practice to speak about the establishment and activities of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region out loud in the First Republic of Lithuania (1918–1940) because it was officially declared that the revolt was staged on the initiative of Lithuanians from the Klaipėda Region (Lithuania Minor). No official Lithuanian press wrote about the establishment and activities of the representation (1920–1923) (it limited with barely a few sentences on the appointment of the representative or his removal from office⁵), even though it was included in the official lists of diplomatic and consular representations of Lithuania established in foreign countries⁶. The posts of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region were not considered by the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania; however, it did not mean that Leopoldas Dymša, the first representative of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region, could avoid criticism from the Seimas on his activities relating to the issue of visas to the citizens of Poland⁷. When speaking about the three-year French rule, lawyer Rudolfas Valsonokas, having thoroughly studied the problem of the Klaipėda Region in 1932, mentioned the Representation of Lithuania in Klaipėda or, to be more precise, a more rigid inspection of the invoices of imported goods carried out by its employees in 1922, only once⁸.

To counteract the ideas expressed in German historiography in the Soviet times, which contended that the Soviet Union occupied the Klaipėda Region, the book by Robertas Žiugžda *Po demokratijos skraiste (Under the Veil of Democracy)* was published⁹. The author sought to deny the concept established in the historiography of the First Republic of Lithuania about “the revolt staged by the residents of the Klaipėda Region” and brought up a new concept of “the entry of the Lithuanian armed forces into Klaipėda”¹⁰. The historian gave a rather detailed account of appointments of Lithuanian diplomats, their communication with the French administration and the Directorate of the Klaipėda Region, the preparatory actions before the revolt (economic pressure, propaganda) as well as the actions during and after it; however, he failed to

mention the activities of the second Lithuanian representative Jonas Žilius in establishing the *Wirtschaftspartei*, the Secret Political Committee, the structure of the representation, its staff and wages and refrained from mentioning all the measures of economic pressure proposed by the Lithuanian representative at that time¹¹. During the Soviet times Regina Žepkaitė also wrote about the acquisition of interest in newspapers and the propaganda in Klaipėda initiated by the Government of Lithuania¹².

The studies published in the Second Republic of Lithuania mention Leopoldas Dymša and Jonas Žilius as well as their propaganda activities; however, they abstain from giving a broader account of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region¹³. The text by the author of this article published in *The Encyclopaedia of Lithuania Minor* in 2003 attempted to reveal the staff, its financing and the activities of the civil servants at the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region¹⁴. Historian Aldona Gaigalaitė wrote about the appointment of Juozas Purickis (Pėteraitis) the Lithuanian diplomatic representative to Simonaitis’ Directorate set up by the rebels¹⁵.

The afore-mentioned study by Vilma Bukaitė is the latest research study on this topic¹⁶. It systemises the material which has been previously known but it does not, however, provide a more in-depth analysis of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region and does not present independent insights. What is new is the fact mentioned by the historian that Petras Klimas spoke about the appointment of the representative in Klaipėda with Dominique Odry on 22 February 1920¹⁷ as well as the evaluations of the French diplomats. They dubbed Lithuania a “disobedient and unruly” “agent provocateur inciting unrest”, whereas the activities of Lithuanian diplomats in the attempt to incorporate the Klaipėda Region were referred to as “the outcome of Lithuanian vanity and Lithuanian political intrigues”¹⁸.

Two French historians published their studies on the French policy in the Klaipėda Region (1920–1923) – Julien Gueslin¹⁹ and Isabelle Chandavoine-Urbaitis²⁰. In his publication, Julien Gueslin highlighted the positions of the French politicians on the issue of transfer of the Klaipėda Region to Lithuania; however, he included no mention of the Lithuanian representation in the Klaipėda Region²¹. Historian Isabelle Chandavoine-Urbaitis unveiled the role of the second Lithuanian representative Jonas Žilius in helping to stage the revolt, i.e. the economic pressure imposed on the Klaipėda Region, the acquisition of interest in the

newspapers and propaganda²². In contrast to Lithuanian historiography, the French historian considered the military troops gathered by Lithuania near the border for the combat of smuggling in the Klaipėda Region (1922) the preparation for taking the region by force²³.

The review of the studies by Lithuanian and French historians hints a conclusion that the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region has not to this day become a separate research object. The activities of Lithuanian representatives in the Klaipėda Region are only mentioned in the general context of the revolt and the incorporation of the Klaipėda Region into Lithuania; therefore, the object of this research is the appointment of Lithuanian representatives in the Klaipėda Region and their activities in economic, political and propaganda spheres in 1920–1923 as well as the significance of those activities to the present day.

In addition to the historiography discussed above, the study made use of the material kept at the Fund of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania (f. 383) of the Lithuanian Central State Archives. The correspondence between Lithuanian representatives in the Klaipėda Region and the European Centre Department of the Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as Lithuanian representatives in foreign countries stored in it added to the understanding of the circumstances of activities of Leopoldas Dymša and Jonas Žilius. The study also used the shorthand records of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania clarifying the reasons of Dymša's removal from office and the appointment of Jonas Žilius the new representative as well as the Lithuanian periodicals of that time (*Lietuva, Teisė*) enhancing the understanding of the legal aspects of activities.

Based on sources and historiography, the aim of this article is to reveal the establishment and activities of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region in 1920–1923 and to single out the major highlights by paying special attention to the aspects of legal evaluation of the incorporation of the Klaipėda Region into Lithuania. The study has been carried out by means of the methods of analysis, comparative analysis, the comparison of Lithuanian and foreign historiography and based on the material kept at the Lithuanian Central State Archives (hereinafter – LCSA), the shorthand records of the Seimas of Lithuania and the periodical press of that time.

1. Appointment and activities of a diplomatic representative of the Republic of Lithuania in Klaipėda in 1920

A few days after the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles on 10 January 1920 (13 January 1920), the Government of Lithuania delivered a proposal to the Entente Powers asking to move the customs border near the Nemunas River. The Entente Powers refused the proposal²⁴. Seeing the unpersuadable character of the Entente Powers, the Lithuanian Government did not refuse its ambitions and resolved to act through the appointment of its diplomatic representative in Klaipėda.

The region was then administered by General Dominique Joseph Odry; therefore, on 25 February 1920 the Conference of Ambassadors entrusted France to take care of “the diplomatic and consular protection of the residents of the Klaipėda Region”²⁵. It was the responsibility of Petras Klimas, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs, who paid a visit to General Odry in February 1920, to appoint the Lithuanian diplomatic representative²⁶. Lithuania decided to appoint Captain Leopoldas Dymša, also a military officer, its representative, who already had cooperation experience with the French (A.H. Niessel mission). On 1 April 1920 Lithuania submitted an official inquiry to General Odry asking whether he would agree to accept a person appointed by the Lithuanian Ministry of National Defence for maintaining direct contacts on any issues in relation to Lithuania and the Klaipėda Region. Odry agreed²⁷.

Due to the procedure of appointment of commercial, military and other attachés applicable at that time (until 1922 attachés were appointed by the ministries sending them upon a prior coordination of the candidacy with the minister of foreign affairs²⁸), Lithuanian Commander-in-chief General Silvestras Žukauskas signed the appointment on 6 April 1920. Officially, Dymša's position was referred to as “military attaché to the governor of the region”²⁹, whereas the representation was entitled Military Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region³⁰. The Lithuanian military attaché presented his credentials to General Odry on 10 April 1920³¹.

In 1920 the appointed captain Leopoldas Dymša sought to move the customs border near the Nemunas River and to Klaipėda Port, while General Odry wanted Lithuania to export wood and food grain to Klaipėda³². After Germany fixed the customs border with the Klaipėda Region on 27 April 1920, Odry urged Lithuania to sell wood to the sawmills in the Klaipėda Region whose operation was impeded due to the lack of wood. Taking advantage of the situation, the Lithuanian Government decided to pursue its goal.

Dymša made it clear when speaking to General Odry that Lithuania was not going to export anything to the Klaipėda Region as long as it had no control near the Nemunas River and in Klaipėda Port³³.

The trade agreement with Lithuania was also of interest to the Directorate of the Klaipėda Region at that time³⁴. Therefore, the representative from the Directorate of the Klaipėda Region was simultaneously involved in secret negotiations with Dymša³⁵. In May 1920 the chairman of the directorate Jan Altenberg proposed the idea of the customs union to Lithuania but the Lithuanian negotiators did not find the proposal satisfactory. On 12 May 1920 Leopoldas Dymša explained the chairman of the directorate that the Lithuanian Government would like “the control near the Nemunas River and in Klaipėda Port to be handed over to the Lithuanian government”. Altenberg categorically rejected the proposal³⁶.

Even though the negotiations were secret, we can suppose that the information about them still came out. Hence, on 7 June 1920 Gabriel Petisné, who was appointed the civil commissioner, decided to bring up a new deal to the Lithuanian Government, Lithuanian wood being its subject-matter. Petisné put forward a proposal to move the customs border between Lithuania and the Klaipėda Region near the Nemunas River and the Baltic Sea (that would be the easiest way for Lithuanian wood to get to the port) by retaining the control over customs points. The Lithuanian representative rejected the proposal and wood processing companies in Klaipėda failed to receive Lithuanian wood in the summer of 1920³⁷.

Seeing that his tactics failed to serve the purpose, from July 1920 Petisné no longer offered but demanded Lithuania to sell wood to the Klaipėda Region; otherwise, he threatened to import it from Poland³⁸. The threat could only be brought to life in 1922 because the Conference of Ambassadors permitted the Klaipėda Region to enter into agreements with foreign countries (Germany, Poland, Lithuania) from 20 December 1921 only³⁹.

The data available in the archives show that in the summer of 1920 Erdmonas Simonaitis, a member of the directorate of the region, also maintained contacts with the Lithuanian Government. The administration of the region withheld three Simonaitis' letters to the Lithuanian foreign minister Juozas Purickis⁴⁰ asking to send the Lithuanian armed forces and to incorporate the region into Lithuania by force. The letters got into the hands of the administration of the Klaipėda Region, and Petisné used them to blackmail Simonaitis by forcing

him to establish a Lithuanian organisation speaking in favour of *freistaat* in the beginning of 1922⁴¹.

2. Fight between Leopoldas Dymša and Gabriel Petisné in the economic sphere in 1921

The surviving data on the activities of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region in 1921 make it clear that the fight between Leopoldas Dymša and Gabriel Petisné in the economic sphere continued. After removing General Odry from office, on 1 May 1921 Petisné became the chief commissioner of the Klaipėda Region, whereas Leopoldas Dymša presented his credentials to the new chief commissioner of the region on 22 June 1921.⁴² The Lithuanian representation was renamed into the “Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region”⁴³, while Captain Leopoldas Dymša was appointed the representative of the Republic of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region⁴⁴.

After becoming the chief commissioner, in 1921 Petisné sought to divert the attention of the directorate of the region from the customs agreement with Lithuania by proposing negotiations with Poland⁴⁵, and on 7 July 1921 he appealed to the Conference of Ambassadors asking to grant the Klaipėda Region the status of a free state⁴⁶. His key argument – the Klaipėda Region could perfectly survive financially as an independent state⁴⁷.

Seeing that the requirement for the transfer of the customs border near the Nemunas River and to Klaipėda Port was not going to be met and to prevent the realisation of the idea of “a free state” (hereinafter – *freistaat*) advocated by Petisné, the Lithuanian representative proposed an action plan, which could reduce the income generated by the region placed under the French administration and isolate the economy of the Klaipėda Region from Lithuania⁴⁸.

While negotiating in 1920, the Lithuanian Government followed the principle not to sell food grain and wood to the Klaipėda Region; nevertheless, a certain portion of them was sold. Hence, the Lithuanian representative, *first and foremost*, proposed to prevent the import of raw materials for wood processing companies in the Klaipėda Region, thus reducing the turnover of the goods produced and exported. *Secondly*, he proposed Lithuania not to buy the products from wood processing companies in the Klaipėda Region, thus reducing the income generated from customs duties. *Third*, to prevent the import of the lacking amounts of food grain from Lithuania and to force to buy them abroad (it would mean additional expenditure from the budget)⁴⁹.

According to Dymša's calculations, owing to such an economic isolation policy, the budget of the Klaipėda Region was expected to lose the revenue of around 30 million marks from customs duties (which would not otherwise be compensated) as well as the revenue from other taxes and charges⁵⁰. Due to the budget deficit, the cost of living had to grow, resulting in the dissatisfaction of the residents in the region. The main goal of the economic isolation policy was to demonstrate the dependence of this region on Lithuania.

Seeing the moods of residents in the Klaipėda Region, Leopoldas Dymša explained to the Lithuanian Government that the economic measures alone would not serve the purpose; active propaganda in the press was also necessary because the residents of the region were not "burning with desire" to be incorporated into Lithuania. The implementation of the plan of the Lithuanian representative in the Klaipėda Region began when the Lithuanian Government was in the midst of intensive solution of the problems with Poland (two Hymans projects) and admission to the League of Nations⁵¹, whereas Poland was trying to strengthen its positions in the Klaipėda Region placed under French administration – by establishing a diplomatic mission – Delegation of the Republic of Poland to the Inter-Allied Commission (*Delegacja RP przy Komisji Międzysojuszniczej*)⁵². The goal of the mission was to convince the directorate of the region that it would be in the best interest of the Klaipėda Region to be incorporated into Poland⁵³. Consul Kazimierz Mahler was especially active in the mission⁵⁴. He used to purchase property and establish companies⁵⁵.

Following the establishment of the Polish diplomatic mission in the Klaipėda Region, the traffic of Polish citizens to Lithuania got more intensive as well. The representative had to explain himself to both the Minister of Foreign Affairs⁵⁶ and the Constituent Assembly⁵⁷ for the visas issued to Poles. Leopoldas Dymša was reproached that the representation under his guidance used to issue visas to Polish legionaries going to Lithuania⁵⁸ and that "Klaipėda is the place through which the entire Warsaw enters Lithuania and Lithuania enters Warsaw"⁵⁹. The members of the Seimas proposed Juozas Purickis (minister of foreign affairs) to replace the representative in the Klaipėda Region. The latter explained to the members of the Seimas that "the budget for Klaipėda matters is very low and no one agrees to go there for such a low salary"⁶⁰. Nevertheless, the remarks of the members of the Seimas were taken into account and a new Lithuanian

representative in the Klaipėda Region was appointed in 1922⁶¹.

3. Appointment and activities of Jonas Žilius in Klaipėda in 1922

Jonas Žilius, the new representative of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region, presented his credentials to Gabriel Petisné on 11 January. It was also the time (12 January 1922) when the Council of the League of Nations adopted a resolution, which was the final point in the Lithuanian-Polish "reconciliation procedure", while the Seimas of the Central Lithuania, elected on 8 January, declared the incorporation of the region into Poland. Jonas Žilius acted in several directions at the same time – *first*, he continued the economic isolation policy of the region initiated by Dymša; *second*, he pursued the policy and propaganda demonstrating the favourable disposition of the residents towards the incorporation into Lithuania in the public domain.

3.1. Economic isolation policy in 1922

An additional unit for border protection sent by the Lithuanian Government on 27 February 1922 helped the representation to pursue the plan – to isolate the region in the economic sphere. The additional unit was to assist in tackling smuggling because Lithuania's initiative to reduce the scope of trade with the Klaipėda Region considerably increased the volumes of smuggling. Reinforced border security yielded an economic result – a deficit of 5 million marks over 3 months. However, it was not enough because as Lithuania refused to enter into economic negotiations with Petisné in March 1922, they were launched with Poland right after the incorporation of the Vilnius Region. The trade agreement between the Klaipėda Region and Poland was concluded on 27 April 1922. It took effect in June 1922 and opened the door for Polish wood to Klaipėda⁶². What is more, on the initiative of Petisné, five German companies in Klaipėda submitted a request to declare the Klaipėda Region *freistaat* under the protectorate of one of the allies⁶³.

Jonas Žilius conceived the plan how to divert the overall flow of documentation of the goods through the trade division of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region. On 31 August 1922 he proposed the Ministry of Finance to only grant access to all the goods carried from the Klaipėda Region to Lithuania through the customs point if they were accompanied by the invoices of the goods issued by the representation. The employees from the representation's trade division were instructed to delay the issue

of invoices and to issue them to those goods which had already been kept at the customs office for 2 or 3 weeks. It was sought to immobilise the trade across the border in such a way which would not draw the attention of trade companies from the region and the chief commissioner.

In early October 1922 Žilnius proposed the Lithuanian Government to use the protection of the litas as a pretext and to close the border as well as to activate the campaign in favour of incorporation into Lithuania as a country of a strong currency (litas), while at the end of October he advised, as a result of the rise in smuggling, to strengthen border security, to introduce bigger fines for smuggling and to prevent the entry of the products from the companies campaigning for *freistaat* altogether⁶⁴.

The refusal of Lithuania to sell products to the Klaipėda Region resulted in the increase of prices in the summer of 1922 and deteriorated the economic situation in the region⁶⁵, whereas on 14 November 1922 the Council of State of the Klaipėda Region declared in the meeting that the situation in the region was becoming catastrophic; there was a shortage of bread and flour. Thus, Lithuania succeeded in implementing the policy of economic isolation of the region but it did not, however, increase the number of residents accepting the idea of incorporation into Lithuania with favour. Therefore, in parallel to the said economic isolation, Jonas Žilnius was forced to resort to active policy and propaganda.

3.2. Active policy and propaganda in order to prevent the spread and promotion of the idea of *freistaat* in 1922

Immediately after presenting his credentials, Jonas Žilnius took actions to prevent the opinion poll carried out by Petisné⁶⁶ aiming to show that 80 per cent of residents were in favour of *freistaat*⁶⁷. Jonas Žilnius asked the Lithuanian representative in London to report on the polls initiated by Petisné in Klaipėda and to prevent the declaration of the Klaipėda Region *freistaat*. Foreign diplomats had to be explained that the declaration of *freistaat* was in the interest of Germany⁶⁸. Jonas Žilnius wrote Tomas Naruševičius that Petisné was blackmailing Simonaitis (because of the letters to Purciskis written in 1920) and was forcing him to establish a Lithuanian organisation in favour of *freistaat*⁶⁹.

To counteract the activities of Petisné, Jonas Žilnius undertook to create a new party – Wirtschaftspartei (Economic Party) – with Lithuanian public figures belonging to Heimatbund (*Deutsch-litauischer Hei-*

matbund) and Arbeitsgemeinschaft (*Arbeitsgemeinschaft für den Freistaat Memel*) as its members. On 27 January 1922 the programme of the new organisation was discussed. Its principal aim was to incorporate the Klaipėda Region into Lithuania on autonomous grounds. The programme was made public in the press and in the political rally held by the founding figures of the party on 7 February 1922⁷⁰. Farmers from the Klaipėda Region, who did not belong to the Union of Prussian Lithuanians, and Germanized Lithuanians from other German organisations were members of the party. Šiušelis was the chairman of the party, while Raišys was its treasurer⁷¹. On 13 February 1922 Jonas Žilnius informed the minister of foreign affairs that the party leadership coordinated its actions with him and it was under his control⁷².

On 11 February 1922 the Secret Political Committee was founded on the initiative of Jonas Žilnius (members V. Petrulis, J. Stiklorius, Raišys). The goal of the committee was to anticipate the tactics and to coordinate the actions with the newly established Wirtschaftspartei. The first meeting of the committee resolved to demand for equality of Lithuanians and Germans in the region and to withdraw Lithuanian representatives from the directorate in case the French refused to meet this requirement⁷³. On 14 February 1922 the National Council of Prussian Lithuanians declared to Steputaitis' Directorate about the withdrawal of its representatives⁷⁴. In February 1922 Jonas Žilnius asked the minister of foreign affairs to announce that “all the Lithuanian organisations in the region are in favour of the incorporation into Lithuania and protest against the free state”⁷⁵.

Over the first years of his work in Klaipėda, Jonas Žilnius made a conclusion that as the Entente Powers were in no haste to solve the issue in favour of Lithuania, it was required to “get ready for taking Klaipėda by force”. He proposed to prepare the plans to occupy Klaipėda and to deploy a sufficient number of military troops and riflemen near the border. The radical proposal made by Jonas Žilnius frightened the Minister of Foreign Affairs Vladas Jurgutis⁷⁶. In his telegram to Jonas Žilnius, Pranas Dailidė wrote that such a campaign indeed had to be organised but in a slightly different way, i.e. from the inside of the Klaipėda Region and with the support from Lithuania⁷⁷.

The Lithuanian representative in Klaipėda started calculating how much “the Klaipėda campaign from the inside” could cost⁷⁸. According to him, 3 million marks (30,000 gold rubles) were required for that matter. The Lithuanian Government only promised 1

million⁷⁹. Jonas Žilius tried to explain to the head of the Department of Central European Affairs Bronius Dailidė that 3 million marks were required to acquire *Volkstimme*, and if Lithuania did not acquire a printing-house, the release of the German paper would cost 1 million marks. Jonas Žilius got an impression that the Lithuanian Government was not willing to acquire *Volkstimme*⁸⁰. Therefore, in 1922 the afore-mentioned *Volkstimme* and *Memeller Dampfboot* remained in the hands of the opponents of Lithuania.

The sums dedicated to propaganda vary greatly in historiography. Robertas Šiugžda mentions that on 17 February 1922 Jonas Žilius received 350,000 ostmarks and another half a million in March for that matter⁸¹. Isabelle Chandavoine gives a figure of 3.3 million ostmarks allocated during 1922. Both the said author and Vytautas Žalys mention 32,000 marks allocated to Jonas Žilius on a monthly basis for the acquisition of newspapers⁸².

On 21 August 1922 a paper *Memelgau Zeitung* and its printing-house were acquired in the name of Martynas Jankus and others⁸³. The paper was in favour of a free state. On 27 August Jonas Žilius received 2.5 million ostmarks from the government and another half a million in September. By means of this money, the press of the region could be talked into the promotion of the idea of incorporation into Lithuania.

In October 1922 Jonas Žilius prepared and instructed the Lithuanian delegation from Klaipėda, which had to speak in the commission chaired by Jules Laroche (3 November 1922). The delegation departed to Paris on 30 October. It was not an easy task because the Lithuanians from the Klaipėda Region were in favour of a Lithuanian *freistaat*⁸⁴.

4. Activities of Jonas Žilius at the end of 1922–January 1923

After the speeches given at the commission chaired by Laroche and the note presented by the Lithuanian delegation to the Commission of Ambassadors on 6 November 1922 specifying financial reasons as one of the arguments (without Lithuania, the Klaipėda Region would suffer the shortage of resources for economic development; it would face problems relating to the use of the mark; the introduction of the litas backed by gold would stabilise the situation in the region),⁸⁵ the advocates of the free state became especially active in the press trying to prove that even without the trade with Lithuania, the region would perfectly live in economic and financial terms and would even be able to pay back the loans⁸⁶.

On 18 December 1922 the Lithuanian Government found out that the commission chaired by Jules Laroche would make the final decision on the Klaipėda Region on 10 January 1923⁸⁷; on 20 November – that the Klaipėda Region would be further governed by the League of Nations and the port would be administered by the commission set up of the representatives from Lithuania, Poland and the Klaipėda Region⁸⁸; finally, on 5 January 1923 – that France was going to found an emission bank for the trade between the region and France as well as other foreign countries in Klaipėda and to introduce a stable currency (French franc) to Klaipėda⁸⁹. Therefore, actions had to be taken immediately.

In the beginning (2–5) of January 1923 Jonas Žilius (together with E. Simonaitis) discussed the campaign in the Klaipėda Region with Ernestas Galvanauskas and Jonas Polovinskas Budrys in Kaunas; afterwards – after the outbreak of the revolt – they concealed the interference of the Lithuanian Government⁹⁰ until the new Directorate of the Klaipėda Region was set up in Šilutė on 13 January 1923⁹¹. It asked the Lithuanian Government to send over a diplomatic representative, who would present the credentials to the volunteers from Lithuania Minor and the directorate formed by them rather than the representative of the French administration. Ernestas Galvanauskas appointed Juozas Purickis (Pėteraitis)⁹². J. Purickis (Pėteraitis) was very fluent in German; he was well aware of German policy and had a fast reaction and ability to take adequate decisions without any additional considerations from the outside⁹³.

A precise date of Purickis' appointment is not known, though, by analogy, the appointment could have taken place in several days. On 25 January J. Purickis (Pėteraitis) gave an in-depth account of the works accomplished by the Committee for the Salvation of Lithuania Minor and the documents prepared to the arriving Entente commission to the Cabinet of Ministers and provided a number of proposals to the Government regarding further actions in the region: he made a proposal to abolish the economic border as soon as possible, to move the customs border near the Nemunas River and to the seacoast as well as to introduce the Lithuanian excise duty and other taxes. He proposed to do everything promptly and to present the commission with a *fait accompli*. He asked the Government to send him cipher telegrams to the representation in Klaipėda⁹⁴.

The appointment of Juozas Purickis (Pėteraitis) the representative of the Republic of Lithuania to the

directorate set up by the volunteers of Lithuania Minor is very important in respect of the international law. The appointment of a representative meant the *de facto* recognition of the Klaipėda Region as the party in revolt, which was the first step to the recognition *de jure* in the international law⁹⁵.

The Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region was closed down on 10 April 1923⁹⁶.

5. What does the Klaipėda campaign organised back then say to us today?

First, Lithuania showed an immense desire, determination and courage to bring to life what was declared in various Lithuanian declarations and conference resolutions in 1918–1919 and officially stated in the Paris Peace Conference⁹⁷ – to retrieve the Klaipėda Region.

Second, the Lithuanian Government prepared for it consistently and systematically from the very beginning of the placement of the Klaipėda Region under French administration through the establishment of its representation, appointment of diplomatic representatives and generous funding of their activities as well as resourceful exploitation of the international situation and the interests of other foreign countries.

Third, even though the determination to incorporate the Klaipėda Region was coordinated with the diplomats of Germany and Soviet Russia, it was nevertheless the **decision of the Government of Lithuania**, which prevented the Conference of Ambassadors from taking a decision in Lausanne on 10 January 1923 – the declare the Klaipėda Region the free state⁹⁸.

Fourth, when staging the Klaipėda campaign, the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region “did a great job from the inside”, i.e. it imitated the agreement of local residents by various political and propaganda means. And finally – most importantly – in terms of the international law, Lithuania incorporated the Klaipėda Region correctly.

6. Can this case be equalled to Żeligowski’s “mutiny”?

After the Klaipėda campaign Lithuanian diplomats were often reproached that what Lithuania did with the Klaipėda Region was the same what Poland did with the Vilnius Region (this is what Swedish diplomats reproachfully said to the Lithuanian representative⁹⁹). However, what is surprising is that the thoughts of the diplomats of that time are repeated even a century later. So how it really is?

The answer is both – yes and no. Yes, because the right enshrined in the international law was exercised – to declare oneself the party in revolt, which is the first step to recognition¹⁰⁰. Poland exercised it in 1920, Lithuania in 1923. But it is not the only similarity.

The principal difference between the two “revolts” was revealed by Lithuanian lawyer and diplomat Ladas Natkevičius¹⁰¹. He drew a very clear line between the two events. According to him, we cannot compare the occupation of the Vilnius Region and the incorporation of the Klaipėda Region into Lithuania because the case of the Klaipėda Region was solved by the Peace Conference “in favour of Lithuania”. He provided other arguments as well. First, the Klaipėda Region was administered by the French occupation government, whereas the Vilnius Region was not administered by the representatives of any international authority. Second, the rebels of the Klaipėda Region defended the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles. Third, the Entente Powers disregarded the Polish protests and granted the rights of sovereignty of the Klaipėda Region to Lithuania. Fourth, Germany (which had been the sovereign of these lands before the separation of the region in 1920) recognised the Klaipėda Region to Lithuania¹⁰².

Conclusions

1. The analysis of activities of Lithuanian representatives in the Klaipėda Region in 1920–1922 leads to the conclusion that in 1920 most attention was paid to the realisation of the objective of the Lithuanian Government to move the customs border near the Nemunas River and to Klaipėda Port; in 1921 – the creation of the plans for the economic isolation policy in the Klaipėda Region and in 1922 – the implementation of the economic isolation policy, the prevention of the idea of *freistaat* promoted by Petisné and the imitation of the willingness of the residents of the Klaipėda Region to be incorporated into Lithuania.

2. The establishment and activities of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region in 1920–1923 demonstrated a systematic attempt of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania to incorporate Klaipėda and immense courage to resist “*the four major powers, which together formed the most powerful force in the world*” and to defeat them.

3. There is the sole similarity between the Klaipėda Revolt and Żeligowski’s “mutiny” – the exercise of the right enshrined in the international law – to declare oneself the party in revolt, which is the first step to recognition.

Summary

The aim of the article is to commemorate the 90th anniversary of the incorporation of the Klaipėda Region to Lithuania. Based on the material from the Lithuanian Central State Archives, the shorthand records of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania, the periodical press of that time as well as the research studies of Lithuanian (Rudolfas Valsonokas, Petronėlė Žostautaitė, Robertas Žiugžda, Sandra Grigaravičiūtė, Vilma Bukaitė) and French (Julien Gueslin, Isabelle Chandavoine-Urbaitis) historians, it reveals the diplomatic efforts of the Lithuanian Government to persuade, through the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region, the residents of the region into the idea of the incorporation into Lithuania.

Based on sources and historiography, the article aims to reveal the establishment and activities of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region in 1920–1923 and to point out the major highlights by paying special attention to the aspects of legal evalu-

ation of the incorporation of the Klaipėda Region into Lithuania. The analysis of activities of Lithuanian representatives in the Klaipėda Region in 1920–1922 leads to the conclusion that in 1920 most attention was paid to the realisation of the objective of the Lithuanian Government to move the customs border near the Nemunas River and to Klaipėda Port; in 1921 – the creation of the plan for the economic isolation policy of the Klaipėda Region and in 1922 – the implementation of the economic isolation policy, the prevention of the idea of *freistaat* promoted by Petisné and the imitation of the willingness of the residents from the Klaipėda Region to be incorporated into Lithuania. The establishment and activities of the Representation of Lithuania in the Klaipėda Region in 1920–1923 demonstrated a systematic attempt of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania to incorporate Klaipėda and immense courage to resist “*the four major powers, which together formed the most powerful force in the world*” and to defeat them.

REFERENCES:

- ¹ Practical–professional conference “The Klaipėda Region and Its Development in 1923–1939” dedicated to commemorate the 90th anniversary of incorporation of the Klaipėda Region into Lithuania.
- ² The conference of 9–10 August 2013 dedicated to commemorate the years of the Klaipėda Region. Pagėgiai Municipality Museum of Martynas Jankus, Bitėnai, Lumpėnai area, Pagėgiai municipality.
- ³ Dissertation by Vilma Bukaitė defended in June 2013 at Vilnius University. See Bukaitė V. *Lietuvos Respublikos politiniai ir diplomatiniai santykiai su Prancūzija 1919–1940 m.* [Rankraštis] Daktaro disertacija: humanitariniai mokslai, istorija (05 H). Vilnius: VU, 2013, 333 p.
- ⁴ Bukaitė V. *Lietuvos Respublikos politiniai ir diplomatiniai santykiai su Prancūzija 1919–1940 metais.* Daktaro disertacijos rankraštis. Vilnius: VU, 2013, p. 145.
- ⁵ Naujas mūsų atstovas Klaipėdai. *Lietuva*, 1922 01 14. Nr. 11, p. 2.
- ⁶ Lists of representations of Lithuania. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 3, b. 266, l. 34.
- ⁷ 21 October 1921, Sitting No. 134. Steigiamojo Seimo darbai. Kaunas, 1922; 28 October 1921, Sitting No. 136. Steigiamojo Seimo darbai. Kaunas, 1922.
- ⁸ Valsonokas R. *Klaipėdos problema.* 1-as leid. Klaipėda: bendrovė Rytas, 1932, 2-as leid. Vilnius: Vaizdas, 1989, p. 82.
- ⁹ The book attempted to deny the statement expressed in German historiography that “the re-union of the Klaipėda Region with other lands of the Lithuanian nation in the composition of Soviet Lithuania of 28 January 1945 was *occupation*”. See Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste.* Vilnius, 1973, p. 4–5.
- ¹⁰ The study also sought to deny the concept established in the historiography of the First Republic of Lithuania about “the revolt staged by the residents of the Klaipėda Region”. Robertas Žiugžda analysed the activities of the Lithuanian diplomats Leopoldas Dymša and Jonas Žilius in Klaipėda in 1920–1922 and devised the theory of “the entry of the Lithuanian armed forces into Klaipėda”. The theory was based on the statement that “the Lithuanian armed forces” had to be sent in because the objective of the Entente Powers to turn Klaipėda into a “free state” posed a serious danger “to the interests of the Lithuanian nation and a threat to the security of the Soviet state”. See Grigaravičiūtė S. *History of Lithuanian Diplomacy, 1918–1940.* CD. Vilnius: Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto leidykla „Edukologija“, 2013, p. 11–12.
- ¹¹ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 74–124.
- ¹² Žepkaitė R. *Lietuva ir didžiosios valstybės 1918–1939.* Kaunas: „Šviesa“, 1986, p. 124.
- ¹³ Žostautaitė P. *Klaipėdos kraštas 1923–1939.* Vilnius: „Mokslas“, 1992, p. 14–30; Eidintas A. Lietuvos propagandinė veikla ruošiant sausio sukilimą Klaipėdoje. *Acta Historia universitatis Klaipėdensis*, 1995, t. 4, p. 30–31; Žalys V. Klaipėdos prijungimas prie Lietuvos 1923 m. ir vietos lietuviai. *Acta Historia universitatis Klaipėdensis*, 1995, t. 4, p. 42.
- ¹⁴ The material collected for the encyclopaedia article was used for revealing the main facts of existence of the repre-

sentation: establishment, appointment of representatives, staff working in it, budget of the representation and main points of its activities. I then made the greatest discovery to myself that it was a representation rather than a consulate. See Grigaravičiūtė S. Lietuvos atstovybė Klaipėdos krašte. *Mažosios Lietuvos enciklopedija*. Vilnius, 2003, t. 2, p. 631–632.

¹⁵ In fact, Juozas Purickis was the informant of the Lithuanian Government for the matters with the Lithuanian Government even before the revolt and instructed the rebels on diplomatic issues. Juozas Purickis acted as incognito during the revolt; he had a passport of Juozas Pėteraitis. See Gaigalaitė A., Žeimantienė J. *Juozas Purickis-Vygandas*. Vilnius: Vilniaus knyga, 2004, p. 56–57.

¹⁶ Chapter 3 of the manuscript copy of her dissertation is dedicated to the Klaipėda issue. See Bukaitė V. *Lietuvos Respublikos politiniai ir diplomatiniai santykiai su Prancūzija 1919–1940 metais*. Daktaro disertacijos rankraštis. Vilnius: VU, 2013, p. 131–179.

¹⁷ Bukaitė V. *Lietuvos Respublikos politiniai ir diplomatiniai santykiai su Prancūzija ...*, p. 134.

¹⁸ Bukaitė V. *Lietuvos Respublikos politiniai ir diplomatiniai santykiai su Prancūzija ...*, p. 133.

¹⁹ Gueslin, J. Prancūzija ir Lietuvos klausimas (1920–1923 m.): tarp iliuzijų ir realios politikos. *Istorija*, 2002, t. 51, p. 27–37. Internet access: <http://www.istorijoszurnalas.lt/images/stories/Istorija_51/Istorija51.pdf>.

²⁰ Chandavoine I. *Prancūzmetis Klaipėdoje ir kas po to (1920–1932)*. Vilnius: „Žara“, 2003. 192 p.

²¹ Gueslin, J. Prancūzija ir Lietuvos klausimas (1920–1923 m.) ..., p. 32–36.

²² Chandavoine I. *Prancūzmetis Klaipėdoje ir kas po to ...*, p. 58, 59.

²³ Chandavoine I. *Prancūzmetis Klaipėdoje ir kas po to ...*, p. 53.

²⁴ Žostautaitė P. *Klaipėdos kraštas 1923–1939*. Vilnius: „Mokslas“, 1992, p. 21.

²⁵ Valsonokas R. *Klaipėdos problema ...*, p. 62.

²⁶ Bukaitė V. *Lietuvos Respublikos politiniai ir diplomatiniai santykiai su Prancūzija ...*, p. 134.

²⁷ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 74–75.

²⁸ Grigaravičiūtė S. *Lietuvos konsulatai Skandinavijoje 1921–1940 metais*. Vilnius: VPU leidykla, 2007, p. 30.

²⁹ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 75.

³⁰ Grigaravičiūtė S. Lietuvos atstovybė Klaipėdos krašte. *Mažosios Lietuvos enciklopedija*. Vilnius, 2003, t. 2, p. 631–632; Report of Leopoldas Dymša to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of 9 November 1920. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 79, l. 24.

³¹ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 74–75.

³² On 24 April 1920 the Directorate of the Klaipėda Region contacted the Lithuanian Government asking food grain in exchange of peas and oats. On 6 May 1920 the Lithuanian Government agreed to sell 2,000 tonnes of wheat and rye to the Klaipėda Region in exchange of cattle and horses from the Klaipėda Region. See Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 76–77.

³³ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 77.

³⁴ The directorate of the region set up by Odry was assigned the functions which had been vested in the Province of East Prussia before the separation of the Klaipėda Region from Germany as well as the functions performed by the institutions of the region, which were under the jurisdiction of the state, i.e. customs, postal service, telegraph, telephone, railroad, forestry, etc. See Valsonokas R. *Klaipėdos problema ...*, p. 62.

³⁵ The negotiations were held on the initiative of the Klaipėda Region.

³⁶ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 77.

³⁷ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 78.

³⁸ Petisné tried to maintain the anti-Lithuanian sentiment in the region and informed the Entente Powers accordingly. According to Žiugžda, Petisné tried to frighten the residents of the region with the incorporation into Lithuania, whereas the German propaganda, taking advantage of the Petisné position, used to add that if the region was incorporated into Lithuania, it would subsequently be annexed to Poland. See Žiugžda, *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 79.

³⁹ Valsonokas R. *Klaipėdos problema...*, p. 77–78.

⁴⁰ Juozas Purickis was the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania from 19 June 1920 to 12 December 1921.

⁴¹ Letter of Jonas Žilius to Lithuanian representative T. Noras-Naruševičius in London of 22 February 1922. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 424, l. 112; Letter of Jonas Žilius to the Minister of the Interior of 24 January 1922. LCVA, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 424, l. 169.

⁴² Žiugžda, *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 100.

⁴³ Grigaravičiūtė S. Lietuvos atstovybė Klaipėdos krašte. *Mažosios Lietuvos enciklopedija*. Vilnius, 2003, t. 2, p. 631–632.

⁴⁴ Naujas mūsų atstovas Klaipėdai. *Lietuva*, 1922 01 14. Nr. 11, p. 2.

⁴⁵ Valsonokas R. *Klaipėdos problema ...*, p. 70–71.

⁴⁶ Žostautaitė P. *Klaipėdos kraštas 1923–1939 ...*, p. 18.

⁴⁷ The idea of Petisné could be brought to life, which was also shown by the well-balanced budget of the first years of

French administration (all administration costs were covered; 6 more million were also allocated for port repair and other construction works). See: Letter of Leopoldas Dymša to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of 21 June 1921. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 424, l. 174.

⁴⁸ The action plan was intended to demonstrate the economic dependence of the Klaipėda Region on Lithuania.

⁴⁹ Report of Leopoldas Dymša to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of 21 June 1921. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 424, l. 176.

⁵⁰ Report of Leopoldas Dymša to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of 21 June 1921. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 424, l. 176.

⁵¹ Valsonokas R. *Klaipėdos problema ...*, p. 71–75.

⁵² Skóra W. *Slużba konsularna Drugiej Rzeczypospolitej. Organizacja, kadry i działalność*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2006, s. 884.

⁵³ Machinacijos dėl Klaipėdos krašto. *Lietuva*, 1922 01 15. Nr. 12, p. 1.

⁵⁴ Skora W. *Slużba konsularna Drugiej Rzeczypospolitej ...*, s. 884.

⁵⁵ Žostautaitė P. *Klaipėdos kraštas 1923–1939...*, p. 18.

⁵⁶ Report of Leopoldas Dymša to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of 18 November 1921. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 2, b. 850, l. 53.

⁵⁷ The work of the Lithuanian representative in the Klaipėda Region was considered by the Constituent Assembly as many as two times in October 1921. The member of the Constituent Assembly Kazimieras Ralys was most dissatisfied with the work of Dymša. See Sitting No. 136 of 28 October 1921. *Steigiamojo Seimo darbai*. Kaunas, 1922.

⁵⁸ Sitting No. 134 of 21 October 1921. *Steigiamojo Seimo darbai*. Kaunas, 1922.

⁵⁹ Sitting No. 136 of 28 October 1921. *Steigiamojo Seimo darbai*. Kaunas, 1922.

⁶⁰ Sitting No. 136 of 28 October 1921. *Steigiamojo Seimo darbai*. Kaunas, 1922.

⁶¹ Grigaravičiūtė S. Lietuvos atstovybė Klaipėdos krašte. *Mažosios Lietuvos enciklopedija*. Vilnius, 2003, t. 2, p. 631–632.

⁶² Valsonokas R. *Klaipėdos problema ...*, p. 80.

⁶³ Žiugžda, *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 104.

⁶⁴ Report of Jonas Žilius to the director of the European Centre Department of 18 September 1922. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 424, l. 15.

⁶⁵ Valsonokas R. *Klaipėdos problema ...*, p. 86.

⁶⁶ The petition on *freistaat* of 7 July 1921 presented to the Conference of Ambassadors proposed to organise a plebiscite in the Klaipėda Region. See Valsonokas R. *Klaipėdos problema ...*, p. 76.

⁶⁷ Letter of Jonas Žilius of 22 February 1922 to Lithuanian representative T. Naruševičius in London. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 366, l. 186.

⁶⁸ Letter of Jonas Žilius of 22 February 1922 to Lithuanian representative T. Noras-Naruševičius in London. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 366, l. 188. Note: in fact, the idea of *freistaat* was most in favour of France; it would have been better for Germany to incorporate the region into Lithuania.

⁶⁹ It most likely implies the Arbeitsgemeinschaft für den Freistaat Memel established on 1 December 1921. Valsonokas R. *Klaipėdos problema ...*, p. 78.

⁷⁰ Letter of Jonas Žilius of 22 February 1922 to Lithuanian representative T. Noras-Naruševičius in London. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 424, l. 113.

⁷¹ Letter of Jonas Žilius of 13 February 1922 to Lithuanian representative T. Noras-Naruševičius in London. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 366, l. 224.

⁷² Letter of Jonas Žilius of 13 February 1922 to Lithuanian representative T. Noras-Naruševičius in London. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 366, l. 224.

⁷³ Letter of Jonas Žilius of 13 February 1922 to Lithuanian representative T. Noras-Naruševičius in London. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 366, l. 224.

⁷⁴ Žostautaitė P. *Klaipėdos kraštas 1923–1939 ...*, p. 23.

⁷⁵ Letter of Jonas Žilius of 13 February 1922 to Lithuanian representative T. Noras-Naruševičius in London. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 366, l. 225.

⁷⁶ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 101–102.

⁷⁷ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 102.

⁷⁸ Akcija iš vidaus buvo suprantama, kaip vietos organizacijų bei jų leidžiamos periodinės spaudos pritarimas Klaipėdos krašto prijungimui prie Lietuvos, o tam reikėjo, kad spaudos leidyba patektų į Lietuvos atstovų rankas. Paprasčiausias būdas tuo metu buvo leidinius nusipirkti.

⁷⁹ Jonas Žilius wrote to the Minister of Foreign Affairs: “if you wish to retrieve the Klaipėda Region, you should not spare it as well”. See Letter of Jonas Žilius to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of 13 February 1922. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 366, l. 218.

⁸⁰ Letter of Jonas Žilius to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of 13 February 1922. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 366, l. 2

⁸¹ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 102.

⁸² Chandavoine I. *Prancūzmetis Klaipėdoje ir kas po to ...*, p. 58, 59; Žalys V. Klaipėdos prijungimas prie Lietuvos ..., p. 42.

⁸³ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 105; Chandavoine I. *Prancūzmetis Klaipėdoje ir kas po to ...*, p. 58.

⁸⁴ Bukaitė V. *Lietuvos Respublikos politiniai ir diplomatiniai santykiai su Prancūzija ...*, p. 136.

⁸⁵ Chandavoine I. *Prancūzmetis Klaipėdoje ir kas po to ...*, p. 49.

⁸⁶ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 118–119.

⁸⁷ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 127.

⁸⁸ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 124.

⁸⁹ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 129.

⁹⁰ Žiugžda R. *Po diplomatijos skraiste ...*, p. 134.

⁹¹ Direktorija veikė 1923 m. sausio 13–1923 m. vasario 14 d.

⁹² Gaigalaitė A., Žeimantienė J. *Juozas Purickis-Vygandas*. Vilnius: Vilniaus knyga, 2004, p. 56–57.

⁹³ In fact, Juozas Purickis was an informant of the Lithuanian Government for the matters with the Lithuanian Government and instructed the rebels on diplomatic issues. During the revolt, Juozas Purickis acted as incognito. He had a passport of Juozas Pėteraitis. Gaigalaitė A., Žeimantienė J. *Juozas Purickis-Vygandas*. Vilnius: Vilniaus knyga, 2004, p. 56–57.

⁹⁴ Report of Juozas Pėteraitis to the Prime Minister of 25 January 1923. *LCVA*, f. 383., ap. 7., b. 378., l. 192–193.

⁹⁵ In his article, G. Rutenbergas states that there are three preparatory recognitions in quest of the formal recognition: 1) recognition as the party in revolt; 2) recognition as the belligerent party; 3) recognition as the nation. See Rutenbergas G. Lietuvos, kaip nepriklausomos valstybės, susikūrimas ir jos pripažinimas tarptautinės teisės šviesoje. *Teisė*, 1927, Nr. 12, p. 28.

⁹⁶ Order No. 121 of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of 26 April 1923. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 2, b. 575, l. 246.

⁹⁷ Such a position was also upheld by Roman Dmowski in his memorandum at the Paris Peace Conference (the Klaipėda Region must be part of the Lithuanian territory). See Valsonokas R. *Klaipėdos problema ...*, p. 53.

⁹⁸ Bukaitė V. *Lietuvos Respublikos politiniai ir diplomatiniai santykiai su Prancūzija ...*, p. 144.

⁹⁹ Grigaravičiūtė S. *Skandinavija Lietuvos diplomatijoje 1918–1940 metais*. Vilnius: Saulabrolis, 2002, p. 111; Report of Ignas Šeinius to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of 22 March 1924. *LCVA*, f. 383, ap. 7, b. 509, l. 91.

¹⁰⁰ Rutenbergas G. Lietuvos, kaip nepriklausomos valstybės, susikūrimas ir jos pripažinimas tarptautinės teisės šviesoje. *Teisė*, 1927, Nr. 12, p. 28.

¹⁰¹ Natkevičius L. *Aspect politique et juridique du différend Polono-Lithuanien*. Kaunas, 1930. 356 p.

¹⁰² Rutenbergas G. Recenzija L. Natkevičiaus knygai *Aspect Politique et Juridique du différend Polono – Lituanien*. Paris, 1930. 356 p. *Teisė*, 1930, Nr. 18, p. 121–128.

Григаравичюте С. Литовское представительство в Клайпедском регионе, 1920–1923 / Литовский педагогический университет.

Основываясь на источниках и историографии, статья повествует о создании и деятельности представительства Литвы в Клайпедском регионе в 1920–1923 гг. Особое внимание уделяется работам Йонаса Зилиуса по политической и экономической тематике в 1922 году. Это было первое исследование в литовской историографии, освещающее основные моменты включения Клайпедского региона в состав Литвы и рассматривающее аспекты правовой оценки Клайпедского восстания.

Ключевые слова: Клайпеда, Клайпедский регион, военное представительство Литвы в Клайпедском регионе, Литва, Франция, Доминик Одри, Габриэль Петисне, Леопольдо Думса, Йонас Зилиус.

Грігаравічюте С. Литовське представництво в Клайпедському регіоні, 1920–1923 / Литовський педагогічний університет.

Грунтуючись на джерелах та історіографії, стаття розповідає про створення та діяльність представництва Литви в Клайпедському регіоні в 1920–1923 рр. Особлива увага приділяється роботам Йонаса Зіліуса з політичної та економічної тематики в 1922 році. Це було перше дослідження в литовській історіографії, що висвітлювало основні моменти включення Клайпедського регіону до складу Литви та розглядало аспекти правової оцінки Клайпедського повстання.

Ключові слова: Клайпеда, Клайпедський регіон, військове представництво Литви в Клайпедському регіоні, Литва, Франція, Домінік Одрі, Габріель Петісне, Леопольдо Думс, Йонас Зіліус.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 13.05.2013

Прийнята до друку 04.06.2013