

**Review of the conclusions of the Study by Vytautas Tininis,  
“Forcible Mobilization. Forcible Inclusion of Inhabitants of Lithuania into the  
USSR Armed Forces at the End of WWII, August 1944-May 1945”**

*by Dr. A. Jakubčionis*

The text of the conclusions drawn by the author includes a preface at the beginning where main aspects and reasons of the forcible mobilization, due to which the country's men were escaping the mobilization, are defined.

The historiography part of the preface presents in a chronological order the literature and the sources of the subject. Authors who were the first to consider the mobilization forcible (the emigrant authors) and the authors of present times who have expanded and developed the subject and grounded it on documentary materials, are mentioned in the preface. The author also briefly defines the concept of the Soviet historiography that treated the 1944-1945 forcible mobilization as voluntary, lawful, and not forcible.

The conclusions are laid out in eight subdivisions. As appropriate, the author firstly presents the fact of absence of legal grounds for the mobilization and violation of the Hague Convention committed by the Soviet Union. Then the organizers and the executors of the forcible mobilization are indicated. Greater attention is drawn to revealing the forcible mobilization and the increasingly growing scale of repressions. Tininis presents a rather detailed analysis of military measures employed, the killings, the equation of those in hiding from the mobilization with armed resistance and their extermination. Thus, in the main the author reveals the Soviet brutality and repressions.

Tininis presents a very valuable data on the number of Lithuanian men forcibly mobilized, sent to the front and the data on the possible number of those killed. A concise presentation of the facts allows for a better understanding of the scale of the repressions and their consequences. At the end of the conclusions Tininis discusses the situation of the mobilized Lithuanians in the Soviet Army and their attempts to withdraw from it.

The bibliography of the subject and the copies of the main documents presented at the end of the conclusions provide with an opportunity to gain a broader knowledge of the forcible mobilization. The documents selected help to clearly reveal the repressions carried out by the Soviet Union, as well as their scale, ways and consequences. The copies of the documents add to the text and may also serve as a separate material.

The conclusions basically meet the requirements and enable to understand the forcible mobilization carried out by the Soviets in Lithuania.

Having given a positive evaluation of the conclusions, I should also like to make a few remarks. The title of the subject should not lay an emphasis on the period August 1944-May 1945 as the end of WWII. The last stage of the war is the period May 1945-2 September 1945. In the historiography part, the author should have first discussed the sources separately, and then presented the research papers on the subject. Tininis could have also shown more critically the fact that the Soviets ignored the issue of forcible mobilization and distorted the facts, which would be new for a foreign reader. The language and the style should also be revised, as there are certain ambiguities in the text. For instance, chapter I has the title ‘The Legal Aspect of Forcible Mobilization’, i.e. the idea is suggested that there were legal grounds for the mobilization, whereas it should be put as ‘the absence of legal aspect’ or similarly. While discussing the hiding of the conscripts from the service, the author should have discussed the legal ways of avoiding the army (attempts to employ oneself in the railway or forest works) and the forging of personal documents. That would have made the conclusions more thorough.