

the following territorial demands:

1) Surrender by Lithuania of its eastern districts, including the capital Vilnius and the surrounding region, under the "legal" argument that these areas did not belong to the pre-war independent Lithuanian Republic, having been part of Poland. Moscow has told Landsbergis that it views these areas as having been part of "Polish-occupied Belorussia," implying that they be ceded to Soviet Belorussia.

2) Granting to the U.S.S.R. of a Danzig-type corridor (a reference to Hitler's 1939 demand that Poland cede to Nazi Germany a "corridor" connecting German Pomerania, via Danzig, to German East Prussia, which after the 1919 Versailles Treaty had been separated by the "Polish Corridor" from the rest of Germany), connecting Soviet Belorussia with the Russian Republic's enclave formed by Soviet-occupied East Prussia (the Kaliningrad, formerly Königsberg, region).

3) Cession to the Russian Republic of the port of Klaipeda (Memel) and the coastal strip extending from it down to Soviet-occupied East Prussia.

The first two demands are viewed by the Lithuanian leadership as very serious, while (rightly or wrongly) they consider the Klaipeda demand a "bargaining chip." To add to the pressure, the Russian chauvinist organization, Yedintsvo (Unity) staged demonstrations in Klaipeda March 14 demanding that it join the Russian Federation. Lithuania's President Landsbergis has employed a statesmanlike policy of not provoking Moscow. He has offered, privately, to accommodate legitimate Soviet state interests—for example, that Soviet East Prussia not be cut off from the Soviet "mainland." He offered ground and air passageways, in the form of transit routes, modeled on the links maintained between West Germany and West Berlin, but under no conditions will he grant Moscow a territorial "corridor."

Beyond these territorial demands, Russia has stated it will not withdraw its occupation forces, and demands that military basing rights, especially for its key bases, be accorded. This means above all, the huge Soviet Air Base at Siauliai, in north-central Lithuania, the biggest Soviet military concentration in the republic, and one of the U.S.S.R.'s most important Western Theater air bases.

Documentation

U.S. must recognize independent Lithuania

From a March 13 statement by Lyndon LaRouche, Democratic congressional candidate for the 10th District of Virginia:

The fact of the matter is that Lithuania was gobbled up by the Soviet empire as a result of an August 1939 treaty with Hitler, called the Hitler-Stalin Pact; that up until recently the United States never recognized the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, as being properly part of Soviet territory. Now, in the course of events, Lithuania, as the largest and, thus, flagship nation of the so-called Baltic states, has declared its autonomy, and, in an orderly fashion, has announced to the Soviet government the declaration of its independence and its desire to deal immediately with the Soviet government in Moscow in formalizing its independence.

It has also asked, in a democratic vote by its population and its parliament, that Western nations begin to recognize the sovereign independence of the state of Lithuania.

Up until a few years ago, U.S. recognition of Lithuania would have gone without question. But now, under leadership of Margaret Thatcher's Britain, we are waffling. Hungary has taken the lead in moving toward recognition of Lithuania's independence. Other nations, including Vaclav Havel's Czechoslovakia, and Poland, have moved in a similar direc-

tion. We must also.

Now, how does this bear on Gorbachov, ostensibly the incoming President of the Soviet Union, the President with dictatorial powers greater than those perhaps of any czar after Ivan Grozny, the so-called Ivan the Terrible? Well, Moscow is screaming, saying this is the internal integrity of Soviet territory, the core empire. Well, it's not the core empire. It never really was Soviet territory in a moral sense, even by Stalin's definition of nationality. Each of the Baltic states is an independent nationality, even by all of Stalin's criteria.

The issue here is twofold: There is a cultural division within Europe between those states which in 1439-40 joined the Paleologue emperor of Constantinople in a great Christian reconciliation called the Council of Florence. This reconciliation defines Western Christian civilization, which extends into Ukraine, for example. It includes most emphatically the Poles. It includes the people of the Baltic states. In opposition to this 1439-40 reconciliation were included the Russian Orthodox Church of the princes of Muscovy, under which, later, the Great Russians became the dominant force, the conquering force, subjugating the Ukrainians and others, particularly so in the wake of the long-term subjugation by the communists.

Thus, there is a cultural division between the Great Rus-

sians and Europeans to the south and west; between the Great Russians, on the one side, and the Ukrainians and those of the West such as the Baltic people, the Poles, and so forth and so on.

By cultural division, I don't mean some secondary trivia, of folk songs and that sort of thing. What I mean is that the dominant conception of man in Christian civilization and the dominant conception of man in Great Russian culture, are antagonistic, irreconcilable.

'Imago viva Dei' separates cultures

Now, we who are human in the West, who are Christians, recognize the Russians as being potentially equal to us, because they are individual human beings with the same divine spark of potential for reason that all human beings have, and thus we look at a Russian face and we see *imago viva Dei*, the living image of God, as we see it in our friends and neighbors, even the ones we may not particularly like at the moment.

So we do not bear malice toward Russians as human beings, but we do recognize that their culture is antithetical to Western Christian civilization. We may have people of Western Christian civilization who are as bad as or worse than Russians in terms of their cultural proclivities. But nonetheless the essential division which separates Poles from Russians, Ukrainians from Belorussians through Great Russians, and Balts from Great Russians, remains.

Therefore, the moral sense of law, of language, is relevant to that which defines Lithuanians as separate from Great Russians today. They cannot possibly share as peoples a common sense of law. They speak a different language. They have a different sense of law. They have a different sense of man.

We in the West define the individual as a civilization, as a culture—there may be exceptions to this view among us—but as a culture we define the human individual, each human individual, as sacred by virtue of reflecting the image of the living God. This is particularly the case with Christianity.

Thus, by this means we base society on this notion of the sacredness of life of the human individual. That is the highest standard of policy within a Christian state, within a state consistent with Western Christian civilization. Therefore, if we do injustice to an individual, we say, "That is wrong!" Whereas if Great Russian culture follows its own culture consistently, if it does injury to an individual, it may say, "Well, we had to sacrifice that individual for the sake of policy." That is Russian, anti-Christian, barbarian thinking.

We have barbarians among us, i.e., in the Justice Department presently, who say individuals must be sacrificed, contrary to law, for the sake of the greater good. That is barbarism! And we have it among us. Those people are virtually Great Russians. U.S. Attorney General Richard Thornburgh's trips to Russia certify that to some degree or another. But we're opposed to it.

Thus, if we are true to the essence of the American Revolu-

tion, to the essence of Western Christian civilization, when people of the Baltic countries, who became part of the Soviet Union only by unlawful, aggressive conquest, by virtue of a rotten deal with Adolf Hitler, say, "We now move to our freedom," we must say, "You have every right to assert your sovereign independence, because you have all the reasons for separating yourself from the Great Russians. And you have every right to do so."

Now, relative to our relations with Moscow: The Soviets have said they're for freedom and they're going through a great reform. Well, if they wish to go through the great reform, they have to acknowledge the rights of Lithuania as sovereign and independent. Otherwise, they are in effect unmasking themselves as being liars in every feature of this reform.

Moscow's intentions

Now, let me take just one little point, a sticking point in this whole business, which reveals the whole issue. There's a strip of Lithuania, which is associated with the city of Memel [Klaipeda]. Now, the Lithuanians naturally would be inclined to say, "We must keep this part of our territory, as part of our independent territory." The Soviets have already said in advance, "No." What's the significance of Memel? What's the significance of this little strip of land to Moscow? It has only one significance. It is the crucial strategic launching point for the Red Army launching a surprise attack on not only Poland, but parts of a united Germany, up to the city of Kiel in Schleswig-Holstein.

Those who studied the two world wars of this century and studied the way in which German troops were deployed into the Baltic states region during those wars, across the convenient waters of the North Sea, will recognize immediately that Memel is the launching point for a Soviet attack upon the northern coastal regions of Germany and also Poland. And that Memel has no significance but that.

Therefore, if the Muscovites are so determined to hold onto Lithuania, and particularly Memel as distinct from the rest of Lithuania, we must read this practically and we have to say, "Dear Czar Mikhail V of all the Russias: If you grant the Baltic states independence, as they may desire it, that will not hurt the Russians, that will help them in our eyes, and you shall gain more by giving the Balts their freedom than you shall by trying to continue to hold them as your slaves and vassals. Because you will have better relations with us, the Baltic region itself will become economically better, much better, and rapidly, than it was or could be under your domination, and you will benefit from having a progressive state on your borders—a progressive state which represents no military threat whatsoever to you. Whereas, if you insist on owning this territory, then we cannot believe a thing you say about all your great humanistic reforms. And if you insist on holding Memel, then we know that aggressive war is lurking somewhere in the halls of the Kremlin."