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The historical documents held by the Arolsen Archives, the world’s largest collection on the victims of Nazi persecution, are commonly divided into three thematic groups: (1) records on incarceration in concentration camps, ghettos and prisons during the Nazi era; (2) employment files and registration cards that were created for forced laborers during World War II; (3) documents on the liberated survivors, whom the Allies referred to as Displaced Persons (DPs). Being true for the majority of the holdings, this description is indeed a good starting point for anyone interested in examining the documents in more detail. However, given that 14 years have passed since the predecessor of the Arolsen Archives – the International Tracing Service (ITS) – made the collections accessible for researchers, continued research has managed to show that the records are in fact more diverse than is generally known. In other words, they contain files that do not exactly match the aforementioned three-fold classification and even extend beyond Nazi victims as the focus of the records kept in Bad Arolsen.

In this sense, this new publication within the *Findings* series serves as an example that may challenge previous notions of the Arolsen Archives as a thematically clear-cut repository. It deals with the work of the International Refugee Organization (IRO) – the largest international relief agency between 1947 and 1951 – outside of Europe and thereby significantly departs from the geographical focus commonly associated with the IRO, namely its work in caring for DPs in postwar Europe, and occupied Germany in particular.

Based on two contributions addressing IRO documents kept in the Arolsen Archives, as well as their historical context, the publication at hand explores the breadth of migration-related administrative records created in the postwar years by looking at Africa and Asia as hitherto relatively unknown fields of IRO operations with regard to: (1) Polish nationals who in 1940/41 were deported from Eastern Poland to the Soviet Union and who later were

---

transferred to British colonies in Africa, and (2) DPs who, having originally arrived in Germany, Austria and Italy from Central and Eastern European countries, accepted immigration offers into Pakistan in 1949 and 1950. In order to understand how these activities fit into the bigger picture, the following overview provides an insight into the history of Displaced Persons, refugees, and the international relief agencies caring for them in the postwar period.

After World War II, the Allies faced the enormous task of looking after about 10 million DPs in Europe alone. DPs were defined as “civilians outside the national boundaries of their country by reason of the war,” who were “desirous but unable to return home or find homes without assistance.” The vast majority were former victims of Nazi persecution: they had been deported for forced labor, or incarcerated in concentration camps. Among them was a notable number of Holocaust survivors. After the end of the war, the DPs were housed primarily in the Western zones of occupied Germany, but also in Austria and Italy in specially established DP camps, where they were generally looked after by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), founded in 1943. The DPs were supposed to stay there temporarily only and prepare for repatriation, i.e. return to their respective countries of origin. And by late 1945, most DPs were indeed repatriated. At the beginning of 1946, though, about a million DPs had remained in the camps because they – mostly for political or economic reasons – could not or did not want to return to their countries of origin, mainly in Central and Eastern Europe. For many Jewish DPs, a permanent return to their various home countries was inconceivable due to the destruction of the Jewish communities and the murder of their family members by the Germans and the persistence of antisemitism in those countries. Also in response to this altered situation, the work of UNRRA, that fulfilled its mandate of solving the DP challenge by focusing on repatriation only, was discontinued in 1947 and taken over by a successor organization, the International Refugee Organization (IRO). Just like UNRRA, the IRO was affiliated with the United Nations, but it was not supported by the Soviet Union, which continued to insist on the repatriation approach. The IRO was founded at the end of 1946 and began its actual work in July 1947. Unlike UNRRA, the IRO was responsible not only for taking care of and repatriating DPs, but also for organizing their emigration to a third party country if that was their desire. The UN General Assembly had already decided in February 1946 that “no refugees or displaced persons who have finally and definitely, in complete freedom [...] expressed valid objections to returning to their countries of origin [...] shall be compelled to return to their country of origin.”

---

So already during the last few months of UNRRA’s existence, the course started shifting from repatriation to emigration: in August 1946, before the IRO was established, the British government decided on a scheme to recruit female DPs from the three Baltic countries for work in British sanatoria to meet the country’s demand for labor.\(^5\) In the months and years to follow, thousands of DPs entered the UK under this program and another one called *Westward Ho*, which also included men. As they provided for a time limit on the stay in the respective target country, these recruitments and other programs, e.g. in France and Belgium, were not designed to be permanent.\(^6\) The goal of the IRO, on the other hand, was not only to find host countries on a temporary basis, but to place DPs willing to emigrate in countries all over the world and to integrate them there on a long-term basis, i.e. to provide them with a job and to naturalize them. This objective was facilitated by the widespread shortage of labor that many countries suffered from after the war. In particular, “manual laborers and agricultural workers, with the exception of a few categories of technicians, engineers and the like”\(^7\) were sought after. These countries were willing to accept the DPs stranded in Europe under certain conditions, which varied from country to country: “The receiving countries in Western Europe based their settlement policy on their own labor requirements, and they used strict control mechanisms. While the US, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia were more liberal, generally the same rule applied: younger, healthy, single and educated people were more wanted than old, sick, married people, etc.”\(^8\) In addition, there were maximums and quotas for national backgrounds, and the founding of the IRO alone did not ensure that all emigration requests could be met. Entry into the USA, which was one of the more desirable destinations, only became possible for a larger number of people with the passing of the DP Act in 1948 and its amendment in 1950.\(^9\) In addition to the countries mentioned, states in South America among others also acted as destinations.

The IRO was not only responsible for placing the DPs in the receiving countries, but also for getting them there. The organization negotiated with accepting countries, maintained offices all over the world, organized the selection of future immigrants and chartered ships and planes. For all this, the IRO had its own budget to work with.


However, among the people cared for by the IRO were not only former Nazi victims, but an increasing number of refugees from Central and Eastern Europe who had left the countries in the Soviet sphere of influence primarily for political reasons. As early as autumn 1944, tens of thousands of Balts had escaped the advancing Soviet Army and fled to Germany. The fear of having to live under Soviet rule and the expectation of being persecuted or deported for being part of the national intelligentsia were frequent reasons for this.\textsuperscript{10}

As early as late 1944, a large number of refugees from Hungary arrived in Germany, most of whom stayed in Bavaria. In addition, there were persons who had left Hungary after the end of the war, among other things to avoid military service.\textsuperscript{11} And in 1948, when the Communist Party seized power in Czechoslovakia, numerous Czech nationals fled to Austria and the Western parts of Germany. Refugees from Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, especially from Russia and the Ukraine, were also among those who came to the West.\textsuperscript{12} Refugees’ numbers also included former collaborators who had cooperated with the Germans, for example as members of the Latvian and Estonian units of the \textit{Waffen-SS}, the police, the \textit{Einsatzgruppen}, and the \textit{Wehrmacht}. In many cases, they mixed undetected with the DPs and were able to secure assistance from the IRO, although they were not actually eligible for it.\textsuperscript{13}

Although many of these refugees from Central and Eastern Europe initially expected to return to their countries of origin soon after the political situation had changed, most of them found it inconceivable to be repatriated to and stay in a Communist country. Instead, they wanted to emigrate to a third country with the help of the IRO. The emerging Cold War facilitated that desire, as the Western Allies were unwilling to extradite citizens of forcibly annexed areas to the Soviet Union against their will or to send refugees back to Communist countries.\textsuperscript{14}

That is to say that the IRO, apart from recognizing DPs who were ‘genuine’ victims of Nazism and who had already been the focus of UNRRA’s work as eligible for assistance, also supported anti-communist dissidents as refugees.\textsuperscript{15} When the IRO was founded, its founding members actually distinguished between DPs and refugees – at least formally in the organization’s Constitution. However, in the practice of day-to-day work with the DPs and refugees – e.g. in the specially established camps – IRO staff used the terms inconsistently or often synonymously. Considering that formal terminology played a subordinate role in IRO’s real work on the ground, historical research focusing on the organization’s activities in the field rarely addresses this point. More crucial was the question of whether the persons concerned would be considered eligible for IRO’s


\textsuperscript{13} Gilbert, Rebuilding Post-War Britain, 32–42.

\textsuperscript{14} Tegeler, Esten, 17.

With the continuation of the Cold War, a general liberalization of recognition practices came about. From 1949, the IRO also helped many people to emigrate, who, from the organization’s point of view, were less considered political dissidents than “adventurers with transatlantic aims.”

World War II saw displaced persons or refugees not only in Europe, but also, with very different persecution or flight backgrounds, in Africa and in Asia, where the war did not end before September 1945. In aftermath studies, they are only marginally considered, if at all. Most of the refugees in Asia and Africa did not fall under the mandate of the IRO, which was focusing on the care of refugees and DPs in Europe, as implied in the Annex of the IRO Constitution.

The best-known place of refuge in general memory probably is former Palestine. Against the will of the mandate power Great Britain and before the founding of Israel, thousands of Jews found shelter there after the end of the war, and sometimes even earlier. The public at large is less familiar with the flight of Europeans to various other countries in Africa and Asia, where they mostly stayed for a limited time. During the war, at least 18,000 German Jews fled to Shanghai, which was one of the last legal places of refuge. Like other Europeans who fled to China, including a large number of Russian emigrants as well as around

---


17 Cohen, War’s Wake, 51. See there (and the following pages) also on the issue of distinguishing between political and economic refugees and the impact of this differentiation on the decades that followed.

18 This is also reflected in the historiography of World War II: The course of the war on the two continents, the fact that people from there fought as soldiers, as well as the victims, are barely remembered by Europeans in particular. In Germany, for example, the fate of the countries of the Global South from 1939 to 1945 wasn’t given much thought until the book “Unsere Opfer zählen nicht” (“Our victims don’t count”) was released in 2005, followed by a traveling exhibition based on the book, which appealed to a broader audience. See Rheinisches JournalistenBüro and Recherche International e.V. (eds.): “Unsere Opfer zählen nicht”: Die Dritte Welt im Zweiten Weltkrieg, Berlin/Hamburg: Assoziation A, 2005. The so-called Pacific War, which was a central component of World War II, not only included Japan as the aggressor and the Japanese-occupied countries throughout Southeast Asia. Rather, the British colony of India at the time was also involved in the war by sending soldiers. Parts of North Africa were also a direct theater of war due to the German invasion. See, for instance, Klaus-Michael Mallmann and Martin Cüppers: Halbmond und Hakenkreuz: Das Dritte Reich, die Araber und Palästina, Darmstadt: WBG, 2006.


10,000 people of Chinese origin who came there during the war from countries mostly in Southeast Asia, and unlike other refugees in Asia, they were covered by the IRO mandate, which ultimately resettled around 20,000 people from China.\textsuperscript{22}

In North Africa, a large number of refugees, Jews and members of the opposition from Nazi Germany as well as from Spain and occupied France, reached the Moroccan city of Tangier, which in the 1930s had the status of an international zone, and was seized by Spain in June 1940.\textsuperscript{23} In addition, several thousand Greeks fled from the Germans to Turkey and subsequently found shelter in refugee camps in various African countries. These included the then Belgian colonies of Congo and Rwanda-Urundi (today: Rwanda and Burundi).\textsuperscript{24} In 1948/49, the IRO finally arranged for around 2,000 Muslim DPs from Albania, Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, who were in the Western zones of Germany, Austria and Italy after the war, to resettle permanently in Turkey.\textsuperscript{25} Turkey had already offered shelter to refugees from Europe during the Nazi era. To a lesser extent, African countries such as Morocco, Tunisia, and Northern and Southern Rhodesia (today: Zambia and Zimbabwe) were also destinations for migration from Europe after 1945.\textsuperscript{26}

The temporary accommodation of Polish DPs in African countries during the war organized by the British government in 1942 and aimed at moving them as far away as possible from any (potential) war zone has attracted some attention from historical research(ers) in recent years.\textsuperscript{27} These people had been deported from Soviet-occupied Eastern Poland to the interior of the Soviet Union in 1940/41. From there, about 20,000 of them came with the Anders Army to Iran in the first half of 1942. Finally – and partly via the then Indian Karachi –, they were transferred to Tanganyika (today: Tanzania), Northern and Southern Rhodesia and other British colonies in East Africa, where they were housed in camps. The first article in this publication deals with this special group of people: \textit{Julia Devlin} uses and analyses selected CM/1 files, i.e. applications for assistance by the IRO, which were filled out by the aforementioned Polish DPs after the war and are now kept in the Arolsen Archives. Apart from biographical details, these documents also include information on the Polish DPs’ various stations of displacement – from their deportation to the Soviet Union to their accommodation in specially established camps on the African continent. The article also talks about everyday life in the camps as well as the closure of the camps in the


\textsuperscript{24} Jochen Lingelbach: “Swimming to Safety”. Available at: https://refugeehistory.org/blog/2020/9/24/swimming-to-safety. Last accessed: 03.05.2021.

\textsuperscript{25} Holborn, International Refugee Organization, 388–389.

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 433–436. Conversely, in the years after the war there were also refugee movements from the Middle East to Europe as Jewish refugees from Egypt asked for support from the IRO in Italy. See Akim Jah: “Schrifliche Zeugnisse von Displaced Persons als Zugang zur Auseinandersetzung mit Antisemitismus in der historisch-politischen Bildung”; in Anne Broden, Stefan E. Hößl and Marcus Meier (eds.): Antisemitismus, Rassismus und das Lernen aus Geschichte(n), Weinheim: Beltz Juventa, 2017, 56–66, here 63–64.

\textsuperscript{27} Julia Devlin: Deportation und Exil: Eine polnische Odyssee im Zweiten Weltkrieg, Berlin: Vergangenheitsverlag, 2014; Lingelbach, Edges.
late 1940s and early 1950s when the resettlement of Polish DPs, particularly to the United Kingdom, became possible.

The British colony of India, along with South Africa, Palestine and Lebanon, also took in part of the Poles originally deported to the Soviet Union. Several thousand came to a camp in Valivade near Kolhapur in Maharashtra, and to other camps in India. At the beginning of 1948, the IRO took these DPs first to the camps in East Africa and later from there to Great Britain, thus responding to the increasingly worsening political situation associated with the partition of the Indian subcontinent. India was now considered unsafe, and the newly independent state urged for a fast resettlement of the Poles. It was only two years later, when the political situation on the subcontinent was still in turmoil, that the IRO, paradoxically enough, facilitated the move of European refugees to South Asia. The organization had negotiated the emigration of 67 DPs from Central and Eastern Europe to Pakistan. These people were doctors and nurses as well as their dependents who were stranded in the Western zones of Germany, in Austria, and Italy and wished to emigrate to a third country. Pakistan, which was desperate for skilled workers, allowed these specialists to enter. The story of these DPs who migrated to Pakistan is the subject of Akim Jah’s contribution. Although the DPs continued to migrate to other countries, especially the USA, after a few years, this example shows how the resettlement of specialists, for which the IRO had its own program, was organized and which enormous efforts were made to accommodate this difficult-to-place group of people. An investigation of both this program and Pakistan as a host country for European DPs has been so far a research desideratum.

While the IRO’s support of the DPs is common ground of both articles, they differ in terms of time and context: whereas the Polish DPs came to East Africa before 1945 in the hope – for many in vain – of being able to return to Poland after the end of the war, the Central and Eastern European DPs, none of whom, incidentally, came from Poland, went to Pakistan in order to escape the lack of prospects in the European DP camps of the post-war period. The latter were highly educated specialists whose expertise and integration were welcome in the country. On the other hand, the DPs in East Africa were mostly impoverished family members – Jochen Lingelbach describes them as “subaltern whites” whose stay was limited from the outset and who were usually housed isolated from the local population.

The resettlement of European DPs in Pakistan was not only chronologically opposite to that of the European DPs in East Africa, but also in relation to those Europeans who had been in the countries of the Global South since the colonial period and who were now returning to Europe in the context of decolonization. The DPs in East Africa, on the other hand, were

---


30 Lingelbach, Edges, 56 and 92; Holborn, International Refugee Organization, 418. The DPs left Valivade at the same time as the last British soldiers left India.

31 Lingelbach, Edges, 261.
there at a time when the British colonial power and, with it, Europeans’ stay there were increasingly called into question.32

Both articles not only illustrate the work of the IRO in Africa and Asia, but also exemplify how the paths of DPs from World War II often strayed from the known routes around the world and went beyond ‘quintessential’ DP biographies. Both articles deal with DPs who, though generally not victims of the Nazis, were assisted by the IRO. The DPs who went to East Africa were primarily victims of Stalinism who had been deported to the Soviet Union and thus displaced. This displacement in fact saved them from being seized by the Germans who attacked Eastern Poland in 1941, which had previously been occupied by the Soviet Union. DPs who had migrated to Pakistan were generally not victims of Nazi persecution. The majority had fled to the West in 1944 or later to escape the Red Army or Communist regimes and were finally recognized by the IRO as refugees.

The two articles focus on two continents usually not associated with National Socialism, World War II, and its aftermath. They also offer a new perspective by tackling the common misperception that emigration always takes place from south to north. Lastly they also remind us that in the not so distant past, countries in the Global South became places of refuge or migration for people from Europe.

The present publication, which draws only broad outlines of the topics of escape and migration from Europe to Africa and Asia before and after the end of World War II, is intended to provide an impetus for further research. The Arolsen Archives keep, for example, IRO documents containing information on refugees who had taken shelter from the Nazis in Shanghai and Tangier. Documents on DPs who migrated to Turkey after 1945 are also preserved in Bad Arolsen and accessible for research.

We would like to thank everyone who supported us in preparing this publication. In particular, we would like to thank Zosia and Jurek Biegus as well as Magda Polesny Schay, Anna VA Polesny, Zuzka Polesny Eggena, and Jurate Jaksevicius Mohen for providing private photos and giving us permission to publish them. We would also like to thank the latter three for their willingness to talk about the time they had spent with their parents in Pakistan. Finally, we would like to thank Margit Vogt and Christiane Weber for proofreading and all other colleagues working at the Arolsen Archives who actively supported us with the preparation of document scans, the design and the production of the publication.

Bad Arolsen, September 2021
Christian Höschler and Akim Jah

32 Ibid., 262.
When a person is filling out forms, it can be alienating for them to read questions about heinous acts in such a matter-of-fact, bureaucratic tone. Take, for example, the tax return; the text in the sparse lines of the cover sheet reads ‘Widowed since’ and/or ‘Divorced/civil partnership terminated since.’ The annexes for children inquire about the date when a child was put up for adoption or worse. So what was, in fact, a tragedy in one person’s life is reduced to just a few words on a form.

There is a similar sense when reading the Care and Maintenance files of the International Refugee Organization (IRO) from after World War II. On standardized printed forms, names, career paths, and stations of the last few years are requested. What ends up being just a few entries on a form are, in reality, the inconceivable life stories of people who wound up in the tentacles of history.

The Care and Maintenance aid programs were introduced by the Allies for people who were abducted, displaced, or otherwise uprooted during World War II. The Allies referred to them as Displaced Persons (DPs) and granted them protection, support, and help with repatriation, provided by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) and, after the dissolution of UNRRA, by the IRO. DPs had to apply for support from the IRO by submitting Care and Maintenance (CM/1) applications. Eligibility officers then checked and decided whether the DP was eligible to receive support.

The Arolsen Archives hold 706 case files from Polish DPs who filed CM/1 applications in Africa. These people were deported from the eastern part of Poland to the Soviet Union by

---

1 On the history of DPs, the UNRRA and the IRO, see the introduction to this volume.
the Soviet occupiers in 1940 and 1941 and later reached East Africa via Iran, where they stayed temporarily while the war continued.

In this article, I will first describe these historical events and then use the CM/1 files of the Biegus and Kaskow families to learn about their life stories. We can thus put the sparse information available from the administrative procedures in the CM/1 files into a historical as well as biographical-individual context.

From 1942 to the 1950s, 19,200 Polish people lived in African refugee camps.\(^3\) Most of them were from the eastern part of Poland, which was occupied by the Soviet Union in 1939 in accordance with the Secret Additional Protocol of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. The Soviet Interior Ministry (Narodnyj komissariat vnutrennich del or NKVD) deported Polish citizens from there to the Soviet Union – mainly Siberia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and the Arctic Circle – in four waves in 1940 and 1941 on charges of ‘anti-Soviet activities.’ Most of them had to work in prison camps and special settlements of the Gulag system. Others were categorized as ‘free exiles.’ Although they were not subject to forced labor, they had to support themselves and lived under extremely difficult circumstances in the republics of the eastern Soviet Union. All Polish citizens who had been in the civil service of the Second Polish Republic – such as members of the military and the clergy, civil servants, police officers, foresters, and teachers as well as their families, from infants to old people – were considered dangerous to the system and thus subject to deportation. In the third wave of deportations in June 1940, a particularly large number of Jewish Poles were deported, who actually came from the German-occupied western half of Poland and who had fled to the eastern half of Poland from the German troops. The Soviet occupiers thought they were suspicious because they remained in touch with people on the German-occupied side. They were suspected of espionage, or their loyalty was questioned.\(^4\)

Much controversy surrounds the research on how many people had been deported. The estimates vary between 320,000\(^5\) and 1.5 million people.\(^6\) When the German Reich attacked the Soviet Union in June 1941, alliances changed. The Soviet Union, which went from ally to victim of the German aggression, became a partner in the alliance against Nazi Germany. As a result, diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Poland were resumed, with the British as mediators. In the Sikorski-Majski Agreement, concluded between the president of the Polish government-in-exile and the Soviet ambassador in

---


London, Ivan Majski, on July 30, 1941, the formation of a Polish army and the release of the Polish deportees were agreed (this was referred to as ‘amnesty’).\(^7\)

Many of the Poles who were now released made their way to Buzuluk (Orenburg Oblast), near the border with Kazakhstan, where General Władysław Anders assembled a Polish army on behalf of the exiled government.\(^8\) Because of harsh temperatures, the recruitment centers were relocated to the southern Soviet republics in January and February 1942, mainly to Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan. The headquarters were located in Jangi-Jul, near Tashkent.\(^9\)

![Polish soldiers and civilians celebrating Holy Mass in the army camp, presumably in Kyrgyzstan, 1942 | IWM MH 1815](image)

Disagreements between the Polish and Soviet military leadership, the inadequate supply of food, equipment, and medicine, the inhospitable climate, and the outbreak of epidemics prompted General Anders to evacuate the Poles to Iran in March 1942. As Iran had been occupied by Soviet and British military, people there could be more easily supplied via the military supply route, also called the ‘Persian Corridor.’ In the spring and August of 1942, more than 110,000 Poles were shipped across the Caspian Sea from Krasnovodsk (which is Türkmenbaşy in Turkmenistan today) to Pahlevi (Bandar Anzali today).\(^11\) The

---

\(^7\) The term ‘amnesty’ outraged many Poles because it suggested that these people had committed a crime. See, for example, Lucjan Krolikowski: Stolen Childhood: A Saga of Polish War Children, Lincoln: Authors Choice, 2001, 26.


\(^11\) Sword, Deportation, 66–68.
Evacuees were initially cared for by British and Polish humanitarian aid workers, the British Army, and the Red Cross. The health of the evacuees was stabilized to the point where they could be relocated to other refugee camps – especially Tehran, Ahvaz, and Isfahan. All able-bodied men and some women, 74,000 people in total, were first brought to Palestine with the Anders Army for military training and then used as the Second Polish Corps under British command, especially in the Italian campaign. For 37,000 civilians – including women, children, and men who were not fit for military service – the search for a place to live continued. The Iranian government only allowed them to stay temporarily, and the British feared that German troops would also take the war to Iran. The British government went to great diplomatic lengths to move the Polish refugees to other countries. However, the United States, Canada, and several South American countries refused to take them or imposed financial demands that were impossible to meet. Still, in June 1942, an agreement was reached with British colonial governments in India and Africa to accept a limited number of Poles until the end of the war. Around 9,000 Poles were accepted in Palestine and nearly 4,500 in Lebanon. New Zealand and Mexico also took in Poles but in much smaller groups.

**Polish Camps in Africa**

In the summer of 1942, the Poles were brought on ships across the Persian Gulf and, from there, across the Arabian Sea to Africa via a transit camp set up by the British in Ahvaz. From the port cities of Beira (Mozambique), Mombasa (Kenya), Tanga, or Dar-es-Salaam (Tanganyika), they were brought to the camps by train or truck. Camps were set up in six countries between the equator and the Cape of Good Hope for a total of over 19,000 people. There were more than 5,000 kilometers between the northernmost camp, Masindi in Uganda, and the southernmost camp, Oudtshoorn in South Africa. The first settlements were built in Tanganyika (now Tanzania), Uganda, and Kenya in the spring of 1942. In 1943, additional camps were established in Southern Rhodesia (today Zimbabwe).
and Northern Rhodesia (today Zambia). The camps varied greatly in size. The largest were Tengeru in Tanganyika and Masindi in Uganda, each with 4,000 residents, as well as Koja in Uganda, with 3,000 residents.

The smaller ones included Morogoro and Kondoa in Tanganyika, each with 400 residents, as well as Fort Jameson in Northern Rhodesia, with 160 people. Existing structures were often used for the smaller settlements. Camp Rongai (Kenya) was a former military airport, Bwana M’Kubwa (Northern Rhodesia) was an abandoned mining settlement, and Morogoro (Tanganyika) was a former mission station that temporarily had served as a prison for Italian soldiers. However, other camps, including Tengeru in Tanganyika and Masindi in Uganda, were built from the ground up.

The respective colonial governments were authorized by the British government in July 1943 to establish the camps, set up the infrastructure, and provide the people with food and clothing for the remainder of the war. The Polish government-in-exile took charge of education, religion, culture, and sports. The administrative center for the camps was the

---

20 Lingelbach, Edges, 38.
23 Lingelbach, Edges, 30, 212.
24 Ibid., 33, 43.
East African Relief and Refugee Administration (EARA) in Nairobi, which was under British control. This center handled finances, among other things.  

Zdisława Wójcik, who came to Masindi (Uganda) as a young woman in 1943, described in 1995 how the camps were established: “The Polish refugee camp of Masindi was located in Uganda, halfway between the northern shore of Lake Kioga and Lake Albert, through which the White Nile flows. The first director of the settlement, engineer Jerzy Skolimowski, planned it out and supervised its construction. The main street was laid out so that it ran in the direction of Warsaw. Masindi was the second largest Polish settlement in Africa (over 3,000 residents). It consisted of several villages, each with a central plaza toward which led various streets lined with rectangular houses. Not only the roofs but also the walls of these two-room houses were made of straw or, more precisely, dry elephant grass. Near the plazas were located kitchens, water pumps, washrooms, and usually some object of importance to the life of the entire settlement, such as a community center, school, or store.”  

Most large camps were built according to this tried-and-tested method. They consisted of smaller sub-units, the so-called villages. A church, schools, administrative buildings, common rooms, and small businesses were put in central places. Tradespeople – such as bakers, tailors, weavers, butchers, and shoemakers – offered their services.

26 M. Massez to A. Delieurneux, 07.11.1945, Middle East Office. History, 2, unnumbered, S-1450-0000-0167-00001, United Nations Archives.
28 Ibid., 143.
Farms were established outside the center. They grew vegetables and grain and bred cattle, pigs, and chickens. These undertakings were important not only to help meet their own demand for food and clothing but also to give people work. This gave the DPs not only a sense of independence from the Polish government-in-exile and aid organizations, but also of purpose.29

An active life with churches, cultural, musical, sporting activities, and scout troops developed in these settlements. Camp Tengeru was also home to a synagogue that housed 37 Jews.30 Great emphasis was placed on education to be prepared for life after the war and to make the best of the situation in the meantime. In Camp Tengeru (Tanganyika), for example, 20 buildings were used for a multi-tier school system: elementary school, secondary school, grammar school, and vocational schools.31 They had to operate under difficult conditions as they lacked not only teachers but also books and materials. Kazimierz Sosnowski, who went to school in Tengeru, looked back in 1995: “I finished primary school in Tengeru and then went to mechanical school for three years when I was fifteen to eighteen years old. We learnt in very primitive conditions. There were not enough books for twenty-three boys. We had five books on mechanical subjects, three books for mathematics, and the teacher had to have one of these. One teacher was a qualified mechanic. There were two village blacksmiths, one qualified carpenter, one qualified

29 Lingelbach, Edges, 33; Piotrowski, Deportees, 139.
30 Lingelbach, Edges, 33, footnote 132.
31 Ministry of Education on Education of the Poles, ED 128/100, National Archives, Kew.
joinery maker, two well-qualified fitters. The workshop was very poorly equipped, so we had to make our own tools. We were the first group of boys, so we had to make everything, including our workshops.”

This was a time of relief for the adults, but there was also uncertainty about the future. They were also concerned for relatives who were at the front and mourning for friends and family who had perished as a result of the oppression at the hands of the occupiers in Siberia or Central Asia or during the war.

**After the War: Dissolution of the Camps**

Part of cultural life in the Polish camps was to listen to the radio together in the common rooms. The camp residents regularly gathered around a multi-band radio to get the latest news, especially about the war. February 13, 1945, was a turning point; the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) announced the results of the Yalta Conference. In February 1945, Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin met in Crimea to negotiate the postwar order in Europe. The dispute over Poland was one of the main issues at the conference. The Soviet Union was given the territory that they had occupied since 1939, with the western border being the so-called Curzon Line. This confirmed the Secret Additional Protocol of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact for the Soviet Union. The so-called Lublin Committee, which was supported by the Soviets and was strongly communist, was recognized by the United States and Great Britain as the legitimate government. The residents at the camps in Africa felt anger, disappointment, and horror. Stefania Buczak-Zarzycka, who found out that the war was over by listening to the radio in Tengeru, remembered: “Thus around my homeland dropped the ‘Iron Curtain.’ For my family and most others, the dream of returning home to Poland, a dream to which we had pinned all of our hopes during our trek through the Soviet Union and the Middle East, was now shattered.”

Returning to Poland now seemed difficult because the territory from which most of the displaced Poles in Africa came was lost as a result of the Yalta agreements. A return to a Soviet-dominated Poland was also inconceivable for many after they had already experienced Soviet oppression. Three months later, the war in Europe was over, and the question of ‘Where to?’ was more pressing than ever. Stefania Buczak-Zarzycka described the mood in the camps: “In spite of the ecstatic atmosphere, we grew more and more concerned for our future, and rumours began to fly around the camp. One of these rumours was that the Polish government-in-exile would purchase land in Africa. [...] Representatives of the UNRRA and IRO came to visit us and expressed their concern for our future. They discussed the possibilities open to us. [...] These visitors were followed closely by representatives of the Polish government in Warsaw who staged an open-air meeting, encouraging people to return to Poland because she sorely needed people for postwar reconstruction.”

---


33 Piotrowski, Deportees, 153.
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During the war, the Polish government-in-exile in London took care of the citizenship issues of the Polish DPs, but after the war was over, the Allies no longer recognized the government-in-exile. The British government was initially responsible for the exiled Poles, followed by UNRRA and, after UNRRA's dissolution, the successor organization, IRO.\footnote{Dr. W. Langrod to Miss M.L. Gibbons, 16.10.1945, Middle East Repatriation Problems to be discussed with the chiefs of missions, 2, unnumbered, S-1450-0000-0167-00001, United Nations Archives.}

Immediately after the end of World War II, UNRRA started to initiate measures to prepare the Polish DPs for repatriation. The official \textit{Report to Congress on Operations of UNRRA} from June 1945 stated, “\[m\]eanwhile, 30,000 Poles in Iranian, Indian, and East African camps [...] were being registered as a preliminary step to repatriation.”\footnote{Third Report to Congress on United States Participation in Operations of UNRRA, June 30, 1945, Washington: Congress, 1945, 19.} However, the Poles deeply distrusted the Allies, by whom they felt betrayed, and UNRRA, which they considered a ‘stooge’ of the Allies, especially since the Soviet Union was also a member of UNRRA.\footnote{Peter Gatrell: The Making of the Modern Refugee, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, 95.} News of the forced repatriation of Soviet nationals immediately after the end of the war had also reached the camps. This policy, which was decided at the Yalta Conference at the urging of the Soviets, caused great consternation among the Poles because their homeland in Eastern Poland was now part of the Soviet Union. What was worse, the new communist Polish government in Warsaw demanded in December 1945 that the Poles be repatriated by UNRRA,\footnote{Taylor, Orphans, 102–103.} but few were willing to return to Poland. They suspected UNRRA officials of being agents of the Soviet Union. Many refused to register with UNRRA altogether.\footnote{Miss M. Massez to A. Delierneux, Report Middle East Office, Poles in Middle East, 07.11.1945, unnumbered, S-1450-0000-0167-00001, United Nations Archives.}

Dr. W. Langrod, an UNRRA employee, reported the following after visiting Polish camps: “From a psychological point of view, the Polish displaced persons in the Middle East and Africa are very difficult to handle. Their previous sufferings and the years of more or less abnormal conditions of their refugee life have left deep traces in their characters and reactions. They are excitable, suspicious, and subject to mass suggestion. The religious attitude in East African Polish settlements often takes forms of fanaticism and bigotry. The DPs fear above all repatriation by compulsion. They mistrust UNRRA; an attempt to accomplish a preliminary registration in January 1945 in Africa was interrupted by an open, hysterical hostility against the Representative of UNRRA. [...] The refugees have, therefore, to be handled with skill and tact.”\footnote{Taylor, Orphans, 117.}

There was also increasing pressure from the host countries to close the camps. They had only agreed to accept the Polish deportees for the duration of the war. For many African countries, an extension was an unwelcome reminder of colonial dependence, and it put their sovereignty into question. India, which had taken in around 6,000 Poles in 1942, was particularly strict. After independence was gained in August 1947, the camps were quickly
emptied. The people who were still there in early 1948 were brought from India to the African camps.41

UNRRA ceased operations in mid-1947. The successor organization, IRO, showed more flexibility; it ignored the absolute repatriation maxim and, in addition to voluntary repatriation, pursued resettlement, which meant helping DPs emigrate to a new country or to settle in their current location (‘local integration’).42

With the responsible bodies changing, the status of the Poles in Africa also changed. Strictly speaking, they were not refugees initially as they had not escaped persecution or war. They were deportees. After their transfer to Iran, British correspondence referred to them primarily as ‘evacuees’ but also as ‘soldiers’ and ‘civilians’ as the evacuation was subject to clear military interests. The term ‘deportees’ was avoided because they did not want to affront the Soviet allies. There was also propaganda going around saying that the Poles fled to Russia from the German occupiers, which made them refugees.43

From September 1944 onward, British correspondence referred to the Poles in Africa as DPs. From then on, the British government hoped that UNRRA would take over financial and administrative responsibility for the Polish camps. Initially, UNRRA’s mandate only covered those territories that had been liberated by the Allies. However, in September 1944, UNRRA passed a resolution that expanded the mandate of the aid organization to now also support DPs who were not in the former occupied areas and who were not victims of the Nazis but were persecuted by the Soviet Union.44

Putting up the Poles of the African camps in a third country was not always easy as many receiving countries had strict immigration criteria. Australia, for example, set clear age limits; single women over 40 years old and single men over 45 years old were not allowed into the country. Also, people who were physically frail stood no chance either because these countries primarily wanted men to perform agricultural and mining work, and women to take up care and housekeeping professions.45

Delegations from the traditional pro-immigration countries – Canada, the United States, and Australia – also visited the Polish DP camps in Africa on their tours through the DP camps. People had the opportunity to apply for entry, but the delegations decided who...

41 There were several Polish DP camps in India, of which Balachadi and Chela (Navanagar) and Valivade near Kolhapur were the most permanent. Camp Balachadi was set up for orphaned children by the Maharajas of Navanagar. Valivade, founded in June 1943, housed around 5,000 people. In addition, several transit camps existed in India, including Karachi, as a stopover for the Poles evacuated from Iran by land. See India – Polish Refugees, Appendix to Appreciation and Plan for the Care and Maintenance of Polish Refugees Numbering Approximately 10,000 Located in Persia and India. Indexed Extracts of Reports submitted by R.B. Durrant Special Representative UNRRA, 11.04.1945, sheet 7, sheet 31, S-1254-0000-0096-00001, United Nations Archives.

42 Peter Gatrell, Making, 90–91.

43 One such example is the contemporary representation by Reuters – Gaumont British Newsreel: “Polish Refugees Flee Poland And Arrive In Refugee Camps In Iran (Persia)”, dated January 11, 1943. Available at: https://www.britishpathe.com/video/vlvaoo9zcq432y8pfpd2hszxsx6j0-polish-refugees-flee-poland-and-arrive-in-refugee-camps-in-iran. Last accessed: 06.08.2021. See also Lingelbach, Edges, 70.

44 Taylor, Orphans, 93.

45 Allbrook/Cattalini, General Langfitt, chapter 6.
would get a visa. This made many Poles feel like they were being “traded.”46 Many families were ripped apart because only younger and healthier members were granted visas, while older, sick, or otherwise unfit relatives had to stay behind. The selection process and emigration to the host countries were coordinated by the IRO Middle East and Africa office in Cairo under Maurice Lush.47

Britain was the main destination for Poles from the African camps. Two thirds of them emigrated there. Polish soldiers who had fought under British command and refused to return to a Soviet-ruled Poland were allowed to settle in Great Britain with their relatives. British Prime Minister Winston Churchill had already announced this step to the British Parliament during the war, and at the Potsdam Conference on July 18, 1945, he continued to advocate his position with Truman and Stalin, as he writes in his memoir Triumph and Tragedy: “There were about 30,000 Polish troops in Germany and a Polish Corps of three divisions in Italy in a highly excited state of mind and grave moral distress. This army, totalling [sic], from front to rear, more than 180,000 men, had fought with great bravery and good discipline, both in Germany and, on a larger scale, in Italy. There, they had suffered severe losses and had held their positions as steadfastly as any troops on the Italian front. The honour of His Majesty’s Government was thus involved. These troops had fought gallantly side by side with ours at a time when trained troops had been scarce. Many had died, and even if I had not given pledges in Parliament, we should wish to treat them honourably.”48

To make the transition from military to civilian life easier for soldiers, the Polish Resettlement Corps was founded in 1946 as a unit of the British Army. This facilitated demobilization and social integration under military control. The Polish Resettlement Act of April 1, 1947, also guaranteed the Poles extensive support in Great Britain, guaranteeing the right to accommodation, training, work, unemployment benefits, and a pension. The Polish Resettlement Act was the first legislation in Great Britain to specifically encourage mass immigration of a specific group of people uprooted by the war. This made it easier for the Poles to settle in.49

Ex-military personnel were allowed to bring their family members, their dependents, with them. For this family reunification program, under the name Operation Polejump, the War Office, together with the Home Office, had defined 19 eligibility criteria or categories for the relocation of relatives. Under Operation Polejump, 9,400 people emigrated from Africa to Great Britain between November 1947 and November 1948.50 However, many of the Poles who lived in Africa did not meet the requirements.51 Widows and orphans of Polish soldiers who were not under British command were primarily affected, as well as

51 Królikowski, Polejump, 164.
families who were eligible to emigrate to the UK but who had family members who did not fit the bill, such as adult daughters whose husbands had gone missing during the war and who did not want to emigrate without them. 52

The camps in Africa were gradually closed after the end of the war. The camps in Northern Rhodesia were closed in December 1948, the camps in Southern Rhodesia in April 1949. The remaining residents were transferred to other camps, but in the spring of 1949, four years after the end of the war, more than 5,000 Poles were still living in Uganda, Tanganyika, and Kenya. 53

From 1948 onward, the IRO pressured the British government to expand the criteria for Operation Polejump or to include the remaining Poles under the Resettlement Act. In March 1950, the Home Office in London prevailed in allowing the remaining ‘hard core’ cases to relocate. 54 This had a direct impact on the Koja (Uganda) and Tengeru (Tanganyika) camps. These were the last two camps that still existed: Koja with 648 inhabitants, and Tengeru with 1,033. 55 Their numbers quickly decreased within a year; in July 1951, only 152 inhabitants remained in Koja. 56 Keeping it running was no longer feasible, which is why all the remaining residents were relocated to Tengeru. The population of Camp Tengeru also decreased. It was officially closed as the last Polish camp in December 1951. 57

The Poles left Africa through the nearest port cities. The residents of the camps in Southern and Northern Rhodesia mostly embarked in Cape Town or Durban, those from Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika in Beira, Dar-es-Salaam, or Mombasa. They were brought to Great Britain on the passenger ships of British shipping companies and troopships.

On August 12, 1950, 1,014 Polish DPs traveled on the steamship Dundalk Bay from Mombasa to Kingston upon Hull, England. The trip took three weeks. The British Red Cross and the Women’s Voluntary Service supported the authorities in receiving and caring for the DPs. Some stayed with friends or relatives, but most were taken to resettlement camps and hostels. 58

In the immediate postwar period, the Polish resettlement camps played a major role in housing Polish ex-military and their relatives. Former military settlements or hospitals of the Royal Air Force or the Royal Army, where U.S. and Canadian troops were also stationed in the United Kingdom during the war or where prisoners of war were housed, were converted to accommodate demobilized soldiers and their families. 59 In October 1946,

52 Taylor, Orphans, 130.
53 Ibid., 128.
54 Ibid., 129; Lingelbach, Edges, 49.
56 Lingelbach, Edges, 58, footnote 159.
57 Ibid., 33, 36.
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there were 265 resettlement camps across Great Britain, which initially accommodated 120,000 people. Their number almost doubled over the next three years as a result of family reunification.

The Biegus Family

One of the families traveling from Mombasa to Hull on Dundalk Bay was the Biegus family. Their IRO support application is preserved in the Arolsen Archives. The application form is called the Care and Maintenance (CM/1) form because the DPs used it to apply for care and maintenance from the IRO. These forms were written in different versions, adapted to the requirements in different countries, occupation zones, and languages. The form that the Biegus family filled out is in Polish. It asked for the places of birth of the applicants and their relatives. It also asked about their last 12 years of residence as well as their reasons for relocation, their job, and how much money they made. Their schools, vocational training, language skills, desired country of emigration, and existing contacts there also had to be specified. What information does the Biegus family’s Care and Maintenance application provide? The applicant is Jadwiga Biegus, who was 38 years old at the time and applied for care and maintenance for herself, her two children, and her father.

Jadwiga and Jan Biegus on their wedding day, September 19, 1936

Private Collection Zosia and Jurek Biegus

60 Blaszczyk, Resettlement, 72.
61 CM/1 file Jadwiga Biegus, 3.2.1.6/81314760/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
The birthplaces of the family are representative of the tumultuous history of the region, which had been integrated into the Danube Monarchy as the crown land of the Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria when Poland was broken up the first time.

Jadwiga’s father, Józef Tuczek, was born in Milatyn Nowy in the Kamionka Strumiłowa district in 1878, which meant that he was Austrian. Jadwiga, born in 1910, was also born as an underling of the emperor of Austria. Her birthplace is Sambor, which became part of the Polish Lwów Voivodeship after the collapse of the Danube Monarchy and the establishment of the Second Polish Republic. Today the city is called Sambir, located in Lviv Oblast in Western Ukraine. Jadwiga’s daughter, Krystyna, was also born in Sambor in 1937 and her son, Jerzy, in October 1940 in Nagorny, Kazakhstan.

Category 10 of the CM/1 form asks about places of residency during the last 12 years. Deportations, evacuations, and various DP camps are listed here in just a few lines: deported from Sambor to Kazakhstan in 1940, to Pahlevi and Tehran from 1942 to 1943, to Bwana M’Kubwa in 1944, to North Rhodesia, and then to the “Polish Camp – Lusaka.”

Category 11 asks for employment and salary information for the past 12 years, the place of work, and the reasons for changing jobs. Jadwiga filled it out conscientiously: she and her daughter stayed with her husband in Tarnopol from 1936 to 1939, and from 1940 to 1942, they were in “Russia – Kazakhstan” and performed forced labor in the fields. The reason for the change in employment is “amnesty”. From 1942 to 1948, Jadwiga worked as a teacher in Ahvaz, Bwana, and Lusaka. She completed her training at the Sambor seminary in 1933 with a diploma. She listed her sister and brother-in-law – Maria and Michał Łotecka in Hereford, England – as relatives abroad. An attached letter dated June 22nd, 1949, shows that Jadwiga’s sister Maria had lobbied for the Biegus family to leave for England.

On August 12, 1950, the family embarked at Mombasa on Dundalk Bay. They reached Hull on September 1, 1950. The son of the Biegus family, Jurek, who was born in Kazakhstan, described the history of his family on the website Polish resettlement camps in the UK in 2005. This individual account gives life to the few facts contained in the questionnaire. “Kazakhstan in the autumn of 1940 was the last place where my mother wanted to be giving birth to me, her second child,” Jurek Biegus begins his story. His mother used to work as a teacher in Tarnopol, while his father had finished his military service and was working in a prison. As a reserve officer, he was called to join his regiment when the war broke out. After Poland surrendered, he went into hiding because as a military leader he may have been subject to persecution by the NKVD. Since she was now without her husband, the mother returned to her parents’ home in Sambor with her two-year-old daughter Krystyna probably around the end of 1939/the beginning of 1940. She continued teaching to support the family. She was questioned several times by the NKVD about her husband’s whereabouts and about her job as a teacher. In March 1940, she was dismissed from her teaching position because she was considered politically unfit.

63 CM/1 file Jadwiga Biegus, 3.2.1.6/81314758/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
64 Ibid.
Shortly afterward, on April 13, 1940, the second wave of deportations began. Jadwiga Biegus, her little daughter, her parents, and her older sister were arrested, taken to the nearest train station, and deported to Kazakhstan in cattle wagons. Jurek’s father, Jan Biegus, then surrendered to the NKVD in the hope that he could stay with his family, but he was not deported. His fate remained unknown for a long time until the family found his name on the list of officers murdered in Katyń – one of 4,400 Polish soldiers who had fallen victim to the mass shootings of the NKVD in the spring of 1940.

Jurek was born in Nagorny, Kazakhstan. The adults worked on a large agricultural collective farm for just a small amount of food in return. After receiving ‘amnesty,’ the family found their way to Uzbekistan in April 1942 to join the Polish army. The grandmother died of an infection shortly before the family was evacuated to Iran. Once in Tehran, the family could finally relax: “Persia was very welcoming. By the sea in Pahlavi, where we disembarked, a tented city had been set up. This was a transit area where we were registered, given papers, issued with clothes, and allocated to one of three camps on the outskirts of Teheran. Camp II, like the other camps, was under canvas but well supplied, food was plentiful, schools and field hospitals had been set up. Troops were being re-equipped, trained, and made ready for duty. Civilians began the long process of adjusting to a normality in which there was adequate food and even time to attend to their social and cultural needs. My mother particularly recalled a visit to the Shah’s palace gardens and walking through the shopping streets of Teheran, although there was still no money for any serious shopping, of course. There was still the reality of war. All the young and able-bodied were expected to join in the war effort, and my aunt joined the Women’s Auxiliary Service. This was a particular wrench because it was she who had been the main provider for our family. She was the one who bartered, traded, and stole the food that made the difference between perishing and surviving. Unable to have children herself, she made it her purpose that my sister and I survived where so many children did not.”
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Jadwiga Biegus, Józef Tuczek (grandfather of Jurek Biegus), Marysia Łotecka (aunt), and the children, Jurek and Krystyna, in Tehran in 1943 | Private Collection Zosia and Jurek Biegus

67 Also available at ibid.
The mother worked as a teacher in the school of the Polish camp on the outskirts of Tehran, and because teachers were scarce, she was allowed to choose whether she wanted to go to India or Africa with the family. Finally, they decided on Africa. So Jadwiga, her two children, and her father were driven by truck to Karachi, which was still part of India at the time, and from there, they traveled by ship to East Africa. The last step took them by train to Bwana M’Kubwa in Northern Rhodesia, but she only stayed for a few months because she was supposed to teach in Lusaka.

Camp Lusaka closed in 1950. A government commission from Warsaw came to the camp and campaigned for repatriation, albeit not very successfully. Additional delegations showed up later on: “The Americans came next – followed by the Canadians, Australians, and New Zealanders – to take their pick of the humanity on offer. In that particular market, my mother – young, intelligent, educated, with two young children who would grow up to be fine citizens of their country – was inundated with offers, but there was a catch. My grandfather was old and might become a burden on the host country, so the offers were
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always in these terms: you and the children can come straight away, and in a couple of years’
time, you will have settled in and earned enough to bring your father across from wherever
he might be at the time. To my mother’s eternal credit, she turned these offers down flat.
We were the last to leave Lusaka [...]. By this time, my mother was headmistress of
the school and responsible for closing it down. She couldn’t bear to burn all the books,
so we acquired our first proper possessions – a tea chest full of books. She was posted
to a camp called Tengeru near Arusha in what is now Tanzania.”

Tengeru was the camp for the remaining ‘hard core’ DPs, whom the British Home Office only
allowed entry to Great Britain after the decision in March 1950. “By early 1950, only those
that had been positively rejected by the three commissions or who, like my mother, would
not accept the terms that were offered were left in the camp. That’s when the British
commission arrived. It was different because I think they knew that leaving people in the
middle of Africa wasn’t an option, and their main concern was to know if anyone had health
problems, particularly infectious diseases like TB, and needed either treatment before
sailing or special provision on arrival in England. In July, we travelled by rail from Arusha
to Mombasa and then sailed on the Dundalk Bay to England, arriving in Hull on 2nd
September 1950. After a few days in a transit camp near Hull, we travelled in a fleet of
coaches to Springhill Lodges camp in the beautiful Cotswold countryside.”
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Jadwiga Biegus with her children Krystyna and Jurek
and her father Józef Tuczek aboard the Dundalk Bay |
Private Collection Zosia and Jurek Biegus.
The Kaskow Family

The Kaskow family was also supposed to be on board the *Dundalk Bay*. They were among the Polish DPs from the dissolved camps in India. Jan Kaskow, the 26-year-old family man, applied for care and maintenance in India for himself, his wife Jadwiga, and their daughter Izabella, who was born in 1946 in the Polish Camp Valivade in India.\(^1\)

The family wanted to settle down in England because Jadwiga’s brother lived there. Jan Kaskow came from the Galician Stanislawow (today’s Ukrainian Ivano-Frankivsk in the Subcarpathian region), Jadwiga from Tarnopol (today’s Ukrainian Ternopil). Both were deported in 1940. The CM/1 file merely states “Rosia,” which means Russia. A more exact location is not available. Evacuated to “Persia” with the Anders Army after 1942, they lived in Tehran until 1943 and were then taken to India via the land route to the Polish camp Valivade in the state of Maharashtra.\(^2\)

The educational and professional information on the Care and Maintenance form shows that Jan was a student when he was deported. In Russia, he worked “in agriculture,” probably on a collective farm. In Tehran, he had a comparatively well-paid job as a delegate of the Polish *Ministerstwo Wyznań Religijnych i Oświecenia Publicznego* (MWRiOP), which was responsible for religion and education. In India, he worked as an accountant and as a teacher. The family tried to emigrate to England from August 1946 onward, where they had relatives. Jan Kaskow’s mother and two brothers as well as Jadwiga Kaskow’s mother and two married sisters lived in the south of England and Wales, some of them in Polish resettlement camps. It appears as though they relocated as DPs as well, but an initial request was denied because Jan’s brother-in-law was not able to fulfil the necessary guarantees. This was communicated to the family in July 1949 by the IRO.\(^3\)

After Camp Valivade was closed in 1948, the family was transferred to Camp Koja (Uganda) in Africa. The application for resettlement was ultimately successful as Great Britain now also accepted ‘hard core’ cases under pressure from the IRO. The family was taken to the *English Point* staging center in Mombasa, where they embarked the *Dundalk Bay* on August 12, 1950. However, Jan, Jadwiga, and Izabella were removed from the passenger list because Jadwiga was pregnant.\(^4\) On September 19, 1950, twin daughters Maria Jadwiga and Barbara Maria were born in Mombasa. It was not until October 28, 1950, that the family boarded the *Llangibby Castle* to Tilbury in England, where they arrived on November 20, 1950.

\(^{1}\) CM/1 file Jan Kaskow, 3.2.1.6/81329326–81329330/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
\(^{2}\) Ibid.
\(^{3}\) Ibid.
\(^{4}\) Passenger list of SS Dundalk Bay, 24.08.1950, 3.1.3.2/81645851/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
Migration as a Negotiation Process

The CM/1 files in the Arolsen Archives are documents from an institution that provides politically or administratively relevant information from the point of view of the issuer. Thus, the information provided is inevitably selective and not very complex. Additional historical material must be used to complement the limited data.75

In the case of the deported Poles, this is generally possible thanks to excellent sources. Many Poles, including those of the subsequent generation, documented their experiences after the war, initially in print media76 and, with the availability of the internet, also in social media.77 As shown in the example of the Biegus family, the contents of the CM/1 files could be filled with numerous details and missing information added, but not everyone was able to or wanted to talk about the past. In addition, the first generation often stayed mum on their experiences.78 For the Kaskow family, the only information available is the data on the form. What else they experienced or what happened to them is anyone’s guess. For example, the trip that was planned for August 12, 1950, and subsequently canceled, raises various questions. The Kaskow couple must have known as early as the summer of 1950 that Jadwiga was pregnant and presumably also that she was expecting twins. Why is the Kaskow family on a passenger list to England on August 12, 1950? The trip lasted three weeks, so there was a good chance that she would have given birth on board. Was this due to an one-size-fits-all implementation of the mass resettlement, overly bureaucratic handling of requirements from the IRO, or were the Kaskow couple so desperate and eager to get to England as quickly as possible that they kept their pregnancy secret and were fine with giving birth on board? In this case, the limited information is all that remains.

Refugees are not an immutable and faceless group. They are treated very differently and have a wide range of liberties depending upon the context. The CM/1 application files also document a complex negotiation process among several actors. On the one hand, we have the applying DPs on the micro level and the eligibility officers who process the applications on site or in London, and on the other hand, we have the UN organizations on the meso level and the Allies on the macro level. The employees of UNRRA and the IRO followed the normative requirements of the United Nations. With the political framework given by the conflict between the Eastern and Western systems, the practice of recognition also changed. DPs of Eastern European descent in particular became political pawns in the Cold War that followed. For example, many Polish DPs who opposed repatriation to Poland were considered by the Western allies to be standing up against Communism, while the Soviet Union

considered them enemies of the system. As a result, opinions differed vastly on who should be recognized as DPs and thus protected, depending on which political camp a person was in. This confirms that migration is subject to migration regime regulations, yet is also the result of complex negotiations among multiple actors. “Migration is not regulated; it is negotiated.”

A lot could be learned about these negotiations by examining the 706 Care and Maintenance files in the Arolsen Archives that were created in connection with the resettlement of Polish DPs in Africa. What arguments did the DPs use to refuse repatriation? Why did they choose which country? How did they react if their wishes were not granted? How do events at the macro level (the worsening of conflict among systems) and the meso level (the restructuring of the international aid organization) affect individual fates?

It would be useful to profile these ‘hard core’ cases who were repeatedly brushed aside by the aid organizations and receiving countries and therefore remained in the African camps. We could then track where they were born, what schooling they completed, and what activities they pursued during their time in the Soviet Union, Iran, India, and Africa. We may even find out why certain destinations were chosen for resettlement and others were not. It must also be noted that over 100 children who are registered in the CM/1 files were born in Africa and that their further life stories have not yet been researched. An examination of the files could also answer questions about who began relationships and started families in the camp. With the help of geographic information systems (GIS), life stories and migration processes could be illustrated based on empirical material.

In addition, studies on Polish DPs in Africa have the potential to yield important information for general research into (forced) migration by diversifying the common perception of DPs as victims of the Nazis or as refugees in occupied Germany as well as the common European perception of the ‘normal’ direction of exodus from south to north.

---


On December 26, 1949, an aircraft left the Italian capital Rome heading for Karachi. On board were doctors, nurses, and their dependents, a total of 53 people from countries in Central and Eastern Europe who wanted to settle in Pakistan. Other well-educated medical professionals followed in August 1950, making their way to what was then the South Asian country’s capital, with Pakistan having gained its independence just three years before.

This article focuses on refugees from Central and Eastern Europe, who, in the years following the end of World War II, traveled to Pakistan as part of the Specialist Resettlement Program by the International Refugee Organization (IRO). Prior to that, they were staying in Austria, Italy, and in Germany’s Western occupation zones, where they were registered as Displaced Persons (DPs).¹

Although the IRO was primarily founded to support those who had previously been persecuted by Nazi Germany, most of the people emigrating to Pakistan were refugees fleeing communist regimes to the West briefly before and in the years after the end of the war. They were considered eligible for assistance by the Western powers in view of the imminent Cold War and represented a specific group among those individuals looked after by Allied aid organizations after the end of World War II, who are often referred to simply as DPs.²

¹ On the history of DPs and the IRO, see the introduction to this volume.
² On the history of the term DP(s) and its distinction from the term refugee(s), see Christoph Rass: “Vom ‘Displacement of Populations’ über ‘Displaced Persons’ zu ‘Internally Displaced Persons’. Überlegungen zur Geschichte einer Schlüsselkategorie der Gewaltmigration im 20. Jahrhundert”. Available at: https://nghm.hypotheses.org/2462. Last accessed: 06.05.2021. Although both the term refugee(s) and DP(s) were defined in the IRO charter, this distinction was not relevant to the resettlement programs (ibid). The two terms were also used inconsistently at the time. As a result, both terms are sometimes used in the sources to refer to the same group of people at the same time. To improve readability, the people relocated to Pakistan by the IRO are referred to as DPs in this text.
There are three dimensions to this article's research interest: Firstly, the idea and practical application of the Specialist Resettlement Program, to which little attention has been paid within research so far, will be presented as a tool of the IRO. Pakistan is particularly well-suited as a case study for IRO emigration policy as it was actually one of the few countries outside Europe in which the IRO resettled a relatively large number of specialists. Secondly, it will be investigated what accepting European DPs meant for the newly created country of Pakistan. Thirdly, the ultimate failure of the Europeans’ emigration – most of whom left Pakistan just a few years later – will be discussed.

The primary sources are mainly administrative files from the IRO, which are held by the French National Archives in Pierrefitte-sur-Seine, and personal documents, especially Care and Maintenance files, which are kept in the Arolsen Archives.  

The Specialist Resettlement Program

In 1949, there were still several hundred thousand people who were recognized as DPs in Germany’s Western occupation zones, in Austria, and in Italy, and who could not or did not want to return to their country of origin. The IRO attempted to find receiving countries in need of workers, to which these individuals could emigrate.

The emigration was initially organized via two different schemes. With the first scheme, the IRO handled mass emigration for specific categories of immigrants: selection committees from the receiving countries came to Germany and Austria to select suitable people who met the specific requirements for workers or the quotas in the respective countries. The IRO then transported these individuals to the destination countries, usually by airplane or on specially hired ships. With the second program, the IRO supported DPs who had arranged their emigration with the help of welfare organizations or who were able to show they had sponsors in the destination countries. In this case, the IRO mainly took care of their transport to these countries.

A third scheme was added in October 1949 and focused on those who had very low prospects of being resettled via the existing programs due to their professional background. This involved 26,000 to 60,000 displaced intellectuals who did not fit under the conditions of mass emigration and who had no friends or relatives abroad who could sponsor them. In a brochure from 1948, the IRO describes their situation as follows:

---

3 The spelling of names in the personal documents sometimes varies. They are stated as they appear in the sources.


5 Ibid.


“[L]awyers, doctors, journalists, engineers, teachers and others whose livelihood depends on intellectual processes present a perplexing problem.” Unlike refugees in trade professions, who perform their job in the same way all over the world and can easily adapt to a new environment, “intellectual qualifications” were considered a “handicap in their efforts to begin a new life.” There was usually no need for this “forgotten elite”, as they are referred to in the title of another IRO brochure, in the potential receiving countries. With the Specialist Resettlement Program, the IRO aimed to find suitable jobs for these people, thus enabling them to emigrate. The focus here lay on countries that had recently been made independent and so needed highly educated citizens.

With this in mind, professional screening boards at the IRO conducted interviews with the DPs and verified their respective qualification based on available certificates and other documents or by means of an examination through the boards themselves. Based on these screenings, personal files were created containing recommendations concerning the candidate's employment options and information about their language skills. Special Representatives of the IRO were then appointed to address governments and public and private organizations “in order to find individual opportunities for resettlement.” The next steps are described in detail in one of the aforementioned IRO brochures: “Once the first few hundred files were compiled, emissaries were sent all over the world to find employers or sponsors for these candidates.” The files were also forwarded to the representatives of interested countries, who then looked for suitable jobs there. In the countries that were willing to accept specialists, the local IRO representative or agents were commissioned with handling the local management and providing support to the emigrants. The search was coordinated by the Resettlement Placement Service led by H.A. Citroen at the IRO headquarters in Geneva.

Those concerned also included a large number of doctors and other medical personnel. The IRO developed a “special screening and identification procedure” for DPs in these medical professions, which were considered particularly difficult to place. This included

---

8 IRO, Facts, 17. See also Holborn, IRO, 302; IRO, Emigration, 23.
9 IRO, Elite.
10 See Cohen, War’s Wake, 113.
11 Within the IRO there was no official name for the program, often only the goal and measures were described, or it was just called the ‘resettlement of specialists’.
13 Holborn, IRO, 304.
14 IRO, Emigration, 39; see also Holborn, IRO, 275, 303 and 428–429. For the composition and work of the boards, see Holborn, IRO, 394.
15 Holborn, IRO, 303. See also Activities of IRO in Relation to Asia and the Far East, 07.02.1950, AJ/43/645, Archives Nationales, Pierrefitte-sur-Seine.
16 IRO, Emigration, 39 (translation by the author).
17 Holborn, IRO, 428–429; IRO, Emigration, 39. The designations of the Resettlement Placement Service vary; the questionnaires from the CM/1 files refer to the Specialist Resettlement Service and Lush sometimes calls the department just the Placement Resettlement Division (IRO to Alington, 14.03.1950, AJ/43/645, Archives Nationales, Pierrefitte-sur-Seine).
an interview by a screening board consisting of expert doctors and the evaluation of certificates and other documents. Following this, in addition to personal files, a medical register was printed listing the names and qualifications of 4,320 doctors, who all came from countries in Central and Eastern Europe.\textsuperscript{19}

The IRO then called on governments around the world to enable immigration for doctors and to name the conditions under which they could practice their profession in their country. The response to this, and to the Specialist Program as a whole, was nevertheless quite muted. Louise Holborn, author of the 1956 publication \textit{The International Refugee Organization}, states as a reason that “the various national laws governing registration and the right to practice in a community restrict such privileges to graduates of recognized schools.”\textsuperscript{20} Besides Norway, which was willing to accept dentists, and the US Pacific Islands, there was only Pakistan that sent a positive response with a “scheme for Army medical officers.”\textsuperscript{21}

**Pakistan after Independence**

Pakistan was founded on August 14, 1947, in the context of the partition of British India. While the largest part of the former colony became the new independent Republic of India (Bhārat), which had a Hindu majority, the western provinces and East Bengal came together to form Pakistan. West Pakistan and East Pakistan were thus around 1,600 kilometers (1000 miles) apart. West Pakistan was home to the seaport of Karachi, which was also the capital until 1958, and Rawalpindi with the General Headquarters of the Pakistan Army. East Pakistan, which was identical to the then province of East Bengal, separated from Pakistan in 1971 to become Bangladesh.\textsuperscript{22} In 1947, the new country considered itself to be a Muslim state with a Muslim majority and thus the home of Indian Muslims. The partition, whose border demarcation had been announced only a few weeks prior to independence, led to a refugee crisis: millions of Muslims attempted to emigrate to Pakistan, while millions of Hindus and Sikhs fled from there to India. The total number of refugees is estimated to have been 12 to 20 million.\textsuperscript{23} This was accompanied by pogrom-like

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{19} International Refugee Organisation [sic]: Displaced Persons Professional Medical Register, Geneva, n.d. (henceforth: IRO, Medical Register). A copy of this register can be found in the online library of the Arolsen Archives. Available at: https://digital-library.arolsen-archives.org/content/pageview/7262669. Last accessed: 06.05.2021. See also Holborn, IRO, 427.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 304.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{22} The independence of Bangladesh from Pakistan was accompanied by massive violence on the part of the Pakistani military, with millions of people fleeing. See also the analysis by Christian Gerlach: Extrem gewalttätige Gesellschaften: Massengewalt im 20. Jahrhundert, Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2011, 165–237.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Jorge Scholz: Der Pakistan-Komplex: Ein Land zwischen Niedergang und Nuklearwaffen, Munich/Zurich: Pendo, 2008, 100.
\end{itemize}
mass killings, in which up to two million people died.\textsuperscript{24} Even years after partition, up to seven million refugees who had come to Pakistan from India had not yet integrated.\textsuperscript{25}

The new state of Pakistan not only had to struggle with the consequences of partition, which also included the exodus of highly educated Hindus to India, but also had to establish state institutions from scratch. There was a deficiency of manpower in many areas, and a particular lack of experienced administrators.\textsuperscript{26} An article in the American journal \textit{Life} from 1948 illustrates the explosive situation in which the country found itself: “Of the approx. 70 million Pakistanis more than 80\% are farmers, a very few are wealthy landlords and the rest are shopkeepers and artisans. Nearly all of Pakistan’s financial and professional men are among the approximately four million Hindus who fled to India. From India Pakistan got about six million impoverished Moslem peasants, who for the most part, left their agricultural implements behind. In return for freedom, Pakistan has huge transient camps full of landless farmers and an almost complete lack of skilled technicians of businessmen.”\textsuperscript{27}

Against this backdrop, Pakistan desperately sought skilled workers, both for the civil and the military sector, and so reached out to the IRO. The Pakistani military played a key role both in making contact and later in accommodating the DPs. The military had emerged from the British-controlled Indian Army, which had fought alongside the Allies in World War II as an all-volunteer force with more than 2.5 million soldiers. Even in the first few years of independence, there were several hundred British officers in the Pakistan Army, which had a shortage of local experienced officers.\textsuperscript{28}

\textbf{Pakistan Looking for Specialists}

In September 1948, just over a year after independence and around a year before the program for the emigration of specialists was launched by the IRO, General Afzul Faruki, General Director of the Medical Service of the Pakistan Army, visited the IRO in Geneva and gathered information about the possible placement of DPs in Pakistan. In March 1949, he renewed his interest and announced that Pakistan was interested in hiring qualified

\textsuperscript{24} With the aim of researching the history of the division and the effects on those involved, the Partition Archives project based at the University of California in Berkeley conducts interviews with partition survivors and archives their stories. See also Murder, Rape and Shattered Families: 1947 Partition Archive Effort Underway. Available at: https://www.dawn.com/news/1169309. Last accessed: 06.05.2021. See ibid. for the difficulty in determining the exact number of killed and displaced persons in this conflict. For the character and dynamics of the massacre and its classification in genocide research, see Paul R. Brass: “The partition of India and Rettributive Genocide in the Punjab, 1946–47: Means, Methods, and Purposes”, in Journal of Genocide Research, 5 (1), 2003, 71–101.

\textsuperscript{25} Chaudhri Muhammad Ali: The Emergence of Pakistan, Lahore: Research Society of Pakistan/University of the Punjab, 1983, 274.

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 247.

\textsuperscript{27} “Pakistan Struggles for Survival”, in Life Magazine, 05.01.1948, 16–18, here 18.

doctors and nurses. Following a further meeting in April 1949, the East Bengali government provided specifics about the desired specialists and requested detailed information on possible candidates in a letter to the IRO in May 1949: “We are in need [...] of doctors, nurses and others. The professorial posts are meant for highly qualified doctors with experience of teaching in colleges. [...] In addition to the doctors we require at least 10 nurses. It is better if full information on the following points is supplied about each candidate: Present occupation, sex, original nationality, dependence, age, education, degrees, language spoken and understood and experience from the time of completing educational career.” The letter continues: “We are most anxious to avail ourselves of the opportunity of employing these highly qualified displaced technical personnel. The idea is to keep them on probation, if employed for one year, and then if found satisfactory, to grant them Pakistan nationality. In the first year we are prepared to give them special consideration in view of their strange surroundings, but after they have been granted Pakistan nationality, they will receive no special consideration as they would be Pakistani Nationals.”

A certain urgency can be identified in the correspondence from the East Bengali government, which was also expressed in the fact that, parallel to the IRO, Pakistan also sought specialists from other international organizations as well as bilaterally in other countries, with the intention of them coming to the country on a permanent basis or for a certain period of time.

On June 4, 1949, the IRO approved the resettlement of specialists in Pakistan. At the same moment, it problematized the one-year period formulated by the East Bengali government for granting citizenship. It hence referred to the practice in other countries which guaranteed the immediate naturalization of the immigrants. This concern was partly based on worries about possible uncertainties surrounding residence status and the legal restrictions associated with this for those affected and their families. At the same time, the IRO itself had an interest in the emigrated DPs quickly becoming naturalized as it could only release a person from its mandate once they were firmly re-established.

On July 22, 1949, the Health Division of the IRO finally sent the Pakistani Ministry of Health in Karachi a list of names for preselection. In the weeks that followed, Faruki visited various IRO locations in Germany and Austria and ultimately chose 50 professionals, who were offered resettlement in Pakistan and a job in the Army. These were general and specialist doctors as well as some nurses and midwives.

29 Extract from Letter by Faruki to Nikhil Sen, 23.03.1949, AJ/43/645, Archives Nationales, Pierrefitte-sur-Seine.
30 Government of East Bengal, Health and Local Self Government Department. Medical Branch to Director PCIRO, 06.05.1949, AJ/43/645, Archives Nationales, Pierrefitte-sur-Seine.
32 IRO to Faruki, 04.06.1949, AJ/43/645, Archives Nationales, Pierrefitte-sur-Seine.
33 IRO Director of Health to Minister of Health Services Karachi, 22.07.1949, AJ/43/645, Archives Nationales, Pierrefitte-sur-Seine. The Health Division of the IRO was initially the point of contact for the Pakistan government (see also Lush, Memoirs, 270).
When the selection process was already underway, discussions were held within the IRO regarding to what extent Pakistan would actually be a suitable receiving country and how specialists could be persuaded to emigrate there. Although the particularly precarious political situation that the country found itself in was taken into consideration, the IRO also wanted to take advantage of the opportunities offered there. This discrepancy and what this meant for communication with the DPs willing to emigrate becomes particularly clear in a letter from Citroen, the chief of the program, in November 1949: “Pakistan is in fact offering employment in the Army while the country is at present in a political situation which is delicate enough as regards its relation with its immediate neighbors and a refugee may therefore argue that enlisting in an Army which may any day be called upon to enter into action is not a reasonable offer of resettlement.” In the selection interviews, Citroen continued, possible emigrants should thus be made aware “that the offer is a good one which gives them a perhaps unique possibility to emigrate to a country where on disembarkation, they can engage in their own profession.”

The IRO, which had at this point generally not yet succeeded in resettling specialists via the third program, was anxious that the DPs who came into consideration actually accepted the offer. In the event of a rejection, those concerned were to be informed that a similarly good opportunity for resettlement was unlikely. Contradicting with this somewhat, Maurice Lush, who was in Pakistan in January 1950 as a Special Representative of the IRO and who will be discussed in more detail later, made on various occasion reference to the “hard life” that the “European refugee” could expect in Pakistan. In a letter to IRO Headquarters he wrote: “In truth anyone coming here in the next few years must come with the pioneering spirit, ready to undergo the hell of a lot of discomfort, to enjoy very few amenities and to work for the very existence for a new state which is by and large ready to forego anything to establish good government. I might be prejudiced, but the Moslem drive behind this new state looks to me good. But we must, we must [sic] warn our people who come out here of what conditions are likely to be at first.”

In his memoirs, he later problematized the sense in sending further European refugees to the country in addition to the million workless, landless and penniless Indian refugees who were already there. Ultimately, according to Lush who was referring to the overall scheme, this signified “great compassion on the part of the receiving country and great courage on the part of the candidate.”

Biographical Backgrounds of the DPs

The first 23 doctors and nurses together with their families left Europe on December 26, 1949, on the aforementioned flight from Rome to Karachi. Four doctors and two nurses came from DP camps in Austria and two nurses were recruited by the IRO in Italy, while the rest came from Germany’s Western zones. One family followed by ship from Genoa on

---

36 Ibid.
37 Lush, Memoirs, 271.
39 Lush, Memoirs, 266.
40 Nominal Roll of emigrants flying from Rome to Karachi on 26th December 1949, 3.1.3.2/81779162/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
January 19, 1950. A further three families with a total of eleven people also flew from Rome to Karachi on August 15, 1950.

As a result, a total of 67 people, including accompanying family members, came to the South Asian country via the *Pakistan Doctors Scheme*, as the resettlement of medical specialists in Pakistan was known. They originally came from Yugoslavia, Russia, Belarus, Romania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, as well as from the three Baltic countries. One doctor originally came from Turkey and another was born in Tashkent, Uzbekistan. Some of the spouses accompanying them were German citizens.

Their professional background and vocational experiences differed just as greatly as the countries from which they came. Alongside distinguished doctors and researchers, there was also a multitude of relatively young doctors who had only recently completed their studies. In some cases, couples and families had come to Germany or Austria together; in others, they had only met each other shortly before leaving for Pakistan. Sometimes both married partners applied for the specialist program and sometimes only one of them, whereby it was not always the men who were resettled and brought their families with them, but also women, who came with their dependents. The large number of children and other family members travelling with them is remarkable. Before they departed from Europe, almost all of the doctors and nurses worked for the IRO or for the Allied forces at a DP camp or hospital.

The political context in which the doctors and nurses and their relatives fled their countries of origin or the reason why they found themselves as DPs differed significantly in some cases. The majority had fled from communism and had generally arrived in Germany, Austria or Italy in 1944 or 1945 or in the years that followed.

One of the most renowned doctors to emigrate was undoubtedly Alexander Szatmari, 41 years old, a specialist in neurology and psychiatry and formerly a lecturer at the University of Budapest. The screening board described the doctor, who had published numerous scientific papers, as follows: “A neurologist with excellent training, 16 years experience in neurology and psychiatry and most profound knowledge in both these subjects.” Together with his wife, who was born in Dresden and with whom he later emigrated to Pakistan, he arrived in Austria from Hungary in July 1948, due to unknown political reasons, and worked at the DP hospital in Salzburg as well as for the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (AJDC), where he is presumed to have treated survivors of the Holocaust.

---

41 Nominal Roll of Emigrants departing from Genoa on Star of Suez to Karachi on 19th January 1950, 3.1.3.2/81728728/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; CM/1 file Imre Farkas, 3.2.1.4/80967162–80967167/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; list of UNRRA Team 264, 3.1.1.2/82021745/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.

42 As another nine came to Pakistan outside of the scheme, in total the IRO helped 78 DPs to emigrate to the country. This number results both from the evaluation of the CM/1 files in the Arolsen Archives and from Holborn’s account (IRO, 442).


44 CM/1 file Alexander Szatmari, 3.2.1.4/81200574/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
Szatmari, who spoke fluent English, was selected by the Pakistan Army to lead a psychiatric service and “to organize the whole field of psychiatry in [the] country.”\textsuperscript{45} He was also to take up a professorship at a medical college that was set to be established.

Janina Jakševičienė (second on the left) with colleagues and patients outside the DP hospital in Kempten, Germany, approx. 1948 | Private Collection Jurate Jaksevicius Mohen

Janina Jakševičienė (fourth person on the left) with colleagues outside the DP hospital in Kempten, Germany, c. 1948 | Private Collection Jurate Jaksevicius Mohen

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
Janina Jakševičienė, born in 1913, had practiced as a pediatrician in Kaunas and Šiauliai and was, among other things, the chief doctor at a mother and child dispensary. She fled from the Red Army in July 1944; her husband had been a district prosecutor in independent Lithuania and feared persecution by the Soviets as a member of the Lithuanian intelligentsia. In Germany, she traveled to Wrocław (then Breslau), where she had an acquaintance, and gained work at a children’s hospital due to a shortage of doctors resulting from the war. She headed west to once again flee from the approaching Red Army and was eventually employed as a doctor again. After the war, she reached Kempten in the Allgäu region in southern Germany, where she worked at a DP hospital. Jakševičienė was accompanied by her husband and two daughters, the youngest of whom was born in Kempten in 1947.46

Alena Polesny, born in Prague in 1911, was a stomatologist. She worked at various hospitals before qualifying as a professor in 1941, then opening her own practice. She escaped her country of origin due to the political situation in Czechoslovakia: “On June, 9th, 1949, I crossed the Czech-German border and escaped to US-Zone because I was afraid for persecution from Cz.”47 Her mother, Marie Provazníková, had defected from the 1948 London Olympics when president of the women’s divisions of both the Czechoslovak gymnastics organization and the International Gymnastics Federation, and coach of the gold medal winning Czech Olympic Team and in a leadership position in the Sokol movement.48 She was in London in August 1948 and sailed to the USA at the end of the same year, where she was politically active against the communist government in Czechoslovakia,49 which Polesny cites as a reason why she fled: “[I] was obliged to escape from my home, where I left a large property.”50 Her husband, Karel, an ophthalmologist, also worked at various hospitals and published papers. They came to Germany with their three daughters, where they both worked as doctors at the DP camp in Murnau.

Those who fled from Central and Eastern Europe also included 28-year-old Hugo-Eizens Daugavietis, who was accompanied by his mother. In his application for assistance, he stated that he had been a doctor in the Latvian Legion, a formation of the Waffen-SS
Although this collaboration with the Germans should have excluded him from IRO support,\(^{52}\) he was nevertheless considered eligible. To what extent his membership was overlooked by the IRO or whether it was intentionally disregarded cannot be determined from the available source materials. And, with Gabor Nagi, who emigrated accompanying his nephew, the group also included a former high-ranking Hungarian official and supporter of the former Regent of Hungary Miklós Horthy.\(^ {53}\)

With a former forced laborer and a survivor of the Holocaust, the emigrants also included two victims of Nazi persecution. Ognjan Petroff, a 30-year-old doctor from Bulgaria, had been required to perform forced labor for the Ludwigshafen city administration from at least 1943.\(^ {54}\) Josef Fetzner emigrated with the Estonian doctor Camilla Fetzner, who came to Germany in September 1944 in connection with the fall of Tallinn to the Red Army and whom he had met at the Resettlement Center in Munich. Only fragments are known about Josef Fetzner’s background and his persecution in Nazi Germany. The merchant from Munich was sought by the Gestapo between 1937 and 1940 and incarcerated at the internment camp for Jews in Ferramonti di Tarsia, southern Italy, in May 1943. He returned to Munich after the end of the war.\(^ {55}\)

In a press release, the IRO in Austria celebrated the fact that the emigration of the first group in December 1949 marked the first time that specialists with high professional qualifications, who had previously had virtually no opportunity to be resettled in immigrant countries, had left Austria.\(^ {56}\) There were also reports about the emigration of the doctors to Pakistan in the international press. The Tennessean published in the USA bemoaned the restrictive immigration requirements in the USA as there was also a shortage of “gifted and trained experts” there, too.\(^ {57}\)

Independently of the Doctors Scheme and the search for specialists by the Pakistani government, five further DPs, as well as four dependents, reached Pakistan from Europe with the help of the IRO between 1949 and 1951. These were comprised of a doctor, who had his own contacts in the country, an architect, and three translators, one being the 26-year-old Waldemar Kroders,\(^ {58}\) who emigrated to Pakistan with the first group in

---

51 CM/1 file Hugo-Eizens Daugavietis, 3.2.1.4/80947977/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; IRO, Medical Register, 24.
52 Holborn, IRO, 206–208.
53 CM/1 file Gabor Nagy, 3.2.1.4/81110312–81110314/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
54 Index card of Ognjan Petroff, 2.3.3.1/77755092/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; DP 2 cards of Ognjan Petroff, 3.1.1.1/68589488 and 68589489/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
57 The Tennessean, 02.01.1950, 4.
58 He is not included in the above figure of 53 people who were on board the plane, leaving Rome on 26.12.1949, because he was not a medical specialist.
December 1949. He was born in Riga and was a Latvian citizen. The IRO was obviously unaware at the time, as shown by documents from the Arolsen Archives, that he was an ‘ethnic German’, had fought in the Wehrmacht, and so, like Daugavietis, should have been denied assistance.\textsuperscript{59} In addition, Pakistan also became a destination for a DP from the Far East. Hussain Hozin, a Russian citizen belonging to the Turko-Tartar community, left the Chinese city of Tianjin on June 25, 1951 and reached Karachi via Hong Kong on July 14, 1951.\textsuperscript{60}

\textbf{The DPs in Pakistan}

“When we arrived in Pakistan on an SAS-Flight from Rome on August 16, 1950 at 10 o’clock at night, as an eleven year old what struck me was that everyone looked brown skinned”, recalls Zuzka Polesny Eggena, who came with her parents to Pakistan. “It was our father who later mentioned in his recorded memoirs the heat and humidity, and the smell of the fires from the encampments near the airport where the refugees from India were using buffalo dung as fuel. He also noted that these fires could be seen from the airplane.”\textsuperscript{61}

The doctors and nurses and their families arrived in Karachi, where they stayed for some time before being distributed to various cities and their places of work. From March 1950, Peggy Alington, the wife of a British accountant, worked as an agent for the IRO in Karachi. Her job was to greet the DPs upon their arrival and represent their interests in Pakistan, inform the Pakistani government about the movements of the emigrants, and report to the IRO in Geneva. Alington also coordinated the further search for jobs for specialists in the country.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{59} Registration card for Waldemar Kroders, 2.2.2.1/73197213/ITS Digital Archive Arolsen Archives; DP 2 card for Waldemar Kroders, 3.1.1.1/129801248/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; T/D file Waldemar Kroders, 6.3.3.2/109695534/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; Nominal Roll of emigrants flying from Rome to Karachi on December 26, 1949, 3.1.3.2/81779162/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives. It is not possible to discuss the later whereabouts of this group of people here due to lack of space.

\textsuperscript{60} Individual migration monthly nominal roll month ending June 30, 1951, 3.1.3.2/81719087/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; UNHCR Hongkong file concerning Hozin Hussain, 3.2.3.2/81581608/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.

\textsuperscript{61} Zoom interview with Zuzka Polesny Eggena, 25.02.2021.

\textsuperscript{62} IRO to Alington, 14.03.1950, and Lush to IRO, 14.03.1950, AJ/43/845, Archives Nationales, Pierrefitte-sur-Seine; CM/1 file Vaclav Kalous, 3.2.1.4/81030015/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; CM/1 file Dschi-Yin Kwok, 3.2.1.4/81064336/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
As far as can be seen from the sources, all of the doctors and nurses worked for the Pakistan Army Medical Corps in the cities of Rawalpindi, Peshawar, Karachi, and presumably Lahore. The doctors wore uniforms and had military ranks. They exclusively worked in West Pakistan.63 The Army Medical Corps, which still exists, is a unit that is responsible for the medical care of the military and has several hospitals for this purpose in the country.64

Alena Polesny worked as a dentist in the rank of a captain and her husband Karel as an ophthalmologist in the rank of a major in Peshawar. The family lived in a bungalow in the cantonment. Their youngest daughter, Anna VA Polesny, recalls in 2021: “We had a good life there. We had a big house with servants and a big garden. [...] They [her parents] had an incredible social [life] because they didn’t have to do any of the domestic things. They went riding in the morning, there were parties every night, it was lovely. [...] We were very privileged.”65 The three daughters attended a boarding school in Murree in the Himalayas,

63 The CM/1 files do not always indicate where the individual people worked. All of those for whom this can be ascertained worked for the Army. Lush (Memoirs, 270) mentions that all “European refugees” who came to Pakistan at the beginning of 1950 were accommodated in the Army.

64 Wikipedia entry on Pakistan Army Medical Corps. Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pakistan_Army_Medical_Corps. Last accessed: 06.05.2021.

65 Zoom interview with Anna VA Polesny, 01.04.2021.
where there were also other children from the group of DPs. Like other doctors, the Polesnys also had private patients, whom they received at an adjacent home office in Peshawar.

As a captain, Janina Jakševičienė practiced as a doctor at a hospital in Rawalpindi, where she was responsible for the family ward. Her husband, who found no use for his profession as a lawyer, did the accounts for a Catholic college. Their daughter, Jurate Jaksevicius Mohen, who was educated in Pakistan, went to a school run by Catholic nuns “down the road from the street from my family.” She remembers that the “servant boy would come on bicycle on lunch with tins to give lunch.” Janina Jakševičienė was later interviewed about her time in Pakistan when she was in the USA. Although she highlighted the friendships she made in Pakistan, she complained about the relative poverty in which she lived due to her low salary, despite the presence of servants.

For some of the DPs, there is evidence that they actually accepted Pakistani citizenship, as was agreed between the IRO and the government; others retained their former citizenship or stateless status.

Janina Jakševičienė (fourth on the right) and her husband Algirdas Jaksevicius (side profile on the right) socializing with colleagues of the Pakistani military in Rawalpindi, Pakistan, between 1952 and 1954 | Private Collection Jurate Jaksevicius Mohen


67 Zoom interview with Jurate Jaksevicius Mohen, 01.04.2021; Jakševičienė, I Bow My Head, 137.


69 Jakševičienė, I Bow My Head, 137.

Leaving Pakistan Again

“You will be delighted to hear that General Faruqi [sic] is very satisfied with his D.P. doctors and that at least four of them, whom I have met personally, are equally satisfied with their treatment by him which they ascribe to his personal qualities and not so much to the Pakistan Army or Government.”71 This letter from IRO representative Lush to Citroen on July 24, 1950 which appears at first glance to be positive, already expresses the dissatisfaction among doctors and nurses of the first group, who had came to Pakistan in December 1949, with the conditions that they found on site. While there appears to be no doubt about Faruki’s personal commitment, the structural possibilities were clearly far below expectations. The Polesnys’ eldest daughter recalls: “It was the very nice Dr. Faruki who ‘promised them the moon’ but when they reported to the military in Peshawar even with his intervention it took well over two months to obtain the equipment that they needed for work.”72

As early as April 1950, Szatmari stated that he was unable to see any prospects for himself in Pakistan. In complete disregard of the fact that it was unthinkable for Szatmari to return to Hungary, Faruki asked the IRO to return him to Europe in this case: “I am afraid that Doctor Szatmari does not feel that he has got enough scope for his specialty in this country besides the climate which does not suit him. He is requesting me to send him back to I.R.O. [sic]. Though I do not agree with him yet I feel that as he has become so much obsessed with the idea returning that he is psychologically morbid. [...] I suggest that he should be returned under the clause of physical and mental unsuitability to settle in his

country.”73 Although the IRO initially suspected that there were also personal reasons for Szatmari’s desire to leave Pakistan, the lack of opportunities that Szatmari found in Pakistan was likely the decisive factor in his desire to leave the country. No funding had yet been agreed for the establishment of the planned psychiatric service, and the founding of the planned Medical College, where he was due to work as a professor, was not yet in sight. Szatmari had clearly been promised too much. The highly professional and also initially motivated scholar was not being challenged sufficiently: He “has become depressed to find himself in a strange [sic] country where there is no scope for his capacity.”74 IRO representative Lush described the situation in less flattering terms: “Szatmary [sic] who, being a psycho-analyst himself and finding no one to psycho-analyse, is becoming a psycho-analytical patient [himself] and should, in the opinion of all, including himself, be removed from Pakistan.”75 With the help of the Catholic Immigrant Aid Society, the IRO managed to find a place for him at a hospital in Saskatchewan, Canada, where he started to work as an intern, and to organize his emigration there.76

Three other doctors also asked the IRO for assistance in emigrating to the USA or Canada. They even named India as a possible alternative, on the assumption that the medical conditions there would be more advanced than in Pakistan.77 The two doctors Kuhbacher and Tolgyes gave as “their reasons for wishing to enter the United States or Canada that they are not able to employ their talents here [in Pakistan] because of lack of facilities and equipment.”78 In Kuhbacher’s case, the IRO expressed understanding of the situation, but also questioned the accuracy of the information he provided during the selection process: “In the case of Major Kuhbacher, who is Gynocologist [sic], there is little opportunity for him to practice his specialty since male Gynocologists are not generally used here[,] a fact well-known to the Pakistani Military authorities, which raises the question, of whether he made clear his limited field when applying for service.”79 The IRO then ordered an internal investigation to clarify whether those concerned had been correctly informed in Germany about the conditions of their work.80 Kuhbacher finally left Pakistan in 1958. On October 22, 1958, he found himself, with a Pakistani passport, on a ship from Southampton in the United Kingdom to Montreal in Canada, from where he traveled to Ontario.81

---

73 CM/1 file Alexander Szatmari, 3.2.1.4/81200580/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
74 CM/1 file Alexander Szatmari, 3.2.1.4/81200603 and 81200610 (quotation: 81200610)/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
76 CM/1 file Alexander Szatmari, 3.2.1.4/81200609, 81200612, 81200554, 81200581, 81200582, 81200613, 81200631 and 81200649/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
77 CM/1 file Alexander Szatmari, 3.2.1.4/81200665/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
78 CM/1 file Ferenc Kuhbacher, 3.2.1.4/81060609/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
79 Ibid.
80 CM/1 file Ferenc Kuhbacher, 3.2.1.4/81060610/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
Alena Polesny (center) at a reception in a private home in Peshawar, c. 1951 |
Private Collection of the Polesny Family

The children of Alena and Karel Polesny: Zuzka Polesny Eggena, Magda Polesny Schay, and Anna VA Polesny in local Shalwar Kameez dresses, Peshawar, Pakistan, c. 1951 |
Private Collection of the Polesny Family
Alongside the structural problems within the military, there was also the fact that the prospect of permanently staying in Pakistan was not appealing for the doctors and nurses. This was a view shared by the IRO, despite contradicting the entire efforts of the program.  

“We cannot really blame them for preferring a permanent future in the USA or Canada, to an uncertain life in the East,” said Alistair.  

All of the DPs who came to Pakistan with the Doctors Scheme had actually named other countries as desired destinations in their application to the IRO in Europe and it is to be assumed that they sought alternative migration opportunities in parallel to preparing for their stay in Pakistan and during their time there. Anna VA Polesny is thus certain that her parents had viewed their stay in Pakistan as a transitional solution right from the start on their way to join Marie Provazníková, Alena's mother. They had submitted visa applications at the DP camp in Germany, but had had to wait due to quotas. “We left Pakistan when we received visas for the USA, after a three year waiting period.” The whole family experienced their time in Pakistan as a “wonderful life, as an adventure” and the memory of it is still vivid in the family decades later, as was evident in their regular preparation of Pakistani dishes.

Janina Jakševičienė left Pakistan in 1955. “When we were leaving on the train,” said her daughter Jurate Jaksevicius Mohen in 2021, “hundreds of people came and put wreaths of flowers around her.” She reached the USA with her husband and her younger daughter in July 1955 and moved to Chicago, the city that she had also stated as her desired destination in her DP registration. There was a large Lithuanian community in the city and the family also had relatives there. According to Jurate Jaksevicius Mohen, the family’s aim had always been to move to the USA; Pakistan had only ever been intended as a temporary stop right from the beginning. Attempts to emigrate directly from Germany to the USA, as Jakševičienė said later, were unsuccessful as their older daughter was suffering from encephalitis and thus had not received a visa for the USA. From Pakistan, with the help of a Lithuanian priest in Rome, they were able to get permission for her emigration to Italy, where she was accepted at a social institution for people with disabilities in Rome.

83 CM/1 file Ferenc Kuhbacher, 3.2.1.4/81060608/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.  
84 Zoom interview with Anna VA Polesny, 22.02.2021.  
85 Ibid.  
The majority of the other families also emigrated from Pakistan to the USA or Canada between 1952 and 1959. This was possible due to a change in immigration policy, as well as because it had presumably become easier to find sponsors. In the USA, the quotas for accepting European refugees were significantly increased with the DP Act passed in 1948 and amended in 1950; also, immigration quotas continued to exist even after the Act expired in 1951. However, the recruitment procedure was very complicated and DPs sometimes spent months in the ‘pipeline’ before it became possible for them to emigrate.\textsuperscript{88} The passages, which usually took place by ship via England, had to be paid for by the doctors and their families themselves; the IRO, whose mandate generally did not cover the financing of further travel, no longer existed after January 1952. As individual examples show,\textsuperscript{89} 


\textsuperscript{89} It is not possible to go into further detail at this point for reasons of space.
it can be assumed that the former DPs were not only able to practice their medical professions in the USA and Canada in the medium term, but were also naturalized.

Two of the former DPs emigrated to Australia and the United Kingdom respectively; the Fetznmers returned to Germany. The trail of two families and a doctor goes cold in Pakistan, and the whereabouts of four of the nurses are also unclear. However, this does not mean that those concerned remained in the country, but that no sources are available to determine their whereabouts.

Despite all of this, the IRO did not view the temporary accommodation of the doctors in Pakistan as a failure. Even in the letter stated above from July 24, 1950, Lush made this clear: “It is true, that one [of the doctors] has told him [Faruki] that he is making every effort to migrate to Australia, but that to my mind doesn’t matter tuppence because, by settling him in Pakistan, we have given him a much better jumping off place for future employment.”

The Failure of Further Resettlements

Even during the preparations for emigration to Pakistan, the IRO began a systematic search for other resettlement options for specialists in South and Southeast Asia. With this in mind, the IRO sent the aforementioned former British diplomat Maurice Stanley Lush to the region as its Special Representative at the beginning of December 1949. Lush had been the chief of the IRO’s Middle East and Africa office until the dissolution of the IRO office in Cairo at the beginning of 1949. In Cairo he had worked on the resettlement of Polish DPs who had come to East Africa and the Middle East during the war. As Special Representative, he was now responsible for resettling professionals not only in South Asia but also in East and South Africa and in the Middle East. His role in Asia was specifically to negotiate with state institutions, organizations, and individuals on further acceptance and emigration on the basis of the permanent resettlement of specialized DPs, not limited to the medical sector. In reference to Pakistan, Lush described his role as follows: “to acquaint Pakistan of the fact that there is in Europe a large number of experts in practically every art, science and profession who are now displaced persons; to discover the extent to which Pakistan is in need of experts; and to endeavor to provide, from the displaced persons in Europe, well qualified, experienced and English speaking experts to fill such vacancies as cannot be filled by nationals of Pakistan, and to obtain the agreement of the Pakistan Government to the employment of these displaced persons.”

---

At the beginning of 1950 and once again in July 1950, Lush visited numerous universities and departments of the central and provincial government in Pakistan, held a meeting with the Prime Minister, submitted dossiers on possible emigrants, and finally created a list of almost 200 vacant positions, half of which he assumed could be filled by DPs. According to this list, Pakistan in general had a shortage of teachers for economy, physics, chemistry, mechanical engineering, soil chemistry, and languages, and for elementary school teachers. Professors of engineering, botanists, and various technicians were sought in the province of Punjab. East Bengal was looking for university professors and continued to need doctors. For various locations, marine engineers, harbor masters, dredging engineers, and printing experts were needed, and the military reported a shortage of various engineers. Pakistan also showed an interest in professors visiting the country on a short-term basis and lecturing on technical questions such as irrigation, hydro-electric work, etc.\textsuperscript{93} Even in July 1950, the IRO assumed, “that there is every chance of the settlement of quite a number of people in this country.”\textsuperscript{94}

The many letters written by Lush, which were mainly sent to the IRO headquarters in Geneva, not only express his optimism that there were applicable positions in Pakistan, but also clearly show the pressure to find suitable prospects for the specialists and fill the vacant positions.\textsuperscript{95} In attempting to persuade the Pakistani side, he also drew links with the Indian refugees in Pakistan and called for empathy from the Pakistani authorities: “You will be aware, from your own experience of Moslem refugees from India, how anxious are these [sic] people to recover the dignity of work and to find a home.” He continued: “They would come to Pakistan, were they allowed, in the hope, that this country would be their permanent home. I.R.O. [sic] would ask for them no special conditions, except, perhaps, that special consideration should be given to providing them with accommodation, for they will arrive without any resources whatsoever.”\textsuperscript{96} However, elsewhere, Lush relativized the comparison of refugees and questioned self-critically whether it was a good idea to add more refugees from Europe to the millions of refugees already in Pakistan.\textsuperscript{97} And the correspondence from the IRO repeatedly indicated that the resettlement of specialists in Pakistan was not a humanitarian action and Pakistan already had enough to do with the refugees who had fled India. Instead, the focus lay on mutual benefits, and Pakistan would be unable to find its urgently required experts so easily and affordably as from Europe and from among the DPs.\textsuperscript{98}


\textsuperscript{97} Lush, Memoirs, 271.

\textsuperscript{98} See the sources mentioned in the footnotes above.
Despite Lush’s efforts, despite the existing need for specialists, and despite the generally positive response from the Pakistani authorities, the resettlement of other suitable specialists proved to be difficult. Over and over again, Lush made it clear to IRO headquarters, which were sending the dossiers, that Pakistan wanted highly qualified – the highest-qualified – and older professionals with a good standing and long experience, and not semi-qualified persons or persons who had just finished their education. The country had plenty of its own young professionals who had recently completed their studies. Lush used a particularly drastic comparison to describe the shortage and what he viewed as a lack of qualification among the DPs whose dossiers had been sent, warning that this could have a negative influence on the future resettlement of DPs in the country: “It is very important to remember this [the qualification] and to select dossiers of really good men and women […]. The presentation of dossiers of second rate experts or of men without the necessary qualifications for the post offered, may do us a great deal of harm at the beginning. […]” If my customer asks for the details of a Hoover carpet machine and you send me an example of a good brush and dustpan, he will not have great confidence in me.”

What the IRO was offering ultimately did not correspond to the expectations on the Pakistani side, culminating in great disappointment. Despite Lush’s efforts to ‘sell’ the forgotten elite, the authorities were not impressed by the specialists, who were still in the DP camps in Europe, as they were considered under-qualified and it was assumed that “the cream of the DPs has been taken by USA and Western Europe.” The Pakistani side also viewed the lack of ability to speak fluent English as a further problem. People who only spoke little English should have been completely excluded from the resettlement proposals.

However, there also appeared to be limited willingness among the DPs that remained in Europe to accept a job in Pakistan. The remuneration, which was considered too low, was also an obstacle in going to Pakistan, which somewhat conflicted with Pakistan’s desire to only hire the most highly qualified people. In February 1950, Lush informed the IRO in Geneva that it was difficult to find further DPs for Pakistan, particularly due to the lack of English skills. The resettlement of further DPs ultimately failed from both sides – partly due to the IRO, who had promised too much, and partly due to the Pakistani government, whose requirements were excessively high.

Even DPs who had already been accepted decided not to emigrate. In summer 1950, shortly before the second group departed – the formalities for entry had already been
completed – one nurse and three doctors decided not to emigrate to Pakistan, instead accepting offers in the USA, Canada, and Venezuela respectively. Two of them had already spent several months waiting to travel to Pakistan and seized their chance when another emigration opportunity became available. The two others were in touch with doctors already in Pakistan, from whom they received discouraging reports about the situation in the country and decided against emigrating. \textsuperscript{104} Within the IRO, the last-minute cancellation led to discussions as to whether the Pakistan Doctors Scheme was actually still a reasonable offer for resettlement and to what extent the defaulting DPs should face sanctions. A letter from the chief of the Latin America and Asia Branch of the Resettlement Placement Service to Citroen expresses a certain degree of frustration concerning the placement of DPs in countries outside of North America: “Goodness knows it is difficult enough to bring about acceptances of refugees in most of the countries falling within the Latin America and Asia Branch without the additional hazard of knowing the refugees will accept only until such time as the US takes them in.”\textsuperscript{105}

**Final Remarks**

With the Pakistan Doctors Scheme, the IRO attempted to permanently resettle hard-to-place doctors and nurses in Pakistan as part of the Specialists Program. Pakistan was the first country to report a shortage of medical experts – even before the program existed – and ultimately accepted a relevant number of specialists.

By October 6, 1950, the IRO in Asia only achieved a total of 216 employment offers for specialists, of which only 54 were accepted, in addition to 127 family members, who also emigrated. With a total of 67 people, Pakistan thus accepted just under half of all of the DPs placed in Asia with the Specialist Program, almost exclusively refugees from communist Central and Eastern Europe. 32 of these were specialists, including five nurses, with the remaining people being family members.\textsuperscript{106} The fact that this program also achieved little success overall is evident from the figures worldwide. Only 1,031 specialists with 1,966 relatives had been placed worldwide on the specified key date, mostly in European countries.\textsuperscript{107} Compared to the 4,320 doctors listed in the medical register, those placed in Pakistan also appear to be little more than a drop in the ocean.\textsuperscript{108} Although the reasons for the modest outcome of the Specialists Program are varied, they are in no small part due to the qualifications of the candidates and the requirements of the receiving countries or their

\textsuperscript{104} CM/1 file Indrikis Parups, 3.2.1.4/81128654 and 81128656/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; CM/1 file Stanislaw Sekunda, 3.2.1.4/81174531/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; CM/1 file John Halasz, 3.2.1.4/80998268–80998269/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; CM/1 file Egile Liepa, 3.2.1.4/81075707–81075709/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.

\textsuperscript{105} CM/1 file Stanislaw Sekunda, 3.2.1.4/81174531/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.

\textsuperscript{106} Inquiries are still ongoing as to whether or to what extent some of those concerned were involved in war crimes and therefore had great interest in quickly leaving Europe behind. Due to the restricted access of the German Federal Archives during the COVID19 pandemic, it has not yet been possible to conduct this research.

\textsuperscript{107} Holborn, IRO, 310.

\textsuperscript{108} Research into the whereabouts of all of the people listed in the register could not only show where the individual people ultimately settled but also the extent to which the Pakistan Doctors Scheme offered advantages for the people who emigrated there. Investigations into the success (or failure) of the program in other countries, which are still needed today, could also make it possible to compare conditions.
low interest. The lack of commitment from IRO in this area ultimately also contributed to the failure: Special Representative Lush was responsible for a huge area comprising Asia and Africa. The aim of using the program to “find far-reaching solutions for the future of its ‘Forgotten Elite’”\textsuperscript{109} was not even remotely achieved.

The Specialist Resettlement Program was a laborious measure requiring “long and persistent efforts.”\textsuperscript{110} Unlike the other IRO programs, it was not the organization of mass emigration that was the challenge here but rather the search for individual prospects, which not only required complex planning but also involved many uncertainties. Not only did the respective person need to be selected and accepted by the receiving party but they also had to accept the offer themselves. The fact that none of the DPs considered Pakistan to be a desired destination, but instead viewed their stay there as an ‘emergency solution’ or temporary option, only served to complicate matters further. As the example of Szatmari shows, the IRO also intensively handled ‘problem cases’ across continents. Nevertheless, for the sample investigated here, the resettlement from Europe to Asia functioned well – until historical developments, i.e. the liberalization of immigration opportunities to Western countries, caught up.

Tablecloth, stitched by Alena Polesny, documenting the places that the family visited on their journey from Czechoslovakia to the US | Private Collection of the Polesny Family

\textsuperscript{109} Holborn, IRO, 427.

\textsuperscript{110} IRO, Emigration, 40.
All of the doctors and nurses, where known, left Pakistan again. Against this backdrop and
in view of the lack of further resettlement successes, especially in the non-medical field,
there can be no doubt that, even in the case of Pakistan, the permanent resettlement of
specialists must be considered a failure. The IRO nevertheless sold the departure of the
specialists from Pakistan as a success, as their opportunity for future employment had
significantly improved due to their stay in Pakistan. And, as Holborn writes, the emigration
via the Resettlement Placement Service program actually represented the only oppor-
tunity for many of those concerned to change their situation in the DP camps in the short
term and end their refugee status.¹¹¹ The story of the European DPs in Pakistan thus also
shows how long it sometimes took before they could finally settle and how their journey
covered numerous continents.

For the Pakistani government, which wanted to cater to its need for professionals, the hopes
that it placed in the IRO were not fulfilled. As a result, reasons for the failure can also be
found on the Pakistani side: besides infrastructural problems, the lack of preparation in
order to fulfill the promised conditions, and the sometimes long processing time for
visa applications, a further factor was also the high standard set by Pakistan leaders on
possible migrants. The impression expressed in this regard that the best qualified were
placed in Western countries and not in Pakistan is untenable, considering the high
qualifications of the doctors who immigrated in 1949/50. A further reason for the failure
lay in the lack of English skills among the DPs from Central and Eastern Europe, which
– rightly – was considered a prerequisite for practicing their profession in the country. This
indicates a fundamental problem in placing highly specialized professionals in countries
where other languages were spoken and therefore calls into question the idea behind
the entire program.

It is not possible to make generalizing statements about the integration of the Europeans
in Pakistan. We know, however, that even families who left the country again later on were
able to integrate very well. Settling may have been facilitated by the existing colonial infra-
structure, such as the Christian schools run by Europeans, as well as, despite deprivation
in individual cases, the good quality of life in the city cantonments, far above the national
average, which hardly conveys the discomfort referred to by Lush. Nonetheless, there
was dissatisfaction concerning working conditions. The significant cultural and socio-
economic differences and the intense heat, along with the constant threat of war with
India, were further factors. For those who only left Pakistan some years later, the reason
also seems to have been their long-term goal to emigrate to North America, where they
often had relatives or members of the same community. The stay in Pakistan was conse-
quently not a viable long-term solution for any of those concerned.

The choice of Pakistan as a destination country for migration from Europe appears remark-
able not only from the current perspective. The ‘developing country’ of Pakistan, which had
only recently obtained its independence, was viewed as a realistic emigration destination,
although the IRO, which was under pressure to organize the emigration of as many DPs as
possible as quickly as possible – and thus also exerted soft pressure on the DPs to accept
the offers –, had no illusions whatsoever about the economic and political situation there.
The willingness – following initial hesitation – to permanently accept and naturalize

¹¹¹ Holborn, IRO, 429.
European refugees, however, shows the openness of Pakistan at that time, in contrast to India and what was then known as Ceylon. However, the reception of anti-communist refugees may come as little surprise considering Pakistan’s (envisaged) alignment with the USA and its anti-communist and anti-Soviet self-image.\footnote{112} The acceptance of European refugees in a country that itself had millions of non-integrated refugees – but who were poorly educated and outside the mandate of the IRO – also appears remarkable. This was also acknowledged (self-critically) by the IRO, although the nexus of European DPs or refugees on the one side and the refugee movements in South Asia resulting indirectly from World War II on the other side appeared to be no issue within the IRO, even in view of the mandate of international aid organizations. And finally, the “problem of refugees”, as it was viewed by the IRO and the United Nations, “pertained first and foremost to the complex situation of dislocated Eastern Europeans, even if forced displacement occurred in other parts of the world.”\footnote{113}

The naturalization of (Christian) Europeans appears, from today’s perspective in which a national minority such as the Ahmadiyyas are deprived of their civic rights and their legitimate belonging to Pakistan is constantly called into question, even by official parties,\footnote{114} astounding, but ultimately reflects the development of the country from the secular understanding of the state by the country’s founder Jinnah towards increasing Islamization.

The actual contribution that the DPs made towards nation-building in Pakistan is, however, difficult to ascertain; further research would be necessary here, including a comparison with other Europeans who had lived in the country during the decolonization phase, and considering how – ultimately – temporary international work assignment served or could serve as an example.\footnote{115} On the surface, the placement of the DPs in Pakistan tends to have more in common with programs within international development cooperation rather than with the other IRO resettlement programs due to its limited duration.


\footnote{113} Cohen, War’s Wake, 13.

\footnote{114} Siobhain McDonagh: Why do Ahmadis Muslims in Pakistan not Have a Vote? Available at: https://www.ids.ac.uk/opinions/why-do-ahmadis-muslims-in-pakistan-not-have-a-vote/. Last accessed: 06.05.2021.

\footnote{115} Pakistani sources, especially from the Army, which, despite efforts, were not available when writing the present text, would need to be taken into account here.
Two developments that shaped the history of Pakistan can ultimately be seen in the reception of the DPs: the preference given to West Pakistan over the economically and politically disadvantaged East Bengal, and the dominance of the military. The first ultimately led to the independence of Bangladesh.\textsuperscript{116} The military, which was already dominant when the country was founded,\textsuperscript{117} developed over the following decades not only into a central political player but, as Ayesha Siddiqua presented in her study “Military Inc.”, also became a comprehensive economic power within the country.\textsuperscript{118} Today, the military is seen as a synonym for the lack of democratization and partially for support for Islamic terrorism in the country.

The letters and memoirs of Lush and the optimistic and positive view of Pakistan expressed in them, however, represent historical documents on the perception of the country in the first few years after it was founded. They are not yet aware of the political crises that would shape the country, at the latest following the assassination of Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan in October 1951.

\textsuperscript{116} Gerlach, Gesellschaften, 165–237.
The following documents from the Arolsen Archives provide an insight into the registration, application for care and maintenance, and resettlement process of DPs in the post-war period. All were mentioned in the previous articles and refer directly to the DPs in Africa and Pakistan. If you are interested in learning more about the original context of the documents, we recommend our e-Guide: https://eguide.arolsen-archives.org/en
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nazwisko</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Numer formularza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bugis</td>
<td>5.5.1948</td>
<td>7060075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Nazwisko</th>
<th>Data urodzin</th>
<th>Narodowość</th>
<th>Miasta, Województwo i kraj urodzenia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JADWIGA</td>
<td>25.10.1925</td>
<td>POLISH</td>
<td>Sambor, Woji, Lwów</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRISTYNIA</td>
<td>27.1.1923</td>
<td>POLISH</td>
<td>Sambor, Woji, Lwów</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERZY</td>
<td>22.10.1920</td>
<td>POLISH</td>
<td>Kozolne, Kazachstan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Inna całość

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imię</th>
<th>Nazwisko</th>
<th>Data urodzin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TÜCZEK</td>
<td>Józef</td>
<td>11.2.1938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Miejsca pobytu stałe za ostatnich 12 lat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ocha</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Miasta lub wios, województwo, kraj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2+3+4</td>
<td>1935-1940</td>
<td>Sambor, Tarnów, Sambor, deportowane, U.S.S.R., Kazachstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1940-1942</td>
<td>Sambor, Tarnów, Sambor, deportowane, U.S.S.R., Kazachstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1942-1943</td>
<td>Teheran, Persia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Swana, M. Kubwa, N. Rodažy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Sambor, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1945-1946</td>
<td>Sambor, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1946-1948</td>
<td>Swana, M. Kubwa, N. Rodažy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Teheran, Persia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUCZEL</td>
<td>Józef</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lusaka, Poland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11. Zatrudnienie za ostatnich 12 lat, włącznie obecne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ocha</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rodzaj pracy</th>
<th>Płace</th>
<th>Pracodawca</th>
<th>Miejsce, województwo, kraj</th>
<th>Powody zmiany zatrudnienia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/12</td>
<td>1936-9</td>
<td>PRZY МЕЖУ</td>
<td>TORUN POLSKA</td>
<td></td>
<td>TORNOPOL POLSKA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1940-7</td>
<td>NA RÔLI</td>
<td>PRAČE PÁRMI</td>
<td>ROŠJA - КАЗАҚСТАН-ГУМЕЙСТВА</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1942-8</td>
<td>NAУЧУЗЯЕЛКА</td>
<td>HWAI-BWANA-ŁUSKA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12. Wykształcenie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ocha</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Typ szkoły</th>
<th>Miejsce, Województwo, kraj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/12</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>SEMINARIUM</td>
<td>SAMBOR WJ. LVOW- POLSKA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. Języki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ocha</th>
<th>Słowno wódzkie</th>
<th>w mówie biegłe</th>
<th>słabo</th>
<th>w czytaniu biegłe</th>
<th>słabo</th>
<th>w pisaniu biegłe</th>
<th>słabo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/12</td>
<td>NIEMIECK</td>
<td>POLSKI</td>
<td>POLSKI</td>
<td>ANGLIEL</td>
<td>ANGLIEL</td>
<td>POLSKI</td>
<td>POLSKI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osoba</td>
<td>Właścic.</td>
<td>Rodzaj</td>
<td>Wartość</td>
<td>Miejsce pożąd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gotówka i dochód</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pomoce od krewnych</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Krewni

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nazwisko i imie</th>
<th>Stopień pośrednictwa</th>
<th>Deklarowany adres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. ŁOTĘCKA</td>
<td>SIOSTRÓ</td>
<td>Hereford, Fortey 97, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. ŁOTĘCKO</td>
<td>ZWAGIER</td>
<td>Hereford, Fortey 97, England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Pomoce

1. Czy otrzymywałeś lub otrzymujesz jakiekolwiek pomoc z UNRYY: tak [ ] nie [ ]

Organizator: [ ]

2. W jakie miało to oznaczenie:

3. Jeśli otrzymywałeś lub otrzymujesz gotówkę podaj jej wysokość:

4. Jeśli otrzymywałeś lub otrzymujesz pomoc z dobrowolnych organizacji podaj jej bomenclie:

17. Dokumenty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Osoba</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rodzaj</th>
<th>Miejsce wykonywania</th>
<th>Kto wydał</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sambor - Seminarium</td>
<td>Nauczycielskie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Document 1**

Application (CM/1) for IRO assistance, submitted by Jadwiga Biegus, 3.2.1.6/81314758/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
Dear Mrs. Lotecka,

Re: HINUS, J. R.

This Organisation is anxious to make resettlement plans for your family, the above-named, and we understand that you wish them to join you in this country.

Before an application can be made to the Home Office on their behalf, however, it is necessary for you to undertake to maintain and accommodate them and to produce a letter from your employer proving your employment, and also from a person who has accommodation available for your family stating this to be so.

If you are able to provide these documents, I should appreciate your advising me of this fact as soon as possible and sending the documents to this office. I will then put forward the case to the Home Office, who will decide whether or not they are agreeable to your family entering this country, and advise you of their decision.

Yours sincerely,

Trudy Clarfelt,
PER, Syria Lethan,
Operations Officer.

Mrs. Maria Lotecka,
Poxley Camp,
NI, HERFORD.

c/o NN, Tanganyika
ER, Nairobi.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>numer</th>
<th>nazwisko</th>
<th>data urodzenia</th>
<th>narodowość</th>
<th>miejsce urodzenia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kaskow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kaskow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Lut 1920</td>
<td>Polska</td>
<td>Tarnopol - Polska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jadwiga</td>
<td>Luty 1920</td>
<td>Polska</td>
<td>Tarnopol - Polska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Izabela</td>
<td>Luty 1920</td>
<td>Polska</td>
<td>Ternopil - Polska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Marzec 1940</td>
<td>Polska</td>
<td>Mombasa - Afryka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Marzec 1950</td>
<td>Polska</td>
<td>Mombasa - Afryka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Miejsce zamieszkania w ciągu ostatnich 12 lat:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>imię</th>
<th>drugie imię</th>
<th>data urodzenia</th>
<th>miejsce urodzenia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luty 1920</td>
<td>Tarnopol - Polska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadwiga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luty 1920</td>
<td>Tarnopol - Polska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izabela</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luty 1920</td>
<td>Ternopil - Polska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marzec 1940</td>
<td>Mombasa - Afryka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marzec 1950</td>
<td>Mombasa - Afryka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11. Zatrudnienie w ciągu ostatnich 12 lat, podpis i obowiązki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czyja</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rodzaj pracy</th>
<th>Czas pracy (od dissect)</th>
<th>Przasnawy</th>
<th>Miejscowość, województwo i kraj</th>
<th>Przywózcy, znany zęgię</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12. Wykaz wiadomości

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czyja</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rodzaj pracy (osek)</th>
<th>Miejscowość, województwo i kraj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>biznes osobieli</td>
<td>Wilamowo - Wielun - Łódź</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>biznes osobieli</td>
<td>Torun - Polski</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. Kontynuacja wiadomości

| Czyja | Płynne | Słabo | Płynne | Słabo | Płynne | Słabo | Częst
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wedle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Głowic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wedle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Środki finansowe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czyje</th>
<th>Wszelkie</th>
<th>Rodzaj</th>
<th>Ważne</th>
<th>Lokalna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gotówka i rodziny**

**Pomoc ze stron podrzywych**

### Krewat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nazwisko i Imię</th>
<th>Adres</th>
<th>Deklaracja zdrowia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pozostało

1. Czy Pan(i) lub ktoś z Pana(i) rodziny korzystał z pomocy UNRRA? _Tak_  
   126
2. Jeśli korzystał(a) Pan(i) z pomocy, proszę podać wongan na miłość:  
   *data*  
   *imię*  
   *nazwisko*
3. Jeśli otrzymać(a) Pan(i) dotacji, proszę podać kwotę  
4. Jeśli otrzymać(a) Pan(i) z pomocy jakiejś instytucji, proszę podać jej nazwę

### Dokumenty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czyje</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rodzaj</th>
<th>Miejsce wystawienia</th>
<th>Przez kogo wystawione</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3
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### Document 3

Application (CM/1) for IRO assistance, submitted by Jan Kaskow, 3.2.1.6/81329327/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
Letter from Trudy Clarfelt, IRO London, to IRO Kampala, 28.7.1949, CM/1 file
Jan Kaskow, 3.2.1.6/81329328/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.

With this letter the IRO informed its office in Kampala that the initial request for relocation of the Kaskow family was denied.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Roll No.</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Citizenship Status</th>
<th>Mar. Stat.</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Date of Arrival</th>
<th>Zone or Field Office of Origin</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>52977</td>
<td>ADAM</td>
<td>Antoni</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; Poland</td>
<td>R.C. M</td>
<td>8.1.1904</td>
<td>P 16.5.1932</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1.9.1916</td>
<td>E.A.F.</td>
<td>Feaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>110002</td>
<td>ADAMONICZ</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; Poland</td>
<td>R.C. M</td>
<td>1.5.1900</td>
<td>P 16.5.1932</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1.9.1916</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>11004</td>
<td>ANDRAK</td>
<td>Bolesław</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; Poland</td>
<td>R.C. M</td>
<td>14.1.1904</td>
<td>P 24.2.1932</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1.9.1916</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>15908</td>
<td>BANIK</td>
<td>Antoni</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; Poland</td>
<td>R.C. M</td>
<td>23.11.1909</td>
<td>P 3.11.1932</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>11011</td>
<td>BANOWSKA</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; Poland</td>
<td>R.C. M</td>
<td>11.10.1902</td>
<td>P 27.1.1931</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>55297</td>
<td>BANOWSKA</td>
<td>Zofia</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; Poland</td>
<td>R.C. M</td>
<td>27.1.1911</td>
<td>P 27.1.1931</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Farm Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>87097</td>
<td>BANOWSKA</td>
<td>Michał</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; Poland</td>
<td>R.C. M</td>
<td>28.10.1916</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Stone Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- R.C. M: Revised Citizenship, Male
- R.C. F: Revised Citizenship, Female
### Document 5

Extract from a passenger list for refugees from Kojka Camp in Uganda, n.d., 3.1.3.2/81645845 and 81645851/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>G.I.U.</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>A.G.E</th>
<th>Country and Place of Birth</th>
<th>Passport No.</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ERNAY</td>
<td>Zoltan</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.12.19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Young/Novi Sad</td>
<td>68842</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HOLGRI</td>
<td>MAGA</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3.20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Young / Nyiregyháza</td>
<td>66744</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HOLLER</td>
<td>STEFAN</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.4.17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Young / Budapest</td>
<td>66742</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RAGHAY</td>
<td>ILIJA</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24.5.27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Young / Tallinn</td>
<td>66723</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RAGHAY</td>
<td>MIKLO</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22.12.99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Young / Tallinn</td>
<td>66724</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DEDEY</td>
<td>ZOLTAN</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18.8.45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Young / Nagyalföld</td>
<td>66725</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BAKOS</td>
<td>AKI</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24.2.47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Young / Székesfehérvár</td>
<td>66726</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>BAKOS</td>
<td>AKI</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16.6.26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dresdten / Germany</td>
<td>66727</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HOLLER</td>
<td>STEFAN</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24.5.27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Young / Nyiregyháza</td>
<td>66728</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ERNAY</td>
<td>ZOLTAN</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.12.19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Young / Novi Sad</td>
<td>66729</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ERNAY</td>
<td>ZOLTAN</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.12.19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Young / Novi Sad</td>
<td>66730</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Document 6

Extract from the Nominal Roll of Emigrants flying from Rome to Karachi on 26th December 1949 with the names and the professions of the first specialists, doctors and nurses leaving for Pakistan, 3.1.3.2 /81779161 and 81779162/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
**Document 7**

DP 2 card issued on 06.10.1945 to Janina Jakševičienė, residing in the D.P. Hospital Kempten, desired destination: "Chicago, USA", 3.1.1.1/67473556/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
Document 8

Extract of the CM/1-file (application for IRO assistance) on Janina Jakševičienė, with the note “accepted by Pakistan”, and confirmation remark, 3.2.1.4/81018737/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
Curriculum vitae.

I, the undersigned Alena FOESNA, born Provanzlikova, MUDr., graduated doctor of medicine hereewith give my career of live in the following:

I was born in Prague in Bohemia, GDR on Jan. 6th, 1911. I am Protestant, Czech brethren of religion, married since Jul. 13th, 1937 with Karl Podlasy, MUDr., and have 3 daughters in age of 11, 8 and 6 years.

My mother tongue is Czech, but I speak well French and German and English tolerably.

I attended primary school 1918-1923 in Prague, grammar school (gymnasia 1923-1931) in Prague where I completed my maturity. I entered the Charles University Medical faculty in Prague 1931-1937 where I graduated as Doctor medicinae universae on May-June 30th, 1937.

My diploma of Physician specialist-Stomatologist I get from Land Office in Prague on Jan. 7th, 1941.

My occupations:

15.8.1937-15.9.1938 State's hospital in Prague XII, Surg. dep. (Prof. Dr. K. Polak) as externist.

1.1.1939-31.12.1940 Clinic for teeth, jaws and mouth diseases of University Charles, in Prague (leader prof. Dr. F. Kotecky) as externist. Since 1.1.1941 I habilitated in Mlada Boleslav (Bohemia) and had my own praxis as a stomatologist.

Since 1.9.1945 till June 1949 I was assistant voluntare on the teeth clinic II, University Charles, in Prague (leader prof. Dr. F. Novotny), dep. teeth orthopedic where I worked one day a week.

Since 1.2.1949 I was leader of the teeth ortopedic dep. on the ambulatory belong to the Publ. Insur. Society (Mar. okres. Pojistovna) in Mlada Boleslav.

Beside medicine I studied gymnastic with state's examinations. I was occupied as a leading Sokol till last Sokol festival in summer 1946 in Sokol society in Mlada Boleslav and beside this I was the skiing teacher of the Czechoslovak skiing center (Swan Lysa Re, rep., co.). I was distinguished by many special skiing turniers.

On June 9th, 1949 I crossed the Czech-German border and escaped to US Zone because I was afraid for persecution from Communist party. Why my anticomunist's mind was generally well known. Anyways my mother-in-law, Mrs. Marie Provanzlik, the chief Mader of Czechoslovak Sokol women (naselnice ex. Obec Sokol Stak) and President of Federation International de Gymnastics (sect. femin.) after leaving Czechoslovakia as Leader of the women team Czechak, for the Olympic Games in London in Aug. 1948 has been living in London as a political refugee where she has hold any anticomunist's radio speeches. After this I and my husband have been threatened by the police. From January 1949 she is living in New York and is occupied as the professor of physical education on Panzer College East Cran
grove, N.J., besides 1948, she is engaged in Slovak and Czech American Sokol's organizations and in some Czech's Refugees' organizations. This all made my position more troublesome and of course, I was obliged to escape from my home where I left a large property.

Since Aug. 1st, 1949 I am occupied as a Dental surgeon in the Camp Murnau I am registered by 180 Med. Reg. No. 5556 as Physician specialist-Stomatologist.

The above mentioned statement is true and correct according to my best conscience.

Document 9

Curriculum Vitae of Alena Polesna (Polesny), compiled in the DP camp Murnau on 14.12.1949, and translation of the title award certificate “dentist physician specialist” from 7.1.1941. Both documents are contained in the CM/1 file (application for IRO assistance) on Karl Alena Polesny and were part of the basis for the selection of placement to Pakistan, 3.2.1.4 / 81136806 and 81136810/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
RECOMMENDATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

First name, age and relationship to head of family:
Alexander, 47, head; Bagyany, 35, wife.

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY:
1925-1931: Mr. Szentmari studied medicine at the University of Budapest and received his M.D. degree in September 1931. During his studies, from 1926 to 1930 he worked at the anatomical Institute of the University and in 1929 at the Brain Pathological Institute.

1931-1940: After graduating, he started his medical career at the Neuro-Psychiatric Clinic of the University of Budapest. Here he worked for sixteen years as an assistant in Neurology and Psychiatry, acquiring profound knowledge of both subjects. During this period he published some 65 articles on neurological subjects in different medical papers.

In 1937/1938 he was Medical Director of the Neuro-Psychiatric Section of St. John Hospital in Budapest.

In 1941 he was appointed Lecturer in Neurology at the University of Budapest.

1946-1950: He left his country in August 1946 and went to Austria. Here he worked for the American Joint Distribution Committee in Salzburg as a physician. At the same time, he was employed as consultant for Neurological and Mental Diseases by the IRO Medical Services in Salzburg. At present he is in working in Pakistan as consultant in Neuro-psychiatry for the Pakistan Army.

EMPLOYMENT POSSIBILITIES:
Dr. Szentmari is a Neurologist and Psychiatrist with excellent training and 16 years experience in both subjects. He has eight years experience in teaching at University and he was Lecturer in Neurology at the University of Budapest for two years. His entire career as a practitioner was devoted to the study of Neurological and Mental Diseases and we recommend him as a highly qualified Specialist in these fields.

Languages: Apart from Hungarian, his mother tongue, Dr. Szentmari speaks excellent German and very good French and English.

References:
General Sorlini, D.O.M. M., Medical Services of Pakistan Army.
Mr. Wolf Ringer, D.I.C. Salzburg
Colonel Michael Nagy, President of Hungarian Council, Salzburg.

DOCUMENTS ENCLOSED:
Photostatic copies of Letters from World Biographical, New York.
Certificate from the University of Budapest.
Copy of IRO testing certificate.
Curriculum vitae.
Photostatic copy of nomination as Lecturer of Neurology at the University of Budapest.
RESettlement mlcemien SERVICE

697/4/8
GHR/26

27th April, 1950.

To: IRO Vienna
Attn: Resettlement Placement Service

Subject: Pakistan Doctors

1. This is to advise you that General Faruki has now written us that most of his families have settled down in Pakistan very nicely and are quite content, with the exception of Dr. Sattari, who does not feel he has got enough scope for his speciality in that country and besides the climate does not suit him.

2. Dr. Sattari has requested to be sent back to IRO, though General Faruki does not agree with him he does feel that Dr. Sattari has become obsessed with the idea of returning that he is psychologically morbid.

3. While we are trying to make arrangements to have Dr. Sattari placed elsewhere we wish to prepare you for the eventuality that should proper placement not be found he can eventually be returned to Austria.

4. I have asked General Faruki to send us copies of all documents Dr. Sattari has in order to help place him. Should your H.Q. or Area Team 1, from which Dr. Sattari came, have copies of any of his documentation, kindly forward them to this H.Q. as soon as possible.

(Mrs) Olga L. Hixson
for
H.A. Citron
Director Resettlement Placement Service
Documents 10-12

Recommendation for Employment of Alexander Szatmari.

Letter from the IRO Resettlement Placement Service to the IRO Office in Vienna dated 27.4.1950 regarding the situation of the specialists placed in Pakistan.

Letter from the Pakistan Army General Medical Service to IRO Resettlement Placement Service dated 30.5.1950 regarding resettlement of Alexander Szatmari from Pakistan.

All three documents are contained in the CM/1 file (application for IRO assistance) on Alexander Szatmari, 3.2.1.4/81200553, 81200582 and 81200594/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
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