



Struggle for Survival

CHRONICLE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
IN LITHUANIA

No. 10

CHRONICLE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
IN LITHUANIA

No. 10

*Translation of Authentic First-Hand Reports
from Soviet-Occupied Lithuania*

Published by

The Lithuanian Roman Catholic Priests' League of America
64-14 56th Road, Maspeth, Long Island
New York 11378

United States of America

© The Lithuanian Roman Catholic Priests's League

LETTER OF THE LATE CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Vienna, 75 02 22

Dear Lithuanians,

I have heard of the consecration of Lithuania and all Lithuanians living throughout the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary on May 13, 1952 and observed yearly since then as a day of prayer and penance for the liberation of Lithuania and World Peace. Those responsible for this noble gesture have asked me to give a word of encouragement to the Lithuanian people. I am happy to do this.

You are one of the oldest nations on European soil and firmly rooted in the Faith and in the Church of Christ. Together with my own people, you have lived through glorious times and—more important—through times of persecution and suffering. Your nation now faces probably the hardest ordeal of its history. Do not lose heart. Injustice, wrong and crime will never be transformed into justice, right and blessings merely by the fact that a long interval has elapsed. Have confidence, pray and renew yourselves spiritually and your country and your nation will be restored to freedom and dignity. Do not hate; the more and better we pray for our persecutors, the sooner will their hearts be converted to what we pray for. In my own heart I have always cherished a special feeling of love for your small but valiant and generous nation.

With my cordial blessings and prayers

Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty

INTRODUCTION

In 1940, when the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania by force, 85.5% of the country's more than 3 million inhabitants were Roman Catholic, 4.5% Protestant, 7.3% Jewish, 2.5% Orthodox, and 0.2% of other persuasions.

In the two archdioceses and four dioceses were: 708 churches, 314 chapels, 73 monasteries, 85 convents, three archbishops, nine bishops, 1271 diocesan priests, 580 monks, of whom 168 were priests. Four seminaries had 470 students. There were 950 nuns.

Nuns cared for 35 kindergartens, 10 orphanages, 25 homes for the aged, two hospitals, a youth center, and an institute for the deaf-mute.

There were 18 Catholic primary schools and the same number of Catholic high schools. Religion was taught in all public schools.

Catholic organizations numbered about 800,000 members. In 1935, there were 28 Catholic magazines and newspapers, with a total circulation of 7,000,000.

On June 15, 1940, the Red Army marched into Lithuania; the independent government was replaced by a puppet regime.

On July 14-15, rigged elections were staged. On July 21, with the Red Army surrounding the assembly house, the new People's Diet "unanimously" declared Lithuania a Soviet Socialist Republic.

On June 25, 1940, the Church was declared separate from the state, and the representative of the Holy See was expelled.

Parish lands were confiscated, clergy salaries and pensions were cut off, and their savings confiscated. Churches were deprived of support. Catholic printing plants were confiscated, and religious books destroyed.

On June 28, 1940, the teaching of religion and recitation of prayers in schools was forbidden. The University's Department of Theology and Philosophy was abolished, and all private schools were nationalized. The seminaries at Vilkaviškis and Telšiai were closed, and the seminary at Kaunas was permitted to operate on a very limited scale. The clergy were spied upon constantly.

On June 15, 1941, 34,260 Lithuanians were packed off in cattle-cars to undisclosed points in the Soviet Union. After World War II, the mass deportations resumed and continued until 1953-

Vincentas Borisevičius, Bishop of Telšiai, was arrested on February 3, 1946, and condemned to death after a secret trial. Before year's end, his auxiliary, Bishop Pranas Ramanauskas, was also arrested and deported to Siberia. Bishop Teofilius Matulionis of Kaišiadorys and Archbishop Mečislovas Reinys of Vilnius were deported to a Siberian labor camp. Archbishop Reinys perished in prison at Vladimir, November 8, 1953. By 1947, Lithuania was left with a single bishop, Kazimieras Paltarokas, of Panevėžys. He died in 1958.

In 1947, the last convents and monasteries were closed, their communities dispersed, and all monastic institutions were outlawed.

After Stalin's death in 1953, there was a slight improvement in the religious situation. Bishops Matulionis and Ramanauskas were allowed to return to Lithuania, but not to minister to their dioceses or to communicate with the clergy or laity.

Bishop Ramanauskas died in 1959, and Archbishop Matulionis in 1963.

In 1955, two new bishops were appointed by Rome and consecrated: Julijonas Steponavičius and Petras Maželis. Steponavičius has never been permitted to administer his diocese.

Bishop Vincentas Sladkevičius, consecrated in 1957, is also under severe government restrictions. In 1965, Monsignor Juozas Labukas-Matulaitis was consecrated in Rome to head the Archdiocese of Kaunas and the Diocese of Vilkaviškis.

Relaxation of pressure on religious believers soon revealed that the Lithuanian people were still deeply religious. It was decided in the mid-fifties to resume the attack. The principal means of attack would be unlimited moral pressure, since physical terror seemed only to strengthen and unify the faithful.

In 1972, the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*, clandestinely published in that country, began to reach the free world at irregular intervals. Primarily intended to keep Catholics in Lithuania informed of the situation of the Church there, these Lithuanian *samizdat* also serve as a constant appeal to the free world not to forget the plight of a people struggling against overwhelming odds to defend their religious beliefs and to regain their basic human rights.

Rev. Casimir Pugevičius
Executive Director,
Lithuanian-American Catholic Services

CHRONICLE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN LITHUANIA

Lithuania, 1974, No. 10

In this Issue: CONCERNS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN LITHUANIA

CASE NO. 345

ARBITRARINESS OF THE COURT IN VILNIUS

DEATH OF CANON PETRAS RAUDA

OPEN LETTER BY THE REV. PRANAS RAČIŪNAS

NEWS OF THE DIOCESES

FROM THE ARCHIVES OF THE *CHRONICLE OF
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN LITHUANIA*

CONCERNS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN LITHUANIA

The aims of the atheists regarding the Church do not change—they want to destroy it at all costs.

In the Stalinist era the idea was to destroy the Church physically. In 1946 arrests of bishops and priests began. In 1947, Bishop Vincentas Borisevičius was shot. In 1953, Archbishop Mečislovas Reinys, sentenced to twenty-five years, died in Vladimir Prison. In 1956, after ten years of concentration camp, Bishop Pranciškus Ramanauškas and Archbishop Teofilius Matulionis returned to Lithuania broken in health, but they were forbidden to exercise their office, and before long both died.

In 1956-57, hundreds of priests returned from concentration camp to resume their apostolic labors. The atheistic government began to realize that the Catholic Church of Lithuania will not be broken by repressions. Those who had died in concentration camp were considered martyrs, and some of them are even objects of religious devotion, e.g., Father T. B. Andruška, S.J.

Nikita Krushchev's "gallant" Chekists in 1957-58 again arrested no small number of priests: Father Petras Rauda, Canon Stanislovas Kiškis, Father T. A. Markaitis, S.J., Father Algirdas Močius, Father Jonas Balčiūnas, Father Antanas Jurgaitis, Father Antanas Bunkus,

Father A. Svarinskas, Father Pranas Adomaitis, M.I.C. (who had worked among German Catholics in Siberia), and Father Petras Jakulevičius.

Except for Father Jurgaitis and Father Bunkus, all were imprisoned for the second time—Father Markaitis for the third.

Such violence brought no results this time either: Those arrested continued their apostolic endeavors in concentration camp, and upon their return to Lithuania, resumed pastoral work.

The atheistic government tried especially to wreck the Catholic Church from within—at the hands of the clergy and faithful themselves. The Commissioner for Religious Affairs promoted priests who were either inactive or subservient to the atheists. Most seriously affected was the urban ministry.

Moreover, the atheists tried to have the Vatican, poorly informed, promote certain undeserving clergy.

"Why does the Holy See hold such priests in esteem and why does it propose them as an example to the others?" asked the priests of Lithuania.

Not one priest was recognized for good pastoral work, with the possible exception of Canon Kazys Žitkus. Those bilking the Vatican wanted to disarm zealous priests psychologically and to embarrass the Roman Curia.

In the chanceries of Lithuanian dioceses a very bad habit has developed, of concealing everything from priests and people. The curtain of silence enveloping the chanceries has been pierced by disturbing rumors that the atheists are determined to liquidate once for all the bishops of Lithuania—the pride of the Faithful—His Excellency, Bishop Julius Steponavičius and His Excellency, Bishop Vincetas Sladkevičius. This blow to the Church in Lithuania the atheists could administer at the hands of the Vatican, if it appointed to the sees of the exiled bishops new candidates handpicked by the atheists themselves.

Mentioned among candidates for the episcopacy are: Monsignor Bronius Barauskas, Monsignor Česlovas Krivaitis, Canon Andriukonis, the Rev. Dr. Viktoras Butkus, Father Bernardas Baliukonis, Father Antanas Vaičius, and others.

The faithful of Lithuania have no doubt that it is not out of love that the atheists want to push through for bishoprics candidates

lacking credibility among the believing public or among priests. The wishes of the faithful of Lithuania are best expressed in the words of Father Stasys Yla: "We want to see as bishop, not a mannekin in bishop's robes, but a human being, father and teacher."

This is borne out by the stacks of greetings sent to His Excellency, Bishop Sladkevičius, on the fifteenth anniversary of his enforced exile (March 17, 1974).

There is no doubt that the bishops in exile have been no less deserving than the bishops who are at their posts. It would be an irreparable blow to the prestige of the Catholic Church in Lithuania and to the Vatican if the bishops esteemed by the faithful were to be shunted aside.

***Lithuania Today Needs Priests
Rather than New Bishops***

The atheistic government has left bishops the right to consecrate the oils, to ordain four to eight priests annually and to preside at priests' funerals. Even the administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation and the appointment of priests to parishes is strictly controlled by the government.

Moreover, it is the wish of the atheists today to arrange the life of the Church in Lithuania in such a way that priests would become responsible not to the bishops, but to parish councils. This being the case, Lithuania has enough bishops for the present, and does not wish any more. If the atheistic government wants to show its good faith, it should allow the bishops in exile to return to their posts.

The priests and Catholic faithful of Lithuania pray that as much objective information as possible reach the Holy See concerning the plight of the Catholic Church in Lithuania; then the Holy Father will take care of her needs quite well, they feel.

The atheists, seeking to destroy the Faith, want to become the absolute arbiters of people's spiritual life, unobstructed from their ends by the people's belief in God or by religious ethics. Atheistic Marxism seeks to have all people think, speak, and act only in accord with the Communist party program.

The atheists, in their war against religion in Lithuania, are trying to break the spirit of the Lithuanian nation, to deprive it of

spiritual values, to lower Lithuanian self-esteem, and acculturate the believing public. Once the Lithuanians have become atheists, have begun contracting mixed marriages, deprecating their Christian culture, conditions will be ripe for them to merge into a homogenous mass of people, all speaking the language of Lenin.

The people, however, are thoroughly disenchanted with Marxist Communism.

Students and intellectuals study Marxism only perforce. The atheistic government is forced to grasp at every ideological and administrative measure to control the people's spirit.

In Lithuania atheism has become the state religion, so to speak, served by the press, radio, television, and propagated by all means possible.

Not only teachers and educators are forced to spread atheism, but so is the entire intelligentsia. While libraries are full of atheistic literature, Catholics have practically none of their own, and what they have is confiscated by security police.

The Siberian *katorga* faces the book smugglers of today, like those of the Czarist era. During Czarist prohibition of the press things were easier, since the Czar did not have so many spies or traitors among the people.

The atheistic government is not satisfied with propaganda, but also takes advantage of well-planned administrative measures. Attached to the Council of Ministers of the USSR is a Council on Religious Affairs, which officially sees that the laws governing religious cults be observed. In reality, this agency uses administrative means to war against religion throughout the Soviet Union.

In Lithuania there is an office of the Commissioner for Religious Affairs, which wages war on religion, adapted to local circumstances. In the capitals of the republics function councils for the coordination of atheistic action, whose affiliates are the regional atheistic councils, presided over by the vicechairperson of the regional executive committee.

Within the boundaries of the region, these vicechairpersons have almost unlimited authority to terrorize priests, interfering with the freedom of their work. Usually these interventions are made verbally, with the vicechairperson crushing in his hand some secret instruction

drawn from the safe. The atheists have no desire to leave their shameful documents for history.

Every section of the country has its atheistic council, whose task is to organize atheistic action, to spy on the priests' work, on believers, etc.

The religious situation in Lithuania is assiduously watched by the Committee on State Security, since any more noticeable expression of religion is considered a threat to the Soviet government.

The present situation of the Catholic Church is causing deep concern both in the Central Committee of the Communist Party, and in the State Security Committee: Believers are going to church in great numbers, receiving the Sacraments, and are even daring to defend their rights.

Moscow demands that the atheists in Lithuania in their war on the Church make use of the means tested in Russia after the October Revolution. In Lithuania, however, the desired results are more difficult to achieve, since the headquarters of Catholics is not Moscow, but Rome.

The atheists have become convinced that it is easier to wreck the Church from within through manipulation of parish councils and through Church leadership amenable to the government.

According to the Soviet Constitution, the Church is separate from the state; but the state interferes in the affairs of the Church at every turn through the office of the Commissioner for Religious Affairs and through parish councils, into which every effort is made to introduce persons as friendly to the atheists as possible, or even thoroughly reliable agents.

Church leaders immediately saw through this scheme of the atheists to paralyze pastoral work. Presently, the atheists are trying to introduce in Lithuania the same arrangement as in Russia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, and elsewhere—Parish Councils must be the real administrators of the parish, and the priests, merely their employees.

The parish council must take care of financial matters, see to necessary repairs; to it believers must apply, to bury the dead, baptize children or to marry. Thus the attempt is made to frighten people away from religious practice. Since the parish council would hire and fire priests, the functions of the bishop become meaningless, or

worse—the bishop is left merely as a decoration so that the world might not see the conniving of the atheists behind the scenes.

Lately, priests in Lithuania, without their bishops' knowledge, are forced to accept new agreements of regional executive committees with parish councils. They are unilaterally and very vaguely formulated, especially with regard to the closing of the church. The fourth paragraph of the agreement says:

This agreement can be terminated. . . if, in accordance with established procedure it is decided to close the house of prayer (the worship facility), use of which was allowed by this agreement." The faithful cannot agree with any plan to close the church.

To forestall objections, the agreements are entered into secretly, at different times, and even by fraud. It is regrettable that priests themselves—to say nothing of the faithful—sometimes act without fully thinking through matters. Those priests who see through the connivances of the atheists, resist signing vaguely formulated agreements, and refuse to hand over church jurisdiction to parish council members intimidated by the atheists. Present agreements are the first step towards the final limitation of bishops' and priests' freedom of action.

Fortunately, the bishops have till now refused to agree to the unchurchly arrangements being pushed by the government. However, there are signs that new efforts will now be made to turn parish councils in Lithuania into all-powerful administrators of parishes. This has been mentioned by Commissioner Tarasov, of the Council of Religious Affairs.

Actions of parish councils in line with the atheists' plan completely contravene traditional ecclesiology, in which the right to govern comes not from the people, but from Christ himself. It is therefore not surprising that Church leaders since the Revolution itself have never agreed to such parish councils.

Victims of this struggle were: Bishop Ciepliakas, Monsignor-Elect Butkevičius, Bishop Matulionis, and others. Essentially, the bishops of Lithuania: Bishop Kazimieras Paltarokas, Bishop Reinyš, et al., all refused to agree to such parish councils. Only when widespread closing of churches and arrests of clergy began, and when a few priests in the city of Vilnius treacherously made concessions, did the bishops accept the formation of parish councils. To date, how-

ever, these councils—with very few exceptions—have never directly interfered in the priests' work.

The atheists, taking a page out of the Czars' book, wish to use ecclesiastical leadership in their war against the Catholic Church. They try to place in responsible positions bishops or priests submissive to the government, who would carry out directives detrimental to the Church, misinform the faithful world-wide about so-called freedom of the Church, and promulgate the regulations of the atheists government among the priests, to restrict the priests' work: the catechizing of children, canonical visitation of parishes, etc.

When they visit Rome our clergy submit to the government. In Moscow they are instructed what they are to say, what they are to keep secret, whom to associate with, and whom to avoid. Returning from the Vatican, they must make a "general confession" to the appropriate agencies.

At the present time among Lithuanian clergy there are widespread rumors that the Vatican might nominate new bishops proposed not by the faithful of Lithuania, but, through clergy currying favor with the regime, by the Council on Religious Affairs. If new bishops, subservient to the government were to be appointed, the atheists would have attained the following goals:

- i. The authority of the Holy Father, which heretofore has been very strong among the faithful and priests of Lithuania, would be wrecked. The priests of Lithuania, even under the most difficult conditions, have shown their loyalty to the Apostolic See. Attempts by the atheists to create in Lithuania a national Catholic Church ignoring the jurisdiction of the pope failed. One priest sentenced to twenty-five years was offered his freedom, the pastorate of the Church of St. John in Vilnius, and a bribe of 100,000 rubles.

The Church of Silence will never understand the kind of diplomacy which would make it possible for the atheists to rejoice over the fact that the Vatican itself disagrees with those priests and laity who are struggling and suffering for the Faith. In return for diplomatic concessions, the atheistic government can promise much, sign the most beautiful treaties, but these will remain a dead letter, like the Declaration of Human Rights, which the atheistic government signed.

The priests and faithful of Lithuania believe that if the bishops

and Catholics of the world had reacted suitably in time, the life of Bishop Borisevičius (shot by the Communists in 1947 — Transí.) might have been saved. The same can be said of the mass arrests of priests. In this regard, we might learn from the example of the Communists world-wide, who so energetically defended Manoli Gleza, Angela Davis, and now are still defending the Communists of Chile.

2. The bishops of Lithuania like Archbishop Matulevičius, Archbishop Matulionis, Archbishop Reinys, and others have won a high respect for episcopal authority in the estimation of the faithful. If the Holy See were to name unsuitable candidates as bishops, the authority of the bishops would be destroyed and great damage would be done to the Catholic Church in Lithuania.

3. *The Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania* mentions only a small part of the facts, bearing witness to atheistic terror and the troubles of the faithful. It cannot compile more, because of persecution.

The faithful of Lithuania await support from their spiritual leaders. Meanwhile, clergy chosen by the government proclaim that our Church is not persecuted. How disappointed the faithful of Lithuania would be, if the Vatican were to increase the number of such priests!

4. The appointment of new bishops subservient to the government would be a moral blow to the bishops so highly respected by the people: the banished bishops Julius Steponavičius and Vincentas Sladkevičius. If this were to happen, their sacrifice would be demeaned; their very loyalty to the Holy Father and the Church condemned, and any possibility for them to return to their duties would be abolished.

5. When the atheistic government takes every possible advantage of ecclesiastical authorities, forcing them to publish regulations detrimental to pastoral work, it is easier for the priests of Lithuania to keep their bearings if the directives are signed not by a bishop, but simply by the administrator of the diocese.

The priests and faithful of Lithuania therefore humbly beseech the Holy Father and the Roman Curia:

- a) not to appoint new bishops subservient to the atheists;
- b) in appointing bishops, to ascertain the worth of a candidate

by checking with the bishops in exile, or with priests duly authorized by them. This would be possible if the Vatican announced the names of candidates no less than six months prior to their nomination.

c) to make no diplomatic concessions to the atheists, based on trust in their good faith. No concessions can be expected from the atheists through bargaining—the Catholics of Lithuania will have just as much freedom as they win for themselves. This fact is borne out by more than one recent victory. The Catholics of Lithuania will be able to accomplish something only when they receive broad support from world public opinion and the upper echelons of the Catholic hierarchy.

The Catholics of Lithuania are grateful to those responsible for the broadcasts of Radio Vatican, to the Lithuanian press abroad, and to the Catholic and non-Catholic press world-wide, for publicizing the wrongs perpetrated by the atheists in Lithuania, and to all who pray or take action that the Catholics of Lithuania might have more religious freedom. It is regrettable that the *Voice of America* pays no heed to this matter. It is therefore not surprising that its broadcasts are listened to very little. It is difficult to get a Lithuanian interested in economic crises or political affairs when he is suffering for his faith.

The faithful of Lithuania, painfully undergoing the raging of the security organs, when one after another of the best sons of the nation and of the Church find themselves in prison, are surprised that till now the Catholics of the world have not come to the defense of those in prison. The atheistic government hopes that if the world remains silent, it can more easily "take care" of them.

CASE NO. 345

The security organs have currently developed a broad campaign, hoping to destroy the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania* and centers of religious literature: Persons under suspicion are summoned before the State Security Committee, searches are conducted, the numbers arrested are growing, and material is carefully being gathered for Case No. 345.

On March 20, 1974, the security people searched the apartment of the Ukrainian priest, Vladas Pigolis, in Kaunas. The search took six hours. The security agents went through books, damaged religious images, and seized all his savings.

* * *

On March 20, 1974, a search was conducted at the home of Kaunas resident (Miss) Bronė Kazėlaitė, at No. 4 Vaistinė g. During the search she was stripped in the presence of a female security agent. The security agents, having searched her room and storage area, seized about 400 unbound copies of the prayerbook "*Melskimės*" (*Let Us Pray*), and several books reproduced by typewriter.

March 20, 1974. Four security agents under the direction of Captain Pilelis searched the apartment and garage of Father Sigitas Tamkevičius. In the course of the search the security agents found two issues of the *Lietuvos Kataliku Bažnyčios Kronika (The Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania)*. They also seized ten recording tapes and some essays; e.g., "Bažnyčia ir Valstybė" ("Church and State"), "Reikia Duoti Pilną Religinę Laisvę" ("Full Religious Freedom Should be Granted"), etc. The search required six hours.

After the search, Party members in Simnas spread the rumor that Father Tamkevičius had a radio transmitter and was sending information abroad, and that was why the security police had made the search. On April 17, Father Tamkevičius was summoned before the Security Committee of Vilnius and questioned about his knowledge of the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*.

April 4, 1974, four security agents from Vilnius searched the home of Vilnius resident Matulionis, who was being treated in the hospital at Druskininkai. During the search all his money was taken, along with some religious books. During questioning, the security people derided Matulionis' religious convictions. After the questioning, Matulionis was taken to Vilnius. His apartment was searched.

The record of the search does not show that any valuables or religious books were found. The following day, in the course of the interrogation, it became obvious that security agents had seized 2000 prayer book-catechisms (in Russian), found in the reproduction section of the Library of the Republic.

The workers in the reproduction section, Opulki, Chiudakov, and Čiplys, stated during interrogation that the prayer books had been requisitioned by Matulionis and that he had ordered 200-300 copies of various religious books in the past. Matulionis said that

he had indeed ordered the prayer books as gifts, but that he knew nothing of any other religious books.

It was suggested that if he told who had requested the Russian prayer book-catechisms, he and the printers would be shown leniency, and the individual making the request would not be hurt. After three days of interrogation, Matulionis was allowed to continue his treatment at the hospital in Druskininkai.

* * *

April 8, 1974. Captain Markevičius, of the State Security Committee made a search of the home of Kaunas resident (Mrs.) Ona Volskienė. During the search a typewriter was seized. During the interrogation, Mrs. Volskienė was accused of copying the sixth issue of the *LKB Kronika (The Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania)*.

April 9, 1974. Security agents broke into the rented room of Dr. Salomėja Mikšytė in Kulautuva and carried out a search. On April 10-11, they searched again. During the search they confiscated a typewriter, some religious books, etc.

* * *

April 9, 1974. Virgilijus Jaugelis of Kaunas was arrested at home. Under the direction of Captain Pilelis of the State Security Committee, a second search was conducted (See *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania* No. 8). Jaugelis was indicted for transgression of Paragraph 68 of the Criminal Code of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. He is presently confined in the security prison in Vilnius.

(Paragraph 68 of the Criminal Code states: "Agitation and propaganda, seeking to undermine or weaken the Soviet government or to commit separate acts especially dangerous to the state, the dissemination for the same purpose of calumnies detrimental to the Soviet government and to public order, and likewise the dissemination or production of, or the possession of such literature, for the same purpose—shall be punishable by imprisonment of six months to seven years, with exile of from two to five years, or without exile, or by exile for from two to five years. The same activities, performed by a person with a record of especially dangerous offenses against the state, or committed in time of war, shall be punishable by depriva-

tion of freedom for from three to ten years with exile from two to five years, or without exile.")

April 24, 1974. A squad of security agents began to search the apartment of Kaunas resident Juozas Gražis at Višinskio g. Nr. 44. After searching his rooms, storage area, and basement, the security agents took Gražis to a house undergoing extensive renovation at Zanavu gatvė No. 33, and here made a thorough search. The search turned up parts for an ERA reproducer, writing paper, and some books: *O visgi S v. Raštas teisus (And Still Sacred Scripture is Right)*. Gražys was arrested.

* * *

April 24, 1974. Security agents searched the house, storage room and basement at Kalniečiu g. Nr. 113. During the search many valuable pre-war books of a religious nature and others were seized. The security people alleged that in one room of this house an ERA machine had been operated at one time. The landladies of the apartment were interrogated by the Security Committee in Vilnius for two days, while the occupant, Vilius Semaška, was questioned for three days. At night they were housed in hotels.

Fragments from Interrogations

"What did you dream about last night, Grandmother?" asked the security agents, who had come to carry out a search.

"Children, I dreamt of five fierce, hungry dogs, which wanted to tear me apart."

* * *

"We will not release you," said the interrogator.

"I know—That's why I went to Confession yesterday evening. My conscience is clear."

* # *

"Didn't you know that you're not allowed to do this?" demanded the investigator, indicating a prayerbook.

"So said the Czar too. But if it weren't for Mažvydas, (16th-century Lutheran minister; author of the first book in Lithuanian — Transl. Note) we wouldn't be speaking Lithuanian today."

Investigator Vilimas went to the dining room during lunch, and someone stole his overcoat.

"The Catholics must be getting back at you," some security agents laughed.

"It's not the Catholics taking revenge. Someone is trying to say, 'Go after thieves, not prayerbooks; then you might not have to go home without your overcoat.'"

* * *

"Aren't you ashamed," said the security agent, "You are a university graduate, and now you will be ending your life in prison."

"I'm prepared. I even brought along a sandwich."

ARBITRARINESS OF THE COURT IN VILNIUS

March 17, 1974, *Tiesa (Truth: Lithuanian version of Pravda—Translator's Note)* published an article entitled "Whose Voice?", describing the trial in Vilnius of five persons. The article did not indicate when the trial occurred, or how the accused were sentenced, but only mentioned their alleged criminal offenses: They were supposed too have stolen typewriters, work of folk art, and church vessels. From the article it was apparent that the trial was political in nature.

March 27, 1973, security organs carried out a well planned action against ethnographers of Lithuania and Latvia, possibly comparable in scope and method to the analogous attack on the publishers and disseminators of the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*. At eight o'clock that morning, over one hundred ethnographers and their associates were brought to the offices of the Security Committee. Searches were carried out and people were arrested. The most active ethnographers, R. Matulis of Vilnius, (Miss) J. Eitmanavičiūtė of Kaunas, and others, were forced to sign pledges "that in the future they will not engage in *independent* ethnography."

Younger ethnographers were forced to cooperate with security organs and were subjected to black-mail. The ethnographers were interrogated by Kontrimas, Radzevičius, Aleinikov, Rimkus, Žilevičius, Sujuta, and others. Those under interrogation were questioned about activities of the ethnographers, the expedition to the Šventoji River, connections with ethnographers in other republics, attitudes among young people, about the collecting of material from the period of the "Greenie" wars (Lithuanian partisan activity against the So-

viets 1944-52 — Transl. Note), dissemination of leaflets, the organizing of the annual commemoration of Kalanta (Romas Kalanta, who immolated himself in 1972, protesting Soviet oppression of Lithuania — Transl. Note), the reading and dissemination of anti-Soviet literature, the personality and attitudes of Žukauskas and others under arrest, relationships with them, connections with Father Mykolas Dobrovolskis of Paberžė and others.

Some of those questioned were taken to Vilnius several times, to confront the accused. Four of those interrogated: Šarūnas Žukauskas, Antanas Sakalauskas, Izidorius Rudaitis and Vidmantas Povilonis, were jailed.

Articles began to appear in the press, strongly demanding that research of the "feudal era" be discontinued, and explicitly emphasizing that ethnography is first and foremost the history of factories, varied by important incidents from the lives of retirees. This shows that this campaign was a link in the chain of the neo-Stalinist "cultural revolution", which had already manifested itself in other cultural fields.

Almost all editors of journals dealing with cultural questions, and directors of cultural institutions or societies were replaced by new people: such obscure functionaries as the editor of *Literatūra ir menas (Literature and Art)*, V. Rudaitis; the editor of *Nemunas*, L. Inis; or by out-and out reactionaries like the current president of the Society for Lithuanian Ethnography, Uogintas.

Pressure is being brought on the "Vaga" publishers regarding further publications in the series *Lituanistinė biblioteka (Lithuanistic Library)*. Censorship, a role carried out by *Glavlit*, (Government publishing agency — Transl. Note) has been tightened, and translations of foreign works have been restricted. In the journal *Komunistas*, there has been dogmatic criticism of the editors of *Kultūros barai* and especially of *Problemos*. Ethnographic expeditions to the Byelorussian SSR and elsewhere have been cancelled.

Those arrested: Žukauskas, Sakalauskas, Rudaitis and Povilonis were imprisoned for almost a year, mostly in solitary confinement, where "night becomes confused with day, because a light burns constantly in the cell..." (testimony of a prisoner). The plight of those in prison can be surmised from the fact that Povilonis, for instance, was hospitalized with a kidney malfunction due to the poor

diet, while Žukauskas was thrown into a punishment cell for addressing the guard in German.

Interrogation methods are illustrated by the fact that they tried to convince Povilonis that Sakalauskas was working for the security people. Thrown off balance, Povilonis, by his own admission, told "all kinds of nonsense" about Sakalauskas. The trick came to light only when the two met in court.

Later, on October 23 (1973) Aloyzas Mackevičius of Mažeikiai, formerly a candidate to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was implicated.

The case was on trial before the Supreme Court of the Lithuanian SSR in Vilnius from February 18, 1974, until March 5, Judge Ignotas presiding, with associates (Miss) Kavaliauskaitė and Tamulionis. Prosecuting the case was Assistant Chief Prosecutor Bakučionis. The defendants were represented by attorneys Kudaba, Borvainis, Gavronskis, Vaicekauskas and (Mrs.) Matijošaitienė. Present in court were only the closest relatives of the accused, soldiers, security agents, and court functionaries. Over ninety witnesses were called.

All those on trial, except Mackevičius, were accused of anti-Soviet activity according to the 68th paragraph of the Criminal Code of the Lithuanian SSR. How did such activity manifest itself?

1. Allegedly establishing an underground organization to inform the public of the criminal activities of the Soviet government against the Lithuanian nation: An oath was allegedly administered, and dues were allegedly collected.

2. Alleged dissemination of leaflets on February 16 (Lithuanian Independence Day — Transl. Note).

3. Allegedly editing the underground publication *Naujasis Varpas* (*The New Bell*).

4. Alleged possession and dissemination of contraband literature.

5. Allegedly supporting the family of Simas Kudirka financially. (The Lithuanian seaman who on November 23, 1970, sought asylum aboard the U.S. Coast Guard at Martha's Vineyard, was imprisoned by Soviet authorities, and released in 1974 to the U.S. with his family on the basis of his mother's U.S. citizenship. — Transl. Note).

Žukauskas was accused of establishing an underground organization, receiving the membership oath, duplicating (2 copies) of Volume XV of the *Encyclopedia Lituanica*, devoted to Lithuania (Pub-

lished in the U.S. and banned by the Soviet government — Transl. Note), writing the text of the leaflet, aiding Sakalauskas in the theft of four typewriters, assisting him in the theft of folk sculptures, and providing an ERA duplicator.

Sakalauskas was accused in court of belonging to an underground organization, and concealing anti-Soviet literature. A search of his quarters allegedly produced: a copy of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, Medvedev's *The Question of Insanity*, two issues of the *Cronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*, *Lietuvių archyvas (Lithuanian Archives)*, *TSRS Užsienio politika 1939-1940 (The Foreign Policy of the USSR 1939-1940)*, Šapoka's *Lietuvos Istorija (History of Lithuania)*, etc.

Sakalauskas was accused of planning to send a collection of his poems to the West, organized the theft of four typewriters. In 1957 he had been sentenced to two years' imprisonment for attempting to escape abroad by canoe over the Baltic Sea.

I. Rudaitis, M.D., was accused of supporting an underground organization, of helping to reproduce and disseminate anti-Soviet literature and petitions, and of raising funds for the organization by speculating in currency. The search of Rudaitis' quarters allegedly produced material for an underground publication still in preparation, which he was supposed to edit.

V. Povilonis was accused of belonging to an underground organization, disseminating appeals on the anniversary of February 16th, of keeping anti-Soviet literature at home, of helping in its dissemination, and of helping with the preparation of the publication *Naujasis Varpas*.

A. Mackevičius was accused of knowing about the activities of an underground organization, and not only concealing it from the security police, but joining in its activities. At the instigation of Žukauskas, he was alleged to have stolen works of folk art, burglarized the church of Tirkšliai, and to have passed stolen goods to Žukauskas.

It was no accident that Mackevičius was implicated in the political case. It is standard practice in Soviet courts to impute to political cases a criminal tone. Since Žukauskas was an acquaintance of Mackevičius, the attempt was made to convict him of theft, to undermine his credibility.

Except for contradictory statements extracted from Mackevičius,

the prosecution offered no proof. This was emphasized by Žukauskas' attorney, Kudaba.

In this case, the court wished to appear as the unimpeachable guardian of religious statues and church property, visiting strict punishment on criminals. Perhaps it will also punish those who organized the destruction of the Hill of Crosses (See: "Popular Shrine"—*Cronicle* No. 4 — Transl. Note), and the Stations of the Cross at Vilniaus Kalvarijos, desecrated many churches, etc. These culprits are known!

Žukauskas admitted that he was the leader of an organization whose purpose was self-education, the collection of literature. He had wished to act within the bounds of Soviet law, but had thought it necessary to correct mistakes made by the government.

"For indeed a great injustice was done to our nation: 36,000 Lithuanians were deported", said Žukauskas. He admitted having disseminated literature which, in his opinion, was not anti-Soviet; e.g., *The Trial of S. Kudirka*. He denied charges of crime—of stealing religious folk art. As for the typewriters, Žukauskas said he had been convinced they were discarded—that he had harmed no one.

Sakalauskas admitted having participated in the organization and having paid membership dues. "We organized for self-education," the accused said.

Sakalauskas' wife, asked about her husband's views, said that they are normal, like any decent person's. Her husband had worked all his life. "Let everyone work as hard; it will be a great contribution to the building of Communism. He taught young people, contributing much time to their training. However, my husband could not condone the short-comings in our way of life, which exist."

"What short-comings?" asked the judge.

"I'll begin with our living conditions. . . We finally obtained an apartment, but there was nothing in it."

"What should there be in it?"

"It seems to me that if there are radiators in an apartment, then they should give heat; if there are faucets, they should have running water. All these things my husband repaired with his own hands, giving his time, which should have been devoted to scientific work..." Sakalauskas' wife said.

The judge interrupted her with questions about listening to foreign radio broadcasts.

Rudaitis said that he had heard nothing of any underground organization, nor had he ever supported any with money. He had received foreign currency by accident. He had also heard nothing of any publication in preparation. He had read all sorts of books, because an educated person must also be knowledgeable about "anti"-literature.

Mackevičius admitted having stolen folk art, and having broken into the church at Tirkšliai. He had done all this to get money, since he likes to dress well. In the thefts, he said, Žukauskas had also taken part. Later Mackevičius said that he had burglarized the church single-handed, in an attempt to show Žukauskas that he could work alone.

Žukauskas told Mackevičius in court, "Alius, speak for yourself and let me answer for my own actions. I'm not about to speak for your misdeeds."

L. Mackevičius characterized his brother as follows: "When everyone sings, he sings; when everyone is silent, he keeps quiet."

Povilonis would not admit belonging to any underground organization, nor disseminating any books, but only to having some at home. He knew nothing of any underground publication, and was associated with Žukauskas only by common ethnographic interests.

Prosecutor Bakučionis called Žukauskas the instigator of the organization and asked the court to sentence him to seven years (the maximum sentence, according to Paragraph 68).

For Sakalauskas, the prosecutor suggested five years' imprisonment. Having accused Povilonis and Rudaitis, the prosecutor proceeded with all his might to defend Mackevičius, saying that he was a victim more sinned against than sinning, and that he had been led astray by Žukauskas and others like him.

Defense attorneys in political cases can say little, except to raise some of the defendant's merits. Attorney Kudaba tried to exonerate Žukauskas of any criminal offenses, Attorney Borvainis mentioned Sakalauskas' services to the public, and Attorney Gavronskis mentioned that Rudaitis was a good physician, and that he had been an anti-fascist. Attorney Vaicekauskas called Mackevičius a "straying sheep", who could be completely rehabilitated. Attorney (Mrs.) Matijošaitienė spoke of Povilonis' services to the Communist Youth Or-

ganization, and his poor health. Some of the defense attorneys tried to blame everything on Žukauskas.

All four of the accused asked the court to find them not guilty, while Mackevičius asked for leniency.

The atmosphere in court was oppressive: In the room sat the worried relatives and the passive attorneys. The accused were not even allowed to look at the audience. If anyone tried to write anything down, a militiamen would step up and confiscate the notes. During the trial the leaflet distributed on February 16 was not read; it was merely noted that it began with the word "Lithuanian" and ended with the words, "Division of Kaunas". The contents of the leaflet should have been analyzed during the trial!

During the trial they spoke of an underground publication in preparation, but the prosecution did not exhibit the contents of that publication. Nor was anything specific said about the underground organization. Thus, the most serious counts on which Paragraph 68 of the Criminal Code of the Lithuanian SSR was cited, went unmentioned.

This was the nature of the trial intended to calumniate and paralyze the ethnographers' movement in Lithuania.

The final statement by Žukauskas took about an hour. He said that he did not oppose the socialist system, but that he thought the Soviet government was not the government of the people, since it had been brought on by ooccupation. The "Revolution" of 1918 in Lithuania had not risen from the masses, but had been prepared in Moscow and brought from there to Lithuania by the Red Army, together with Kapsukas and Angarietis. (Communist agitators—Transl. Note).

Their government was controlled by Poles, Russians, and Jews, who had nothing in common with the Lithuanian masses yearning for freedom. The Lithuanians had organized a volunteer army in order to drive out the new occupants of Lithuania, the Bolsheviks.

Žukauskas went on to mention the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact on the division of the Baltic area. By means of it, the Soviet government of 1940 was brought to Lithuania by the Red Army. The so-called Revolution or revolutionary situation in Lithuania is nothing but a common lie. In 1940 arrests and deportations were carried out, and during the post-war years they were worse: expropriations, partisan activity, "red guards", massive deportations, resulting in the sacrifice

of about 300,000 people. To say nothing of arrests, imprisonment, concentration camps, various repressions, the shooting of innocent people and the "cult of Stalin"!

After the War (World War II — Transí. Note), people were hauled off to Siberia not on the basis of class, but of nationality. There are still people deprived of the right to return to their homeland. This has caused great harm to Lithuania. To this day there are signs of Russian chauvinism, and a policy of forced acculturation. Russians in Lithuania get somewhat better treatment than Lithuanians.

The increase of Russian inhabitants in Lithuania is explained by saying that there is a shortage of workers, while meantime Lithuanians are drafted to Kazakstán and other places in the Soviet Union. And so colonization proceeds. The Russian empire is still the prison of nations. All nations of the world are struggling for freedom, and all progressive forces support them. How are we Lithuanians worse than the others?

Žukauskas does not consider his activities a crime against the people or the nation, nor does he ask for a mitigation of sentence, but demands simply that he be released. He addresses the court:

"This is no trial, buft a frame-up. . . Why is it not public? Does the court really fear that an angry public would tear it to pieces? Are you afraid because you have 'gathered for a piece of gold, or a spoonful of fancy food' (V. Kudirka, Lithuanian patriot and author of the national anthem — Transí. Note).

"Although you are Lithuanians in name, the old folk saying applies: 'Your own dog's bite hurts more.' "

Žukauskas ended his speech with the words of Mykolaitis-Putinas (One of the greatest Lithuanian writers, — Transí. Note): "The enemy oppresses us with iron hands, and yet the dearest word is—freedom!"

On March 5, 1974, the decision of the court was announced: S. Žukauskas, born 1950, student in the sixth year of the Kaunas Institute of Medicine, fluent in English, French, and German, is sentenced to six years of strict regimen concentration camp, and all his property is confiscated.

A. Sakalauskas, born in 1938, instructor in German at the Polytechnic Institute of Kaunas: five years of strict regimen concentration camp.

V. Povilonis, born in 1947, engineer-technologist: two years of strict regiment concentration camp.

I. Rudaitis, born in 1911, physician: three years of strict regimen concentration camp, and confiscation of property.

A. Mackevičius, born 1949, student at the Kaunas Polytechnic Institute: two years of standard regimen concentration camp.

Site of serving sentence: Solikamsk (Area of Perme), except for Mackevičius, who will serve his sentence in Provieniškės.

Žukauskas was left in the security prison until autumn.

ARCHDIOCESE OF VILNIUS

Vilnius

A few years ago the monument erected on Kryžkalnis (The Hill of Crosses) began to deteriorate, and steps were taken to have it restored. Mindaugas Tamonis, born in 1940, a graduate student in technical sciences working in the chemical laboratory of the Institute for the Conservation of Monuments, was sent to examine the monument.

***Report by Senior Scientific Collaborator M. Tamonis
to the Director of the Institute for the Conservation
of Monuments***

On April 5, 1974, I did not go on my assigned mission to inspect the monument to the Red Army—the liberator of Lithuania—standing on the Hill of Crosses, for reasons not pertaining to the competency of the Institute for the Conservation of Monuments: I do not recognize the present status of Lithuania. It is my firm conviction that every serious citizen is obliged to seek all his life that mistakes, both those which are personal and those made by the state, be rectified. Unless the mistakes of the past are condemned and completely taken to heart, it is impossible to build the future.

Among the most serious mistakes of the period of personality cult (the Stalin era — Transl. Note), and either completely or partially left uncorrected, I place:

1. Mass deportation of innocent citizens,
2. The incorporation of the Baltic states into the complex of the former Russian Empire at a time when throughout the world the striving of nations for independent statehood had grown extraordinarily.

I find it impossible to participate in the memorializing of events which annihilated Lithuanian statehood and resulted in so much injustice. I agree to honor the wars fought alongside neighboring nations against German fascism, by restoring and conserving monuments built for this purpose, only when there is a complete guarantee that:

1. In the most important locations of the death of masses of citizens on account of the so-called "personality cult", memorials be erected, showing our people's culture, respect for others, and decency.

2. The freedom of choice guaranteed in the Constitution (formally, so far) be strengthened by additional legislation, providing a mechanism for its implementation; i.e., periodic universal referenda in every republic. The Baltic republics, as well as others, if their citizens so desire, must regain true and complete statehood, and the same kind of cultural-economic independence as the other socialist nations have.

3. The threat of the rise of a new period of personality cult be done away with. This would be attained by introducing a multiparty system; i.e., by allowing the establishment of the Social-Democratic, Christian Democratic, and other parties with appropriate press organs, carrying out truly democratic elections, enabling a diminution of the influence of that party which has hurt the interests of the people. These measures would increase the democracy and effectiveness of the government of states within the frame-work of socialism.

Universal progress demands the constant democratization of society in socialist countries, and energetic movement forward in all areas of life. It will not be possible to accomplish the ideal of a socialist-communist world if the countries which created this order have no great authority, if they are not renowned world-wide for respect for human rights, toleration for differing opinions, a serious regard for them, for honor and for justice.

M. Tamonis

April 5, 1974

ARCHDIOCESE OF KAUNAS

K a u n a s

At 8 o'clock on the morning of April 9, 1974, in the Basilica of Kaunas, Bishop Juozas Labukas ordained to the priesthood six mem-

bers of the fourth year class of theology Taking part in the ordinations was the Commissioner for Religious Affairs, K. Tumėnas. Simultaneously, in the Cathedral of Panevėžys, Bishop R. Krikščiuėnas conferred the priesthood on the other two members of the fourth year of theology. The Cathedral of Panevėžys was full of people for the ordination, because since 1945 no priest had been ordained there.

Catholics regret that ordination to the priesthood is conferred on a workday and would like it to be celebrated on a day free of work—Saturday—and at a somewhat later hour.

The priests of Lithuania are very dissatisfied that they receive almost no information about the theological seminary. Most priests do not even know how many seminarians are studying there, how much is paid the government for use of the seminary building—4500 rubles— or in what conditions the seminarians live, since most of them become ill in the course of their studies.

The seminary premises have been occupied by the military since 1944, and the seminary church has been turned into a warehouse. The present seminary is housed in the facilities of the (former) Salesian monastery. The main building of the seminary requires capital repairs, which the government will allow only for government buildings—the cost will be great, and the work will proceed at a snail's pace. For some years it will be necessary for the seminarians to pray in the basement of one of the buildings, and to attend lectures in dormitories, unless the chancery of the Kaunas Archdiocese would allow the seminary the use of two large, empty halls.

Šiauliai

Zenonas Mištautas, studying at the Šiaulių K. Didžiulio Polytechnic Institute, was long harassed by a teacher for his faith. Convinced that talk was useless, she took more subtle measures.

In the course of completing his pre-graduation practicum in the VI Board of Construction, Mištautas was assigned to give an atheistic lecture to the workers. When he refused, he was deprived of his stipend for failing to do his "public duty".

On January 11, 1974, Class Director Pučkus summoned Mištautas, told him that his conduct mark was to be lowered, and read him Director Zumeras' order.

"For not carrying out public duties and for failing to give an

atheistic lecture in the Sixth Board of Construction, Zenonas Mištautas' conduct mark is to be lowered to 3."

When Zenonas appealed to the Director, the latter explained that the setting of conduct marks was the prerogative of the teachers' committee. For his "willful refusal to carry out his public duties" the defense of his diploma was postponed for a year.

Mištautas requested Zabulis, Minister of Higher and Special Studies, to let him defend his diploma, since his parents were expecting him to contribute to their support. By the time he came back from the army, he would have forgotten many things, and would have to return to his studies.

Minister Zabulis allowed the decision of the teachers' committee to stand, because he was informed that Mištautas was a believer, that he had carried a cross to the fortress-hill of Meškuičiai in honor of Kalanta, etc.

DIOCESE OF PANEVĖŽYS

Svėdasai

At eleven o'clock on the morning of March 7, 1974, Canon Petras Rauda died at Svėdasai. He had been born in 1894 in Radviliškis. The father of the late priest had been a booksmuggler (During the Czarist interdict against Lithuanian literature, 1864-1904 — Transl. Note), and he himself had occasion to "take tutoring" (Studying Lithuanian clandestinely — Trans. Note).

Becoming a priest in 1917, he performed his duties faithfully all his life. As an assistant pastor in Joniškis, he contributed much to the birth of the Republic of Lithuania. For many years, he served as a chaplain at various places in Lithuania. Serving as pastor in Utena, he saved the lives of several citizens of Jewish nationality. In 1944 Bishop Kazimieras Paltarokas elevated him to the position of Honorary Canon and appointed him vicerector of the Theological Seminary of Kaunas.

During the post-war years he was harassed by security organs and sentenced to eight years in prison, because knowing of the memorandum directed abroad, prepared by P. Klimas, Mrs. Lastienė, and others, he had not informed the security people.

Canon Rauda was imprisoned in camps at Turinsk, Okunev, and

Molotovsk. In Kaunas security prison, Canon Rauda happened to be confined with Attorney Toliušis, leader of the Populist Party, and with "Vanagas"—"The Hawk", leader of a partisan unit. The intelligence and placidity of the Canon, together with the heroic suffering and death of "Vanagas" led Toliušis to God and the Church. Upon his return from the camp, Toliušis used to say: "Seeing the church steeples, one wants to weep—Lithuania still lives!"

In 1957, Canon Rauda was arrested again, for keeping a diary in which he described the interrogations during his first imprisonment, and life in the camps. He was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment. Confined in the camps of Mordovia, Canon Rauda made the acquaintance of the Primate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Metropolitan Slipij (now a Cardinal and a member of the Vatican Academy), and became fast friends with him.

After five years, broken in health, Canon Rauda returned to Lithuania. In 1965, completely blind, he nevertheless continued his priestly work in Svėdasai. During his final illness, he said that he was offering his final sufferings for the Diocese of Panevėžys. In response to one priest who asked him what he would like to say to priests, he replied:

"That all priests should be as dutiful as Canon Bronius Antanaitis."

Canon Rauda knew six foreign languages. In his homeland and in the camp he was surrounded by the youth and the intelligentsia. Throughout his life he rejoiced over priests who performed their duties faithfully and prayed for those who betrayed the Church.

Canon Rauda prepared Professor Jurgutis for death, and author Vienuolis-Žukauskas went to him to confession on two occasions. The nation has lost a noble Lithuanian, and the Church—a loyal defender and a man of sacrifice. A great light has gone out—a light which enkindled hundreds of smaller lights.

The inhabitants of Svėdasai came in great numbers to the church to pray for the soul of the beloved Canon. Preachers described well the life, work, and suffering of the deceased.

It had been planned to bury him on Sunday, but the Executive Committee of the Utena District would not allow it, for fear of a massive religious demonstration which might "negatively" influence the school children. The local government of Utena would not allow

participants in the funeral to prepare lunch in the dining room. Anykščiai and Utena would not allow taxi-cabs to take people from Svėdasai to Utena. The communal farms of the Anykščiai, Kupiškis, Rokiškis, and Utena Districts were forbidden to allow trucks for the funeral.

Anykščiai let a car be rented only to transport the casket. What surprising solicitude on the part of the atheists, not to forget a deceased priest!

A car to carry the flowers was obtained from the seminary. Forty private automobiles accompanied the remains of Canon Rauda from Svėdasai to Utena. The streets everywhere were lined with people. Government officials who assiduously observed the funeral procession were able to see how the people of Lithuania can honor their spiritual leaders.

Participating in the funeral were Bishop Romualdas Krikščiuonas, Bishop Julius Steponavičius, Bishop Liudvikas Povilonis and 180 priests.

A n y k š č i a i

*A Statement to the Minister of Health of the Lithuanian SSR
by the Rev. Petras Budriūnas, residing at Šatalov No. 8,
in Anykščiai*

• For some years in the city hospital of Anykščiai, believers have not been allowed to summon a priest with the Blessed Sacrament. Their requests receive a variety of replies: "The patient is not in critical condition", "He doesn't need a priest; you do", "There is no special room", "Once you take the patient home, you can have the priest as often as you like." Those who ask for the priest are deceived and derided.

On October 7, 1973, the mother of Valentinas Kovas, of Daujočiai, and the daughter of Juozas Grižas, of the Village of Čekoniai, requested Chief Physician Šinkūnas to allow the priest to visit their weak patients, but he would not give permission. Some hours later, Valentinas Kovas died.

On August 19, 1973, patient Donatas Česūnas, of the Village of Storiai, and his near relatives asked permission of the Chief Physician, but he would not allow the priest to come. During visiting hours, Doctor Šinkūnas personally ordered the priest from the ward.

In July of 1973 he would not allow the priest to visit Teklė Sta-

siulienė, of Višintai; on November 8, 1973, Ona Baržiūnienė of the Village of Stanislava; on November 19, 1973, Emilija Bagdonienė, of Elmininkai, and others.

In the press it is always emphasized that in the hospitals nothing prevents performance of religious observances which are requested by the dying or the seriously ill. On January 3, 1974, in the newspaper of the Anykščiai District, *Kolektyvinis Darbas (Collective Work)*, in the article by P. Mišutis entitled "Soviet Law and Religion", the author writes:

"Ministers of Religion may visit the patient in the hospital, in penal institutions, and at home, if the patient so wishes."

On November 30, 1973, in *Tiesa*, in the article entitled, "Law and Religious Cults," one reads: "Prohibition does not apply to the performance of those rites requested by the dying or the seriously ill, who are in hospitals or in penal institutions."

However, in the hospital of Anykščiai, this prohibition does apply, since the priest is not allowed to visit the patient even when he is in a private room.

In 1972, Stefanija Karosienė, lying alone in Ward 5 of the Internal Medicine Section, was not allowed to summon a priest.

On July 17, 1972, Petras Katinas and Šukys were alone in a ward, and asked for a priest, but their request was not heeded. When I tried to visit the patients at their request, Doctor Šinkūnas intercepted me in the hospital yard and ordered me to go back.

A few years ago, I appealed this matter to the former vice-chairman of the Executive Committee of the Anykščiai District, K. Zulona. He promised to look into the matter, but I never had positive results from him. On September 17, 1972, I requested that the present vicechairman of the Executive Committee of the District of Anykščiai, A. Baltrūnas decide this serious question.

He replied that people had more than once come to him, and he promised to speak with the Chief Physician. It appeared as though this problem would be solved, but once again someone blocked the road.

Twice the pastor of Anykščiai had reported the above-mentioned interferences to the Prophylactic Division of the Ministry of Health. Moreover, the near relatives of the patients directed telegrams to the Ministry of Health, requesting permission. The Bishop of Panevėžys

was also informed of the spiritual needs of the patients, and through him, the Commissioner for Religious Affairs.

On January 9, 1974, I was summoned by the vice-chairman of the Executive Committee of Anykščiai, A. Baltrūnas, who admonished me in writing for administering the Sacrament of the Sick December 25, 1973, to Julius Vitkevičius, of the Village of Lagėdžiai without permission of the hospital administration.

I had visited this patient for about three minutes just before his death. Moreover, Mr. Vitkevičius' wife told me that she could not find the Chief Physician in time, and that her husband was very weak. Of course, the Chief Physician would not have given permission for Vitkevičius, any more than he had on January 15, 1974, for Domas Šilinius, of Višintai; January 29, 1974, for (Mrs.) Liudvika Meškauskienė of the village of Anykščiai. February 4, 1974, for (Mrs.) Monika Ušackienė of Anykščiai, or others.

This situation has existed in Anykščiai for more than fifteen years. Hundreds of people have been seriously deprived, morally speaking, since their final wish was not carried out, at the most critical moment of life—the hour of death.

I respectfully request you, the Minister, to see that the law regarding religious cults be observed in the hospital at Anykščiai, so that believers might be able to take advantage of the right to receive the Blessed Sacrament.

Anykščiai, March 2, 1974

The Rev. P. Budriūnas

S v ě d a s a i

In 1973, a communal farmer named Tuskenis, for the Žalgiris Commune was a patient at the hospital in Svėdasai. His wife requested Dr. Kamarauskienė to allow the priest to visit her seriously ill husband.

The doctor retorted, "Crawl on your knees like a puppy; I'm still not going to allow a priest."

P a n e v ě ž y s

In April, 1974, at the insistence of the security forces, (Miss) Marytė Medauskaitė, a calculator operatrix with the Financial Section of the City of Panevėžys was discharged from her position. In the opinion of the security people, she is a nun.

DIOCESE OF TELŠIAI

Telšiai

In the fall of 1973, Engineer Paplauskas erected a traditional shrine for the Suffering Christ in the church-yard of the Cathedral of Telšiai. For that, the Executive Committee of the City of Telšiai fined him fifty rubles. They demand that the shrine be removed from the church-yard as allegedly spoiling the appearance of the place.

Klaipėda

In January, 1974, Vice Chairman Ruginis of the Executive Committee of the City of Klaipėda ordered the pastor to send away from the altar some worshipers, because they wore folk dress. In the judgment of Ruginis, it is not allowed to show up in church so dressed.

The pastor, fearing any unpleasantness, promised to allow the worshipers to the altar only when they bring written permission from the Executive Committee.. .

The faithful are deeply annoyed by Ruginis' order, saying, "Where is our freedom of belief, if government officials decree what kind of dress we must wear when we go to church?"

* * *

In Middle School X of Klaipėda, History Teacher (Miss) Ke-turakaitė explained to her pupils that there was no Christ, and that this was just a story created by someone.

One pupil asked, "Teacher, there are many stories, but no one counts the years from them, but only from Christ." The class began to laugh, and the teacher was glad to be saved by the bell.

Palanga

The pupils of Palanga Middle School and their parents complain that Teacher Taurinskas and (Mrs.) Ceinakienė, fanatical atheists, stand guard at the church on Sundays, watching what pupils go to church. The efforts of the atheists notwithstanding, there are pupils who go to church even on weekdays.

Kretinga

During the summer of 1973, the administrative committee of the Executive Committee of Kretinga fined (Mrs.) Šilienė, a resident of Kretinga, fifty rubles because she prepared a few children for First Confession and Communion.

Naujoji Akmenė

During the summer of 1973, the seventh-graders of Akmenė Middle School II, accompanied by their Lithuanian Language teacher, came to Kaunas. As the pupils were going through the city square, one child asked a companion on what spot Kalanta immolated himself. A security man stepped up to the children and asked what they were looking for.

"The place where Kalanta died," explained one pupil.

The security man asked the name of the teacher, and what school they were from. Having written everything down, he shouted, "Get lost! I don't want to see you around here again!"

A few days later, the principal told the teacher, "Turn in your resignation quickly and leave the school, because you're in for trouble."

In tears, the teacher wrote her resignation, saying that she was "voluntarily" leaving the school. The people of Naujoji Akmenė are very sympathetic towards this teacher, who has finished higher studies, and now must work in a factory.

Seda

At the end of 1972, the teachers' meeting of the Seda Middle School was considering the pupils' progress and deportment. One teacher read the names of those who received 5, the highest mark, and behaved in exemplary fashion. When the names of sixth-graders Regina Skrabeikytė and Janina Bernotaitė were mentioned, the Communist Youth Organization secretary (Mrs.) Kentraitė-Kristutienė shouted,

"These girls are not Pioneers, so their conduct cannot be rated exemplary!"

The majority of teachers disagreed with the opinion of the secretary of the Communist Youth League, but Mrs. Kristutienė insisted,

"If we rate the conduct of non-Communist Youth exemplary, we'll never make them join these organizations."

Veiviržėnai

The pastor of Veiviržėnai, Father Brazdžius, brought home an old wayside shrine, which had become the victim of a land reclamation project. Renovating it, he erected it next to the rectory. The regional government demanded that Father Brazdžius take the shrine

down. Because he would not do so, he was transferred to another parish.

The present pastor of Veiviržėnai, Father Jankauskas, is being pressured to tear down the shrine which Father Brazdžius erected. In November of 1973, Commissioner of Religious Affairs K. Tumėnas came to Bishop Pletkus in Telšiai, demanding that the bishop order the pastor of Veiviržėnai to remove the shrine from the rectory yard.

Barstyčiai

Stasys Andriekus used to teach in the Middle School of Barstyčiai. The pupils as well as the parents loved and respected him. His work was rated highly by the school administration and by the Department of Education.

In 1970, Teacher Andriekus was discharged from his position because at Easter he had taken part in the Resurrection Services at the Cathedral of Telšiai.

Summoned to the Department of Education and asked why he, a Soviet teacher, went to church, Andriekus replied, "I am a believer and I act according to my conscience."

Andriekus is now working as a letter-carrier.

Židikai

In 1973, the government of the Mažeikiai *rayon* fined the pastor of Židikai and the parish council president fifty rubles each, because they had repaired the siding of the church, even though permission for this had earlier been given.

DIOCESE OF VILKAVIŠKIS

Paluobiai

Open Letter:

Honorable Senior Instructor at the Kapsukas State University of Vilnius, A. Augas:

In the March 1, 1974 issue of *Kauno Tiesa (Kaunas Truth)*, No. 31, in your article, "Behold the Cassocked Friends of the People," you write:

"In the beginning of 1945 Bishop Bučys, urged by the Vatican Secretary of State, Cardinal Montini (the present Pope Paul VI)

assigned the priest Pranas Račiūnas to gather intelligence data about the Red Army.

"Račiūnas was supposed to hand on the information to the Vatican spy Laberge, then in Moscow, he to the Vatican, and the Vatican, to U.S. Intelligence. Račiūnas, firmly believing that the Americans would liberate Lithuania, eagerly served them."

In your article, you do not mention that I was imprisoned for twenty-five years without trial. You do not indicate the true reason for my confinement. Here it is:

In 1947 in Lithuania, the Bishop of Telšiai, Vincentas Borisevičius, his auxiliary, Bishop Pranciškus Ramanauskas, and the Bishop of Kaišiadorys, Teofilus Matulionis, has already been arrested. The danger loomed that the dioceses of Lithuania would be left without bishops. The bishop of Panevėžys, Kazimieras Paltarokas, according to Canon Law, could not consecrate new bishops without permission of the Vatican. The bishop had no direct way of contacting the Vatican. For this reason, upon orders of my spiritual superiors, I went to Moscow to visit Father Laberge, Chaplain at the U.S. embassy, to request that he obtain the pope's permission to consecrate new bishops for Lithuania. On my arrival in Moscow, I obtained written permission from the local militia to live temporarily in Father Laberge's quarters. This request of mine was the basic reason for my imprisonment.

You accuse me of rushing "to serve them"; i.e., to gather and transmit information about the Red Army. I ask you to show specifically when, where, and what kind of information I gathered, and when, where, and to whom I handed it on, or even tried to do so.

It seems that you have never read, or do not wish to relate accurately the records of my interrogation, not even one of the most important, supervised by Lt. Col. Chistiakov, Chief of the Interrogation Section of Vilnius Security. The question of espionage against the Red Army does not figure at all either in the records of my interrogation in 1949, or in the decision in the review of my case by the Military Tribunal of the Military Region of Moscow.

I served sixteen years without seeing a judge, hearing the accusations of the prosecutor, or the testimony of witnesses, or hearing the reasonable judgment of a court, even though I demanded such a trial many times in writing, even though the Soviet Constitution

guarantees each citizen of the Soviet Union the right to defend his innocence in court. The method of punishing "*in absentia*," such as was used in my case, was condemned by the Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR.

In the labor camps, living with professional thieves and robbers I had occasion to hear that their ethic forbids one to beat a man who is bound. Among them, breaking that rule is punishable by death. It is a cheap shot for you today to write articles libeling priests when it is practically impossible for them to respond to this libel via the press, radio or television.

If I, for example, were to call you, even in a private letter, a spy for the Chinese or English, you, feeling innocent, could take me to court and I should be punished for libel. But when you libel me, even publicly in the press, I cannot defend myself in that same press, even though the law provides no exception for priests or faithful.

Does your atheistic conscience consider it honorable to abuse the situation which has developed? Should not your self-respect as a university teacher be greater than that of the above-mentioned criminals?

Paragraph No. 7 of the Civil Code of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic indicates that "a citizen or organization has the right to require through the courts that information demeaning respect and honor be retracted, if the person disseminating such information cannot prove that it matches reality."

The law therefore obliges the person who disseminates information to prove that the information by him fits reality. If the respondent is unable to prove it, then such information is to be corrected. "The one who states that another person is unconscientious is obliged to prove it." (A. Vileita, "*Piliečių garbes ir orumo gynimas*," "Defense of Citizens' respect and honor", *Mintis — Thought*, V., 1969, pp. 32-37)-

"Since the law obliges that the validity of information disseminated be proved by the person disseminating the information, and since he did not demonstrate such validity, and the court has no other proof of the validity of the information disseminated, the court finds that the information disseminated by the respondent does not fit reality and orders the latter to deny such information." (ibid. p. 55).

It would be possible to accuse me and other persons mentioned in your article only when you had undeniable proof.

On what basis do you affirm that in 1945 Bishop Bučys assigned me to spy on the Red Army? Bishop Bučys left for Rome before June 15, 1941, and from the time when the Soviet Army marched into Lithuania in 1944, I had no contact with him. Read about this in the records of my interrogation.

You state categorically that Father Laberge was a spy of the Vatican. Look at the decision of the Moscow Military District Military Tribunal's decision in its review of my case in 1965.

There it is clearly stated: "It is not proven that Laberge was an agent of foreign intelligence." Whom to believe? Your libelous article or the document of the Military Tribunal?

You write: "In the beginning of 1945, at the instigation of the Vatican Secretary of State, Cardinal Montini, Bishop Bučys assigned the priest Pranas Račiūnas, of Panevėžys, to gather information concerning the Red Army." In 1945, Montini was neither a Cardinal, nor the Vatican Secretary of State. It was only in 1958 that Pope John XXIII elevated Montini to Cardinal, when he ruled the Archdiocese of Milan.

Finally, can you submit evidence that the present Pope Paul VI (Montini) ever urged Bishop Bučys to spy on the Red Army? Can you specifically show where, under what circumstances, Pope Paul VI gave such instructions? On what documents do you base your statements? Show which records of my interrogation speak of this.

I do not know what urged you to write such untruths and to mislead the Soviet reader, libeling Pope Paul VI, the late Bishop Bučys, Father Laberge, and me. I do not know whether you concocted such an article, or whether someone else wrote it, and you simply signed it.

Perhaps you wished in this way to serve atheistic propaganda in Lithuania. However, even atheists are obliged to keep to the norm of ethics. Do you not, by such an uncritical article, lower the prestige of the honorable title of Senior Instructor of the University of Vilnius? I do not know your moral standard. I do not know whether you, having had the nerve to write untruth, as a representative of learning, without ascertaining the facts, will have the will to make amends. An honorable person of strong character, having made an

error, will always make amends. But will you, having had the nerve to calumniate several people, even the pope, have the courage and self-respect to recall those calumnies, or at least see **that *Kaunas Truth*** would print the text of my open letter?

Your article appeared in the press just a few days after the visit of the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Andrei Gromyko to Pope Paul VI. Do you think that your article, accusing a pope of organizing espionage against the Red Army, is the beginning of a new campaign against the present pope, fitting in with the present course of Soviet foreign policy?

On the basis of Paragraph 7 of the Civil Code of the Lithuanian SSR, I demand that you prove legally the truth of the accusations you have made against me. If you can not, you are obligated to recall the aforementioned accusations. Otherwise, I retain the right to take you to court.

I am sending copies of this open letter to: His Excellency Bishop Juozas Labukas, His Excellency Bishop Liudvikas Povilonis, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Andrei Gromyko, the Rector of the University of Vilnius, J. Kubilius, Commissioner for Religious Affairs K. Tumėnas, and the editors of *Kauno Tiesa*.

The Rev. Pranas Račiūnas

Paluobiai, March 20, 1974

Griškabūdis

Simas Kudirka's mother, living near Griškabūdis, was invited to visit relatives in the USA for three months. She received the necessary documents and even a round-trip ticket Moscow to New York, April 27.

Before she left for Moscow, representatives of the Executive Committee of Sakiai and later, a representative of Security, came to see Mrs. Kudirka and tried to convince little old lady not to go to the USA. They promised to give her hay for her cow, to allow her to see her son in the concentration camp (District of Permė) and to see that she received letter from him.

She decided to go to the USA and arriving at Vilnius, bought a ticket to Moscow. Accompanied by three men, Mrs. Kudirka approached Car 6. However, the little old lady was unable to board. At that time, a large number of security agents and militia lurked

about the platform. Four militiamen presented themselves, demanded the lady's papers, and led her off to the militia room.

Here again Mrs. Kudirka was importuned not to go to the USA, until the train "Lietuva" pulled out for Moscow.

On May 7, one of Mrs. Kudirka's companions, B. Gajauskas, was summoned to Kaunas Security. The security people wanted to know why, after having served a 25-year sentence, he had caused a political provocation on the railroad station platform.

Mrs. Kudirka informed relatives in the USA by telephone telling why she had been unable to reach Moscow. It appears that there will be no difficulty for her to leave for the USA.

Ku č i ū n a i

Lately in Lithuania, in a wish to find out the situation of religion, sociological surveys have become very fashionable. In all schools of Lithuania, pupils must answer the questionnaires.

March 5-10, 1974, the teachers of the elementary school of Ku-čiūnai: Bendaravičius, and the Misses Baldauskas, Ulinskas, and Barkauskas gave the pupils of Grades 4-8 the following kind of questions: "Do you believe in God? Why do you believe? Do you go to church? When were you in church? Do you read religious books? Do you go to confession often? Do you pray at home? Do your parents believe?"

More than 90% of the pupils wrote that they believe in God and go to church. The principal of the school became frightened at the answers and suggested that the teachers watch at the churches, as had been done several years earlier, and keep the children out of church. However, most of the teachers were of a different mind: It is not fitting for a teacher to be a militiaman.

In the fifth grade, when the teacher, (Miss) Barkauskaitė presented the questions, two pupils arose, and making the sign of the cross, recited a prayer. To the teacher's admonition: "Why is that necessary?" the pupils replied "We need courage!"

The faithful are deeply annoyed at these "sociological" investigations. They are simply a heavy-handed interference in matters of conscience. Many are of the opinion that only the first question should be answered: "Do you believe in God?", and not any of the others, since the purpose of these surveys is to find out who influences

the children, who teaches them, who gives them religious books to read, etc. Some of the answers could be out-and-out betrayal, which the atheists would use in their war against religion.

Vištytis

In the church of Vištytis a small children's choir was organized. The parents gladly allowed the children sing in it. The children's choir pleased the faithful very much, but it was a thorn in the side of the atheists.

On Sunday, November 18, 1973, during the evening Mass, investigators came to the church. The next day, principal Virškus and the home-room teachers began the interrogation: Who sang? Who teaches you to sing? Where are rehearsals held? Does the pastor give you candy?

Some of the children became frightened, while others, like the Aleknavičius girl, the Uldinskas girl, and the Dulckis girl courageously stated that they sang and that they would continue to sing in the future. It was what their parents wished, and besides they themselves enjoyed it.

The teachers explained that the girls could continue to go to church, but they must not sing, since the other children would then want to join.

The terrorization of the children lasted all week. The teachers tried in all sorts of ways to convince the children not to participate in the singing. They visited the homes and asked the parents not to allow the children to go to choir.

"Our children are doing no one any harm by going to sing. You would do better to see that there are fewer hooligans, instead of concerning yourselves with our children's singing," the parents told the over-zealous teachers.

On November 22, 1973, in the evening, four girls came to the rectory so that the priest's housekeeper might teach them to sing. While the dogs barked, Area Chairman Žarskis and Party Secretary Gaidis snuck about the rectory. The uninvited guests frightened the children rather badly, asking their names.

In the autumn of 1972, J. Uldinskas, the chauffer of the Vištyčiai Soviet farm drove the priest to see a critically ill patient. When

they found out about this "offense" the director of the collective farm and the secretary of the party organization berated Uldinskas:

"We could excuse you, if the car had been used for other things, but driving the pastor around is most strictly forbidden."

S u t k a i

At the end of 1973, in the elementary school of Gerdžiūnai an atheistic afternoon was organized for the children—a play. The fifth-graders were supposed to act out *The Gods of Olympus*, and the sixth-graders—*The Follower of Christ*.

Pioneer leader Vitalija Pavalkytė and sixth-grade home-room teacher Angelė Karalienė made sure that the parts in this play were acted by those pupils who serve Mass at the church in Sutkai. The purpose was obvious: to ridicule the Faith. Pupils Vidmantas Bačkaitis and Algis Mickevičius, revolted by the show in rehearsal, fled from the school.

At the elementary school of Gerdžiūnai, the practice is to draw caricatures of believing pupils in the wall newspapers. The atheists of Gerdžiūnai hope in this inhuman way to lessen the number of pupils attending church.

FROM THE ARCHIVES OF THE CRONICLE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN LITHUANIA

During the winter of 1956-57, in the Middle School of Kulautuva, the Party Secretary, Teacher L. Gangapševa saw a small cross hanging from the neck of Teacher (Miss) S. Jasiūnaitė. Gangapševa reported his discovery to the Party Committee of the Kaunas region, and to the Department of Education.

To the school came Instructor Filomenova of the Party in Kaunas and summoning a hasty meeting of the teachers, discussed the offense of "the one who walks around with crosses." In the course of the meeting the instructor described the cross as a historical horror and as a threat to the Soviet Union, and Teacher Jasiūnaitė as a perpetrator of that threat.

"Such a person as this Jasiūnaitė shall not work in our school any longer!" exclaimed Filomenova, pounding the table with her fist.

However, Teacher Jasiūnaitė was not discharged from the school that year. Most probably this was prevented by Teacher Jasiūnaitė's proletarian origins. Born of a worker's family Miss Jasiūnaitė lost her father at the age of six, spent her childhood as a shepherdess working for farmers, and later, working as a serving girl, attended night school as an adult, and the Kaunas *gymnasium* for adults.

While teaching, she completed a correspondence course with the Teachers' Institute of Šiauliai. Thus, to hold Miss Jasiūnaitė an enemy of the Soviet system was absolutely awkward. In the regional meeting of the Workers' Council of Deputies, it was suggested that she be rehabilitated.

Party Secretary Strielchev, summoning Teacher Jasiūnaitė, expressed regret that she, a representative of the working class, went against the Soviet system and he advised her to say that she did wear the cross, but as an ornament or trinket.

During the summer of 1958, Teacher Jasiūnaitė was summoned to the Ministry of Education. Chief of the Cadre Section A. Paškauskas told her that she would be transferred from the middle school of Kulautuva.

"What for?" the teacher asked.

"Is it true that you had a cross?"

"It is true."

"Did you have it as an ornament or as a religious object?"

"The cross is no plaything to me. I value it as a symbol of faith."

"Then you are a believer?"

"Yes, I believe."

Paškauskas went off to consult with someone, and later took Teacher Jasiūnaitė to Assistant Minister (Miss) Vyšniauskaitė. The latter repeated similar questions about the cross, and receiving the same answers, said that Teacher Jasiūnaitė would not be able to work in the school, or in any office connected with ideological work.

A few days later Miss Jasiūnaitė received a written notice of dismissal: "Jasiūnaitė, Stasė, daughter of Vincas, is discharged from her duties as teacher at the middle school of Kulautuva, effective September 1, 1958."

Miss Jasiūnaitė appealed in writing to the Ministry of Education, requesting them to explain the reason for her dismissal. After repeated inquiries, the Ministry of Education authorized the regional

Department of Education to explain *verbally* to Miss Jasiūnaitė the reasons for her dismissal.

After her dismissal, Miss Jasiūnaitė looked around for employment. In November, 1958, she was accepted as a worker in the kitchen of the Kulautuva Tuberculosis Sanatorium. Her acceptance was processed by the assistant director. Upon her return from courses, Directress (Miss) R. Caikauskaitė discharged Miss Jasiūnaitė from her position. When Miss Jasiūnaitė asked that she be given at least a job as charwoman, the directress only made fun of her, saying that she was a teacher and should go to work in a school.

In vain Miss Jasiūnaitė complained to the government of the Kaunas region, and to the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR, asking to be reinstated as a worker at the Tuberculosis Sanatorium. The Executive Committee of the Region of Kaunas used to answer for all of them, saying that they did not run an employment office and that they were not obliged to find work for her.

It became apparent that government representatives of Kulautuva and representatives of the regional government had agreed not to give Miss Jasiūnaitė work. In the summer of 1959, Directress Astrauskas of the children's sanatorium "Kregždutė" hired Miss Jasiūnaitė as a medical aide.

Upon finding out, Party member Dr. Biveliienė warned the director and within a week Jasiūnaitė was discharged from her job.

Finally in 1959, Miss Jasiūnaitė applied to Secretary Nikita Krushchev, of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR. The Executive Committee of the Kaunas region received orders to give Miss Jasiūnaitė a job, but not in school.. .

For further information, or to help the
Persecuted Christians in Lithuania, please contact:

Lithuanian Catholic Religious Aid
6409 56th Road
Maspeth, L.I., New York 11378
U.S.A.