



CHRONICLE OF THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH
IN LITHUANIA
No. 21

CHRONICLE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
IN LITHUANIA

No. 21

A Translation of Authentic Reports
from Soviet-Occupied Lithuania

Published by the Lithuanian Roman Catholic
Priests' League of America
351 Highland Boulevard
Brooklyn, NY 11207

© Copyright 1978 by the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Priests' League
of America

Printed by
Franciscan Fathers Press
341 Highland Blvd.
Brooklyn, NY 11207

CHRONICLE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
IN LITHUANIA

No. 21

Introduction

Perhaps one of the most remarkable aspects of the dissident movement in the U.S.S.R. today is the way in which it has united Orthodox Christian, Jew, Catholic, and agnostic in the common cause of human rights.

The *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania No. 21* opens with a report of the trial of Sergei Kovalev, in Vilnius, Lithuania, December 9 - 12, 1975. Kovalev, a well-known Russian biologist, was tried partly because of his aid to Lithuanian nationalists and Catholics. Friends and acquaintances from far away as Moscow, including Yuri Orlov and Andrei Sacharov, came to attend the trial, but were banned from the court-room along with western correspondents, in spite of the fact that the trial was billed as "public".

Kovalev was found guilty on all counts and sentenced to seven years of strict regime labor camp and three additional years of internal exile.

Following the report of the Kovalev trial is yet one more petition asking the Soviet government to allow Bishop Julijonas Steponavičius, of Vilnius, to return to his duties, from which he has been kept since 1958. It is signed by no less than 68 Catholic priests of Lithuania.

Next comes an autobiographical sketch by the former political prisoner Antanas Terleckas, addressed to I. V. Andropov, head of the KGB, with an appeal to be relieved of the constant pressure placed upon him by the Soviet security organs.

Reports from various cities and towns document the continuing persecution of religious believers at the hands of the atheists, with the tacit approval of the Soviet government. A computer specialist at the State University of Vilnius with an

exemplary record is discharged for her religious practice. Various examples of atheistic propaganda are presented. The *Chronicle* describes how the process of russification is kept hidden from foreign visitors. Instances of the forced closing of churches are reported.

From Meškuičiai comes a report of the destruction of four hundred religious shrines on the Hill of Crosses, after a group of young people had arranged a religious procession to the site. From Kaunas comes a report that all religious symbols and ceremonies are forbidden at funeral parlors; the carving of religious symbols on gravestones is discouraged.

This issue of the *Chronicle* contains reports from a number of towns and villages, of the destruction of religious shrines. A worker refusing to enlist in the Communist Party is discharged. Truck drivers delivering gravel for repairs to a church are punished. The cultural genocide of Lithuanians living in Byelorussia is documented. The latest developments in the case of Mečislovas Jurevičius, persecuted for his religious beliefs, are reported.

Like other issues of the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*, this issue devotes a significant section to the documentation of the religious persecution of youth, especially through the school system.

Rev. Casimir Pugevičius
Translation Editor

CHRONICLE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN LITHUANIA No. 21

In this issue:

- The Trial of Sergei Kovalev
- Letters and Statements
- Way of the Cross
- News from the Dioceses
- M. Jurevičius is Unemployed
- Continuing Persecution of Youth
- In the Soviet School

Lithuania

January 25, 1976

TRIAL OF SERGEI KOVALEV

During December 9-12, 1975 the LSSR Supreme Court tried the case of S.A. Kovalev.

President of the court panel: LSSR Supreme Court member M. Ignotas. Peoples judges: (Mrs.) Didžiulienė and Tereshin. Secretary: (Mrs) Savinienė. State prosecutor: Assistant Attorney General Bakučionis. The defense attorney was appointed by the court.

Kovalev is charged with violating article 70 of the USSR Criminal Code: he is alleged to have been a member of the organizing group for the defense of human rights and to have written (since 1969) many statements and inquiries: a letter in defense of Grigorenko (1969),

a statement marking the first anniversary of the occupation of Czechoslovakia (1969), in defense of Bukovsky (1971), concerning Yakir and Krasin (1973), an inquiry about the exile of Solzhenitsyn (1974), a letter to the U.N. regarding the Crimean Tartars (1974), a letter to the League for Human Rights concerning Bukovsky (1974). Kovalev is also charged, with transmitting information on Soviet labor camps to the West at the "political prisoners' day" (10/30/74) press conference in Sakharov's apartment. The indictment labels this information "defamatory."

S.A. Kovalev is charged with reviving the publication of the *Chronicle of Current Events*, with gathering information for, editing and transmitting issues 28 through 34 of the *Chronicle of Current Events* to foreign countries. The charge is based on material found in Kovalev's possession corresponding to *Chronicle* material and notations made by Kovalev on certain documents. The charge of transmitting the *Chronicle* abroad is based on a statement made in May 1974 by S. Kovalev, T. Velikanova and T. Chodorovich regarding their intention to disseminate the *Chronicle*, as well as on the fact that issues 28-34 of the *Chronicle* were published by Kronika Press in New York.

Kovalev is charged with having three issues of the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania* in his possession and using them in the *Chronicle of Current Events*.

Kovalev is also charged with distributing *The Gullag Archipelago* by A.I. Solzhenitsyn. A photostatic copy of this book and part of a type-written copy were found in his home. This charge is based on the fact that the book was confiscated from V. Meresin, who was attempting to photograph it, and given to the security police, and also on Kovalev's letter to Andropov (October 1974) demanding the return of his book.

Kovalev denied being guilty of any of the charges made against him and refused to answer the judge's question: "Does he agree with the facts as presented in the indictment?"

Kovalev requested three things at the beginning of the trial:

1. Permission to use the text of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
2. To call to the stand a list of witnesses, among them Krasin and Yakir.

3. To engage either S.V. Kalistratov or D.I. Kaminskaya as defense counsel.

Kovalev personally and through his wife asked for these lawyers both during preliminary interrogations and later. His requests were turned down on the pretext that these lawyers did not have licenses and for other reasons.

The court rejected all of Kovalev's requests, except to call Krasin as witness.

Kovalev refused the services of his court appointed lawyer. The court invited Kovalev to speak. The accused stated that he did not speak during the preliminary interrogation and refused to be present at interrogations because he considered them illegal and criminal. He made an exception in expressing his opinion when objective facts were examined.

Kovalev asserted that it would be logical to continue maintaining this position during the trial because in such proceedings persons are tried not for crimes but for their convictions. He would however participate in the proceedings as regards the question of whether the letters and the *Chronicle* contain deceitful statements, but would not answer questions about when and by whom those and other documents were written.

When stating his opinion of the letters and the *Chronicle*, Kovalev called them useful and not against the law. He stated that regretfully there are mistakes in the *Chronicle of Current Events*, agrees to help analyze the mistakes and has evidence that they were merely mistakes and not conscious lies.

During the second day of the trial (December 10), twenty-two witnesses were called to the stand.

Doctor L.A. Liubarskaya of the Dnepropetrovsk specialized psychiatric hospital was questioned about the detention and therapy of Pliushch at the hospital. The judge conducted the cross-examination based on facts presented in the 34th issue of the *Chronicle*. Dr. Liubarskaya replied that everything in the hospital was performed according to instructions.

Kovalev had asserted that the Soviet Union uses psychiatric hospitals for the purpose of taking care of those who think differently and stated that he was not allowed to defend himself by presenting his witnesses. The court rejected Kovalev's request to call as witnesses Zhitnikova, the wife of Pliushch.

Assistant Chief of Staff A. A. Kozhemaichina, of the Moscow area Chekhov *rayon* psychiatric hospital, testified about the detention

of P.G. Grigorenko at the psychiatric hospital. The judge overruled an entire list of questions from Kovalev to the witnesses. Among others, the following questions remained unanswered: "In what way had Grigorenko's health improved at the time of his discharge?"

As for the news printed in the 32nd issue of the *Chronicle* on the detention of Chantsy at the hospital and prison, the following were called as witnesses: Doctor B.V. Polkin of the Kirov area main psychiatric hospital and Chief Controller (Administrator) of the Kirov Internal Affairs Office, LP. Kaftaniuk. The judge read a statement by Chantsy (from trial transcript) that during his imprisonment he was beaten and crippled, that he was confined seven times in punishment cells and afterwards in solitary confinement. Administrator Kaftaniuk remarked: "The Kirov city prison does not have solitary confinement cells, and it is physically impossible to survive punishment cells seven times."

Several other *Chronicle* episodes were examined. The witnesses—Gudas, a bulldozer operator from the Kaunas *Rayon* lumber mill and Skhvortsova from Arkhangelsk—denied in part certain statements in the *Chronicle*. The judge overruled most of Kovalev's questions to the witnesses.

Witness G.E. Khoroleva from Moscow testified that once when she stopped in at a relative's apartment, which had been rented to Velikhanova, she found a folder containing letters from convicted individuals and notified the security police after deciding that the contents of the folder were suspicious.

A group of witnesses (V.N. Chikhina, V.A. Garbatov, J.L. Dobrachev, V. M. Meresin) was questioned about the photocopying of Solzhenitsyn's book *The Gulag Archipelago*. According to their testimony, Garbatov allowed Dobrachev, to photograph Schweitzer's book in the laboratory. Meresin assisted Dobrachev, and when he left, the assistant began to photograph *The Gulag Archipelago*. This was discovered by Garbatov who had been called by Chikhina; he took the book and the film and later gave them to the security police.

Mereska refused to answer the question of who owned the *Gulag Archipelago* book, which was being photographed, and stated that he was acting thus for purely moral reasons.

When speaking about the witnesses, V.F. Turchin stated that he is long and well acquainted with Kovalev and is convinced that Kovalev could not have been involved in the dissemination of any defamatory documents.

After questioning the last witness V. Turchin and hearing both sides (Prosecutor Bakučionis agreed to dismiss the witnesses, but Kovalev protested), Judge M. Ignotas ruled that the witnesses were free to go and called a recess.

The witnesses Boitsova, Turchin, Litvinov, Jasinovskaya, Meresin and Mizjakin remained in their seats. They were repeatedly asked to leave the courtroom on grounds that it was necessary to ventilate the facility. The captain of the guard even quoted the court's ruling. The witnesses were astonished that permission to leave the courtroom was considered to be an order, especially since such a ruling by the court is against the Code of Criminal Procedure. The demands of the witnesses had no impact and preparations were made to expel them by force. Then Turchin exacted a promise from the captain that they would be allowed to return to the courtroom after the recess. Then the witnesses left the courtroom. Just a few minutes before the end of the recess, the captain left the Supreme Court building. After the recess no one, except L. Boitsova, was allowed into the courtroom. Uniformed guards forcibly pushed them away from the doors against "the people", who had begun to file into the courtroom; "the people" unanimously protested the "Muscovites' rowdiness." M.M. Litvinov (a witness) and J.F. Orlov attempted to enter the courtroom, but were led away to a special room and threatened with arrest "for resisting state officials." An hour later they were released.

As Kovalev was being led from the courtroom he saw that most of the witnesses had remained in their seats. After the recess, he heard noise and the sound of arguing at the door and, seeing that of the witnesses only Boitsova was in the courtroom, he stated that he would not remain in the courtroom so long as all the witnesses were not allowed into the courtroom and would go on a hunger strike until the witnesses and all who wished were allowed to enter the courtroom, and he demanded to be led out. The judge called a recess until December 11 at 10 A.M.

V. Turchin, V. Meresin, M. Litvinov, A. Mizjakin and F. Jasinovskaya wrote a statement to the President of the LSSR Supreme Court regarding the illegal expulsion of the witnesses from the courtroom and, on the basis of article 313 of the LSSR Code of Criminal Procedure, demanded that they be allowed to stay in the courtroom until the end of the trial. All the witnesses were granted permission to be in court.

On the morning of December 11th, Kovalev recounted yester-

day's incident with the witnesses and demanded the following:

"1. That all witnesses who so desire be guaranteed attendance in the courtroom and that I personally or through my wife and other witnesses be given the opportunity to ascertain that others truly did not wish to attend the proceedings.

"2. That attendance in the courtroom be guaranteed for A.D. Sakharov, T.M. Velikhanova, A.P. Lavut, M.N. Landa, V.A. Reku-bratsky, J.F. Orlov and my other friends who have expressed the wish to attend my trial and will be named by my wife and other witnesses, with the following condition: I must be allowed the opportunity to ask whether all who wished to attend were allowed to do so.

"3. That the trial examine the question, which does not appear in trial material, of how, in similar cases, the principle of public trial is violated in a frequent and organized manner. Also, with this in mind, that all persons named by me be called as witnesses, as well as those who came to my trial, about whom I do not yet know, but who will be named by witnesses.

"4. Of course, I am demanding that this statement be included in the dossier of this trial.

"For my part, I regret the expressions used at the time of the incident which though literary are still offensive, I am prepared to apologize to the court in the presence of all participants and express my thoughts in less sharp words. The most appropriate wording would be as follows:

"A limit must be placed on your cynical arbitrary rulings. I reject and refuse to be among persons who willfully break the law and among those who help them. I, of course, realize that an apology does not wipe out punishment for the offense. In that case, if my modest and limited demands are not met, I will continue my hunger strike until the end of the trial and will, of course, not return to the courtroom.

"If the court so easily dispenses with a defense lawyer, it will also easily conclude the case without the accused.

"I can only add this: I will be very distressed if my requests are not met, because I was prepared to present the court with important evidence of my innocence, without expecting, for that matter a just ruling. And so I will be distressed if, in the event my requests are not granted, I do not have the possibility to do this. But what can be done!?"

The judge announced that the witnesses who arrived that day and

asked to be admitted to the courtroom were present. Others had left for home. The question of the attendance of other persons is not a procedural matter and is left to the decision of the court bailiff. The judicial panel rejected defendant Kovalev's request which he made in his statement.

Kovalev urgently maintained that the principle of a public trial is a procedural principle and its referral to the court bailiff was unfounded. He demanded that all his requests be granted or that he be immediately led from the courtroom. As he was being escorted out, Kovalev addressed the witnesses sitting in the first row and said: "All my love to you and all those outside the doors and in Moscow. Warm wishes to Andrei Dimitrijevič (Sacharov)!"

After consulting among themselves, the judicial panel decided to expel Kovalev from the courtroom and try his case without him.

The court began to examine the evidence. The employment references of Kovalev from the University where he was employed until 1969, as well as from the Moscow Fisheries-Land Improvement Experimental Station (1970-1974) were read. The references contained information about his academic credentials.

The judge listed the documents: statements and letters written by Kovalev; transcripts of the trials of Yakir and Krasin containing the statement that, along with other individuals, Kovalev was a member of the organizing group; an open letter listing the goals and tasks of the organizing group; an appeal to the 5th Psychiatric Congress stating that medicine in the Soviet Union is used for purposes of repression; a detailed transcript of documents seized during the search, among them: various letters and materials from prisons, documents on arrests and trial proceedings, a list of convicted persons, letters from labor camps: copies of the *Chronicle of Current Events* and the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*; various documents on the Russian Orthodox Church in the Georgian Republic; "the reaction of Muscovites" to Solzhenitsyn's exile; the note: "We ask that this information be relayed to international organizations that have as their announced goal the defense of human rights, on the basis of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights"; an appeal to the International Committee for the Protection of Human Rights, the Human Rights League and Amnesty International.

According to handwriting experts, a number of handwritten texts, as well as comments on various typewritten documents, were written by Kovalev.

The prosecutor asked to introduce certain documents which

may have significant importance as evidence: comparison charts regarding the similarity of material taken from Kovalev and Korolev to material published in the *Chronicle*.

The judicial panel rejected Kovalev's request to call witnesses and to make public the testimony of Doctor Bochkovska of the Dnepropetrovsk psychiatric hospital during preliminary interrogations. It differed in certain details from the trial testimony of Doctor Liubarskaya.

This ended the presentation of courtroom evidence and the court began to hear opposing arguments.

Kovalev sent the court a statement that he would not retreat one step from his demands. Kovalev wrote: "I consider and will continue to consider my participation at these proceedings to be in my interest since I prepared for them extensively. As before, I felt I did not act properly. It is you who provoked me by expelling the witnesses. Under different circumstances I would not have made such demands. Because it has become so common to break the law during trials of similar cases, I tend to view my actions as imperative. I would also have acted similarly for the sake of a meaningful participation in the trial. Regrets about the conflict which occurred are no longer appropriate. I will not alter my demands. I will not break my hunger strike!

The state prosecutor spoke without the presence of either the accused or the defense attorney.

The prosecutor again enumerated the letters and statements written by Kovalev, proving that they were authored by Kovalev solely because they exist, solely because they were published in some issue of the *Chronicle*, or even broadcast by foreign radio stations such as Radio Liberty, the BBC and the Voice of America. The content of the documents was not examined. Prosecutor Bakucionis stated: "The Soviet Government is not interested in a person's convictions; it is interested in his keeping them to himself and not committing crimes. In documents which he (Kovalev) signed, one idea stands out: to impose on the Soviet individual a bourgeois understanding of freedom, trying to portray freedom as independence from the community." The prosecutor spoke of the growing danger to our community of such activity as undertaken by Kovalev, and, seeing no mitigating circumstances, he asked for a sentence of seven years in strict regime camps and an additional three years of exile.

The prosecutor pointed to the attitude of witness Meresin

during the trial when he testified to where he had obtained the book *The Gulag Archipelago*.

After the prosecutor's summation, the presiding judge announced that the court would begin deliberating the verdict. This lasted nearly a day. About an hour before the end of deliberations, Kovalev was asked in prison whether he would make a final statement. Kovalev refused. The court made public his refusal without comment before reading its finding on December 12th.

The verdict was "guilty on all charges". On the subjective side, based on the context of the documents themselves and on the fact that they were used in foreign propaganda, Kovalev was found guilty of intending (he personally denied this) to undermine or at least to weaken the Soviet government.

The sentence. Seven years in a strict regime labor camp and three years in exile.

The verdict is final and cannot be appealed. In a related ruling, the court handed the prosecutor documents on Meresin's refusal to testify.

Vilnius during the Trial of S. Kovalev

Kovalev's preliminary interrogation and trial took place not in Moscow, but in Vilnius, although he was tried under article 70 of the USSR Criminal Code. The government clearly wanted as few trial witnesses as possible.

Kovalev is a well-known defender of human rights, a brave fighter on behalf of persecuted Soviet Union citizens, among them, Lithuanian Catholics.

Lithuanians, especially the faithful, could not remain indifferent to these shameful trial proceedings which are used to condemn a man who defends basic human rights: the freedoms of speech, press and conscience. They remember the Gospel words ; "I was naked and you clothed me, I was sick and you visited me, I was imprisoned and you came to see me." Therefore, people from various parts of Lithuania came to the trial, wishing to see with their own eyes the person who dared stand up to "the powerful of this world" and defend the persecuted. After learning of the upcoming trial, the faithful ardently prayed the Lord to grant their benefactor strength.

Both the Supreme Court and the security police painstakingly prepared for this trial. It was clear that Kovalev's relatives and friends would come to Vilnius and that the trial proceedings would unavoidably resound throughout the world. The judge's role in such a

trial is unenviable. On the one hand, a conviction must be attained under all circumstances. On the other, the judge must look objective, keep to established procedure and grant the accused all the rights provided under law. But how can he incriminate the security agencies which kept Kovalev in an interrogation prison for an entire year? Therefore, all Supreme Court judges tried to shirk this trial to the best of their ability. After lengthy disputes, this shameful mission was entrusted to the secretary of the Supreme Court party organization, Judge Ignatas.

Up to two or three weeks before the trial certain Vilnius dissidents were summoned to the Military Commissariat or the security police where security agents waited for them. The agents forced those who were summoned, by either persuasion or threats, to promise they would not attend the upcoming trial. The head of the thermo-isolation scientific group Juozas Prapiestis was summoned to the Vilnius Military Commissariat at the beginning of November. The security agent who spoke with him warned him not to attend Kovalev's trial. Other friends of Prapiestis also had talks with security agents.

Before the trial began, calls were made to places of employment asking that certain individuals be assigned to work the first shift.

On the morning of December 9th, several known dissidents arrived by train from Moscow, as did Kovalev's relatives, his wife, son and brother. There also arrived Academician Sakharov, the president of the Moscow Amnesty International group Turchin, Armenian Academician Orlov and his wife, Litvinov and his wife, and others. Correspondent M. Levi of the Canadian newspaper "Toronto Star" also arrived with his wife after receiving permission. There were about twenty persons in all. Undoubtedly some did not succeed in leaving Moscow.

KGB agents detained T. Belikanova, T. Chodorovich and M. Landa on their way to the Byelorussian station. They were detained several hours in security offices, charged with ridiculous crimes, which were not even mentioned later, and, after being warned not to attempt to leave, were released after the train to Vilnius had already left.

On the eve of the trial, several Jews who had not yet been allowed to emigrate, were informed that their cases were being reviewed, and five were allowed to leave. One condition was set: they were not to attend the trial. Vilnius dissidents were not

able to come to meet the Muscovites. The Vilnius dissidents—A. Terleckas, V. Petkus, V. Smolkinas—had barely appeared on the station platform when they were immediately arrested by security agents and taken one by one to security headquarters. And so, the flowers intended for S. Kovalev's wife and Academician Sakharov wilted in the security headquarter trash basket.

The people from Vilnius were arrested without any warrant. When those who were arrested demanded the reason for the arrest and the document sanctioning their arrest shown them, the chekists evaded the questions, promising that everything would be explained at security headquarters and that all documents were there. This was a lie. No documents sanctioning the arrest turned up there, either.

Because the people from Vilnius did not hide their reason for coming to the railway station, each was individually berated for improper conduct by the chekists at security headquarters, they were threatened with imprisonment and even prosecution if they attempted to attend the trial. Colonels Kruglov, Baltinas and Cesnavičius assured them that Academician Sakharov was mentally ill, while the other Moscow dissidents were immoral individuals. They explained that Lithuanian dissidents were not known abroad; therefore, the world would be silent regarding their arrest. They threatened that a place had already been prepared for Terleckas and after him for Petkus at the Vilnius psychiatric hospital. They were asked if they did not want to emigrate to the West.

Upon being brought to security headquarters, Vilnius resident V. Smolkinas immediately wrote a complaint to the Attorney General, that unknown characters had forcibly pushed him into a "Volga" and brought him to security offices, did not present a warrant from the Attorney General's office and refused to explain until they had corroborated his statement. Therefore, they discussed only hunting and fishing with him.

The same afternoon, one after another, all three Vilnius residents were released. The time of their release coincided with the end of the trial deliberations.

Thus, even before the trial had begun, the chekists demonstrated their contempt for all human rights and showed that laws protecting individual freedoms did not apply to them.

Because no one met the Moscow dissidents on their arrival, Academician Sakharov and his son-in-law J. Jankelevich were invited to stay at the apartment of Vilnius resident Etan Finkelstein who

had returned from Moscow on the same train. Finkelstein is a graduate of Gorky University, and for the past five years had been asking permission to emigrate to Israel. Academician Sakharov stayed at his apartment. The other arrivals scattered among Vilnius residents whose addresses they had obtained beforehand.

The situation was hopeless for those who wanted to attend the trial. All entrances were guarded by security agents who admitted no one, except for officials. Among the security agents, who were everywhere—in the court building and its immediate surroundings—, could be seen security police Major J. Trakimas, the "boss and guardian" of all former and present political prisoners, and other security officials.

Academician Sakharov and his friends came to the Supreme Court building before ten o'clock. Security auxiliaries did not admit them into the courtroom.

After being turned back from the courtroom, Acad. A. Sakharov addressed the Supreme Court President. He wrote the following in his statement:

"Since I have known Kovalev for many years, I can testify at the trial about his exceptional honor and integrity, about his devotion to law, justice, the defense of human rights and public access to information. I demonstrated my deep respect for Kovalev when I invited him as guest of honor to the December 10, 1975 Nobel Prize award ceremonies in Oslo.

"I know that Kovalev is charge with transmitting to the foreign press information made public at the October 30, 1974, press conference which I called on the situation of political prisoners in the Soviet Union. This information was in fact transmitted by me. I take full responsibility for these deeds and wish to state this at the trial.

"I am also the co-author of the letter, presented as evidence, to KGB Chairman Andropov, which demanded the return of S. Kovalev's copy of the *Gulag Archipelago*.

"I participated in formulating many of the joint inquiries with which Kovalev is charged, as if they were defamatory. Such a portrayal of our joint inquiries is unjust in my view and I wish to explain and present my views at the trial."

Canadian correspondent M. Levi was also refused admission into the courtroom. He was unsuccessful in maintaining that Soviet correspondents in Canada are allowed to attend trials and that

agreements were signed in Helsinki regarding non-interference with the work of journalists.

Only those with special permits were allowed into the courtroom. Even Supreme Court employees were admitted only with employee passes with photographs which had been issued on the eve of the trial. One court employee forgot her pass, was unceremoniously searched and, only after convincing them that she really worked there, was admitted inside. Others who came to the trial were either told to go home or were taken to the security police by the chekists.

It was easier for those whom security officials and their agents did not know personally. They were able to enter the court vestibule and meet with both Lithuanians and Muscovites who were there and to congregate near the courtroom door. Security officials glared at all of them angrily. But they were not intimidated and patiently waited in the court corridors.

One unknown woman brought hidden flowers into the vestibule and after uncovering them, presented them to Nobel Peace Prize winner Academician A. Sakharov, who gratefully accepted them and said: "These flowers really belong to my friend Sergei. It is he who is fighting and suffering more for your rights." The woman left in tears and all present clearly remember the Nobel Prize winner's tender gaze and the flowers from the Lithuanian woman clutched to his breast which he later presented to Kovalev's wife.

Some time later, a group from Šiauliai approached, to which two "teachers from Jonava" and a "sailor from Klaipėda" attached themselves. These new arrivals were not stopped by the chekists. The "teachers" tried very actively to establish contact with Academician Sakharov and other Muscovites, offered to look after them and even had their picture taken with them. However, even before the end of the trial proceedings, the "teachers" were unmasked. One of them, Zajančauskas, turned out to be a security agent formerly from Druskininkai, now employed by security headquarters in Vilnius.

On the first day of the trial, only Kovalev's brother was admitted into the courtroom. The trial lasted four days. Academician Sakharov and other dissidents came daily to the court building, but they were not admitted into the courtroom.

From the second day of the trial, efforts were made to keep away from the court building all Lithuanians who were suspected of wishing to gain entrance, and those who did gain entrance were expelled. The court vestibule and corridors were patrolled by over

twenty plainclothes and uniformed security policemen. "Operations" were almost constantly directed by Colonels Kruglov and Baltinas.

The second day of the trial, Šiauliai resident Mečislovas Jurevičius was barred by a security agent as he was approaching the court building, and it was suggested that they talk "farther away from the door, around the corner," so that persons in the vestibule, among them the Muscovites, could not see how they were going to deal with him. Seeing that Jurevičius was not going "around the corner," they began to threaten him on the spot. Then two more security agents came from the vestibule and together they dragged Jurevičius into a car.

After taking Jurevičius to security headquarters (Lenino g. 40), they took his personal documents and began interrogating him : What was his purpose in coming to Vilnius? Perhaps to gather information for the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*? Who else had come with him from Šiauliai and from Kuršėnai? Where did he learn of S. Kovalev's trial? Where had he dined the night before? Had he met with Academician Sakharov? Jurevičius replied that this was his personal business. Security officials began to berate Jurevičius: "What do you all want with this trial?" After all, Kovalev and Sakharov are non-believers and so on. They threatened Jurevičius with prosecution for having written many articles for the *Chronicle* and for probably reporting this conversation in the *Chronicle*.

Jurevičius replied that he had no intention of hiding from anyone this detention and conversation with security agents and that, therefore, this information will be able to reach the *Chronicle* without him.

Security agent Urbanavičius stated that he had read the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*, but did not like the statements by priests, articles about N. Sadūnaitė and so on.

During the interrogation, he was told that the security police would find him employment (Jurevičius had been fired because of his religious beliefs: he would not work on religious holidays), that he could still celebrate Christmas, but would have to work on the Feast of the Three Kings.

Jurevičius replied that he would already have found employment on his own, but had been fired from his position as worker, and was not hired as manager. Then Security Agent Baltrušaitis "explained" that Jurevičius was not qualified for a position in management because of "political immaturity."

At the end of the interrogation, the security agents stated that they would now take Jurevičius to the railway station and would place him on the Šiauliai train; he was not to attempt showing his face in Vilnius for a week or he would be harshly punished. When Jurevičius replied that he would still come to Vilnius, the agents said, "Well, then we'll give you an escort." And so Jurevičius was taken to the railway station with his "party," was placed on a train and sent off to Šiauliai.

On the eve of the trial, A. Terleckas, an employee of the Opera and Ballet Theater, was fired from his job. He worked as a fireman at the theater. Now he was unemployed and looked after the needs of the dissidents. Although the chekists seriously threatened him and demanded that he stay away from the trial, he did not obey. He was saved from an incident and arrest by visiting dissidents and the Canadian journalist, who never left his side.

When Kęstutis Jokubynas came to the Supreme Court building, he was approached by Col. Baltinas who demanded that he leave the building. Jokubynas refused. The agents decided against using force in the presence of the Moscow dissidents and foreign correspondents.

Virgilijus Jaugelis attempted to enter the courtroom, but was approached by one of the patrolling security agents and ordered to leave. Jaugelis continued to stand near the courtroom door. He was then led away and punished with a fifteen days arrest for "insulting and disobeying a security policeman." During the interrogation a security agent struck Jaugelis several times in the throat with his fist with such force that later Jaugelis could hardly speak. Then Jaugelis wrote a complaint to the District Attorney. The investigating committee ruled that no signs of a beating were found, only that Jaugelis spoke in a low voice. Several days later, Jaugelis was released for reasons of health.

During the trial, the Nobel Peace Prize ceremonies were held in Norway. Sakharov, whom the government did not allow to leave the country, was represented by his wife. Sakharov tried two evenings to telephone Oslo from Vilnius, but was not successful. The Vilnius Central Post Office took the call, but it was not completed.

Late in the evening, as Academician Sakharov, his son-in-law, Terleckas and another Muscovite, were walking to the post office, they were attacked by hoodlums. Terleckas was struck several times in the face, but the Muscovites were only verbally abused. The apartment where the dissidents met in the evening was under

strict surveillance. During the entire trial, an unoccupied car stood next to the apartment's entrance. The building was constantly surrounded by suspicious characters. Farther up the street, passenger cars were on constant surveillance duty. Persons entering the apartment were openly photographed. "Private" cars which always appeared whenever someone came out of the apartment offered their services.

The organist of the SS Peter and Paul Church received a telephone call from an alleged friend of Academician Sakharov who offered his services if the organist wanted to send something to Moscow.

It was announced that the court's ruling would be read on December 12th at 2 P.M. In fact, the ruling was read at 1:30 p.m. and the witnesses who arrived late were not admitted into the courtroom. The dissidents waited in the building foyer. Academician Sakharov expressed his dismay at such a harsh ruling to the Canadian journalist. The "public" which exited the courtroom after attending the trial with special permits, surrounded the dissidents and began to ridicule and berate them. Among them "poet" Keidosius tried especially hard. The chekists, Col. Krugov and others, were not to be outdone. Lithuanian dissidents protested the fact that the ruling had been made in the name of the Lithuanian nation.

Keidošius and the chekists shouted that only they represent the Lithuanian nation.

Pushing his way from the court building, Sakharov ran up to the standing "crow" (prison vehicle — Ed. Note) and began to pound with his fist, shouting "Bravo, Seriosha!" When the security agents protested the Academician retorted: "This car is only as strong as your government!"

In the evening, a group of Vilnius residents said farewell to Academician Sakharov and some of the dissidents at the railway station.

The next day several Lithuanian women brought flowers to Kovalev's wife.

On December 14th Kovalev's wife was allowed to visit her husband. She told him about the flowers she had received and the good wishes sent him by Vilnius residents. Sergei Kovalev seemed in good health and spirits. The court verdict did not depress him. His only regret was that for several years he would not be able to contribute to the struggle for human rights.

Thus, Kovalev's "open" trial was conducted in such an atmosphere.

On December 12th, while awaiting the court's ruling, Kovalev's friends (A. Sakahrov, V. Turchin, I. Orlov and others) wrote a statement in which they described in detail why and how Kovalev was tried, and what atmosphere and with what deviations from legal standards the trial was conducted. The statement contains the following:

"We declare that Kovalev's trial is a travesty against an honorable and brave man who has sacrificed so much for all the world's inhabitants by defending justice, the free exchange of information and due process."

After Kovalev's trial 174 Soviet dissidents from fifteen cities signed a statement demanding freedom for the accused:

"On December 12, 1975, the well-known scientist, biologist and active participant in the world-wide movement for human rights, Sergei Kovalev, was sentenced to seven years in strict regime labor camps and three years in exile.

"In his public activity for which he was brought to trial, Kovalev always fought against illegality and injustice and endangered himself on behalf of those persecuted for their beliefs. A high-minded opponent of force, he fought with words: by public protest, wide-spread and accurate information. He is one of those who publicly declared they were responsible for the dissemination of the *Chronicle of Current Affairs*. For this, he was convicted as "an especially dangerous criminal."

"During the trial Kovalev attempted to defend the *Chronicle*, and the struggle for human rights against charges of defamation and an anti-government position. By brutally violating the principle of a public trial and trial standards, the court forced Kovalev to refuse further participation in the trial.

"There was a clear tendency to hide these proceedings from the public, to make them actually secret. The purpose of such proceedings and rulings is clear: attempts are made to break us of the habit of responsible citizenship and of active sympathy and help for those whose rights are violated. Attempts are made to return us to the days when similar proceedings were upheld as a matter of course, when not a single voice was heard in protest.

"We believe that the shameful suicidal era will not repeat itself in

our country. We demand an end to the repression of the exchange of ideas and information.

"We demand an end to persecution against those who defend human rights and persons who become victims of political repression.

"We demand that the conviction of Kovalev be overturned."

Among those who signed the above statement are many persons well-known to Lithuanians: A. Sakharov, A. Almarik, E. Boner-Sakharova, N. Bukovsky, T. Velikanova, Grigorenko, Dvasin, D. Dudko, R. Medvedev, I. Orlov, V. Turchin, T. Chidorovich, L. Chiukovskaya, A. Terleckas, V. Petkus and others.

On December 18, the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize Winner Academician Sakharov spoke at a press conference for foreign journalists:

"At the start of this press conference, I would first like to stress that Kovalev was convicted for defending, as dictated by his conscience, other men who he believed had become the victims of injustice . . . The charge did not prove either his intention to undermine the Soviet government or the defamatory nature of his actions. The trial was manifestly illegal: not public, without opposing arguments, without a defense attorney or the defendant, without a final statement. Almost like a Stalin-era "troika!" Or, to use a more modern comparison, like a labor camp trial. . .

"The trial dealt with seven charges which the court attempted to use to prove the defamatory nature of the *Chronicle*. When we wrote the December 12th statement, we did not have on hand any of the *Chronicle* texts used in court as evidence. Today we can assert that in only one or two insignificant instances did the court succeed in casting doubt on the truth of the news in the *Chronicle*.

"Kovalev's arrest and trial is a warning to Soviet and world public opinion. After Helsinki and at the time of the Nobel Prize award ceremonies, the government clearly wished to make a show of strength and force, allowing even our own laws to be held in contempt.

"To leave this warning unanswered would mean the betrayal of a noble man and of vital principles on which so much depends. To demand that Kovalev's conviction be overturned—that is the only possible answer."

S. Kovalev's sacrifice served Lithuania well.

The trial proceedings and persecutions demonstrated that the Lithuanian and Russian nations can be drawn closer together by the actions of the security police.

The Catholics of Lithuania are grateful to Kovalev for his noble humane heart and pray the Almighty to grant him perseverance, health and countless blessings. The sacrifices of Russian dissidents have helped Lithuanians see the Russian nation in a new light.

When he returns from prison, we will greet the Russian scientist S. Kovalev as a brother and great friend.

Letters and Statements

To: The Council of Ministers of the LSSR

Copies to: The LSSR Commissioner for Religious Affairs

All Lithuanian Diocesan Curias

His Excellence Bishop V. Sladkevičius

His Excellency Bishop J. Steponavičius

A Statement from: The priests of the Vilnius Archdiocese

From the very beginning, from the time of the Apostles, the life of the Catholic Church has been under the leadership of bishops with the Pope at the head. The Second Vatican Council greatly clarified the role of bishops, as descendants of the Apostles, as authoritative teachers, consecrators and rulers. Throughout the world, including the newest developing African countries, dioceses are administered by bishops appointed by the Holy See. Only for brief periods, from one bishop's death or resignation to the appointment of the next one, temporary administrators are named without all the powers of a bishop. The dioceses of Lithuania have normally been ruled by bishops. Only in the 19th century, when the tsarist regime determined to weaken or even to destroy the Catholic faith in Lithuania, were the dioceses of Vilnius and Žemaičiai left for a longer time without a bishop.

The priests of the Vilnius Archdiocese, our faithful, as well as all Catholics in Lithuania, are distressed that for close to fifteen years, since the beginning of 1961, Vilnius has not had a Catholic bishop. Bishop Julijonas Steponavičius, who was appointed by the Holy See, has been exiled to far-off Žagarė by order of the state government and is not allowed to perform his duties.

Such a decision by government agencies and such a long exile for the bishop is incomprehensible to the priests and the faithful. We know Bishop Steponavičius as a quiet, conscientious, diligent and loyal citizen. He has never made any anti-Soviet statements nor has he engaged in any anti-Soviet activity during either the bourgeois era or the Nazi occupation or under the Soviet government.

Appointed bishop, he saw to it that priests did the Church's

work in an orderly manner. To our knowledge, there have been some misunderstandings between him and the then Commissioner for Religious Affairs, but only because the Commissioner overstepped his authority by interfering in internal Church affairs, and attempted to force the bishop to destroy his own authority with measures undermining religious life. If such interference has not occurred, Bishop Steponavičius would never have opposed the representatives of the Soviet Government.

We have heard that the faithful in other countries also are scandalized at the bishop's expulsion from Vilnius without any fault on his part, but only because he loved his faith and performed his duties. We would also like to point out that the Holy See had arranged with the Soviet authorities, through Bishop K. (azimieras) Paltarokas, Father Julijonas' candidacy to the bishopric. He was removed without consultation with the Holy See and without warning.

Because, in recent years, the Soviet press and radio constantly stress that Soviet authorities do not interfere in internal Church affairs and because we all want normal relations between State and Church, between the government and believing citizens, we strongly urge the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers to allow Bishop Julijonas Steponavičius to return to Vilnius and quietly perform his duties as bishop.

Vilnius, September 25, 1975.

K. Garuckas, A. Mačiulis, V. Černiauskas, A. Simonaitis, J. Kardelis, J. Baltušis, A. Ulickas, A. Kanišauskas, A. Keina, J. Budrevičius, N. Pakalka, K. Gajausmas, B. Jaura, B. Šakėnas, K. Molis, M. Petravičius, K. Pukėnas, dr. S. Malachovski, N. Jaura, S. Kakarieka, B. Stonys, A. Lachovič, dr. K. Kulak, J. Saulius, C. Taraškevičius, R. Blažys, V. Navicki, P. Daunoras, D. Valančiauskas, N. Norkūnas, J. Kukta, D. Valiukonis, K. Valeikis, J. Slėnis, J. Lauriūnas, S. Valiukėnas, I. Jakutis, S. Tunaitis, A. Merkys, D. Puidokas, A. Petronis, K. Vaičionis, K. Žemėnas, J. Balčiūnas, B. Laurinavičius, H. Kitauskas, J. Vaitonis, A. Andriuškevičius, A. Čiūras, K. Gailius, V. Aliulis, V. Zavadskis, A. Tamulaitis, V. Velimanski, L. Ivančik, J. Obremski, J. Charukievič, P. Jankus, S. Toporek, J. Grigaitis, A. Dziekan, A. Trusevič, J. Tunaitis, M. Žemaitis, S. Markevič, L. Lavcevič.

To: Leonid Brezhnev, Secretary General of the USSR
Central Party Committee

- Copies to:
1. The USSR Commissioner for Religious Affairs
 2. The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
 3. The Lithuanian SSR Commissioner for Religious Affairs
 4. The Administrator of the Vilnius archdiocese

A statement from: Father Vladislovas Černiauskas
Ignalina *rayon*, Mielagėnai

On November 14, 1974 I sent a statement to the Secretary General of the USSR Central Committee. I sent copies to the USSR Commissioner for Religious Affairs, the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Lithuanian SSR Commissioner for Religious Affairs, and the Administrator of the Vilnius Archdiocese. In the statement I detailed the wrongs suffered by the faithful of the Mielagėnai and Trakai parishes at the hands of atheists. I received no reply from any of the above-mentioned agencies. Only on December 26, 1974, I was summoned before the Executive Committee of the Workers' Soviet of Mielagėnai, by the Ignalina *Rayon* Executive Committee Vice-Chairman, A. Vaitonis; and on January 20, 1975 to Vilnius by LSSR Commissioner for Religious Affairs K.(azimieras) Tumėnas.

Annoyed, Commissioner Tumėnas said: "Why do you write statements to Moscow? It is the business of the church committee, and not of the pastor, to write statements." He said that the statement was without foundation and he would pay no attention to such statements in the future. "We will never reply in writing. If such replies were made in writing, foreign radio stations would immediately begin broadcasting everything."

A. Vaitonis said the same: "You must know that your complaints will be forwarded to us. No one will come from Moscow to investigate such trivial matters. No one is giving or will ever give you a reply."

On December 26th Vaitonis showed me permits for church repairs which neither the church committee nor I had seen before, and asserted that they had been sent to the Council of Workers' Deputies of Mielagėnas, that the Church committee knew about this and that they were not obligated to inform me, the parish pastor. I asked to see the document forbidding all repairs to our church, which I and the church committee chairman J. Bajoriūnas were told to sign in May 1974. I was shown a completely different document. What deceit!

Moreover, Vaitonis emphasized that a priest is not allowed to concern himself with church repairs: "Those who take or will take the initiative in leadership will have their horns broken, and we will strip them of the right to perform their priestly duties; and if you perform your priestly duties and take a leadership role, we will force you to stop."

It is clear from the above-mentioned statements by civil government officials that the civil atheist government forbids the repair of churches, but allows their destruction. For example, during the night of July 16-17, 1974 someone broke into the Mielagėnai church, desecrated the Blessed Sacrament, and on April 7, 1975 set fire to the church during services. When the *rayon* police were called, it merely surveyed the damage and did not even attempt to look for the hoodlums. Such circumstances lead us to think that these crimes were committed by local atheists, who have the support of the police.

In all, from the above examples and the November 14, 1974 statement to the Secretary General of the USSR Central Committee, it is clear that the Catholic Church in Soviet Lithuania is cruelly persecuted and against the faithful there is discrimination.

We ask the Secretary General of the USSR Central Committee to ensure the Catholics of Lithuania the right to enjoy the religious freedom proclaimed by the Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Mielagėnai, June 23, 1975

Administrator of the Mielagėnai Church
Father A. Černiauskas.

To: The intellectuals of Western Europe and the Soviet Union:
H. G. Grass, L. Kolskovsky, E. Ionesco, S. Sinyavsky,
A. Solzhenitsyn and A. Sakharov.

A terrible misfortune has once again befallen the Lithuanian nation: on November 5th of this year the talented poet and scientist Mindaugas Tamonis was killed by a train. Once again the secret hand of the KGB has destroyed a 35 year old creative and noble man.

Last year in an open letter Tamonis, chief engineer at the Monument Conservation Institute and doctoral candidate in technical sciences, strongly protested the oppression of the Lithuanian nation and demanded the most basic rights for her. For this daring protest,

Tamonis was committed to the Vilnius Psychiatric Hospital at Vasaros Gatvės No. 5, and held four months.

On June 25th of this year Tamonis addressed a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania, stating his concern about the danger of neo-stalinism and protesting the undermining of Lithuanian culture. On June 27th he was again forcibly committed to the psychiatric hospital. Under the strain of her son's hardships, his mother died of a heart attack on June 29th.

A month later Tamonis was released from the hospital, although recently—before November 5th, that is—he again received a summons to come to the hospital, but did not go.

After returning from the hospital the second time, Tamonis was ignored and persecuted in various ways.

His family—two children and his wife—has lost its bread-winner, the nation has lost an idealistic patriot, a talented poet and scientist. M.(indaugas) Tamonis has paid with his life for a handful of brave words of truth.

On November 5, 1969, the talented lithographer Arūnas Tarabilda, exhausted from the constant struggle for the right to be a conscientious artist and Lithuanian, died of a stroke. This artist, also 35 years old, was also interrogated and then assigned as a recruit to a tank unit where, it is thought, he was exposed to radiation. Thus the meaningful lines of creative work dedicated to Lithuania came to an untimely end.

In the fall of 1970, the talented scholar Dr. J. Kazlauskas, Professor of Lithuanian at the Vilnius University, died under mysterious circumstances. This 40-year-old progressive and active scholar had already incurred the displeasure of the government for his daring theories on Baltic studies.

More similar facts could be cited.

Today the lips of Lithuania's most talented and creative individuals, who refuse to break their ties to their native land, are silenced. Silence is the price of survival. And those who are determined to speak and attain a brighter morrow for their country face great hardships and their days unexpectedly come to an end.

Under conditions of oppression and conformity, it is extremely difficult for the nation to nurture and bring to maturity noble descendants, creative and aggressive individuals. Therefore, their loss is equal to national perdition. Under present circumstances, physical genocide is no longer possible. It is replaced by the subtle, deceitful and persistent destruction of Lithuania's creative individu-

als. This is proven by events of the past years, this is confirmed by the late M. Tamonis. The Lithuanian nation, which was a state for hundreds of years, which created its own culture and amassed great spiritual wealth, cannot be left to the arbitrariness of the historical process. . . She want to keep pace with the progress of life, she wants to enjoy the rights and freedoms which other nations enjoy.

Honorable friends of Lithuania! Your talented, humane works are well known even in Lithuania. Your ideas have met with ardent support in the hearts of many Lithuanians. Your names are uttered here with respect and love.

We ask you to help us in the holy struggle for the freedom of Lithuania, for her brighter future, for the most basic human rights.

We ask you to speak in protest against the wrongs being done us, against the stifling and subtle destruction of our intellectuals, against the tragic fate of M.(indaugas) Tamonis and other intellectuals.

November 1975

Lithuanians

WAY OF CALVARY

To: The Chairman of the USSR Security Committee,
I.V. Andropov

On December 23, 1974 five chekists and two activists of the Communist Youth League came to "wish me a Merry Christmas." In lieu of a Christmas present, they brought a search warrant. In a sense, this is an anniversary, for exactly 30 years ago my parents' home was searched for the first time (Krisvasalis Village, Ignalina *Rayon*).

During 1944-47 I was searched many times without authorization from the Attorney General. During 1949-1955, the chekists were too busy to waste their time on searches. They merely summoned me to the military commissariat and from there took me to the MGB.

After the 20th Party Congress, I was usually searched with formal authorization from the Attorney General. Sometimes, I am searched in secret. For instance, on October 16, 1964 they came to the home of my mother-in-law Uršulė Keraitienė and took her to security headquarters to discuss the affairs of her son-in-law, who, in their words, seldom goes to church and has chosen Russian friends and even

Jews in his fight against the Soviet government. At the same time, other chekists inspected my books and notes.

Why have I been terrorized by the KGB for over thirty years?

My parents owned barely three hectares of land and therefore often had to work for large farm owners. In 1940 the Soviet government gave them three hectares, and in 1944 seven. During 1940-1941 my uncle often tried to convince my father that only "Father" Stalin had saved our family from poverty. Nevertheless, on June 14, 1941 he was deported to Siberia with his wife and small children. On the way, he was separated from his family and sent to a labor camp where he died several months later. His wife also died of starvation.

The night of June 14 to 15, 1941 is indelibly etched in my memory. My parents went to bid farewell to those being deported to Siberia. While waiting for them, I, a 13-year-old boy, became an adult. That night an unquenchable hatred for Stalin was born in my soul. . . . When, as a student, I had to listen to lectures about Stalin's selfless love for the Lithuanian nation, I detested even those who were spreading this lie.

In June 1941 the Russians were replaced by the Germans. They shot people merely because they had been born Jews. I detested Fascism and terrorism with my whole being and I was happy to be of help to Russian war prisoners. However, I was amazed that in the fall of 1942 in Švenčionėliai, Russian-speaking guards did not allow me to approach them. Only during the winter, when the prisoners were guarded by old German soldiers, was I able to give the prisoners my last morsel of bread.

My parents often took in escaped Russian war prisoners and helped them. However in the spring of 1945 the returning Soviet Army thanked my father by "arresting" him. Actually, they were content with merely beating him.

On July 27th I was arrested for belonging to an underground organization, "The Iron Wolf," of which I did not even know. When NKVD soldiers handed us, six "wolves," over to the head of the Švenčionėliai KBZ, he berated them for not having shot us on the spot, because "all Lithuanians are Fascists and bandits." At the time, those bandits were only 13-16 years old. Not only my family, but no one in our village served the occupant. The call-up by the German Army was answered by only one young man and he later ran away. No one joined the Red Army either. The youth of Krisva-

salis became Lithuanian partisans (whom you call bandits). I did not follow their example because I was afraid of weapons and blood, and hoped to survive those years without joining anything. Despite this, security agencies did not allow me to remain an impartial observer.

I was first arrested in 1945 for two months. During those two months I learned many valuable lessons. Lieutenants Mikolaičikas and Pavlov and Sergeant Kizenkov kept fit by beating me and my friends with rifle butts, gun cleaning rods and other tools, they even set the stage for shooting us by ordering us to dig our own graves.

Despite all this, I did not return from prison with any feeling of hatred for my tormentors. I quickly forgot everything, I forgave everything. However, the security police did not forget anything. Security agents probably thought that in two months they had succeeded in turning me into an aware Lithuanian, and began their surveillance on me. They often searched me on trips—in buses and trains.

In the fall of 1946 I came to Vilnius to study and rented a room with my friend V. We were different individuals. V.'s father and brother had already been convicted in 1945 and another brother, the leader of a partisan group, had died in March 1945 in the Labanoras forest in a battle between the NKVD army and 400-500 partisans. V.'s friends—Juozas Bulika and Adolfas Kuryla—were not my friends. However, on May 19, 1949, I was taken to the MGB and charged with maintaining contact with them. It seems that Kuryla had been arrested and Bulika had been recruited and sent to infiltrate a partisan group. V., who was a friend of Bulika and Kuryla, was not even summoned by the MGB. Why? Is it not because he went into hiding in May 1949 to keep from being arrested in our "case," and I was given the opportunity to acquaint myself with a Soviet prison and I seemed more dangerous than he in the eyes of the MGB?

In April 1950, I was again taken to MGB headquarters. Because I had joined the Communist Youth League in 1949, the chekists suggested that I provide information on the alleged defection of their agent Bulika to the enemy. I was also assigned to observe the mood of the students and report by telephone. Not once did I telephone and I was temporarily left in peace.

On April 2, 1952 my friend A. was arrested, charged with organizing dissent against Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Chairman J. Paleckis. Captain Danilchev (today a VRM colonel) tried to

persuade me, as member of the Communist Youth League and the son of a poor family, to help provide information on A., the son of a land-owner.

When I refused, Cap. Danilchev threatened, in the name of the KGB, to hold this against me for life. In the fall of that year, at the request of Monochina, the head of personnel at the Vilnius State University, I was expelled from the Communist Youth League, threatened with expulsion from the university and induction into the army. I was saved by my beggarly social background and most important by Stalin's death. Chekist Bulygin (today an attorney) threatened to "put me away," but he also was prevented by Stalin's death.

After graduating from the university in 1954, I began to work at the Lithuanian branch office of the USSR State Bank. There were no Lithuanians in the department where I worked. Russians who had worked here for ten or more years (some had worked in Lithuania since 1940-1941) knew not a single word of Lithuanian and nothing about Lithuania. I could not convince them that the Lithuanian language was not a German dialect, that Lithuanians did not collaborate with the Germans during World War II and that Lithuania was the only German-occupied country where they did not succeed in forming an SS legion (for which the occupant closed all Lithuanian high schools and some middle schools.) They used to ask me what language I spoke with my daughter and to which school I intended to send her. I had to explain that the national consciousness of Lithuanians was superior to the national awareness of the nomads of the Soviet North. You should have seen the faces of my listeners when I lectured them on such historical facts as, that Lithuania once ruled such cities as Kiev, Kursk, Minsk, Smolensk and that the northern city of Odessa was founded by Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas! So the rumor started that I was a nationalist. Complaints began to flow to the KGB. The bureaucrats persuaded Manager Knyva to remove me from the office.

In the fall of 1955, I was transferred to the Dzerzhinski section and my salary was cut. However, the "thaw" after Stalin's death was still in effect and the manager reassigned me to the office, appointed me assistant city manager, and allowed me to study for my doctoral degree.

After Stalin's death, there started a movement to found Lithuanian schools in Lithuanian ethnographic territories which had been assigned to Byelorussia. I also joined this movement, which was under

the leadership of Academician J. Balčikonis and T. Ivanauskas. Together with students we went to Byelorussia, visited Lithuanian villages, brought Lithuanian-language Soviet newspapers and Lithuanian-language Soviet books. At the same time, Lithuanian schools were also being founded in Poland's former Lithuanian sections. I corresponded with the teachers of those schools and sent them Lithuanian-language Soviet books. I did not think that my activity was against the Soviet Constitution. Nonetheless, the KGB thought otherwise. They sent their agent Titlius, an employee of the "Vaizdas" printers, into the ranks of active members. He suggested to V. Laugalis that an underground organization "The National Front" be established and sought to have an economist at its head. During the Hungarian uprising Laugalis invited me to a meeting of people who thought as he did. Only one of Laugalis' friends came: J. Semėnas. We adjourned without reaching any decision. Several months later Laugalis asked me to take type from Titlius' printing firm. I refused. With this my underground activity came to an end. The spirit of Hungary quickly dissipated. The Lithuanian "conspirators" also quieted down. Laugalis left to teach in a *rayon* school. However, a year after our first and last meeting, the KGB decided to arrest us.

A search on Christmas Eve 1957 yielded no incriminating evidence. The security police interrogated me two days without a break, using the achievements of Academician Pavlov in the field of conditioned reflexes. When even this did not work, they gave me strong narcotics. Cap. (now Colonel) Kolgov persuaded me to drink a bottle of lemonade . . . Afterwards, for an entire week, I was unsure not only of my own fate, but also of that of my family. At the dictation of the Captain, I wrote a "Sincere confession."

Existence in the KGB prison was bearable. All means were used to break my morale; as if by coincidence I was placed in cell 27, from the window of which I could see my pregnant wife at the bus stop each morning taking our four-year-old daughter to nursery school. I was not allowed to shave for an entire month, and was then taken to see my parents, in order to torment them with my appearance and me with my parents' tears. After realizing that I bore solitary confinement well, they brought to my cell Jesuit Father Aleksandras Markaitis, whose health had been completely broken. Imprisoned for the third time, Markaitis suffered from insomnia and the fear that he would immediately be summoned by Col. Martavičius (now head of personnel at the Vilnius trade department) and badly beaten as in

1949. On quiet spring nights we used to hear the tape recorded voices of my children . . .

In addition to allegedly belonging to "The National Front," I was also charged with undermining the foundations of Soviet Marxist philosophy and disseminating the speeches and will of LSSR Supreme Soviet Deputy, Lithuanian classical author Antanas Žukauskas Vienuolis. During the August 1, 1956 session, Vienuolis condemned the polonization of the Vilnius area, and during the spring 1957 session he was not allowed to defend our exiles in Siberia. However both speeches and his will (in which Vienuolis requested that a cross be erected on his grave) were circulated in underground Lithuanian publications.

My accusers did not even dare include such "evidence of guilt" in my case file. However, this evidence played a vital role in determining the length of my sentence. During recesses at the Supreme Court trial Attorney General Galinaitis often ran behind the scenes and huddled with the judge at length. We saw photostatic copies of the above-mentioned evidence in the hands of the Attorney General. They did not forget, either, my ties to the Lithuanians of Byelorussia and Poland. Although, as Interrogator Pilelis asserted, those ties could not be used under the article of the Criminal Code, they did however give foundation to my being characterized as a Lithuanian nationalist.

The court could not prove anti-Soviet agitation which I allegedly carried out at philosophy seminars. Therefore, I was sentenced to only four years. I was convicted not because of actions performed, but because I could have performed them had the vigilant chekists not prevented me.

Seven intellectuals whom I did not know were also tried in our case. One of them was charged with distributing selected works of the Lithuanian classical author Juozas Tumas-Vaižgantas and the poem *Vivos Plango, Mortuos Voco* by Vincas Mykolaitis-Putinas. The trial "proved" that the poet wrote this poem in 1947, and that therefore it is anti-Soviet.

After the trial Capt. Chlopov (now Colonel) assured me: "The extreme climate and hard physical work will cleanse your mind, which has been polluted with nationalistic trash." And how they cleansed it! On one Ozerlag construction site I experienced much hardship. But, when I returned to my homeland, I quickly came to feel that, in the opinion of certain bureaucrats, my mind had

not been "cleansed" sufficiently to entrust me with the position of economist at a salary of 100 rubles.

Finally I was able to find work as a dispatcher.

I left many friends at the labor camps and I regularly corresponded with them. The KGB did not like this. Surveillance was strengthened. The KGB even tried to recruit a close relative, who was supposed to follow me. I wrote about my troubles to R. Skeiveris at the labor camp. Summonses to "talk" with the KGB increased. Col. Dušauskis (now in the reserves), Chief Knedis of the Counter-intelligence Department, Lieut. Col. Kardonovsky, Chekist Karpuchin, of unknown rank and duties, Capt. Ščesnavičius (now Lieut. Col.) all accused me of nationalism. I, in turn, asked them why Russians, Arabs and Africans are proud of their nationalism, but a Lithuanian must be ashamed of his. Why love of Russia is considered Soviet patriotism, but love of Lithuania a bourgeois nationalism? A high-ranking chekist made me an offer: either I write a newspaper article condemning the social system of the once-independent state of Lithuania, or once again I would find myself on trial. I did not write the article. The case was transferred to the people's court of the "Puntukas" factory. V. Grabauskas, head of the laboratory, agreed to re-educate me. He used obvious means to change my views: he tried to force me to become a group leader, join a union, he invited me to participate in holiday demonstrations. For my disobedience Grabauskas imposed economic sanctions: I was paid a salary 30% lower than that paid workers with a high-school education. My family of six lived in a 23-meter apartment with no conveniences. My wife had been promised a promotion and a two-room apartment. Someone telephoned her superior and the dream of improved living conditions vanished.

In the fall of 1967 I was detained near the KGB offices by Cap. Ščesnavičius and forced to have a "talk." He accused me of spreading anti-Soviet rumors which lurk in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's letter to the USSR writers' convention. He tried to persuade me that the letter had been fabricated by foreign intelligence and that this would be revealed by Aleksandr Isaevich Solzhenitsyn himself.

At that time I was taking a correspondence course in history at the State University of Vilnius. I publicly defended my country's history three times. The KGB recorded my statements. On May 23, 1968, at a discussion held at the "Sigma" literary club, I accused playwright Dalia Urnevičiūtė and other writers of distorting historical truth. As a result, Capt. Ščesnavičius and Chekist Karpuchin again

tried to bring me to trial. However, even those who had suffered at my hands refused to be lying witnesses.

For some time I attended lectures on the history of the Lithuanian state and Russian literature along with doctoral candidates. Soon, Vilnius State University Assistant Rector B. Sudavičius banned me from attending these lectures. At the beginning of 1969, he called an urgent meeting of the Lithuanian History Faculty and demanded that professors use every means to prevent my earning a history degree. This task was undertaken by Dr. S. Lazutka, who offered to advise me in my doctoral work. Although I was aware that Lazutka was active in the Communist Party (he was a section head) and was Assistant Rector of the Vilnius State University, I still fell for his pseudoliberalism. I wrote my thesis on the subject "Lithuania under Russian Rule (1795-1915)" and submitted it to my advisor. On the morning of April 25th, I was visited by three security agents, including Capt. Ščesnavičius. They confiscated old pre-war magazines, books on Lithuanian history, and notes from books and magazines. Several days later, when he returned the rough draft of my thesis, Major Kazys (now Colonel) warned me: If I value my freedom, I must not show anyone my work, which is steeped in hatred for Russia. . . Prison for lack of love for Tsarist Russia? Why must I love her? Because it weakened the Lithuanian-Polish state by diplomatic and military means and brought slavery to my nation in 1795? Or perhaps because my father was forced to fight in the defense of her imperialist interests? My father returned from the war an invalid.

At that time, the KGB continued trying to make a case against me. Someone named Juozas Bernotas appeared. He urged me and V. Petkus to help him fight the Soviet government, he berated us for our passivity and so on. He suggested that we form a committee for the defense of Ginsberg and Galanskov. This experienced agent provocateur did not succeed.

When I returned home late in the evening of January 14, 1972 I found Capt. Trakimas (now Major). He took me to hear the long and insulting monologues of Col. Ščesnavičius.

That night, a search of Pyotr Yakir's apartment in Moscow turned up Simas Kudirka's speech at his trial, and in the Vilnius apartment of Stasys Jakas, a typewriter on which this speech had been typed. The KGB decided that this was my work. Again I was summoned to the KGB, interrogated. . . The KGB accused Jakas, a Communist, and his friend Vaclovas Sevrukas, a member of the Com-

munist Youth League, of having been lured by nationalists; they urged him to help unmask the nationalists, and promised him freedom in exchange for evidence against me. When they did not obtain any evidence to "unmask" me, the KGB could not prosecute me. But Col. Baltinas predicted that "by walking on the edge of an abyss, you will soon find yourself in prison."

On May 23, 1973 the militia detained two confectionary department expeditors: L. Geicas and F. Svirskis. I was temporarily in charge of that department. The expeditors admitted that during the quarter they had shipped 210 rubles worth of goods without authorization": At militia headquarters three confectionary department employees asserted that over nine months I had stolen a large sum of money with which I financed the nationalist underground. In exchange for testimony against me, the expeditors who were caught with the evidence were released, and I was arrested.

Everyone at the city militia was jubilant. First Lieut. Gedmantas boasted that he had had me under surveillance for several years and had been assigned to fabricate a bribery case against me. "Then," he said, "a 15-year sentence would have been a certainty, but now we will still have to work on it."

The interrogation began not with an explanation of the facts in the case, but with conversation on side issues. Major Lashchenko, who was easily recognized as trained by the KGB, treated me like a condemned man and was surprisingly honest. Speaking on the subject of nationalism, I agreed that small countries must be assimilated. But the loss of their identity will take place over several centuries and, therefore, I saw no need to accelerate it by artificial means. But the Major asserted that the natural process of assimilation is "painful," and for that very reason all means used to accelerate the blending of nations is justified. He condemned my views and ended the "discussion" with the following words: "You did not see how we crushed the Hungarian uprising. If you had seen it, you Lithuanians would not raise your heads. Lithuania! Your Lithuania is like a flea, see (he made an expressive gesture with his thumbnail) and it is gone!"

After searching my apartment Major Lashchenko returned only with copies of old Lithuanian magazines. As my family later told me, the Major was extremely upset by the map which hung in my room (a map printed in Soviet Poland) depicting Lithuania in the 16th century. How can such a map be shown to school children?

In the detention cell (KPZ) there always happen to be prisoners

in similar circumstances, someone happens to have the means of contacting the outside world and is prepared to help you. There are stories about the punishment you can expect, about the futility of resisting the government, about the possibility of freedom (if you are submissive and collaborate with them). As a rule, during the first most difficult days, these persons try to explain the things the interrogator failed to instill. With me there "happened" to be the assistant chief of the Vilnius industrial supply department, J. Žemaitis, whose childhood friend was none other than KGB Colonel Dushansky. Because I did not fall for the suggestions of the "benefactor", the gates of the Lukiškis prison closed behind me several days later. There were six of us in an eight-square-meter cell. My new friends were murderers, robbers, pickpockets and retarded teenagers. It was unbearably stifling from the cheap tobacco smoke and the stench of the toilet. The soup was made from dried potatoes and salted tomatoes (9 rubles per month were allotted for food). Several days later I was transferred to a similar cell. This also is done purposely, because rumors quickly spread about a person who is transferred often from cell to cell, that he is a "stool pigeon," (a recruited agent). Such persons are usually killed by the prisoners.

The KGB agent at the Lukiškis prison, Major Strelchenya, entered my cell and spoke to me as to an old friend, though I had never seen him before. The prisoners could also have killed me for my connection with the "godfather" (security agent). All the news was discouraging. Luggage thief A. Gorelov assured me that he had read of Academician Sakharov's death in *Izvestia*. . . However, the thief Lionius who was right there remembered seeing this same Gorelov at the Vilnius station wearing a militia officer's uniform.

I was assigned a new interrogator, 1st Lieut. Vasiliauskas, who tried very hard to build a strong criminal case, but there was no evidence except for the testimony of those two expeditors. I wrote to the Vilnius City District Attorney, citizen Topol, asking permission to meet with my lawyer. I received a negative reply, stating that since I am an adult and not blind, I can meet with my lawyer only when the interrogation is completed. The interrogator forwarded my case to the psychiatric commission, and also transferred me to the cell of the swindler Boris Bernstein who was serving a 15-year sentence. Bernstein, acting the lawyer, assured me that I would perish in the cellars of the psychiatric prison hospital. Although the commission found me sane on June 12th, on August

4th I was housed in cell 379 of the prison psychiatric hospital. It is difficult to describe in words the suffering of its inhabitants and the atmosphere. Anicetas Skarulis, Vaclovas Strupinskas, Jonas Liubartas, Petras Ivanauskas are all very unfortunate. One sings, another prays, a third looks for food in the toilet. . . They all cry from the painful aminazine injections with which they are treated three times daily. Valius Šaltis, who is only feigning insanity, is also being "treated" with aminazine. His family history is sad: his father, a Communist, was shot by the Germans. The oldest son was tied to a tree next to his murdered father and lost his sanity during the night. The mother remarried and this was her 19-year-old son Valius . . . Informers in the cells and eavesdroppers in the hallways have long since informed the prison administrators that Valius is feigning insanity. It is no secret that the administration can also observe the behavior of prisoners on television monitors. Then why must he be tortured with aminazine?

From time to time Doctor Strimaitienė would visit the cell. In her eyes, you could see nothing but burning hatred for her patients. It is not without reason that one prisoner, locked up here for distributing leaflets in the city of Panevėžys, assured me that this hospital's psychiatrists were themselves seriously ill. Only they heal themselves not with aminazine . . .

As a rule, one is not taken from the psychiatric hospital for interrogation. But interrogator Vasiliauskas, intending to apply greater pressure, considered it appropriate to summon me and inform me that my wife was in critical condition following an operation, that my children were alone, that I was suspected of having schizophrenia and that new charges had been brought against me. At the same time, he started a rumor in Vilnius that I was in a psychiatric hospital.

Security agents tried to convince my wife that a severe sentence was in store for me and that it would be best if she were to certify that I was mentally ill! My wife replied with two protests.

On October 8th I was summoned by the attending physician, Dr. Senionienė. Before beginning the interview, she gave me some kind of pill. She was only interested in my political views and asked questions that only a KGB agent would ask. As she was leaving, she stated that I would have to "be a guest" of this hospital until spring. But four days later I was unexpectedly summoned by the commission which had obviously been convened to confirm the finding that I was mentally ill.

Although I was not given any medication detrimental to my health and the medical staff treated me with unusual courtesy, I am nevertheless convinced that most of the employees of this hospital are paid not by the health department alone . . . The hands of these doctors would undoubtedly not falter in fulfilling the vilest order from "above." If my wife had not protested, I would have been released with my health damaged to the same extent as that of doctoral student Mindaugas Tamonis when he returned from the hospital.

Prisoners are usually taken from the hospital cell to the prison interrogation cell. I was placed for three days in a solitary confinement cell with broken windows. Then I was thrown into cell 149, occupied by a chronic psychiatric hospital patient, the murderer Stasys Jonaitis, and a patient feigning insanity. Living conditions were worse than in the psychiatric cell. Only after urgent demands and protests was I transferred to cell 73, where most of the prisoners were comparatively sane. When I looked into a shard of glass (instead of a mirror) I saw a very sick man. . .

Interrogations continued. They began taking me to the city militia for interrogations and often transported me by passenger car, obviously so I could catch a glimpse of fall in Vilnius and then contrast that sight with my life in the filthy Lukiškis hole.

Sometimes I was allowed to meet with my brothers. Because my wife was gravely ill, meetings and news from home were never happy. At the same time, pressure was being increased during interrogations. When Interrogator Vasiliauskas could not find any proof of my guilt, he made every effort to wring testimony from witnesses, even during face-to-face confrontations. For instance, on November 2nd, he corrected the transcript in which the testimony of witness G. Matveika was inaccurately related, only after I threatened to jump out of the window or slash my wrists. Because I refused to sign the transcripts, he began to fabricate face-to-face confrontations, which had not even taken place.

During the trial the defense attorney demanded that I be acquitted because my guilt had not been proven. I was nevertheless given a one-year sentence. They could not "squeeze out" any more than that. I must admit that our present trials are not as they were in 1958. Now at least formal proof of guilt is required. And a year is still not considered punishment here. Moreover, after spending seven months in prison before the trial, one cannot expect to be acquitted. Such events do not occur here.

During the remaining five months, I was still in great danger.

Despite my requests that I be placed in an solitary cell after the trial, I was assigned a common cell. I had great difficulty defending myself here, among criminals. Belongings were taken away, weak persons were beaten, eighteen would gang up on one, at random. They tried to force me to participate also. When I refused, they threatened that, if the victim was to die, they would testify that I had instigated the fight.

On January 18, 1974, I was taken to the Vilnius strict regime labor camp, on the site of the former Visitationist Fathers monastery and the nearby Sacred Heart of Jesus Church. Here the ever-present eye of the security police could also be felt. This eye was assistant head of the work detail Ivanov. The labor camp was full of *agents provocateurs*. They offered their services in every way imaginable, with the intention of dragging me into the midst of swindlers. On my last night at the labor camp, the warehouse where I worked was robbed. The agents spread the rumor that my friends were responsible. Interrogations began. Fortunately, no witnesses were found . . .

After returning home I hoped that I had already been sufficiently punished for my national and political views and the KGB would leave me in peace. My hope did not come true. After a few days I was again summoned by militia Capt. Deneikin and later by Lieut. Ganatauskas. He treated me very roughly. The Lieutenant informed me that he had the right to summon me for "a talk" every month for five years, so that I would not decide, for instance, to steal a fire hose from the theater where I worked as a fireman.

On December 2, 1974 I went to the "open" trial of my acquaintance Petras Plumpa and his friends. I was allowed in, but the next day I was asked to leave the courtroom.

During the performances of the American City Center Joffrey Ballet Company I was barred from coming to work at the theater under orders from the KGB. I then came as a spectator. I was later followed by Chief Mykolas Šližys of the Fire Prevention Bureau who forbade me to enter the employee cafeteria for a mug of beer. Three tails under the orders of KGB agent for Vilnius theater facilities First Lieut. Gulbin followed me even into the men's room.

After the Americans had left, the above-mentioned citizen Šližys, personnel director (Mrs) Lipšicienė and former theater director Laurušas had a talk with me. These theater employees stated that the Opera and Ballet Theater is an ideological institution, a cradle of Lithuanian culture, a primary objective under the pro-

tection of the KGB, which is demanding that I be dismissed because I see and hear too much here. In the words of the director, if a university graduate with two degrees works for 65 rubles, he is either sick or has other motives . . . They suggested that I write a voluntary letter of resignation. I asked the Prosecutor to defend me against discrimination. I was then transferred for nine months to monitor the automatic fire-prevention system in a closed booth, so I would have no opportunity to influence those who were true Soviet thinkers . . .

On the morning of December 23, 1974 I was intercepted by chekists; they brought me back to my apartment and turned everything inside out looking for the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*. Major Kalakauskas was astonished that I, who in his view so hated everything Russian, would read Russian-language books. Was I not afraid of becoming russified? I assured the chekists that even my grandchildren would not become russified. And as for hatred, I am not the only one who is annoyed nowadays when an employee who has worked in Lithuania thirty or more years, insolently shouts: "Speak Russian!" or "I don't understand Lithuanian."

Here is just one of many facts: In 1972 I ordered some gas. It was not delivered. It was not delivered even after a repeat order. The reason: I ordered it in Lithuanian. I expressed my grievance not to the *Chronicle* but to the Lithuanian Communist Party organ *Tiesa*. Although my complaint was not printed, the gas company management for a time understood my native tongue. After my arrest they nonetheless paid back my family: for a long time they did not fill orders or delivered half-empty tanks. Currently they no longer take orders in Lithuanian. I will again have to demand and attain what is guaranteed by our Constitution. I do not like all of your laws, but, since I am a Soviet citizen, I respect them but demand that my rights be also respected.

My children are also under surveillance by the security police. During a search Major Krasnikov asked my wife's mother whether her son-in-law is not preventing the children from becoming Soviet citizens. During our talks, they constantly referred to them. "Special" attention is given them in school. For instance, on May 14, 1974 the homeroom teacher of my son Gintas summoned my wife and informed her that the school administration was very concerned that her 15-year old son had disappeared somewhere for a whole hour on a particular day (the first anniversary of the death of Romas

Kalanta). However, it is doubtful that this "concern" will have more influence on my children than life itself, which differs in so many respects from what they are taught in school. Searches, my arrests, summonses to the security police have had a greater influence on my children than Soviet or anti-Soviet activity. Even before coming into this world, they had fallen into a whirlpool of searches (in 1957 my wife was eight-months pregnant; on May 25, 1969 she was also pregnant and several days later gave birth to our one-month premature son Ramūnas). Later their bookcases and their children's clothes were subjected to searches. In 1972 when I was taken to the security police in a Gaz-69 car, three-year -old Ramūnas began from then on to fear that make of car . . . After returning from the courtroom he told his grandmother that he will blow up all prisons when he grows up. And yet no one prodded him.

I get the impression that the security police is trying by every means and on every occasion of "re-education" to frighten me, to break me physically and morally and turn me into an obedient robot. Many chekists have expressed this more than once without any qualms. As early as 1958 Capt. Jenkevičius (now reserve Col.) stated: "We must frighten you so you will be afraid, otherwise you will begin shooting at us from behind corners. If your knees don't shake when you pass the security police, they will shake when you return from Siberia." . . . On November 15, 1972 Capt. Markevičius (now Major) boasted that the court had sent all those he had interrogated into the next world.

At that moment, Major Kazys rushed into the office and quickly blurted out: "Terleckas? Aren't you in jail? I can't sleep, knowing you are walking our Soviet soil!"

And Col. Baltinas stated very candidly: "You will never live in peace." Quite recently after the funeral of Mindaugas Tamonis (11/10/75) during which I was a pall-bearer and silently participated until the end of the ceremonies, a chekist named Vladas threatened me through a 16-year-old student I know in the following terms: "We'll take care of you also." Does the KGB really think it will succeed in frightening me to the point that I will be afraid even to attend my friends' funeral?

Even summonses for "re-education" are made with the purpose of instilling terror. In July 1972, for example, I was taken down a long corridor where on every door the sign "interrogation in progress" was lit up. I knew that after the May demonstrations in Kaunas and the July events at the Sports Stadium, "guests" were

plentiful at the security police. But were they all really being questioned at one time?

Because my acquaintances number many Russians and Jews, the chekists try to frighten them by assuring them that their friends are persons whose hands have been bloodied. God grant that our enemies' hands be as clean! In this regard, I would like to mention a man who has been serving over twenty-five years in labor camp. Jonas Abukauskas was the leader of a partisan group in 1948, and was given the order to shoot a "people's defender." The wife and young children begged mercy for their husband and father. Jonas did not carry out the order. Soon he himself surrendered to the government and started a family. He was arrested and sentenced to the firing squad. He spent nearly a year on death row. His wife has long ago remarried, and his daughters have never seen their father, but Jonas has never regretted having shown mercy to his enemies. At the prison camp, where only Lithuanians and Latvians lived in one barrack, he planned to escape. When the attempt failed, Abukauskas and three others assumed all responsibility. Their sentences were extended. If Jonas survives 28 years of imprisonment he will be my best, my dearest guest.

During closed meetings, security agents at various offices have no kind words for me. Hearing of this, my acquaintances try to frighten me also. They say that the time has now come to bury me. Nonetheless, I am not worried. First, because I am prepared for any sacrifice whatsoever. In my opinion, not a single drop of blood will be in vain. Second, because the KGB is afraid of my views, but do not believe I would dare take concrete action. Otherwise, they would follow me more circumspectly. Currently this is done too openly—I am followed by chekists whom I know by sight or, for instance, by theater director-administrator P. Vaivada. . . It seems that no one in Moscow is interested in us. But on March 3, 1975, the day we left from the Byelorussian station there appeared "our" agent who sometimes does surveillance duty at V. Petkus' apartment in Vilnius. . .

Although the KGB could find ways to dismiss me from the theater, it has thus far been content with harassment. In February of this year a convention of Lithuania's cultural employees was held at the theater. I was relieved of my duties. On November 6th, after being on duty for four hours, I was told to go home and return the next day, but even then I was told to leave. Don't they trust me? Don't they want me to see how, soldiers rush around on holidays look-

ing for crowds and even search office desks? Although only seven firemen out of twenty-two are ex-prisoners, on November 7th, Albinas Žiedūnas, former choral director of Lithuania's ensembles who has spent fifteen years in labor camps and in exile, was on duty.

To top it all, in May of this year two television monitors (not at my post) disappeared. Security Capt. Bernatavičius questioned only me. In other words, I alone am a potential thief.

Following a search in December 1974, I was asked at the security police whether I did not wish to change my political views. Certainly not! After living through so much in thirty years, I cannot become enamored of your government. In fact, not much is required of me: to praise the government occasionally and, during holiday demonstrations, to pass the reviewing stand with a sign or flag in hand. But I am cured of even such cheap concessions. I do not know how to love my enemy. And that the chekists are my enemies was clearly stated by Col. Baltinas. When I asked him how I should address him, his answer was precisely this: "Just don't use 'comrade'. You are my enemy." What does "enemy" mean if no action is taken? No trial has proven any anti-Soviet activity on my part. I never fought against the Soviet government and never agitated against it. Even without love, I can still be loyal to your government in Lithuania even under such circumstances. I remain silent. I have remained silent for five years of my own will. What does the KGB want from me when they conduct searches, summon me for interrogation, threaten me?

Citizen General, you are probably being assured that tens of thousands of Lithuanians have almost completely "quieted down" after serving in your labor camps. Only a handful of "madmen" continues a struggle doomed to defeat—their struggle against the Soviet government. You only need to deal with this small handful and Lithuania will be quiet and peaceful, like Byelorussia. Don't you believe it! During the Kaunas demonstration there was not a single labor camp inmate in the street.

You have probably not been told of the events that occurred in 1972 at the Vilnius Sports Stadium during the international handball (played on a soccer-type field—Trans, note) tournament. Teenagers and students staged a noisy "sick-out" during the first days of the meet in support of Swedish, German and other teams, excluding the Soviet team. The next day it was necessary to hand out tickets in factories and workshops where Lithuanians make up barely 10-20% of the work force. Shouldn't we contemplate this? We should also

consider why bi-lingual Russian and Lithuanian programs have disappeared in Vilnius schools? The nationalists could not have closed them down. I am certain that Lithuanian Communists are not guilty either. Then who is guilty?

First Lieutenant Daugalis said that, with my views, it is dangerous to live in Lithuania. But what should I do? I do not want to emigrate. For an aware Lithuanian there is less danger of assimilation in Lithuania than there, in the West. I do not consider the Lithuanian nation better than others. But I would consider it a great misfortune if I had to speak a foreign language with my grandchildren.

Our reality is very far from idea. But I believe in progress, and this progress, I think, does not require my help. Therefore, I remain aside from all *Chronicles*. . . although the KGB has more than once harassed me regarding them. In my view, the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania* is dangerous to you only as a testimony of the Lithuanian underground. Well, with the Vatican's help you will deal with it also (*The Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania* does not agree with this view of A. Terleckas. — Ed. Note.)

I hope everything will change for the better. Although Lithuanian Security Captain Markevičius mourns the passing of the Stalinist era; although he regrets that today he cannot without interrogation or trial send me and "those like me" to the Arctic Regions to "incite the polar bears," those days will nonetheless not return. I ask you to direct the Lithuanian KGB to leave me in peace.

Respectfully yours,
Antanas Terleckas

Vilnius, November 23, 1975

WHOSE TURN AFTER M.(INDAUGAS) TAMONIS?

In 1973 several members of the chorus were fired from the Opera and Ballet Theater for writing anti-Soviet slogans on the Vilnius Cathedral. In December 1974, a substantial "purge" of personnel was begun at the theater. Many who were politically unreliable were dismissed. Political prisoner Antanas Terleckas, employed as a fireman, anticipated this action and wrote a complaint to the city Prosecutor. A year later a new "purge" epidemic spread through the theater. One of the first victims was Assistant Director Algis Jasilionis who was accused of hiring a nationalist "element." He was forced to leave the theater "of his own free will." He was followed by several dozen engineering and service personnel employees.

On December 8, 1975 Terleckas was fired from his job. His transgression was that on November 9th he had absented himself from his post. That day, Terleckas had received permission to leave work for an hour to help a friend lay a wreath on Tamonis' grave. Realizing that Terleckas had witnesses, the theater management changed the order: now he was accused of leaving the theater on November 25th. On that very day he escorted Kovalev's wife to the railway station after she had brought her husband food.

Theater director-administrator Vaivada, local union committee chairman Vasiliauskas, and Chief Sinaitis of the Fire Prevention Bureau submitted substantial fabricated "proof and personally spoke nothing but lies at the trial. The "weighty" points made by the theater management in firing Terleckas from his job is evident in the following conversation between fireman Terleckas and theater employee, USSR folk artist Jonas Stasiūnas:

"It's good you were only fired."

"And what else could they do to me?"

"But you were at the railway station to meet Sakharov!..."

"Yes I was, but I had already been fired. I don't see anything wrong in that. I love Sakharov and his friends, so I went. You go meet your friends, and I go meet mine . . ."

"You should raise your children to be Soviet individuals."

"What does that mean? To be cowards? There are already enough cowards in Lithuania."

"Therefore you are brave."

"If anything, you can certainly envy my courage. . ."

"Comrade Director, be sure to relate at the trial that Comrade Terleckas went to the station to meet Sakharov. No court will return him to his job. . ."

However, on January 15th, after three sessions, the court reinstated the fireman. The lies were too obvious. The court was forced to make a ruling extremely distasteful to the security police and the theater management.

After coming to work on January 16th, Terleckas did not boast of his triumph, he behaved unpretentiously, but was soon told to leave the theater by Vaivada, who claimed not to have received the court's ruling. The theater management will not be working for nearly an entire week because a party convention will be held at the facilities.

The conflict with the theater management (it is common knowledge that the security police stands behind it) made the unknown fireman famous. As soon as he showed up at the theater, the

fireman was asked by the "purged" staff to relate his meetings with Sakharov, the details of Kovalev's trial and so on.

Security will of course make every effort to rid itself of this "agitator." A clash exists between the interests of the weak fireman and the omnipotent security police. How will it end?

When detained at the railway station, V. Petkus was told by security Colonel Baltinas: "Sevrukas and Tamonis stayed at the Vasaros 5 Psychiatric Hospital, now it is Terleckas' turn, and then yours." Terleckas was himself politely threatened by Major Kalaukauskas that Tamonis' fate awaits him. Only the future will show whether the security police dares send A. Terleckas to the psychiatric hospital a second time.

* * *

NEWS FROM THE DIOCESE VILNIUS ARCHDIOCESE

Vilnius

On June 5, 1975 (Miss) Broné Kibickaitè was dismissed from her position as computer center engineer at the Vilnius State University.

At the beginning of September 1974, (Miss) Kibickaitè was told by Mathematics School Dean Merkys: "We have to let you go." He slipped a sheet of paper towards her and suggested she write a statement that she was leaving work of her own free will.

"Why do you need my statement? Write an order," suggested (Miss) Kibickaitè.

"We have no basis . . . Please understand us. Write the statement and it will be better for both you and us. We will give you a good recommendation," explained the dean.

"I am not asking for mercy, if I have done something wrong, fire me."

"Please understand us," begged the dean.

Similar conversations took place not only at the dean's office but in the workroom and the director's office. When (Miss) Kibickaitè asked "Why am I being fired?" they all replied: "We don't know. Please understand us."

One month, two passed and Kibickaitè continued to work at her job. When the security police learned that (Miss) Kibickaitè had not yet been dismissed, they forced her superiors to hurry:

"What? We have dealt with worse cases. How do you operate, if

you cannot deal with 'her kind'. Make the circumstances!"

Party secretary Apynis told Miss Kibickaite:

"If you do not leave voluntarily, we will have to write reprimands for good work and you will still be fired."

The computer center director added:

"And complaints will not help you in any way, we will come out winners everywhere."

Miss Kibickaite asked Apynis:

"Could you as secretary of the party organization explain what I have done wrong?"

"No! We are powerless. We are being pressured, we are pressuring you. Because of you we are being swamped with problems. Either you leave work, or we three: the dean, the director and I, must leave."

As (Miss) Kibickaitė was writing a statement in the director's office that she was leaving work "of her own free will" and again asked the reason for her dismissal, the director timidly murmured: "Religion."

Bronė Kibickaitė had worked seven years as engineer at the Vilnius State University computer center.

Vilnius

On December 11 and 12, 1975 an inter-republic scientific conference on "Catholicism and the Current Ideological Struggle" was held in Vilnius at the main building of the Academy of Sciences. It was sponsored by the Committee on Foreign Ideological Trends under the Community Studies Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, the Academy of Community Studies under the Communist Party Supreme Soviet Institute of Atheistic Studies, and the Philosophy, Law and Sociology Department of the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences History Institute.

Display cases in the conference hall contained exhibits of atheist books widely published in Lithuanian. However, they also included *The New Testament*, *The Book of Psalms*, *The Ritual*, and *The Decrees of Vatican Council II*, printed by present-day Lithuanian state printers. These books, which become collector's items from the very day of their publication, were meant to prove the existence of "freedom" of conscience in Lithuania to the ordinary conference participant.

The participants, who gathered in that same hall on the evening of December 11th for the solemn commemorative concert marking

the 100th anniversary of the birth of M.K. Čiurlionis, were also treated to a similar display of "freedom" of expression in Lithuania.

Vilnius

The Museum of Atheism no longer has a visitors book. Whenever anyone asks about it, museum employees ask the visitor who he is and where he is from.

The official position on Father Ylius has been changed at the museum. Now it states that Father Ylius was responsible for the provisioning and medical care of armed bands, and that medicine and money were found in the hiding place under the organ (earlier it stated that weapons were hidden there.)

Vilnius

Employees of the State Library had been asked by the family of M.(indaugas) Tamonis to take pictures of the wake at their apartment and of the funeral. (Tamonis' father works at the State Library.)

Two days after the funeral, Library Director Jurgaitis demanded to see the funeral photographs. Because the photographs had not yet been developed, Director Jurgaitis took the negatives.

It was noted that an unknown individual was in the director's office at the time.

Although the family of Tamonis asked that the negatives be returned, they have not yet received them.

Vilnius

December 2, 1975 marked the start of the 6th World Handball Tournament held in Vilnius. Many teams of foreign athletes arrived in the city. The Vilnius *Pergalė* confectionary factory was assigned to see to the needs of one of them. Before the arrival of the guests, factory director Ugianskis suddenly received an order to remove all slogans, posters and other writings in Russian from the walls and leave only those in Lithuanian.

When this order was carried out, only one poster remained hanging in the entire factory.

Kačergiškė

At the crossroads of the road to Vydžius and Tverečius there stands a small church which has been served by the priests of the small Paringis parish ever since it lost its priest. In 1961,

when Paringis pastor Father Jašiukis (who later died in an accident) declined to serve the Kačergiškė parishioners, those duties were assumed by Pastor Balčiūnas. He built a rectory near the church. The Vice-Chairman of the Ignalina *rayon* committee summoned Father Balčiūnas and said: "I was thunderstruck when I learned you've become the curse of Kačergiškė." Father Balčiūnas was forbidden to serve the faithful of Kačergiškė in their church. The church committee was dismissed, taxes were refunded and the church was closed in 1962. Plans were made to demolish it, but when it was learned that this church was on the list of cultural monuments, it was not demolished. The closed church is used as a grain warehouse.

Karkažiškis

(Švenčioniai *Rayon*) Father N.(ikodemus) Jaura served the Pabradė and Karkažiškis churches until 1963. Using this as a pretext, the Švenčioniai executive committee refused to confirm the church committee of the large and beautiful Karkažiškis church, and ordered it annexed to the Pabradė church committee. When this was done, the government closed the Karkažiškis church, which was left without a separate church committee. Father Aliulis, then deacon of Švenčioniai, was ordered by Religious Affairs Commissioner Rugienis and other government representatives who participated in the closing of this church, to carry out the Blessed Sacrament wrapped in a cloth. Father Aliulis somehow succeeded in getting permission to carry out the Blessed Sacrament in the ciborium.

The faithful of this parish are still unsuccessfully begging Vilnius and Moscow bureaus through various petitions to give them back their church. The church itself still stands empty.

KAUNAS ARCHDIOCESE

Meškuičiai

On the evening of November 18, 1975 a student returning from school was detained near the Hill of Crosses. The security agent asked where the boy was coming from. When he replied that he was coming from school and that his home was nearby, he was released.

As he passed the Hill of Crosses, he saw a group of people uprooting the crosses on the hill and loading them on trucks. One truck had already been loaded with crosses brought from

the hill and another had been started. And several other trucks were still standing empty.

The enraged atheists of Meškuičiai were not content with taking the crosses which already numbered close to four hundred, not counting the small ones, most of which had been hung on a beautiful maple growing at the top of the hill. Countless times atheists had built bonfires of crosses, statues and other religious articles near that beautiful maple standing on the hill. But the maple remained green and a cross shone in its crown. This time the atheists acted even more brutally: they cut down the tree hung with crosses, rosaries and pictures.

Some of the destroyers of crosses are beginning to wake up: Some did not attend this latest destruction of crosses. One of them stated: "My wife is very religious and is upset at the desecration of crosses. She is sick now and I will not be her murderer." Another fell ill as he was preparing for this dishonorable work. The most vehement planners of the destruction of crosses are Stepas Česnauskas, secretary of the Communist Youth League, the Communist driver Simanavičius and security agent (Mrs) Dimskienė. They are all from Meškuičiai.

Perhaps this time the atheists were disturbed by that beautiful maple growing on the Hill of Crosses because it had been planted in 1918. It was planted by young people on the occasion of the re-establishment of Lithuania's independence.

Meškuičiai

In October 1975, the author of this article witnessed the following scene at the Meškuičiai hill.

At eight o'clock in the morning a bus approached the hill and a large group of young people—students and high school students—emerged from it. The young men took a cross from the bus and assembled it at the foot of the hill, while the girls decorated it with rue. Then they all carried it up the hill, each trying to at least touch this honorable burden. Candles were lit around the tall cross and all knelt down to pray:

"Lord, grant us the strength to courageously profess our faith and show that we love You!

"Lord, help us overcome our nation's present-day evils: disbelief, incontinence and drunkenness!

"Lord, be merciful to those who demolish with sacriligious hands the crosses we erect and destroy the holy places of Lithuania!"

Kaunas

In the Old Town, at Santakos g. 14, funeral home facilities have been established. Regulations governing their use have been posted. Among other things, it contains the following:

"At the funeral parlor facilities, it is forbidden:

- to change the existing decor;
- to use religious pictures or other religious articles;
- to sing religious hymns;
- to use the services of cult servants;
- to arrange for burial ceremonies with religious rites within the facilities."

These regulations were endorsed by the Kaunas City Executive Committee on February 21, 1975.

Kaunas

The Kaunas City Executive Committee has most strictly forbidden the monument workshop "Ažuolas" (near Atramos g.) to cut the image of the cross into the monuments on order. Since November 1st various inspectors have been making daily visits to check how the rules are being carried out.

Workers are forced to finish the monument, that is cut the cross, outside the workshop gates.

Kaunas

For over ten years now the Church of Igula in Kaunas has been closed. In 1965, in broad daylight, many Kaunas residents witnessed how hired workers removed the crosses from the church. For ten year the remaining metal posts stood bare. In the fall of 1975, for one week, the Church of Igula was again adorned with small crosses. Then the crosses were again removed and some time later globes were put up, supposedly symbolizing the world and space ship. This is totally inconsistent with the principles of restoration, which demand authenticity. Thousands of Kaunas residents remember how the crosses of the Church of Igula looked.

Baubliai

During the night in the spring of 1975, militiamen surrounded the woods located in the village of Baubliai and used a bulldozer to demolish and level a wayside shrine repaired by the people and the graves of Lithuanian partisans near the shrine.

Utena

Kaunas resident (Miss) Petruškevičiūtė, a college graduate assigned by the ministry to work as specialist at the Utena knitting mill, was urged to join the party. Later she was told that if she did not join the party, she would be dismissed from work. When she refused to join the party, she was dismissed from her position as specialist by order of the director and was replaced by partymember (Mrs) Jankauskienė, a high-school graduate. When her co-workers learned of (Miss) Petruškevičiūtė's dismissal, they all went to see the director and protest her dismissal from the position of specialist. The director explained to the workers that (Miss) Petruškevičiūtė was not qualified to work as specialist. The workers, angered by the director's order, wrote a complaint to the Ministry of Industry signed by all (about 60 persons). The complaint stated that (Miss) Petruškevičiūtė had been unjustly dismissed from her position because her work shift not only carried out the work plan, but surpassed it. The workers are now waiting for a reply and hope to keep Petruškevičiūtė in her position of specialist for a whole year, because she has been working for only two years and, under Soviet law, workers appointed by the Ministry cannot be dismissed from their position for three years.

Rokiškis

On November 30, 1975 Marijona Balaišienė was being buried in the Salos parish cemetery with religious rites. The funeral procession left the church and turned toward the cemetery. Salos District Chairwoman Raugalienė ordered Stukas, who was carrying the Cross, to walk not in front of the procession but in the midst of the people. Then the pastor, Father Petras Nykštus, loudly observed that the person who carries the cross belongs in the front of the procession. Stukas tried to go to the front but chairwoman Raugalienė stopped him and ordered him to go behind the casket. The pastor did not give in.

"This funeral is being conducted with religious rites and, therefore, the cross must be carried at the front of the procession. When a funeral is conducted without religious rites, you can then leave out the cross. If you do not carry the cross, I will not escort the decedant to the cemetery. No one has the right to interfere with a funeral procession."

The funeral participants began to hazard guesses about who

would win, the chairwoman or the pastor? After the pastor repeated his warning, the carrier of the cross, disregarded the chairwoman's order and went to the front of the procession, and two hundred people escorted the decedant to the cemetery.

Salos

In the summer of 1975, the Salos churchyard was being renovated. Two drivers, Isakov and Repšys, brought the gravel. Rokiškis Road Department Supervisor Žukauskas wrote a report to Road Department Director Dilis asking that the above-mentioned drivers be punished. Chief Krištapavičius of the Rokiškis *Rayon* road maintenance department fined the drivers ten rubles each.

Žaiginiai

The evening of October 22, 1966 was dark. A wagon stopped near the Žaiginiai church. Juozas Mockus was bringing a sick baby to be baptized.

When the parents left the church after the christening, they noticed that the wagon was missing. The men began to search for the wagon and found it in the yard of Party Secretary Vincas Montvila. Paying no attention to either the men's requests or the mother's tears, Montvila unharnessed the horse and said, "Because of the christening I won't return the horse." On a dark rainy night, the poor people with a sick baby in arms slogged home five kilometers over a muddy road.

Joniškis (Molėtai *Rayon*)

Alfonas Seibokas, an old man classified as a second-degree invalid, receives a pension of only twenty eight rubles. To support his family, he decided to acquire some religious articles and sell them to the faithful.

In October 1975, devotions in honor of St. Therese of Lisieux were being held in Joniškis. Alfonso Seibokas set up his display of religious articles in the Churchyard: rosaries, medals, photocopied picture cards. Militia Agent Ramanauskas immediately approached and arrested Seibokas. He took him to security headquarters, searched the old man's pockets, took seventy-eight rubles and all the religious articles. Then he began to beat him on the head and, pushing him to the ground, began to kick him shouting: "This is for spreading religious superstition!"

On October 20th Alfonso Seibokas was taken to the Molė-

tai security headquarters. Again his pockets were searched, again he was interrogated, berated and threatened with punishment for spreading religious superstition. Asked where he obtained the religious pictures, Seibokas explained that he had photographed them himself. The officials threatened him with two years imprisonment. After the interrogation, the security agents told the old man to walk home, since all his money had been taken. When they released him, the security agents told him to return the following day and bring bread, because he would have to be imprisoned for several years for making and selling religious articles.

The battered old man barely made it home where he suffered a heart attack. The ambulance took him to Ukmergė hospital. The following day, his wife informed the security police that her husband was in the hospital.

After leaving the hospital, Seibokas went to see a lawyer. The latter refused to write a statement to the court and advised him not to take any legal steps because he would not get the religious articles or the money back: "The court will certainly not find in your favor, but will charge you with speculation and will punish you," explained the lawyer.

(The author of this report makes the following conclusion: If the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania* were not read on foreign radio broadcasts, such bandit-employees would skin us alive." — Ed. Note.)

TELŠIAI DIOCESE

Mažeikiai

On September 25, 1975, (Mrs) Emilija Gelumauskienė (see *The Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*, No. 19), a resident of the town of Mažeikiai, wrote a complaint to USSR Chairman of the Council of Ministers Kosygin, with the purpose of protecting from the government a cross erected near her home. Mažeikiai government officials intercepted the complaint at the post office and ordered (Mrs) Gelumauskienė to demolish the cross.

"If we allow you to have a cross, you'll build a church next to your home!" shouted the officials.

"I will not demolish the cross and I will not allow you to demolish it!" asserted the old woman.

When they saw the old woman's determination, the government officials decided to use trickery. On December 3, 1975

(Mrs) Gelumbauskienė received a summons to come to the Executive Committee and bring her registration book and her homeowner's book. While (Mrs) Gelumbauskienė was at the executive committee, four individuals (two security agents and two civilians) cut down the cross. Neighbors witnessed the following sight: After the cross was cut down, it was dragged to the bam and thrown into the mud, the trunk was chopped into pieces, and the small fence which had surrounded the cross was broken up.

(Mrs) Gelumbauskienė who has suffered many hardships in her lifetime, said that this desecration of the cross had been the greatest blow.

"I would wash the cross not only with water, but with my tears," said the old woman crying. "Lord, forgive those executioners!"

Several days later (Mrs) Gelumbauskienė received from the Mažeikiai *Rayon* maintenance department office a bill for fifty rubles for the demolition of the cross.

In January 1976 (Mrs) Gelumbauskienė again addressed Chairman Tomkevičius of the Mažeikiai *Rayon* Executive Committee requesting the return of her complaint and the photographs of the cross which she had sent to Kosygin. The chairman replied that (Mrs) Gelumbauskienė should look for her complaint and photographs where she had sent them.

Šaukėnai

On the night of October 13, 1975 an old oak cross, erected in 1928 to commemorate the tenth anniversary of Lithuania's Independence, was demolished in Šaukėnai.

The local pastor had long been ordered to get rid of this cross, but had refused. Local Communists demolished the cross under the cloak of night.

Gargždai

On October 31, 1975, Father A(ntanas) Šeškevičius wrote N(ijolė) Sadūnaitė a registered letter, return receipt requested. Only when the sender asked the Gargždai post office to inquire why the labor camp had not notified him whether the letter had been given to Sadūnaitė, did the labor camp post office give notice by telegram that Father Šeškevičius' letter had been received on November 5th, not by (Miss) Sadūnaitė but by Camp Censor Devajeva.

VILKAVIŠKIS DIOCESE

Valakbūdis

On October 31, 1975 Valakbūdis pastor Father Antanas Lukošaitis was visited by Šakiai District Chairwoman (Mrs) Žemantauskienė and Šakiai *Rayon* Security Agent Bakšas, who demanded that the pastor not conduct a funeral procession the evening of All Saints Day, in either the churchyard or the cemetery. (Mrs) Žemantauskienė threatened that if the pastor did not obey, he would be evicted from his apartment. Pastor Lukošaitis remarked that if beasts have dens and birds have nests, the pastor also needs a place to rest his head. (Currently Father Lukošaitis has a very wretched apartment: a kitchen and one small room in the basement. Earlier he lived in a tent.)

Disregarding the warning, Father A. Lukošaitis conducted a solemn procession to the cemetery. Women dressed in national costume placed a wreath at the cross with the following inscription: "Let us honor the dead, for we also shall die."

That evening Šakiai area atheists came to the cemetery. Most, as last year, were drunk.

THE HARDSHIPS OF LITHUANIANS ANNEXED INTO BYELORUSSIA

Slabodka (Breslau *Rayon*, in present-day Byelorussia.)

After countless requests by the faithful, the *Rayon* government granted permission to repair the church, but when the outside was finished, repairs to the inside were forbidden.

Druya (Breslau *Rayon*)

Several years ago crosses were removed from church spires in Druya. Because they were firmly cemented in, the tops of the spires were also damaged. Currently the spires are deteriorating further and bricks are falling into the yard of the former convent (now a school) where children play during recess.

Poliasa (Present-day Byelorussia.)

At the end of 1975 state farms were reorganized to include Lithuanian-speaking villages. These villages were split up by ones or twos and annexed to state farms composed of mostly Byelorussian villages. The results of this reform were quickly felt. The reformed Zhdavov State Farm was placed under the direction

of Lucia Bernardovna Zhilinska, whose family mansion still stands near Poliasa. Just before Christmas, farm worker Stasys Lysauskas informed the chairwoman that farm worker Karolina Paulavičienė had said the following in Lithuanian: "Now that the Byelorrussians have overrun the farm, there will be no living with it." The following day the chairwoman summoned the farm workers and stated that the farm was a state institution where speaking Lithuanian is forbidden. (Mrs) Paulavičienė, who had spoken Lithuanian, was fined five rubles. The next person to speak Lithuanian would be fined ten rubles. The chairwoman personally collected the money from (Mrs) Paulavičienė and pocketed it. Farm tractor drivers were also punished with similar fines. A deputy helped the chairwoman impose the punishment.

M.(EČISLOVAS) JUREVIČIUS UNEMPLOYED

On January 10, 1975, the training program of the Šiauliai LAD manufacturing firm fired the painter Mečislovas Jurevičius because on 11/10/74, 12/7/74, 12/25/74 and 1/6/75 he observed religious holidays and absented himself from work on those days. Jurevičius petitioned the Šiauliai People's Court regarding the unjustified dismissal from work. However the court rejected his claim. The Šiauliai lawyers which Jurevičius contacted for legal assistance refused to help him. Prosecutor J. Pivaras who attended the trial, did not defend Jurevičius' right to the job which was violated by the Šiauliai city people's court when it upheld the order of the Šiauliai LAD manufacturing firm management to dismiss Jurevičius from work. Industrial law expert (Mrs) M. Čepulienė was not able to explain to the court that the internal work regulations of the training program of the Šiauliai LAD manufacturing firm conflict with the USSR Constitution, art. 124 and the LSSR Constitution, art. 96 and that the LSSR Criminal Code art. 143 provides penalties for this. Moreover, Jurevičius' statement was not read at the public court session.

To: The People's Court of the City of Šiauliai

A Statement from: Jurevičius, Mečislovas, son of Jurgis,
residing in the city of Šiauliai, at Žemaitės g. 102, apt. 10.

I have worked as a painter in the training program of the Šiauliai LAD manufacturing firm for over nine years. During

that time no fines were imposed on me. On January 10, 1975, pursuant to Order No. 4 from the firm's Director, I was dismissed from work because I was absent from work on 11/10/74, 12/8/74, 12/25/74 and 1/6/75. I gave written notice to the firm's management prior to being absent and explained that those days are obligatory religious holidays and that it is my duty, as a conscientious Catholic, to observe them. Disregarding my prior notices and explanations, the Director transformed my religious convictions and freedom of conscience, which is guaranteed by art. 124 of the USSR Constitution and art. 96 of the LSSR Constitution, and upheld by art. 143 of the LSSR Criminal Code, into absenteeism and thus violated my right to work and the right to freely practice my religion. The same violation was committed by the local union, when it endorsed my dismissal from work for religious convictions. In this context, I ask the people's court to recognize that my religious convictions and the obligations inherent in them are not a violation of work regulations, that this does not strip me of my right to work. I, therefore, ask to be reinstated by the same firm as painter, with pay for forced absence.
Šiauliai, January 31, 1975."

To: The People's Court of the City of Šiauliai

A Statement from: Jurevičius, Mečislovas, son of Jurgis residing
in the City of Šiauliai, at Žemaitės g. 102, apt. 10

On January 10, 1975 I was dismissed from work by the union committee of the Šiauliai LAD manufacturing firm. The reason for my dismissal: four days of "absenteeism." I would like to state the following: I have worked at the firm since October "z. 1965. During all those years I committed no offenses, I received no warnings, reprimands or the like. On the contrary, I achieved 160% of my work quota. For my irreproachable work I received mention in the Šiauliai newspaper *Red Flag* and was presented with the "loyalty" honor award and certificate. I had absolutely no misunderstandings with either the management or my co-workers. Now I have been dismissed not for disrupting the plan, but because I am a conscientious Catholic, a religious man, and avail myself of the rights granted me by the USSR Constitution, (art. 124 of the USSR Constitution, and art. 143 of the Criminal Code, which clearly guarantee citizens the freedom to carry out their religious obligations).

I consider my dismissal from work illegal, based on the above-mentioned laws and the interpretation of work regulations (Internal work order regulations, Chapter VI, Par. 57, which deals with dismissal from work for absenteeism without justification). I did not come to work on the basis of the Constitution and the laws, with justification. Moreover, I clearly detailed in my statements the reasons for not coming to work and promised to make up those days on free days or during vacation. I am clearly supported by the May 12, 1966 ruling of the LSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium "regarding the application of art. 143 of the LSSR Criminal Code," which states that the decision to dismiss citizens from work must be made independently from their religious views. Articles 143 and 145 of the Criminal Code not only support my claim but place the blame on those who have illegally dismissed me from work.

Based on the above, I ask that the decision of the LAD firm management to dismiss me be overruled, that I be reinstated and paid for forced absence.

M. Jurevičius.

DECISION

In the name of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic
Šiauliai February 19, 1975

The People's Court of the City of Šiauliai, consisting of the Chairman, People's Judge B. Šumauskas, and People's Councilors A. Čeiliutka and A. Danielius, Recording Secretary (Mrs) D. Trukienė, in the presence of Prosecutor J. Pivoras, the plaintiff M. Jurevičius and attorney for the defense (Mrs) M. Čepulienė, considered in open court session the civil suit of Jurevičius, M., against the training program of the Šiauliai LAD manufacturing firm regarding his return to work and ruled:

The plaintiff worked as painter for the defendant since 1965. On January 10, 1975 he was dismissed from work, under art. 43, par. 4 of the LSSR Code of Work Regulations, namely, for absenteeism. The plaintiff asks to be reinstated and paid for forced absence, because on 11/10/74, 12/8/74, 12/25/74 and also 1/8/75—religious holidays—he did not go to work because of his religious convictions. He notified the management in advance about his absence from work. He feels that

under article 124 of the LSSR Constitution he is exercising freedom of conscience. The defendant asks that the suit be dismissed. The suit is dismissed because the plaintiff was absent from work on work days without permission from the management, and therefore was guilty of absenteeism. The plaintiff cannot justify this absenteeism as an exercise of religious convictions, because this violates internal work regulations which govern all employees. Art. 124 of the USSR Constitution has not been violated because no one is forbidding the plaintiff to believe, but, since under the Constitution the Church is separate from the State, work-days cannot be compared with religious holidays. Under art. 241 of the LSSR Code of Work Regulations, the ruling can be appealed within ten days to the LSSR Supreme Court through the Šiauliai People's Court.
People's Judge B. Šumauskas

To: The LSSR Supreme Court Panel on Civil Cases
Plaintiff Jurevičius, M.J., residing in Šiauliai, at Žemaitės g. 102, apt. 10, in the 1975 civil case against the defendant Šiauliai LAD manufacturing firm regarding his reinstatement to work.

APPEAL

According to the February 19, 1975 ruling of the people's Court of the City of Šiauliai, my suit to be reinstated to my job was rejected. This judgement I consider to be cancellable.

I have been employed by the defendant as a worker since October 2, 1965. During the entire work span, I received no disciplinary fines. I was many times praised for my work. I was dismissed from work on January 10, 1975 by Order No. 4-K under art. 43, par. 4 of the Code of Work Regulations for absenteeism on 11/10/74, 12/8/74, 12/25/74 and 1/6/75.

I must point out that I am not guilty of absenteeism. I am a religious man and did not work on the above-mentioned days because of religious holidays. Before each religious holiday named, I notified the management in writing that I would not be able to work on those days and why. I agreed to make up those days on other free days. I am not involved in training work and therefore feel that such a request can be fully carried out. This is not against the Constitution of the Soviet Union. Everyone

has freedom of conscience. I wish to exercise it also. I see no obstacle to this. The People's Court of the City of Šiauliai disregarded all the above-mentioned circumstances. I feel this is unjust.

I ask that the February 19, 1975 ruling of the People's Court of the City of Šiauliai in this case be overturned and that I be reinstated in my job, having established that I am not guilty of absenteeism, but did not work because of religious convictions, and, therefore, such absenteeism is justified.

February 26, 1975

M. Jurevičius

The LSSR Supreme Court panel on civil cases, composed of President M. Čapskis and Members L. Miežėnas and J. Radzevičius, in the presence of Prosecutor (Mrs) D. Kazakaitienė and Plaintiff M. Jurevičius, in open court session considered the appeal of the civil suit brought by the plaintiff M. Jurevičius against the Šiauliai LAD manufacturing firm for reinstatement to his job. After deliberation, the court panel made the following ruling: the plaintiff worked at the firm as painter. The defendant dismissed the plaintiff from work on January 10, 1975 for absenteeism without justification. The plaintiff asks to be reinstated, indicating that he was absent from work for justifiable reasons. The People's Court of the City of Šiauliai ruled against the plaintiff on February 19, 1975. In his appeal, the plaintiff asks that the court's ruling be overturned and that he be reinstated at his job. The prosecutor has moved that the appeal be rejected, the appeal is rejected. It has been established that the plaintiff was absent from work on 11/10/74, 12/8/74, 12/25/74 and 1/6/75. The plaintiff was systematically guilty of absenteeism without justifiable reason. The court has rejected the suit in accordance with art. 43, par. 4 of the USSR Code of Work Regulations. There is no basis for an appeal. The Civil Court of Appeals, based on art. 335 of the Communist Party Central Committee, has decided to reject the appeal of M. Jurevičius. The February 19, 1975 ruling of the People's Court of the City of Šiauliai stands.

President M. Čapskis,
members L. Miežėnas and J. Radzevičius

CONTINUING PERSECUTION OF YOUTH

In June 1975, Instructor R. Patašius of the Kaunas Polytechnical Institute (KPI) was summoned to the military commissariat. KGB employee Rusteika was waiting for him there. After stating that the Politechnical Institute was under his jurisdiction, Rusteika invited R. Patašius to security headquarters for a "talk", which lasted about four hours.

From the very start, Instructor R. Patašius was charged with being a vehement anti-Soviet agitator and an evil person.

"You know, you can immediately be fired from your job," stated Rusteika.

"Fire me, if you can," boldly replied R. Patašius. "Only the sooner, the better."

Rusteika charged that Patašius, as a member of the independent film studio KPI-FILM, is known for his anti-Soviet views and had defamed the Soviet system in private conversations.

Patašius was ordered to report in detail on the moods and views of other film studio members. Patašius did not reply to such questions.

"I am prepared to repeat and confirm whatever I have ever said myself, but I am not prepared to be an informer and squealer. Find out on your own, if you need to."

Rusteika was very interested in Patašius' relationship with P. Kimbrys. He asked what subjects they discussed, whether they discussed religious questions.

"We discussed everything that can be of interest and is of interest to young people, including religion. We even discussed politics."

"What will you accomplish by doing this?" asked Rusteika in an agitated manner.

"Maybe nothing, but that still does not mean that a person cannot have personal opinions on all questions that interest him."

"Then perhaps you don't like the Soviet system?"

"The system is the system," replied Patašius, "but there are things that do not impress me at all."

As an example, Patašius cited the fact that in 1969 he could not perform his pre-graduation training work merely because he received neither a "specform" in time (a loyalty certificate, required for employment in industry working on military contracts —

Ed. Note) nor a negative reply. Thus he was unable to defend his graduate degree project.

At the end of the "talk," Rusteika expressed the opinion that Patašius would probably keep this meeting secret.

"No," stated Patašius, "such meetings will not bring me dishonor, and I will not promise to lie and deceive for you."

In September 1975 P. Kimbrys, former KPI film laboratory employee and member of the KPI-FILM studio, was summoned to the security police. He was interrogated by Rusteika and told that the security police had already collected all the information needed to convict him.

"But today we are not living in the 50's," explained the security agent. "Then, we would have talked to you differently, because different demands were placed on us. Now, much will depend on your honesty during this talk."

Then Rusteika listed the charges against Kimbrys: he is known for his anti-Russian views; he keeps on the wall of his room a map of the 16th century Grand Duchy of Lithuania ("from sea to sea"); he had a copy of the "Archives of Lithuania" in his home; he has helped in publishing the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*, and so on. When Kimbrys asked on what evidence he was charged with those things, Rusteika replied that the case was not yet closed and he, therefore, could not reveal all the facts. Kimbrys remarked that he did not consider it a crime to hang on the wall a map which can be found in any Lithuanian history textbook. Regarding the books mentioned and other underground literature, he categorically denied these charges.

Rusteika inquired whether Kimbrys knew which of his friends could have helped publish such literature and asked him to characterize "what kind of people" were the other members of KPI-FILM.

The more than four-hour-long interrogation ended with Kimbrys giving written answers to questions, and promising to "draw conclusions." As he was saying good-bye, Rusteika mentioned that he would probably be seeing Kimbrys again.

Such interrogations are not the first in the history of the independent KPI-FILM studio. *The Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania* has knowledge of additional instances of persecution:

At the end of 1971, the then head of KPI-FILM, Kaunas

Polytechnical Institute (KPI) Automation Department fifth-year student V. Mizaras was questioned by security agent Rubys about the mood of his fellow students.

During the months of January, February and March 1972, the studio's vice-president, Automation Department fourth-year student V. Vačkys was intensively invited and recruited to work for the security police.

In June 1972, the work contract with then-studio-head R. Kausa was suddenly cancelled (we speculate that the guiding motives were identical to those used earlier to deny Kausa admission to any Lithuanian school of higher education—namely "forcible emigration" during his youth "to polar bear country . . ."). Since then, KPI-FILM has not had a salaried head . . .

In June 1972 KPI-FILM members, E. Smelenskias and F. Girininkas were cross-examined at the security police.

During 1972-1973, KPI Film Lab employee (Miss) L. Blatnyté was interrogated regarding KPI-FILM and also given a recruitment talk.

In the fall of 1973, studio member V. Lavanavičius was summoned to the security police.

At the end of 1974, KPI Film Lab employee Č. Butavičius provided the security police with evidence against KPI-FILM.

KPI-FILM was founded 15 years ago and survived with the help of student support. It was long known as one of the most productive independent film groups and the only permanent film studio in a Baltic school of higher education. Studio members have produced several dozen films: about youth (*Our Time — Youth; From 9 to 17*), about their city (*Steps of Time*), about famous cultural and scientific leaders: *Maironis, A Man Close to Our Hearts* (about Professor Academician K. Baršauskas), *The Face* (about folklorist B. Buračas) and many others. The studio played a major role in the life of Lithuanian students; it expanded their horizons, provided information about the art and scientific world and encouraged creative thought. But as it carried out its modest and unobtrusive work, the group still caused alarm. Perhaps the subject matter of the studio's films seemed undesirable. (*The Face* captured first place at the Lithuanian Film Festival, but was not selected for the Baltic Republics' independent film review, for supposedly poor technical quality. . .) Perhaps the fact that this small group of enthusiastic amateurs could not be penetrated by the vigilant ear of the KGB caused annoyance.

Regardless of why, the studio actually exists only on paper, without a head, without its most active members, who have dispersed to seek a more peaceful occupation . . .

This is not the first time in the history of Soviet Lithuania that the wings of youth's imagination have been clipped. We need only recall the "Campaigner Generation" (in May 1969 the restoration work they undertook at the birthplaces of S.(teponas) Darius and S.(tasys) Girėnas was labeled "the greatest ideological diversion since 1956" at a Kaunas party leadership meeting), the tragedy of the national heritage movements, the fate of the KPI student music clubs, *Pepklubas* and *Liaudies Daina*, the countless discussion clubs which sprang up unnoticeably and were silently weeded out. . .

But how should this be labeled: the limitless possibilities afforded the Lithuanian youth by the Soviet system or the unending hardships imposed by the Soviet system on the youth of Lithuania?

IN THE SOVIET SCHOOL

Šiauliai

On September 16, 1975 a meeting of the welders group was held at the Šiauliai Technical Trade School, during which an attempt was made to enroll all the students in the Communist Youth League. Students would be called in front of the class and asked: "Do you yourself refuse to join the Youth League or do your parents forbid you to join?" Those who did not join the Youth League were ejected from the classroom and told to bring their parents. Student Urbutis explained that he would not join the Communist Youth League even if forced to do so.

"I will not yield to force. Neither I nor my parents want me to join the Communist Youth League."

When asked if his parents are believers and attend church, the student replied:

"We are all believers and attend church."

Urbutis was ridiculed. Instructors Gylys and Milius ordered the students who did not join the Communist Youth League to stand for a half hour with their arms raised.

"All thieves, hoodlums and Fascists do not belong to the Communist Youth League," shouted Milius. "If you fill out the forms you won't have to stand with your arms raised, but if you don't fill them out, we will expel you from school."

The students were terrorized for an entire hour but did not give in. Those who did not join the Communist Youth League were assigned the hardest work. Half of the class did not join the Communist Youth League.

Šiauliai

On November 27, 1975 Assistant Principal (Mrs) Žičkienė of the Šiauliai J. Janonis Middle School summoned the mother of class VII b student Rimutė Vaitkutė and asked whether her daughter prays at home, goes to confession and so on.

"What kind of question is that? My daughter and I are both Catholics, therefore we fulfill our Catholic duties," replied (Mrs) Vaitkienė.

"Your daughter has not yet joined the Communist Youth League. She will be ridiculed in school for attending church."

"My daughter is not afraid of that. She will be able to bear it for her convictions, because she knows this is honorable."

Šiauliai

Juozas Vidugiris, the father of a seventh-grade Šiauliai 9th Middle School pupil, died on December 22, 1975.

Homeroom Teacher (Mrs) Elena Baškienė brought a wreath with her students and inquired when the funeral would be held and most important, whether with church rites? If with church rites, she would not allow the students to attend. Otherwise, the whole class would be present. On the eve of the funeral, homeroom teacher Baškienė again came to inquire and when she learned that the funeral would be conducted with church rites, she did not allow the children to leave school.

Plateliai

Vida Mikalauskaitė, a seventh-grade pupil, began to sing in the Plateliai church choir at the beginning of 1975. When Principal Stripinis of the Plateliai Middle School. (At his instigation, the stations of the cross were demolished in Plateliai.) and the teachers learned of this, they decided to drive the girl away from the church. Homeroom teacher (Mrs) Balavičienė ordered Mikalauskaitė's mother to stop sending her daughter to church. (Mrs.) Mikalauskienė asked the homeroom teacher not to interfere in this matter because the constitution guarantees freedom of belief.

"Well, at least take her in the evening, so no one can see," instructed the teacher.

The homeroom teacher accused the girl of debasing the name of the Soviet school by singing in the choir.

Kretinga

On January 16, 1976 a parents meeting was held in the ninth grade of the Kretinga Middle School. Home Room Teacher Pempienė scolded the, because the children would not join the Communist Youth League.

"We will make every effort to raise Communist Youth League members into good, exemplary persons, therefore, you parents must influence your children to all join the Communist Youth League."

"That's exactly what you should do," answered one mother. "Raise the members of the Communist Youth League to be exemplary, decent and well-behaved, then perhaps their example will influence our children also and we won't have to force them, they will join the Communist Youth League on their own."

"But don't you force your daughter to kneel at the altar in church?" asked homeroom teacher (Mrs) Pempienė.

"I do not force her. My daughter voluntarily attends church and even keeps vigil. That's why she is good and well-behaved, you, her teacher, cannot deny that," calmly replied the mother.

Palanga

In 1971 Algirdas Petrutis enrolled in the fifth grade of the Palanga Middle School. Because he had been forcibly enrolled in the Pioneers, without his parents, consent, the pupil did not wear his Pioneer necktie, although the teachers constantly reminded him of it. Once, homeroom teacher Vytautas Kusas kept Petrutis after school and ordered him to write one hundred times, "A Pioneer without a necktie," thus attempting to force Petrutis to wear his Pioneer neckties.

The boy complained at home. The pupil's guardian Astrauskas went to see school Principal Kazlauskas and demanded that the boy be crossed off the Pioneer roll, because he did not want to belong and his guardians supported him. The child does not and will not wear his necktie. If the child is harassed further he will be withdrawn from school. The principal explained to Astrauskas that he cannot withdraw the boy from the Pioneers

because the school's goal is to enroll all pupils in this organization. For a time no one forced Petrutis to wear the necktie.

At the end of 1973, homeroom teacher Vytautas Kusas told the class to draw a picture on an atheist subject. School-boy Petrutis complained to his guardians that the homeroom teacher told him to draw a picture of a priest collecting money in church and then buying a "Volga" car with the money. The guardians explained that a religious boy cannot draw such pictures. At school the child refused to draw the picture. The angry teacher told Petrutis to take his books and not return to school. The boy went home crying. (Mrs) Astrauskienė went to the school and asked the homeroom teacher why the boy was expelled from school.

"We told him to draw this postcard," and took from his drawer a regular postcard which he showed (Mrs) Astrauskienė.

"I would now like to know which one of you is lying," asked (Mrs) Astrauskienė, "the pupil or the teacher? Petrutis told me that you ordered him to draw a picture on an atheist subject. I will call the child and clear this up."

The homeroom teacher blushed and did not allow the pupil to be called. Teacher (Mrs) Ditkevičienė who was present at the conference called (Mrs.) Astrauskienė a religious fanatic.

"I ask you sincerely," (Mrs) Astrauskienė addressed the teachers, "not to ruin the children with your atheistic subjects, but rather teach them. If you expel the child one more time on atheistic pretexts, I will write a complaint to the Ministry of Education.

Gargždai

In the spring of 1975, VIIc homeroom teacher (Mrs) Rimeikiene of the Gargždai No. 2 Middle School, was selecting students for an atheist club at a class meeting. She asked students who attend church to stand up. At first, half of the class stood up. After glaring at the students who publicly attend church, the teacher addressed those who remained seated. Whenever the teacher named a student and wanted to enroll him in the atheist club, the student stood up and said: "I attend church, and cannot join atheists." Finally, the whole class consisting of 32 students unanimously stated that they all attend church and would not join an atheist club. The teacher became very angry and began

to scold all of them. Finally, homeroom teacher (Mrs) Kuneikienė chose four students and forcibly enrolled them in the atheist club.

Principal Liudvika Jurgulis of the Gargždai No. 2 Middle School is determined to turn all students into atheists. The students complain that they are often given questionnaires to fill out about their convictions, they are summoned into the auditorium and lectured on atheist subjects for two to three hours. Those students who attend church are publicly ridiculed and atheist Communist Youth League members are assigned to "look after" them. Groups of atheist Communist Youth League members go to the homes of believer students and explain the "damage" of religion to the parents.

Upon discovering that VII c class student Ivaškevičius attends church, director Jurgulis and teachers (Mrs.) Ridžiauskienė and Imbrazienė, came to class and demanded from student Ivaškis to tell them why he is a believer and who is forcing him to attend church. Furthermore they attempted to force the pupil to promise never to attend church again.

Religious students are summoned to the principal's office and scolded for attending church.

Although the children are boldly terrorized, there are some brave ones who attend church every Sunday.

Rūdiškės

(Trakai *Rayon*) At the end of 1975, the principal of the middle school summoned to his office ninth-grade student Petras Stašauskas, an altar boy at the Rūdiškės church, and told him to sign a statement that a priest had asked him to come to church and serve at Mass. The student refused to sign. He admitted that he voluntarily attends church and serves at Mass. The principal threatened to prosecute him. Later he attempted several times to convince P. Stašauskas not to attend church and lowered his department grade.

Jadvyga Poplovskaya, an eleventh-grade student at the same school, also received a lower department grade for attending church and was threatened with receiving such recommendations that no school of higher education would admit her.

INDEX OF PERSONS

Abukauskas, Jonas, 41
Balčiūnas, Rev. J., 48
Blatnvtė, L., 63
Butavičius, C, 63
Černiauskas, Rev. VL, 22-23, 24
Gelumbauskienė, Emilija, 53-54
Girininkas, F., 63
Ivanauskas, Petras, 36
Ylius, Rev. Antanas, 47
Jakas, Stasys, 33
Jasilionis, Alg. 43
Jaugelis, Virgilijus, 17
Jokubynas, Kęstutis, 17
Jurevičius, Mečislovas 16, 17, 56-60
Kausa, R., 63
Kazlauskas, Jonas, 25
Kibickaitė, Bronė, 45-46
Kimbrys, P., 61-62
Kovalev, Sergei A. 3-21
Lavavičius, V. 63
Liubašilas, Jonas, 36
Lukošaitis, Rev. Antanas, 55
Markaitis, Rev. Aleksandras, 30
Nykštus, Rev. Petras, 51
Patašius, R., 61-62
Paulavičius, Karolina , 56
Petkus, V., 33, 41, 45
Petruškevičiūtė, 51
Petrulis, Algirdas, 61-67
Plumpa (Pluira) Petras, 38
Sadūnaitė, Nijolė, 16, 54
Sacharovas, A.D. 4, 12-13, 15
16, 17, 44, 45
Seibokas, Alfonsas 52-53

Skarulis, Anicetas 36
Skeiveris, R., 32
Sladkevičius, Bishop Vincent, 21
Smeleckas, E., 63
Stašauskas, Petras, 68
Steponavičius, Bishop Julijonas 21-22
Strupenskas, Vaclovas, 36
Šaltis, V., 36
Tamasonis, Mindaugas, 24-26, 37, 40, 45,
Tarabilda, Arūnas, 25
Terleckas, Antanas, 13, 16, 17, 40, 43-44
Žiedūnas, Albinas, 42

INDEX OF PLACES

Baubliai, 50
Gargždai, 54, 67
Joniškis, 52
Kačergiškė, 47-48
Karkažiškis, 48
KAUNAS
Kretinga, 66
Mažeikiai, 53-54
Meškuičiai, 48
Mielagėnai, 23, 24
Palanga, 66
Plateliai, 65
Rokiškis 51
Rūdiškis, 68
Salos, 52
Šaukėnai, 54
Šiauliai, 56, 64, 65
Utena 51
Valakbudis, 55
VILNIUS
Žaigunai, 52

TO HELP THE CHURCH IN COMMUNIST-OCCUPIED
LITHUANIA OR TO OBTAIN FURTHER INFORMATION,
SEND YOUR TAX-EXEMPT DONATION, OR WRITE TO:

Lithuanian Catholic Religious Aid, Inc.
351 Highland Boulevard
Brooklyn, NY 11207



Places mentioned in the CHRONICLE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN LITHUANIA, No.21