Ignas K. Skrupskelis

Emancipating Lithuania:
The Early Years of President Grinius

VYTAUTAS MAGNUS UNIVERSITY

Ignas K. Skrupskelis

Emancipating Lithuania: The Early Years of President Grinius

Monograph

Kaunas, 2020

Reviewed by: prof. habil. dr. Egidijus Aleksandravičius
prof. dr. Šarūnas Liekis

Approved by the Department of History at Vytautas Magnus University on 25 September 2018 (Protocol No. 05-01) and the Counsil of Faculty of Humanities at Vytautas Magnus University on 19 October 2018 (Protocol No. 3-3).

The bibliographic information about the publication is available in the National Bibliographic Data Bank (NBDB) of the Martynas Mažvydas National Library of Lithuania.

ISBN 978-609-467-453-2 (Print)
ISBN 978-609-467-445-7 (Online)
https://doi.org/10.7220/9786094674457

© Ignas K. Skrupskelis, 2020
© Vytautas Magnus University, 2020

Contents

Freedom, self-respect, and duty by Valdas Adamkus. . . 7
Introduction. . . 10
I Voyages . . . 33
II One of the Etceteras. . . 49
III A Peasant Boyhood . . . 87
IV One Good Teacher . . . 104
V Medicine among Muscovites. . . 129
VI A Bell-ringer and His World. . . 142
VII The Value of the National Idea. . . 183
VIII Established in Life. . . 196
IX The Revolutionary Alternative. . . 218
XThe Land Question. . . 241
XI An Underground Activist. . . 255
XII A Public Figure. . . 279
XIII On the Fringes of Politics. . . 311
Postscript. . . 343
Selected Bibliography. . . 348
Index of Personal Names. . . 352
Subject Index for Kazys Grinius. . . 357

"It was the job of our awakeners to gather all the dormant Czech forces together, to spark them to active life, and to nourish the flame of Czech culture that could successfully compete against its German rival."
Thomas G. Masaryk, "Czechs and the Awakening," (1895), *The Spirit of Thomas G. Masaryk (1850-1937): An Anthology*, ed. George J. Kovtun, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990), p. 63.

Freedom, self-respect, and duty

I begin by confessing that at the very start Professor Ignas Kęstutis Skrupskelis surprised me by the choice he made for the hero of his book. Why was that surprising? First of all because the author is well-known in U. S. academic circles as a researcher of William James's correspondence who through his work had broadened the ken of English-speaking readers. It therefore wasn't easy to understand the author's turn from American philosophy to Lithuanian history. Later I realized that his field of research in the history of philosophy coincided chronologically with the early activities of the Lithuanian National Rebirth movement and of the future Lithuanian president Kazys Grinius, while the call of Lithuanian identity naturally transformed Skrupskelis, the historian of philosophy, into a historian of Lithuanian politics and culture.

But the second consideration which at first was also unexpected and which made me repeat my why-question had something to do with our long-standing experience in Lithuanian-American community affairs. Whereas I always tended toward liberal positions, Skrupskelis's worldview and activities in the Lithuanian diaspora always seemed to me to place him on the right wing of Christian activism. So I would have expected him to have gravitated toward one of the many Lithuanian historical heroes on the conservative Catholic side of politics rather than to Kazys Grinius, a man of sincerely felt left-wing liberal sensitivity. Nevertheless, Skrupskelis does a fine job of recognizing and conveying to the reader some of those very things that were supremely important to President Grinius—and conveying these in a way that probably surpasses even the best an

ideological follower of that president could have achieved. Here we have a clear case of a rather large difference in worldviews leading to a superior outcome.

In reading Skrupskelis's text I called to mind my own early associations with this president and his dramatic fate. Ever since my youth in prewar Kaunas I was close to the home and hearth of the Grinius family. I was a very good friend of the president's son Liūtas. In this way the president himself who in December 1926 was relieved of his duties by a military coup d'etat was never out of my horizon; and from a respectful distance I could observe how a noble democrat, a defender of the powerless, a physician, and an educator went about rising to the challenges of a turbulent age. Of course, not everything that transpired in the friendship of two adolescents was known to my friend's father. I have no idea how much President Kazys Grinius knew of the vows Liūtas and I made during the troubled times of the anti-Nazi underground in Kaunas. Nor can I guess how he would have reacted had he known. On the other hand, we could well sense his determination as a matter of principle to aid his Jewish friends and colleagues who found themselves in mortal danger.

In his book Skrupskelis patiently retells the young Grinius's biography, insightfully recognizing the views already evident in the early journalistic writings of the future Lithuanian president. The author not only carefully delineates the way the intellectual positions and moral choices of a Lithuanian national movement activist developed and matured, but also makes clear to an English-speaking reader little acquainted with Central Eastern European and specifically Lithuanian history what all of this means in the context of Western democracy and the larger states exemplifying it. I myself am happy to have been allowed to spend time with the aging Kazys Grinius: I recall how his wise eyes looked at the spectacle of Lithuania's wounded democracy with both sadness and hope.

Recalling my encounters with the book's hero I am seized by the realization that it was Lithuania's loss of independence and the Soviet occupation that hurled both of us into the maelstrom of emigration. We ended up in the United States of America as refugees from mankind's bloodiest war that for the occupied Baltic States and Western Ukraine did not end in 1945. It was my fateful luck to have been able to be at President Grinius's side during some of the last moments of his life. What I saw, heard, and understood of his parting words accompanied me both on my professional path in America and my activities within the World Lithuanian Community. And the fact that after returning from nearly a half-century of exile to a newly independent Lithuania I was twice elected president

of my country still struggling to break free of a Sovietized mentality had much to do with the lessons that President Kazys Grinius had taught me.

His example and words let me understand that you cannot love your country if you do not love its people. He encouraged the belief that in spite of all the dire consequences of war it is possible to engage in politics with soft hands. Enabling the pursuit of human happiness is the state's goal, while human rights, the protection of privacy, and solidarity are supreme values. President Kazys Grinius never doubted that the welfare and the happiness of Lithuanians are not things that may be sacrificed on bureaucracy's altar. The Russian image of an all-powerful state apparatus was alien to him. On the other hand, as a liberal democrat he always valued, and often himself actively strengthened, the civic ability of free people acting through their local community organizations to defend the principles of self-governance, subsidiarity, and solidarity.

President Kazys Grinius doubtless envisaged a Lithuania with plenty of democracy and republican spirit, of voluntary associationism and the friendship of free people, and, of course, with an unquestioned determination to safeguard the space marked out by the Constitution and by the rule of law. Today in the Republic of Lithuania celebrating its 100th anniversary traces of post-Soviet mentality are still tangible. Having several decades long endured the oppression of foreign occupations and unfriendly regimes, Lithuanians gripped by the euphoria of independence find it easier to fetishize some of their government institutions than sensitively to care about the happiness of all Lithuanians. But I am convinced the history recreated by Professor Skrupskelis strongly suggests that everything that happened in a small country on the shores of the Baltic Sea constitutes a set of dramatic variations on a common human theme. The result is a story of a nation persevering in its struggle for the restoration of human dignity, for the love of justice, of law, and of human rights. It is a tale about how liberty and civic commitment could find a home in one human being's heart.

Valdas Adamkus

Introduction

Small nations fare poorly in canonical history. This should not surprise us. After all, small nations are small, that is, lacking resources to develop their own voices and have them heard. Established and generally accepted history is the work of historians of the major powers, reflecting their interests and limitations. A recent example concerns the collapse of the Soviet Union: as far as British Sovietologist Archie Brown is concerned, the important actors were leaders of the great powers. Their motives and actions are important, while unarmed Lithuanian crowds staring down Soviet tanks are forgotten.[1] Yet, had it not been for small Latvians, Estonians, Georgians, Lithuanians, the Soviet Union could well have survived. Had nothing changed in those small countries, neither Soviet nor American leaders would have had to consider appropriate responses.

---

[1] Archie Brown, review of Robert Service, *The End of the Cold War* (2015) in *New York Review of Books*, March 23, 2017, pp. 55-59. Even calling those events the Cold War reflects a great power bias. For one thing, for the victims of the Nazi-Soviet alliance it was not cold. For another, at the start of the Cold War, little more happened than that the United States government began to appraise Soviet policies and Stalin more soberly. In his diary, vice-president Henry A. Wallace, records fragments of intimate conversations among policy makers in the years 1942-1946. There is not a single mention of the Soviet-Nazi alliance, the 1939-1940 invasion of Finland, the Katyn massacre, events suggestive of less than benign Soviet intentions. Reports of various atrocities reached him, especially from Polish sources, which Wallace dismissed as attempts to stir up trouble. There are scattered references to Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, without concerns about their fate under Soviet rule or a hint that they should have a say about their future (*The Price of Vision: The Diary of Henry A. Wallace, 1942-1946*, ed. John Morton Blum (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1973)). None the less, even at present, Wallace is at times depicted as one who understood the Soviet Union—he would have prevented the Cold War, had he rather than Truman become president. I found Wallace's diary depressing: Roosevelt, Stalin, Churchill, three emperors drawing lines on maps, with the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations as window dressing.

My intent and hope, is to allow Lithuania to speak for herself, as the hundredth anniversary of February 16, 1918, the declaration of independence, is upon us. As things stand, the scattered references to her in general histories are by authors who know nearly nothing about her.[2] At times, these assertions are merely false, but some are prejudicial and even laughable. In the absence of familiarity, details, there is a tendency to fall back on stereotypes, to do deductive history, ending up in many cases with falsehoods.

Developments in these small nations have the misfortune of being categorized as nationalism, while nationalism is often attacked as the cause of wars, conflicts, chauvinism, narrow-mindedness, persecution of minorities. Critics urge that it is much better to celebrate diversity, to use the current American idiom, than to wallow in the petty conceits of one's tribe. But the emancipators of Lithuania—I suspect of many other nations as well—believed that the

[2] I will cite one example of the problems faced by historians, this one in reference to the revolt which broke out in June 1941, as the German attack on the Soviet Union began. In Christopher Browning, *The Origins of the Final Solution* (University of Nebraska Press and Yad Vashem, 2004), p. 270, in the chapter contributed by Jürgen Matthaüs, German historian and researcher at the Holocaust Memorial Museum in the United States, we read: "Skirpa and his men exploited anti-Jewish feeling and claimed that Jews formed the backbone of the Bolshevist system... ." Matthaüs does not note that none of the three editors of the Soviet propaganda publication he is citing was a historian, that one certainly was a war criminal and the second, probably so, with neither having academic qualifications. That there are reasons for doubting the authenticity of the document. That in any case, it is unrepresentative of the views of the Lithuanian Activist Front which Kazys Škirpa (1895-1979) headed. There should have been a note explaining that Škirpa was not in Lithuania but under house arrest in Berlin and was a member in good-standing of a political party which for decades had been publicly critical of anti-Semitism. Leaders of German death squads, who were in the country within hours, were exploiting anti-Jewish feelings among many other feelings to be expected after a year of terror, but Lithuanian leaders were concerned to restore order as the panicky Soviet flight left the country in chaos. Uneasy about German intentions, they rushed to fill vacancies with trustworthy individuals. The paradox of the revolt: militarily it was aimed at the Soviets, politically—the Germans, preparing to survive the new occupation. American historians see the war in terms of American involvement, in black and white. It was not that simple for people trapped between two predators. It is easier for Americans to ignore Lenin's, Stalin's, Mao's, Pol Pot's body counts or that North Korea is a communist achievement. For example, on November 7, 1967, The *New York Times* congratulated the USSR on its first fifty years and expressed good wishes for the future, the body count concealed under the phrase "fifty hectic years." As part of its series on the Red Century, on August 12, 2017, the *Times* informed readers that after the revolution women enjoyed more and better orgasms. There are some good contributions among the more than 40, but several are nothing better than nostalgia for the good old days when young idealists were upholding goodness and truth. Reading, I responded with images of Nazi pensioners over beer: after all, some of them too began with youthful dreams of making it right. In his contribution, November 6, 2017, Simon Sebag Montefiore notes a sentimental revival of communist ideas. In this regard, public opinion is outdated, lags behind scholarship, which is coming more and more to recognize the criminal nature of the Soviet regime.

rise of small nations was not a barrier to diversity but a condition of it. Unless they awakened, they would melt away and mankind would lose their distinctive contributions. They argued that only mature, developed, prosperous nations can contribute their distinctive individualities to the mosaic which mankind should be. One of the many depressing aspects of Orwell's *1984* is uniformity due to the absence of small nations and states.

The nineteenth century is known as the era of nationalism in Europe, the time of the awakening of nations. The awakenings culminated in independence when, after the war had shattered three continental empires of Austro-Hungary, Germany and Russia, small nations for some years could muster enough strength to ward off predators. Compared with others, Lithuania was late, but after the collapse of both Russia and Germany, the country enjoyed two decades of independence, decades of considerable economic, cultural, and social progress.

The European small nations emerged under the shadow of the First World War, the clash of empires dominated by nationalistic chauvinism. But the nationalism of small nations is different from that of the large ones. The latter centers on power and expansion. While the former is a struggle to have education and other public business conducted in the language which ordinary people understand. As long as aristocracies prevailed, the vernacular could be relegated to petty, private transactions of the lower classes. That members of the ruling class spoke a different language was only evidence of their superiority. Theirs was the language of culture, while the rude speech of ordinary folk was further evidence of ill-breeding.[3] But with the rise of democratic polities, vulgar vernaculars could not be ignored. After all, children, who in first grade understand nothing, are at a disadvantage; citizens dealing with government agencies in a foreign language are at a disadvantage.

---

[3] Jacob Loewenberg (1882-1969), Jewish, born in Latvia, became an important American philosopher. In his memoirs, about Latvian he writes: "He thought of it then as a vernacular of rustics and servants. Very much later he awoke to the fact that Lettish was indeed a language" (Jacob Loewenberg, *Thrice-Born: Selected Memories of an Immigrant* (New York: Hobbs, Dorman & Company, 1968), p. 2). He recalls that the small town in which he was born was divided into four "distinct groups": "The Letts were nearly all peasants; the merchants and shopkeepers almost always Jews... . The landed aristocracy was German and the ruling bureaucracy, Russian." Another Jewish philosopher, Morris Raphael Cohen (1880-1947), born near Minsk, writes: "As the majority of Goyim (Gentiles) … were peasants or poor city dwellers, some of them former serfs, few of them literate, the Jews generally regarded them as an inferior race" (Morris Raphael Cohen, *A Dreamer's Journey: The Autobiography of Morris Raphael Cohen* (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1949), p. 27).

Of course, there are exceptions, situations in which linguistic differences are an advantage. Grinius recalls a search of his home in 1908. His nine-year old son woke up and asked his mother, in Lithuanian which those searching did not understand, "did you hide everything?"[4] And there are cases when Grinius decided not to waste time in explaining to the authorities the nuances of Lithuanian slang. But on the whole, people face fewer barriers when education and public business in general is conducted in their cradle tongue. The alternative is to change the language habits of whole regions, which takes several generations, thus leaving many behind and, inevitably, traces of the language being replaced. The Polish used by Lithuanians was different from standard Polish. Many attending university in Warsaw recall being mocked for their rude speech.

Simon Sebag Montefiore, in *Young Stalin*, suggests that the "foolish" 1890 edict requiring schools in Georgia to be conducted in Russian, pushed Stalin towards becoming a revolutionary. He quotes one of Stalin's schoolmates: "They considered us Georgians to be an inferior culture into whom the blessing of Russian civilization had to be beaten."[5] Demeaning policies and derogatory remarks are part of the experience of small nations, often ignored by historians. Americans now recognize the harm done to African-Americans. They are less apt to recognize reminders of inferiority as factors in the rise of small nation nationalism.

The rise of small nations in Europe would be better categorized as anti-imperialism instead of nationalism. This is recognized by Edward Said. In explaining why he does not discuss the Russian empire and many others, he comments: the omission is "not meant to suggest that Russia's domination of Central Asia and Eastern Europe" has been "either benign (and hence approved of) or any less imperialistic." According to Said, "most of us should now regard the historical experience of empire as a common one." And I agree with his identification of the common threads: "There is always the appeal to power and national interest in running the affairs of lesser peoples; there is the same destructive zeal when the going gets a little rough...; there is the horrifically predictable disclaimer that 'we' are exceptional, not imperial...." Said also undercuts the tendency to see racism as exclusively a matter of color: "White' colonies like Ireland and Australia too were considered made up of inferior humans; a famous Daumier drawing for instance, explicitly connects Irish whites and Jamaican Blacks."[6]

---

4 Kazys Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys* (*Reminiscences and Thoughts*), volume 3 (Marijampolė: Piko valanda, 2016), p. 62.

5 Simon Sebag Montefiore, *Young Stalin* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007), p. 43.

6 Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), pp. xxii, xxiii, 134.

Lithuanians had to confront the imperialistic ambitions of both Russia and Poland. My sense is that Russian claims were more grounded in power and geography, including the need for ice-free ports on the Baltic Sea, than in claims of superiority. Polish claims also often rested on power, with emphasis on Poland's need to expand beyond her ethnographic limits if she is to fulfill her historical destiny of separating Germany from Russia. But the theme of Lithuanian inferiority is prominent: many Poles took pride in having civilized Lithuanian savages, thereby claiming that they were exceptional and not imperial.

In the late nineteenth century, the few educated Lithuanians began to notice, that beyond the borders of the Russian empire things were changing: as local languages emerged into public life, the standard of living rose. People became better educated and lived better. To Lithuanians, imperial rule had brought nothing but poverty, misery, ignorance, backwardness, the disappearance from their midst of the few educated ones, what is at times called brain-drain. The conclusion was obvious: if we learn from the nations around us and follow in their path, we too will enjoy a better life. In this context, it is hard to resist the idea that people live best when they govern themselves. And, while there are others, a common language is among the less troublesome ways of forming a people. Jews from different parts of the world learn Hebrew and become Israelis. Literacy in English is a condition of more than just American citizenship.[7] The Soviets failed impressively on the basis of a common faith.

At the time, the urban population was small and mostly Jewish or Russian. The gentry was mostly Polish in language. The overwhelming majority of Lithuanians were peasants, that is, subsistence farmers, consuming mostly what they had produced with their own hands.[8] Money was for paying taxes, buying small manufactures from Jewish peddlers, but for little else. There was little investment, few opportunities for saving. Excessive consumption of alcohol was a serious problem, in the eyes of many, the major barrier to economic development because the small amounts of spare cash went into the hands of operators of rural dives, mostly Jewish. The estate owners profited from distilling,

---

7 In the words of E. Annie Proulx, *Accordion Crimes* (New York; Scribner, 1996), p. 28, a disembarking greenhorn is a "prisoner of language" as he listens to senseless sounds.

8 Subsistence farmers live at risk: too much or not enough rain and they starve. But such life encourages creativity and ingenuity. An eye-opening book is Nijolė Pliuraitė-Andrejevienė, *Lietuvos vaikų žaislai* (*The Toys of the Children of Lithuania)* (Vilnius: Versus Aureus, 2012). Looking at the hundreds of illustrations one gets the sense that it is children playing with computers who are underprivileged. How can a play-station addict compare with a boy playing a pipe which he himself made?

Jewish communities from retailing, while the czar collected taxes, leaving Lithuanians with little more than drunken brawls and hangovers.[9] Even in the late nineteenth century a Lithuanian tavern owner was news. Furthermore, it was a society based on tradition: people lived and worked because that was the way their ancestors had lived and worked. Lithuanians had to become modern, that is, move into cities and establish themselves in urban occupations, transform farming from subsistence to market farming, the economy from a barter into a money economy. People had to be educated, learn to base their lives on the latest and best information. With modernization sweeping Europe, a folk culture grounded in tradition became too limiting, confining. In this context, the question of language is central: the audience most in need could be reached only by those using the vernacular.

In summary I argue, with Lithuania's experience as evidence, that small nation nationalism, the awakening of European small nations in the nineteenth century, is not a cause but an effect, especially of the modernization and democratization sweeping Europe. Leaders of small nations came to understand that unless they controlled their own destiny, their people would miss out on the good things which modern life offered.

The usual Lithuanian name for these developments is 'atgimimas', constructed in the same way as 'renaissance' and approximated by 'revival'. Both suggest that something lost is being recovered. I decided to use 'awakening' because it suggests that one who was dormant and passive is becoming awake and active. The Hegelian idea of something implicit becoming explicit is also helpful by adding the element of becoming aware of what has been present all along. The awakening, when it moves on to political claims is a kind of recovery, in the sense that Lithuanians who used to be politically active have become active once again, but under very different social conditions. Thus, keeping in mind that in the nineteenth century masses of ordinary people were becoming political agents the language of something long dormant awakening is appropriate.

The period could be called Lithuanian emancipation, emphasizing that a people for a long time confined to the private sphere were emerging into public life and winning control over their lives. The use of 'emancipation' in the title is intended to draw attention to the fact that developments in Lithuania have more in common with the civil rights struggle in the United States than, for

[9] See Mark Lawrence Schrad, *Vodka Politics: Alcohol, Autocracy, and the Secret History of the Russian State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014). Schrad provides a brief but reasonably correct account of Lithuanian temperance movements (pp. 117-19).

example, German nationalism. Both in the United States and in Lithuania a long oppressed people were struggling to free themselves in legal, social, and political senses. But I decided to retain 'awakening' in the text since it is closer to the term established in Lithuanian historiography.

The national awakening was part and parcel of democratization and modernization and in the eyes of many, the most promising means of achieving broad social goals. In the first half of the nineteenth century, there was a literary revival in Lithuanian. But it was confined to a small circle within the elite literary culture. The awakening in the second half was much broader both in intentions and consequences: focused as it was on the general public, it gave rise to a modern Lithuania. In my view, authors who see the awakening as mere nationalism miss the point. Under conditions prevailing at the time, the country could not become modern without also becoming Lithuanian.

Times have changed. A century ago the desire to live better pushed in the direction of nationalism. Now, it pushes in the opposite direction: in the present age, small nations lack the size and resources needed by exceptional individuals to flourish. Obvious examples: scientists need colleagues, laboratories, libraries, beyond anything that a small nation can provide; basketball players need the level of competition which can be found only in a large country. Political and intellectual leaders orate about patriotism, democracy, and other broad principles, while people conduct their lives mostly with reference to the small details amid which they find themselves. It happened that for Lithuanians of the late nineteenth century the details—education, jobs, families, food, clothing, housing, medical care—added up to patriotism.

I have been emphasizing the role of education and enlightenment. Kazys Grinius, one of the central figures of the time, understood this and for that reason is best seen as an agent of the Lithuanian enlightenment.[10] Among other things, he undertook to explain the germ theory of disease and the uses of soap to people who had difficulty imagining that invisible organisms could be real. Ghosts, demons, apparitions, of course, but bacteria? In addition to ignorance, Grinius had to overcome deeply ingrained attitudes, religious and social. I recall being uneasy when we boys extinguished a bonfire using our private resources: will fire respond to sacrilege with holy wrath? There are stories of farmers doubtful that tractors can be useful because they do not excrete, that is, do not produce fertilizer.

[10] Lithuanian orthography is mostly phonetic. To pronounce 'Grinius', say grin, add the vowel in 'pure', and finish with an 's'. There are two general biographies: Alfonsas Eidintas, *Kazys Grinius* (1993), more of a sketch than a full biography, and Gediminas Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius* (2000).

One of his tasks was to overcome the widespread belief that Lithuanians are a simple people, whose lowly status is part of the natural and inevitable order, destined never to change. Said writes: "almost to a man and woman the Europeans who dealt with colonies like India became insulated from the facts of change and nationalism. ...Even Karl Marx succumbed to thoughts of changeless Asiatic villages, or agriculture, or despotism."[11] My point is that many Lithuanians themselves believed in changeless villages, agriculture, despotism, with the despots including Russian-speaking Cossacks and Polish-speaking landlords.

Given the times, it would be misleading to insist on a rigid boundary between biography and history. The present is a work about both the Lithuanian awakening and Kazys Grinius, the former as it swirled around the latter: Grinius himself was both shaped by complex, intertwined social processes, and helped to shape them, give them form and direct them towards a definite goal, that of a modern and independent Lithuania. As a student in Moscow, he became involved in a circle studying the works of Marx and Engels. But upon reading Herbert Spencer's "The Coming Slavery," he concluded that socialism will establish dictatorships and crush freedom. He became a "radical democrat, Lithuanian nationalist." As he recalls, Spencer emphasized the growth of bureaucracy and central planning, which was bound to lead to massive resistance.[12] I do not know what he read, but he could well have encountered something like the following: "Remember that the aim of your discipline should be to produce a *self-governing* being; not to produce a being to be *governed by others*."[13]

He was born in 1866, the oldest son of modestly prosperous farmers, in a region with a different history from the rest of Lithuania. The region, while part of the Russian Empire, was administered as part of Poland and even used a different calendar and a different system of weights and measures.[14] In 1887 he completed secondary school in Marijampolė and went on to study medicine

[11] Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, p. 151. Said emphasizes that the character traits insuring Oriental inferiority were permanent: Orientals "could not learn to walk on sidewalks, could not tell the truth, could not use logic...." Natives were "essentially lazy" while North Europeans were "energetic and resourceful." I am not aware that any one has compiled a list of Lithuanian inferiorities found in Polish literature. Likely, the lists would be similar.

[12] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 65.

[13] From the essay "Moral Education" (1858), cited from Herbert Spencer, *Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical* (London: Watts & Co., 1911), p. 90.

[14] Because two different calendars were used, there is some confusion about dates. Most of the dates in the text are old style, because this calendar is most frequently found in the literature of the awakening. But for some events, historians have added thirteen days and they are usually presented with dates in the new style.

in Moscow. There, he became an active member of the Society of Lithuanian Students in Moscow and began to publish Lithuanian articles. The friendships and social ties formed there eventually resulted in the formation of one of the three large Lithuanian political parties. After returning to Lithuania, he established a medical practice and became one of the major figures of the awakening, its anti-clerical, secularizing wing. Arrested five times under the czars, he spent about six months in prison. He married Joana Pavalkytė in 1896 and had three children. She, his first wife, whose background was more Polish, became a Lithuanian and feminist activist, politically somewhat to the left of her husband. Since my concern is with the awakening and not its fruits, I conclude with the first months of the Great War, although with several excursions to bring the plight of small nations into sharper focus.

A sketch of his life beyond the limits of this work is needed for a more complete picture. In 1914, fleeing the war, the family ended up in the North Caucasus, where Grinius practiced medicine. In February 1917, he witnessed the joyful and hope-filled response to the abdication of the czar and the revolution; however, with tendencies towards anarchy. But after Lenin's coup in October, he witnessed Russia's turn to terror and civil war. Late in 1918, his wife and daughter were murdered by pillaging Bolsheviks. They were then in Kislovodsk, a well-known resort.

In May 1919, he and his two sons were allowed to leave Kislovodsk and travel by ship to France. To return to Lithuania overland, they would have had to cross several front lines. It is interesting that Inessa Armand, Lenin's mistress, traveled to Kislovodsk in hopes of recovering from an illness which soon proved fatal. From her biography it is clear that there still was fighting and looting after the departure of what remained of the Grinius family.

In France, his younger son died. Grinius worked for the Lithuanian Legation at the Peace Conference. He at last reached Lithuania on November 26, 1919 and resumed his medical practice. In April 1920 he was elected to the *Steigiamasis Seimas* (The Constituent Assembly), charged with writing a constitution. From June 22, 1920 to February 2, 1922, he served as prime minister of the 6th cabinet. After his resignation, he served in the *Seimas* and for several years, edited *Lietuvos žinios* (*Lithuanian News*).[15] Elected president by the *Seimas* on June 7, 1926, he was forced to resign by the military coup of December 17,

[15] *Lietuvos žinios* was a newspaper published in Vilnius in 1909-1915 and revived in Kaunas on February 16, 1922. It was the voice of Grinius's political party.

1926. Thereafter, while continuing to write advocating a return to democracy, most of his efforts were devoted to public health, especially efforts to reduce infant mortality and the incidence of tuberculosis. He served as director of the department of health and sanitation in the Kaunas city government. In 1927 he married Kristina Arsaitė and with her had one son. He survived the first Soviet occupation. Under the Germans, in late 1942 he was one of three signers of a protest against German policies. As a result, he was banned from Kaunas, but allowed to live in a remote village. During both occupations he continued to write and publish on questions of public health. In August 1944, as the Soviet armies were advancing westwards, he along with thousands fled to Germany and after the war ended up in a camp for displaced persons. He arrived in the United States in 1947 and died in 1950 in Chicago.

His arrival in the United States was covered by the *New York Times*. I begin with an account of this coverage because it illustrates how difficult it was, even for a major American daily, to report the predicament of a small nation. Grinius's arrival was a human interest story, one of many arising in the course of the war, rather than evidence of still another catastrophe overwhelming a small nation. In another break with chronology, also in the first chapter, I provide an account of the murders in Kislovodsk and Grinius's subsequent activities in France.

No mention has thus far been made of a fact central to the writing of Grinius's biography. When fleeing in 1944, he buried his papers in the ground. When an attempt, under the Soviets, was made to recover them, the papers had been damaged by water to such an extent that nothing was salvaged. In addition, some papers were destroyed in 1944 during an allied bombing of Berlin. As a result, an account of his early years can only be based on his memoirs. There are also obituaries he wrote of friends and coworkers, as well as accounts of specific events. But he had a good memory and in his memoirs provides considerable detail. Some assertions can be verified from other sources.

His bibliography runs to over 2,000 items.[16] Many are brief, no more than several sentences. It is highly unlikely that his bibliography will ever be established: he published an unknown number of unsigned pieces and, especially in his early years, used numerous pen names, somewhere around 250. Several of these were used by others, at about the same time in the same publications.[17] To

[16] The bibliography which I have compiled is being published by the Lithuanian National Library.

[17] Lenin used about 100 pseudonyms, see Victor Sebestyen, *Lenin: The Man, The Dictator, and the Master of Terror* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2017), p. 107.

April 1904, old style, when the ban was lifted, for forty years, it was forbidden in the empire to print in Lithuanian using Latin letters.[18] Books and periodicals were published across the border in Prussia and the United States and smuggled in as contraband. The nearly universal use of pseudonyms is understandable. But the habit persisted, albeit to a lesser extent, in Grinius's case, into the 1920s. Under the circumstances, sets of periodicals annotated by editors are needed. No such sets are known and it is highly unlikely that any survive. It is reported that papers associated with *Varpas*, a periodical to which he contributed extensively, were in Grinius's possession, but were buried in 1944 and damaged beyond recovery.[19] Furthermore, while Lithuanians managed to salvage something after the second World War, many relevant periodicals were destroyed when Soviet troops sacked Prussia. There are periodicals of which no complete sets are known, testimony of the region's violent history.

The loss of his papers is less of a problem for me for another reason. In my Lithuanian research, my primary concern has been the formation of Lithuanian public opinion, in an attempt to understand why in the end most ordinary Lithuanians opted for independence, preferring independence to other available alternatives. Historians tend to focus on leaders and their actions. My concern is to understand why some leaders attracted followers and others did not. By the nature of the case, the shaping of public opinion is a public process reflected in newspapers and not something hidden, to be uncovered only through archival research. Fortunately, Grinius wrote much, so that it is possible to trace the development of his vision for Lithuania.

I may add that the heroes of Lithuania's awakening were not soldiers, politicians, professional agitators, but amateur writers and book smugglers. Grinius recognized this and provided biographical sketches of perhaps a dozen of the latter. Symbolic of the differences in the development of Lithuania and Poland is the fact that the second wife of Marshall Jozef Pilsudski smuggled revolvers, while Grinius's wife smuggled books. A common stereotype in Lithuania: Poles are dreamers with little sense of reality. When I read Aleksandra Pilsudska's

---

[18] The ban was introduced in stages and the different persons involved had different intentions. But, in the main, it was intended to block Polonization and lead to eventual Russification. See Darius Staliūnas, "Lietuvių tapatumas, kalba ir rašmenys Rusijos tautinėje politikoje" ("Lithuanian Identity, Language and Orthography in Russian Nationality Policy," *Raidžių draudimo metai* (*The Years of Banned Letters*), ed. Darius Staliūnas (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2004), pp. 79-109.

[19] Zigmas Toliušis, unpublished memoir of Morta Zauniūtė, Lithuanian National Library, F66-35, fol. 51.

(1882-1963) memoirs my first thought was: only a Pole would arm himself with revolvers preparing to battle Russian armies.[20]

The live alternatives were five: autonomy within the Russian Empire, revolution and Communism, union with Poland in one form or another, independence closely linked with Germany, and complete independence. There was talk of a federation with Latvia, but this made little headway. A few, suggested the revival of something like the medieval Grand Duchy, but this never reached the level of widespread consideration.

The first alternative was a child of necessity, reflecting the disparity in size and power between Lithuania and Russia. After Russia's defeat, there was no empire for a few years, and the question of autonomy became moot. The second alternative could only have been imposed by force: the Communist appeal in a Catholic country was weak because of militant atheism. In addition, Lithuanian Communists committed a gross political blunder: in a region they controlled, they decreed that peasants make inventories of their possessions in preparation for life in communes. This aroused suspicion, especially because the Germans had demanded similar inventories before requisitions and taxes. And at a time when prosperity and status were associated with landownership, when many urged farmers to leave villages and establish free-standing homesteads!

The third alternative had more appeal among the social elite: Poland offered a more complete language, better suited to the demands of modern life, and in general, a more highly developed literature and art. But her attraction was tempered by memories of brutal Polish speaking landlords, going back to the days when most Lithuanians were serfs. Some Poles approached racism: Lithuanians, with emphasis on social class, were peasants by "blood," incapable of civilization. A Polish film about the Battle of Grunwald was made in 1960: glistening, armored Polish knights served by attendants and Lithuanians barely covered by furs ripping apart meat with their bare hands. This could have been the case in 1210, perhaps. But by 1410, the year of the battle, given several centuries of warfare with the Teutonic Knights, Lithuanian armament could not have been far below European standards. Among the better known Lithuanians in Polish literature is Podbipyenta, a noble savage—a friendly bear?-- dreaming of severing three heads with one swipe of his sword, warring side by side with

[20] Aleksandra Pilsudska, *Memoirs of Madame Pilsudski* (London: Hurst & Blackett, 1940), p. 125. The fashions of the day had their advantages: "Mausers were strapped down our thighs so that we could conceal under our skirts two or even three at a time...blocks of dynamite were ...padded into our corsets." This was taking place in about 1908.

Polish *pans*, in Sienkiewicz's *With Fire and Sword* (1884). Be that as it may, decisive were fears that in a union with Poland estates would not be nationalized and land not redistributed—there were cases of Lithuanians during the wars of independence enlisting in Polish legions, believing that they would receive land.

The fourth alternative, the German one, arose when German troops were still in the country, when there seemed to be no chance of anything better. It died unmourned, except for recriminations as to who was responsible for inviting a German prince to assume the Lithuanian throne.[21]

And in the end, Grinius and other awakeners persuaded people that they would prosper only if they took affairs into their own hands. Not a difficult task, because for more than a century foreign and imperial rule had been a recipe for poverty and backwardness.

From a great intellectual distance, federation with Poland could well appear the enlightened alternative to the narrow-mindedness of petty nationalism. But this is a view only from far away, advanced by those, I suspect, who think of history in terms of an elite literary culture. Viewed at closer range, with emphasis on social realities and not rhetoric, Polish federalism was not much different from Polish annexationism, both with an overlay of contempt for pig-herding country bumpkins.[22]

Madame Pilsudska was a modern woman. She was educated, employed before her marriage, smuggled munitions in her skirts in forty pound loads. Yet, judging from her memoirs, she was unaware of living after the French Revolution, in fact in the twentieth century, dominated by the masses struggling for recognition and respect in addition to, of course, the good things of life. She grew up on the edges of ethnographic Lithuania, apparently oblivious of the changes taking place around her, as insulated from social change as Englishmen in British India. She was raised by her grandmother on an estate. The grandmother "managed her big country estate ... governing the peasants with a firm hand, arbitrating in their disputes among themselves, giving them shrewd advice when they came to her

---

[21] On July 11, 1918, The Lithuanian Council declared Lithuania a monarchy and invited a German prince to assume the throne. Zigmantas Kiaupa, *The History of Lithuania* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2005), p. 242, emphasizes German efforts to retain influence in the region and the resulting pressure. At the time, the German army was not yet withdrawing. Grinius, on the other hand, blamed the clerical parties, see Gediminas Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius* (Vilnius: Pradai, 2000), pp. 216-17.

[22] Marija Urbšienė-Mašiotaitė, *Prisiminimai* (*Memories*), (Vilnius: Džiugas, 1996), p. 18, recalls that in Riga her mother was speaking Lithuanian with a friend. A passerby asked: are you recalling your pig-herding days? The friend responded: his memory would improve if he had a whip in hand.

with their problems and medicine when they were ill." A good example of the paternalism, condescension, which for many made union with Poland repulsive. Her account of the weeks before World War II is not much more egalitarian. She describes a harvest festival on her estate near Cracow: "the first mazurka ... was led by my daughter Wanda and the blacksmith. ... As I watched them whirling in the gay lilt of the mazurka, I thought that here was a part of the real wealth of Poland, these young peasants with their happy faces and strong bodies.... Weddings, christenings and funerals are the main interests of the countryside...." A democratically minded Grinius would have exclaimed: no harm in festivals (unless they degenerate into brawls), but what about infant mortality, access to health-care and education, just a few of the many questions which constitute the burden of citizenship? And what about the looming disaster? Unfair, but I cannot resist comparing her peasants with "darkies," slaves happily dancing the nights away, in *Aunt Phillis's Cabin* (1852), Mary Eastman's southern response to *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.

With the coming of war not a secret and catastrophe only weeks away, probably the peasants did more than dance. Likely, they huddled exchanging fears, reassuring each other with visions of victory. Did she not notice? Did she think it not worth mentioning?

She is somewhat aware of Poland's problems with minorities, but in her own fashion: Poland was defeated because of her "poverty and the vast network of espionage with which we were surrounded." Guiltiest were Germans, some of whose ancestors had settled in Poland several centuries ago. "But so strong and so persistent is Teutonic blood that when the crucial moment came they betrayed without a qualm the land which had sheltered them and reverted to their far distant ancenstry."[23] She is writing this, after escaping from collapsing Poland, in England, for an English speaking audience in an attempt to enlist sympathy for Poland!

Pillow-talk ought not be dismissed. No doubt, only some Poles lived in spiritual ghettos. No doubt, there were Lithuanians, or Americans for that matter, equally isolated from social realities around them. But she was linked with the architect of modern Poland for nearly thirty years, first as co-conspirator, then as confidant, lover, mother of his children, and eventually wife. Pilsudski himself is praised for his federalism. Federalism shows a more open mind than annexationism. Federalism at present resolves some of the security concerns of small nations. In the future, it may well be the only way of solving ecological

[23] *Memoirs of Madame Pilsudski*, pp. 65, 18-19, 28.

problems. Many Lithuanians of the 1920's and 1930's advocated federation. But genuine federation supposes comparable partners acting after preparation. When Lithuanians began to think about their future in political terms, conditions for federation did not exist. Federations were considered only because they were lesser evils. And Pilsudski himself was not willing to recognize Lithuanians as serious political actors. This is shown by his role in organizing the failed Polish military coup in Kaunas in 1919.[24] According to Polish historian Andrzej Garlicki, when in 1926 after Pilsudski's coup the cabinet took up the question of minorities, Pilsudski "emphasized successes and achievements in the assimilation of the minorities through the dissemination of Polish culture."[25] But the threat of assimilation is precisely what distresses minorities.[26] For Lithuanians in closer contact with Polish thinking, the distinction between Polish federalists and annexationists was one without a difference. Both parties believed in the importance of spreading their superior culture. In union with Poland Lithuanians would have been both members of a minority marked for assimilation and sturdy bodies. Madame Pilsudska is right when she writes about her husband: "The Polish nobility into which he was born was a conservative class, the remnants of a ruling order that had been without equal in power and privileges."[27] Grinius was not born a member of the "ruling order."

I cannot decide whether it is nationalism or his upper class origins, likely both, which underlie the following sentiment which his wife attributes to Pilsudski. After outlining the history of the relations between Poland and Lithuania, she writes: Pilsudski "dreamed of reviving that heart to heart collaboration of the past. Between him and that dream stood the menace of Bolshevism." Only an unbridled imagination could describe the relations between the two

---

24 M. K. Dziewanowski, *Joseph Pilsudski: A European Federalist, 1918-1922* (Stanford, Cal.: Hoover Institution Press, 1969), p. 163.

25 Andrzej Garlicki, *Josef Pilsudski, 1867-1935,* transl. by John Coutouvidis (Scolar Press, 1995), p. 145. Garlicki recognizes that Pilsudski was born in Lithuania and that the family possessed estates big enough to support an "opulent lifestyle," at least before the financial blunders by Pilsudski's father drove them into bankruptcy (p. 1). Bankruptcies were common throughout the empire and some land passed into the hands of peasants. This is one of several factors enabling Lithuanians to begin their climb.

26 Assimilation dominates American history. Even the displaced persons, who struggled not to be assimilated, mostly lost over several generations, assimilative forces being too powerful. But most of the immigrants entered as individuals seeking better jobs, often lured by unscrupulous recruiters hunting for cheap labor. But minorities in Europe more often live in communities, in their own territories, with histories, traditions, aspirations.

27 *Memoirs of Madame Pilsudski*, p. 157.

as "heart to heart." In fact, they were about average, with moments of cooperation, but also conflict, distrust, and even treachery. But the important point is her conviction that the fate of several millions is to be decided by her husband's dreams.[28] Notice, that Lithuanian aspirations are not so much as mentioned: Lithuanians are to keep silent while their betters decide what is best for them.

In 1919, on his way to France from Kislovodsk, Grinius conversed at length with a Polish count, who insisted that Lithuania was too small for independence, while it was imperative for Poland to regain at least the boundaries of 1772. Confounding Poland as a nation-state with the federal Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the count voiced Polish aspirations of becoming a great power, needing Lithuania as part of Poland to realize his dreams. Grinius responded with examples of successful small nations: where two fight, the third wins.[29] It was that way for Lithuania in 1918.

The conflating of modern Poland with the late Medieval commonwealth has found its way into general historiography. Thus, Hugh Seton-Watson writes: "The Lithuanians, who formed part of Poland for nearly four hundred years...."[30] Many Polish historians would push back the date by a hundred and fifty. But it is misleading to call a federal structure, of which Poland was only one part, and the nation-state Poland by the same name, especially in view of the fact that only a handful of English readers would be able to spot the ambiguity.

In retrospect, in a turbulent twentieth century, compared with others in the area, Lithuania survived in reasonably good shape. Because of independence, she escaped the worst decades of Lenin and Stalin, while size failed to protect Poland and power lured Germany and the Soviet Union into disastrous adventures.

In 1887, the Lithuanian doctor and activist Jonas Šliūpas (1861-1944), in New York, in Polish, published a pamphlet introducing Lithuanian aspirations to Polish readers. In his view, Lithuanians do not aspire to restore the medieval grand duchy and are content with ethnographic boundaries. He was attacked sharply by Jan Witort (1853-1903), in 1889, in *Kraj*, a Polish weekly published in

---

28 *Memoirs of Madame Pilsudski*, p. 287. In 1430, the Grand Duke of Lithuania arranged to be crowned king. But the emperor's legates made a fatal blunder: they picked a route through Poland, where Polish nobles waylaid them. There was little "heart to heart" during the devastating Swedish wars of the seventeenth century: at one point nobles of the Grand Duchy denounced union with Poland and declared the Swedish king to be the Grand Duke. For a brief account see Anne Applebaum, *Between East and West: Across the Borderlands of Europe* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1994), p. 52.

29 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 218-19.

30 Hugh Seton-Watson, *The Decline of Imperial Russia, 1855-1914* (New York: Praeger, 1956), p. 35.

Saint Petersburg, Russia. For Witort, Lithuanian activists are chauvinists, with little by way of brains and education. They are marked by ignorance, arrogance and Lithuanian obstinacy, a sign of intellectual incapacity. There is no Lithuanian culture which could replace the Polish one, while foreign cultures would be even worse. Likely, the last is an allusion to Šliūpas's socialism and its supposedly corrupting influence. Witort comes close to claiming that Lithuanians are racially inferior, by nature incapable of civilization.[31] Witort's view is much like the British view of Indians: "The Hindu is inherently untruthful and lacks moral courage."[32]

In 1939, after Lithuania regained Vilnius, there was considerable public interest in the fate of the estate of Gen. Lucjan Zeligowski, the Polish general in command of the forces which occupied Vilnius in 1920. The estate was nationalized. Discussion revolved around plans to establish an agricultural school or distribute the land to those Lithuanians who had suffered most from efforts to impose Polish culture.

The primary conditions of independence were products of events which Lithuanians could not so much as dream of turning in their favor. Like other small nations, Lithuania could only wait and probe, while the large predators warred and blundered. Grinius liked the proverb just quoted, that when two (or three) fight, the third (or fourth) wins. From the point of view of the major actors, the small nation-states which arose after the war were unforeseen consequences, the detritus of shattering empires.[33] But even within such narrow limits there were choices to be made: some in Lithuania looked to Poland for salvation, others--to the utopian fantasies of Karl Marx, and both alternatives were able to muster armies, powerful for the time and place. In spite of such temptations,

---

31 *Lietuviai ir lenkai* (*Lithuanians and Poles*), ed. Arūnas Vyšniauskas (Vilnius: Vilnius University Press, 2016). This is the pamphlet by Šliūpas, published here in Polish and Lithuanian translation. Also included, in Lithuanian translation and the original Polish is Witort's *Litwomani*. My interpretation of Witort's position is based on the Lithuanian translation, especially pp. 111-12. 'Litwomani' is pejorative term which, according to the introduction by Vyšniauskas (p. 15), came into use in the late 1880s and became widespread in Polish circles. Witort was born in Lithuania, but I have no information about his ethnic background.

32 Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, p. 151.

33 Norman Davies, in *Rising '44: The Battle for Warsaw* (New York: Viking, 2004), pp. 21-22, makes an interesting point about the intersection of biography and history. Churchill and Roosevelt grew up with Victorian maps, showing nothing, nothing of "significance" anyway, between Germany and Russia. The world of their childhoods seemed neat and orderly, with only several important actors requiring attention. Davies suggests that they never came to terms with the messy situation in which they were required to act. Grinius placed his hope in the United Nations. But how can the United Nations protect when the likely predators enjoy veto powers?

Grinius held on to sober common sense and pushed public opinion towards democracy and independence. In 1905, the year of revolution, Grinius's first wife was more radical than he was, became a member of the social democratic party and was elected to the central committee.[34] In other circumstances, she herself could have ended up a Bolshevik. And to add to the bibliographic confusion, the man who became the best known among Lithuanian disciples of Lenin, sometimes published in the same periodicals using the same pen names as Grinius, and expressing similar views.

Another excursion by way of introduction: I would like this study to be also a contribution to philosophy. In many history books, this time in the history of Europe is described as the era of nationalism. The description is acceptable, but only if it is understood that nationalism in its early stages, in Lithuania and many other places, was not a cause but an effect. Mark Mazover writes: "During the nineteenth century, nationalism had already begun to corrode the older dynastic or religious sentiments upon which imperial loyalties had once depended."[35] A more accurate account would reverse the causal order: the corrosion of old loyalties gave rise to the new loyalties of nationalism.[36] And why did the old ones corrode? The French Revolution and the spread of democratic ideas brought out into the open the cultural, social, economic quagmire to which the imperial order confined minorities. In the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, an empire in all but name, citizenship was the prerogative of perhaps ten per cent of the population, sporting pedigrees and mostly Polish speaking. The rest were merchants, servants, beasts of burden, cannon fodder. This state of affairs persisted throughout more than a century of Russian rule: at the beginning of the twentieth, most Lithuanians had never been inside a classroom, had never consulted a doctor, nor lived in a house with a chimney, many had never slept on

---

34 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 120.

35 Mark Mazover, *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), p. 44. It was hypocritical for the great powers after the First World War to insist as a condition of diplomatic recognition that the new nation-states respect minority rights. After all, they were great powers in part because they had assimilated and destroyed minorities.

36 In his philosophy of history Hegel distinguishes between consciousness and self-consciousness, between something simply lived and something becoming aware of itself. Using this language one could say that in the age of nationalism, ancient communities rose to the level of self-consciousness. But even this would make history too linear: there is evidence that Lithuanians in the Middle Ages were aware of differing from their neighbors in language, customs, religion, that is, were to some extent self-conscious.

a bed. It was no longer possible, given modernization, to accept such conditions as part of the divinely ordained, forever fixed, order.

It would be unfair to leave the impression that the empire did not modernize. There were changes, but mostly in cities, where few Lithuanians lived, and later in the periphery than in imperial centers. For example, horse-drawn streetcars have been known since the early years of the nineteenth century. In Kaunas, they began to operate in May 1892, even though Saint Petersburg had been enjoying electric powered transportation for a decade. But there was progress: many schools were built in expectation of introducing compulsory education, plans shattered by war, to cite another example.

After 1905, the pace of modernization quickened. Lithuanians of that time—and Americans to the present--associate the decade before the war with political repression. There was that but, to quote Davies, Lenin's seizure of power replaced "the old liberalizing regime of late tsardom" with "a totalitarian monster of far more sinister proclivities."[37] It can be argued that the war interrupted Russia's progress. Had there been no war, Russia could have become a constitutional monarchy, likely painfully, with many dark stretches. It is another matter whether Lithuania would have survived in a modern, prosperous Russia.

Mazover does not, in this context, mention the division of empires into social classes, often viewed as results of heredity, often associated with nationality and given religious sanction. Some Lithuanians did not understand that outhouses played an important part in disease prevention. Seeing them as upper-class prerogatives, they replied: outhouses are not for simple people. It should surprise no one to find Grinius explaining the germ theory of disease or arguing that bathing is important not only for aristocrats but also for peasants. It is a simple matter to translate observed correlations between poverty and short life-expectancy into political terms: imperial governments are too far removed from the brief lives of ordinary people. In his political writings, Grinius at times approached what is sometimes called direct democracy, favoring municipal government over national.

In my own intellectual voyage, I no longer treat nationalism as an explanatory concept, most certainly not in the case of small nations in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In this context, nationalism is merely a collective name for thousands of individual decisions, guesses as to the political arrangement promising a better life, made in different circumstances, with different

[37] Davies, *Rising ,44*, p. 21.

motives and consequences. I no longer think that a generalized, conceptual, critique of nationalism is enlightening or even possible. My skepticism was first aroused by the cosmopolitanism of the philosopher John Dewey: it was obvious that little of what he says is relevant to Lithuanian experience. Dewey knows almost nothing about the history and aspirations of small nations: his critique of nationalism is mostly a critique of the policies of imperial Germany.[38]

Miroslaw Hroch was right when while accepting an honorary doctorate from Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas, he refused to treat the concept of nationalism as a fixed essence. He proposed to classify the formation of modern nations in nineteenth century Europe into three categories. France, Holland, and Sweden illustrate the first type. Here, initiative belonged to their ruling classes and intellectual elites, with emphasis on their own histories and cultures. Germany, Italy, and Poland fall into the second category when existing nations are collected into single political entities. The third type is marked by the absence of elites and literary traditions in their own languages. Lithuania, Ireland, Norway and others, he places in this third category,. He calls this third type "small nations," with emphasis not on size but the type of formation.[39]

In my view, concerning Lithuania, he is not far from the truth, although he overstates the absence of literary traditions. Lithuania, like some other small nations, was an "incomplete nation," to use one of Hroch's helpful terms. Lithuania's social, economic, and intellectual elites were small. There was no political elite. But, I would emphasize, that she also lacked a Lithuanian urban middle-class. And, as was noted by some even in the nineteenth century, the failure of a Lithuanian urban class to develop was the major factor in retarding modernization. I would also lay stress on the felt urgency to modernize. Lithuanians had to be modernized so that they could claim the ever growing number of good things modern life offered.

Hroch underrates the role of size. I am more inclined to agree with William James, a vocal critic of American imperialism, for whom size was important. In 1899, commenting on American policy in the Philippines, he wrote: "I begin to believe that every 'big' thing is necessarily corrupt." And a few months later: "The bigger the unit you deal with, the hollower, the more brutal, the more

---

38 Ignas K. Skrupskelis, "Some Oversights of Dewey's Cosmopolitanism," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society,* 2009 July, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 308-47.

39 Miroslav Hroch, "What Does It Mean to Be a , Small Nation'," *Darbai ir dienos* (*Deeds and Days*), 2007, nr. 48, pp. 329-32.

mendacious is the life displayed. So I am against all big organizations as such, national ones first and foremost."[40] In his old age reflections, Grinius reaches a similar conclusion: we cannot expect enduring peace as long as the Russian empire, disguised as the Soviet Union, survives, that is, has not been replaced by many independent countries. At the same time, although vaguely, he seems to suggest that over-expansion inevitably leads to collapse.[41]

Notwithstanding egalitarian rhetoric, power determines a nation's place in the scheme of things and shapes her conception of herself--James includes "the lust for mere bigness" among the cardinal human passions. Power is a function of size: there have been nations both large and weak but there have been few, if any, both small and powerful.

Of pre-war European leaders, Lithuanians most admired Thomas Garrigue Masaryk (1850-1937), the philosopher president of Czechoslovakia, among the principal figures of the Czech awakening, which began nearly a century before the Lithuanian. According to Masaryk's biographers, he saw the awakening as a quest for respect, dignity, and as the recovery of the spiritual treasures of Czech history, lost in the imperial splendor of Austro-Hungary. I cannot judge how fair a picture this is—perhaps the intellectual emphasis is more a reflection of his philosophical interests than social realities. Be that as it may, Masaryk's vision contrasts with that of Grinius, of course, not in absolute but relative terms. Grinius too wanted Lithuanians to respect themselves and was not opposed to the recovery of the past. But he was not a philosopher but a medical doctor, devoting most of his attention to ordinary lives and ordinary concerns. There are Lithuanian figures in some ways more like Masaryk, more than Grinius concerned with the glories of the past. But in the end, it is Grinius with his common sense who best represents the social underpinnings of the awakening in Lithuania.

They were different in still another way. The young Grinius did not dream of organizing a Lithuanian military force. Like Pilsudski, Masaryk did. Lithuanians began to think in military terms later, after the February Revolution, recruiting Lithuanians serving in the Russian army. Grinius was not involved in

---

40 *The Correspondence of William James*, vol. 8 (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 2000), pp. 523, 546. Said, for whom Kipling is a central figure, would enjoy reading that Kipling "knows perfectly well that our camps in the tropics are not college settlements or our armies bands of philanthropists" (p. 495).

41 Kazys Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, volume 2 (Chicago, 1962), p. 107.

these efforts. But in one important way Grinius and Masaryk were alike: they both were of peasant origin.

In 1918, while in the United States, Masaryk founded the Mid-European Union to lobby the American government on behalf of the new states. The Lithuanian representative was Jonas Šliūpas. Masaryk remembered the confrontations between Šliūpas and the Polish representatives, Roman Dmowski (1864-1939), an annexationist, and the pianist and politician Ignacy Paderewski (1860-1941). Both saw Lithuanian aspirations as a barrier to the realization of their dream of making Poland a great power. Masaryk sided with Lithuania, but struggled to keep the two sides civil so as not to disrupt the Union.[42]

Concerning Masaryk, René Wellek writes: "Masaryk was a peculiar nationalist. He inherited from the Romantic movement the linguistic concept of a nation which was combined with the concept of a nation's special character and mission."[43] Few Lithuanians had so much as heard of the Romantics and few speculated about their distinctive mission. There is little in the biography of Grinius to suggest that he himself was motivated by such intellectual concerns. It is true that he as most Lithuanians came to see themselves as a community delineated by a common language. But for him, in the beginning, the value of language was instrumental: how else are you going to reach the thousands who speak no other? He recalls Russian officials explaining to villagers how to prevent epidemics in a language which few understood. Some of the more important of his early publications were translations, making modern ideas available to Lithuanian speakers.

There is suggestive evidence linking the rise of the vernacular with the need to reach a larger audience. The first book printed in Kaunas in Lithuanian appeared in 1848. It was a pamphlet setting forth regulations to prevent cholera epidemics. The stated intent was to educate not only peasants but other inhabitants of Kaunas province as well.[44]

It goes without saying that in time the language becomes an interest in its own right. A language cannot serve its function without some standardization of orthography, vocabulary, grammar. It has to grow up so as to serve as a vehicle for literature, science, government, commerce. Thus, it is not surprising

---

42 Juozas Jakštas, *Dr. Jonas Šliūpas* (Chicago: 1979), pp. 230-31.

43 René Wellek, in his foreword to *The Spirit of Thomas G. Masaryk (1850-1937): An anthology*, ed. George J. Kovtun (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990), p. ix.

44 Nijolė Lietuvninkaitė, "Kauno lietuviškos knygos leidybos ištakos"("The Origins of Lithuanian Book Publishing in Kaunas"), *Kauno Istorijos Metraštis* (*Yearbook of the History of Kaunas*), 2000, vol. 2, pp. 30-37.

that we find Grinius making suggestions as to what standardized Lithuanian should be like. Something similar can be said concerning nationality. In the case of Lithuania, it begins as an effect of various social changes, but in time, it itself becomes a cause, when national interests come to be perceived and pursued for their own sake. Masaryk also perceived a similar sequence. In 1895 he wrote: "At first, language and nationality were perceived merely as necessary tools of enlightenment. It was only later that the perfection of language and intensification of national awareness came to be regarded as valuable in their own right, as goals worthy of special political commitment."[45]

Of course, Lithuanian developments were only a fragment of the swirling chaos of reform and revolutionary movements--political, social, national, religious, feminist--eating away at the very foundations of the empire. When we examine their programs, it becomes clear that at the time national, political, and social awakenings were inseparable. For example, in the fall of 1905, the year of revolution, Lithuanian feminist women gathered in Vilnius to establish their own association. The first of their resolutions called for Lithuania's autonomy within ethnographic boundaries, while equal rights for men and women were relegated to second place. In December of that year, also in Vilnius, what came to be known as the Great Vilnius Assembly took place, primarily concerned with Lithuania's political future. But the Assembly found time to listen to a feminist delegate about the equality of men and women and to some maid-servants demanding increases in pay, free medical care, and two hours a day set aside for educational purposes.[46]

---

45 From the essay "Czechs and their Awakening," *The Spirit of Thomas G. Masaryk,* p. 65.

46 Virginija Jurėnienė, "I-asis ir II-asis moterų suvažiavimai: Lietuvos moterų judėjimo siekiai ir išdavos" ("The First and Second Women's Assemblies: The Goals and Results of the Lithuanian Women's Movement," *Kauno Istorijos Metraštis,* 2005, vol. 6, pp. 113-35. According to both gatherings, all adults should have voting rights without property qualifications. The just announced rules for elections to the first Duma imposed property qualifications and excluded women from voting. I may add that in independent Lithuania government offices closed early so that employees could attend evening classes.

I Voyages

On January 25, 1947, on p. 3, the *New York Times* published six short paragraphs under the headline, "Ex-Head of Lithuania Hopes for Republic." Readers were informed that the *Marine Marlin*, a converted troop transport ship, from Bremerhaven, five days late, battered by storms, "losing forty feet of her forward port bulwark," had docked in New York, at Pier 90, North River, at 3:15 PM the previous day, with 927 passengers, "most of them survivors of concentration camps." Among the passengers was Kazys Grinius, "80-year-old ex-President of Lithuania." Grinius told reporters that "it was his firm belief his country would once again become an independent republic, free of Russian dominance." He was "basing his hope for Lithuania's freedom in the Atlantic Charter."

Likely the story puzzled many: preoccupied with the great events of the day, the war and its aftermath, Lithuania was no more than a footnote. Was Grinius a survivor of a concentration camp? (No.) When and how did he become an ex-president? (Not in 1940, but in 1926.) Why and how did he leave Lithuania? (In 1944 as the second Soviet occupation began.) And exactly what did "Russian dominance" mean? Influence, occupation, or something in between? (In 1940, after occupying the country, the Soviets declared Lithuania a constituent republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.) Few readers would have noted that neither the word 'Communist' nor the word 'Soviet' appeared: but those who did,

would have been annoyed by the failure to incriminate the ideology responsible and by the misleading identification of Russia and the Soviet Union. A persistent confusion, I might add, which made it more difficult for Americans to make sense of the events of 1989-1991 as the Soviet Union was disintegrating, events in which Lithuania played a major role.[47]

Instead of clearing up such puzzles, the story devoted a paragraph to a woman who brought with her a family heirloom saved from the Nazis, "a brooch containing fifty diamonds." Another paragraph described a two and a half year old girl: "The youngster wore a coat made of officer 'pinks' and the silver leaves of an American Army lieutenant colonel, who has adopted her." The girl was an orphan—Polish or German, guessing from her name. Her parents had perished in concentration camps. The woman was perhaps German. Her mother had died in 1942 also in a camp. Thus, human interest journalism. The story failed to mention another arrival, an eight year old Lithuanian girl, dug out from under rubble after an Allied bombing, who exclaimed that she had never seen a miracle like the lights of Broadway.[48]

A more political account appeared several days later, on January 28, buried on p. 20, under the headline, "Balt Ex-President to Be U. S. Citizen." We learn that Grinius reached the United States after eighteen months in a displaced persons camp in the American occupation zone in Germany; that he was accompanied by his wife (second) and 18-year old son; that they had been admitted under an "immigration quota for Lithuania that permits the entrance of 386 persons a year." In an interview given at a hotel in New York, Grinius described life in the displaced persons camps as "fair and humane" and unquestionably better than in his homeland which was "now occupied by Soviet forces."[49] About

---

47 Davies too is annoyed by the American tendency to call the Soviet Union Russia, see *Rising '44,* p. 21. Typically, it is "Russians" who died in the war, in spite of fact that the Red Army included many nationalities, while it is Lithuanians, Latvians, Ukrainians, etc. who are alleged to have collaborated with the Nazis.

48 Lithuanian Central State Archive, 663/1/52, fol. 80.

49 The Displaced Persons Act, under which most entered the United States, was signed into law by Truman on June 25, 1948. I remember my four years as a displaced person as among my better ones: we lived in a castle surrounded by forests in which we boys disappeared, searching for abandoned weapons, begging for cigarettes from American soldiers, roasting potatoes, foraging for mushrooms and berries. We never found weapons and had to pool our resources to buy one cigarette on the black market, but the potatoes—stolen?--were delicious. Because under Communism teachers were at high risk, many had fled and we had good schools, even though we had few textbooks, and in the first days, lacked even pencils or paper. A disproportionally large number became American academics. The American space program is a beneficiary, because the theory enabling computers

60,000 Lithuanians were still living as displaced persons in Germany and had no intention of returning to the "Soviet occupied country." He also said that the underground movement, "begun under German occupation" continued: "Clashes were frequent." He was right both about the number of refugees and the resistance, which was just beginning to decline. But, assuming the error was his and not the reporter's, he was mistaken in identifying himself as the only living ex-president. Lithuania had had three presidents. The first and last, Antanas Smetona (1874-1944) was indeed dead, dying in a fire of suspicious origin in Cleveland on January 9, 1944. But Grinius's predecessor Aleksandras Stulginskis (1885-1969) was alive. However, early in 1947, Lithuanian publications reported that Stulginskis had perished somewhere in the Soviet Union.

Did he say he wanted to become an American citizen? Possibly. But more likely, it is a misunderstanding—Grinius did not know English and was being translated. His brother, Jonas Grinius (1877-1954), was living in Philadelphia and probably was a citizen. His son, also Kazys, a colonel in the Lithuanian army, had lived in the United States for some years, but probably was not a citizen. Possibly, it is the son's plans that were being discussed rather than his father's.

More details about the voyage of the *Marine Marlin* were supplied by the 18-year old son, in a letter of February 2. They left Bremerhaven on January 9: he and the aged former president were housed in sleeping quarters with bunks for 100 men. The elder Grinius became ill, could not eat, and spent four days in poorly ventilated quarters. Wrote the son: "It was not pleasant to be confined, especially because we did not see sunlight and the air was foul. But we had to get used to it." The image of an elderly president, much like his small country, hardening himself to the absence of sunlight and air, is symbolic of the realities of power and stands in stark contrast to the gilded rhetoric of the Atlantic Charter, in which Grinius placed his hopes.[50]

After docking, continues the son, they were besieged by reporters and photographers: brief reports with photographs appeared that evening in major New York newspapers. The assault by immigration officials and reporters lasted nearly five fours, so it was eight in the evening when they reached a Lithuanian center for

---

to diagnose and repair themselves was developed by Algirdas Avižienis (b. 1932) , a Lithuanian DP. The more controversial Marija Gimbutas (1921-1994) contributed to archaeology, art history, and feminism. Jonas Mekas (1922-2019) is considered a pioneer of art-films in America.

[50] The Atlantic Charter was a propaganda piece, to reassure the British public, and not a declaration of policy. Many Lithuanians did not understand this and believed that the Western Allies would not allow the Soviets to occupy their country.

more speeches and interviews. They arrived at their hotel—the Barbizon Plaza--only at midnight. At a later news conference, the son reports, reporters inquired about plans to visit the State Department. What Grinius replied is not known, but it is a simple matter to answer in his place: perhaps a few years later to secure votes in an upcoming election, but never when questions of policy were at stake. As far as the State Department was concerned, Grinius was an ordinary immigrant, admitted only because his brother signed a guarantee that Grinius would not be a public charge. It goes without saying that the mayor of New York, who met with Grinius, was not among the architects of American foreign policy.[51]

The *New York Herald Tribune*, on January 25, p. 13, did publish a photograph of Grinius, his wife, and younger son. However, the newspaper deflected attention from the plight of his country to American concerns about a resurgence of an aggressive Germany with the headline "Germans Called Cool to Theory of Democracy." Grinius is described as an "eighty-year-old immigrant," that is, as someone seeking a better life for himself, and not as a refugee or an exile, struggling to free his country from devastating terror. Once again, avoiding incriminating Communism and the Soviet Union, the story explained that many displaced Lithuanians do not want to return because "Lithuania is under Russian domination."

In such accounts, reflecting American points of view, the occupation does not appear even as footnote. The term refugee being too harsh and raising political questions, the term displaced person was coined so as not to hurt Stalin's feelings. Here and elsewhere we see it at work depoliticizing and sanitizing.

Before docking, Grinius filled out an immigration questionnaire stating that he had a son and three brothers living in the United States, the brothers being long-time residents, whom he had not seen for about four decades. There was a question about arrests for political activity. He answered that because of his membership in the Democratic Party of Lithuania and for distributing banned literature under the czars, he had been arrested five times and spent six months in prison. From a letter he wrote a week after landing to a friend in Switzerland, we learn that he was somewhat overwhelmed by the attention of journalists and photographers. In other words, he wrote, "we begin our life in the United States

---

[51] Excerpts from the letter were published in *Varpas*. 1947, no. 2, p. 27-28. This *Varpas* (*The Bell*) was a mimeographed newsletter published in the displaced person camps in Germany. It should not be confused with other periodicals of that name.

with pomp and circumstance."[52] Judging from newspaper accounts, this was an exaggeration. But Grinius must have been glad to stand on firm ground and was unfamiliar with ways in which important visitors are greeted. Much like beauty, pomp is in the eyes of the beholder.

In spite of the difficult crossing and age, Grinius saw himself as a political agent, and was regarded as such by his countrymen. He immediately plunged into the work of liberating Lithuania, a phrase which the younger generation of exiles, in time learning the difference between rhetoric and policy, tended to pronounce with slightly ironic overtones. On February 17, 1947, on p. 12, the *New York Times*, reported about the commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day—February 16—at Webster Hall, on East 11th street, New York, which later became a "funky rock music club."[53] Addressing in Lithuanian a crowd of some 2,000, Grinius spoke with optimism: "The freedom of Lithuania as well as that of all enslaved nations will eventually be brought before the Assembly of the United Nations. That's one of its main purposes." The meeting passed a resolution demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops and "participation of American-Lithuanian experts at the forthcoming Moscow conference." Among the speakers was Alvin O'Konski, a congressman from Wisconsin, known for his opposition to Communism—it would be interesting to know how he assessed the chances of Lithuanian experts at a conference in Moscow. Another speaker was the Lithuanian minister to the United States—unlikely that he had access to policy makers.[54]

Grinius—described by the *New York Times*, March 9, 1947, as "an octogenarian physician"—spoke on March 8, at a dinner "tendered by the United Lithuanians, purporting to represent 1,000,000 Americans of Lithuanian extraction." He condemned "what he termed the Soviet policy of deporting Lithuanians to Siberia as slave laborers." He explained that "having lived through the first Russian occupation in 1939, the German occupation beginning in 1941, he and 200,000 other Lithuanians had not been able to face a second Russian occupation and had fled the country."

---

52 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, pp. 486-87.

53 *New York Times*, December 9, 2007, p. 12. The story--"A Rec Room for Rallies, Fistfights and Roc,"--mentions that in earlier years Grinius spoke there.

54 Because the United States did not recognize the incorporation, the Republic of Lithuania continued to exist, albeit only *de jure*, and her diplomats remained in Washington. From the point of view of international law, Lithuania was occupied and not a constituent republic of the Soviet Union. This was of some importance in 1989-1991.

The estimate of 1,000,000 was often repeated and while crude is plausible. The reference to Siberia is not very misleading, in spite of the fact that many of the slave camps were located west of the Urals, because the name is often used simply to indicate a place of punishment. But the 1939 date likely is a misunderstanding: Soviet bases were forced upon the country in late 1939, but the occupation itself began on June 15, 1940, the very day when headlines in Lithuania announced the fall of Paris. That 200,000 fled the second Soviet occupation is an overstatement. Perhaps, Grinius added the number of refugees and the number of deportees or "special settlers,"[55] and the reporter misunderstood, but even then the number would have been too large for 1947. On the other hand, because some of the largest deportations took place after 1947, while no definitive data are available, the count of those arrested and sent to slave camps, those deported and resettled, and refugees approximates 200,000.

Several months later, Grinius spoke in Chicago, with its large Lithuanian community. His tone was alarming: "Lithuania Ruled by Red Violence, Says Exiled Chief," proclaimed the headline on p. 12 of the *Washington Post* of March 21. Russia—the Soviet Union is not named--"has established a reign of violence, censorship and death or exile in the small Baltic state." He declared that "Russia was determined to wipe out his country." Grinius was voicing what most Lithuanians at that time believed. The first claim, about the reign of terror, has been amply confirmed. The second, turned out to be an exaggeration. But who can tell what would have happened had Stalin not died in 1953, when manpower was still precious after wartime losses? The arrests and deportations, with family as the unit of accounting, in 1940-1941 were only a first step of a massive operation which, while falling short of a final solution, would have left the country moribund. From this point of view, war broke out at a good time and saved many lives. No doubt, the fear, the uncertainties, the rumors and suspicions of that year were still vivid in Grinius's mind.

Grinius indulged in some overstatements. But he was not blind. In an interview in 1937 about the prospects for peace in 1938, he asserted that the Soviets would not be a reliable ally: should Hitler offer peace, the Soviets would accept and to some degree support Germany.[56] This contrasts with Henry Wallace, one

[55] Norman Davies, *God's Playground: A History of Poland*, 2 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 2: 668, uses the term 'special settlers' to describe Polish deportees.

[56] Interview with several leaders in *XX Amžius* (*Twentieth Century*), 1937 December 23. *XX Amžius* was a Catholic daily newspaper published in Kaunas, the organ of a group of intellectuals known as the Young Catholics.

of many socialist innocents abroad, in 1944 still vice-president of the United States. He compared a Soviet slave camp to Fairbanks of the gold rush, favorably: "The Kolyma gold miners are big, husky young men, who came out to the Far East from European Russia." He viewed collective farmers in the Far East as hardy pioneers, apparently oblivious of the millions who perished in collectivization drives or the hunger for land which played a major role in the collapse of czarism. Grinius respected ordinary lives. A telling contrast with the ideologically intoxicated poet Pablo Neruda, who after a Soviet tour in 1949 declared, "The entire human race knows what a colossal truth is being worked out there." And we should remind ourselves that neither Wallace nor Neruda traveled in steerage.[57]

Grinius must be counted among the more fortunate ones: he was alive. He was listed for deportation during the mass deportations of June 14, 1941. Perhaps, as Liūtas Grinius recalls, he like many others, avoided capture by not sleeping at home after noticing military trucks, loaded with women and children, guarded by soldiers with fixed bayonets.[58] And in 1944 he and his family succeeded in squeezing themselves into a train, when many were fleeing in horse carts, on bicycles, or on foot. He did not hide in roadside ditches from strafing Soviet warplanes, as did many others. A sign of his steadfast character: while lingering in a Prussian town as the front paused, in spite of the chaos, dangers and uncertainties, he worked on his dictionary of medical terms, Latin, German, and Lithuanian. This project did not survive Allied bombings of Berlin.

I have already mentioned the fate of the three presidents. Smetona fled on June 15, as Soviet armies, 150,000 strong, crossed the border. His flight pleased many, especially in the ranks of the democratic opposition which included Grinius. It also confused many during the first days: Smetona's departure could be seen as an added bonus, by those who took the speeches by members of the puppet government the Soviet's installed at face value. This government, after laying a wreath at a monument to Lithuania's independence announced the beginning of long delayed reforms and thanked the Soviet army for keeping the

[57] Paul Hollander, *Political Pilgrims: Travels of Western Intellectuals to the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 157, 130. Hollander's emphasis is on the politics of hospitality. Wallace several times remarks on the unlimited quantities of good wine available at meals. It is clear from his diary that he dismissed reports of Soviet crimes as attempts to poison relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

[58] Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 436. The men were separated from their families and shipped to slave camps, while the women and children were "resettled." Deportations were carried out in most of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact acquisitions, and it remains a puzzle why Stalin, a week before the invasion, should have undertaken such a massive exercise in logistics.

country safe from war. Be that as it may, Smetona eventually reached the United States and, as has been said, died in a fire. Stulginskis and his wife were arrested in June 1941. Deported, at the time he was somewhere in the Soviet Union. In 1952 he was arrested and sentenced to 25 years, but released after Stalin's death, was allowed to return to Lithuania in 1956.

During the years of independence, Lithuania had had 18 cabinets and 12 prime ministers. 10 prime ministers were alive on June 15, 1940: one, widely respected, after serving for several weeks in the puppet government as minister of finance, fled, eventually dying in France; two were arrested and executed; two were arrested and died while in Soviet hands; two were arrested and survived; two lived out the occupation and fled in 1944, one dying in Austria and the other (Grinius) in the United States; one, a general, served under Soviet command until the outbreak of war, fled in 1944 and eventually died in the United States. Only one of the ten died in Lithuania. It makes some sense that the Soviets executed five former internal affairs ministers: they were in control of the police which had arrested underground communists. They likely would have executed one more, the minister who served after the 1926 coup when four communists were shot by firing squads: he was in prison on June 22, 1941 when the Germans attacked and the prisoners in Kaunas broke out that night after the guards fled. But why did they execute three ministers of education? It is sometimes said that German policy was to cut off Poland's head. The assault on the ministry of education—teachers were one of the high-risk groups—suggests similar Soviet plans for Lithuania, long-term ones, going far beyond incorporation. In the last years of the war, six "resettled" widows of Lithuanian cabinet ministers, with their small children, were working in Arctic fishing collectives, at the mouth of the Lena.[59] What does that reveal about Stalin's intentions in the long term? But Stalin was secretive, said less than he thought, and especially under Putin access to archives is much restricted.[60]

---

59 Zigmas Toliušis, *Mano kalėjimai* (*My prisons*) (Vilnius: Mintis, 1991), p. 241. Zigmas Toliušis (1889-1971), a lawyer, active in politics, often associated with Grinius, was himself arrested by the Soviets four times.

60 There is tradition of ignoring Communist crimes. The military historian Gerhard Weinberg, *A World at Arms* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 135, has this to say about some of what I have described: "The red army occupied the Baltic States after a series of ultimatums and began to organize official incorporation." Few would suspect that the word 'organizing' covers arresting and killing.

As Grinius was settling into his new life, so was Ona Bacevičienė, his widowed sister, and two of her daughters (one in late stages of pregnancy), encouraged by a squad of Soviet soldiers. In December of 1947 the three found themselves in Siberia, destined for a brick factory. Because they had politically suspect relatives abroad, their Siberian term was for five years.[61] Unlikely that Grinius was aware of their plight. Also unlikely that the women agreed with Wallace and saw themselves as "big, husky" pioneers.

The 1944 flight was Grinius's second escape from plundering Bolsheviks. While the political prospects were bleaker than they had been in at the time of his flight in 1919, his private burden was much lighter. In October 1918, Grinius, his first wife, and their three children were living in Kislovodsk, in the North Caucasus, a resort, passing back and forth between the reds and the whites in the civil war. Grinius himself was at some risk of arrest, but also at one point was urged to join the Bolsheviks. He was in charge of a hospital and also had a small private practice, being paid in bread, eggs, and other provisions. A band of Bolsheviks broke into their home while Grinius was away and murdered his wife and sixteen-year old daughter. While robbery is more likely, the motivation could have been political: Grinius's older son was away, serving with the whites. Revenge is also a possibility: a Lithuanian Communist claimed that the murders were justified because Grinius did not give a fur-coat to a Communist soldier being released from the hospital.[62] On the other hand, there are reports that several months later a Bolshevik activist was seen walking around town wearing the pants of Grinius's brother-in-law. When Grinius returned from work at the hospital, he found the apartment looted and damaged by fire, his wife dead from a rifle bullet, his speechless daughter cowering, wounded by a pistol shot to the head, but the youngest child was untouched, running away to look for help as three Red Army soldiers searched for loot. The family had taken shelter in a basement from bombardment. The daughter died two weeks later, after several operations.[63] Adding to the husband's and father's burden, the younger boy, from his birth in poor health, died from measles after the three survivors had

---

61 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 498.

62 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 199.

63 The exact date of the murders cannot be established, in any case, either September or October 1918. Both mother and daughter were buried in Kislovodsk in an Orthodox cemetery because the Catholic priest refused to bury them in the Catholic one, arguing that they were not church goers. In 1999 Ilgūnas traveled to Kislovodsk and learned that the cemetery had been abandoned in around 1950 and a factory built on the site.

landed in Marseilles. War and revolution isolated Grinius: news of the murders reached Lithuania only in August 1919.

While in Paris, on September 30, 1919, Grinius wrote a long letter to his brother Jonas, whom we have met on a Manhattan dock. This is the earliest of the very few personal letters which have survived.[64] We learn that in 1915-1917 he lived near Grozno, in charge of a military hospital with 2,300 beds. The hospital was looted and destroyed by Cossacks and they moved to Kislovodsk, where once again he was in charge of a military hospital. In Kislovodsk, the children attended school, with the son Kazys graduating from secondary school in the spring of 1918. Sometimes, the city was held by Cossacks, sometimes by Bolsheviks. On one occasion, four Bolshevik soldiers entered their home, but left after it was explained to them that the family were Lithuanian refugees. At some point, probably to avoid being conscripted by the Bolsheviks, the older son joined the Cossacks, under the command of Andrei Grigor'yevich Shkuro (1887-1947).[65] Known for disobeying orders and improvising, Shkuro and his men are accused of taken part in anti-Semitic pogroms in Kiev, in August 1919. But Grinius's son was no longer with them.

According to Grinius, the February revolution was greeted joyfully: in his memoirs he describes how young people, girls, wore medallions with Kerensky's portrait and sent congratulatory telegrams. With pride, people boasted that their's was a bloodless revolution. But joy was followed by anarchy. A revolutionary committee formed in the hospital in which Grinius was the chief medical officer. The committee decided to fire him, but it was soon replaced by another committee which wanted to keep him in place. Tradesmen who supplied food trusted him and threatened to cut off supplies if Grinius left. At this point, a nurse approached him and after expressing her admiration for strong men, squeezed his hand and kissed it. He pretended not to understand what she had

---

64 It was published in *Keleivis (The Traveler)* October 29, 1919, a socialist newspaper in Boston. The original is not known.

65 Shkuro's memoirs were published, *Zapiski belogo partizana* (Buenos Aires, 1961), but there is nothing in them about Grinius. After the civil war, Shkuro did not live in Russia. During the Second World War, he led a Cossack unit in the German army. Taken prisoner of war by the British, he was handed over to the Soviets. On January 17, 1947, *Pravda* announced that he along with five other generals who fought on the German side had been executed by hanging, see Nicholas Bethell, *The Last Secret: The Delivery to Stalin of Over Two Million Russians by Britain and the United States* (New York: Basic Books, 1974), p. 164.

in mind, thereby avoiding a "romantic affair." In late December 1918, Bolsheviks kept Grinius under arrest for several hours and talked about shooting him.[66]

There is much in his memoirs about robbers, shots in the night, windows shattered by bullets, a dead nurse, a dead infant, a man saved from injury by a silver cigarette case, and rain-soaked hours spent waiting for a prostitute and her clients to vacate a room. At some point, his library in the hospital was looted and destroyed by Cossacks. But in the chaos, it is nearly impossible to keep track of who was shooting at whom. Dirt, lice, bedbugs, bribes, and the threat of cholera were the only certainties.

In October of 1917, just before Lenin's coup, Grinius traveled to Moscow to attend a conference on the management of resorts. The trains were packed, with passengers, unable to force their way inside, riding on top of railway cars. Grinius asked a deserter why he was fleeing the front: for peasants and workers life would be no worse under the Germans, the deserter replied.[67] Grinius responded to Marxist utopianism with scepticism: the idealists will be killed in the first wave, leaving behind "the obsequious, the cowards, egoists, liars, pretenders, scoundrels." Humans are driven by hunger, cold, fear, family loyalty, the desire for a better life. Of these, the Bolsheviks rely on terror and famine.[68] Grinius is describing what, according to Robert Conquest, came to be called "negative selection": a chronological series of portraits of Soviet leaders is a "pictorial chart of the evolution of mankind read backward."[69] A fair summary of the history of the Soviet Union and Communism, especially if we add the caution that idealists often are fanatics and do more harm than scoundrels. In any case, Grinius was not intoxicated by revolutionary rhetoric, but remained steadfast in his common sense. There were Lithuanians who fell under the communist spell.

In his memoirs, Grinius describes how the family ended up in the Caucasus, more than a 1000 miles away: this included trips to Moscow and several hospitals in which Grinius worked. They moved not only to escape the war but also in search of a more suitable climate for his wife, who was suffering from tuberculosis. When the First World War broke out in July 1914, they were living near what was then the border separating the two empires. The only Lithuanian daily, *Lietuvos žinios* (*The Lithuanian news*) began to be published sporadically,

66 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 167-170, 193.

67 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 189.

68 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 65-66.

69 Robert Conquest, foreword to Luba Brezhneva, *The World I Left Behind* (New York: Random House, 1995), p. v.

shutting down entirely on September 5, 1915, in its last issue announcing the withdrawal of Russian troops from Vilnius. As a result, details of the war in Lithuania are scarce. The border region was for a time occupied by the Germans. After their retreat, *Lietuvos žinios,* on September 8, 1914, published several accounts of shelling, looting, burning, military requisitions. One correspondent complained that German patrols vandalized his beehives.

The fortunes of war turned. Grinius gives a vivid description of what alerted him that the Germans were coming once again. Prominent are images of Russian soldiers running for their lives, but still holding on to the spoils of war, "gramophones, loud-speakers, bolts of cloth." Officers were escorting loaded wagons, while German airplanes flew overhead, their crews occasionally firing pistols. Grinius is aware that the Germans were planning to colonize the region. He notes that Hitler pursued the same goals, but on a larger scale.[70] The Grinius family left Marijampolė in September 1914.

Characteristically, in wrings of this period, written in Russia and mailed to Vilnius, he emphasized the importance of hygiene and sanitation when rebuilding burnt houses and instructed farmers in the proper way of burying battlefield casualties to prevent the spread of diseases. In a similar vein, on the eve of World War II, he explained how to make gas masks at home.[71]

How likely is it that a similar essay, no matter how timely, about the digging of mass graves and aimed at a general audience was published elsewhere? This is one of several of his pieces which attracted my attention: who was this man whose mind functioned in such unusual ways, but was so full of sense? While in Russia, he published at least five pieces in Russian on mineral waters and resorts.[72] Again, and indication of an interesting character: far away from home, amid strangers and the uncertainties of war, unsure of his livelihood, he pursues his professional interests.

In a hint of the problems encountered in defining what is Lithuania some correspondents remarked on the presence of Lithuanian-speakers in the German army. And in spite of decades of opposition to Russian rule, typically,

---

70 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 131-32. Streets were renamed, often in honor of German leaders. The Lithuanian-American academic, Vėjas Gabriel Liulevičius, *War Land on the Eastern Front* (2000) has emphasized the colonial aspect of both wars.

71 Kazys Grinius, "Kaip pačiam pasigaminti dujokaukę" ("How to Make a Gas Mask"), *Sveika šeima* (*A Healthy Family*), 1939, no. 1

72 Vincas Tercijonas, "D-ro K. Griniaus medicinos raštų sąrašas" ("List of the Medical Writings of Dr. K. Grinius") *Varpas*, 1926, pp. 239-44.

the Russian army was referred to as "our." Most of Lithuania was occupied by the fall of 1915, an occupation which brought the country to the brink of famine. Among several factors: the German requisitioned horses, leaving farmers unable to work their fields. While Lithuania had declared independence on February 16, 1918, the German army, under pressure from the victorious allies, began to withdraw only late that year. The delay was in some ways fortunate, because the Germans were important in repelling Bolshevik incursions.[73]

According to the letter to his brother, the three survivors left Kislovodsk and on May 19, 1919 reached the reached the the Black Sea port of Novorossiysk. There they boarded the British freighter the *War Pointer* bound for Marseilles, along with several hundred Poles and perhaps 50 Lithuanians. In the letter he explains that the Cossacks, then in Kislovodsk, had declared a general mobilization, which included all doctors under 55 years of age. But, because Poles were allowed to mobilize themselves, he and his children signed up as Poles.[74] When the ship docked in Istanbul, Grinius and some friends toured the city. They decided to continue to Marseilles, because an overland journey to Lithuania was much too dangerous. Upon landing, they were taken to Lorgues and held in quarantine for 21 days. His younger son died there on July 5 (old style). Eventually, he reached Paris and worked there with the Lithuanian legation at the peace conference. He headed the repatriation commission, assisting Lithuanian prisoners of war, captured by the Germans on the Estern Front and found by the French in Germany, to return home. Once again we get a glimpse of him, in spite of crushing personal tragedy, working to rebuild a country ravaged by war and four years of occupation, on top of a century of czarist misrule. And he reflects on the

---

[73] As damaging as the German occupation was, it must be counted a lucky stroke, saving Lithuania from Lenin. Anne Applebaum, *Red Famine: Stalin's War on Ukraine* (New York: Doubleday, 2017), provides a vivid account of how the Ukraine suffered from Lenin's lust for her grain. Lithuania was lucky because she offered no tempting booty. Applebaum's introductory chapter on the history of the Ukraine is worth reading even for understanding Lithuanian history, with changes in names and dates. The same Polish-Russian rivalry, belief that the peasants preserved the true nation, problems of education in a foreign language, emphasis on the formation of a civil society. The difference: the Ukraine was important for Russia, while Lithuania was insignificant, except for her border with Germany.

[74] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 210-11, blames gen. Anton Denikin for not permitting Lithuanians to return to Lithuania. Denikin, he writes, did not recognize Lithuania's independence, but recognized that of Poland and Finland. In his view, people had hoped for much from Denikin, but were bitterly disappointed upon realizing that Denikin offered nothing more than a return to czarism. He recalls corpses swaying in the wind for days.

state of affairs in Lithuania: "There are not enough educated people. For freedom fell upon us unexpectedly and found us unprepared."

We get a brief glimpse of father and son in an August 30, 1919 letter from Paris, written by someone of Lithuanian origin serving in the United States navy. He writes that while on leave in Paris, he met several Lithuanian acquaintances, Grinius and his son Kazys among them. They were connected with the Lithuanian delegation to the peace conference and also organizing a Lithuanian army. The author was tempted to join, but could not do so because of his American commitments. He adds that those returning from Kaunas pictured a dire situation, as the Germans were departing: the city was empty, except for lice and dirt infesting hotels.[75] Returning from France, on a train in Lithuania, Grinius experienced the devastation at first hand: steam was escaping from the locomotive through bullet holes. When it ran out of fuel, passengers scattered to gather firewood.

For a better sense of these early efforts at rebuilding, I need to emphasize that in 1918 there were practically no Lithuanians with political or administrative experience and very few university graduates. By working in several fields, Grinius was not an exception, but typical for the times. A University was founded formally in 1922, the first in the country since the czars had shut down the Vilnius University in 1832, and the first conducted in the Lithuanian language.[76]

Grinius's *New York Times* obituary, June 5, 1950, p. 21, the longest item about him the newspaper published, makes no mention of the plundered pants, a better indicator of Communist reality than boosterism combined with spineless philosophizing which some in the West took for informed analysis. It does, however, mention the murders of his wife and daughter, albeit without reference to ideology—they were "murdered by Russian terrorists." It also adds details about his life during the German occupation: "When Germany invaded Lithuania in World War II, Dr. Grinius was asked to help establish a Nazi-controlled government. He refused, saying he would not sanction the shooting of Lithuanian

[75] *Naujienos*, September 15, 1919. *Naujienos* (*News*) was a Lithuanian social democratic newspaper published in Chicago. In 1919, the journalist Walter Duranty reported that there were only five working locomotives in Latvia, that the population was on the verge of starvation, but lice and typhus were plentyful, see S. J. Taylor, *Stalin's Apologist: Walter Duranty, The New York Times's Man in Moscow* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 87. My mother, then a girl of fifteen, was in Vilnius and recalls carrying home a bucket of flour from the Hoover commission and buying a horse's head in the market.

[76] In the 18th and 19th centuries, but in part surviving to 1944, there was a Lithuanian seminar at the University of Koenigsberg, in Prussia, for training pastors to serve in Lithuanian parishes.

Jews, deportation of Lithuanians to Germany and colonization of Lithuania by Germans." There is confusion here. I can neither affirm nor deny than an offer was made. But if one was made, it likely was in early August, some six-weeks into the war. By then, some thousands of Jews had been murdered, but the definitive move towards a Final Solution came some months later. And in August of 1941 the questions of colonization and rounding up Lithuanians for work in Germany were not yet sharply posed. With emphasis on colonization, the three questions were raised in November 1942, in a memorandum to the commissar for Lithuania.[77] Grinius was not the author, but was one of three signers. According to the son Liūtas Grinius, then fifteen years old, when Gestapo officers came for him, his father calmly finished shaving, dressing, ate breakfast, making the Gestapo wait. The son recalls that when his father returned from the interrogation, he explained that he had had a good meal without spending any of his ration coupons.[78] Interrogated, in a letter written in 1946, Grinius recalled arguing that Lithuanians and Germans should be treated equally and Lithuanian Jews made subject to Lithuanian laws.[79] Because of age, Grinius was not exiled like the other two, but required to live in an isolated rural area. He continued to write on medical questions, as he had done during the Soviet occupation. According to the son, while still in Kaunas, the former president in his seventies scandalized the neighborhood by sweeping the yard.

Liūtas Grinius writes that his father was under great pressure in the summer of 1940 to join the Communist government. More likely that the *New York*

---

77 On December 30, 1942, on p. 4, datelined Stockholm, December 29, the *New York Times* published a story "Germans in Baltic Play Double Game." Grinius and the protest are noted. It is not a human interest story. It is political, depicting an occupied country struggling to survive. Because the story originated in Stockholm, it is likely that the information came from resistance sources, by way of Lithuanian diplomats who were still functioning.

78 Liūtas Grinius, "Ką sūnus apie tėvą pasakoja" ("What a Son Says about His Father"), *Varpas*, 1967, no. 7, pp. 20-35.

79 Fragments of the letter were published in *Sėja* (*The Sowing*), 1953, no. 6, p. 5. *Sėja* was published in Chicago. The German text presented to the commissar is not known. It is likely that the full transcript of Grinius's interrogation has not survived. Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius,* pp. 445-46, quotes the commissar's response to the memorandum at length. The commissar claimed that there was no colonization and accused the signers of spreading falsehoods, fomenting unrest, and weakening the struggle against Bolshevism. From the beginning, the Germans insisted that Lithuanian authorities had no jurisdiction over Jews. If Lithuanian authorities had had jurisdiction, charges of collaboration and war-crimes would have been handled by the courts. As a result, Jews would not have been treated as a racially delineated group, but as individuals in accordance with rules of evidence. In any case, by late 1942 the issue was largely moot, since the majority of Lithuanian Jews were dead.

Times confused the two occupations and no offer was made by the Germans. More than the Germans, the Soviets tried to enlist credible, respected figures to act as masks. Grinius would have been a dazzling trophy. But instead of joining, he recorded some anti-Soviet humor. Why are Russians happy and smiling? A Russian woman explains: because after waiting in line all night she bought a pair of shoes; because her husband is still free although more than a month ago she heard talk that he was about to be arrested.[80]

On February 1, 2016, Yad Vashem, the official memorial to the victims of the Holocaust in Israel, honored both Grinius and his second wife. It is an unusual and curious fact that the Jewish man they were sheltering sat at their dinner table with Lithuanian guests, not hiding under a false identity. A few cases are known of Lithuanians buried in the same pit with the Jews they were hiding.

[80] Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, pp. 434-35.

II One of the Etceteras

Even the last czar titled himself Grand Duke of Lithuania, though for decades there had not been a political or administrative unit of that name. And as the title came later in a long list, most of the time abbreviated versions were used, proclaiming that the czar was ruler of all Russians, King of Poland, Grand Duke of Finland, and many etceteras. Imperial policy makers knew that there were Lithuanians among the inhabitants of the Northwest Provinces, but deemed them an insignificant people slated to disappear as Russian language and culture spread and the empire became more and more a Russian nation-state. In May 1904, Pyotr Dmitrievich Sviatopolk-Mirskii (1857-1914), then governor-general in Vilnius, reported to his government: "There is not, to my mind, the slightest basis for perceiving in the process of Lithuanian development a danger for the state interests of Russia." He urged that "restrictions on the Lithuanian language be lifted" because in any case Lithuanians would soon become completely assimilated, while the restrictions antagonize them and "strengthen the hand of Polish nationalists."[81] In addition to feeding national ambition, Russification was of strategic importance. It would help secure the border, since Lithuania at the time bordered on Germany.

---

[81] Theodore R. Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1996), p. 53.

In 1989-1991, when the Soviet Union was collapsing, Lithuania existed as an administrative unit and it was only a matter of ending the occupation by declaring that throughout this territory Soviet laws had no standing. And because Lithuania was surrounded by other established units—Latvia, Belarus, Poland, and the Russian enclave of Kaliningrad –, no serious border questions arose. Over the years, political units came to more and more coincide with cultural and economic regions. Indeed, at times restless, minorities still existed, as they had in earlier years, but they were much weakened by emigration, assimilation, integration, intermarriage. Most everyone was best served by leaving it to historians to sort out old disputes, thereby allowing politics to reflect current realities. By contrast, a century earlier, when the several awakenings had advanced to the making of political claims, questions concerning borders were critical: Lithuania, Latvia, Belarus, Poland had no established borders. Each was faced with the necessity of delineating a territory and being human began by making maximum claims. Lithuanians began to adopt the concept of ethnographic territory, a difficult task since the cultural facts were changing from generation to generation and census results were often ambiguous, supporting incompatible claims equally well. The declaration of independence of February 16, 1918 was silent on the question of boundaries. But when the declaration was affirmed on May 15, 1920 by the Constituent Assembly, the term "ethnologic boundaries" was used.

The most bitter conflict was with Poland—before being replaced by Germany and Hitler, Poland posed the greatest security threat. The Lithuanian awakening had many elements of class-warfare, pitting Lithuanian speaking peasants against Polish speaking landlords. As one newspaper expressed it in 1919: "Lithuanians, a nation of farmers, have no desire to enter into an arrangement in which one is the horse, and the other—the rider." The question of land reform was central to the politics of the early years of independence. By contrast, prominent in Polish politics were memories of greatness, nostalgia for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, even though there was no social basis for a Greater Poland. In the meantime, Lithuanians looking back came to regard union with Poland as the cause of their decay. Lithuanians interpret too literally the massive painting (1878) by Jan Matejko in Warsaw of the 1410 Battle of Grunwald, depicting Vytautas, Grand Duke of Lithuania, wielding his sword in the thick of battle, and his cousin Jagiello (Jogaila), King of Poland, off in a corner, no doubt muttering his beads.

Lithuanians delight in images of princes on horseback wading into the Black Sea or stories that Jagiello needed help to father the dynasty of Polish kings. However, for them that was the past, not fuel for ambitions of becoming a great power.

In Poland, history played a different role. The difference is in part due to a difference in size. Lithuania is obviously small, lacking power to as much as dream of restoring old boundaries. While Poland is something in between: too large to class herself with small countries, too small to challenge her larger neighbors. Poland was not a great power, but large enough to allow Poles to hope of becoming great again.

Nostalgia and ambition are embedded in the "historical invocation" of the Polish constitution of 17 March 1921: "In the Name of Almighty God ! We, the people of Poland, thanking Providence for freeing us ..., adhering to the glorious tradition of the immortal constitution of 3 May, striving for the welfare of the whole, united, and independent mother-country...."[82] Reference is to the constitution of May 3, 1791, which for all its liberal virtues, was almost a non-event because implementation was slowed by internal dissension. And in the end, it was overwhelmed by the second partition in 1793 and the final, in 1795. In the estimate of Norman Davies, the constitution remained on paper, with none of the reforms "ever put into effect." Davies at this point notes the tendency of Polish historians to attend to what "people would have liked to happen than to what actually occurred."[83] Be that as it may, on the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth it proposed to create something approaching a unitary state, a Greater Poland.[84] Admittedly, in the 1921 text, exactly what makes up the "mother-country" is left unsaid. But it is possible to read it as a call to take up the burden of 1791 of molding the different peoples of the Commonwealth into a single nation, in the modern sense. The rising of the masses, symbolized by the French

82 Davies, *God's Playground*, 2: 402.

83 Davies, *God's Playground*, 1: 512.

84 Bronius Makauskas, *Lietuvos istorija* (Kaunas: Šviesa, 2000), pp. 182-83, argues that the constitution intended to form a unitary state, but because of Lithuanian opposition, a compromise was sought. On October 20, a document was signed preserving a federal structure, but also retaining some common institutions. There exists a Lithuanian translation of the constitution, suggesting that some of the gentry were more comfortable in that language and, possibly, wanted to involve the lower classes. The translation is undated, but according to Juozas Tumelis, who published the text, it probably goes back to the eighteenth century. See his "Gegužės Trečiosios konstitucijos ir ketverių metų seimo lietuviškais vertimas," ("The Lithuanian Translation of the May 3 Constitution and the Four-Year Congress"), *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis. 1977 metai* (T*he Yearbook of Lithuanian History for 1977*), (Vilnius: 1978), pp. 90-132.

Revolution, brought into the limelight the fact that the Commonwealth was inhabited by four major groups: Poles, Ukrainians, Belorussians, Lithuanians. The historical invocation makes no reference to social realities: not everyone in Poland was willing to recognize the last three as political agents entitled to make claims of their own. According to the Polish historian Jerzy Borzęcki, in the 1920 peace negotiations, should Russia meet Poland's maximum demands, "only Warsaw would determine how the Borderlands population would express its will." And until that time, the Borderlands would be administered by Poland and four other countries, two invited by Poland and two by Russia. The Vilnius area would be included in Poland "without any concessions to Belorussians."[85] Since Lithuania was not occupied by the Red Army, she was outside the territory being considered. But the fate of the rest was a matter of Poland's convenience. The term "Borderlands" itself suggests that the peoples of the old Commonwealth have standing only in reference to Poland, that Poland is surrounded by something fuzzy and trivial, to be cleaned up by the serious political agent.[86]

Polish views stand in sharp contrast to the resolution adopted in November 1917 by a Lithuanian conference in Voronezh, Russia, one of several conferences leading up the declaration of independence. The conference made clear that the future Lithuanian state should make no claim on the territories of the Grand Duchy, but establish Lithuania within ethnographic boundaries, with some corrections called for by economic considerations.[87]

The flags of the two accentuate the difference. The Lithuanian flag does not refer to ancient glories, but the flag of Poland features a stylized eagle, that is, the Polish half of the coat of arms of the Commonwealth. I should interject at this point that Grinius did not regard the May 3 constitution as immortal. In fact, in his view, it did little for the peasants, was passed fraudulently when many members of the congress were absent, and hastened Poland's demise by

---

85 Jerzy Borzęcki, *The Soviet-Polish Peace of 1921 and the Creation of Interwar Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 54-55.

86 Applebaum, *Between East and West*, p. 46: "Polish patriots imbued the word *kresy*, the Polish word for 'borderlands' or 'marches,' with nostalgic meaning. Used only when speaking of the East, *kresy* implied a lack of demarcation, an endless horizon with nothing certain beyond."

87 Albinas Rimka, *Lietuvos ūkis: statistikos tyrinėjimai* (T*he Lithuanian Economy: Statistical Investigations*), 2nd ed. (Kaunas, Švyturys. 1922), p. 17. Albinas Rimka (1886-1944), economist, introduced statistical methods into Lithuania, lived in the United States in 1911-1917, in 1926 served as minister of finance. Rimka belonged to the same political party as Grinius.

provoking Russia.[88] He published this on May 3, 1923 in *Lietuvos žinios*, of which he was then the editor. In unusually large print, readers were informed that on this day Poles were celebrating the *de jure* recognition of their "campaign of plunder" against Lithuanians and Ukrainians, that is, international recognition of Poland's boundaries, including Vilnius and Lvov.

It is not a coincidence that Poland had problems with minorities, including punitive expeditions against the Ukrainians in the 1930s. According to the 1931 census, Poles made up only 68.9% of the population.[89] It has been suggested that Poland's economic troubles stemmed from overspending on the military, with some of the force needed to keep minorities in line.[90]

It is to be expected that different historical experiences should help shape different visions of a worthwhile future. The Polish and the Lithuanian histories are not contradictories, such that one must be true and the other false. Rather, both can be true but incomplete, demanding a place in a broader synthesis. In recent years, Timothy Snyder has attempted a synthesis, but with suggestions that present day Lithuanians are petty-minded in viewing the 1569 Lublin Union skeptically. However, he suffers from an important limitation: he does not know Lithuanian and is largely unfamiliar with the work of Lithuanian historians—at best, he is familiar with two sides of a three-sided controversy. The forty page bibliography of *Bloodlands* (2010) contains not a single Lithuanian source, even though there exists much scholarship and controversy about the events of World War II, some of it available in English.[91] *The Reconstruction of Nations* (2003), devoting as it does around 100 pages to Lithuanian history, cites a handful, but nothing that was published in Lithuanian. In my view, Snyder is less a historian struggling to uncover and understand what happened, but more a moralist explaining to Lithuanians how far they have strayed. It is hard to give a different interpretation to the following: "As after the First World War, after the collapse

---

88 For the irregularities see Daniel Stone, *The Polish-Lithuanian State, 1386-1795* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2001), pp. 280-83. Stone agrees that the October act maintained a federal structure. Unlikely that either Grinius or Madame Pilsudska were aware of the act, since it has become prominent only in recent decades. Marx thought highly of the May 3 constitution (Davies, *God's Playground,* 1: 535).

89 Davies, *God's Playground*, 2: 404.

90 S. Č (described as a noted Ukrainian activist), "Vakarų ukrainiečių kovos ir Vilniaus byla" ("The Struggles of Western Ukrainians and the Vilnius Case"), *Mūsų Vilnius*, 1929 July-August, no. 7-8, pp. 268-71.

91 For example, the bilingual Christoph Dieckmann and Saulius Sužiedėlis, *The Persecution and Mass Murder of Lithuanian Jews during Summer and Fall of 1941* (2006).

of the Soviet Union Lithuanian authorities conveyed historical myths to a mass public. The popular demand for historical truth was met with the republication of interwar history texts, especially those of the leading national historian and mythmaker, Adolfas Šapoka... As after the First World War, after the collapse of the Soviet Union the danger was that historical myth legitimized as political discourse would prevent Lithuanian governments from executing a rational foreign policy."[92] By any standards, a preacher's call for repentance.

Like many others, Grinius devoted some of his old-age to reflection. There are remarks in his memoirs showing an awareness of the different standards often applied to large and small nations. For example, while reflecting on the Christian precept to love one's neighbors, he asks: if large nations include only their own among their brothers, why should we condemn as immoral the struggle of the patriots of small nations for their future?[93]

Both genuine territorial uncertainties and ignorance are reflected in nineteenth century maps. Thus, the 1897 *Century Atlas of the World* marks as Lithuania a territory south of Grodno, no part of which is included in present day Lithuania, an area where few Lithuanian speakers lived or had lived, at least

---

92 Timothy Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus (1569-1999)* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 101-102. This about a book which he has not read. Nor does he realize that the book has five authors. The editor, and one of the five, Adolfas Šapoka (1906-1961), while not the pioneer, belongs to the first generation of academic Lithuanian historians, as distinct from essayists with an interest in the past. The occupations and the need to support his family in Canada ended his career as a historian when he was 34. After the Soviet Union collapsed, something had to be done quickly to replace communist propaganda: Šapoka's was the obvious choice. Should people have continued to read about the profound friendship which has existed between the Lithuanian and Russian peoples since time immemorial? How Elder Brother is blazing a glorious trail for mankind to follow unto True Communism? Snyder is unaware that in 1995 Zigmantas Kiaupa published his *Lietuvos istorija iki 1795 metų* (*The History of Lithuania to 1795*) and that this and other volumes have replaced Šapoka. Snyder appears not to understand that history is always written from a point of view and that the same event often affects different groups in different ways. A startling failure, considering the prominence of perspectival conceptions of knowledge. The Lublin Union both accelerated the decline of the Grand Duchy and the rise of the Kingdom of Poland. Why is that a myth? Are Native Americans myth makers because they emphasize the disasters which fell upon them after Columbus, disasters paving the way for European expansion? Disasters which many textbooks overlook, while emphasizing the achievements of the newcomers. And it is difficult to make sense of the reference to foreign policy. In the earlier period Poland and Germany were the major security threats, in the latter— prospective NATO partners. Apparently, in Snyder's view, sturdy but slow-witted peasants cannot tell the difference. Lithuania joined in 2004, but NATO membership was the primary foreign policy goal while Snyder was writing. Kiaupa's, *History of Lithuania*, in English, presents a more balanced account of Lithuanian-Polish relations.

93 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 113-14.

in recorded history. Finland and Poland fare better: the atlas shows them more or less where they are (Finland more, Poland less). It is helpful to recall that the Finns were autonomous, mostly self-governing, even enjoying their own currency for most of the nineteenth century, while the Poles were too numerous and too culturally advanced to be easy targets for assimilation. By contrast, Lithuanians had to resist political efforts to assimilate them, cultural pressures favoring Polonization, and mark out a territory with no historical precedents to guide them and few administrative structures to serve as a framework. History did not provide much guidance: Lithuanians came to claim Klaipėda (Memel in German) which had been under German control since the days of the Teutonic knights, but not Minsk, part of the Grand Duchy for centuries. Russian administrative units were somewhat more helpful, but only one, the Province of Kaunas (Kovno in the *Century Atlas*), could be claimed in its entirety.[94]

In practice, when negotiating boundaries, the concept of ethnographic Lithuania included not only areas dominated by Lithuanian-speakers, but also those marked by strong and recent signs of Lithuanian presence. Furthermore, at times, ethnographic arguments were buttressed with historical, geographic, and economic ones. The signs of Lithuanian presence include accounts by Polish-speakers that their parents, grandparents, spoke Lithuanian, and place and family names of Lithuanian origin. The study of the origin of names has been undertaken both by serious linguists and by amateurs. Because of its importance in forming the concept of ethnographic Lithuania, linguistics is also something of a cottage industry. Few English-speakers are familiar with the Indo-European family of languages. Many Lithuanians are, and take pride in the fact that the language is important for historical linguistics because it has been conservative, preserving many ancient forms lost in modern English, with which however it shares a common ancestry. The name of the Volga River has several interpretations, but if derived from the Lithuanian 'ilga', the Volga becomes just one of several long rivers known to mankind. This points to a past so remote as to have no political relevance. But even more extensive linguistic evidence, indicating a more recent presence, had to give way to the realities of power. A region of Prussia, defined by a line somewhat north of Koenigsberg, had many

94 Lithuanians are no exception in having problems delineating their homeland, see, for example, Shlomo Sand, *The Invention of the Land of Israel* (2009). The map in Seton-Watson's *Decline of Imperial Russia* (pp. 8-9) is misleading: the location of Klaipėda is not marked, but the border is drawn so as to leave the city on the Russian side.

place-names of Lithuanian origin, as well as numerous Lithuanian-speakers. However, in view of German power, this fact produced mostly memories and regrets. As Germany was being defeated on the Western Front, some Lithuanians began to dream of reuniting ethnographic Lithuania. In 1919, they made various proposals to the Paris peace conference. But with the exception of the area north of the Nemunas River, the Klaipėda district, nothing came of these hopes.[95]

And, as Grinius discovered to his embarrassment, the concept of ethnographic boundaries is itself vague and ambiguous. He recalls that in 1909-1910 they published a map of ethnographic Lithuania. Grinius insisted that Vilnius and the immediate vicinity be excluded. However, in 1920, while he served as prime minister, during peace negotiations between Lithuania and Communist Russia, one of the Russian negotiators brought up the map and pointed out that the prime minister himself did not think Vilnius should be included in Lithuania. Recalling the incident, he explains that his standard then was the language spoken at home. But by that standard, even Kaunas should have been excluded. His error was failure to take into account the ease with which cities could change their language habits, as shown by the example of Kaunas.[96] At issue during these negotiations was whether Vilnius should be part of Lithuania or Belorussia. On July 12, 1920, Grinius signed the peace treaty, recognizing Lithuania's claims to Vilnius, with Lithuania's boundaries significantly to the east of the present ones.

The starting point for uncovering ethnographic Lithuania is the imperial census of 1897. Perhaps, it was no worse than the average—I can recall no American census without controversies about under or over counting. Several problems arise. It is not difficult to list the various causes of bias, political, social, religious, emphasize the incompetence or bad faith on the part of the census takers. But it is impossible to translate these biases into multipliers, yielding new and more reliable estimates. Albinas Rimka, close to Grinius in politics and ideology, pioneer of statistical methods in Lithuania, compared the census results with various estimates and concluded that the Lithuanian numbers represent the minimum, while the Polish, Belorussian, and Russian numbers represent maximums. But he does not even attempt to suggest corrected numbers: the data simply are not there. According to Rimka, in Vilnius Province, the parents and

---

95 For a detailed account of various proposals for solving the Prussian question see Aldona Gaigalaitė, *Lietuva Paryžiuje 1919 metais* (*Lithuania in Paris in 1919*) (Kaunas: Šviesa, 1999), pp. 64-73.

96 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 91.

grandparents of many Poles and Belorussians were Lithuanian speakers in the 1850s.[97] Furthermore, unavoidably, census results presented a more definite picture than in fact existed: many used several languages and many had no strong sense of national identity. Lithuanians at times smiled at the bewilderment of persons required to choose one nationality: we are from here some replied in a jargon derived from several languages. Had power arrangements been different, a new nation could well have come into existence, separating Lithuania from Belarus.

For obvious reasons, it is necessary to take account of political pressures to minimize the Polish presence. According to Grinius, in 1897 commenting on the results of the census, the ministry wanted a fair accounting. Census takers were instructed to record exactly what the respondents told them. But, as often happens, local functionaries made their own rules. Grinius writes that in the county of Trakai, in the Province of Vilnius, census takers were told to find that the Polish population amounted to no more than 1%.[98] In the vicinity of Lublin, persons who said they were Catholics were recorded among the Orthodox. When they protested, they were beaten by the police and arrested for resisting authority. Grinius cannot resist commenting on the injustices of Muscovite rule: the law was violated by officials, but is was protesters who suffered. He has a poor opinion of Russian officials: they are incompetent and dishonest drunkards. The short item about the census is followed by another about a Russian who committed suicide. He solicited substantial bribes with false promises to keep people out of the army. When discovered, he killed himself.[99] I do not know how accurate these accounts are: Grinius has an obvious interest in exaggeration. But that in the empire incompetence and corruption were not accidental but systemic is a widely held view. Seton-Watson writes concerning the bureaucracy: "Their

---

97 Rimka, *Lietuvos ūkis*, p. 34, 25. Vytautas Merkys, *Tautiniai santykiai Vilniaus Vyskupijoje 1798-1918* (*Relations between Nationalities in the Diocese of Vilnius 1798-1918*) (Vilnius: Versus Aureus, 2006) surveys the numerous attempts to describe the population of the diocese. As finally delineated in 1849, the diocese included the Czarist provinces of Vilnius and Grodno. Most estimates of the Province of Vilnius show that to the middle of the nineteenth century, about half of the inhabitants were Lithuanians, but that their proportion was declining in favor of Belorussians.

98 The "1 %" could be a misprint for "10%." A "1%" outcome would not have been credible. The census shows the Polish population of Trakai county as 11.26%. In 1919, the Lithuanian ministry of industry and trade published the *Statistinės žinios apie Lietuvą ligi karui 1914 m*. (*Statistical Information about Lithuania to the War in 1914*) (Kaunas, 1919). Unless explicit notice is made, it is to be understood that this publication is my source for statistics.

99 Both stories appeared in *Ukininkas* (*Farmer*), July 1897, no. 7, pp. 107-108. The first is signed with an initial, the second with a pen name. It is possible to question their authorship. On the other hand, Grinius was editor at this time.

incompetence was a result of the general economic and cultural backwardness of the country. Their corruption was a result of their poor pay. It was difficult to support a family on the salary of a minor State employee."[100] In any case, my primary concern is with public opinion, not with what was happening, but with what people believed was happening. Stories about widespread corruption serve to make reports of biases among census officials more credible.

Unlikely that political pressures favored Lithuanians: for local administrators doing a good job meant turning subject nationalities into good Russians—the more Russians, the better their career prospects. In addition, religious pressures reduced Lithuanian numbers and increased Polish ones. Most Lithuanians were Catholics. Given that few attended schools or read newspapers, church services were an important means of influencing a broader audience. For many, priests and landlords were the only authority figures they encountered. Of course with notable exceptions, many Catholic priests in Lithuania were Polonizers, at least this is how Grinius and other leaders of the awakening saw them.[101] And there is anecdotal evidence that Polonizing priests mocked Lithuanian as a heathen language, one which God does not understand. Thus, to be good Catholics, priests had to preach in Polish and people--pray in Polish. Merkys, suggests that the rise of literary romanticism also harmed the Lithuanian awakening. Romanticism brought into the forefront images of pagan Lithuanian warriors, making it easier for priests to denounce the language as unfit for Christian lips.[102]

There is another factor pushing Catholic Lithuanians to identify themselves as Poles. To the years of independence, there were few educated Catholic laymen. Only the clergy spoke for the Church, while educated laymen styled themselves freethinkers. Grinius himself never explained his own attitude towards religion, at least not publicly. But he often attacked clergymen and was a pronounced enemy of ecclesiastical institutions. In the years of independence, he advocated a separation of church and state more radical than that found in the United States. There were good priests, both patriotic and sincere, and in

---

100 Seton-Watson, *The Decline of Imperial Russia*, p. 17

101 Pranas Čepėnas, *Naujųjų laikų Lietuvos istorija* (Chicago, 1977),1: 75, states that in 1900 of the 650 priests in the Diocese of Samogitia, 315 supported the awakening, 145 were opposed, and 190 were neutral. The supporters were mostly young, those favoring union with Poland—older. The diocese did not include Lithuanians in Vilnius and Suvalkai Provinces. The generation gap is suggested by a report in *Varpas*, 1900 May, no. 5, p. 59, that most of the students in the seminary in Kaunas threatened to leave if the seminary continued to punish those overheard speaking Lithuanian.

102 Merkys, *Tautiniai santykia*i, p. 354.

later years Grinius recognized some of them. But at the time of the census, the clerical average was not encouraging. In such circumstances, it was not difficult to depict the Lithuanian awakening as anti-religious, something best avoided for the sake of the afterlife.

And what was there to keep a landowner from pressuring dependents? How would Madame Pilsudska's grandmother have advised the laborers on her estate, given the paternal relation between them? Are you not Catholics? Of course, then you are Poles. Readers should remember, that many of the respondents were unaccustomed to dealing with authority and had only a vague idea of what a census was and why it was being conducted. Some would have found the procedure intimidating.

Particularly concerning the Province of Vilnius, another factor must be noted, namely, the presence of what are now called Belorussians. Some were Catholic, some Orthodox, some Uniates, that is, Catholics in communion with Rome, but following an eastern rite. Three of the seven counties making up the province were so overwhelmingly Belorussian that they do not enter into Lithuanian calculations. But for Vilnius County, at the center of later conflicts, the census shows Poles to be the smallest of four major groups. We find the following: 93,900 Belorussians, 77,200 Jews, 76,000 Lithuanians, 73,100 Poles.[103] And because of some tendency to identify Catholics and Poles, the Polish presence probably is exaggerated. Thirty eight thousand Russians were counted. Many of them were either civilian officials or military personnel, intending to return home once their tours were over. The total for the county is 363,000. The discrepancy of some 5,000 can be explained by the presence of Muslims—going back to the Middle Ages—Germans, and other small groups.

Borzęcki claims that that there was a strip of ethnic Polish territory in the Province of Vilnius, extending as far north as the Dvina River (Daugava in Latvian, Dauguva in Lithuanian, Düna in the *Century Atlas),* separating Lithuanians from Belorussians. The 1897 census does not support him. As evidence, he presents as the "Polish view" that the Catholic bilingual "Polish-Belarusian" speakers must be counted as Polish. "They voted for Polish candidates, had underground Polish schools, and maintained stronger ties with their

[103] Rimka, *Lietuvos ūkis*, p. 29, gives only proportions, and ends up with a different ranking. In his table, Jews rank first, Poles third, and Lithuanians fourth. I was not able to establish where his numbers come from. In 1861, he notes, Lithuanians were 60.7% in Vilnius Province. Belorussians increased from 4.8% to 23.1%, Poles declined from 34.5% to 21.5%.

Polish than their Belorussian Orthodox neighbors."[104] The view is reflected in the Polish tendency to call such Belorussians "white Poles." Borzęcki's claim, even if it were true, confuses political choices with national identity. But there are reasons for doubting that all of these people sided with Poles. Even his reference to bilingual speakers is tendentious—some Lithuanian visitors heard a hybrid, a mixture of Lithuanian, Polish, Belorussian, with some Yiddish for good measure. The Belorussian architect and activist Klaudzi Duš-Dušeuski (1891-1959), exiled in 1921 to Lithuania by Polish authorities and living in Kaunas, later imprisoned by both the Soviets and the Nazis, repeats this fragment of his national folklore: a Pole built a house without windows and then went outside to gather the sun's rays in a sieve. He claims that Belorussian partisans supported Lithuanian efforts to drive Polish forces out of Vilnius; that Belorussian is banned in Catholic churches; that there are few Belorussian schools, and some of these are conducted by Poles who do not know the language; that the region is in economic crisis.[105] Perhaps he is exaggerating, but Norman Davies describes Polish policy of the 1920's and 1930's in similar terms.[106] To the present, there are a few Belorussians who identify themselves as Lithuanians speaking another language, who come to Lithuania to recover their ethnic heritage. Apparently, in both Lithuania and Belarus there are regions with traditions of making musical instruments much like bag-pipes. It is not always clear who is more apt to side with the bigger battalions, God, census takers, or historians?

In a history of Belorussia in English, we find another complication. Nicholas P. Vakar, notes that in the spring of 1919, in the western part, controlled by the government in Warsaw, the Poles disbanded Belorussian military units and shut down schools and newspapers, thus supporting Duš-Dušeuski's account. In the meantime, in the eastern part controlled by the army under Pilsudski, self-government was encouraged. Vakar concludes that it is not clear

---

104 Borzęcki, *Soviet-Polish Peace of 1921*, p. 3. Merkys, *Tautiniai santykiai*, pp. 97-99, treats the claim that Catholic Belorussins were Poles skeptically, attributing it to a "pragmatic turn towards their national vision."

105 Duš-Dušeuski in 1929 published a series of five articles in *Mūsų Vilnius* (*Our Vilnius*), the official magazine of the Union for the Liberation of Vilnius. He argues that Vilnius is Belorussian, with Poles having no claims. The Belorussian People's Republic was proclaimed on 25 March, 1918. But after the territory was occupied by Soviet and Polish forces, independence activists fled to several European cities. See Tomasz Błaszczak, "Baltarusių emigrantų veikla Kaune 1919-1926" ("The Activity of Belorussian Emigrants in Kaunas in 1919-1926"), *Kauno istorijos metraštis* (*Yearbook of Kaunas History*), vol. 8 (2007), 173-85. According to him, sentiment for reviving the Grand Dutchy was strongest among Belorussians.

106 Davies, *God's Playground*, 2: 409.

who was making policy at the time.[107] The government was annexationist: after promising self-government, the Polish government declared Belorussia to be an "inalienable part" of Poland. And why not? If Belorussians are only Poles speaking a dialect, why encourage separatism? Then as now, there are strong preferences for schools in the standard language—witness American controversies over Ebonics several decades ago. There are good reasons for unified military and administrative structures.

That there were several Polish policies was the view of Mykolas Römeris (Michal Pius Römer) (1880-1945), jurist and rector of the Lithuanian University. In 1919 he was in Warsaw, being recruited by Pilsudski to serve as an agent of Pilsudski's Lithuanian policy. Römeris is convinced that the Polish administration in occupied portions of Lithuania and Belorussia is only a front for the landowners, struggling to hold on to their estates. Pilsudski is different and hopes to enter Lithuania as her liberator from Germans and Bolsheviks. But Römeris doubts whether the people around Pilsudski will follow him in this regard: when forced to choose, they will defend Polish interests narrowly conceived. Also Römeris suspects that Pilsudski's pose as Lithuania's liberator is only a tactical one. There is no doubt that for Römeris the land question is central to Polish-Lithuanian relations.[108]

As has been said, political pressure to some extent reduced the Polish numbers. But religious considerations pushed them upwards. It is unlikely that Lithuanians or Belorussians were the beneficiaries either of politics or religion. There is another factor to be considered, more likely to be at work among those with a weak sense of nationality. In 1896, while urging Lithuanians to admit their identity during the forthcoming census, Grinius recalls a recent event in East Prussia. A man walked into a bar and asked whether there were any Lithuanians there. Upon hearing that everyone was German, he expressed regret because he wanted to treat Lithuanians to beer. At this juncture, the crowd broke out into

---

[107] Nicholas P. Vakar, *Belorussia: The Making of a Nation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), p. 110.

[108] Mykolas Rõmeris, *Dienoraštis* (*Diary*), translated from the Polish (2007), pp. 322-24. The Polish historian Andrzej Nowak argues that Pilsudski's policies were inspired by geopolitical considerations. Pilsudski believed that Poland reduced to her ethnographic limits could not hold out between Germany and Russia (Andrezj Nowak, "Josefo Pilsudskio rytų politikos tikslai 1980-1920 metais," ("The Goals of Josef Pilsudski's Eastern Policy in 1918-1920") *Lietuvos istorijos instituto metraštis*, (*Yearbook of the Lithuanian Institute of History*), 2001, pp. 151-68. If so, Rõmeris was right that Pilsudski as Lithuania's defender from Bolshevism was only a tactical pose.

Lithuanian chatter. He adds that there are many more Lithuanians in Warsaw and Chicago than surveys show.[109]

Passing has been widely practiced by African-Americans of mixed ancestry and light skin. It has aroused controversy. According to Randall Kennedy, an African-American Harvard law professor, critics emphasize group loyalty, and defenders—benefits to individuals. He himself as a "liberal individualist" prefers a society in which "racial self-determination" is possible, in fact, even the reversal of "stated racial identities."[110] And it is true that it makes little difference whether Italian opera is sung by Leontyne Price (African-American), Joan Sutherland (Australian, of Scottish ancestry), Violeta Urmana (Lithuanian), Kristine Opolais (Latvian), the magnificent Pretty Yende (South African)--it is great art. This supports individualism. But the opera is still Italian, that is, dependent on distinctive traditions of a group, on historical experiences, languages, times and places which are found nowhere else. Lithuanian writers during independence often emphasized that the culture of humanity is a mosaic of different national contributions.

Someone passing must constantly be on guard not to betray himself, especially to his close friends. It takes effort to pretend not to understand when overhearing a familiar language. In his memories of his days in Marijampolė secondary school, Vincas Kudirka identifies being Lithuanian with belonging to a lower-class: if his friends learned that he spoke Lithuanian, they would know that his father wore homespun and spoke no other language, that is, was one of the *chlopi*, to use the Polish term. When his parents or relatives visited, he made sure that he met them only in remote places where none would notice.[111]

Concerning the beer drinkers, Grinius is untypically judgmental. A "liberal individualist" in matters of religion, he tended to think of nationality as something independent of a person's wishes. At times, he was willing to sacrifice individual interests in the name of the group, as when he encouraged a boycott of Russian language schools. In this instance, individualism gave way to his social reform agenda. Literature was not his primary concern. He did not press the argument that an African-American could: victimized by segregation he can write about it in ways impossible for someone white, no matter how liberal and

---

109 *Ru,* "Kaip skaitlių lietuvių susekti?" ("How to Count Lithuanians?"), *Varpas*, 1896 November, no. 11, p. 171.

110 Randall Kennedy, *Interracial Intimacies: Sex, Marriage, Identity, and Adoption* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003), pp. 332-33.

111 Vincas Kudirka, "Tėvynės varpai" ("Bells of the Homeland"), *Varpas*, 1893, no. 3, p. 34.

well-intentioned. The distinctive voice of African-Americans lost by passing is valuable not only as literature but also for moral reflection. Grinius does not pursue such lines of argument. Rather, he emphasizes that educated Lithuanians who establish themselves elsewhere do not return to spread enlightenment. He does not make explicit the currently popular idea of "role models," but is moving in that direction.

There is no question that the 1897 census results were affected by passing Lithuanians, members of a lower class claiming higher status. There is still another factor suggesting that Lithuanians were under counted. The Russian government provided little but required much. There were few schools, libraries, roads, little by way of health-services, little to encourage belief that governments benefit ordinary people. But government was zealous in collecting taxes, hunting recruits for the army, punishing offenders against majesty (if anything, Communist leaders were more sensitive[112]), building palaces, amusing the hereditary upper-class with lavish feasts. Government was not popular or trusted. Many remembered a "head tax," phased out in 1883-1887, levied on everyone, including infants. Especially in isolated areas some doubted that an honest accounting was worth the trouble: why record infants and old people? Many would soon die, but the tax, if reimposed, would still have to be paid. And then there was the bother and bureaucracy of removing them from tax rolls, calling for a journey of many miles, over bad roads, perhaps, just when every hand was needed to bring in the harvest. I would guess that fear of taxes affected the rural count more than the urban—few Lithuanians lived in cities. But I have read reports of a sudden sharp drop in Jewish birthrates after the imposition of a fee for registering births.[113]

Because of changes in political and administrative boundaries, simple comparisons cannot be made between the census of 1897 and the census of 1923. Neither count included the Klaipėda region. Data for the Vilnius region and other areas not included in the republic were subtracted from the 1897 results, making the two census areas approximately the same. The 1923 census found

---

[112] Kazys Almenas (1935-2017), after a career as professor of nuclear egineering in the United States, returned to Lithuania to write detective novels. In one, the detective and his wife discuss why newspapers delayed announcing Brezhnev's death. Her explanation: they needed time to stock shops with toilet paper. (Those familiar with Soviet newspaper recycling will understand, whether or not there was a delay.)

[113] Albinas Rimka, in an unpublished manuscript about the ethnic makeup of the Vilnius region. He argues that Jews were under counted because they tended to evade taxes (Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, F 276-329, fol 64).

1,701,863 Lithuanians. Comparison shows a noticeable increase in the proportion of Lithuanians, a jump from 67.2 per cent to 83.9 percent. The Polish percentage dropped sharply, from 8.9 to 3.2. These changes are hard to explain without the supposition that in 1897 thousands of Lithuanians were passing or for other reasons were credited to other groups. During independence, Polonized Lithuanians were distinguished from Poles, a distinction which gave rise to its own problems. I do not know how it is reflected in the 1923 census. Officially, respondents could claim whatever nationality they wanted. The German percentage dropped from 2.4 to 1.4: in 1897 some Lutheran Lithuanians were counted as Germans. During the war, Russian authorities carried out forced evacuations of Jews. Many never returned. As a result, their percentage dropped from 12.9 to 7.6. The Russian decline from 6.5 to 2.5 was due in the first place to the withdrawal of military and administrative personnel.[114]

Lithuanians were a rural folk. In 1897 a total of 1,600,000 were counted in the Provinces of Kaunas, Vilnius, and Suvalkai (Suwalki). The urban population of these three approximated 420,000: Lithuanians added up to 26,000, while 176,000 were Jews and 101,000 were Poles. The 1923 census found more Lithuanians in cities. Not counting Vilnius, the urban population was 302,934, with 57.1 percent Lithuanians, and 32.2 percent Jews. Poles came in third with 2.9.

Under the czars, setting aside travel times, the experiences of rural Lithuanians moving into cities or emigrating to America were not very different. In both cases, they had to learn a foreign language, adapt themselves to different manners, experience the stigma of being outsiders fit only to perform menial chores. Grinius recognized both the necessity and the many hardships and dangers of urbanization. He noted that women moving into garrison towns often become prostitutes. But he was among the first to recognize that Lithuanians could not survive in the twentieth century without a strong presence in cities.

Snyder writes: "If Lithuania was to be a modern nation, it had to be a peasant nation. Leaders of a peasant nation must challenge their social superiors on the treacherous ground of language and history."[115] Does Snyder think that

---

114 *Statistikos biuletenis* (*The Statistical Bulletin*), 1924, no. 6, pp. 23-24.

115 Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations*, p. 33. Antanas Lingis (1869-1900), "Keli žodžiai apie tautišką klausymą" ("Several Words about the National Question"), *Varpas*, 1893, no. 3, pp. 41-43, claimed that Lithuania's backwardness is to be explained by the absence of a Lithuanian "third estate," meaning thereby city dwellers such as merchants and craftsmen. Lingis, a physician, was one of the students in Moscow. The fact that he writes about the "third estate" suggests that his reflections originated during discussions of the French Revolution.

Lithuanians are so walled in by their "nationalism" as to be unaware of changes in the outer world? So smug as to think that a "peasant nation" can be modern? Much like Madame Pilsudska, he pays no attention to social revolutions. Is the civil rights movement to be dismissed because descendants of slaves challenged their "social superiors"? That there is much emphasis on poverty among the victims of racism? While Lithuanians still speak of farms and villages with fondness as the area where the language and culture survived, they realize that in order to survive they had to establish themselves in cities. They certainly did not dream of remaining a "peasant nation." They believed that because the country lacked natural resources and capital to build up manufacturing, they would have to remain a country with many farmers. But one of the important initiatives during independence was to transform subsistence farmers (peasants) into educated farmers producing for the market.

One of the misfortunes of Lithuanian history is the near coincidence of social-class and nationality: Lithuanian speaking peasants tilling and harvesting, Polish speaking landowners enjoying and creating culture, and a Jewish middle class buying and selling in the towns and cities. It is impossible to understand the achievements, failures, and abuses of the two decades of independence outside this framework. Those visiting Kaunas around 1900 at times remarked that they were as if in the Middle East, amid shops with signs in Hebrew letters. But visiting in 1940 they found a Lithuanian city.

I have been arguing that in many cases national identity was weak, a fact impossible to record in crude census data. In addition to the Jewish presence, in 1900 Kaunas would have been mostly Russian and Polish. But the Russian presence was inherently temporary and the Polish, as it turned out, while extensive was weak. Grinius remarks on this: in Kaunas, the 1897 census found that only 6.5% were Lithuanian-speakers and 20% Polish, while the 1923 census found that more than 60% were Lithuanians and 4% Poles. With amusement, I suspect, he cites a Lithuanian priest, who in 1902 urged Poles in Lithuania to learn the language and become leaders. He concludes that Polish culture was neither as powerful nor as pervasive as thought by those who feared that it would take centuries to overcome Polish presence.[116] In Kaunas and elsewhere, most of the conflicts arising from Lithuanization were with Jews, from the smearing of Hebrew letters in Jewish shop-windows, to arguments whether shops should be closed on Saturdays or Sundays, and the relocating of slaughter-houses located

[116] Kazys Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, volume 1 (Tübingen: Patria, 1947), p. 121.

in the Old Town next to the ruins of the castle, a site charged with symbolism for Lithuanians, but not Jews. With the Poles, there was some pushing and shoving concerning the language to be used in church services, but no persistent problems. People simply adapted themselves to the new conditions when Lithuanian-speakers in larger numbers began to move in, establishing government offices, schools, newspapers, theaters, and eventually—businesses.

Vilnius would have been more difficult. This was recognized by Lithuanians: in the 1930s, the government supported Union for the Liberation of Vilnius emphasized the multi-cultural character of the city. Vilnius, it was argued, while founded by Lithuanian rulers, was for centuries the home of Jews—the Jerusalem of Lithuania--, Belorussians, Lithuanians, Poles and others.[117] In Lithuanian hands, Vilnius would acquire a strong Lithuanian presence, but would remain multi-cultural. By contrast, for Pilsudski and his wife, Vilnius was merely another Polish city, treasured to the point of sentimentality, but Polish—Pilsudski's heart is still in Vilnius, while the rest is buried elsewhere. Lithuanians pressed historical arguments: Vilnius was never part of the Kingdom of Poland, but for many centuries was the residence of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania. Additionally, Lithuanian claims were supported by economic arguments: analysis of transportation routes, access to agricultural areas, and other factors show Vilnius to belong to Lithuania's economic zone. It goes without saying that here as everywhere translating ideals, however praiseworthy, into policy and practice is difficult. But since, before the war, Lithuania controlled Vilnius only for brief periods, her good intentions were never tested.

For the young Grinius that Vilnius is part of Lithuania was obvious. He believes that more Lithuanians live in the city than the record shows—some 20,000, most of whom do not confess their nationality for fear of appearing boorish.[118] But he is more aware of Vilnius as the residence of bishops who oppress Lithuanians by not permitting services in Lithuanian and of Russian governors intent on Russification. As 1905 approached, he commented on workers'

[117] Snyder, *Reconstruction of Nations*, p. 78, is unaware that the Union for the Liberation of Vilnius emphasized the multi-cultural character of the city and the need to preserve it in the face of Polish chauvinism. Readers of its magazine, *Mūsų Vilnius* (*Our Vilnius*) encountered not only Lithuanian but also Belorussian and Jewish points of view, with emphasis on Polish anti-Semitism. The magazine aimed at a mass audience and counting subscribers and members of the Union, likely reached some 10,000. See Ignas K. Skrupskelis, "Kaip Vilnių vadavom" ("How We Were Liberating Vilnius,") *Kultūros barai* (*Cultural Fields*), 2014 June, no. 6, pp. 75-80.

[118] *Vl.,* "Vilnius," *Ukininkas*, 1899 July, no. 7, 109. If 20,000 is a fair approximation, then at the time more Lithuanians lived in Vilnius than in Kaunas.

unrest. Late in his life he noted, that by 1914 Vilnius was much more Lithuanian than it had been a decade earlier. Likely, the press ban affected the ethnic make-up of Vilnius. Had there been no ban, Lithuanian writers, journalists, printers, would have settled in Vilnius, as they began to do before the ban. After the lifting, Lithuanian publications and other cultural institutions established themselves, eventually resulting in a Lithuanian presence in business, industry, and even city government.[119] Such natural development was broken off by the war and the Polish occupation with its resulting assimilationist pressures. The Lithuanization of Vilnius, according to Grinius, was not planned. Rather, it was the natural outcome of a maturing nation.[120]

That Grinius's etimate of 20,000 Lithuanians in Vilnius was not far off the mark is suggested by the following. In the 1890s Lithuanian social democrats, active mostly in Vilnius agitated among workers in Polish. But within a few years, they began to use Lithuanian, suggesting that there was an audience they were not reaching.[121] Some numbers supplied by Merkys also suggest that Grinius was about right. In 1908, on set days, sermons in Lithuanian were preached in Vilnius churches. On one such occasion, 2227 signed up as Lithuanians. When one adds family members, servants unable to attend, non-believers, persons unwilling to admit their lowly status, 20,000 becomes a reasonable number. It is clear from Merkys, that nationality was a very unstable phenomenon, depending upon pastoral assignments, the presence of influential laymen, church policy. In 1906, the Holy See issued a circular to all bishops in the Russian empire, allowing every nationality to use its own language for sermons and additional prayers.[122] On the whole, Merkys finds, while there were some confrontations, the introduction of Lithuanian into Vilnius was peaceful, but he also cites some Polish petitions that this rude, pagan language be barred.

---

[119] Lietuvninkaitė, *Kauno Istorijos Metraštis,* vol. 2, p. 30 states that in 1840-1849, 58 printed items in Lithuanian appeared in Vilnius, and only one in Kaunas. Gabrielius Landsbergis-Žemkalnis, who in 1904 worked on the first Lithuanian daily, recalls that there were no Lithuanian printers at the time in Vilnius and the first issue of *Vilniaus žinios* (*Vilnius News*) was type-set by persons who did not know Lithuanian (*Raštai)* (*Writings*) (Vilnius: Vaga, 1972), p. 289).

[120] Kazys Grinius, "Šturmas į Vilnių" ("The Storming of Vilnius"), *Naujienos*, 1948 July 2, part of an interview titled "Kaip mes kovojome už Lietuvos laisvę" ("How We Fought for Lithuania's Freedom"). The "we" of the title are the V*arpininkai*.

[121] Alfonsas Moravskis, *Lietuvos darbininkų judėjimo istorija* (*History of the Lithuanian Workers' Movement*) (Kaunas, 1931), p. 28.

[122] Merkys, *Tautiniai santykia*i, pp. 444, 348.

Povilas Dogelis, a Lithuanian priest was in Vilnius in March 1916 during the German occupation. The German census recorded 3673 Lithuanians in the city, clearly an under count. Analysis of one precinct shows that eight Lithuanian census takers found 157 Lithuanians, while 19 Polish--only 97. Twenty-three Jewish census takers found 98; three Belorussian—14. Thus, one Pole recorded five Lithuanians, while one Lithuanian found almost 20 of his countrymen.[123] A plausible adjustment would make the number close to Grinius's 20,000.

The 1897 census determined nationality on the basis of the language spoken at home. But there were families in which one parent spoke Polish and the other, Lithuanian. Dogelis describes his childhood in the 1880's: "Mother knew no Polish. Father spoke Lithuanian well, but liked Polish speech better. Mother used Lithuanian with the children, father—Polish. Father himself taught the children to pray in Polish."[124] Chances are that for census purposes they counted as Poles.

Grinius holds that language is one thing, but cultural and political loyalties—another. In 1892 he translated a Russian text showing that a common language is not always a unifying factor. Thus, educated Irishmen both know English and are zealous separatists while elsewhere, people speak different languages but share common loyalties. The authors of the text, described as Russian liberals, argued that the security of the empire is not threatened by Latvians developing a scientific terminology in Latvian. Noteworthy is the emphasis on the instrumental value of language. In courts in Estonia many problems arise because of mistakes by translators: "it is easier for several educated persons to learn Estonian than for a whole nation to learn the language of the Muscovites."[125]

I was alerted to the fact that language and political loyalties can differ by newspaper accounts of an anti-Polish rally in Kaunas on August 17, 1919. Polish armies were pouring into the country, with the help of local Poles. Polish agitators—including one member of the Kaunas city council—proclaimed that Lithuania was too weak to survive on her own. But a large crowd gathered—some suggest as many as 20,000. When the main speaker was nearly done, voices in the crowd cried out, "Speak Polish, we do not understand." He repeated his remarks and the crowd pledged to fight to the last drop of blood, chanting in

123 Povilas Dogelis, *Mano gyvenimo prisiminimai* (*Memories of My Life*) (Kaunas, 1936), p. 223.

124 Dogelis, *Mano gyvenimo prisiminimai* p. 8.

125 *Varpas*, 1892 April-May, no. 4-5, p. 78. The piece is mostly a translation of a statement by Russian liberals protesting against repressive measures in Latvia and Estonia. It is signed "G. K." and it cannot be attributed to Grinius with certainty. But there are no reasons for believing that he would have disagreed with the content.

Polish, "Long live independent Lithuania." There also were speeches in Yiddish. It is noteworthy that the main speaker, a Catholic priest, did not appeal to a romantically colored heroic past, but to social justice: the Warsaw imperialists and landowners are marching to save their estates, to take the land away from our workers, to once again feast upon the fruits of our labor.[126] No doubt, some in the crowd had labored to supply Polish tables with fine china, imported wines.

Grinius's mentor Vincas Kudirka (1858-1899) did hold that nations are constituted by a common language. In an 1892 piece he linked the rise of vernacular languages and nations with social emancipation: the meaning of whips is understood without a dictionary. Thus, in the past, the lower classes had little need of language, except to curse their fate and tell bawdy stories when drunk. While a student in Warsaw, Kudirka became anti-Semitic, but in this piece he is endorsing the views of Max Nordau (1849-1923). Nordau's Zionism emerged a few years later and it is possible that Kudirka did not know that Nordau was Jewish.[127]

Many in the awakening began with little or no knowledge of the language. Grinius, like other editors, was required to make corrections or even to translate. At times, it was argued that there should be a Lithuanian newspaper in Polish: many of the gentry and townsmen know little Lithuanian but at least sympathize with Lithuanian aspirations. The situation was much like that in Ireland, where many English-speakers have no sympathy for England.[128] Grinius himself, in 1911 called for a weekly in Polish aimed at the peasants of Vilnius Province, many of whom are Lithuanians who do not know the language. As things stand, in words unusually judgmental, he claims that these peasants are backward, do not understand modern ideas, because they are still under the sway of clergymen and the nobility. They are superstitious and believe every self-proclaimed wonder worker. A well-edited publication, suitable for the barely literate, would enlighten them and advance Lithuanian interests.[129]

---

126 Ignas K. Skrupskelis, "Kaip atsitiko, kad lietuviais gimėm?" ("How Did It Happen That We Were Born Lithuanians?"), *Kultūros barai*, 2007 September, no. 9, pp. 13-20.

127 Vincas Kudirka, *Raštai* (*Writings*), (Vilnius: Vaga, 1990), vol. 2, p. 760. In his satires, Kudirka lampoons everybody, especially passing Lithuanians. They contain anti-Semitic passages, which however do not stand out because others are treated equally harshly.

128 Jonas Jonila, "Apie lietuvišką laikraštį lenkų kalba" ("About a Lithuanian Newspaper in Polish"), *Vilniaus žinios*, 1907 February 23. The author is Jonas Žilius (1870-1932), a priest, author and translator, at the time living in the United States.

129 Kg., "Vilniaus gubernijos sulenkėjusiems lietuviams reikia lenkų kalba lietuviško laikraščio" ("Polonized Lithuanians of Vilnius Province Need a Lithuanian Newspaper in Polish"), *Lietuvos žinios,* 1911 February 15.

In 1908-1914, *Litwa* was published in Vilnius, aimed primarily at Polish speaking educated Lithuanians. Many of the authors also wrote in Lithuanian—in *Litwa* their names sometimes appear in their Lithuanian form and Polonized at other times. There were attempts in the 1920s, in the Vilnius region, to publish periodicals in Polish with a Lithuanian content. In view of such facts, it is somewhat misleading to define Lithuanians as a people speaking a common language. Reasonably accurate for the 1930s, but not for earlier years. Once Lithuania became self-governing, much like elsewhere, a single language for conducting public business became a great convenience. To cite just several examples: little is known about the ministry for Jewish affairs, which existed in the early years, because it conducted its business in Yiddish; even worse is the Jewish press because most of the time Hebrew characters were used.

There are conversion narratives by persons thinking they were Poles only to awaken to the fact that they were Lithuanians after all. As a schoolboy, Grinius himself had moved in the Polish direction, but not far enough to need conversion. However, his first wife grew up in a Polish speaking household, only after her marriage to become a Lithuanian activist. The best known of the conversion narratives is that of Kudirka, known even to American sociologists.[130] Kudirka, also a medical doctor, was Grinius's mentor and inspiration: in later years Grinius often laid stress on his acquaintance and association with him. Kudirka was the author of poems, one of which became the national anthem, and satirical sketches. As has been said, he became anti-Semitic, but Grinius and the political party which Kudirka inspired developed in the opposite direction. From about 1900, that party's newspapers began to criticize anti-Semitism in no uncertain terms. In later years, Grinius liked to emphasize that in 1906 his party changed its name from the Lithuanian Democratic Party to the Democratic Party of Lithuania. In the earlier version, Lithuanians were thought of as an ethnic group, in the later—as residents of the country regardless of nationality.

Kudirka's biographers cite his own confession that while a student in Marijampolė secondary school, he pretended not to know Lithuanian in order to conceal his lowly origins—he was passing, in the American sense.[131] He deemed the language to be worthless, in sharp contrast to Polish which could boast of a rich literature, world famous poets. Probably in 1883, the first number of *Aušra*

---

130 Robert Ezra Park, *The Immigrant Press and Its Control* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1922), pp. 44-45.

131 Julius Butėnas, *Vincas Kudirka: Biografinė apybraiža* (*Vincas Kudirka: a Biographical Sketch*) (Vilnius: Vyturys, 1988), pp. 22-23.

(*The Dawn,* then written *Auszra*) fell into his hands and with tears in his eyes he understood who he was. *Aušra*, published across the border in East Prussia, was the first periodical in Lithuanian, using Latin letters, intended for circulation in Lithuania. Unfortunately, while Kudirka's narrative is dramatic, moving, it fails to explain why the conversion took place. Biographers have suggested, that in Warsaw he noticed that Polonized Lithuanians were different from genuine Poles. That likely was a factor—Lithuanians spoke Polish with an accent. But it is also true that while in Warsaw, while never becoming one, Kudirka moved closer to socialism, that is, his attention shifted from an upper-class literary culture to the lives and needs of ordinary people. This is the aspect to which Grinius draws attention: Kudirka realized that Lithuanians were impoverished because they were exploited by Russians, Poles, Jews, and that if he remained Polish, he himself would be part of the problem.[132] According to Grinius, Kudirka told him he was upset by the displays of Polish prejudice against Lithuanians.[133]

Tadas Ivanauskas (1882-1970) became a naturalist, doing much to standardize Lithuanian zoological nomenclature. In many photographs he is shown surrounded by snow drifts on winter hunting expeditions. But also a conservationist, he was sharply critical of the dredging of rivers and worried about fertilizer seeping into waterways. Born on the ethnographic border between Lithuanians and Belorussians, he recalls that people spoke a jargon with many Lithuanian words, while some of the songs were translations from Lithuanian. In his autobiography, suggestively titled *I Make up My Mind*, he considers why born a Lithuanian (in the broad sense) he became a Lithuanian (in the narrow sense). Important was his experience of being a stranger in Warsaw: his fellow students mocked him because he mispronounced Polish words. This, he writes, "intensified his feeling of opposition to Polishness, the roots of which reach his childhood." And from his childhood he remembers listening to the reading of the poetry of Mickiewicz, which filled his imagination with deeds of Lithuanian kings. He learned Lithuanian while a student in Saint Petersburg. A question to which the answer will never be known: how many conversions took place in response to bullying?

---

[132] Kazys Grinius, speech at the commemoration of the 80th anniversary of Kudirka's birth, *Lietuvos žinios*, 1939 February 28; 1939 March 1.

[133] Interview with Grinius, about his memories of Kudirka, *XX Amžius*, 1939 November 21.

The following text is helpful in understanding the response of many Lithuanians to Polish political overtures: during his boyhood Lithuanians also teased Poles, but "Poles were marked by a certain aggressiveness. They considered Lithuania only a Polish province, and Lithuanians—a subordinate nation, obliged to be always thankful for the Union, the Christian faith, language, culture and many other Polish gifts."[134] Ivanauskas expresses something found in other Lithuanian biographies, the sense that many Poles were simply incapable, even when they wanted to, of regarding Lithuanians as equals.

I may add that Ivanauskas's brothers went in a different direction. Two became Poles, one of them a politician, the third—a Belorussian politician.

Mykolas Biržiška (1882-1962) was very cosmopolitan, the antithesis of the stereotypical nationalist, more cosmopolitan than Grinius. In 1931, while on a fund-raising tour in the United States, he met with Jewish journalists in New York to chat about common schoolmates. Raising funds for the Union for the Liberation of Vilnius, he spoke at many rallies, attracting Ukrainian, Belorussian, and Jewish listeners and speakers. A member of the minor nobility, the son of a Lithuanian father and Belorussian mother, in his autobiography confessed that in the 1897 census he declared himself to be Polish. His two younger brothers were recorded as Lithuanians. But then, in his final years of secondary school, Biržiška converted to become one of the signers of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence and an important cultural historian. The chief influence was a friend with whom he talked about the plight of the peasants and condemned those Lithuanians who upon completion of university get jobs in Russia and disappear. After much hesitation as to his national identity, he decided to learn Lithuanian, at first secretly so as not to attract attention.[135]

Of importance for understanding the 1897 census are his reasons for declaring himself to be Polish. He was swayed by his mother's argument that if he said he was Lithuanian, he would be counted as Russian, because Russians did not acknowledge Lithuanians and, in any case, considered all Catholics to be Poles. Biržiška claims that it was the census which first drew his attention to the problem of national identity, a question which he and his friends began to discuss extensively. Perhaps they were Polish, but not in any important way,

---

134 Tadas Ivanauskas, *Aš apsisprendžiu* (*I Make up My Mind*), 2nd ed., (Vilnius, 2010), p. 83.

135 Mykolas Biržiška, *Anuo metu* (*In That Time*), (Kaunas: 1938), pp. 311, 323.

understanding that answering census questions was one thing and being truly Polish something different.[136]

The linguist Jonas Jablonskis (1860-1930), considered the founder of standard Lithuanian, also began his education as a Polish speaker. But while a student in Moscow he began to associate with other Lithuanian students. Furthermore, two of his Russian professors knew Lithuanian and urged him to devote himself to the study of his native language.

Julija Žymantienė (1845-1921), better known by her pen name Žemaitė, stands among the classics of Lithuanian literature. Had she written in one of the major languages, likely she would have standing in world literature because of the simple and unpretentious way in which she depicts the travails and miseries of the peasants. The daughter of impoverished gentry, almost without formal education, she did not need to convert, because her Lithuanian and Polish sides developed side by side, with the former winning out in the end. But she taught her children to read in Polish and held a volume of *Aušra* with trembling hands. Her autobiography brings out the close connection between language and class. At about eleven, she began school, the teacher being a distant relative. When she revealed that she could read in Polish, Russian and Samogitian (a Lithuanian dialect), the teacher scolded her: never read Samogitian again because it corrupts your Polish. Some years earlier, she overheard the children of the count speaking with their governess in French: "Why are they talking this way?" So that the peasants would not understand was the reply. She childishly inferred that in France too the nobles talk in ways the peasants cannot understand and decided that when she grew up she would teach Samogitian to noble children in France. She befriended a peasant girl, in spite of warnings that this would corrupt her manners and morals. Her autobiography contains many brutal scenes, again showing the correlation between language and status. To punish restless serfs, the count their owner called in a troop of Cossacks. And thus, a Polish speaker gave orders, while Russian speaking Cossacks scourged Lithuanian speaking peasants to a bloody mass. Several were scourged to death.[137] Even after the abolition of

---

136 Biržiška, *Anuo metu*, p. 279. There is a complication which I am ignoring: they also discussed whether they were Samogitians or Lithuanians. Bižiška's father and brothers said they were Samogitians. The 1897 census drew this distinction. Samogitia (Žemaitija) is the name of a region in western Lithuania in which several related dialects are spoken. A speaker of standard Lithuanian faces difficulties in some parts, but not in others. There is some Samogitian separatism, but weak.

137 Žemaitė, *Rytą giedra* (*Clear skies in the morning*), (Vilnius: Union of Lithuanian Authors, 2005), pp. 159, 56, 36-37, 39.

serfdom, scourging was used to punish criminals, but only of peasant origin and not members of the nobility or townsmen.

Gabrielius Landsbergis-Žemkalnis (1852-1916), a playwright, a member of the gentry, was raised a Polish patriot, but in stages realized that he was a Lithuanian, describing the process as an awakening. In 1885, returning after five years in the Crimea, he noticed that things were changing. Some peasants stopped kissing the hands of nobles and began to initiate handshakes, a serious breach of social protocol. He heard grumbling that peasants were becoming unmanageable, reading books smuggled in from abroad, sending their children to school. There were Lithuanian prayers in churches and some priests approved of this. Some years later, one Polish gentlewoman told him that in these changing times the gentry had no recourse but to bind themselves with the "nation" by learning the language. But some of the gentry were encouraging the government to take action against Lithuanian agitators.[138]

Pilsudski could have become a convert. He was of mixed Polish, Belorussian, Lithuanian ancestry, like most of the noblemen who traced their lineage to the Middle Ages. According to Grinius, a friend who in the mid-1880s was a student in Saint Petersburg told him that he nearly turned Pilsudski into a Lithuanian patriot, teaching him the language.[139] In 1902 Pilsudski still showed sympathy for Lithuanians: "It is a known fact that priests often engage in Polonizing activities. These are countenanced by bishops and prelates, who frequently send to Lithuanian parishes priests who do not know a single word of the language of their parishioners. It is also no secret that a certain section of the Polish intelligentsia looks with ill will upon the development of Lithuanian culture ...." But by 1908, anticipating the coming of war, he began to organize a Polish military force and his federalism and socialism began to recede.[140]

Perhaps it is only coincidence, but two Lithuanians to rise in the Soviet hierarchy were generals, that is, disposed of power which a small country cannot provide. One of them, Vytautas Putna (1893-1937), if anything, was demonstratively

---

138 The name Landsbergis is Germanic. Žemkalnis, which he used as a pen-name, is a translation. His memoirs are published in *Raštai* , pp. 271-289. His grandson is Vytautas Landsbergis, a musicologist, who in 1989-1991 emerged as a political leader.

139 Kazys Grinius, *Povilas Matulionis: Atsiminimai* (*Reminiscenes of Povilas Matulionis*), Chicago, 1953, pp. 15-16. An argument could be made that Pilsudski was a Lithuanian patriot, differing however from other patriots in his vision of the best future for Lithuania.

140 Dziewanowski, Marian Kamil, *Joseph Pilsudski: A European Federalist, 1918-1922* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1969), pp. 35, 38.

Lithuanian, for example, giving his son a distinctively Lithuanian name. And he is said to have explained that in Lithuania he would not be a general. Putna was one of the commanders besieging Warsaw in 1920. That year, he wanted to lead several Russian divisions to retake Vilnius from Zeligowski, but did not receive permission. In 1921 he was involved in the brutal suppression of the Kronstadt sailor rebellion. In 1926, after the military coup which overthrew Grinius, Putna telegraphed Pilsudski warning him not to attack Lithuania. He was shot in Stalin's military purge. Although the son of Lithuanians, he spoke Polish at home and learned Lithuanian when at about the age of ten he moved to Riga, with its substantial Lithuanian colony. He aspired to become an artist. One painting depicts a cheating Jewish merchant, a Pole with a whip driving men into the fields, and a Cossack officer beating peasants who kneel before him. In time, he became a Communist and dreamed of world revolution, for which Russia is a better starting point. Putna emphasized manners. On one occasion, he met an unshaven officer and ordered that the sloven be sent a razor. Apparently, for him good manners were an important sign that one was not a lowly peasant.[141]

Power for Pilsudski was important—he seized it in a military coup in 1926 and ruled as dictator for nearly ten years. He dreamed of building a great power, stretching from sea to sea. For such ambition, Poland is more promising than Lithuania. Grinius, on the other hand, dreamed of relieving the backwardness and misery of ordinary people.

There is no evidence that Grinius and Pilsudski ever met. But Grinius was aware of Pilsudski from 1894 onwards. One of Grinius's friends, dating to their days as students in Moscow, at the time active in Pilsudski's political movement, in the 1890s several times helped Pilsudski escape to East Prussia. Another time, Pilsudski was in one room, while next door the Lithuanian who was to guide Pilsudski across the border was serving drinks to the gendarme charged with Pilsudski's capture. Properly warmed up, the gendarme pulled out a photograph of Pilsudski and complained how difficult it was to find him.[142] Several years later, controversies and splits developed between Pilsudski's moderate socialists and social democrats, some of the latter moving in a Lithuanian direction. Grinius was aware of these developments.

---

141 Saulius Pivoras, "Utopijos pilietis Vytautas Putna" ("Vytautas Putna: A citizen of Utopia"), *Lietuvių atgimimo istorijos studijos* (*Studies in the History of the Lithuanian Awakening*), vol. 8 (1896), pp. 261-70. I would argue that for Marxists, and many others in the past, equality was attained by rising, that is, by members of the lower class adopting the culture of the upper class.

142 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 246.

The decades before independence are dominated by opposing social pressures. The search for higher status, for education and careers, encouraged emigration, both internal and external. But concerns over social justice pushed towards remaining and working at home, thus developing Lithuanian identities. Much was a matter of chance: many would have developed in the opposite direction had they encountered different friends, teachers, fewer bullying schoolmates. Some, who would have disappeared in Russia, returned fleeing the red terror. But there were also conscious choices: Biržiška would have preferred to study literature but studied law, because as a lawyer he could earn his living without having to emigrate.

In the nineteenth century the Sorbs, a Slavic nation, enjoyed a literary culture in Sorbish. But they did not establish their own state: they succumbed and became Germans, albeit with sad memories of what has been lost. Developments in Lithuania can be compared with those in Ireland and Scotland. In all three cases the educated tended to adopt a more sophisticated foreign language, for economic, class or religious reasons. But in Ireland and Scotland the hold of English was stronger. Thus, in Lithuania, the spread of Polish or Russian was more easily reversible. Independence was a consolidating factor: education in the native language became available, while the rush to catch up with Western Europe created employment opportunities for the educated.

Jewish nationalism which gave rise to Zionism and eventually resulted in the state of Israel has a similar chronology to Lithuanian developments. It is suggestive that the novelist Abraham Mapu (1808-1867) left Kaunas, the city of his birth, in 1867, that is, shortly after Grinius's birth. Mapu is considered a major figure in the revival of the Hebrew language. In his novels, he idealized the ancient Hebrews and called for reforms.[143] This revival began as a literary movement, but laid the foundation for political claims in the late nineteenth century. In a similar way, there is a Lithuanian literary revival in the first half of the nineteenth century, with a tendency to idealize the past, which by way of figures like Grinius becomes a popular movement, resulting in calls for autonomy and eventually independence. I might add that some of Mapu's novels were published in Kaunas, something which could not have happened to a Lithuanian, unless he bowed to the czar and accepted the Russian alphabet.

---

[143] Vladas Sirutavičius, Darius Staliūnas, Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, *Lietuvos žydai: Istorinė studija* (*The Jews of Lithuania: A Historical Study*) (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2012), pp. 223-24.

Grinius and Pilsudski were contemporaries. Both conspired against czarist autocracy, both had socialist inclinations and believed in democracy. Yet, they ended up on different sides, with Pilsudski striving to destroy what Grinius hoped to build. This is not the place to delve into Pilsudski's psychology. But if his wife is credible, he cannot be understood except in the framework of his nationalism. Her memoirs include a map showing what supposedly was Poland in 1771, in the north nearly reaching Riga, and coming within 100 miles of the Black Sea in the south.[144] This stands in stark contrast to the Poland of 1914, an area not 300 miles wide around Warsaw, a stark call for Poland to rise again. Not a hint that what she calls Poland in 1771 had two clearly separated parts, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland. Not a hint that the supposed Poland was also inhabited by Ukrainians, Belorussians, Lithuanians. To call that Poland is to make the same mistake as to use the name England to include Wales, Scotland, Ireland. The Poland of the constitution of 1791 was more modest, and structurally more of a single state. But to attempt to rebuild even that Poland is to ignore democratization, the entry of ordinary people into public life.

If the person who should have known him best is correct, Pilsudski's federalism, socialism, commitment to democracy, were secondary: his actual policies were governed by his vision of a Greater Poland, combined with a nobleman's habit of not taking seriously the aspirations of the lower classes.[145] Pilsudski was a nationalist, willing to sacrifice his other ideals for the sake of making his country a great power. Grinius was not a nationalist in that sense. His political development has a different starting point, namely, his awareness of the backwardness, sufferings, troubles, aspirations of ordinary people. In the end his thoughts also come to be centered on his nation, but because he concluded that an independent nation-state offers the best hope for social progress.

The territory of this nation-state must be determined not by historical memories but by ethnographic data.[146] In that sense, Lithuania consists of the czarist Kaunas Province, the western counties of Vilnius province, most

---

144 *Memoirs of Madame Pilsudska*, pp. 312-13.

145 Snyder, *Reconstruction of nations*, p. 58, notes the sense of superiority possessed by Pilsudski and others of his background. But he connects this more to culture than to class.

146 The historian Paulius Šležas (1902-1938), in Adolfas Šapoka, *Lietuvos istorija*, 3rd ed., 1950, p. 495, points out that two different senses of the term Lithuania are involved. The former, applicable to the time before the partitions, is to be understood in terms of political boundaries, the second—in terms of an ethnographic region. According to him, the Lithuanian awakening is inseperably linked with democratization.

of Suvalkai Province, a small area bordering on the Baltic Sea of Courland Province, small sections of Grodno Province. According to the 1897 census, 1,630,000 Lithuanians lived in this area, with the actual number likely being somewhat higher. Additional allowance must be made for the several thousand Lithuanians, mostly educated, scattered throughout the empire, some of whom returned with independence. The territory I have sketched out is more or less what Grinius envisioned in 1914. However, he does not mention the Lithuanian areas of Courland and Grodno Provinces and suggests that the two counties with Belorussian majorities be divided, so as to exclude many Belorussians.[147] Clearly, Grinius wants the Lithuania of the future to have few problems with minorities.

Several hundred thousand Lithuanians lived in what was then East Prussia, in the German empire, an area that Lithuanians came to call Lithuania Minor. A few of them were important to the cultural awakening, but the area was not included in calculations of the territory of the hoped for republic, except in the late stages of the war, as Germany faced defeat. Eventually, the port of Klaipėda and the surrounding area were detached from Germany by the victorious allies and given over to French administration. In early 1923 Lithuania staged a coup and annexed the area. But these events extend beyond the chronological limits of this biography—Grinius played no role either in the coup or in the diplomatic wrangling which ensued.

Excluding the imperial centers of Saint Petersburg and Moscow, Lithuanians were somewhat better off than most other inhabitants of the empire. But Lithuanians looked to the West, where modernization was further advanced and its benefits spread more widely, and within ethnographic Lithuania, they found themselves near the bottom. Statistics which would allow comparisons between the several nationalities in the region are scarce, but leave little doubt that others lived better. The 1897 census provides data concerning education: in Vilnius Province, 47 per cent of Poles had some education, 43 per cent of Jews, 25 per cent of Lithuanians; in Kaunas Province, 48 per cent of Poles, 39 per cent of Jews, 38 per cent of Lithuanians; in Suvalkai Province, 41 per cent of Poles, 45 per cent of Jews, 33 per cent of Lithuanians. Jewish data could well reflect religious attitudes and not social conditions: about half of Jewish males had some schooling, but only a third of the females. Among Lithuanians differences between males and females are not as marked. In fact, in Kaunas Province there

147 Kazys Grinius, "1913 metai" ("The year 1913"), *Lietuvos žinios*, January 21, 1914.

were more females with some education, but because there were more females, the percentages for males and females are about the same. It should also be remembered that most Lithuanians lived in the countryside with schools far away, while most Jews lived in cities with nearby schools. Likely, the differences between Poles and Lithuanians also reflect differences in urbanization and social class. The percentage for Belorussians is somewhat lower than for Lithuanians. The Russian percentage is similar to the Polish. For Russians, there is a marked surplus of males, suggesting that they were not permanent residents. For other groups, females outnumber males.

These numbers likely understate the extent of literacy among Lithuanians.[148] Because most schools were in Russian, there were informal underground Lithuanian schools. Also, some children learned to read from itinerant beggars, who in addition provided entertainment and carried gossip and news from village to village. On the other hand, the standard was low. Uncertainties about what was considered literacy make comparisons with other countries uninformative. But there is little reason to doubt that educational achievement among Lithuanians was significantly lower than in Western Europe.

While with independence Lithuanians began to catch up, school attendance figures still reveal substantial disparities. At the start of the 1922-1923 school year, 14,244 Lithuanians were attending grades five through 12, making up 68.06 per cent of the total student population. For Jews the figures were 4533 or 21.66 percent, for Poles, 1,471 or 7.15 percent. According to the 1923 census, there were about 400,000 children ages 12-19, inclusive. Of these, only about 5 percent were in school, about 4 percent of Lithuanians, 15 percent of Jews, and 15 percent of Poles. The number of those in school was larger, because some in this age group were attending primary schools. I am assuming that all three groups had similar birth-rates. In fact, Jewish fertility was lower, so that the actual ratio of Jews was greater. Most Jews and Poles were in schools operated by their respective communities, some with and some without support from the Ministry of Education.[149]

Lithuanians also ranked low in access to health-care. In 1922 the country registered all physicians. By far the best situation was that of Jews, a ratio of one

[148] Rimka, *Lietuvos ūkis*, pp. 36-37, finds that in 1897 about half of the inhabitants of Lithuania knew how to read and write. He argues that Lithuanians living in the vicinity of Latvians and Germans had noticeably higher literacy rates that those living near Russians and Poles.

[149] *Statistikos biuletenis, 1924, no. 8, p. 26; Švietimo darbas* (*The Work of Education*), 1922, appendix to no. 12.

physician to about 900. For Germans, the ratio was one to about 2000, for Poles—one to 2400, for Russians—one to 3000, for Lithuanians—one to 7800. Many at the time considered a ratio of one to 1000 optimal. By that standard, there was a small surplus of Jewish physicians. The war improved the Lithuanian situation because some became physicians in connection with service in the Russian military and some returned after spending most of their lives elsewhere. It should be noted, that emphasizing concerns about ritual purity, in independent Lithuania, Jews insisted on and enjoyed a separate health-care system. Some non-Jews used the Jewish one, but Jews tended to avoid non-Jewish institutions.

In 1925, the average life expectancy at birth was 33.9 years. The major nationalities ranked as follows: Lithuanians—32.4, Poles—43.6, Jews—50.5. There was a glaring difference in infant mortality. For Jews it fluctuated around four per cent, among the lowest in Europe. For Lithuanians it was around 16 per cent, among the highest, declining to just over 10 per cent by 1940.[150] Grinius thought that actual infant mortality for Lithuanians was higher, approaching 20 per cent in the early 1920s. He also thought that the disparity to an extent reflected cultural differences: Jewish mothers weaned children later and were more attentive to hygiene. At a time and place with little refrigeration and milk unpasteurized, the length of nursing could be significant. Throughout independence, infant mortality usually peaked during the summer months, from conditions associated with the digestive tract, Grinius often presented Jews as examples from which there was much to learn, especially concerning hygiene and child-care.

I am not aware of comparable statistics for the years before 1914. No doubt, wartime requisitions, food shortages, epidemics, evacuations forced and voluntary, changed the picture. But the differences between Lithuanians and Jews are too great to be explained by the calamities of war and both sides suffered. They must reflect conditions under the czars. I would argue that urbanization was important: cities are a more promising venue for life in the twentieth century than subsistence farms and Jews were forced to live in cities. Grinius did not attempt to develop this explanation and emphasized cultural differences.

Whatever the explanation, the data shows the heavy burden which was Lithuania's imperial legacy: compared with Western Europe, the country was far behind in education and urbanization. While all nationalities suffered, Lithuanians emerged in the worst shape because the twentieth century has not

[150] Ignas K. Skrupskelis, "Galime šį tą nudirbti" ("There are Things We Can Do"), *Naujasis židinys* (*The New Hearth*), 2014, no. 2, pp. 33-45.

been kind to the uneducated and to subsistence farmers. Grinius was probably aware of data from Saint Petersburg showing that mortality among the poorest was twice that of mortality among the wealthiest.[151] But with little by way of statistics available, he had to rely on ordinary observation. In any case, he concluded that action was urgently needed. The statistics from the 1920s I have presented show that he was right.

I can add, that crime statistics during the years of independence support the view that Jews and Lithuanians belonged to different social classes. The former dominated in white collar crime, fraud, forgery, counterfeiting, while the latter—in crimes of violence. Many killings and severe injuries occurred during drunken brawls, at times pitting against each other youths from different villages.

Some observers thought that excessive consumption of alcohol was a major barrier to social and economic progress. This is a credible claim, because instead of investing in the education of children, buying fertilizer and farm equipment, many wasted away the little money they had. After all, this was a subsistence economy: money played only a minor role. It was needed for taxes and small manufactured items, such as needles, knives, but not much else. Likely, here as elsewhere, there was a correlation between heavy drinking, poverty, and crimes of violence.

The most influential Lithuanian of his time was bishop Motiejus Valančius (1801-1875), unusual because he rose to high places despite his peasant origins. After becoming bishop, in 1858 he inspired a temperance movement, based on American and Irish models. In a short time, it attracted around 1,000,000 participants. In Kaunas Province, alcohol sales dropped by 70%. The movement even spread to Russia. The income of the several interested groups fell drastically. Mark Lawrence Schrad estimates that during most of the nineteenth century, taxes on alcohol, with vodka being by far the most profitable, accounted for more state revenues than any other source. Thus, not drunken brawlers but sober peasants threatened the empire. In fact, the situation was worse because many public officials for income relied not on salaries but bribes connected with the distilling and retailing of vodka. This pyramid of systemic corruption rested on a base of retailers who, to make a profit after paying taxes and disbursing bribes,

---

[151] "Kas ilgiau gyvena, ar turtingi ar vargdieniai?" ("Who Lives Longer, the Wealthy or the Poor?"), *Ukininkas*, 1897 June, no. 6, pp. 95-96. The item is probably not by Grinius.

were forced to cheat their customers mercilessly. According to Schrad, the temperance campaign had an anti-colonial aspect.[152]

In Lithuania, most of the retailers were Jews. Unsanitary rural drinking establishments were the venues where the two frequently interacted, with one side pouring bad booze down the willing throats of the other.

Temperance movements eventually peter out. But the demise of the one launched by Valančius was accelerated by government pressure: he was undermining the very foundation of the throne. However, the movement left behind a tradition of temperance societies, which together with agricultural cooperatives, amateur theater groups, educational societies created the social conditions of independence.

Valančius understood the value of literacy. In his diocese, which included much of Lithuania and part of Latvia, he established a system of parish schools, so that peasant children would be able to read catechisms and other religious books. In 1861 in his diocese there were 157 parish schools, with about 6500 pupils. A modest number, but a step in the right direction. A step which, among other things, helped to erode class barriers. Valančius himself wrote many didactic tales in Lithuanian, likely the first attempt to create literature for ordinary people in that language. In many, he tried to show how people can enjoy themselves without alcohol. He was an enemy of superstition arguing for example, that those who have prophetic dreams are the lazy ones who spend much of their time sleeping. Not exactly modern science, but a step forward. In any case, his initiatives did not survive the repressions which followed the revolt of 1863. Temperance societies were banned in 1864.[153]

In Kaunas and Vilnius Provinces, serfdom was abolished in 1861, although there were some free peasants before that. In that context, given the belief that class is a matter of "blood," the claim that peasants are capable of reading and writing was a radical one. Even more radical was the idea that they can and should learn something about science. This suggests that ordinary people can make informed decisions and are not simply there to obey the orders of

---

152 Schrad, *Vodka Politics*, p. 119.

153 A strange coalition opposed temperance, uniting landowners operating distilleries, Jewish retailers, and the government. Educational statistics are from Vytautas Merkys, *Motiejus Valančius* (Vilnius: Mintis, 1999) p. 290. Valančius was a progressive churchman. For example, some estate owners barred their serfs from marrying persons belonging to different estates. As a result, some couples simply cohabited without benefit of clergy. Valančius was supportive of them (Merkys, p. 435). Merkys describes Valančius's struggles against superstitions (pp. 312-23).

enlightened gentry. Valančius took only timid steps, timid against the background of social revolutions taking place in Europe. But it is unlikely that without his efforts, Grinius and the other awakeners would have found any audience at all.

The tendency is to emphasize the heroic struggle for freedom which was the revolt of 1863. On the other hand, the revolt set back social progress by several generations. What if the school system founded by Valančius had expanded and developed? Another victim was the language. On September 7, 1863, the governor of Kaunas Province banned the use of Polish in official correspondence. The ban was extended to the diocese. But Valančius, likely, to make it more difficult for Russian officials, instead of Russian, began to use Lithuanian and many priests replied in kind. Suspecting that Valančius was evading government controls, on June 17, 1865, the governor threatened punishment if Valančius or his priests corresponded in Lithuanian.[154]

The country suffered not only from repressions but also the arrival of Russian colonists, replacing those resettled deep in Russia. But there were also gains. The Russian government was most concerned to crush the Polish gentry and, trying to win local support, made concessions to the peasants, resulting in more of them owning land. Furthermore, Lithuanian speaking peasants began to resist assaults on their language and especially on their Catholicism. In time, people learned that they can do more than humbly petition their Most Gracious Father. An important advance. In describing his own political development, Grinius recalls that as a student in Moscow he resolved not to petition but to demand.[155]

I know of only one non-Lithuanian who examined the 1897 census in an attempt to assess the chances of a Lithuanian state. This was done in about 1909 by the Polish-Jewish Communist Rosa Luxemburg (1871-1919). Grinius became aware of her in the mid 1890s as among the leaders of Polish social democrats, the internationalist wing. Her conclusion was skeptical: "Obviously, setting up the former 'Lithuania proper' as the area of Lithuanian nationality is, in present-day conditions, an entirely arbitrary and artificial construction." She claims that Lithuanians are a minority in the Provinces of Kaunas, Vilnius, and Grodno, and form only a small majority in Suvalkai. I am not clear as to what is

---

154 Merkys, *Motiejus Valančius,* pp. 702-704. Merkys notes that petitions to the bishop by peasants were in Lithuanian.

155 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 139.

"Lithuania proper"--she explains the term in reference to "prepartition Poland." But whatever that was, Grinius and other leaders of the awakening had little interest in eighteenth century Poland. Rather, they were thinking in ethnographic terms, that is, trying to delineate a territory inhabited by a nation in the modern sense. Furthermore, Luxemburg exaggerates differences between Samogitians and Lithuanians, excluding the former from any future Lithuanian state. Such emphasis served Polish interests. However, while there was some Samogitian separatism, it never resulted in strong political demands.

She does recognize that the 1897 census under-counted Lithuanians because it reflected the language spoken at home: "a sizable proportion of Lithuanians use the Polish language in everyday life." She also recognizes the near coincidence of class and nationality: "the nationality relationship is here—generally speaking—a relationship of social classes." She notes the small Lithuanian urban population but adds that the "education of the Lithuanian population is on a relatively high level, and the percentage of illiterates is almost the lowest in the Russian Empire." But even this, in her view, does not improve Lithuania's political chances because "the education of Lithuanians is preponderantly a Polish education." A curious blunder for a Marxist: she generalizes from the aristocracy to the whole population. At the time she was writing the masses, if literate at all, were literate in Lithuanian or Russian, but not Polish. In any case, she concludes that autonomy for the region would be neither Lithuanian nor Belorussian but Polish.[156]

One of her observations is music to a Lithuanian ear: "Polish bourgeois nationalism is directed as much against the Ruthenians as against the Lithuanians. .... The recent movement for national rebirth of the Lithuanians was met with similar hostility in Polish nationalist circles." She cites a threat from a Polish newspaper published in Vilnius in 1906 responding to Lithuanian efforts to use Lithuanian in Catholic services: "If the perspectives, reached by way of mutual concessions and peaceful conventions, of living side by side peacefully do not please the Lithuanians, if they insist on taking advantage of every means of harassing and annihilating the Poles...."[157] Apart from suggesting that there are more Lithuanians in Vilnius than census results show—how could a handful

---

[156] *The National Question: Selected Writings by Rosa Luxemburg*, Horace B. Davis, editor (New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1976), pp. 269-73.

[157] *The National Question*, pp. 164-65.

annihilate anyone?--the text implies that Lithuanians agree their language to be worthless but enjoy making a nuisance of themselves.

Luxemburg had little use for the principle of national self-determination and this in part explains her erroneous assessment of the social and political facts. Furthermore, hers was a Polish perspective. But ideological blindness is also at fault: "Social Democracy, whose political program is based on the scientific method of historical materialism and the class struggle, cannot make an exception with respect to the nationality question."[158] Like most Marxists, she does not realize that her concept of the proletariat is an ideological construct, with little in human experience corresponding to it. Or, in different words, the Marxist concept of the proletariat is normative rather than descriptive, taking the proletariat not as they are but as they ought to be. Blinded by Marxism, she misses much of the lives of ordinary people.

In 1904, she argued that the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party should not be admitted to the International Socialist Congress in Amsterdam. She was joined by none other than Georgi Plekhanov on behalf of Russian social democrats, claiming never to have heard of the Lithuanian group. The German author being summarized comments: a person would have to have very acute hearing to hear what happens in a Lithuanian forest from his villa on Lake Geneva. In the end, he argues, Plekhanov and Luxemburg are doing what czars do, deciding how 2,000,000 Lithuanians should live.[159]

At issue, of course, is not geographical but social distance: czars and Marxist intellectuals, because they share privileged backgrounds, are equally removed from social realities, equally given to deciding how others should live. Luxemburg was born into a middle-class, reasonably comfortable, educated family, Jewish, but assimilated Jews, from the time of her grandfather. Her parents "thought and spoke Polish."[160] Adam Ulam, paints an instructive picture of Plekhanov, the great man, aloof from visitors, emerging from his villa, in the reading room of the public library, "his noble brow bent over some theoretical treatise," elegantly dressed, his shoes shined. Plekhanov, born into a serf-owning family, was living in Geneva and had not lived in Russia for over twenty years. Lenin could also be included among Bolsheviks of privileged background. Robert Service, after noting that Lenin had met few factory workers and saw factories "only from the

158 *The National Question,* p. 101.

159 *Varpas*, 1904 November, no. 11, p. 161.

160 J. P. Nettl, *Rosa Luxemburg*, 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), 1: 51.

outside," writes about Lenin in the late 1890s: "He lived as a middle-class *rentier*... He still thought the most effective way to enhance the prospects of Revolution in his country was to engage in economic and political controversy with other middle-class intellectuals."[161] Little changed with the seizure of power. A small but telling detail: Leonid Brezhnev's mother was amazed by all the red banners in the streets "at a time when there was a shortage of bandages and cotton wool and the country was unable to clothe its children properly."[162] In *Why Nations Fail*, we read: "the first thing Lenin and his entourage did was to create a new elite." The authors add by way of explaining the Soviet collapse, that the Soviets created "extractive," institutions, "designed to extract resources from the people."[163] Biographies of Soviet leaders leave little doubt that the extractions also supported the new rich and famous. During the Holodomor, the Soviets required that all shades be pulled on trains traveling through the North Caucasus and the Ukraine so that members of the elite on their way to favorite vacation sites would not see the corpses of starvation victims littering the countryside. [164]

Grinius could have drifted into Marxist Communism, but did not, I suspect more because of the circumstances of his birth and early life than for intellectual reasons. Unlike most of the early generation of Bolsheviks, he does not come from a privileged background. In his case, nothing like Ulam's portrait of Plekhanov is possible, except for the elegant clothes when Grinius was courting his first wife. Unlike Marxists, Grinius did not set out on an utopian project of creating a new and better humanity. Rather, he labored to improve the conditions in which people live, each in accordance with his own conception of the good life.

---

161 Robert Service, *Lenin: A Biography* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 96.

162 Brezhneva, *World I Left Behind*, p. 19.

163 Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson, *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty* (New York: Crown Business, 2012), pp. 389-90.

164 Taylor, *Stalin's Apologist*, p. 202

III A Peasant Boyhood

Kazys Grinius was born on December 17, 1866 in a small village in the northeast section of Suvalkai Province. It is not clear what his last name was at the time of his birth. Lithuanian names tend to be long because they carry with them the social history of the land. Often, they begin with a Lithuanian base, then acquire a Slavic ending, and end up with a Lithuanian ending on top of the Slavic. According to Grinius, the origin of his name is unknown, perhaps from the Lithuanian 'grynas', meaning unadulterated, or the German 'grün'.[165] Slavicized, it becomes Grinevičia, Grinevič, or Hryniewicz, and eventually Grinevičius. Lithuanian is still a much inflected language. (The dual number disappeared several generations ago.) The 'čius' indicates the declension to which the name belongs, while the 'vičia' and 'vič' do not. As late as 1912, in a text about Duma elections, he refers to himself as Grinevičius but signs it as Grinius. In 1910, he advertised his medical practice in Vilnius as Grinevičius. During this period, occasionally, he is called Grinevičia. The first official document in the name by which he is known was issued in 1919 by the Lithuanian Legation in Paris.[166]

The history of the Province of Suvalkai is different from that of the rest of Lithuania. In 1807, during the Napoleonic wars, the French created the Duchy

[165] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys,* 1: 23.

[166] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 222.

of Warsaw. This included Suvalkai Province, in appearance a human head in profile attached by a narrow neck to the body of Poland. To the north, the head bumped the Nemunas River, with the forehead ending slightly east of Kaunas. The Dutchy lasted until 1815. After its demise, Poland underwent several transformations, but Suvalkai remained associated with it and was administered out of Warsaw. As a result, the calendar was different, the Gregorian as throughout most of Europe, while the rest of Lithuania followed the Russian empire and used the Julian (old style). Lithuanian newspapers often showed two dates, with the Gregorian calendar 13 days in advance. Also, weights and measures differed.

Relying upon extensive and detailed statistics, in 1899 Grinius noted that only 12 percent of the population of Lithuania lived in cities, that about a third of the rural inhabitants did not own their own land and earned their living as agricultural laborers, that about a third of the land belonged to estates, that sanitation was poor. Furthermore, Lithuania was thinly inhabited and while the population was growing, it was growing slowly. Emigration was extensive, much of it to the more industrialized provinces. "Emigration is the passive protest of our nation against the abnormal conditions of our life." Not only Lithuania lost: because of their backwardness, in their new homes, the emigrants survived on low wages and lived in isolation.[167]

It is important to emphasize such analyses to counter the widespread view that the leaders of the awakening were fuzzy minded nationalists, blindly charging ahead. On the contrary, Grinius and many others were fascinated by statistics and found in them hard evidence for their political programs: people living on the fringes of empires do not do well. He feared, for example, that Lithuania would soon be deforested, because maximizing their profits from lumber, Russians do not care enough to replant.[168] He was aware of studies showing that the wealthy live longer than the poor.

Of the three, Suvalkai was most rural and the scarce urban population enjoyed fewer amenities. In 1912-1913, counting as a city a place with more than 10,000 inhabitants, there were four cities in Kaunas Province, two in the Lithuanian part of Suvalkai, and one (Vilnius) in Vilnius Province. Including smaller towns and without taking nationality into account, there were nine cities in Kaunas Province, ten in Vilnius, and ten in Suvalkai, but the ones in the latter were smaller. None of

---

[167] S. Z., "Keli patėmyjimai iš statistikos" ("Some Conclusions from Statistics"), *Varpas,* 1899 July-August, no. 4, p. 57.

[168] Raulas, *Ukininkas*, 1899 January, no. 1, p. 14.

these had sewers and only one, in Vilnius Province, had water works. With two exceptions in Vilnius Province, all had street lighting. Most used kerosene, one each in Vilnius and Kaunas Provinces used electricity, and one in Vilnius used gas. One city in Kaunas Province and one in Vilnius had telephones, but none in Suvalkai. In 1913, 1648 were counted as industrial workers in Suvalkai, 6603 in Kaunas, and 12,291 in Vilnius. The same table provides data for Grodno Province which was noticeably more industrialized, counting 17,874 workers.

The health needs of Suvalkai Province were not well met. In 1912, there were 227 hospital beds for a population of more than half million. Kaunas Province had 820 and Vilnius—2637. The relative isolation of Suvalkai is shown by incidence of venereal diseases with 3119 infected in Kaunas Province, 4604 in Vilnius, but only 598 in Suvalkai. Of course, some of the differences must be attributed to differences in reporting. Perhaps, the sexually active in Suvalkai, despairing of getting medical attention, stayed home to suffer and infect others.

There is no doubt that the awakening begins in Suvalkai—in later years Grinius delighted in counting how many of his schoolmates contributed by writing or distributing banned books, how many were imprisoned at one time or another. It is often assumed that farmers in the province were more prosperous, could more readily afford to educate their children. The 1919 statistics manual which I am using has an elaborate section on crop yields, ranging from winter rye to potatoes and peas. The data do not support the thesis that Suvalkai farmers were more prosperous. With few exceptions, per acre yields in Kaunas Province were higher. Vilnius and Suvalkai were more evenly matched, with Vilnius doing somewhat better. Comparison of farm animals yields the same result. In 1912, Suvalkai farmers were raising 70,785 pigs, while those of Vilnius—332,525, and those of Kaunas—362,158. Horses were no different, 97,753 in the first, 250,225 in the second, 321,462 in the third. There is curious evidence that Kaunas farmers were more enterprising, more willing to try new things: in 1910 there were 21,849 goats in Kaunas Province, 4531 in Vilnius, and only 319 in Suvalkai. But, apparently, raising goats was not profitable, the numbers declining in all three.

It is also not the case that the farms were bigger. In 1905 the average farm in Kaunas Province was 16 hectares, 15 in Vilnius, and only 11.3 in Suvalkai. The debt burden in Suvalkai was somewhat lighter and profits from lumbering somewhat higher, but not enough to suggest greater prosperity.

In view of such data, I find it hard to understand why Lithuania's awakening began where and when it did. Perhaps there is some connection with alcohol

consumption, but that is impossible to measure. Suvalkai produced noticeably less beer, mead, spirits. Thus, perhaps there was a significant difference in alcohol consumption, with the people of Suvalkai spending less on drinks and more on education. The difference in alcohol consumption could well be greater than the numbers suggest. The traditional home-brewed beer of northern Lithuania is potent—one pint will knock many off their feet. But in statistical tables, all beer is treated alike. On the other hand, alcoholism as a social problem, much like drugs, is linked not only with poverty but also with hopelessness. Perhaps, the Lithuanians in Suvalkai drank less because they were several more generations removed from serfdom? Having stronger traditions of conducting their own affairs, they had more hope, a stronger sense that things can change, were more willing to sacrifice so that their children would enjoy more opportunities. In Lithuanian lore, the people of Suvalkai are portrayed as skinflints. Could this be a folk-memory of a people more inclined to budget their resources, who better understood that to improve their lives they needed to save and invest? However that may be, serfdom was abolished in Suvalkai Province in 1807, but in 1861 in the rest of Lithuania.

Another factor could be proximity to East Prussia. One table for 1909-1913 compares crop yields for the Provinces of Kaunas, Vilnius and Grodno with those of East Prussia. For five major crops, in all cases, the yields were higher in Prussia, in the case of potatoes by a factor of three. Perhaps, talk about the good things in the greater world outside was more widespread in Suvalkai than elsewhere.

In several Suvalkai schools some instruction in Lithuanian was permitted. At times, Grinius comes close to attributing the awakening to the influence of one teacher in one secondary school. Petras Kriaučiūnas (1850-1916) certainly played a major role. But it is more important to explain not why he taught as he did, but why he found willing students. The answer has to be found in the social conditions of the time.

Grinius was a private person, striving to keep his private life separate from his public one. This is shown by the fact that he left no lurid accounts of the murder in Kislovodsk. This is typical: he wrote without displays of emotion or gilded rhetoric. I cannot imagine him writing anything like the historical invocation of the Polish constitution of 1921.

He described his childhood, as if an ethnographer giving instructions to a documentary film-maker, with special care to avoid anachronisms. We

encounter a horse suffering from pneumonia recuperating in the family's living quarters, thieving Gypsies, wandering Hungarians in blue shirts and black hats who castrate farm animals, beggars entertaining with stories about Napoleon or how the Russians used to hunt draft-dodgers. We learn how they made kerosene lamps and on winter evenings how the women made candles from lard. There was much to be envied, a life less bland, with more novelties and surprises, more colorful, at least in the telling, than ours with its inescapable shopping malls, television, video games. On the other hand, chickens were underfoot in the kitchen—unsanitary albeit useful, because their droppings were readily at hand to be used as fertilizer. Lambs mingled with the family to escape the cold.

The practice of sheltering farm animals in living quarters was common. Stasys Matulaitis (1866-1956), a physician, from the same region as Grinius, recalls that his prosperous father built a new house in the 1870s. After that, pigs and piglets were no longer underfoot in the kitchen. The new house had wooden floors—unusual at the time—and even the children slept on beds. In about 1875 his father bought a threshing machine.[169] The Matulaitis family was unusual: of five bothers, three became medical doctors and one, a pharmacist. All five were activists in the awakening.

Grinius's mother thought that an outhouse was above their station—she feared that God would punish them for such fancies. They did not have one until his brother tricked her by claiming that he was only building a pig sty. In one direction, there were five drinking establishments on a stretch of road of eight kilometers, and 15 over 20 kilometers in another. There were three distilleries on estates within 15 kilometers of their home: "It is not a wonder that my father's neighbors drank, and some wasted everything away." Grinius's maternal grandfather, in the fall when the harvest was in, would begin drinking on Sundays after mass, on his way home visit some relatives for more conviviality, and return home with a crowd to top it off, sobering up only on Wednesdays.[170] There were fleas everywhere and on Sundays mother would search their heads, squeezing lice between a knife and a fingernail and pulling them out.[171] There was one

---

[169] Stasys Matulaitis, *Atsiminimai ir kiti kūriniai* (*Memoirs and Other Writings*) (Vilnius: 1957), pp. 24-25.

[170] Kazys Grinius, "Argi mes jau prasigėrę?" ("Are We Really Only Drunkards?") *Lietuvos žinios*, January 27, 28, 1938.

[171] In some photographs, there are schoolboys with shaved heads, an effective way of ridding them of lice. But I have never seen a girl with a shaved head. Did they wash their hair? Or were they more concerned about their appearance and avoided photographers?

towel for the household, changed once a week, which included the large family and hired hands: nobody washed the area between their knees and bellies. But the children were bathed regularly. Before the age of five, they wore only shirts, even in winter when they simply stayed indoors.[172]

Alcohol had an important role, sealing bargains or encouraging officials to turn a blind eye. It was unthinkable for a matchmaker to negotiate without a bottle on the table. According to Grinius, everyone stole firewood and lumber—some earning more from this than from their farming. There were forest wardens, but their favor could be bought with a bottle, cheese, hams. Sometimes, gendarmes would wonder by and threaten fines for unleashed dogs or for not having the required ladders--fires were frequent and devastating. But some conviviality would put them into a kindlier frame of mind.

Theirs was a subsistence economy. They slaughtered animals, cured hams, made sausages. The women spun and weaved. The men carved spoons, wooden utensils, tools, made ropes. His father made carts, wagons, furniture. Some things they bought, or obtained by barter from Jewish peddlers—buttons, fancy scarves, knives, soap, combs, pickled herring. The peddlers in turn bought rags, bones, grain, calves, furs, hides.

This was the life of fairly prosperous farmers, working 17 hectares of land—above average for the region--, hiring several field hands and a girl to help in the kitchen, moderate drinkers. In the 1897 census, 85.86 per cent of the inhabitants of Suvalkai were classed as peasants, that is, as persons who lived more or less like the Grinius family. The data suggest that perhaps 30 per cent of the rural inhabitants did not own their own land and hired themselves out for little more than food. Obviously, the standard of living of this class was below that of farmers. In a society rigidly stratified by class, landless farm laborers barely outranked beggars. Obtaining one's own land was an important step upwards in the social hierarchy.

This is what Grinius experienced as a child, while Pilsudski's childhood was spent surrounded by servants and nannies. Was Grinius aware of how the upper classes lived? To some extent, he had to be. Yet, he describes his home in matter of fact tones: this is the way things are, this is the way people live. Nowhere is there a boy, on a cold and rainy night, peeking through a window at

---

[172] Kazys Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878" ("Memoirs: 1866-1878"), *Varpas*, 1926, pp. 64-145. In spite of the title, the narrative extends to 1893. The same years are covered in *Atsiminimai ir mintys*. But the 1926 text is more informative. At times, I will use material from both of these without citation.

ladies in gowns and diamonds gossiping next to a roaring fire, holding flutes of champagne.

There is another feature which must be noted: stratification not only by class but by nationality. I have already noted how Gipsies and Hungarians made their living. Jews were peddlers, traveling around in carts, selling and buying, bartering, giving medical advice and dispensing medicines. They operated the taverns. Many craftsmen were Jews--according to Grinius, most of the wandering tailors. Hides were tanned by Muscovites, who would arrive in the fall, rent a building, and spend the winter. There were healers, also wearing blue shirts, perhaps from Austrian Slovakia, who cured both humans and animals.

Jewish middle-men were an economic problem and a source of conflict during the years of independence. The country needed to export grain to Europe, which was becoming protectionist, but with the grain handled by so many middle-men, could not insure quality. As a result, Lithuanian grain brought lower prices and had a poor reputation. When in the early 1930s Lithuania tried to reorganize and centralize grain purchasing, Jewish newspapers complaining that as many as a 1000 Jewish families were being deprived of their livelihood. Because few if any Lithuanians were engaging in the grain trade, it was not difficult to portray economic policy as an example of anti-Semitism. Jewish merchants enjoyed many contacts in Germany. But with the rise of Hitler, and the deterioration of German-Lithuanian relations, trade relations with England were expanded. But Jewish merchants had few English contacts. Similar problems arose when the attempt was made to regulate and license craftsmen.

Grinius remembers that more Lithuanians were becoming cobblers. But in his opinion, they were rogues, taking advantage of innocent village maidens. His father distrusted them, at times explaining that they set a bad example, never to be imitated.

He describes the farm house in which they lived with ethnographic exactness. At one end was the parlor used for receiving guests, holding wakes. The parents slept there. Next to it was a wide, empty, entrance hall to the back of which a large pantry was attached. In the pantry they stored beets and kept the grindstones. Here, in winters, the family, humming traditional grinding songs, would grind grain, letting the flour accumulate in a large chest. (There was a commercial mill in the area, operated by a German.) On the opposite side of the entrance hall was the room where most of the action took place. This is where the hired help and most of the children slept on wide benches lining the walls.

There was also a bed big enough for four children. In this room they butchered the animals and cooked, letting out the smoke by a special opening in the ceiling—most Lithuanian farmhouses at the time did not have chimneys. Grinius speculates that the smoke killed off some of the microbes. The floor was of hardened mud. The area beneath the place where they stored spoons and other utensils the children called the river of piss. There was a barrel of fermenting cabbage, and another—of husks for the pigs. The room also served as workroom, for spinning and weaving, rope-making. For light they used kindling, attached to the walls by special devices so as not to set the house on fire. Brown roaches stared from the walls, but there were no bedbugs. People talked that bedbugs live only among Prussians.

I find it hard to believe his claim that on the whole the home was well-ventilated—when the door was opened to clear the air in winter the children huddled around the stove, where they were not welcomed by the cook. Perhaps, as a child he simply accepted as ordinary the smoke, the dust from rope-making, the stench of fermenting food for pigs. In later years he emphasized the importance of building homes that were well ventilated.

In the long winter evenings, they would go to bed early. The parents would go to the parlor, leaving the children alone with the hired help. "Here was a real school." They listened to tales of witches, cannibals, werewolves, and about the nine-headed one and the glass mountain. They solved riddles and roughhoused until some parent returned and ordered them to sleep. Children had to be creative: if you had a knife, you had whistles, pipes, toy ships, simple or elaborate according to taste, fishing poles, bows and arrows, bats. Grinius is silent about this aspect of his childhood. But there is no reason to think that he was not a typical boy. He mentions going into the woods and gathering mushrooms—everyone in that part of the world becomes expert at foraging for berries and mushrooms. (Even now, the first appearance of boletes is newsworthy, stimulating talk and speculation similar to Spring training in baseball.)

There is much ethnography but little of the personal. He remembers that once he was spanked for dropping his little sister. Once, perhaps in 1870 or 1871, as they were riding in a wagon, his father smelled something in the air, deciding that it was the smell of gunpowder from the Franco-Prussian War. There is reticence to reveal his inner life: there is nothing about his likes or dislikes, his hopes and fears, friends, playmates.

Grinius respected and admired his father. Vincas Grinius (1837-1915) never attended school, yet helped by an uncle learned to read and write. He learned Polish by associating with the servants of a nearby estate. Eventually, he learned Russian. He watched and assisted land surveyors, in the process picking up some geometry and arithmetic. He did not know the multiplication table, but solved multiplication and division problems by turning them into problems of addition. After making his own instruments, he did extensive surveying on his own—with obvious pride Grinius notes than none of his father's several hundred surveys were ever challenged in court. His father also kept account books.

In the home there was a small library—another sign that the family was above average. The books were mostly religious—from one of them Grinius learned how to read. But there were what were called calendars, similar to American almanacs. There were several volumes of the didactic tales of bishop Valančius, and several books of law, including one explaining the rights of peasants after the liberation of the serfs.

He remembers his mother in the context of religion. It was Ona Griniuvienė (1839-1919) who insisted on daily prayers and on Sundays and holy days roused everybody out of bed to chant the rosary and after breakfast make their way to church, located several miles away. She could read, but not write, and spoke only Lithuanian. She distrusted Russians: they were "envious, greedy, habitual looters." She cautioned against displays of wealth: the government will simply raise taxes.[174]

In the memoirs published in 1947, there is at this point an extensive digression about "godlessness" among Lithuanians. Clearly, a sensitive subject, one however he treats without autobiographical interjections. Psychologically, it is suggestive that he should digress at this point, when describing his mother as pious and demanding. When writing Grinius was in his eighties and the digression could be a symptom of failing powers. Yet, the account itself is lucid. Could this be evidence of a strong association between childhood and having senseless ritual forced upon him? Perhaps, the religion he observed during those days was so obtuse and lacking in sincerity that his distancing from religion began in childhood, while his mother nevertheless insisted. In another context he recalls that they were not permitted to complain about priests or to express religious

[174] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 112.

doubts.[175] Mostly, for godlessness he blames bad and Polonizing priests. Thus, after giving a standard positivistic account of the withdrawal of religion confronted by advancing science, he states that there were many godless among uneducated peasants. His own father distrusted priests and avoided having them as guests: "Where priests carouse, their hosts become beggars," the father liked to say. Could there have been tension in the household between the simple and pious mother and the more cynically inclined father?

Perhaps the most revealing account of his religious attitudes occurs in the context of the revolution of 1905. With considerable bitterness he depicts the clergy as enemies of reform, defenders of czarism and autocracy, not to mention superstition. In the long run, he claims, while other factors were also at work, it is the fault of the clergy that Lithuanians have drifted away from religion. The clergy could have supported the struggle for independence, land reform, freedom of conscience. Instead, the clergy demanded obedience. He writes: "We democrats were non-practicing Catholics, while Catholic clergy insistently insisted upon the observance of religious rituals in accordance with the traditions of Rome." In power, making appointments, Catholics always insisted on religious orthodoxy, ignoring competence. "These are Jewish methods: even if no better than manure, but our people."[176]

These several pages leave much unsaid. Exactly what is a non-practicing Catholic? A believer who does not attend mass? An atheist who was baptized as a child and raised as a Catholic? Thus, even on the verge of confession, he retains his privacy, does not reveal his own beliefs. The odd phrasing about the traditions of Rome while suggestive is inconclusive. Grinius holds that the Church often acts politically and he could well have objected to interference by a foreign power. From time to time there were efforts to establish a national church, with persons close to Grinius involved. But it is not clear whether he himself took part,

It should be noted that there were very few educated Catholic laymen into the 1920s. Unavoidably, the Catholicism of the time was not for the educated. I have seen religious books from that time that are embarrassments, much like financial accounts explaining how many days in purgatory could be avoided by a particular pious act. For a more enlightened Catholicism one had to wait for independence and the maturing of a new generation. Many of the clergy were forced into the priesthood by demanding parents, at times threatening to

175 Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," pp. 74-75.

176 Grinius, *Atsiminimi ir mintys*, 2: 135-38.

withdraw support if the son refused.[177] Kudirka was a seminarian for a time, likely an unwilling one. Some became priests as the only way of escaping their lot and joining the aristocracy. They lived accordingly.

There is another factor. Except for the last several years of independence when educated Catholic laymen found common ground with Grinius and his party, he spent most of his political career battling Christian Democrats. And in the digression he explains that when the Christian Democrats won, it was because of female voters. In fact, when Lithuania is once again independent, avowed Catholics will be elected mostly by women. But as happens often with Grinius, there is an unexpected twist. It turns out that religion has its benefits: meatless days are good for hygiene and general health, because then food tends to be uncooked and contains more vitamins. There are also considerable savings. After king Jan Sobieski lifted the siege of Vienna in 1683, saving Christendom from Turkish infidels, in appreciation the pope allowed the Commonwealth to add a third day of abstinence each week. The savings, according to Grinius, in a short time covered the expenses of the war. Whether this is good history and good economics I do not know.

As he recalls, his mother required that they abstain from milk, butter, eggs, and meat for 100 days a year, and abstain from meat for another 72.

The room in which they lived and worked was crowded, especially in winter, with the chickens and the lambs, and children. His mother gave birth 11 times. Two girls died in childhood. Thus, there were seven brothers and two sisters, with Grinius the oldest. And once again, he is not about to intrude upon their privacy, providing almost no information. He is more concerned to note the different dialects spoken in their vicinity. One brother, Jonas Grinius, readers have already met on a dock in Manhattan—he had to flee because of involvement in the revolution of 1905. In 1944, there were two others living in the United States. The youngest of the children, a sister, was 60 in 1944.

He devotes a page to his neighbors: many sad tales of early deaths and drinking. His nearest neighbor liked to tell stories and jokes, but he drank, lost his home, and the family died out, either from tuberculosis or syphilis. Another neighbor, stole firewood and sold it in town. He too drank, but managed to give

[177] My maternal grandfather lived alienated from his family for refusing to enter a seminary. Two of his brothers were priests—one was among those Grinius loathed. My grandfather shared an apartment with Grinius while they were students in Moscow. A lawyer, for several decades he served as a justice of the peace near Moscow and probably would not have returned to Lithuania had it not been for Lenin's terror.

his children some education: one of his sons was for a time a seminarian. But they all died of tuberculosis. The son of still another completed secondary school, but died while a student in Moscow. Grinius mentions several other families marked by drinking and death. But there were success stories. One neighbor played the zither and had six daughters: they were known as the singing house. He played and the daughters danced. Another's son became a priest, but emigrated to the United States abandoned the priesthood and became a medical doctor.[178] If we include his own, Grinius mentions nine families. Two, including his, succeeded through education in leaving behind their peasant origins. Two tried, but failed, dying before their time. Two made no effort to leave, but lived reasonably well for their time and place. Concerning the remaining three: they lived out their allotted years mired in alcohol and disease. It should be emphasized that his neighbors were farmers owning their own land. Estate laborers had less.

Grinius's own education began at home. His mother taught him to read, beginning with the repetition of syllables and moving on to words. For the second winter, his father bought a graphite tablet, teaching him to write and solve simple problems in arithmetic. He learned more from his parents than some of his contemporaries who attended informal and illegal village schools. For example, one of Grinius's classmates and later a medical colleague, when eight years old, was taught by a veteran of the Polish army, using a Polish reader. This wanderer arrived in the village and formed a class of some ten children. The class met in different homes, a week at a time, depending on which parent provided room and board. The Polish elementary reader used in class extolled whipping as the best means of forming good moral character. It is fortunate that Grinius did not fall into the hands of such a teacher.[179]

Probably in the fall of 1876 when he was near his tenth birthday, his parents took him to school. It was conducted in Russian and the pupils were forbidden to converse in Lithuanian. An older boy recorded infractions and the guilty ones would be scolded or have their hands slapped with a ruler. Perhaps thirty children attended. The school was located some six kilometers from their home, too far for him to commute in a horse cart over bad roads. He was placed in the home of a distant relative, a widow bedridden with tuberculosis. As he recalls, he enjoyed his freedom. The hired hand allowed him to accompany him

---

178 Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," p. 73.

179 V. Tercijonas, "Daktaras Jonas Staugaitis—biografiniai bruožai" ("Doctor Jonas Staugaitis—Biographical Sketches"), *Medicina*, 1929, no. 11, p. 764-812 (citation, p. 765).

to weddings and other celebrations, where he played with other boys. But after several months, his parents discovered that the housekeeper was stealing food intended for him, and removed him from the widow's care.

After the failed revolt of 1863, Russification was the order of the day, with schools playing a central role. In this regard, czarist policy was not different from American. In the former, the goal was to produce Russians, in the latter—Americans. Many now admit that boarding schools for Native Americans were a disgrace, guided as some were by the slogan "Kill the Indian, save the man." In the name of civilizing and Christianizing, the children were given American names, required to wear their hair in American fashion, punished if caught speaking their own language, often not allowed to spend holidays at home. This regime was still in place after World War II. Much the same situation prevailed in schools in Lithuania, but easing somewhat as the century progressed and starting to disintegrate after 1905.

In 1895 an author, possibly Grinius, described a Russian school in Lithuania, exaggerating for effect, one hopes. Some demobilized non-commissioned officers, decide to stay and begin looking for jobs. Failing to secure government employment, they earn money as teachers until something better turns up. They go to a village, find 20-40 children at 50 kopeks per child, per month, and begin to teach. The first lesson is about the czar whom God sends to govern all and who must be obeyed without question. Everyday they sing, asking God to protect the czar. Every pupil brings a stick. Pretending that their sticks are weapons, the children are drilled in marching. Education consists of little more than repeating the letters of the Russian alphabet after the teacher. And after a while, the teacher questions the children about the books they have at home, in some cases resulting in searches and arrests.[180] Such schools are designed to produce Russians and obedient subjects and do little to advance education.

The secondary school in Marijampolė, which Grinius was to attend, was changed from a Polish to a Russian one in 1867. Children were forbidden to talk in Lithuanian both in school and at home. If caught, they were shamed by having to wear a tablet around their necks and were scourged if they still wore it on a Saturday. Thereby, children were turned into language police and informants: to cleanse themselves of the disgrace they had to find someone else speaking Lithuanian and hang the tablet around his neck. Stories are told of

[180] Krantys, "Maskolių agentai ir jų darbai" ("Muscovite Agents and What They Do"), *Ukininkas*, 1895 February 25, no. 4, p. 25-26. It is uncertain whether Grinius is the author.

children being suddenly awakened, in the hope that startled they would use the wrong language. Lithuanians were pressured even when the school was Polish. A student, who later entered the priesthood, recalls being urged by the Polish school principal to change his name to a Polish one.[181] The regime in this school was different when Grinius himself became a student.

After withdrawing him from one school, early in 1877 his parents enrolled him in another. This one met in the teacher's parlor. Here he was promoted to the second grade because of prowess in arithmetic. That fall, his parents transferred him to his third school, this one located in Marijampolė. His third grade teacher was a young man who played the violin and taught them how to sing, but little else: most of the time the children ignored him. Once again he became a boarder, this time in a home where everyone was required to speak Polish—this is where he learned the language. Grinius writes: "All of us wanted to become good Poles and learn the language well."[182] Thus, while not yet a teenager, he was expected to use three languages, one at home, one in school, and a third in his boarding house and with friends.

For his bed and board, his parents provided the food and paid about 100 rubles for the nine months of the school year. According to his estimate a day laborer who was fed by his employer could earn about 100 rubles in a year. Obviously, unless he was fortunate enough to live within walking distance of a school, the best a day laborer could hope for is a wandering beggar to teach his children the rudiments of reading. Poor farmers were not much better off. Even substantial farmers like Grinius's parents would have had difficulties: depending on yields and market prices, to raise 100 rubles they would have had to sell the rye harvest from about two hectares.

Since Grinius spent most of his school years and early life in Marijampolė, some account of the town is in order: among cities and towns, at the time it was the most Lithuanian. Located some 60 miles southwest of Kaunas, it has been known by many names. During the Soviet occupation, it was called Kapsukas,

---

181 J. Totoraitis, "Marijampolės gimnazijos praeitis" ("The Past of Marijampolė Secondary School"), *Švietimo darbas*, 1921 January-February, no. 1-2, p. 96-97. The language prohibition could have occurred while the school was still Polish—the date is not indicated clearly. Anecdotes of this kind are impossible to verify. But they are persistent and frequent and fit a time in which corporeal punishment was normal. Madama Pilsudska, *Memoirs*, p. 84, recalls that in about 1890, her school demanded that girls wear their hair in a Russian fashion, "combed smoothly back from the forehead, plaited, and arranged in a coil at the nape of the neck."

182 Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," pp. 76-77.

in honor of a Lithuanian communist, no doubt, to eliminate the religious reference to Mary. The 1897 *Century Atlas* shows it as Mariampol, but in the nineteenth century Grinius, like many Lithuanians, referred to it as Senapilė (Old Town) or the more Russian Starpolė or Starapolė. In one account, Grinius shows exasperation, annoyance, that the town has no settled name. In 1896, according to Grinius, the town had about 6,500 inhabitants, 62 taverns, seven priests, four primary schools, one secondary school, several Jewish schools, one Catholic church, one Lutheran, two small Russian orthodox churches. He estimates the Lithuanian population at about a 1000, mostly new arrivals from villages, since townspeople did not become Lithuanians. How do they earn their living? Several hundred work as housemaids, earning their keep and sometimes as much as seven rubles a month. If they live frugally and remain in good health, they can save several hundred rubles for their old age, but many of these girls end up with nothing. Since there are hundreds of soldiers in town, some become promiscuous. Other unmarried women become *davatkos.*[183] They work as seamstresses, housekeepers in rectories, and other odd jobs. In his view, *davatkos* should be regarded as mentally ill, perhaps suggestible, and should be studied by psychiatrists. There are some ten Lithuanian craftsmen, all of them recent arrivals. The beggars are mostly rogues--a shelter should be built near a church to control them. There are several hundred Lithuanian primary and secondary school students, several Lithuanian priests, and several Lithuanian merchants, who established their businesses only in recent years. With the exception of several bachelor ones, there are no established Lithuanian households. In the white-collar class, there are at most ten Lithuanians. He estimates that there are several hundred Lithuanian laborers who chop wood, clean streets and do other menial and difficult jobs. The Lithuanians live in the outskirts, often several families to a room. Thus, under conditions not different from those in immigrant districts of New York at the time.

Grinius wrote this in 1896, concerned to assess the role the townspeople could play in the awakening. Housemaids were mostly hopeless cases—they cannot be persuaded to so much as speak Lithuanian. Laborers are concerned with survival and little can be expected of them. *Davatkos* were set in their ways and

[183] Singular--*davatka*, plural—*davatkos,* said mostly of women of exaggerated religiosity. The word is untranslatable, although 'devotee' comes close. A *davatka* is a member of what approaches a social class, recognizable by dress and behavior, and usually found in churches or around them. The term now is derogatory and even more so when applied to males.

learn no other languages—they could help by distributing Lithuanian prayer books. A few of the wandering beggars already sell Lithuanian publications. But the students are a very promising element, since they are quite Lithuanian in their outlook. He concludes with the observation that townsmen everywhere are more progressive, more willing to adopt new ways. "It would be good for us to pay more attention to the Lithuanian element in towns."[184]

A snap shot of Marijampolė in about 1900 shows that urban Lithuanians were, for all practical purposes, immigrants, in menial positions. The town has one banking office—Jewish owned; two pharmacies—Polish; two book shops—Jewish; one printer—Jewish. In the county there were six pharmacies, one Lithuanian, two Jewish, two Polish, one German. There were five small factories, four Jewish, one German owned.[185] It is of course true that Lithuanians could transact business in any of these establishments. But their non-Lithuanian owners were unlikely to support Lithuanian culture, for example, to advertise in Lithuanian publications. Even during independence, Lithuanian newspapers received little advertising, in contrast to American newspapers. It is not surprising that the major periodicals were not commercially successful and were subsidized by various political or social groups.

While he never became versed in statistical methods, Grinius preferred to assign numbers, crude ones when nothing better was available. He rarely thought in terms of vague generalizations, but tried to take into account differences, sociologically important details. He valued factual information. He did not indulge in sweeping commonplaces such as "Lithuanians are a hospitable people." His account of Marijampolė in *Varpas* is typical. He, like many others at the time, understood that their first job was to turn peasants into informed, knowledgeable farmers. But in this early piece he reveals an understanding of a greater challenge, that of transforming a rural culture into an urban one. In one way, for Lithuanians it was easier, because they could imitate others where urbanization had been underway for some time. But in another--more difficult, because playing catch-up, they tended to lose their educated to more developed competitors. Superiority is the argument and the appeal which has everywhere worked to destroy native cultures. Claims of being culturally superior

---

184 Šiaurys, "Senapilės miesto lietuviški gyventojai" ("The Lithuanian Inhabitants of Senapilė") *Varpas*, 1896 February, no. 2, p. 21-22.

185 *Vienybė lietuvininkų* (*Lithuanian Unity*), 1901, nr. 21, p. 248. This weekly was published in Plymouth, Pa.

are prominent in Polish thinking about minorities: Pilsudski saw assimilation as a way of helping them. Grinius is not blind to this. But he is haunted by the thought of the many left behind mired in backwardness. Playing catch-up has another defect. After all, advanced countries do not stop and wait. Because they continue to make progress, the gap remains and to many it appears that nothing has been accomplished. For politicians and the public, there is little comfort in the tepid "we are not farther behind."

Of course, when he arrived in Marijampolė as a primary school pupil in the fall of 1877 such concerns were decades away. In all probability he arrived clad in homespun: his clothes, manners, language set him apart from schoolmates and townspeople. For a ten year old boy the pressure to fit in must have been irresistible: stares, whispers, smirks are powerful forces. And fitting in required not only new clothes, but also a new language. How else can one enjoy the good things on offer? Unless one acquired Polish, one would spend the rest of one's life mucking out stables, slaughtering animals, drinking and brawling at the local dive because there was little else by way of recreation and amusement. Inevitably, Polish would appear as the only entry into the wider world, the only means of escaping the stigma of one's peasant birth. In this regard, Lithuanians faced a dilemma faced by many before and after them.

IV One Good Teacher

In his 1947 memoirs, Grinius lists 80 students, including himself, of Petras Kriaučiūnas at the Marijampolė secondary school, and with obvious delight records their contributions to the awakening. Grinius overstates his case by listing several who were not among Kriaučiūnas's students. But this does not diminish Kriaučiūnas's role. Most of those listed became doctors or lawyers, but with a sprinkling of priests—one became a bishop of Eastern rite Catholics--, teachers, authors, journalists. Andrius Bulota (1872-1941), a lawyer, became a deputy in the Duma and Grinius worked with him to turn the political opportunities thus created to Lithuania's advantage.[186] Another Duma deputy was Petras Leonas, (1864-1938), also a lawyer, who at one time served as Lithuania's minister of justice. Another became a Communist, departing for Belorussia in 1926. At least four ended up in the United States, one fleeing political persecution. In this context, Grinius provides two other lists. One has 23 names, including his own, with several exceptions students of Kriaučiūnas, who were punished under the czars for political activities, were demoted, fired, searched, and in some cases imprisoned. The other has 58 names (one Latvian). They were members of the Society of Lithuanian Students

[186] Andrius Bulota deserves a biography in his own right. A complex figure, the most prominent Lithuanian in the Duma, he was in Russia during the revolution and was politically active as a Social Revolutionary. In independent Lithuania he was mostly absent from public life. In 1940-1941, he became an adviser to the so-called People's Seimas. During the German occupation, accused of being a Communist, he was shot.

in Moscow in the years 1886-1893. Grinius calculates that 60 per cent of them were graduates of the Marijampolė secondary school.[187]

Many important figures do not belong to any of these categories. On the other hand, considering the prominence of Marijampolė, we are given a reasonable picture of the numbers involved, namely, several hundred activists of varying importance.

Kriaučiūnas's role underscores the fact that the awakening did not spring into life fully formed: it grew from small beginnings, eventually becoming aware of itself. He was a student at Marijampolė during the changeover from a Polish to a Russian school, completing the seven years then available in 1870. One day during class a teacher explained that Lithuanian was mere jargon, unsuited for literature and serious thought. Feeling insulted, Kriaučiūnas set out to prove that Lithuanian was an ancient tongue, akin to Latin. With the help of a Latin dictionary, he compared Latin and Lithuanian words and during the graduation ceremony, recited a Polish poem in his own translation. Some witnesses recall that the students broke out into applause and shouted for more.[188]

At various times, in order to weaken Polish influence, Russian policy encouraged small Lithuanian initiatives as steps towards eventual assimilation. The recitation in Lithuanian was not civil disobedience: even some school officials approved, although one teacher insisted that he should have written out his translation in Russian letters. But his disregard of class boundaries defied rigid social codes: in a stratified society, it took courage for someone educated to identify himself with the lowest class. For a Lithuanian to speak Polish was to declare that he was not a peasant, and Kriaučiūnas refused to do this.

In time, he came to encourage civil disobedience, both by example and by word. It is said, for instance, that when teaching a class and writing Lithuanian words using the forbidden Latin letters, he would turn the blackboard so as to keep outsiders from noticing. He refused, on at least one occasion, to kiss an Orthodox icon when this was a traditional part of a public ritual. It is important to realize that conversion to Orthodoxy was widely seen as important for one's career and a step towards becoming Russian. By his refusal, he revealed himself to be untrustworthy and lacking in respect for sacred things, that is, not suited for the position of a teacher, whose first obligation was to train the czar's

---

187 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 46-64.

188 Juozas Leonavičius, *Petras Leonas—Lietuvos sąžinė* (*Petras Leonas—Lithuania's Conscience*) (Kaunas: Technologija, 2002), p. 66.

loyal subjects. This obligation was spelled out in the oath required of teachers. Kriaučiūnas was not Orthodox, but on special occasions, even Catholic students and teachers were obliged to attend Orthodox services. Jews were excused.

A strong man with broad shoulders he once wrestled the janitor to the ground and began to beat him. He learned that the janitor, a Lithuanian, was a snitch, in the evenings spying on students, reporting them for playing cards or engaging in other forbidden activities. Threatened with further reprisals, the janitor changed his ways.

By no means all Lithuanians were patriots. Grinius recalls a teacher of Russian and classical languages, also serving as an inspector in the secondary school, a Lithuanian, who converted to Orthodoxy, married a Russian and was raising a Russian family. On one occasion his fifteen year-old daughter, when questions of nationality were being discussed at the table, in tones of annoyance declared that her father and mother were Russians, that the family was Russian. But his conversion left him with a guilty conscience: a heavy drinker, he would at times bellow curses on all Muscovites. And the school administration did not trust him. One student recalls that another teacher, appointed to teach Lithuanian, a Russianized Tartar who knew little of the language, was spying on the inspector through a keyhole. Grinius himself saw the Tartar at a keyhole observing Kriaučiūnas.[189]

There were many practical considerations favoring the Russian option. Petras Leonas, in an 1885 letter describes a Lithuanian urging a gathering of younger Lithuanians to become Russians. In fact, the man argued, all Lithuanians should learn Russian and adopt Russian culture because Lithuanians lack resources and must make use of Russian ones. He appears to have in mind advantages both to the community and to individuals.[190] The advantages to individuals are obvious: better opportunities for careers. Also, a larger field from which to select a wife. There were many village girls, but few educated ones, and many young men wanted to leave village life behind. Be that as it may, a young student in Moscow or Warsaw would have more opportunities to find a suitable companion if he did not harbor scruples about the nationality of his children. The advantages to communities are less obvious.

---

189 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 250-51; 1: 135. The daughter's outburst is described by Petras Leonas, "Petro Leono laiškai Matui Pranckevičiui (1885-1887)" ("The Letters of Petras Leonas to Matas Pranckevičius (1885-1887)"), *Mūsų senovė*, 1937, no. 1, pp. 151-67; 1938, no. 2, pp. 325-40. Outburst is on p. 156.

190 Leonavičius, "Petro Leono laiškai," p. 158.

Kriaučiūnas came from a large peasant family, five brothers and three sisters. It was a progressive family for the times—one of his brothers also completed secondary school, several completed primary schools, one emigrated to the United States. He completed a seminary, but refused ordination because he would be posted outside Lithuania. Appointed in the fall of 1881, he taught Latin in Russian. A creative teacher: the students sang Latin nouns to a familiar melody while he played the violin. But the school allowed a Lithuanian elective, meeting once or twice a week after classes. As some recall, Kriaučiūnas not only taught the language but also trained future agitators. Grinius describes the class as a kind of secret academy for training leaders. Often, Kriaučiūnas talked about the ongoing awakening and about Lithuania's distant but heroic past. Some 500-600 children attended the school—it was large for its time. Most of the students were Lithuanians, with some Poles, and a sprinkling of Jews. In the early grades, the students used Russian among themselves. In later grades—Polish. But due to the influence of Kriaučiūnas, and the spread of the awakening, many began to use Lithuanian regularly. He was forced to resign in 1887, after his pay was cut and he was assigned fewer teaching hours. But his influence lingered on. As we saw, Grinius could single out the secondary school students as the most promising Lithuanians in Marijampolė.[191]

Kriaučiūnas returned as a teacher in 1906. Lithuanian class still attracted students. Likely, revolutionary enthusiasm could still be felt. One student recalls that in 1905, they met in secret to read and discuss *The Communist Manifesto*, by then available in Lithuanian translation. Others were attracted by positivism and atheism, borrowing books from a secret library established by some of the older students. But not all the books were politically charged. The students were especially interested in the novels of Jules Verne and James Fenimore Cooper. And it is helpful to note that they did not come from the middle class, but were farm boys. During home visits, they did chores, including riding horses to pastures, bareback.[192]

---

[191] *Lietuvos mokykla* (*The School of Lithuania*), 1921, July-August, no. 7-8. This issue was devoted to Kriaučiūnas. The biographical sketch is based on student recollections found there. Grinius contributed several fragments.

[192] Petras Klimas, *Iš mano atsiminimų* (*From My Memoirs*) (Vilnius: 1990), p. 11-12. Petras Klimas (1891-1969), diplomat and historian, completed Marijampolė Secondary School in 1910. His biography has some unusual twists. 1940 found him a diplomat in France. The Germans arrested him in 1942 and held him in a concentration camp. Released, he returned to Lithuania, to be arrested by the Soviets in 1944, surviving ten years in Siberia.

Many recall that Kriaučiūnas was an apostle even outside the classroom, using casual social encounters to instill pride in being Lithuanian. Since he wrote little, nothing is known about his sense of history. Likely, it was a highly romanticized heroic vision suitable for cultivating pride in one's heritage. But we should not be too quick with complaints about the sacrifice of truth in the name of nationalism: Lithuanians are not the only ones to use, and abuse, history instrumentally. The empress Catherine the Great was an adept, declaring as she did that in the partitions she was reuniting Lithuanian lands "with the Russian motherland."[193] History, both good and bad, is prominent in the American civil rights struggle. The movie *Dances with Wolves* (1990) turns upon an overdrawn contrast between noble savages and boorish whites. The hero, an American soldier, finds redemption in the arms of a woman, white in ancestry, but Indian in culture.

In a society rigidly divided into classes, political questions are prerogatives of the upper ones: no doubt, peasants grumble, mock their betters behind their backs, evade taxes, but they do not thoughtfully consider alternatives. According to Grinius, at the time, political changes leading to independence seemed so remote that serious persons rarely if ever talked about them. How could they? There were no Lithuanians in the 1880s who had discussed questions of policy with someone having decision making authority. He recalls that once in class Kriaučiūnas described Russian policy as "rounding": by seizing the lands of others, Russia was becoming rounder. But this appears to be as much as he offered by way of criticism of the regime. Was Kriaučiūnas afraid of informants, of being overheard? Or was he silent because he was not interested in politics? More likely the former, because Kriaučiūnas encouraged them to read about other nations that were awakening or had already awakened, and learn from their example. Grinius thinks it likely that Kriaučiūnas wanted Lithuanians to follow in the footsteps of Greeks, Serbs, Bulgarians, and others that already had achieved independence. Perhaps, a constitutional monarchy would be best, similar to arrangements in Great Britain, Sweden, Denmark in which the power of the king is checked by a democratically elected parliament.[194] It is noteworthy that in many of his early writings Grinius draws attention to the struggle for freedom in other parts of the world. In 1893, he published a longer piece on Switzerland: in democratic Switzerland, different nations live in peace and harmony. Given the emphasis on learning from others, it is possible to read into this

[193] Robert K. Massie, *Catherine the Great: Portrait of a Woman* (New York: Random House, 2011), p. 560.
[194] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 65.

text the wish that the Lithuania of the future should should not oppress minorities, but follow the example of Switzerland.

Kriaučiūnas saw the national struggle as a struggle for equality: students should demand the same rights as those enjoyed by Russians. The claim was a radical one, both from the point of view of nationality and of class. For centuries, peasants lived in a world in which clothing, manners, language, proclaimed their lowly status—from their earliest childhood they learned to stand aside and humbly remove their caps at the approach of an official, a lady, a priest, a landowner. In a brief item from 1897, Grinius notes that on the roads peasants still pull aside to accommodate their betters: "When shall we cure ourselves of such blind timidity? Surely, this is a relic of serfdom."[195]

Only a great writer could imagine a conversation between Grinius and his mother—who feared the wrath of unseen powers for the luxury of an outhouse--, that she and a priest are equally deserving of respect. Given Kriaučiūnas's emphasis on activism, it is likely that such disputes took place. After all, the awakening encountered not only opposition from Russians and Poles, but also had to overcome a belief widespread among Lithuanians that they are a simple people and have no claim upon the freedoms enjoyed by others.

Defying traditions going back for centuries, Kriaučiūnas insisted that it is not shameful to be Lithuanian, to speak Lithuanian: near the center of his program stands the demand for linguistic rights. Lithuanians should be able to conduct public business in their own language, in courts, police stations, local government offices. Neither should they be forced to pray in Russian or Polish. In view of the social conditions in the 1880s, it was too early to raise political demands: people had to be educated to think in political terms. But defense of language rights was a form of civic engagement, a first step towards citizenship. Ordinary people had to be convinced that they were not mere subjects of policies established by those far away, both in distance and class, but citizens both entitled and obliged to help shape these policies.

Unlikely that Kriaučiūnas himself, or Grinius as his student, conceptualized their program in such terms—philosophical interpretations usually come after the fact. But in historical retrospect the concept of citizenship appears central: they struggled to make ordinary people think of themselves as citizens and demanded that the authorities treat them as such. Just beyond the horizon lies the question: what political arrangements are best? The aristocratic Pilsudski

195 *R., Ukininkas*, 1897 June, no. 6, pp. 93-94.

thought that he alone was qualified to answer and could impose his preferences by force, if other means failed. Lenin claimed much the same, adamant that he alone understood the laws of history. Kriaučiūnas and Grinius, with their peasant backgrounds, approached the question from a different direction: the answer can only be given by an enlightened and prosperous citizenry. It is not an accident that Grinius became a popularizer of modern science. It is only from great distance that the awakening can be conceptualized as merely an instance of romantic nationalism.

Citizenship at times calls for violation of unjust laws. Lithuanians were not forced to sit in the back of the bus, but they could not print in their own language using the alphabet they had used for several centuries. The historian Vytautas Merkys lists 2467 individuals investigated in connection with the ban. The number of cases is greater since some were investigated several times—Grinius was interrogated on three occasions. In addition Merkys, lists 724 cases in which the culprits were not identified. The persecution was most intense in the 1880s and 1890s, probably several hundred investigations each year. Merkys adds that nearly 80 percent of those investigated were peasants, with a large number of paupers. Some of the latter were simply trying to earn a living. Noteworthy is the inventory of Kudirka's library compiled in 1895 in the course of his arrest: in his notebook there were fragments of translations into Lithuanian of the American reformer Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* (1879), and Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.[196]

The ban is a good example of how the best laid plans are foiled by unforeseen consequences. It was intended as a first step towards Russification: wean them from Polish things and the rest will follow. There were publications, including textbooks and prayer books, using Russian letters, often distributed for free, while the smuggled books were comparatively expensive. But as things worked out, the ban served as a focus for anti-Russian resistance, a unifying one, with less room for political rivalries and religious strife. It led many of the lowest class, who otherwise would have remained on the sidelines, into the political struggle. But as energizing as it was politically, culturally the ban was a serious setback. In the United States, the decades after the Civil War saw an explosion of newspapers

[196] Vytautas Merkys, *Draudžiamosios lietuviškos spaudos kelias, 1864-1904* (*The Pathway of the Lithuanian Banned Press, 1864-1904*) (Vilnius: 1994), pp. 10, 213. Some books using Latin letters were published after the ban, with special permission, but not for circulation in Lithuania. A similar ban was in effect in one region of Latvia.

and magazines aimed at an urban readership. This gave rise to professional journalism, an important component of a democratic polity. Printing advanced noticeably. But because of the ban, nothing similar could take place in Lithuania. When the ban was eventually lifted, Lithuania found herself decades behind—in 1904 Lithuanians were struggling to establish printing presses, professional journalism began only in the 1920s. The ban was not without consequences for the Vilnius question. Before it, the embryo of Lithuanian publishing was beginning to form there. It's further growth would have increased the Lithuanian presence.

According to Grinius, in a long essay published in Russia, Kriaučiūnas argued that the Russian alphabet was not suited for recording Lithuanian sounds, because it had too few signs. He urged his students to read and distribute forbidden books, an activity which could land them in prison.[197] But perhaps not as extensively as Grinius suggests—Merkys lists no investigation centering about Kriaučiūnas.

The language question arose not only in connection with the press: all education was conducted in Russian after the shutting down of the parish schools established by Valančius. This stimulated the rise of underground village schools, typically serving a handful of pupils for several months. There were hundreds of them—their number can only be guessed at, since many left no traces, either in memory or police investigations. The teachers had few qualifications and often were barely literate, able to teach no more than reading simple religious texts. But as a result, the literacy rate was higher than the official school attendance rate and some have argued that literacy, albeit minimal, in Lithuania was higher than in the empire as a whole. Kriaučiūnas urged his students to encourage literacy, to distribute reading texts in villages and towns, organize educational circles. Such activities could result in unwelcome attention from the authorities.

A language barred from the public arena does not keep up with the times, withers and becomes extinct. Lithuanian was not a language for conducting public business, although at various times there had been moves in that direction. It could survive only if people lived in isolated communities, something which was becoming less possible. The change from aristocratic to democratic polities made the task of developing the language urgent, while imperial policy sought to confine it to the private sphere and in time eliminate it altogether. Kriaučiūnas urged his students to push in the opposite direction, in municipal

197 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 38.

offices, law courts, churches, demand services in Lithuanian. But the most important thing was that students, upon completing their education, return and work among their own people, an obligation which was to become prominent in Grinius's own program.

In later years, when Grinius looked back at 1905 and its aftermath, he came to attack Catholic churchmen for continuing to pray for the czar, for their failure to support the revolution and Lithuania's political advancement. As far as we know, he was indifferent to theology—perhaps a hangover of his mother's authoritarian approach. But for most of his life he was uneasy about the prominence of religious institutions in the public sphere. Arguably, a highly clerical and conservative Catholic Church was the most influential agency in the country, standing in the way of progress, from his point of view. At the same time, when it comes to sexual morals, Grinius was conservative: he would not have favored the sexual revolution. Families were the building blocks of societies, and in later years, he came to advocate large families, in the face of what he saw as spreading promiscuity threatening Lithuania's survival. In his memoirs, at this point, he added a footnote that Jews, Poles, Belorussians are more fertile than Lithuanians, and that Lithuanians would become extinct if every family did not have at least four children. He recalls reproaching a priest in 1896 for doing nothing, while illegitimate births were rising and more were using birth control.[198]

As Grinius remembers, Kriaučiūnas defended religion, but only on pragmatic grounds. Reason is helpless in the face of religious claims: they can neither be proved nor disproved. Thus, it is best not to get entangled in religious disputes and tolerate all religions, at least the long lived ones. Theology aside, most religions are useful by comforting the afflicted, helping to maintain public order, by their rituals adding an aesthetic dimension, providing a moral foundation to human development. All religions, as long as they abide by the great precept of all morality, that of loving one's neighbor as oneself, are to be respected. The claim of any religion to have "a monopoly of the salvation of souls" is to be rejected. This is the source of religious strife: religious wars are the most horrible.

This may not be a fair summary of Kriaučiūnas's views: after all, he left the seminary at the point of ordination, ostensibly not because of a crisis of faith but because he wanted to remain in Lithuania. On the other hand, he could well have been exposed to French positivism and other currents critical of religious dogmas. But if he really said such things in class, he was taking considerable risks

198 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 41; 1: 227-28.

by fundamental attacks not only on Catholicism but also on Orthodoxy, because both claimed to play exceptional roles in the history of salvation. Neither saw herself as just one among many teaching men to love one another. My own sense is that in these reflections, decades later, Grinius is formalizing casual comments overheard in class. And his own attitude towards religion had softened: he would not have found much good in religion in the 1920s when Christian Democrats were his main political rivals. But by the late 1930s emphasis was on the unity of the democratic opposition, resulting in search for common ground.

In the autumn of 1879, approaching his thirteenth birthday, Grinius began his secondary school education.[199] Blessed with a retentive memory, he provides many details about his years there. The first year curriculum was dominated by languages: eight hours of Latin, six hours of Russian, out of a weekly total of 24. There was also arithmetic, geography, religion, and penmanship. As far as he recalls, there was not a Lithuanian class because the teacher died. He boarded along with nine others in the home of a widow, at a cost of 120 rubles for the year. Tuition was 25 rubles. Discipline was strict, enforced by an older boy serving as monitor. Under his supervision, they did their homework. Without his permission, they could not go to the town. The monitor punished by making miscreants kneel in a corner or by slapping them. School officials visited boarding houses to see that the pupils were not playing cards, drinking, reading banned books. Girls were not allowed. He recalls a touring magician—admission was 30 kopeks-- but because he was short he could see little over the bigger boys.

He learned later that two of his friends skipped the magic show to visit prostitutes. From such boys they learned about sex, spending their evenings telling "pornographic" anecdotes. This, it should be pointed out, is about as close as he comes to revelations about his private life. Among themselves, they spoke Russian. They wore uniforms, which included hats "similar to that worn by Napoleon III," with the initials of the school in front. Meals were sparse and monotonous, supplemented with apples and cheese brought by the parents. Few had money to purchase rolls in town. That year, two older boys, both expelled for poor grades, broke some windows of Jewish shops and homes. They fled and were never arrested. Grinius and others were interrogated by school officials.

After receiving the highest grades, he returned home for the summer and spent it herding pigs, as if to live up to a common Polish stereotype.

---

[199] The account of his days in secondary school is based on his "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878."

The second year curriculum included French and German, one as a requirement, the second—as an elective. The French teacher was good, an "elegant" Pole, suspected by the students of having "the bad illness."[200] On one occasion, the pupils went on strike: because he assigned too much homework, they refused to answer in class even when they knew the answers. The German teacher spoke Russian and German badly. He is remembered mostly for his faithful dog, who would follow him to school, then go home, to return and wait till classes were over. The year seems to have been uneventful, except for pranks they played on one young teacher, a newlywed. His wife made sandwiches which he carried around protruding from his coat pockets. Some of the boys would steal the sandwiches and sit in his class eating, while the class tittered.

After school, the boys amused themselves by throwing stones at windows and other targets, fishing in the nearby river, smoking hidden in outhouses, playing cards. The latter they did in a stable, sitting on beams above two pigs. In their understanding, Poland was something sacred—at the time, Grinius adds, they did not understand that Poles were not their friends. In 1881, upon the accession of Alexander III, they swore an oath of allegiance, in church, in Russian.[201]

That summer, while haying he was caught in a heavy rain and after running to escape it, he came to be afflicted by a dry cough, which stayed with him for the rest of his life. In 1881-1882, his third year (seventh school year), they began the study of Greek and algebra. A Lithuanian elective was offered, but he did not enroll—this would have been his fifth language, not counting Polish which he used with friends. They spent five and a half hours a day in school, and were expected to spend an additional four hours on homework. In this context he notes that Marijampolė had a public garden, overgrown and thus convenient for couples seeking privacy. Whether the fifteen year old Grinius made use of its seclusion we do not learn. Only ladies and gentlemen were allowed: the gendarmes were instructed to keep out peasants in homespun. For Lithuanians, another reminder—to enjoy elegant surroundings one had to speak, dress and act Polish or Russian. Kriaučiūnas appeared before Christmas of that year. Grinius recalls: "He did not hide the fact that he was Lithuanian and spoke Lithuanian in public."

---

200 Likely, the boys had heard of venereal diseases. Less likely, that they would have noticed homosexuality.

201 The assassination of Alexander II on 1 March 1881 brought an end to efforts to reform Russia in the direction of a constitutional monarchy. The new regime was more repressive, intensifying efforts towards Russification. See Egidijus Aleksandravičius and Antanas Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje: Lietuva XIX amžiuje* (*Under the Rule of the Czars: Lithuania in the XIX century)*, (Vilnius: 1996), p. 91.

Grinius had an eye for detail. He remembers that during his fourth year townsmen were pulling down the bell tower of the old church. Unfortunately, the organist grabbed the rope in the wrong place and was hoisted into the air as the tower fell. He was seriously injured. That year in school, they were introduced to still another language, namely Old Church Slavonic. (The language of the Lithuanian Statute, that is, the legal code of the Grand Duchy.) A new French teacher appeared, another elegant Pole who amused the class with anecdotes of Russian officers in Paris in 1814 butchering the French language. He was a good teacher, but did not last long, probably because the administration was offended. A loss, in spite of the fact that he was critical of the Lithuanian awakening. But most fateful for Grinius's life was his decision to attend Lithuanian language classes: he began to read Lithuanian books and gradually he and his friends began to think of themselves as Lithuanians. The elective drew some 20-30 students.

In his fifth year, 1883-1884, he became financially independent: he became monitor of his boarding house and earned pocket money by tutoring. Among his charges was Jurgis Matulaitis (1871-1927), who in 1918 became bishop of Vilnius and served there, as the city passed from hand to hand, until 1925, harassed not only by Bolsheviks but also by Polish chauvinists.[202] The fact that two such prominent figures are linked in secondary school again shows how small was the circle of educated Lithuanians. Grinius also faced some pressure to enter the seminary, as was customary after four years of secondary school. But his parents were not adamant and with the support of a distant relative, a priest, he continued on a secular path. A minor incident that year contributed to his political development. The local police chief died and all the pupils were lined up in pairs and marched to the cemetery. A harmless drunkard, the chief was nevertheless an agent of an oppressive regime and not a good role model, or so the boys groused among themselves.

Kriaučiūnas was the dominant influence: Grinius became an activist. Kriaučiūnas taught systematically, emphasizing Lithuanian grammar. But he also kept them informed about the awakening, by reading letters, bringing rare and banned books, encouraging them to collect folklore. They read and helped distribute *Aušra,* thereby risking unwelcome attention.

---

[202] Matulaitis has been beatified and is a candidate for sainthood. Given his background, which included extensive work in Warsaw, he could have served as a mediating figure. But as a prominent Lithuanian in Vilnius, he was the target of a vicious, likely organized, campaign conducted both in Polish newspapers and complaints to the Vatican.

Aušra was published from April 1883 to the summer of 1886, a total of 40 issues, in Prussia and distributed either by mail in unmarked envelopes or smuggled across the border. The number of paid subscribers varied from several dozen to several hundred, scattered throughout Europe and the Russian empire. The print runs were larger, about 1000 copies.[203] The founder and first publisher, whose name appeared on the cover of the first issue, was Jonas Basanavičius (1851-1927) a physician, who between 1880-1905 lived mostly in Bulgaria. He collected Bulgarian folklore, helped establish the Bulgarian public health system, became a member of a Bulgarian democratic anti-Russian party, and a Bulgarian citizen. Upon his return, he settled in Vilnius to became one of the founders of the Lithuanian Learned Society and a signatory of the declaration of independence. In the Lithuanian imagination his place is similar to that of Washington in the American.

While Grinius did not deny his importance, at times he was unsparingly critical. When in 1905 the government allowed Basanavičius to return, he visited Kriaučiūnas, where Grinius met him: "I saw a man past fifty years, elegant, bearded, of medium height. He appeared tired, a man who spoke slowly, without energy, and thought slowly. He launched into a long discourse about lions in Lithuanian mythology. It was boring." Basanavičius thought well of himself and tended to be autocratic in dealings with others.[204] On the other hand, according to Grinius, Basanavičius wrote better than he talked. Like most educated Lithuanians of that time, he was a jack of all trades. He made worthwhile contributions as a collector of Lithuanian folklore, but wasted much effort from the late 1890s onward on his Thraco-Phrygian hypothesis about Lithuanian origins. In the boring discourse about lions, he probably was explaining similarities between Lithuanian and Thraco-Phrygian depictions of the king of beasts. The hypothesis evoked much amused laughter when it was proposed and is generally dismissed as the work of an amateur. At the same time, in his defense, it should be said that there were no scholars to discipline him. In any case, as historical myths go, less misleading than American stories about the first Thanksgiving, another example of the instrumental uses of history.

Was Lithuanian the language spoken in paradise? This question, in *Aušra* in 1885 received an affirmative answer, the claim being that Lithuanian was the

---

[203] On the hundredth anniversary, the Lithuanian Historical Society in Chicago published a facsimile edition of *Aušra*, in two volumes. The second volume (pp. 647-739) contains a detailed account by Jonas Dainauskas of the origins, program, and demise.

[204] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 219-21.

language from which all others have been derived. As linguists later pointed out, this was the work of amateurs who noticed chance and often far-fetched similarities.[205] At the same time, while rightly amused, we should keep in mind that English culture of the time was only decades away from Biblical chronologies, placing the age of the earth at some thousands of years.

Aušra had little to say about Lithuania's political future because, Grinius suggests, Basanavičius hoped that the czar would allow the publication of *Aušra* in Kaunas. And it is likely that hopes of eventual legalization muted direct challenges to the regime, hopes that the government would relent lured by expectations of weakening Polish influence, an argument which Basanavičius pressed in several Russian articles.[206] It would have been premature to raise questions about Lithuania's future. In the 1880s there was no constituency: the nobles were silenced by repressions following the 1863 rising, while peasants had to be educated to see themselves as political agents.

Snyder offers a flippant account of the origins of *Aušra*. He misses the point, both because he is unfamiliar with the literature and is not interested in the underlying social changes. As he sees it, Basanavičius in 1882 went to Prague: "Seizing an image used in Prague to suggest a nation awakening from darkness, Basanavičius decided to name the review *Auszra* (The Dawn)."[207] In fact, Lithuanian students—mostly children of peasants—in Saint Petersburg and Moscow began to band together in the 1870s. Talk about Lithuanian publications resulted in four issues of a mimeographed newsletter published in Moscow in 1880-1881, called *Aušra*. Furthermore, numerous Lithuanians lived in Riga. In 1881 they received permission to form a club, also called Aušra. Symptomatic of the social underpinnings is the following fact: within several years control of the club passed into the hands of children of the nobility and the club, while required to retain the Lithuanian name, became Polish speaking. Basanavičius himself published papers on Lithuanian history, but in publications using Gothic letters, unfamiliar to most Lithuanians. In fact, the need for a periodical in Lithuanian was recognized at least by the 1850's. But these hopes perished, along with much else, after 1863.

---

[205] Petras Jonikas, "Ar rojuje lietuviškai kalbėjo?" ("Did They Speak Lithuanian in Paradise?"), *Mūsų senovė*, 1940, no. 1, pp. 188-89.

[206] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 44.

[207] Snyder, *Reconstruction of Nations*, pp. 34-35. A sketch of *Aušra*, including the origin of the name, is available in English in *Encyclopedia Lituanica* (1970).

That the times were ripening is shown by the fact that in the first issue of *Aušra* we find a brief review of a collection of readings for young readers, published in Klaipėda in 1883,[208] mention of two Lithuanian-Polish dictionaries and two Lithuanian grammars in preparation, as well as plans to publish an almanac. From the third issue we learn that the teacher Kriaučiūnas has discovered a collection of Lithuanian manuscripts, including a partial translation of Milton's *Paradise Lost,* numerous original and translated poems, a book about the breeding of horses, and other texts. Regularly there appeared a summary of foreign news. Thus, in the first issue, we learn that 100 lost their lives in disasters in Milwaukee.

In later years, reflecting on the role of *Aušra* in the awakening, Grinius emphasized that Basanavičius and others used history instrumentally: "Let us not bow submissively before foreigners, let us study our noble past ..." was their battle-cry.[209] In effect, Lithuanians were being urged to tell their own story, rather than meekly acquiesce with the Polish and Russian claims that they have no story to tell. Considering their purpose and the fact that they were not historians but amateurs, it is not surprising that they were selective, emphasizing the nobler aspects of the past. To this extent, Snyder is not mistaken, but he stands too far away to notice that Lithuanian historiography has made progress. And in fairness to Basanavičius we should recall, that *Aušra* appeared but two years after the death of Thomas Carlyle for whom history was the story of great men, worth remembering for their achievements and not their defeats and failures. Critical history, standing on thousands of hours in dusty archives and comparisons of different narratives and different perspectives, is something more recent.

The ideal solution would have been to share the heritage, political and cultural, of the Republic of Two Nations, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, among at least four modern nations, namely Ukrainians, Poles, Belorussians and Lithuanians. As we saw, Madame Pilsudska held a different view: it is Polish all the way. But it is surprising that Snyder reads the history of the Commonwealth much as she does: "Lithuanian activists were only concerned to extract a Lithuanian culture from the Polish inheritance."[210] Given their social backgrounds, for Basanavičius, Kudirka, Grinius, part of Polish culture were

[208] Klaipėda was then part of the German empire.

[209] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 42.

[210] Snyder, *Reconstruction of Nations*, p. 36. Aleksandravičius and Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje*, pp. 270-71, argue that language should not be the decisive criterion. Their point of view is that of sharing a common heritage. For example, Mickiewicz is said to be the harbinger of romanticism for both Lithuanians and Poles.

mocking glances. After all, when Grinius arrived in Marijampolė, he watched as his relatives in homespun were excluded from the public garden.

Careful readers of the history edited by Šapoka would find warnings that the word Lithuania is ambiguous, in one context referring to a political unit inhabited by several different nations, in another, to a smaller region inhabited in the main by just one. Perhaps, the ambiguity should have been given more emphasis for the sake of beginners and casual browsers. But there are warnings. By contrast, Basanavičius in *Aušra*, September 1883, exploits the ambiguity in a polemic with a Polish periodical. He is trying to undermine the claim that the name Lithuania appears in world history only because of the loving attention paid her by Polish writers. Basanavičius replies that these writers, although writing in Polish, were Lithuanians, a defensible claim only if the term is used with reference to the Grand Duchy. He then asserts that most everything worthwhile in Polish culture was created by Lithuanians: even Copernicus was not a Pole, but a Germanized Prussian, with some Lithuanian ancestry, using the term in a narrower sense.[211]

It is easy to smile at such juvenile spats. But Basanavičius had a laudable purpose: should none have challenged the prejudice that Lithuanians were by nature peasants, at a time when many thought of nationality as biologically given? That the only way up was to abandon your parents, brothers, sisters, leaving them to continue standing aside and meekly raising their caps at the approach of Polish speaking gentry?[212]

The final 1883 issue of *Aušra* reminds us that the contrast between a Polish-speaking upper class and Lithuanian peasants is an oversimplification. With the exception of some of the great families, many of the gentry in Samogitia remained Lithuanian speakers and had no ambition to acquire Polish language and manners. This view, expressed by an author himself a member of the Samogitian gentry, can be statistically confirmed: in Kaunas Province, according to the 1897 census, 36.6 percent of the gentry said that Lithuanian was

---

211 Jonas Basanavičius, "Aušra' ir 'Dziennik Poznanski's" *Auszra*, 1883, no. 7, pp. 185-96. The Prussians, a collection of Baltic tribes, inhabited a region colonized by Germanic peoples in the early Middle Ages. Basanavičius claims the poet Adam Mickiewicz as a Lithuanian. Mickiewicz is the subject of a three-way tug of war, because he wrote in Polish, mostly on pagan Lithuanian themes, but was of mixed ancestry, born in the Belorussian area of the Grand Duchy. Snyder notes that two popular names of Lithuanian girls come from his poetry (*Reconstruction of Nations*, p. 34).

212 It is helpful at this point to remember the obsequious manners of African-American porters in old films.

their home language.[213] Furthermore, writers of Samogitian origin were at the center of the outburst of culture in Lithuanian in the first-half of the nineteenth century. But their aims were literary and their social base was small. By contrast, the later awakening coincides with the democratization of societies and the spread of literacy. Its activists were seeking to transform and modernize the whole of society and were themselves children of peasants.

Such were the currents and concerns to which the seventeen year-old Grinius was exposed in 1883. But neither Kriaučiūnas nor Basanavičius succeeded in persuading him to take much interest in history. While a medical student in Moscow, he took part in the creation and publishing of a fanciful history of Lithuania. There were several other stabs towards uncovering the past—he described and published selections from several collections of documents which fell into his hands. But there is little else except, of course, for his memoirs of the awakening.

Both Kriaučiūnas and Basanavičius encouraged the collecting of antiquities, folk art, and folklore. Collecting folklore was important for several reasons, among them, the desire to identify what is distinctively Lithuanian, what can be found nowhere else. As Grinius remembers, according to Kriaučiūnas, it was the language which best revealed Lithuanian individuality. He encouraged his students to make a special point of talking with old women, who spoke no other, and to collect tales, songs, sayings, riddles, incantations. And it was important to record exactly what was said, word for word, without corrections or embellishments.[214] For similar reasons, in the first issue, Basanavičius assured collectors that there would always be room for their work. But collecting never become for Grinius a major interest. In 1910, he along with Basanavičus and several others published guidelines for collectors, explaining how materials should be classified. But that was his main involvement, although there were several other small forays. For example, late in his life he described an appeal for protection to one of the gods chanted by snake catchers.[215]

Grinius's mind was turned towards the practical: he was not drawn to art for the sake of art, to knowledge for the sake of knowledge. Perhaps, folklore would help a philosopher to understand what is distinctive about Lithuanians,

[213] Aleksandravičius and Kulikauskas, *Carų valdžioje*, p. 233. Kaunas Province included more than Samogitia.

[214] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 40.

[215] Kazys Grinius, "Apie gyvačių dievaitį Atžingį" ("About Atžingis, the God of Snakes"), *Naujienos*, 1949 October 29.

how they differ from all others. Grinius was not an enemy of this or similar enterprises, but they were not the paths he chose for himself. Characteristic is his memory of his first encounter with Lithuanian literature: Kristijonas Donelaitis (1714-1780) "we did not much like. In him we found no energy, no life."[216] *The Seasons* by Donelaitis is still considered one of the high points of Lithuanian literature. In his poem, in a realistic manner, Donelaitis describes the lives, travails and sufferings of Lithuanian serfs in East Prussia He scolds those among the gentry who abuse their serfs. But in the end, he accepts class divisions as part of the order of nature. He calls for moral improvement, but not for the complete reordering of social relations. Likely, it is this aspect which drew Grinius's comment about the absence of energy and life.

Reports that *Aušra* was corrupting the youth of Marijampolė reached even the United States. In the July issue we find a retort to an article published in a Polish periodical and reprinted in Russia and America.[217] The anonymous author complained of the growing tensions between Lithuanian and Polish students in the secondary school, where most of the students were Lithuanians. In the past, the school produced many men useful to "their country." But now, unidentified "traitors" from the other side of the border are stirring up trouble, agitating against the Poles. The author calls upon the bishop and the clergy to launch a campaign against such malicious agitators. In his 1926 memoirs, Grinius identified the author as the teacher of French who mocked Russian officers in Paris.

One can only speculate how Grinius knew the identity of the anonymous writer.[218] Did the elegant Pole launch a tirade in class? Did the students themselves guess by a process of elimination? A trivial incident from many points of view, hardly worth mentioning. But it calls for an explanation: why should a handful of teenagers passing from hand to hand an obscure monthly—not a daily when dailies were already commonplace-- deserve attention in distant Warsaw, Saint Petersburg, Chicago? Perhaps, there were some fearful that their faith in Poland everywhere and always might be an exaggeration? That there were forces in motion powerful enough to challenge their claims of cultural and

---

[216] Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," p. 92. Donelaitis was a Lutheran pastor, trained in classics at the University of Koenigsberg, where he also attended the Lithuanian seminar, required of pastors who would serve in Lithuanian speaking parishes. An English translation of *The Seasons* was published in Los Angeles in 1967.

[217] St. Szunb., "Eik laukan!" ("Get Out!"), *Auszra*, 1883 July, no. 5, pp. 121-24.

[218] Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866:1878," p. 91.

political monopolies? Why else call upon a bishop to take action, if one or two raps on the knuckles would put a stop to the whole business?

To my mind, the rejoinder in *Aušra* is significant for another reason. Its author speculates that the anonymous Pole was a member of the nobility, that is, in his view, a member of a class which for centuries went about selling the crown to the highest bidder, until they sold away the whole of their patrimony. Readers should be reminded that after the union in Lublin, the monarchy was elective and corruption the order of the day. Noble houses throughout Europe competed—even Leibniz has a treatise demonstrating with mathematical precision that his patron was best suited for the crown of the Commonwealth. And the rejoinder further emphasizes the social class aspect by suggesting that before acting the bishop should establish whether *Aušra* was friends with workers or with "painted foxes." There is also a suggestion that many Poles living in Lithuania agree with and support *Aušra's* program—these are more entitled to speak for their nation than the complainer. There have been consultations: these Poles understand that *Aušra* does not serve foreign gods but only her less educated brothers.

While Basanavičius contributed a series of articles on cholera, the dominant motif during the first year was national pride: we are not fated to remain peasants, just think what our ancestors have done! As Grinius recalls, the social emphasis was the contribution of Jonas Šliūpas, who was the editor from the middle of 1883 to the middle of 1884.[219] Šliūpas is mostly remembered for his intellectually primitive anti-religious polemics—likely, his association with *Aušra* precipitated a split between secular and religious forces, a split still noticeable in the politics of the early years of independence. Expelled from both Russia and Prussia for his radicalism, after leaving *Aušra*, he ended up in the United States where he completed medical school and became familiar with the secular humanism of the Ethical Culture movement. During the years of independence, he became a teacher and organizer of a Society for Ethical Culture in Lithuania.[220]

Šliūpas is not an important thinker, even in a Lithuanian context. He was neither profound, nor critical, nor clear. In vague strokes, he popularized democracy and equality, ideas long known to the wider world. But even the commonplace that the lives of ordinary people can be improved was radical for that

[219] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 42.

[220] While the ethical culture movement was strongest in the United States, there was an International Ethical Union, but I have seen no evidence that the Lithuanian group was affiliated with it.

time and place, as was the belief that children are not fated to follow in parental footsteps. At the same time, a teenager like Grinius, especially one emerging from rural, political, religious isolation, did not need trail blazers. He needed someone to show him that there was a wider world, that he and his school mates were not lonely dreamers, to give encouragement, direction. This *Aušra* and Šliūpas could and did do: schoolboy talk of better days was not idle chatter but part of something more solid and consequential.

In a programmatic piece in the first issue for 1884, Šliūpas urged Lithuanians to understand that a group does not become a nation by virtue of a distinctive language, but by virtue of cultural progress. And while progress encompasses many areas, at the center, according to Šliūpas, is equality: only the nation which provides for everyone, whether born a peasant or a nobleman, can be considered well-off. Nations must insure that everyone, every day, can "boil a chicken in his pot." Equality furthermore must encompass education and the various rights and obligations. Another commonplace, but radical in an autocratic and religious society: enlightenment and virtue are possible only when everyone is free to search for truth. It goes without saying that this principle was not compatible with the authoritarian pedagogy of the Marijampolė secondary school. Šliūpas also advocated democracy and preached sedition: countries such as Muscovy and Turkey, ruled by autocrats unrestrained by laws, are worst off.[221]

The boys were inspired. Sitting in the back row, hoping that teachers would not notice, Grinius and a friend composed and made copies of their own newspaper, some ten issues in all, calling it *Prieaušris*.[222] No issues are known—perhaps, the last copies were destroyed with the waterlogged collection of Grinius's papers. However, one text, not by Grinius, is known. *Aušra* noted that they have received five issues of *Prieaušris* and have sent it on to a Lithuanian publication published in Prussia using Gothic script. Unfortunately, only one of the juvenile efforts made it to print. In the November 7, 1884 issue of *Niamuno sargas* (*Guardian of the Nemunas*), there is a short essay by the friend, condemning as traitors those Lithuanians who abandon their own language and customs. The piece is moralizing, placing the blame on strife and disagreements among Lithuanians, with no reference to economic or social pressures. Grinius's own

---

221 Jonas Šliūpas, "Tikrasis jeszkinis tėviniškumo" ("The Real Search for Patriotism") *Auszra*, 1884, no. 1-3, pp. 1-10.

222 *Auszra* , 1884 October-November, no. 10-11, p. 388. The name combines the preposition 'prie' and *Aušra*. The preposition has several meanings, here it means next to, near.

early writings, later only by several years, show an awareness of social factors. This suggests that the 1884 piece does not give a complete picture of what the boys understood. The emphasis on character could well be the result of trying to display one's own high moral standing. As a composition, the piece is juvenile. Of course, there is no way of estimating how good it would have been if written in Russian or Polish. Grinius's friend is known to have published a number of pieces in *Aušra*, but it is unlikely that Grinius himself contributed.

Another 1884 incident shows that Grinius and his friends were becoming activists. On Sundays, and other special days, the students assembled at the school and two by two marched to mass. A special sermon was part of the services, but it was in Polish. According to Grinius, the sermons were boring and pointless, especially because many of the younger boys did not understand the language. Four of them called on the priest and asked for additional sermons, but in Lithuanian. When he refused, Grinius declared that under the circumstances it would be best if there were no sermons at all. Sermons were discontinued. Afterward, the boys were interrogated by the head master in an attempt to unmask the organizer. But, according to Grinius, there was no hidden organizer: the boys acted on their own. In the end, they were not punished. In this context, Grinius describes himself as a "conscientious Catholic."[223] The complaint that students in Marijampolė do not understand church services in Polish was noted as far away as Moscow: the boys elbow each other and in Russian ask what the priest is saying. This item appeared in 1884, but from the cited text it is not clear whether it was triggered by the protest involving Grinius.[224]

Early in 1886 *Aušra* published a somewhat juvenile article, signed 'K.', probably by Grinius's friend, in effect, on what Americans used to call the power of positive thinking. This is a sketch of the life of a Croatian bishop, a patriot, whose accomplishments culminated in the founding of a university in 1867. The author concludes: "Do not Lithuanians have the right to demand that Lithuanian priests and bishops support Lithuanians?" The author is not so much concerned with specific goals—the chances of a Lithuanian university were near zero. His concern is to inspire, encourage by showing what one dedicated patriot can accomplish and, of course, remind Polonizers of their heritage and that they are

[223] Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," pp. 103-104.

[224] The Moscow newspaper was quoted by Jonas Jablonskis, "Lietuvos dvasininkų jėga" ("The Power of Lithuanian Clergymen"), see Jonas Jablonskis, *Straipsniai ir laiškai* (*Articles and Letters*) (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1991), pp. 26-27. This is a Lithuanian translation of an article Jablonskis published in Russian in 1884.

not living in Poland.[225] Criticism of Catholic clergy is prominent in Grinius's own writings, as is awareness of similar social and political currents elsewhere, movements from which Lithuanians can learn a great deal. We can surmise that such subjects were prominent in the chatter at the secondary school. At the time, Grinius was approaching his twentieth birthday.

Authority, whether clerical or secular, did not fare well: the boys mocked and evaded the minute regulations and restrictions imposed by distant powers. Self-government was the political ideal of the mature Grinius. And we can surmise that it was his experiences of authority as a schoolboy which helped shape his preferences for local government. There was an index of banned books, established in some far away imperial center. In various ways, the boys managed to obtain some of the forbidden books and passed them from hand to hand. Kriaučiūnas distributed not only Lithuanian contraband: Grinius notes that he received from him a book on the sociology of Herbert Spencer and on statistics. Setting aside the radical doctrines of Marx, even many liberal nineteenth century commonplaces would have seemed dangerous. In studying Spencer's sociology, for example, Grinius would have learned that the legitimate functions of government are limited: governments only exist to create conditions in which individuals can flourish, a subversive idea in that time and place. And it is individuals who are entitled to the final say about the kinds of lives they shall lead. He also would have learned that religions are cultural facts growing out of certain emotions to be studied in all their variety, a view of religion completely at odds with the traditions of Orthodoxy and Catholicism.

Suspicion and disrespect were widespread. Grinius recalls that in spite of the hours spent in class, they learned little German and French. At fault, were poor teachers or so the students suspected at the time. And they theorized that it was a matter of policy: should they learn German or French, they would enjoy uncontrollable access to much that was subversive of established religion, thought, and the imperial order.

Grinius himself does not provide enough detail. But Statys Matulaitis, who attended the secondary school at about the same time, and like Grinius emphasizes the role of Kriaučiūnas, does not recall visions of past glories. He recalls reading Darwin, Ludwig Büchner's *Kraft und Stoff* (1855)--one of many and mostly forgotten bibles of materialism, John William Draper's *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe* (1862). Matulaitis does not mentions

[225] "Ką vienas žmogus įstengia" ("What One Man is Capable Of"), *Auszra*, 1886 , no. 2, pp. 472-74.

Draper's better known and more influential work, *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science* (1874), in which religion is portrayed as the enemy of science. I think it likely that the students had at least heard of it. Intellectual snobbery, not uncommon at this age, would account for some of the interest. Likely, disgust with senseless religious ritual forced upon them was also a factor, setting the boys to search for more meaningful alternatives. There is no direct evidence that Grinius took part in such reading and talk. But if we suppose that the students were divided between religiously minded conservatives and anti-religious progressives, Grinius more likely falls into the latter category.

Concerning himself, Matulaitis says by his sixth year, his religious beliefs had cooled. Religious practices they turned into a farce. Confession during the Easter season was obligatory. The group of them agreed to confess the same sins in the same order, beginning by confessing to being atheists. Bound by the seal of confession, the priest—Grinius also disliked him—had to endure the mockery. Matulatis became militant in his atheism, while Grinius kept his own religious attitudes a private matter.

Matulaitis mentions Basanavičius, whom they did not value because of his loyalty to the czar and failure to raise fundamental questions. They laughed at his theories about Lithuanian origins. But in this context, Matulaitis insists, they were becoming more and more Lithuanian.[226]

How much of this testimony should be set aside? Matulaitis was arrested in 1925 for communist activities and after 1927 lived in Minsk, was then exiled to Kazakhstan, and returned to Lithuania after the war. Possibly, he hoped with his memoirs to solidify his credentials as a life-long participant in the revolutionary movement. At the same time, we have to note that the secondary school students of the time were older, a more select group than their American counterparts and that crises of faith are common in late teens. Also, Sebag Montefiore, has Stalin reading *On the Origin of Species* in the early 1890s, when Stalin was thirteen.[227]

Timothy Snyder misses much by selecting one or two obvious nationalistic targets and romantic poetry. Likely, Basanavičius had more admirers among his fellow students than Matulaitis remembered. At the same time, his testimony helps place the awakening in the context of intellectual currents sweeping many places and revolutionary ferment in the empire. Kudirka, after all, was

226 Matulaitis, *Atsiminimai*, pp. 48-68.

227 Sebag Montefiore, *Young Stalin*, p. 49.

translating not romantic poetry, but radical texts, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* among them.

Grinius completed secondary school in the spring of 1887, with not the best grades, but good enough for admission to university. The final examinations emphasized Russian: those who failed, were not allowed to take other examinations. The Russian examinations were sent to Warsaw to be graded. In general, Grinius's education emphasized languages, especially Greek, Latin, Russian. He recalls resisting Greek, upon deciding that he would not need it in later life. There was some classical and Russian history, a smattering of general science, psychology, logic, but no biological sciences, no literature, nothing that now could be called civics, no philosophy. Years later, he recalled that some 20 of the graduates purchased bottles of vodka, wine, beer, regaled each other with raunchy stories and "behaved like all drunks, then and now, behave." He regrets that such traditions are still widespread: there are better ways of spending money.[228]

Because Snyder holds that the awakening begins with the Romantic Movement and the poetry of Adam Mickiewicz, it should be noted that in describing his education Grinius makes no mention either of the Romantics or Mickiewicz. There are in his memoirs several references to the poet. He complains at one point that the Kaunas city government razed the house in which Mickiewicz lived without even placing a marker. There should have been a marker with Pushkin's words, "Singer of Lithuania."[229] Likely, Grinius at some point read Mickiewicz, but there is nothing to suggest formative influences. In fact, in old age, he commented skeptically on Mickiewicz's idea that Poland,including Lithuania, is Europe's redeemer, suffering for the sins of others. For Grinius, Lithuania's mission is to survive.[230]

There is, however, in his memoirs an important reference to Herbert Spencer. Citing several influences, Grinius explains why he never became a Marxist. In this context he notes that in about 1891 he read, in Russian, Spencer's claim that socialism would end up by abolishing individual freedoms.[231]

Several references to the memoirs of teacher and author of books for children, Pranas Mašiotas (1863-1940) will help to fill out the picture of the

---

228 kg. , "Maturistams" ("To Graduates"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1911 May 10.

229 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 241.

230 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 78.

231 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 140-41.

secondary school in Marijampolė. Mašiotas attended the school a few years before Grinius. He especially recalls the various pressures concerning languages. They were commanded to speak in Russian everywhere, in school, in dormitories, on the street. But the townspeople expected them after their fourth year to know Polish well and use it regularly. It was the arrival of Kriaučiūnas that emboldened schoolboys to speak Lithuanian in public, rather than only in secluded places with visiting relatives.[232]

[232] *Prano Mašioto Šviesa* (*The Light of Pranas Mašiotas*), ed. Reda Tamulienė, Kęstutis Urba (Vilnius, 2013), pp. 13-15.

V Medicine among Muscovites

In the nineteenth century, like many others, Lithuanians often referred to Russians as Muscovites. The name seems a holdover from long ago days when there were competing Russias. Lithuanians watched as the Duchy of Moscow defeated her rivals and a single Russia emerged—at several crucial moments Lithuanian princes backed the losers. The growing power of Moscow was one of the factors leading up to the Lublin Union. Moscow's dominance is shown by the sacking of Vilnius nearly a hundred years later: in 1655, as the city burned for several weeks, heavily loaded wagons rolled eastwards in seemingly endless procession. The word Muscovite was used even when Saint Petersburg and not Moscow was the imperial capital, the residence of the czar and the seat of government. The railway, built in the 1860s, from Warsaw to Saint Petersburg passed through Vilnius. There was no direct railroad connection between Vilnius and Moscow.

Since 1867 ten government scholarships—360 rubles per year—were awarded to graduates of Marijampolė secondary school for study in Moscow, to those with grades in the Lithuanian class.[233] To some extent, this explains

[233] Aleksandravičius and Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje*, p. 94. According to these authors, for the government the "Lithuanian question" was not of first-rate importance. Policies were often inconsistent. But these scholarships were introduced in an attempt to weaken Polish influences.

Moscow's prominence in biographies of the period. There was at this time only a handful of educated Lithuanians, probably in the hundreds, especially if priests and those scattered throughout the empire are excluded. Most of the educated laymen were either medical doctors or lawyers, with very few in the humanities, pure sciences, engineering. Mention has already been made of the Society of Lithuanian Students in Moscow. In the list compiled by Grinius, one member was in the humanities (the linguist Jablonskis), two in mathematics (including the aforementioned Mašiotas), three engineers, and three whose profession Grinius did not know. The rest of the 57 were either doctors, pharmacists, or lawyers. Returning was easiest for doctors: they could always establish a private practice. But there were no employment opportunities for scientists and humanists at home. There was no university and few Lithuanians could expect appointments to teach in secondary schools. None of the three engineers contributed their engineering skills to Lithuania's development prior to independence.

Instructive is the biography of the engineer Petras Vitkauskas (1874-1924), who completed engineering studies in Moscow, but too late for inclusion in Grinius's list, showing as it does how Lithuania's insignificant position in a backward empire retarded development. Grinius knew him well, having worked with him in several societies. Vitkauskas played an important role in developing Moscow's infrastructure, especially the system of electric tramways which served Muscovites to the mid-1930s when subways were built. In independent Lithuania he served for a time as minister of transportation and obtained substantial foreign credits for the purchase of locomotives. Vitkauskas was a restless soul, overflowing with hopes and dreams of industrializing Lithuania. In 1905, while in Russia, in a letter he explained that he had plans for a motor, better than any available, but had no money to test it. In 1906, elected to the first Duma, he made a speech about the need for land reform. After dissolution, he returned to Lithuania and planned to build an electricity generating plant, use the power for city lighting, and sell the remainder to factories. In 1922 he was trapped in post-revolutionary Russia, lacking funds needed to return, but still was drafting plans for a starch factory in Lithuania. Eventually he did return, but died shortly thereafter, still relatively young, from a disease which the medicine of the day could have cured, had it been locally available.[234] Of course, for someone like Vitkauskas, charlatanism is an obvious risk. But whether he succumbed will

[234] Kazys, Grinius, *Inžinierius Petras Vitkauskas (1873-1924)* (*The Engineer Petras Vitkauskas (1873-1924)*) (Kaunas: 1924).

never be known because the financial and political conditions needed to test and develop his ideas were not there. He died without knowing whether his motor would perform as he hoped it would. But there is a real possibility that in a supportive environment Vitkauskas would have become the European Henry Ford and Marijampolė an important industrial center. This was a time when individuals in garages and tool sheds, with only modest capital, could make important discoveries and lay a foundation for whole industries.

After the dissolution of the Duma, Vitkauskas signed the Vyborg protest and was imprisoned. To a visiting friend he explained that he was in good spirits and busy translating Alfred Russel Wallace's *Darwinism* (1889). They were not allowed to converse in Lithuanian, because the warden did not know the language.[235] Vitkauskas must have brought the book with him. Unlikely that one on such a subversive subject could be found in a prison library in Lithuania.

Many chose medicine for practical reasons. Years later, Grinius claimed that while in secondary school he was much attracted by mathematics. But if he studied mathematics, his best hope would be government employment, but because he was Catholic it was unlikely that he would to be posted in Lithuania. Had he been Orthodox or even Muslim, his prospects would have been brighter. So he, like his classmate and many others, chose medicine because in private practice he could live where he wanted.[236] But Grinius was concerned to show how czarist policies retarded Lithuanian development and my sense is that he is exaggerating in his own case. There is evidence of his taste for mathematics. But his attraction to medicine seems genuine, nothing suggesting that it was just a way of earning a living. It is noteworthy that in later years most often he signed his writings as "Dr. K. Grinius," and even referred to himself in this formal way. He made medicine his life, while politics to which he ended up by devoting much time, while important and unavoidable, was a distraction. Public health and health education became his special interests, areas which combine medical knowledge, social concerns, and journalism. He certainly was not a romantic, either in character or intellectual interests. Romanticism belongs to an upper class literary culture, a world into which he was not born and had no aspirations of entering.

He arrived in Moscow in the fall of 1887 not quite 21, one of a group of Lithuanian students, changing trains several times there being no direct connection between Lithuania and Moscow. He did not have a scholarship, but had

---

235 The visitor was Petras Leonas. His account appears in *Vilniaus Žinios*, 1908 August 19.

236 Kazys Grinius, "Dr. Jonas Staugaitis," *Lietuvos žinios*, 1938 June 1.

earned and saved enough by tutoring, about 250 rubles, to cover his first year—with obvious pride he records that after the fall of 1883 he did not need to ask his parents for money. University fees averaged 50 rubles per semester, but, with one exception, he was exempt as a good student. He estimates that lodging, food, and transportation for the nine months academic year came to somewhere between 153-171 rubles. At these prices, he shared lodgings with other Lithuanian students, while his diet included large quantities of potatoes and bread. During his first year, he lost weight, dropping from 180 to 168 pounds.[237] Other expenses included books and suitable clothing—after 1884 university students were required to wear uniforms, greenish, with yellow buttons, a blue color, and caps with a blue band.

He earned money mostly by tutoring. Once, he received about 50 rubles for massaging a merchant's elbow to make it again functional. In his second year, he received a small scholarship of 77 rubles for the year. In his third year, because of his excellent academic record, he was first in line for one of the Lithuanian scholarships, but was not awarded one. Apparently, in earlier years, several Poles had impersonated Lithuanians, helped by good grades in the Lithuanian class, according to Grinius, without learning the language. As a result, the committee in Warsaw became cautious and found Grinius not to be Lithuanian, because of his Slavic name, apparently at the time, Hryniewicz.

As has been noted, to attend school, children had to leave home in their early years and live on their own. In financial emergencies they could not turn to their parents—telephones were not available. As a result, especially after 1905 when the system began to change more rapidly, students formed societies from which they could borrow modest sums. The need persisted into the early years of independence—one Catholic organization founded in 1910 helped many to attend schools and the university, becoming an important political and cultural force. The students' association in Moscow served a similar function. Grinius does not note whether he borrowed from it, but it was there in need.

In truly desperate hours, a charity cafeteria was available, exuding the odor of an "old prison," dirty, serving terrible food. He writes: "From the physiological point of view, the place was very unfavorable to the Pavlovian reflexes of the students. Upon smelling or seeing the food they did not begin to salivate." Students described the place as an agency for wreaking havoc on the digestive

[237] Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878", p. 119. Likely, he has in mind the Russian pound, somewhat smaller than the American one. If so, his weight dropped from about 165 to 154.

tract. The person who helped finance this institution also operated a dormitory, equally dirty. According to Grinius, if the benefactor expected grateful students to pray for his soul, he was badly mistaken.[238] He is remembering this decades later: the malodorous dining hall must have made a profound impression. He is rarely as colorful in his descriptions. But only infrequently were things as desperate as all that. In fact, after some years, he obtained a kerosene heater and was able to prepare simple but nutritious meals, heavy on barley and potatoes, but including eggs, bacon, butter, pork. Over the years, he often changed his residence, sometimes for convenience as to be closer to lecture halls and clinics, sometimes to escape noise, dirt, bedbugs. Around Moscow, he traveled on the horse drawn railway—Vitkauskas, his friend of future years, had not yet electrified the system.

Once again questions arise as to what was cause and what was effect: did Lithuanians band together because they were patriots or did they become patriots because they banded together? After all, there are practical reasons for young people of similar backgrounds to rely on each other after arriving in a strange city with bare pockets. Likely, causality can be found in both directions. Grinius's list of members of the society in Moscow lists no women. In the early 1920s, there was a handful of female doctors—one who completed her studies in Berlin contributed extensively to the literature in radiology–, but all of them completed their studies later.

In any case, as Grinius recalls, there was no time to seek out female companionship. A heavy class load and evenings in libraries did not allow for much social life. For theaters, he lacked both the inclination and the money. One or two Russian girls showed some interest—one suggested that together they take in student boarders, but he did not respond, at least as far as the surviving record goes. Lectures, dissections, and study filled his days. For summer vacations he returned home.

Most of the first year was devoted to the sciences: anatomy, botany, zoology, mineralogy, inorganic chemistry, physics, history of medicine, and an anthropology elective. The faculty was good, with several exceptions. The professor of botany rarely showed up for class, perhaps because he was sick or just lazy. The professor of the history of medicine, a specialist in forensic medicine, was useless, but everybody passed the examination. Grinius complains that as a result he did not develop a fruitful interest in the history of medicine. Important to development of his Lithuanian side was Filipp Fedorovich Fortunatov (1848-1914),

238 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 28-29.

a Russian linguist who knew Lithuanian, internationally known for work on the phonetics of the Indo-European languages. Grinius found Fortunatov's lectures "monotonous and boring." But once a week the students gathered in Fortunatov's apartment where he expressed his support for the Lithuanian struggle against the unjust ban and distributed some of the banned periodicals. He was exempt from censorship and received Lithuanian publications regularly by mail.[239]

The second year was much like the first, devoted to laying a foundation in the sciences, except that most of the instructors had little to offer, at least according to Grinius's reflections decades later. Medical studies began in the third year, for Grinius—1889-1890. They covered a broad range, involved extensive work with patients in clinics and many hours dissecting corpses. The students were being prepared for general practice, including psychiatry, surgery, ophthalmology, obstetrics—he recalls observing some ten births. The examination for a license to practice medicine was formidable, perhaps 23 examinations over a period of six weeks. It happened that late in 1892 there was a cholera epidemic and the examinations were postponed. For perhaps a month, Grinius was stationed in Minsk, charged with examining passengers on trains and removing those infected. He returned to Moscow, this time in civilian clothes, wearing a thick woolen homespun coat, the only one like that in the city. The degree of medical doctor was awarded on February 23, 1893 (March 8)--Grinius is unsure of the exact day–, and within days he received a temporary license to practice medicine.

During this stay, he bought a collection of stories by Vladimir Galaktionovich Korolenko (1853-1921) and talked about them with his landlord.[240] Korolenko, son of a Cossack father and a Polish mother, in the end decided that he was Russian. What now would be called a dissident, among other things, in 1881 he was exiled for refusing to swear allegiance to Alexander III. Was Grinius drawn to Korolenko because he himself was ashamed of having sworn allegiance? Of course, he was much younger at the time. The collection of stories which Grinius bought—for a ruble and a half—included some from Korolenko's Siberian exile. It is significant that facing a difficult month of examinations, he selected just this volume for recreation, both because it was by a well-known enemy of czarism and expensive. It is evidence that his political outlook was being shaped not by romantic historical myths but by awareness of oppression.

---

239 K. Grinius, "Apie F. Fortunatovą" ("About F. Fortunatov"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1914 December 21. The linguist Jonas Jablonskis was among Fortunatov's students.

240 Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," pp. 142-43.

Grinius's then landlord lived with a "blonde" Jewish mistress. Later, he learned that she converted to Orthodoxy and married her lover, after Moscow's governor had ordered all Jews to be moved out of the city. Especially in the early 1920s, when he recorded this incident in his memoirs, he was a sharp and frequent critic of anti-Semitism.

The student body totaled some 5000, often rebellious, discontented with autocracy. In one of his early published pieces, written in 1887, likely after his first arrival in Moscow, Grinius reported that five universities in Russia were closed because of unrest.[241] Student regulations introduced in 1884 required them to wear uniforms and placed emphasis on loyalty to the czar. Some were expelled for small verbal transgressions: everywhere there were spies and informants. In his memoirs, he mentions two incidents during his years in Moscow, although there seems to be confusion. As he recalls, in the first, he was only an observer, in the second a participant, spending perhaps nine days in the Butirka, a prison notorious under the czars, under the Communists, and in present day Russia. This was the first of five imprisonments under the czars—the longest lasted two months.

The first he dates January 12, 1888. That day marked the anniversary of the founding of the university. There were speeches and awards to outstanding students. In the evening, during the traditional celebration, one of the students slapped a university functionary, an inspector policing student life. The student was arrested. Next morning, there were protest meetings and demonstrations. The university was closed for several days: there were rumors of arrests and expulsions.[242]

The second protest occurred in the fall of 1889, triggered by the arrest of several hundred students of a Moscow academy. The university students rose to protest: they demanded repeal of the 1884 regulations, civil liberties, equal rights for women. After several were imprisoned, there were new demonstrations and demands. At that point, the police surrounded the university, arrested many, and crowded them into the Butirka. Grinius recalls, that as they were marched through Moscow streets, they were blessed by women with icons in their hands. It seemed that Moscow was "in revolt against absolute monarchy." Perhaps 1000 were packed into several prison corridors, some 300 academy students, the remainder—university.

---

241 *Szviesa*, 1887 December, no. 5, p. 209. *Szviesa* (*Light*, now written *Šviesa*) was a Catholic periodical published in East Prussia. Article is signed "Br."

242 Grinius, "Atsiminimai:1866-1878," p. 116.

The Butirka is notorious for vermin, filth, overcrowding. Solzhenitsyn, from personal experience, describes conditions there fifty years later: "those newly arrested ... sat on the stairs for several days at a stretch, waiting for departing prisoner transports to leave and release space in the cells. ...When, then, was the Butirky not crowded?"[243] Many Lithuanians arrested in 1940-1941 were shipped to the slave camps by way of Butirka. Had Grinius himself been arrested, chances are good that he would have revisited familiar places, except that there would have been more prisoners, longer stays. In 1888, as later, one by one, prisoners were taken away from the cells and packed corridors. Before the revolution, most of them were rusticated, to use a term familiar to nineteenth century British students, that is, suspended and sent home. After the revolution, many were taken to the cellars for a bullet at the base of the skull.

For several days morale was high: the students sang and organized games. But then depression set it, especially after learning that the 4000 students not in prison, showing no interest in supporting the protesters, continuing to attend classes. Three Lithuanians were imprisoned: one was rusticated and remained at home until the following academic year, while Grinius and the third officially were expelled, but readmitted after signing a pledge to abide by university regulations. Summing up his experiences of the time, Grinius writers: "the transgressors were treated softly and politely. There were no consequences concerning scholarships and other privileges."[244]

It appears that Grinius's memory betrayed him. *The Times* (London) of December 13, 1887, datelined Moscow, December 9, reports a confrontation between students and Cossacks, with one student killed and hundreds of arrests. According to the *Times*, January 27, 1888, the ears were boxed on December 4, 1887 and the university was closed on December 12.[245] The Russian correspondent asserts that the confrontation was prearranged and that five students were killed during the rioting. I could find no newspaper reports of riots in the fall of 1889, suggesting that Grinius is mistaken and that he was arrested in late 1887, several months after his arrival in Moscow. On the other hand, in connection with his arrest, Grinius mentions neither Cossacks nor dead students, suggesting that he is not recalling the 1887 confrontation.

---

243 Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, 3 vols. (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 1: 125n.

244 Grinius, "Atsiminimai:1866-1878," pp. 127-28.

245 Sebestyen, *Lenin*, p. 59, places the unrest in December 1887.

Vincas Kapsukas-Mickevičius (1880-1935), generally referred to as Kapsukas, dean of Lithuanian Bolsheviks of his generation, in his letters and reminiscences has few good things to say about Grinius and Kudirka, Grinius's mentor. Kapsukas and Grinius were involved in several political projects, before the former turned to Leninism. With undisguised scorn he published Kudirka's letter to the czar petitioning to be allowed to continue his studies—in 1885, while a medical student in Warsaw, Kudirka, had been imprisoned for his involvement in a translation of Marx.[246] I am not aware that Kapsukas commented on Grinius's sacrifice of conscience for the sake of medical studies. No doubt, he would have been equally judgmental. But he took ample opportunities to pour contempt on Grinius on other occasions. This is not surprising, because he was inclined towards revolution and Grinius—towards reform. A century later, in view of the the crimes and disasters inflicted by revolutionary Marxism and its final failure, there can be little question as to who was right. After all, had Grinius refused to sign, the best he could have hoped for was the life of a professional agitator. Arguably, had he refused, he would have violated his conscience even more—as a medical doctor he could ease human misery.

Grinius was a moderate, a reformer, doing what can be done here and now, rejecting the everything or nothing approach of hard-core Marxism, an option suitable only for fairy-tales in which everyone lives happily ever after upon slaying the wicked witch.

Political ferment, revolutionary and reformist, marked not only the Russian students. During his years in Moscow he became acquainted with several "patriotic" Belorussian students. In 1892, while in Minsk fighting the cholera epidemic, he tried to contact local patriots, but failed. While there, he noticed many speaking what he calls a degraded Polish, but most of the townsmen spoke Russian. Vakar writes that after the war, "Belorussian masses were not prepared for the idea of statehood."[247] This suggests that the Belorussian awakening, perhaps in its early stages as far advanced in educated circles as the Lithuanian,

---

[246] Vincas Kapsukas-Mickevičius, *Raštai* (*Works*), volume 10 (Vilnius, 1971), p. 440. The attack on Kudirka represents a massive about-face. Kudirka used the pseudonym Kapsas (reference is to a Lithuanian dialect), while Mickevičius in his honor favored Kapsukas (a diminutive form). In Lithuanian contexts, he is frequently called simply Kapsukas—in the Soviet edition of his works, the name Mickevičus does not appear on the title page. Witnesses state that in his office in Moscow, he kept a large portrait of Kudirka.

[247] Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," p. 142; Vakar, *Belorussia*, p. 109. Vakar, p, 84, mentions radical Belorussian organizations in Moscow, but dates them in the late 1890s.

never spread widely. By contrast, Grinius and others succeeded in reaching a broader public.

There were some Latvian students in Moscow: several of them wanted to expand contacts with their kinsmen and attended Lithuanian gatherings. Grinius recalls a Latvian railroad worker, whom he considered a member of the Association, who came frequently, in spite of the fact that the meetings were illegal and he could be fired. The Latvian resembled Garibaldi and had fought with the Serbs against the Turks in 1876-1877. Unlikely, that this veteran did not entertain the raw Lithuanians with tales of liberation struggles in distant lands. The aforementioned Stasys Matulaitis, also a medical student in Moscow, recalls that the students were interested in Garibaldi, Byron, the Greek struggle for independence, the Czech awakening.[248]

But a Lithuanian cannot avoid the Polish question, much like an Irishman cannot avoid the English one. Not surprisingly, he goes into more detail when recalling his Polish fellow students. Relations were good with the more moderate, less nationalistic ones. Many of these eventually joined the Polska Partia Socjalistyczna and followed Pilsudski. On 3 May, 1891, on the 100th anniversary of the constitution of May 3, Lithuanians were invited to a commemorative seminar. Grinius and a friend attended—there were several good presentations. One of the speakers praised the Lithuanian students for their activism, contrasting them with worthless Polish "living corpses." However, falling back on another Lithuanian stereotype, that of honey-tongued Poles, Grinius comments that they understood the flattering comparison as an "ordinary Polish compliment." But there were accusatory undercurrents about separatism to which the Lithuanians present did not respond. On the whole, their relations with many of the Polish students were good, with both sides having much to say about Muscovite oppression, but they never became good friends. Less friendly were the students who became National Democrats, followers of Roman Dmowski, an enemy of federalism, generally considered Pilsudski's main rival. In her memoirs, Madame Pilsudska has few kind words for him.[249] In later years, the Lithuanian press often named National Democrats in connection with the persecution of minorities. Davies writes: "In almost all those areas where the National Democrats

---

248 Matulaitis, *Atsiminimai*, p. 74.

249 Grinius, "Atsiminimai:1866-1878," p. 133. At one time, Pilsudski and Dmowski were rivals for the favors of a famous beauty, a woman who became Pilsudski's first wife.

gained mass support, the non-Polish elements of the population were antagonized." Davies writes of "Dmowski's virulent intolerance."[250]

But most of his life revolved around his fellow Lithuanians. The political ferment of the times is brought out by several incidents. In one case, in the fall of 1889, Lithuanian students gathered to commemorate the French Revolution. As Grinius recalls, there were several excellent presentations. Or again, in 1891 he himself gave a talk arguing, that following in the footsteps of more advanced nations, Lithuanians should become patriotic. In 1893, he published a programmatic essay, "Vertė tautiškos idėjos"("The Value of the National Idea"), based on his 1891 talk. There will be occasion to present his ideas later on. In the meantime, in view of writers like Snyder, it should be emphasized that Grinius, and his fellow students, were less concerned with the past and more with the future. Everywhere in the larger world they saw progress once people had taken affairs into their own hands. An obvious question for the times: what do Lithuanians gain by hanging back and letting others decide their destiny?

Snyder overlooks the fact that in the late nineteenth century universities, at least in that part of the world, were centers of unrest and political agitation. American students paid more attention to Yale-Harvard football that to the plight of immigrant coal miners. By becoming a member of Harvard College a student joined an exclusive club, which served as a base for careers in business or politics. And the American students, much like Madame Pilsudska, accepted their status as part of the natural order. The university which Grinius found in Moscow was different.

Likely, Grinius's vision of the past was romantically colored. Probably in 1891, several of the students resolved to write a history of Lithuania. The group included Grinius. The result was *Trumpa senovės lietuvių istorija* (*A Brief History of Ancient Lithuanians*), with misleading information on the title page as to date and place of publication. The book was not published in Vilnius in 1864, as shown, but in East Prussia in 1892. The earlier date made it seem that it was published prior to the ban and was legal—not an uncommon attempt to avoid confiscation. The history itself is as fictitious as the title page: at one point a Lithuanian duke who never existed is said to conquer Rome. Ending the story with the death of Vytautas in 1430, the authors portray Lithuanians as a peaceful people, never attacking others. The book had four authors and Grinius claimed not to remember for which chapter he was responsible, however, adding that the

[250] Davies, *God's Playground*, 2: 375.

work met with some success and was several times reprinted.[251] In all fairness, it should be noted that the authors were students—one of law and three of medicine—with little if any historical training. Lithuanian culture was not complete and balanced: at the time there simply were no Lithuanian historians. And the book never became a textbook.[252]

Romanticized history remained on the fringes, while his political development was being shaped by the ferment around him. There were perhaps 30-40 Lithuanian students in Moscow at the time. They gathered once a month to read and discuss papers. According to Mašiotas, who preceded Grinius by a few years, they had to avoid suspicion and kept cards and empty bottles on the table. The custodian had to inform the police if five or more students gathered, but large gatherings for cards and drinks were expected.[253] Grinius does not give information about the subjects discussed: no doubt, questions of politics and the future arose frequently. A few were what Grinius, without providing details, calls "socialist cosmopolitans," persons with a wider and more universal point of view. But the majority were, like Grinius himself, patriots, that is, persons focused on Lithuania and her future.[254] At the meetings, they spoke in Lithuanian, some with difficulty, but elsewhere even among themselves they tended to use Russian. Grinius's first literary efforts came out of these meetings, but of that later. As he recalls, he wrote reluctantly and with difficulty.

The summers he spent at home, traveling by railway. Years later he recalled, the long waits in Vilnius for the train to Marijampolė. Instead of idling in the station, they used the time to stroll to the Old Town, visiting historical sites, sad because in Lithuania's "ancient heart," they heard no Lithuanian.[255] (The castle tower and the cathedral are a twenty-minute walk from the station.) Upon arrival home, he helped his parents on the farm, much like others of his and several later generations. On subsistence farms, haying and harvesting calls for

---

251 Grinius, "Atsiminimai:1866-1878," p. 131.

252 For a review of available history textbooks, see Antanas Alekna, *Lietuvos mokykla*, 1918 September-October, no. 9-10, pp. 295-300. Historian Antanas Alekna (1872-1930), a priest, reviewed three texts, all published before the war, and found all three seriously deficient. In his view, least defective was by Konstancija Skirmunt (1851-1934), a woman descendant of Lithuanian nobility, an advocate of close Lithuanian-Polish ties. She admired the constitution of 1791 and claimed that in the early fourteenth century Lithuanians and Teutonic Knights posed equal threats to Poland. She called for a newspaper in Polish, aimed at Polish speaking Lithuanians.

253 *Prano Mašioto šviesa*, p.17.

254 Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," p. 132.

255 Grinius, "Šturmas į Vilnių,", *Naujienos*, 1948 July 2.

many hands, male and female—in northern latitudes with a short growing season the calendar is relentless. But he found time for recreational hiking, traveling alone or with friends, on foot or in horse-drawn wagons, spending his nights at chance farmhouses. He visited classmates, made new acquaintances. In these seemingly casual social contacts it is possible to sense the germ of a broad movement. Nothing definite, but the names of his future co-workers tend to recur. In the summer of 1890, in the company of several friends, he called on Kudirka. That summer, they carried some of the banned literature. A friend was accosted by a guard at the Kaunas railway station—a small bribe of 20 kopeks put the guard at ease. He himself escaped in a similar way at another station. This guard was so pleased with his 20 kopeks that he placed an official stamp on Grinius's contraband so that others would not try to search him. In 1892, in a Kaunas restaurant he and a friend tried to talk with the waiters in Lithuanian. The waiters did not understand, or pretended not to. They visited their old teacher, Petras Kriaučiūnas. As they were on their way to the steamboat dock, they were stopped by a policeman, who questioned them about Kriaučiūnas. Apparently, the policeman was Lithuanian, explaining that he was alienated from his family because instead of becoming a priest he had become a Muscovite. Grinius took his supper with a farm family, sleeping on hay. He tried to steer the conversation towards political oppression, but the farmer responded that nothing could be done. After all, the Russians had a miraculous painting![256]

These small incidents were instructive as to the state of the country and the problems he would face. Many of those he sought to awaken were bound not only by a sense of social inferiority, but also by ignorance and superstition. Defeat a power great enough to call upon God for miracles? Not counting countless policemen and soldiers? It was in such surroundings, in Moscow as well as in the countryside, that his interest was ever growing in Lithuanian history, literature, and especially in her future.

[256] Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," pp. 135, 139-40.

VI A Bell-ringer and His World

The last issue of *Aušra* appeared in the summer of 1886: the printer unable to pay his bills declared bankruptcy, there being no wealthy Lithuanian industrialists to be called on in a crisis. (Nor were the bell-ringers capable of organizing bank-robberies, as Pilsudski and the Bolsheviks did later.) But *Aušra* continued to circulate since most of its material was timeless. Almost three years later, dated January 1889, *Varpas* appeared, also in Tilsit (now Soviesk) in East Prussia, with Kudirka as editor and Martynas Jankus (1858-1946) as publisher. Jankus was an editor and printer from East Prussia—what Lithuanians call Lithuania Minor—who had for a time served in a similar capacity with *Aušra*. Arrested several dozen times by the Germans before the war, at one point he organized a political party hoping to elect a Lithuanian to the Prussian provincial legislature.

Varpas differed from *Aušra* in several respects. The latter published timeless articles nurturing Lithuanian pride, while the former included useful information. Thus, in the first number there are several tables prepared by the Vilnius meteorological bureau with data on temperature, humidity, barometric pressure. The new orientation is expressed in colorful language in a scolding editorial which opened the fourth (April 1889) issue: the times call for hard work, but readers submit mostly poetry about winter evenings, the songs of sparrows,

larks, nightingales, the "howling of dogs." Considering winter cold, most of the contributions would be useful in the fireplace but nowhere else. I get the sense that there is little difference between the letters *Varpas* received and present day tweets: strong likes and dislikes, abusive language, but rarely anything of substance. In the meantime, the writer continues, Europe is approaching a time of great changes and much must be done to prepare Lithuanians to make use of new opportunities. He does not elaborate, but a medical student like Grinius could readily interpret the editorial as a call, among other things, for popularized but accurate medical information. The same author, in an editorial in the seventh issue (July 1889), encourages Lithuanians to establish businesses and scolds them for their lack of initiative: we stand around picking our noses, scratching our backsides, as we watch others profiting from our labors. Arguably, there is some anti-Semitism here, more in expression than substance, but Germans and Russians are also blamed.

In the same July issue of *Varpas* we find a thoughtful reflection on corporeal punishment of children: perhaps in schools, in extreme cases after every other means has been exhausted, but never at home. Historians who label the awakening as nationalism forget that prior to *Varpas* there was no forum in which Lithuanians, except those versed in a foreign language, could exchange information and discuss pressing questions faced by any society. Kudirka's biographer catalogs some of the questions which Kudirka himself dealt with in the early issues: destructive fires in towns and cities given the prevalence of wooden houses, summer droughts, embezzlement in savings associations, lack of a convenient Lithuanian dictionary. Kudirka urges Lithuanians to form a company and, following the Estonian example, buy a steamboat because such a business would be profitable. He praises a woman for going to Warsaw to study beekeeping and upon her return establishing an apiary. Inspired, nearby villagers decided to support three of their own while they learn beekeeping. He concludes that what people need most is information and good examples, that is, what are now called role models, to help people break out of the traditional peasant mold.[257] And a reminder, that only in Lithuanian could those most in need be reached.

Noah Webster, who standardized American English, published his *American Dictionary of the English Language* in 1828. Kudirka's complaint about the absence of a dictionary marks Lithuanian developments as coming late, but

[257] Butėnas, *Vincas Kudirka*, p. 82.

within the broad chronology of Western culture. Webster confronted questions of spelling. Several generations later, Lithuanians confronted similar problems.

A second important difference between *Aušra* and *Varpas* has to be noted. The former was the work of several individuals and did not give rise to a political movement. By contrast, *Varpas* represented a group which gradually, after several mergers, splits, and name changes, developed into a political party, called *Valstiečiai liaudininkai,* literally translated, Peasant Populists. However, given its present day association with disdain for established laws and procedures, the term 'populist' is misleading. In context, it simply indicates the party's claim to represent the interests of small farmers. *Liaudininkai* were generally considered socialists, but moderate and certainly non-Marxist. They were mildly anti-religious, but vocally and sharply anti-clerical. While critical of anti-Semitism, at times they criticized Orthodox Jews for their clericalism. Of the *Liaudininkai*, Grinius is probably the best known. He served as prime minister and president as a member of this group. During the early years of independence, their main rivals were the Christian Democrats. The two parties agreed on the need for land reform, but the Christian Democrats favored less radical redistribution, after coming to terms with property rights arising out of Catholic conceptions of natural law. There were two smaller parties, probably smaller because they did not advocate the redistribution of land. The Marxist Social Democrats favored collective farms, while the *Tautininkai* (members of the Nationalist League) argued for large farms. This political differentiation begins in the 1890s, although *Varpas* hoped to attract all Lithuanians.

Grinius's prominence in the party is shown by an incident in 1917. Many Lithuanians fleeing the war and the Germans, found themselves in Saint Petersburg. The February Revolution made it possible for the party to function openly. Members and sympathizers met on March 26 (unclear according to which calendar) and telegraphed greetings to Alexander Kerensky and Grinius. The mood was one of rejoicing: the conference congratulated Russians on the victory of democracy.[258] Eventually, there was even talk that it would be best for Lithuania to establish federal ties with other new democratic states. But within months, the atmosphere changed: Lenin's coup initiated a turning away from democracy.

[258] *Naujoji Lietuva* (*The New Lithuania*), 1917 March 31. This weekly was published in Saint Petersburg and for a time acted as the voice of Grinius's party. It's sympathies were with the Russian Social Revolutionaries. But then it became radicalized, although not in Lenin's direction. The group expelled several of Grinius's closest allies.

Grinius often called his group *Varpininkai*, that is, persons associated with *Varpas*. And today, most Lithuanians associate *Varpininkai* with the periodical. But the word means bell-ringer and the founders much exploited this sense to emphasize their mission of rousing Lithuanians from slumber. Kudirka himself contributed to the first issue a poem with a refrain in which the imperative "rise" (*kelkite*) is repeated four times.

Grinius described his election to the *Varpininka*i steering committee as determining much of his later life. This happened in the summer of 1893, in his absence, while he was sailing on the Caspian Sea.[259] The 1893 gathering came to be counted as the sixth conference. Of course, all of them were secret, in appearance social gatherings should the authorities get suspicious, with plenty of beer on the tables to make claims of innocence convincing. But it was not all business and pleasure. There were moments for sentiment and reflection. The 1892 conference took place in the village where Grinius was born. After dinner, Grinius led in an old man carrying homemade *kanklės* (a musical instrument of the zither family), who in a "soft falsetto" plucked at the heart-strings with some ancient Lithuanian airs. Kudirka, who had musical training, recorded the song on paper. He turned away to hide tears.[260] A white-haired, bearded, old man with *kanklės* on his lap is a staple of Lithuanian lore. Likely, Kudirka was not the only one crying.

None of the *Varpininkai* conferences attracted police attention, but the risks were real. Trouble could come for no better reason than an envious or suspicious neighbor, perhaps a Polish sympathizer chancing upon a gathering of Lithuanians. Thus, just to make sure, no minutes were kept. In a sense, the *Varpininkai* began as a conspiracy, but a strange one, without organizational structure, assigned responsibilities, secret codes. They protected themselves by not recording what they said or did. In the absence of records, we know little of what went on. To a large extent, we have to rely on Grinius's memoirs. Unfortunately, while concerned to list those present, he contented himself with generalities as to what was discussed.

The first conference was held on June 29, 1888, in a hotel in Marijampolė. Present were Grinius, the lawyer Petras Leonas and several others, representing the Moscow students, with Kudirka and several others representing Warsaw.

---

259 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 147.

260 V. Palukaitis, "Vinco Kudirkos mirties 25 metų sukaktį paminėti" ("To Commmemorate the 25th Anniversary of the Death of Vincas Kudirka"), *Varpas*, 1924, pp. 167-73.

Also present was Kriaučiūnas, by then no longer a teacher, having been dismissed in a purge of Lithuanian teachers. With the addition of several locals, there were perhaps ten participants. At issue was the Catholic monthly *Šviesa*.[261] This discussion is evidence of a deep division in Lithuanian politics, a division noticeable even in the resistance movements after World War II. On the one side stood those Catholics holding that the Catholic worldview should serve as a moral foundation for political activity. On the other—more secular individuals, either outright foes of religion like Šliūpas, or those like Grinius holding that religion should remain a private matter, that is, favoring a complete separation of church and state. In later years, bitter disagreements arose concerning the role of the Catholic Church in education. But in 1888, Lithuanians had little if any influence over educational policies or, for that matter, any policies. The struggle was more like an American culture war, pitting progressives concerned to spread modern knowledge against religiously minded conservatives.

In December 1887, three short items, probably by Grinius, appeared in *Šviesa*. One was about the economic crisis in Turkey: soldiers are not being paid, the government lacks funds to protect people from robbers. The second was about American prosperity: there is so much money in the treasury that the government does not know what to do with it. The third was the already mentioned piece about student unrest in Muscovy. Grinius could have had first-hand knowledge only of events in Moscow. The rest, he would have had to glean from newspapers. But it is significant that he found events in distant lands noteworthy. It was important for Grinius, and others, to recognize that the world is changing, that there is much to be learned, that Lithuania will perish if she does not move with the times, that people should not remain intellectually confined to the villages of their birth. His singling out Turkey and the United States marks this broader interest.

Nazi ideology emphasized cultural purity: Germany suffers because her public culture contains much that is not German, both in origin and character. It was important to identify and purge what is not German. When the term nationalism is applied both to Germany and to Lithuania's awakening, to avoid misconceptions, it is important to add that they were struggling to move in opposite directions. Germany was striving to become exclusively German, while Lithuania—open to the larger world. My sense of Poland is that she stood somewhere in between.

---

261 Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," p. 119.

Be that as it may, at the 1888 meeting Kudirka argued that *Šviesa* was not suitable because it was clerical and even obscurantist. He insisted on a publication which clergymen did not influence. Kriaučiūnas objected that *Šviesa* was useful because by publishing stories which people liked, they accustomed them to reading. I am not familiar with the story at issue, about the travels of one silver coin received by Judas for his betrayal. Similar stories at times obscured the line between allegory and history, risky especially among ill-educated people inclined towards superstition. Authors intend to teach a moral lesson, but readers rush off to buy amulets. Certainly there is much to criticize in many such stories, both from secular and theological points of view. But controversy over intellectually suspect tales hides a deeper division between progressives concerned to spread useful knowledge, enabling people to live better, and conservatives convinced that to live well people need a religious and moral core. The *Varpininkai* were of the former orientation and the conference concluded that a non-religious periodical was needed.

The first issue of *Varpas* is dated January 1889, assembled in Warsaw, with the Moscow students annoyed because they were not involved. It was published in Tilsit, in East Prussia, and smuggled in as contraband. In spite of a chronic shortage of funds, the monthly survived to the end of 1905, when after the lifting of the press ban the editors decided to pursue other avenues. The last issue, December 1905, was edited by Grinius. *Varpas* was revived in 1913, again across the border in Tilsit, to avoid censorship, growing ever harsher after the suppression of the revolution of 1905. But because of the war, the revival was short lived. A second revival took place in 1920, with Grinius editing several numbers. It appeared irregularly to 1932. The first contribution by Grinius appeared in October 1890. To the war, more than 80 contributions by him were published, some shorter, others longer, but the exact number cannot be determined because of uncertainties in his bibliography.

The second conference, in July 1889, attracted some 20 participants. There were no by-laws, no membership lists. Once again, should they need an alibi, there was food and drink. The main decision was to publish a second monthly, more suitable for farmers and villagers, with *Varpas* directed towards the better educated.[262] The first number of *Ūkininkas* (*The Farmer*, then written as *Ukiniķas*) appeared in January 1890, last—October 1905. Grinius contributed several hundred items. He edited most of the 1897-1899 issues. The last three

[262] Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 45.

numbers of 1905 announced that it is the organ of the Lithuanian Democratic Party, evidence of a growing emphasis on politics and a rising revolutionary spirit. Thus, the July issue began with the Party's declaration that Lithuania's future should be decided only by the inhabitants of Lithuania. The declaration called for an assembly, elected by the people regardless of nationality, religion, or gender. It was to assemble in Vilnius and decide Lithuania's future. In these last issues we find comments to the effect that Russia, in spite of being governed by God's Anointed, has been defeated. I detect glee: we told you so!

In 1901-1903 the same group published a third monthly, *Naujienos* (*News*), a serious tactical blunder, according to Grinius. The *Varpininkai* were losing support to the more radical, Marxist, social democrats. The response was a periodical with a broader appeal, politically neutral, uncritical of the czar, so that people would not be afraid to read it. This Grinius saw as a mistake: what in fact was needed was a more revolutionary tone.[263]

Grinius estimates, a very rough guess, that these publications attracted some 7000 readers and over 350 contributors.[264] The editorial facilities of the three were not clearly distinguished and this adds to the bibliographic chaos. To make matters worse, some items were sent off to other periodicals, especially to *Vienybė lietuvninkų* (*Lithuanian Unity*), a weekly published in Plymouth, Pa. The editors and many of the American correspondents of this weekly signed their names, but those in Lithuania used pseudonyms. It would have been helpful if the editors had kept copies and penciled in the names of contributors, especially in the case of the many unsigned pieces.

Grinius himself begins contributing extensively in 1890. Before that there are the three short 1887 pieces already mentioned and one from 1888, a longer note about Marijampolė published in *Lietuviškasis balsas* (*The Lithuanian Voice*, then witten *Lietuviszkasis balsas*), established by Šliūpas in New York and moved to Shenandoah. Grinius claims that already as a secondary school student he was receiving *Balsas* by mail.[265] Surely, the censors would have noticed an envelope from America? Perhaps, they were delighted by emphasis on disagreements between Lithuanians and Poles? But there were criticisms of the Russian government. In the August 12, 1885 (No. 5) issue we read that Russian policy is to keep Catholics in Lithuania impoverished so that they could be moved to remote

263 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 32.

264 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 55.

265 Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," p. 119

provinces. There, far away from their own people, they would forget both their religious and national heritages. Of course, we do not know whether Grinius read this. But if he had, he would have also learned that goods in Lithuania are more expensive, compared with other lands, where people have more knowledge and better tools. Also, that except for distilleries, there is little by way of manufacturing and that retailing and the various crafts are in the hands of Jews and foreigners. Lithuanians do not benefit from such enterprises.

Later issues of *Lietuviškasis balsas* would have angered not only the czar, but also American factory owners and clergymen. Three short items appeared in the issue dated 1888 September 14 (no. 22). The first reported the failure of a nihilist plot to assassinate the czar—all friends of mankind regret that the plot failed. In the second, we learn that Harriet Beecher Stowe, whose popular book helped abolish slavery's yoke, is dying—would that the workers movement acquire such a talent. The third concerns a Lithuanian priest collecting money to build a church in New York—those who gave nothing did best. Of the eight pages, one and a half is devoted to advertising, some by non-Lithuanian merchants. The press in the United States had access to an important source of revenue while Lithuanian publications nearer home in the decades of the ban did not. It made no sense to advertise in what the police treated as criminal enterprises.

Šliūpas, we should remember, was one of the editors of *Aušra*. His American venture by no means ignored history. A historical essay in the 1888 December 31 (No. 30) issue could have been cited by Snyder as evidence that Lithuanians misrepresent the Lublin Union. The author claims that after the union, Lithuania was flooded by vagabonds and layabouts from Poland looking to enrich themselves. But readers of *Lietuviškasis balsas* would also have learned much about the struggle against oppression in many parts of the world, with a call for readers to do likewise.

In the *Ukininkas* of 1890 there are ten items either claimed by Grinius or attributed to him. Of course, nothing is signed by name—possibly, some remain unidentified, others attributed in error. Five items were of special interest to farmers. Some of the accounts of animal ailments belong in rowdy comedy sketches, present day Lithuanian being less earthy, more genteel. For example, the description of the struggles and travails of a horse suffering from constipation: the condition can become so bad as to block the "pissing gate."[266] At the same time, we should remember that for farmers performances of natural

[266] "Gyvuliu ligos" ("Diseases of Animals"), *Ukiniķa*s, 1890 March, no. 3, pp. 40-41.

bodily functions were ordinary events and malfunctions could have disastrous consequences. A small farmer could easily lose his only work animal and his only means of transportation, with starvation a serious possibility. Also important was for a buyer to know whether the seller was lying about the age of the horse. Grinius names the sellers as Gipsies, who shared a reputation with used car dealers on roadside lots. The savvy buyer will carefully examine the teeth, in accordance with charts which the author supplied, but keeping in mind that horses age differently and that the condition of the teeth also depends upon the horse's chewing habits and the quantity of sand that gets into its mouth.[267]

We associate the term enlightenment with philosophical ideas, especially with rejection of conceptions of the world based on religion in favor of those based on reason. Grinius is an enlightenment figure, but with a different emphasis. Where religion is concerned, he attacks clericalism but leaves theology untouched, that is, he attacks institutional abuses but not the intellectual content. The sincerely religious can and often do hold similar views. Rather, his target is traditional lore, some of it having religious origins, and the habit of doing things because that is the way they have always been done. It takes effort to get beyond the colorful and crude language of these early pieces. But once we do that, we see that he is trying to convey scientifically grounded, useful information. He wants his readers to act on the basis of the best information, and that is provided mostly by science. He recognizes that traditions are sometimes wholesome. Some fasting is good for health reasons. Some Jewish religious practices are hygienic. The Lithuanian custom of erecting shrines near springs deters people from fouling the water.[268] At the same time, it is obvious that many traditions do harm. In the articles on animal diseases, for example, he warns that traditional treatments are often useless and at times damaging. Incantations at least do no harm. But other practices, often resorted to by Gypsies, are quite injurious. For example, if a horse rolls around too much, some suggested pouring spirits or kerosene on its back and setting it in on fire.

The *Varpininkai* also published pamphlets and almanacs. By reading them and the several periodicals, people learned that there are scientists who have

---

267 "Kaip pažiti, kiek turi metu arklys" ("How to Tell the Age of a Horse"), *Ukinįkas*, 1890 March, no. 3, pp. 41-42; April, no. 4, pp. 57-58.

268 There are numerous asides to that effect. More systematic is his "Medicinos ir higienos žinių populiarizacija lietuvių tarpe" ("The Popularization of Information about Medicine and Hygiene among Lithuanians"), *Medicina,* 1922 May, no. 5, pp. 241-46; June-July, no. 6-7, pp. 315-25; August, no. 8, pp. 397-408.

reliable and useful information. From the point of view of the psychology of a farmer, implied is an important shift away from tradition, the habit of repeating what one's ancestors have done, to the habit of seeking out information.

Earthy is his description of those suffering from dysentery. Lithuanians are fortunate because the disease is not as widespread as it is in southern regions. But in recent years it has become more frequent, especially in Suvalkai Province. It can be deadly. In our climate, on the average, fifteen out of a hundred die. In language which loses its flavor in translation, he explains what "learned doctors" opine are the causes of dysentery. There are "poisons" which enter the body and begin to reproduce, polluting the blood and eating away at the innards. After describing several treatments, he urges sufferers to consult doctors, at the same time reminding them, that long trips over bad roads can do more harm than the illness. Better to send a messenger and ask the doctor to come. Most important is cleanliness: clothes and utensils must be thoroughly washed, the bedding kept clean. The house itself must be disinfected by sealing it and burning sulfur. Feces, urine, vomit should not simply be dumped outside because the "poison" could seep into wells and infect them. They should be treated with boiling water before discarding.[269]

An aside about the roads is in order. Of course they were not paved and maintenance was usually the responsibility of villages and farmers. One traveler recalls that it took three hours to travel eight kilometers and on the way he saw the skeleton of a horse that had perished in the mud. An extreme instance, but evidence that travel even over short distances could be time-consuming and difficult. Weakened by consumption, Kudirka at times complained that it would have been better to work in some office. He would not have had to spend his nights on the road making house calls.[270] When Grinius established his practice, he traveled over such roads.

I am not sure of the meaning of the word which I have translated as poison. It may have been used as a generic term merely indicating something harmful. After all, most of his readers had never heard of bacteria. Perhaps, he was trying not to make things too complicated. At the same time, his account is an example of cause and effect reasoning: people get sick and die not because fate has so decreed, but because certain causes are at work, causes to which there are appropriate responses. We should be careful not to confuse a lack of book learning with stupidity. Survival on a subsistence farm called for ingenuity and

269 K. Gr., "Dizenterija" ("Dysentery"), *Ukiniķas*, 1890 March no. 3, pp. 39-40; April, no. 4, pp. 53-55.

270 Butėnas, *Vincas Kudirka*, p. 114.

resourcefulness: many skills were needed. But there was much that was simply accepted as misfortune and people had to be taught that even in that broader sphere they have some control over outcomes. Soon enough, Grinius will realize that he faces a similar challenge in the sphere of politics.

One casual remark cannot be ignored. He makes what may or may not be a derogatory reference to Jews. He claims that sometimes patients do not need medicines, but need something to make them stronger. Good wine can be used for that purpose, but it is not available in shops, even to those willing to pay. Rather, the shops sell foul liquid that Jews make in secret and call wine. The problem arises because he uses a diminutive form which, although not always, often has a derogatory tone, suggesting that the person carries little social weight, is worthless. Certainly, several decades later, he is critical of anti-Semitism. Also, he comes to see Jews as models from whom Lithuanians have much to learn, especially in regard to the rearing of children, drinking, solidarity, and even cleanliness, this last in defiance of an established stereotype. But in these early texts Jews are often connected with exploitation and unfair trading practices, efforts to prevent competition. Some of the uncertainty could have been removed by the use of quantifiers. Thus, the proposition 'Some Jews peddle a foul liquid as wine' is probably true, in that out of hundreds of merchants there must have been some unscrupulous ones, keeping in mind that most customers knew next to nothing about wine and had little experience of shopping. Here as elsewhere, savvy shoppers help to keep sellers honest. But the proposition 'All Jews peddle a foul liquid as wine' is certainly false, while 'Jews misrepresent foul liquids' is undecidable, and thus meaningless in terms of a formal criterion of meaning. Grinius usually makes assertions of the third kind, that is, without indicating whether he intends some, all, a few, many and thus in many contexts it is difficult to decide whether he has in mind facts or making unfounded generalizations. Unfortunately, the required degree of precision is too much to expect from a university student writing for a minimally literate audience. Especially in a context in which nationality and class nearly coincide: if counterfeit wine was sold, probably the sellers were Jews because most shopkeepers were Jews. In that context, the proposition 'Only Jews counterfeit wine' could well have been true, not because Jews on the average were less honest, but because they were the only sellers.

This excursion into logic is intended as a warning not only when reading Grinius, but many other texts as well. Our present day tendency is to resolve ambiguities by imposing the most incriminating interpretation, thereby finding

more prejudice than in fact there was, lumping conflict and irritation with intolerance. In the end, his developed views leave no doubt. What they were at this early stage cannot be decided, leaving open the possibility of some antagonism towards Jews. But if there was antagonism, it was weak. There is no evidence later of anything like a conversion, no indications of a complete change of heart.

Such cautions are in order, given the tendency among historians—including some Lithuanians—to resolve all ambiguities by imposing anti-Semitic interpretations. In an important way, even in his early writings, Grinius does not behave like a typical anti-Semite. Anti-Semites usually end with a call for a general war against Jews. Grinius does not, even in this early period. Rather, he lists specific actions which Lithuanians can take to improve the situation. If Jews sell poor quality goods at high prices, people should respond by becoming warier and encouraging competition. Reasonable advice on economic grounds.

Certainly, then and later, many Lithuanians believed that Jews were defending what they claimed as their turf by blocking Lithuanian access to urban professions. Existing Jewish communal organizations could be used for such purposes. When in 1890 Kudirka moved to the town of Šakiai, the *kahal* decided—most of the houses in town were Jewish owned —not to rent to him. For some months, he had to make do in an attic over the rectory and receive his patients in a granary. Friends and agents of the established Jewish doctor stopped people entering the town and steered them away from the newcomer. Stasys Matulaitis relates that in one town for his business a Lithuanian rented space from a Jewish owner. The *kahal* disapproved. When the Jew refused to void the rental agreement, a crowd of Jews beat him up.[271] Stories of this type are widespread, of unfair trading practices such as boycotts, underselling, bribing of licensing officials. And in many cases they point to an established community acting to protect one of their own from competition. Given that the evidence is anecdotal, it is hard to decide whether such practices were a minor nuisance which Lithuanians dramatized or a serious barrier to Lithuanian advancement. But the question has to be kept in mind when interpreting complaints about Jews. The temptation to impose the label of anti-Semitism is strong, forgetting that conflicts between newcomers and those established in a trade are not exceptions but the norm. At this time, in towns and cities, Lithuanians were the disadvantaged newcomers, with no government support and little organized support from their own community. Normal conflicts of interest were exacerbated

271 Matulaitis, *Atsiminima*i, p. 94.

by differences in language, religion, traditions, and class. During independence, many conflicts arose over store hours since Lithuanians preferred to shop on Saturdays and keep Sundays free for religion and families. The search for compromises by town and city councils seems endless. My sense is that rabbis were less willing to bend and used various means, including Sabbath watchers, to impose their traditions. There were protests over ritual slaughter in the name of prevention of cruelty to animals. Language was a problem because more educated and secular Jews were in the habit of using Russian, which some interpreted as evidence of disdain.

Schrad finds systemic corruption the dominant feature of Russian politics. If he is right, we would have another explanation for widespread dishonesty among merchants, Jewish and otherwise. Working in that system, in order to survive, they had little choice but to bribe and cheat.

Grinius himself at times resorted to bribery when dealing with the authorities. In his memoirs, perhaps somewhat uneasy, he justifies his own contribution to corruption: he was a soldier in the war against czarism.

Grinius's several pages about tapeworms and other parasites infesting human digestive tracts emphasize his role as an enlightenment figure. The reader learns that there are many objects not seen by unaided eyes, but visible though a "magnifying glass." Also, that there is progress: there are facts now known which were unknown just a few decades ago. At the same time, scientists make mistakes which, however, they uncover by continuing to investigate. And most importantly, there are things which we can do. There is simple hygiene—we should wash our hands after petting a dog and before eating. We should find better ways of disposing of human waste which can contain tiny worm eggs—the pork we eat comes from pigs which wallow in it and become infected. There are things governments can do—in Germany and Russia's larger cities there already are meat inspectors and inspected hams are safe to eat without boiling. Incidentally, we learn that Germans eat more raw meat than Russians or Lithuanians.[272]

To complete this picture of what concerned the twenty-four years old Grinius, some account of his other writings is in order. In one, co-authored with a friend—he urges Lithuanians to establish businesses. As things now stand, in villages and small towns the shops are operated by Jews (using the sometimes derogatory

[272] X., "Apie kirmeles, kuriomis žmones užsikreczia valgydami jautiena ir kiauliena" ("About Worms With Which Humans Become Infected after Eating Pork or Beef"), *Ukinįkas*, 1890 April, no. 4, pp. 58-60.

diminutive). They sell goods discarded by merchants in cities and multiply prices several times. As a result, what Lithuanians buy is expensive and of poor quality. German colonists in southern Russia fare much better and Lithuanians should imitate them. There, some villages have devised a system of licensing shops and allow a profit margin of no more than 15%. Those violating the rules are boycotted. They have also established cooperatives, the profits of which are distributed to the members or used to help the needy of the community. Grinius seems to think that the latter alternative would work better. But the Germans help each other, while Lithuanians are selfish, each one merely looking out for himself.[273]

Only a thorough statistical analysis could show whether the contrast Grinius draws between the German colonists and Lithuanians in fact holds. But most Lithuanians of his time were only several decades removed from serfdom and it seems reasonable to assume that centuries of servility would have behavioral consequences. Where Jewish shopkeepers are concerned, there is some tendency to think that retailers are mere speculators who get rich, but add nothing of value. A farmer in a climate with a short growing season, after a summer of fourteen hour workdays, is not going to have much sympathy for someone who makes his living by sitting behind a counter. Such resentments were much exploited by Marxists. Likely, Grinius is thinking along those lines. But in the absence of statistics it is impossible to say how much price gouging took place.

Cooperatives were another irritant in Lithuanian-Jewish relations. Few if any Lithuanians had capital to invest. Thus, in a country dominated by small and poor farmers, cooperatives were the obvious means of creating larger economic units, something a modern economy demands. Grinius and other *Varpininkai* urged Lithuanians to form cooperatives. Many Catholics advocated the same, adding a non-utilitarian argument, namely the natural law right of people with common interests to associate. Cooperatives played an important role in Lithuanian efforts to raise the standard of living. But the outcome was an economy in which Lithuanian cooperatives often competed against Jewish merchants.

Most students spent their summer vacations helping on the farm. For Grinius, the summer of 1890 was different. He spent most of it touring unfamiliar parts of Lithuania and visiting friends, many of them future political associates. Emphasis was on regions near Latvia. Northern Lithuania differs from most of the rest because of the presence of Calvinism, dating back to the days

[273] Svirplis ir Gr...s, "Reikaluose prekystes" ("In Matters of Trade") *Ukinįkas*, 1890 September, no. 9, pp. 129-30.

of the Reformation. At one stop Grinius heard about a small society organized by a tailor which received publications from abroad. The members sent off for publication articles and poems and collected folklore. Such small societies were springing up here and there. They were not organized by a center, evidence that the awakening was a grass roots movement, that many responded to the changing times by taking small initiatives.

No doubt, Grinius used the tour to advertise *Varpas*, for networking and talk of hopes and plans. He traveled mostly by horse and cart, joined by one friend or another. After touring the northern regions, he turned south and for the first time visited Kaunas, which after the loss of Vilnius in 1920, became the cultural and political center. Most of Grinius's life as a public servant belongs to Kaunas. Most of his life as a medical practitioner belongs to Marijampolė and other towns in his native Province. From Kaunas he went home and after spending several days with his parents on the farm, he and some friends traveled to the third *Varpininkai* conference. It was towards the end of August, at the height of the harvest, and they passed ripe, unharvested, fields of rye. Possibly, it was at this conference that Grinius became acquainted with the details of book smuggling, because they met on the farm of a smuggler. The sense of conspiracy must have been heightened by the arrival of a hay wagon, loaded with books hidden in hay. Kudirka was present, as were several Catholic priests, differences between the progressives, or liberals as they came to be called, and the so-called clericals, had not yet resulted in a complete break.[274]

In the October 1890 issue of *Varpas* there is one item by Grinius, his first contributions to that periodical, unsigned, but claimed by him in later years. The content is trivial, routine, about talk of closing down the secondary school in Marijampolė because Lithuanian students leave for the seminary after several years; about the crops and that rye is not ripening properly; about a tree-borer that is killing pine trees; about an outbreak of dysentery and several children who died after inoculation; about local courts in which Lithuanians need translators and lose much in the translation.[275] Very ordinary, especially when compared with the romantic poetry of Mickiewicz. Trifles, but worth noting because they give concrete meaning to the widespread notion of nation-building. As we saw, Snyder identifies this with the spreading of historical myths: the awakeners constructed a Lithuanian nation by talk of past glories and sufferings. No

274 Grinius, "Atsiminimai:1866-1878," pp. 128-29.

275 "Iš Suvalkų gubernijos" ("From Suvalkai Province"), *Varpas*, 1890 October. no. 10, pp. 157-58.

doubt, there was some of that. As we saw, even Grinius contributed as a student in Moscow. But if we look less selectively and more closely, we notice something else and, in my view, of greater importance. The awakeners were creating the sense of a greater community, extending beyond one's family and immediate neighbors. They did this in a very direct way, namely, by writing about others far away who speak the same language and share the same concerns. Members of this community can communicate with each other in their own language: they do not have to ape the gentry and deride in heavily accented Polish their neighbors in homespun. It turns out that Lithuanians everywhere are harassed, often for trivial reasons, by functionaries with whom they cannot communicate. That everywhere their complaints and concerns are ignored because those in power have neither knowledge of nor interest in their plight.

Grinius's report is very concrete, without raising any of the broader issues. His contribution to this issue of *Varpas* is small, perhaps half a page out of sixteen. But several pages of similar reports from other regions serve to complete the picture of shared problems in a land ruled by strangers. The issue begins with an account of conflict between liberals and clericals among Lithuanians in the United States. Likely, some readers concluded that these emigrants are better organized, freer to express themselves, than the countrymen they left behind. Most demanding intellectually is an installment of a longer essay on the functions of government by Petras Leonas, one of the leaders of the students in Moscow, a man Grinius much admired. Given the autocratic traditions of the empire, his thesis was radically subversive, not only of czarism but also of Marxist Communism. According to Leonas, while states perform many functions, their primary one is to help people achieve their goals.[276]

In later years, Lithuanians had a strong sense of solidarity with other small nations. They admired Masaryk and in 1938 during the Sudeten crisis, bands in Kaunas restaurants played tunes from *The Bartered Bride*. In the issue of *Varpas* under review, there is a survey of European politics which begins with the complaint that small nations are too often forgotten. A trivial event in the life of one individual in a powerful country gets more coverage that a small country "rowing toward happiness with all its powers." Grinius's arrival in the United States in 1947 and the confused reporting is to the point. But, the unknown author continues, recent events in Portugal and Switzerland are exceptions. In

[276] Liutas (Petras Leonas), "Privatiszka ir draugijinė ukes organizacija" ("Private and Communal Organization of the Economy"), *Varpas*, 1890 October, no. 10, pp. 143-51

Portugal there is a sharp conflict between republicans and monarchists, while in Switzerland, the government had to intervene to protect liberals from clericals. The general impression is that in the greater world people are in a position to organize and act. The glaring contrast with conditions in the Russian empire could have escaped only a few, certainly not those who had just read Leonas on the proper functions of government.

In the same issue, another empire is treated scathingly. The potato crop in Ireland has failed and the Irish are in desperate straits. But the English government, which often responds to cries for help with mobs of police, is claiming that conditions are not bad, in the face of glaring and horrifying evidence. According to the author, it is a terrible state of affairs when the lives of millions hang on just one crop and the amount of rain. The situation calls for drastic reforms, but in spite of pleas by Irish leaders, the parliament in London is only willing to make a few changes at the top.[277] Thus, another case of a remote imperial center indifferent to the plight of a subject nationality. It is suggestive that the first academic history in Lithuanian was a history of Ireland, *Airija* (1908) by Janulaitis.

Conditions in Lithuania were not as terrible. The threat was not famine, but a future bleak and unpromising. Large numbers were fleeing, some to nearby industrial centers like Riga, others to the United States. At the same time, the Irish enjoyed an important advantage. They were better organized and had leaders who could plead their cause. The author in *Varpas* mentions Charles Stewart Parnell and his failure to persuade parliament. Probably, he had no clear idea of Parnell's career and power. But many of his readers must have envied the Irish: there was no comparable Lithuanian. Later, after the first revolution, the Duma created opportunities which Grinius and his friends tried to exploit, in vain. But in 1890 all that was far away.

To complete the picture of *Varpas* as an instrument of enlightenment, I should note that the issue under discussion completes a series of articles on microorganisms, the discoveries of Pasteur, and inoculation. The series concludes with an optimistic note. While as yet science knows little about fighting microorganisms, there is no doubt that in the future much will be learned and many new medicines developed. That scientific explanations should replace tradition and superstition is the theme of a paper by Grinius on will-o'-the-wisps, an adaptation from the Polish, which appeared in the June 1891 issue of *Ukinįkas*.

---

277 Joniškis, "Politika," *Varpas*, 1890 October, no. 10, pp. 159-60.

There is information about phosphorus, but his central claim is that only those ignorant of science believe in ghosts, miracles, apparitions.[278]

Of course, not everything was science and enlightenment. There is some romantic and far-fetched history. There is also some anti-Semitism. There is little ambiguity in Kudirka's remark from a discourse on Jews and other things: "Even learning will not cleanse Jews of the dirt befitting the lowest grade of Jewishness."[279]

In 1891 Grinius wrote extensively, but contributed nothing to *Varpas*, as far as is known. But among his many contribution to *Ukinįkas*, we find some longer pieces, in which we can discern the germ of a political and social program. Nothing explicit, but there are hints that eventually Lithuania should become independent. After all, he notes, the Bulgarians drove out the Turks and the Muscovites and are now prospering. The broad picture is of a changing Europe: everywhere subject nations are coming to understand that they are not inferior, not doomed by nature to remain forever servile. They are demanding their rights and often winning. And everything depends on people organizing and taking action to instill pride and educate themselves and their countrymen.

In this 1891 paper Grinius insists that Lithuanians are largely responsible for their own plight. As Pogo, an opossum in an old American comic-strip, once remarked: we have met the enemy and he is us. Lithuanians do not take pride in themselves. Many of them agree that their language is fit for peasants only, inherently incapable of becoming a language of education and culture. But they should realize that a hundred years ago the Czechs were in a similar position: Austrian gendarmes were confiscating and burning Czechish books. It was widely predicted that all Czechs would forget their language and become German speakers. But then, several wise leaders arose and instilled pride. Grinius envisages the following chronology of the Czech awakening. Pride was followed by the spread and development of the language. It was adopted by the educated, came to be used in schools, universities, theaters, and public life in general. As a result, the Czechs prospered and now there is talk of a Czech kingdom.

Something similar took place in Bulgaria. Some decades ago the Bulgarians were mired in poverty, misery, superstition. Travelers commented on the promiscuity of Bulgarian women. But now, Bulgaria is unrecognizable. Grinius mentions revivals, some more advanced some less, among Rumanians, Serbs, Greeks,

---

278 "Žaltvykszles" ("Will-o'-the-Wisps"), *Ukinįkas*, 1891 June, no. 6, pp. 263-66.

279 Q. D. ir K., "Tevyniszki varpai" ("Homeland Bells"), *Varpas*, 1890 October, no. 10, pp. 151-53.

Hungarians, Irish, Finns, Slovaks, Ukrainians, Latvians, Estonians, Croatians, Italians in Austria[280]. Only a catalog with no details, but a prophesy that the last days of the imperial order in Europe are upon us.

Were Grinius a participant in the American civil rights struggle, he would side with the more communitarian advocates of black power. Individual Lithuanians had a way out not available to most African-Americans. They could pass. They could assimilate and prosper. As Grinius estimated, perhaps half of the several thousand educated Lithuanians were on their way towards assimilation. But this path was available only to a handful. The masses could be helped only by a communitarian approach. In the end, people had to educate and organize themselves and take action on their own behalf. Grinius believed that people would act only if they stopped believing in their inherent inferiority.

For African-Americans, the brand of inferiority is the color of their skin. Black power advocates respond that black is beautiful. Lithuanians were branded by their language. Basanavičius, Kudirka, Grinius proclaimed that Lithuanian is beautiful and ancient, as capable as any of growth, of becoming the vehicle of high culture. In the paper by Grinius under discussion he in fact asserts that Lithuanian is a beautiful and ancient tongue. Snyder, forgetting that no language sprang into being fully formed, sneers at claims that a language is ancient, arguing that an ancient language is one that has not matured because of isolation. It is a symptom of backwardness, not something of which to be proud.[281] He is not in error as to the facts. But he overlooks the instrumental value of such claims: that language is ancient is the functional equivalent of black is beautiful. Both serve to assure people that there is no stigma attached to the circumstances of their birth. For Grinius and other awakeners, pride in one's cradle tongue is only the first step. They well understood the urgency of establishing a standard Lithuanian.

His remark about promiscuous Bulgarians requires comment. He was a progressive in his social views. There were times when he was inching towards radicalism. But, especially when measured by present standards, he was a conservative in matters of reproduction. In later years, he insisted that adultery and promiscuity posed a threat to national survival.

Where the role of women is concerned, he wrote often about motherhood and the importance of good mothers to general well-being, as if in this respect also he was a traditional conservative. But it would be a mistake to conclude that

---

280 Gr., "Musu reikalai" ("Our Concerns") *Ukiniķas*, 1891 January, no. 1, pp. 1-8.

281 Snyder, *Reconstruction of Nations*, pp. 37-38.

he regarded women only as mothers. The seeming one-sidedness is the result of his concern with infant mortality and the importance which he attached to breast-feeding. Both of his wives were more than mothers. Both were civic leaders and activists. And in the paper under discussion, he urges parents to send their daughters to school. Many are reluctant to do this, he complains, because girls can never become priests.[282] Several years later, in his account of Switzerland, be noted that there, unlike Russia, women are allowed to attend universities and there are many female physicians. In many ways, he was a feminist.

Perhaps his most important associate, the organizing genius behind many of the *Varpininkai* publications and enterprises, was a woman, a feminist, Felicija Bortkevičienė (1873-1945). Somewhat older than Madame Pilsudska, but of similar background, a gentlewoman by birth, she defied her parents by marrying a commoner. A widow after 1909, she did not remarry and remained childless. More of a revolutionary than Grinius, she was imprisoned often and by a series of regimes. Her longest stint was in 1919 when she was held as a hostage by Kapsukas and his communist regime in Vilnius. In other words, she was not one of the mothers in whose breasts the future of the nation resided. Yet, he much admired her and repeatedly praised her for what generally are not considered feminine qualities, namely, her ability to handle finances and organize.

Historiography favors winners and has distorted the picture by focusing on Bolsheviks. In fact, this was a time of seemingly uncountable liberation movements in the Russian empire: the Russian revolution, as a broad movement of people taking control of their own lives, perished in Lenin's and Stalin's prisons.

---

[282] Unfortunately, because of bibliographic uncertainties and his penchant for privacy, what could be important has to be relegated to a footnote. On November 7, 1909, *Lietuvos žinios* published information about Mariavite services available in Vilnius. The news item is signed with the initial "K," frequenly used by Grinius but many others as well. The Mariavites were founded in Poland by a woman in the early 1900's, condemned by the Pope in 1906, with at the time three small congregations in Lithuania. They were a national church renouncing allegiance to Rome. Celibacy was not required and women could be ordained. There were contacts at about this time between the group around Grinius and the Mariavites, but it is not known whether Grinius was involved. He was living in Vilnius at the time. On the basis of his polemics, especially in the early 1920s, it is clear that Grinius was attracted by the idea of a national church. He criticized Lithuanian Catholics for their double allegiance, their service to the Vatican, sometimes, in my estimation, in a nit-picking way. But perhaps it was mostly politics: Grinius like many others was upset because it seemed that the Vatican recognized Polish claims to Vilnius and Christian Democrats were the main rivals. There was a Lithuanian Catholic national church in the United States: Catholics in the United States were being attacked, alleging allegiance to a foreign power. I am not aware of anything indicating how he would have responded to the ordination of women.

Nations, religions, peasants, factory workers, women, Jews were in revolt. In his memoir of her, Grinius recalls that she knew code-words used by Jewish radicals and used them to help political prisoners escape, including Kapsukas, her eventual jailer.[283] My sense is that in these early years she found all liberation movements worthy of support, in her enthusiasm ignoring differences in tactics and goals. As years later she recalled those days, for her and Grinius central was the concept of citizenship. Their goal was to educate people, regardless of social class, religion, or nationality to the point where they could assume the burdens and prerogatives of being citizens.[284] The view of citizenship as something to which one rises is not without problems. But it helps avoid the dogmatism of people like Lenin—younger than Grinius by only a few years--who hold that unquestioning faith in Marxist dogmas is a necessary, and often sufficient condition, for participation in public life. A vast gulf separates an informed and self-reliant citizenry from masses of the faithful mindlessly intoning ritual phrases (and snickering when sure that they are not being watched).[285] The 1891 paper, with its emphasis on enlightenment as the starting point and necessary condition of progress, helps to understand why Grinius was able to resist the allure of Marxist communism. Grinius wrote to spread useful information enabling people to make informed decisions, while Lenin—to display himself as the one called to lead Russia out of crisis and chaos.

Revolutionary times were just over the horizon. According to Soviet chronology, Lenin organized the first Marxist circle in the early 1890s. His first important work appeared in 1894. By around 1900 he was denouncing reformists and opportunists. Several of Grinius's political associates, activists of the awakening, succumbed to the passion arousing simplicities of revolutionary ideology and became Communists. But Grinius resisted and remained a reformist, advocating a patient and steady course, in spite of the giddy chaos of liberation movements around him. It is suggestive that Lenin, mostly in comfortable circumstances and sometimes supported by wealthy industrialists, had few contacts with actual workers and learned about the needs and hopes of the the proletariat from Marx's writings. Robert Service notes how Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders vacationed in the Swiss mountains, or congregated in Maxim Gorky's

283 Dr. K. Grinius, "Felicija Bortkevičienė," *Varpas*, 1946 March 1, no. 1, pp. 7-10.

284 Felicija Bortkevičienė, "Senam draugui!" ("For an Old friend"), *Varpas*, 1926, pp. 186-92.

285 In the late Soviet period, quotations from Lenin were sometimes called lightning rods. Some of the quotations were genuine. Others—not quite as much.

splendid villa on the island of Capri. What better places to study the true needs of working men?[286] But Grinius, born into a peasant family and at times just a country doctor, spent most of his formative years living and working with ordinary people. Lenin dreamed of changing the world, and was willing to sacrifice the present in the name of a visionary faith in an imaginary future.[287] Grinius labored to improve the lives of those around him.

In the January 1891 issue of *Ukiniķas* there are two translations attributed to Grinius. The first is about life in Kirghizia. We learn about their sack-races, how they devour mutton by swallowing without chewing, and hunt bears. The last I find incredible. It turns out, omitting unimportant details, that you begin by enticing the bear into playing catch and after earning its trust slice its throat. The long description of boar hunting is too complicated for summary.[288] One can only imagine the cries of wonder and delight when read by the hearth on long winter evenings. And never mind that they eat horses. But they share. If a wealthy man has meat, even the poorest does not go hungry.

There is a serious purpose behind the translation from the Polish of "Mountains of Gold in Brazil." It is to discourage emigration. Lured by promises of land by unscrupulous agents, whole families emigrated to Brazil. There they did not receive the promised land. Many children died of hunger and women turned to prostitution. Some of the survivors returned with the help of the Russian consul.[289]

The July 1891 issue of *Ukiniķas* has another translation by Grinius, entertaining but with the moral that we are the authors of our own misfortune. This is a story by the Ukrainian writer and political activist Ivan Yakovich Franko (1856-1916), "How I Bought a Machine for Chopping Fodder." The hero, an inventive and ingenuous villager, is always looking for ways of making labor easier and more productive. But his neighbors, holding on to traditions, continue to laugh and mock, even after repeatedly benefiting from his ingenuity. The hero is an entrepreneur. But his neighbors are conservative, stubbornly working in

286 Service, *Lenin*, pp. 190-91.

287 Michael Pearson, in *Lenin's Mistress,* several times suggests that Lenin sent others on dangerous missions because "no physical risks could be expected of the future leader of the world revolution" (p. 97). Another suggestive contrast. Lenin, safely in Switzerland, read about the revolution in newspapers and at first suspected that the reports were a hoax (p. 150). Grinius experienced it at first hand, both the hopes of February and the disastrous consequences of Lenin's return.

288 "Pas Kirgyzus" ("Among the Kirghizians"), *Ukiniķas*, 1891 January, no. 1, pp. 24-37. It is signed Grinius.

289 "Auksiniai kalnai' Brazilijoj" *Ukiniķas*, 1891 January, no. 1, pp. 40-44.

traditional ways. He eventually succeeds and buys the machine. To avoid jeering neighbors, he tries to bring it home unnoticed and is much distressed when darkness is broken up by moonlight.[290]

The greater world offers much by way of devices to improve life. But most people decline the good things on offer out of fear, envy, ignorance. I think it unlikely that Grinius translated this story merely because it is amusing. It is light reading for winter evenings. But it also carries an underlying serious message, well in line with Grinius's own concerns. Lithuanians face many problems. There is political oppression, symbolized by the confiscation of even the most innocent of books. There is social oppression, the sneers and mocking glances of Polonized Lithuanians and some educated Poles. But there is also the stifling effect of ignorance, resignation, conservativism. In this early phase Grinius is mostly concerned with the causes of backwardness which can be attacked only by education, example, encouragement, work which he sees as foundational. But as revolutionary tensions rise throughout the empire, the political struggle becomes more prominent.

The message of self-reliance had some effect. For example, in late September of 1907 the first conference of Lithuanian speaking women met in Kaunas. Perhaps 300-400 participated, some in urban dress, others in traditional village garb with kerchiefs on their heads. Likely, the largest collection of Lithuanians Kaunas had seen in decades, if not centuries. The consensus was that first and foremost the country needs schools and teachers: there will be no progress until there are schools teaching in the native language. The conference also provides evidence of the inroads made by radical socialist ideas. The sharpest disagreements arose concerning the possibility of an organization representing the interests of all women. Radicals argued that women share no common interests because they are divided into classes: a wealthy woman and her maid are class-enemies. But the advocates of common cause won and a committee was formed to establish an organization of women. Elected were Grinius's wife, Bortkevičienė, Žemaitė, and others. It was agreed that women should have right to vote in Duma elections, that they should be able to sue in the courts without their husband's permission, that they should be paid equally with men. But most importantly, women all social classes share an interest in education, the well-being of the country, and Lithuania's awakening. It is suggestive that the organ of the Lithuanian social democrats (not Bolsheviks) reported on the

[290] "Kaip asz nusipirkau akselinę maszina," *Ukinįkas*, 1891 July, no. 7, pp. 293-304, translated by K. Gr.. Grinius's sister, Ona Bacevičienė, lost most of her hand to such a machine.

meeting critically, focusing on class-conflicts, but *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, the voice of Grinius's group, while recognizing disagreements, judged the conference a success.[291] Compared with 1891, the conference shows how much progress had been made. Nothing like that could have been held in the earlier years.

But in 1891 the situation was bleak, with only rare and scattered signs of improvement. We have no centers of learning and culture, he complained: "our life is provincial and conditions for well-known reasons are worse than in other provinces." There are a few educated persons working for the common good. A few are strong enough to resist police persecution and the Poles who nose around looking for anything they can use to do us harm. But most stagnate in their isolation and live mired in everyday tasks. In the meanwhile, our enemies are destroying us without even resorting to warfare. After making the startling claim that Lithuanians are not even allowed to speak, he explains: "in our time the press is so important, such a powerful force for progress that it amounts to speech." His conclusion is pessimistic: "The whole of Europe, so much better off than we are, is worrying about what tomorrow will bring, while we idlers still sleep and probably will begin to think only after they ban thinking."[292]

Sermons often paint the present in darker colors than it deserves. But he is certainly right about the stimulating effects of cultural centers and nearly right about their absence in Lithuania. There already were stirrings in the Catholic seminary in Kaunas. One of its graduates, the poetic voice of the awakening, Jonas Mačiulis-Maironis (1862-1932), had already published a scattering of poems and pieces of prose, in *Aušra* and elsewhere, of course hiding behind several pen names. But his major work, *Jaunoji Lietuva* (*The Young Lithuania*) had to wait for 1907. At some point before then Maironis wrote: "The Slavs are risen. From the Black Sea spring is advancing over the Carpathians. But in Lithuania—it is winter." Grinius would have agreed with the thought: everywhere nations are rising and Lithuania must either rise or perish. He also would have approved of the poet's call to stand shoulder-to-shoulder. But had he heard of Maironis in 1891, likely he would have classed him with the rest of the suspect clerics.

There is no shortage of sermons in the pages of *Ukiņkas,* scolding lazy Lithuanians for wasting money on tobacco, drinking, gambling, litigation over trifles. They would be better off if they spent the money on books and education. But in the issue of November 1891 there is sound advice about elections

---

291 *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 September 16, no. 42, pp. 623-24.

292 G., *Ukiņkas*, 1891 February, no. 2, p. 96-98.

and voting. The unknown author explains the complicated system of electing local officials. He then emphasizes that only honest, sober, hard-working men, concerned with the welfare of the community, should be elected. Unfortunately, among the candidates there are drunkards, half-wits interested only in the honor, crooks hoping for an opportunity to be bribed. How does one identify them? They are the well-met fellows plying voters with drinks.[293] One only wishes that we could have as simple a test for identifying our own scoundrels and half-wits. Grinius is not the author of this piece, but it is very much in line with his call for an informed and thoughtful citizenry.

Surprising is the recognition of what we now call globalization. A villager, who has never traveled more than a few miles from the place of his birth, learns that his prosperity depends upon prices in distant markets. *Ūkininkas* regularly published the prices paid for various grains and farm products in New York, London, Berlin, Marseilles, Odessa, Warsaw. A farmer in northern Lithuania learned that his peas were worth more in Riga than in Liepaja. The November issue includes an article about tariff wars and how they affect local farmers. Ten years ago Lithuanian farmers were prosperous, because they sold their surplus grain in Prussia. Then Germany became protectionist, imposed tariffs on grain, and once the Prussian market died up, prices fell. In earlier years, there were many boats loaded with grain on the Nemunas. Now, there are few and they carried only stones for paving Prussian streets and building dams. Russia retaliated by raising duties on manufactured goods. The United States comes into the picture as one of the countries engaging in protectionism. To make matters worse, as incomes fell, taxes increased. Many Lithuanians are losing their land to colonists. Those arriving from Prussia live well in spite of lower prices. They are more productive because of better farming practices. But the unknown author is guardedly optimistic. Protectionism benefited German farmers, but food prices in cities rose and gave rise to protests. Tariffs are being lowered and he expects them to become even lower. On the other hand, flax growers cannot expect improvement, unless the government finds ways of helping them. Linen is being replaced by cotton, because while the former is more durable, the latter is cheaper to mill. The writer expects this trend to continue.[294]

---

[293] J. Bitaitis, "Kaip reikia rinkti...?" ("How We Should Elect...?"), *Ukinįkas*, 1891 November, no, 11, pp. 503-10.

[294] -j-a-, "Ar gali pasigerinti padėjims žemdarbių ukinįkų Lietuvoje?" ("Can the Condition of Tillers of the Soil in Lithuania Be Improved?"), *Ukinįkas*, 1891 November, no. 11, pp. 482-88.

At this distance it is hard to imagine what effect, if any, such articles had on behavior. Unlikely, that *Ukįnikas* reached many with enough land to have large surpluses. Most land owners producing for the market took their news in Polish, while subsistence farmers could not change their ways because they harvested barely enough for bread and seed. They were trapped in a cycle of poverty with no exist in sight, no matter how well they understood the causes of their misery. In any case, their only link with markets was a Jewish peddler and his cart, with much bargaining and barter. Perhaps, *Ukiniįkas* was only imitating foreign publications without a clear idea of what could be accomplished. Perhaps, we have nothing more than evidence of the good intentions of a handful of editors and writers, evidence that the *Varpininka*i understood the link between backwardness and subsistence farming. On the other hand, when advertising began to appear after the lifting of the ban, there are ads for farm machinery and chemical fertilizers. This suggests that some move towards farming for the market had already taken place.

Probably, problems of veterinary medicine were touched upon in zoology class during his first year in Moscow. In keeping with the resolve to improve living conditions by improving farming practices, in 1891 adapting a Russian paper, Grinius contributed several pages on the link in cows between diseases and milk yields. Farmers are urged to forget magic and tradition and learn what scientists using "magnifying glasses" have learned about the diseases of cows. There is considerable detail, for example, about the many reasons why milk sometimes is discolored and why seemingly healthy cows begin to give less milk. There is a strong warning about the dangers of milk from diseased cows.[295] When compared with similar offerings from the year before, the 1891 paper is more informative and the writing more mature. It would draw few laughs in a comedy routine.

There are other papers of this type which need not be mentioned. Their ceaseless hammering away at one theme shows what first and foremost concerned these bell-ringers: that their backward countrymen at long last rise and claim the fruits of modern life, to which they were as entitled as anyone else. This underlying theme is what is missed in many academic stereotypes of nationalism, emphasizing as they do intellectual and not social history. The rise of romanticism is a major event in the history of literature. At most, it is on the fringes of the Lithuanian awakening.

---

295 K. Gr., "Karviu pieno ligos" ("Diseases of Milk from Cows") *Ukiniįkas*, 1891 June, no. 6, pp. 275-81.

In an article written in 1947, Grinius theorizes about the reasons why the awakening began and why it succeeded. He thinks that after the abolition of serfdom, some peasants became wealthier and were able to educate their children. This increased the number of the educated and contributed to the spread of democratic ideas, ideas of liberty, equality, and rights. The invention of machinery, of labor-saving devices, opened up new possibilities. At the same time, industrialization produced great misery, making it obvious that the prevailing distribution of wealth was unjust. He does not mention romanticism and the creation of historical myths.[296]

In spite of pessimistic accounts of a people long dormant, Grinius could point to some successes even in 1891. With delight he estimates that in the 25 years of the ban, the Muscovites have produced only 150,000 Lithuanian books using Russian letters, a small number when compared with the 500,000 printed in Prussia over the last ten years. There must have been several hundred thousand Lithuanian speaking households at the time. Two or three per household over ten years is not much, especially considering that periodicals were counted as books. (*Aušra* alone accounts for some 30,000 of the half-million.) On the other hand, even such numbers indicate progress, grounds for hope that in time we will govern ourselves. Grinius guesses that smuggling doubled the price of books. [297] Thus, in addition to fear of searches and arrests, cost too was a deterrent.

I have mentioned that Merkys lists 2467 individuals investigated during the years of the ban. For obvious reasons, it is much harder to get a sense of how much petty harassment there was. According to Grinius, in the last several years the gendarmes have sunk to confiscating missals from people on their way to Sunday mass. He mentions one incident in Kaunas Province when enraged church goers beat up the officer and retrieved their property. He has heard of other violent confrontations. And on the whole he thinks it is good that people are rising up to claim their rights. "Our government," he argues usually begins with small steps, and increases the pressure if it meets no resistance. As evidence, he mentions an 1890 incident in Suvalkai Province. There, claiming that Lithuanian sleighs damage roads, officials insisted that people change to Russian-style ones. After several of the banned sleighs were destroyed, people beat up several functionaries and

---

296 Dr. K. Grinius, "Petras Kriaučiūnas," *Studentų Varpas* (*The Students' Bell*), 1947 May, no. 3, pp. 19-22.

297 "Maskoliu norai ir darbai"("What the Muscovites Want and Are Doing"), *Ukinįkas*, 1891, no. 10, pp. 463-69; no. 11, p. 510-15.

everything quieted down. Now, people ride in the sleighs they always have and do not even know whether the prohibition is still in effect.

His conclusion? The Muscovites care nothing about people's welfare. Their only concern is to turn Lithuanians into Russians. But he does insist on a distinction which is easy to draw, but hard to put into practice: the enemy is the government and not individual Russians. He is aware of the many Russians who also are struggling against an abusive regime.

From Grinius's point of view, the expression "evil empire" is redundant: any empire is evil. Imperial policy makers are too far away from local concerns to do them justice, even when enlightened and acting with the best of intentions. Grinius, much like most of his contemporaries, saw Russification as malice. They overlooked the fact that a common language, history, sense of identity carry obvious benefits. There are genuine conflicts of interest. For example, a defendant on trial in a foreign language is at a disadvantage, a fact calling for the use of local languages. But difficulties in translation and the need for generally accessible records argues that a common language would better serve the interests of justice. This was the argument pressed by the minister of justice in the Duma in 1909: although reasonable, concern for the interests of defendants must be set aside in favor of the interests of the state.[298] Another example. The United States of the 1930s survived the Great Depression. But it was and is a homogeneous country, while the Soviet Union, lacking unifying elements, splintered in the face of more modest economic difficulties. Great powers have strategic interests and the power to override local concerns. The Panama Canal and Gibraltar are only a few of many examples. Grinius mocks Russian efforts to turn Kaunas into a fortified garrison town, although it was an obvious move given its location on the Russian side of the Nemunas, the main natural barrier in the region. As things turned out, the forts defending Kaunas were not significant in World War I. Eventually, the Soviets turned some of them into concentration camps and the Nazis--into killing grounds. But Kaunas cannot be imagined without the massive church which began life as an Orthodox cathedral and in local parlance is still called the church of the garrison, while only a handful know its formal, Catholic name.

According to Grinius, in fortifying Kaunas, the Muscovites turned grain fields and lush pastures into piles of dirt, on which they strut "like cocks on manure," displaying their glittering finery. Every summer, they hold maneuvers, wasting powder: "Well, at least it scares away crows." They do this so that

[298] Andrius Bulota defended individual interests, see *Lietuvos žinios*, December 12, 1909.

they can kill their neighbors—in Lithuanian, an unmistakable allusion to the Christian injunction. The Russian peasants who did most the work either settled in Kaunas or went home. Thus, only few are left on the Suvalkai side of the river and girls can travel to Kaunas without fear.[299]

In the same issue of *Vienybė lietuvininkų* we find a collection of Lithuanian news suggesting that it was a society in which the authorities were mistrusted and confrontations with the police were ordinary occurrences. Thus, at a river port below Kaunas, they were loading grain onto barges. But the potatoes—"the poor man's bread"—had rotted and people feared famine. A crowd of women gathered to stop the loading. The gendarmes were called and fights broke out. It turned out that many in the crowd were men dressed as women. Something similar happened near Vilnius, but in this case the protesters were Jews. They laid down on the railway tracks to prevent loaded trains from leaving and ignored even the pleas of a rabbi. There were other instances of mistrust. In a region with very sandy soil, farmers asked to be moved to a more fertile area. But when officials promised to do just that, fearing that they would be relocated to Russia, they protested that in Russia there would be no churches. To the present day, the region is known for mushrooms—in season, many stand by the roadside selling what they have gathered in the woods to supplement farm income. Similarly, in Suvalkai Province, the authorities began to register the poor. People wondered why. Were they planning to break up estates and distribute land or relocate the poor somewhere in Russia? A footnote on Lithuanian-Jewish relations. A Lithuanian was arrested for smuggling, while carrying in his wagon goods for a Jewish merchant. Unbeknownst to him, the goods were contraband tea. The lesson: people who befriend Jews are asking for trouble.

My sense is of an anarchic society in accordance with the Russian proverb that mine is only what I myself can guard and defend. No doubt, the authorities protected the gentry, their property and their privileges, but ordinary people had little reason to expect anything good. A reformer like Grinius faced the difficult task of awakening a dormant nation. But, perhaps, the greater challenge was to transform the prevailing mind-set so that government would be seen not as an enemy but as a friend and supporter. It is difficult after a century of oppression by a distant and foreign power to overcome prevailing cynicism and persuade people that good government is possible. In the later nineteenth century, an era sometimes referred to as the springtime of nations, the argument

[299] X., "Garliava," *Vienybė lietuvininkų*, 1891 September 29, no. 39, pp. 462-63.

had to be stated in national terms: we will do better when we govern ourselves. It seemed self-evident that good government is possible only when it is close to those governed, conducted in a language everyone can understand, only where one's friends and neighbors are its visible face. In the end, good government is possible only where there is an active and thoughtful citizenry.

To that end, the students in Moscow translated, adapted to Lithuanian conditions, and published in 1892 in Tilsit (not in Vilnius in 1863 as indicated on the title page), a pamphlet titled *Genių dėdė* (*The Woodpeckers' Uncle*). Some bibliographers assert that it is based on the work of Szymon Dickstein (1858-1884), a Polish Jew, socialist and popularizer of Marxism. In an 1948 interview, Grinius claims that the ideas were borrowed from Ferdinand Lasalle (1825-1864), a German-Jewish socialist, leaning towards democracy and nationalism. He refers to it as a translation and adaptation by a fellow student in Moscow, but in 1948 he comes close to claiming authorship.[300] The extent of Grinius's contribution cannot be established. But in his writings he mentions the pamphlet several times, with obvious pride. In one news item, possibly by Grinius, it is said to be a pamphlet which the authorities much fear.

At the time, the hierarchical conception of authority was dominant in the world in which Grinius lived: political legitimacy descends from the top down, with monarchs claiming to rule by the grace of God, as British coins proclaim to the present day and American coins faintly echo.[301] Many Marxists, certainly Lenin, understood authority hierarchically, founding political legitimacy on the pragmatic equivalent of God, namely the Will of History as revealed to those who read the sacred texts piously. The hierarchical conception of authority is grounded in dogmas. Concerning Jewish religion Cohen writes: "Of course, if you claim to be in possession of a special revelation, then you have a mortgage on the truth of the universe, the other fellow can have nothing true to tell you...." Lenin, like many hard-core Marxists, believed himself to have a mortgage on truth and other fellows had nothing to tell him.[302]

The difference between history as conceived by Marxists and the God of religion is a metaphysical one. In practice there is little difference because for

---

300 Grinius, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878," p. 128; "Grinių dėdė," ("An Uncle of the Grinius Family"), *Naujienos*, 1949 January 15, 29.

301 Schrad, *Vodka Politics*, provides examples of hierarchical authority: at times, guests of various czars had to drink themselves into a stupor, whether or not they wanted to. In Schrad's view, Stalin was the supreme autocrat of the dinner-table, often cheating by having his own glass filled with wine (pp. 2-9).

302 Cohen, *A Dreamer's Journey*, p. 216.

both, history is a drama directed by non-human powers, leading to an inevitable glorious conclusion. For both, in the end, mankind shall ascend unto glory. Thus, both Marxists and religious believers can think of themselves as agents of a higher power. Both can evade criticism and responsibility by seemingly profound references to the mysterious ways in which higher powers work. Soviet propaganda obfuscated much by talk of the "objective conditions" of socialism. Neruda saw Stalin not as a politician to be judged by secular standards, but as History Incarnate. Stalin, perhaps in mockery, on some occasions said that he was only doing the will of God.[303] Often, but especially around 1905, Grinius accused Catholic priests of preaching the divine origin of authority and dwelling on the virtue of obedience. In later years, he was to encounter similar themes in Fascism and National Socialism. For us, the humble origin of democratic authority is not a defect but the basis of its legitimacy. But in 1892 Grinius and other advocates of democracy confronted a centuries-old identification of aristocracy and authority, encrusted in pomp and circumstance.

The voice of experience in *Genių dėdė* is a somewhat older farmer who has been to America. He is known not by his name but as the Woodpeckers' Uncle. The discussion begins with a timely question considering that it takes place in a tavern: why are drinks so expensive, when distilling is simple and cheap? In part, Uncle explains, it is because distillers make a profit. But mostly, because alcohol is heavily taxed, as much as 3.79 rubles per bucket. In fact, there is a tax on tobacco and most other goods, including matches, a necessity in a world of wood stoves. It is true that the wealthy too pay taxes, but for them, they are not a burden. And where does the tax money go? To the czar and his many relatives. Little is spent on schools.

From taxes, the discussion broadens out to questions about the meaning and value of freedom. Many remembered serfdom and were not sure whether things had changed much for the better. Then they labored for others, driven into the fields by overseers, now they do the same driven by want. And local self-government granted by the czar makes no difference. No matter what people ask for, the government ignores them. Should a village meeting ask for Lithuanian schools, or courts and other offices in which they can be understood, there is no hope of a favorable response. In the end, there is one and only one solution. An elected government limited by a constitution must replace absolute monarchy.

303 Sebag Montefiore, *Young Stalin*, p. 75. According to him, perhaps Stalin saw himself as the "supreme pontiff of the science of History."

Somewhat naively, ignoring the well-met fellows mentioned earlier, Uncle explains that under a constitutional government bad officials simply would not be re-elected. There is favorable comment on the assassination of the czar, but the main burden is placed upon enlightenment and activism. Serfdom, he asserts, was abolished because people began to rebel. When the discussion broke up, everyone went home convinced that "salvation depends upon ourselves."

The pamphlet raises no questions about the relation of Lithuania to the empire. Given that Grinius and his fellow students in Moscow were aware of the rise of nations in Europe, the question must at least have been lurking in the background. But, for one reason or another, they ignored national and emphasized class differences. In the world as it is at present, workers labor and make things, while the upper classes produce nothing and still stuff their pockets with cash. The upper classes are made up of landowners, factory owners, wealthy merchants, governors, generals. Appropriately, given the emphasis on education, teachers are not included among idlers who doing none of the work appropriate the benefits. The injustice of prevailing class divisions is brought out sharply by Uncle's claim that there is enough wealth in the world to more than meet everyone's needs for food and clothing. The problem is one of distribution and not lack of resources. Some live in luxury and others barely escape starvation, and not always even that.

We should recall that most readers were peasants, in their view suffering because they either owned no land at all or not enough. Thus, Uncle's insistence that land should belong to those who work it is not surprising. The principle has a radical socialist, and even Marxist, ring. But in a Lithuanian context it was generally understood in terms of private individual ownership. Memories of grandfathers who referred to outhouses as communes survive to the present day. Properly understood, the principle was regarded as a self-evident principle of justice, transcending ideology. It became the cornerstone of Lithuanian politics, underlying the redistribution of land begun in the early 1920s and spearheaded by a Christian Democrat priest. In 1940-1941, the very Communists who had brutally crushed an independent peasantry in the Soviet Union, in Lithuania solicited support by distributing land to small, independent farmers.

Uncle suggested that most of the tax money is wasted on the army and high living, a frequent theme of Lithuanian anti-czarist propaganda. One example. In 1905 *Ukininkas* published an unsigned article, on the subject of where does our tax money go. Over 30% is spent on the military, over 20% on the debt, 2% on

education, 1% on the czar and his court and family. The year is not made clear. But it is noted that in 1894, out of an annual budget of over 700 million rubles, 1,200,000 rubles were spent on the czar's wedding and it is suspected that another 500,000 went to the czar's mistress, "retired" before the marriage. In countries with parliaments, the author points out, the people through their representatives decide on how they are to be taxed and how the funds are to be spent.[304]

Fables are both entertaining and instructive. The setting is familiar: people gripping, encouraged by a drink or two. The issue is posed in terms which everyone can understand: why am I breaking my back so that the czar's useless cousins live in luxury? And in this way, the discussion moves on to philosophy, to reflections on the origin and nature of authority. Inciting people to reflect on fundamental questions should be part of any program of enlightenment. Grinius's emphasis is on factual, scientifically based information. This can be shown easily by sheer numbers. But while information is important, by itself, its spread will not transform a society from one of subjects to one of citizens. The fact that he encouraged the publication of this and several similar fables shows that he also appreciated the importance of reflection on fundamental questions.

Not a fable, but in the genre of thought-provoking stories, is a translation from the Polish of a dialogue between father and son, in effect, a casuistry session in an ethics course. It is symbolic of changing times that it is the son who raises difficult philosophical questions, while the father defends established norms. At one point, exasperated and confounded, the father orders the son to go watch a trained monkey in the town square. In his case, wisdom did not grow with age. The conversation begins with the misfortunes of a neighbor, in prison for petty theft. The father insists that all thieves should be punished. But the son retorts that the man stole because he had no money to pay for what his dying wife needed, that she died while he was in prison, that his daughters took up with Muscovites because they had no means of support. Not swayed, the father still insists. There is a socialist angle because he is the owner of a brick factory. The boy responds with questions. What would father do if they themselves were starving? Would not allowing them to die be worse than stealing? And what is the difference between those who steal and those who do not pay their workers

---

304 "Kur dingsta mūsų sudėti mokesčiai?" ("Where Do Our Taxes Disappear?"), *Ukininkas*, 1905, no. 7, pp. 175-85. For payment to the mistress see Simon Sebag Montefiore, *The Romanovs, 1613-1918* (New York: Vintage Books, 2017), p. 481.

a fair wage? As a Christian in heaven, how would father explain to his workers that he did not pay them what they were worth?[305]

In the summer of 1891 Grinius made another walking tour, spending some time in the vicinity of Kaunas. His impressions were published early in 1892. Kaunas, he writes, has changed. Years ago, the dominant language was Polish, but now it is Russian. The rapid change is somewhat encouraging, suggesting that Lithuanian could as easily replace Russian. At the same time, the change is evidence that Lithuanians cannot hope for Jewish support. Most of the inhabitants of Kaunas are Jews and Jews always accommodate themselves to whoever is in power. Thus, when Russians became dominant, Jews abandoned Polish and learned Russian.

We would now say that this behavior is not distinctively Jewish. After all, Lithuanians in the United States adapt themselves to the dominant culture. In that sense, Grinius's reflections appear to have an anti-Semitic tinge, especially because he adds that Jews always support "victors and oppressors." As things stand, Lithuanians are slaves to Jews, unable to do anything without them, "neither buy nor sell, neither die nor be born." But at this point he develops his argument in the opposite direction. It turns out that the problem is not Jewishness in any racist sense, but Jewish clericalism. He writes that we can expect nothing good from Jews until they end their isolation, "abandon their fanatical and superstitious Talmud, rid themselves of rabbinical rule." This will take a long time. A contributing factor is the persecution of Jews, because persecution strengthens the bonds among those persecuted and sharpens differences between the persecuted and their oppressors. Thus, if we want to get some benefit from Jews, we ourselves have "to change our attitude and behavior towards Jews." And he ends with a very modern thesis, that in mixed marriages, the religion and nationality of children should depend on the wishes of parents. The state has no business interfering. He cites as something that can only happen in Muscovy that children of religiously mixed marriages must be raised as Orthodox, including, for example, the children of a Muslim father and a Lutheran mother.[306]

How are we to understand an argument beginning with seemingly anti-Semitic premises and ending with a liberal conclusion? My sense is that of an immature writer who is beginning to appreciate difficulties raised by minorities, but is unable to express himself clearly, that is, introduce the needed

---

305 G. K., "Šis-tas" ("Something"), *Varpas*, 1892 April-May, no. 4-5, pp. 79-80; no. 7, p. 108.

306 "Kaunas," *Varpas*, 1892 February, no. 2, pp. 29-30.

qualifications. In the case of Jews in Lithuania, the problem was even more serious because of conflicting economic interests, with the two standing on opposite ends of most business transactions. However that may be, Grinius is consistent in his anti-clericalism. If dominance by clerics is bad for Lithuanians, it must be bad for Jews. Furthermore, by recognizing the rights of parents, he is espousing a principle radically at odds with Marxist ideology. The Soviet Union did not abolish clericalism but pushed it to extremes, with priests and rabbis replaced by party first secretaries. The function of the latter was to insure that the masses did not deviate from Truth. We should recall that by this stage Grinius was familiar with Spencer's view of the purpose of government and his belief that socialism would end up by abolishing individual liberties.

As a historical note I might add that Grinius was mistaken in believing that Lithuanians would receive no help from Jews. The two found common ground during the Duma period. A number of Jews fought on the Lithuanian side during the wars of independence.[307] Several made important contributions to Lithuanian jurisprudence and public health. Many of the Jews in Vilnius dreaded Polish anti-Semitism, a fear exploited by Lithuanian propaganda. I might add that in the years of independence, only a small handful of educated Lithuanians succumbed to anti-Semitism. President Smetona made a special point of meeting visiting Jewish political and intellectual leaders. At least among the educated, there was the attitude and behavior that Grinius called for.

Grinius, like many others in his time, saw the Lithuanian awakening as part of a widespread struggle against imperialism and for democracy. In May 1891 students representing nearly a dozen Slavic nations in Austro-Hungary gathered in Prague. They agreed on a number of resolutions with which, in Grinius's view, Lithuanians should become acquainted. His obvious but unstated intent was to broaden the discussion from concerns about language and national survival to reflections on the constitutional arrangements needed for good government.

The Prague gathering called for autonomy for each nationality within its ethnographic boundaries, united with others in a federation modeled on Switzerland. The Swiss model was popular at the time and was often invoked as the best alternative to empires. It would have allowed even very small groups to flourish, at the same time preventing fragmentation. But it was rarely implemented successfully. Having witnessed the dissolution of Yugoslavia and

[307] Jewish involvement in the wars of independence is reflected in *Pažadėtoji žemė—Lietuva* (*The Promised Land—Lithuania)* (Vilnius, 2013).

Czechoslovakia, we would be more skeptical and pay more attention to social barriers. In the end, Grinius himself saw no possibility of genuine federation. But the inexperienced enthusiasts in Prague assumed that good intentions would prevail. And having agreed on federation, they proceeded to other matters.

They called for progressive taxation on wealth, with exemptions for necessities such as salt, bread, meat. They wanted free education, including university, so that even the poorest would have access. The courts, including the services of defense attorneys, should also be without cost. There should be information centers so that people planning to emigrate to America would not be deceived by unscrupulous recruiters. Governments should support temperance and ignore the fact that alcohol taxes produce much revenue. Instead of standing armies, there should be militias, with military training available in schools. There should be an international court to resolve disputes and prevent wars. At the core was the call for the greatest freedom possible, so that everyone, explicitly including women, could concern himself with public affairs. Thus, the emphasis was on citizenship.

An inconsequential gathering voicing commonplaces in later years familiar to American progressives. But it was a public and free discussion of public affairs, while secretive conclaves were the best *Varpininkai* could hope for, if they managed to avoid detection. Later German nationalism was a narrowing of vision. Its goal was to rid Germany of alien accretions. The Lithuanian awakening was a widening, an attempt to make Lithuanians aware of the scientific and political currents in the wider world. In this tradition, decades later, the leading Lithuanian public intellectual lectured to students leaving for foreign universities that their mission was to bring back what was best in foreign cultures. Incidentally, the idea that there is much to be learned abroad can be found in the America of the nineteenth century. It is less likely to be found at present.

Thus, important is not the gathering itself, but that Grinius decided to bring it to the attention of a wider audience. Among the speakers was the Ukrainian socialist Ivan Franko, mentioned in connection with the machine for chopping fodder. He told the students that they were not here to celebrate a specific Slavic civilization opposed to the civilization of the West. Their future was not one of empty words but of hard work to meet the needs of Slavic workers. Beginning with their own nations, they were to progress and work for the benefit of all. Masaryk, idolized by Lithuanians in later years, also was there. He expected few benefits from politics. Rather, their way was the way of civilization. They were to work for the benefit of the greatest number, trying to draw in as

many workers as they could. They should not strive for mastery over others, but demand good relations between all, so that all should be equal and free. They should lead the Czech and the other nations out of ignorance, elevate them morally and economically. Another speaker, declaring his belief in progress, refused to idolize the past. He had faith that they could improve the lives of everyone.[308]

Many would have read about this gathering of the Slavs of Austro-Hungary with envy. Nothing like it would be possible in the Russian empire for more than a decade, both because of political repression and the shortage of educated Lithuanians. Another adaptation from the Russian by Grinius, this one about the Ukrainian radical party in Galicia, served to underscore both the differences between the two empires and Lithuania's backwardness. Grinius added an introductory note to the effect that both the Ukrainians and the Lithuanians have been among the world's "pariahs," preyed upon by the more powerful and energetic. But the Ukrainians have awakened and much can be learned from them. According to Grinius, the Ukrainians themselves have learned much from "progressives" everywhere. The radicals are no longer content to demand recognition as a nation, for example, to insist that Ukrainians should not be thought of as Poles. They have also taken up the "real concerns" of people. They have undertaken to explain what rights Ukrainians enjoy under the Austrian constitution and have allied themselves with other parties struggling to make the constitution more democratic.[309]

In a hierarchically structured autocracy, matters of public policy were private, to be discussed only by a few even of the ruling elite. In the Russian empire, an organization of citizens representing different classes, able to formulate a coherent political program would have appeared a distant utopian dream. It is true that Pilsudski's Polish Socialist Party was organized in 1892, but in Paris and few if any Lithuanians had so much as heard of it at the time. The *Varpininkai* themselves waited to 1902, but even then failed to agree on a platform. Thus, Grinius's list of the demands made by the Ukrainian radicals was an indication of the great distance which the Lithuanian awakening still had to cover.

A curiosity from our point of view was the proposal to establish centers for the distribution of salt, to be sold at cost, without profit. Before the advent of refrigeration, salt played an important role in insuring a supply of food in winter and spring. Of more contemporary relevance is the proposal to abolish

---

[308] Gr. K., "Susivažiavimas slaveniškos progresyviškos jaunumėnes Austra-Vengrijoj 1891 m." ("The Gathering of the Progressive Youth of Austra-Hungary, 1891"), *Varpas*, 1892 October, no. 10, pp. 142-44.

[309] Kg., "Galicijos rusinų radikališka partija" ("The Radical Party of Little Russians in Galicia"), *Varpas*, 1892 November, no. 11, pp. 157-59.

the Austrian royal lottery which "sucks out the last farthing from the poorest." (Lotteries are generally viewed as a regressive taxes. Independent Lithuania had a lottery.) Necessities should not be taxed, but taxes should be raised on the "playthings and ornaments of the wealthiest."

Often, socialism is understood as a dogma demanding public ownership of the means of production. The gathering was not socialist in that sense. But in its efforts to speak for the most disadvantaged it was socialist, but in a broader sense. When a decade later the *Varpininkai* began to organize themselves as a political party, they saw themselves as spokesmen for the landless and small farmers. Two provisions of the Ukrainian program focused on the needs of these classes. The first concerned bankruptcy. The minimum necessary for sustaining a farmer and his family should not be auctioned off. In fact, a farmer's land should never be sold to satisfy debtors. The second provision called for the granting of grazing rights on royal lands to landless farmers. Other provisions need not concern us, except the demand for the abolition of class barriers. Farmers and members of the gentry should have equal voting rights, with everyone 21 and older enjoying the right to vote. As will be seen later, the bewildering rules for Duma elections divided society into curiae, seriously harming Lithuanian interests.

We have encountered the word progressive in Grinius's account of the gathering of Slavic students in Prague. The term has many American associations, historical and present day. As this is being written, it has once again been brought to public notice by the failed presidential aspirations of Bernie Sanders. Grinius is beginning to see himself as a Lithuanian progressive, that is, as both a member of a national community and as an agent of reform in line with the movement sweeping Europe. Several short pieces serve to bring out his adherence. In one case, he is somewhat annoyed that a "progressive Polish newspaper" in estimating the population of Poland counted Lithuanians as if they were Poles. He comments that this has to be "either an error or ignorance on the part of the writer because such a [progressive] newspaper could not do this deliberately."[310] Thus, in his view, no progressive would slight another nationality intentionally. After all, progressives everywhere, everyone in his own backyard, strive for the same ideals and respect the aspirations of others.

Grinius was a man of many trades, while language was one of his life-long interests. Thus, in 1946, in a refugee camp for displaced persons, he wrote an essay about making it easier to learn Lithuanian, arguing that Lithuanian words

[310] K. G., *Varpas*, 1892 October, no. 10, p. 146.

are too long and suggesting ways to make them shorter.[311] He was an eclectic reader. In 1892, using the work of a Polish linguist, he compiled a list of Polish words of Lithuanian origin. Was he responding to claims that civilization flowed in one direction only? Be that as it may, the list includes several suggestive borrowings, among them the word for tar (*degutas*). It raises the possibility that Poles borrowed the very important technology of water-proofing without which rivers would have never become trade-routes. Grinius adds that the Russian word for tar shows the same origin. Three other borrowings could be evidence of Polish contempt for Lithuanians. All three indicate someone lazy, shiftless.[312] But I hasten to warn that I am not a linguist.

But to return to Grinius and progressivism. In another adaptation from the Russian, instead of progressives we find Russian liberals. The upshot? A common language does not guarantee political loyalty. Witness the Irish. Centuries of oppression have eliminated Gaelic from among the educated, but the Irish remain uncompromising separatists. These Russian liberals were critical of Russification policies in Estonia and Latvia. In 1891 the Estonians held their first song festival. It began with expressions of loyalty to the czar. Yet many Russian newspapers urged the government not to allow the festival to take place, holding such festivals to be separatism, that is, a threat to the empire. Estonians complain that they are at a disadvantage in courts because the proceedings are in Russian. Would it not be easier to teach Estonian to a few officials than Russian to all Estonians? And Latvians want to make their language suitable for science and literature. What is the harm in that? Russians did the same a century ago. The Czechs and the Poles did it more recently. Why should for Estonians and Latvians a fully developed language be only a dream?[313]

There is contemporary note in this account: the government was adopting bad policies in response to media pressure, even though conservative fears had no factual basis. And an argument could be made that there would have been less separatism had imperial authorities welcomed and supported the cultural and economic aspirations of subject nationalities. After all, Lithuanian political claims

---

311 Dr. K. Grinius, "Ko galima laukti iš lietuvių kalbos?" ("What We Can Expect from the Lithuanian Language?"), *Mūsų viltis*, (*Our Hope*), 1946 April 19, no. 9-10, p. 2.

312 "Nekurie lenkiški žodžiai lietuviškos kilties" ("Some Polish Words of Lithuanian Origin"), *Varpas*, 1892 October, no. 10, p. 145-46

313 G. K., "Atsišaukimas Maskolių lyberalų apie tautišką krutėjimą mažesniųjų Maskolijos tautų" ("The Attitude of Muscovite Liberals Towards the National Movements of the Small Nations of Muscovy"), *Varpas*, 1892 April-May, no. 4-5, p. 78.

arose mostly in response to persecution and poverty. Pilsudski could dream of securing Poland's future on the battlefield, Poles being numerous enough, especially if counting as generously as Madame Pilsudska. Lithuanians and other small nations had no choice but to make do with whatever others made available.

Detail is important in destroying the widespread caricatures of the national movements of this time. For someone like Grinius, the awakening is as much political, social, economic, as it is national. Only someone obtuse would not have seen that chances for reform were better in a small region than in a vast empire. While Lithuania had her conservative Polish aristocrats, these enjoyed less power than the counts and dukes infesting imperial centers.[314] And as it turned out, it took exile and slaughter for Russia to rid herself of them. In Lithuania, the estate owners lost what privileges they had through the redistribution of land. And why not appeal to people bound by a common language and other historical ties, even if some of that history has to be invented? But once again we should be aware of the possibility that had Russian policies been different, the Lithuanian response would have been different.

The wide range of Grinius's interests is shown by his translation of an essay by the Russian philosopher, Vladimir Solovyov. The main thesis is much in line with Grinius's own emphasis on education. Solovyov argues that social and political reforms by themselves will not suffice to improve the human condition. It will take human beings who are wise, able, and of strong character. There is a contemporary sounding emphasis on ecology: some Russian regions suffer from drought because of deforestation. Before undertaking his Virgin Lands campaign, Khrushchev would have profited from a reading: Solovyov thinks that opening up new areas to agriculture would despoil the forests and rivers and would have few benefits.[315]

In the late nineteenth century, American public opinion was not favorable to Russia. An important influence was the American traveler and journalist George Kennan (1845-1924), whose account of the lives of imprisoned Russian revolutionaries was serialized in the *Century,* and published in book form as *Siberia and the Exile System* (1891). In 1892 Grinius adapted several of Kennan's articles for Lithuanian readers, likely by way of a Russian translation. As Grinius

[314] After the lifting of the press ban, almanacs published in Lithuania included lists of members of the royal family, perhaps a hundred names of the emperor's children, aunts and uncles, their children, etc.

[315] Vladymyr Solovjov, "Tikri ir netikri keliai del pagerinimo žmonių buvio" ("Genuine and Dubious Ways of Improving the Human Condition"), *Varpas*, 1892 November, no. 11, pp. 156-57; adapted by K. G. In independent Lithuania, Solovyov religious writings were an important influence.

saw it, Kennan was trying to explain why young Russians are opposed to czarism, to the point of plotting assassinations. In fact, Alexander II was assassinated in 1881, after several failed attempts. This czar was, it might be added, a reformer whose great achievement was liberation of the serfs, a few years earlier than Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. By way of explanation, Kennan emphasized the terrible conditions under which Russian revolutionaries were imprisoned. His account is based on interviews with hundreds of prisoners, revolutionaries, and officials with knowledge of prison conditions. It is a vivid and detailed account, emphasizing the complete lack of sympathy for ordinary human feelings. An example is the case of a young woman who died in prison. Her mother wanted to know when her daughter would be buried so she could pay her last respects. When she went to the prison at the appointed time, she learned that she was too late. The functionary dismissed her protest: "It is our business." Grinius has Kennan asking: "What would you, the reader, do in such circumstances?" Vengeance would violate Christian precepts, but would be entirely in keeping with human nature. We cannot condemn people as bloodthirsty fanatics because, after suffering such blows and having no means of redress, they should resort to the first things that come to hand.[316]

Whatever may have been the biases and shortcomings of Kennan's account, it urged Lithuanian readers to view their struggle over national rights as part of a broader and more fundamental challenge to the imperial system. It also raised questions about the means to be employed. No doubt, for Grinius, education and enlightenment was the necessary condition, a foundation and starting point for everything else. It is less clear how he responded to calls for violence and terrorist tactics. He certainly advocated civil disobedience. My sense is that he had some sympathy for resistance involving even violence, especially around 1905, but had little hope that terrorism would lead to good outcomes. In his memoirs he comments that Alexander III strove to restore despotic rule by undoing the liberal reforms of the assassinated Alexander II. In another place, he remarks that the reforms attracted a number of educated Lithuanians who became Russophiles and encouraged assimilation as the best way of improving conditions in Lithuania.[317]

---

316 George Kennan, "Prison Life of the Russian Revolutionaries," *The Century*, 1887 December, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 285-97; "Gyvenimas maskoliškų revoliucijonierių kaliniuose," *Varpas*, 1892 November, no. 11, pp. 160-63; 1892 December, no. 12, pp. 171-72; translated by Kg.

317 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 161; 1: 249.

VII The Value of the National Idea

Given the absence of diaries, letters, even intimate, revealing accounts by friends, the biographer has no choice but to rely on published texts. In the case of Grinius, these early writings show him to be a progressive working to educate people so that instead of remaining subjects they become citizens. The former live in a confining circle of personal concerns, the latter are aware of the wider world and are interested and active in public affairs. He argues after weighing the good and the bad, in spite of risks, that reform movements should be national, interacting with similar movements elsewhere in the spirit of cooperation. Surveying the nineteenth century, he finds everywhere a strong link between national awakenings and progress.

I have already mentioned his 1891 talk on the value of the national idea to his fellow students in Moscow. It is impossible to establish what revisions, if any, he made when publishing the talk in 1893. But in the published version he lists what he calls the national idea as the most recent of a series of great ideas, ideas so full of promise to improve the human condition that their spread was not stopped even by the most severe persecution. The first is Christianity, which the power of Rome could not prevent from spreading. Next is the Reformation, which freed "human minds and consciences from the shackles of medieval

scholasticism." Third is the great French Revolution, the ideas of which dispersed widely in spite of many efforts to suppress them and gave rise to new great ideas. Among the latter is the national idea.

Some at present might criticize Grinius for being Euro-centric. His vision of European history has a Hegelian feel and, for all we know, he could have acquired some familiarity with Hegel's philosophy of history from his fellow students. But a Hegelian reading would suggest that the national idea is not the last word. Perhaps, like its predecessors, it will become a permanent aspect of the human spirit, but eventually lose the central place which it presently holds. However, Grinius's chief failure is failure to make explicit his understanding of the link between the French Revolution and the rise of nations. But there are hints that his view would be something like the following. A nobleman in Lithuania could find more common ground with a distant cousin in Belorussia, and even Poland, than with his malodorous manure mucking serf. No matter where they lived, members of the gentry tended to treat local cultures contemptuously and dismiss them as vulgarity. In this way, the gentry could at least think of themselves as cosmopolitan and not national. In earlier centuries, the prominence of Latin among the learned can be explained by the fact that it was the only written language and boasted of an extensive literature. But the dominance of English in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, of Polish in Lithuania, especially the use of French in Russia, has many elements of snobbery.[318] The Revolution brought the lower classes into the foreground. As the idea of equality took hold and long pedigrees came to impress only a few, aristocracts were overwhelmed by sheer numbers. With the rise of the masses the vernacular established itself in the public sphere, and aristocrats had little choice but to go along. In fact, something like that happened in Lithuania. Some of the gentry left for Poland, while many remained and learned the new ways.

In the article in question, Grinius judges the national idea from an instrumental point of view. The idea encourages people to work for the good of others. Thus, in place of egoism it fosters altruism. It unites many, even those of different religions, in the name of a common cause. Grinius notes that the Protestant Parnell and Catholic priests are working together for the freedom of Ireland. It energizes people, enabling them to undertake tasks which initially appeared impossible. The new found energy and dedication improves the well-being of everyone. People become better educated, better-off economically. Their morals

[318] Even in present-day English, only the use of names of bodily functions of Latin origin is considered polite. The vulgar 'piss' has gained ground in recent decades, but not in its direct sense.

improve. The Bulgarians are an example. They used to lead miserable lives. Now they are becoming wealthier. In cities, they became merchants, built schools, sent their sons to study abroad. In language which Grinius does not use at this point, we can generalize and describe this development as a transition from a hierarchical and rural to a more egalitarian and urban culture. Following improvement of their spiritual and material circumstances, the Bulgarians began to call for self-government.

It is suggestive that he mentioned Irish unity, which exists in spite of religious differences. Without saying so, he comes near claiming that patriotism is the only sentiment powerful enough to prevent religious strife. In Lithuania religious interests were being pushed aside by secular ones. The prospects were real that society would be shattered by a culture war, when unity was called for in the face of the many economic and social challenges. At the time, the national idea could well have seemed to be the only available glue. I might add that if this was his vision, it was somewhat simplistic. As later experience shows, both sides needed time to grow up. The secularists had to abandon their exaggerated anti-clericalism. A generation of educated Catholic laymen had to arise, capable of distinguishing religion from the institutional interests of churches. But by the late thirties, Grinius and his political associates found common ground with the Young Catholics. Both sides realized that they were equally committed to democracy, reform, and Lithuania.[319]

Bulgaria was not the only country in which, according to Grinius, nationa-lism was the primary force pushing for progress and justice. Here and in other places, he provides a longish list. There are stirrings even in the remote regions of the Russian empire, with nations beginning to struggle for recognition. The Lithuanian movement is little more than ten years old and there already are noticeable gains. It is important that in many places nationalism goes hand in hand with democracy and helps to improve the lives of the most impoverished. Some despise nationalism and proclaim themselves cosmopolitans. But in their case, cosmopolitanism is only a cover for "spiritual and moral misery." He

[319] One example. With exceptions, Catholic clergy considered everyone baptized to be a Catholic, regardless of his actual state of mind. This meant that he had to be married in church, buried in a Catholic cemetery, and his children to receive religious instruction, regardless of preferences. While the official defense was theological, many suspected that the motives were financial. Rising Catholic laymen accepted the liberal principle that religious adherence was a matter for individuals. In turn, Grinius and his group softened their opposition to Catholic schools. Where marriages and burials were concerned, rabbinical conferences also tended to disregard individual preferences.

asserts that there are genuine cosmopolitans but does not explain how they differ from the fraudulent ones.

The democratic credentials of the national idea are enhanced by the fact that it can be understood even by those lacking education. And with reference to Lithuanian concerns about the survival of the language, he finds encouraging evidence. In recent years there have been cases where "little languages" have pushed back and regained ground from "powerful languages." A suggestive choice of words: at issue is not inherent superiority but size and power.

One of Grinius's observations in this 1893 essay could be turned against Lithuanian interests. In the past, new states arose through diplomatic intrigues and the whims of princes. Now, some account has to be taken of "ethnographic and national questions" and, most importantly, the wishes of the people themselves. This is an advance in the direction of democracy, as he suggests. But a policy maker in Saint Petersburg could interpret the principle as favoring Russification. Likely, the majority of the inhabitants of the empire preferred a Russia unified by language and religion, much like Americans favor an English speaking America and many, a Protestant one. Lithuania herself had minorities with different political aspirations. In the 1930's, a plebiscite in the Klaipėda (Memel) district would not have been to Lithuania's advantage. But Grinius is not the only one to have left the principle of national self-determination ill-defined.

He recognizes that the national idea has its dark side. It engenders chauvinism: some begin to think that their culture is so superior that by imposing it upon others they are helping them. For example, some Jews believe that they are God's chosen people, called to rule others. Germans, in the name of their superior culture, want to "devour" other nations. (He could have had in mind German efforts to assimilate the Lithuanians in Prussia.) The English come in for the harshest criticism. In the name of their calling to spread civilization, they harass the people of India, with opium poison the Chinese, starve the Irish, all the while explaining to their victims that they are doing this for their own good. Russia too has her "ultra-patriots." They believe that Russians are endowed with special virtues to which "rotten" Europe must eventually surrender.[320] A prophetic remark, considering Lenin's conceit that his band will initiate nothing less than a transformation of human nature.[321]

---

[320] K. G., "Vertė tautiškos idėjos," *Varpas*, 1893 March, no. 3, pp. 43-46.

[321] A Soviet dictionary of philosophy under "Socialism and communism" looks forward to the day when adherence to the principles of Communist morality will become "an internal human need and habit,"

Likely, the prominence of England reflects not exceptional malice, but a larger empire. Said writes: "By the late nineteenth century England's empire was pre-eminent in the world and the cultural argument for empire was triumphing."[322]

Said lays stress on the close connection between nationalism and imperialism. For obvious reasons, small nations lack power to indulge in imperial adventures or delude themselves with belief in the superiority of their way of life. This fact, emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between the nationalisms of large and small nations. I may add, that Grinius was not alone: during the years of independence sympathy for the victims of colonialism is often found in Lithuanian newspapers. As I write this, the Catalonian question is once again in the news. To my ears, commentary in the *New York Times* has too much of the bromide, "why do they not just learn to get along." I have read sympathetic accounts of Catalonian aspirations in Lithuanian newspapers in the 1930s.

We tend to place the rise of the small nations of Europe in one moral category and the collapse after World War II of the British and French empires in another. We tend to condemn "nationalism" in the one and admire "anti-colonialism" in the other. Grinius would not have found whatever differences there may be morally significant. In the earlier case, a number of self-governing units in Europe replaced three empires. Decades later, something similar occurred in Africa and Asia. And neither process took place without abuses by the rising nations.

Self-government, that is, democracy as near as possible to direct democracy, is Grinius's ideal. He finds a very strong connection between it and well-being, material and spiritual. The connection is prominent in another 1893 essay "Switzerland and Her Mountains." Grinius never traveled abroad as a tourist. His knowledge of Switzerland was derived from books. This piece is described as an

---

that is, replace all other motives. I cite a Lithuanian translation, *Filosofijos žodynas* (*Dictionary of Philosophy*), (Vilnius: Mintis, 1975), p. 398. Perhaps there are fairy tales as much in defiance of experience, but I have not read them. Notwithstanding, this is presented as the goal towards which the Party is directing Soviet society, with the suggestion that the inevitable scoffers should be dealt with. I might add that even Christian ascetic literature recognizes that the "old Adam" survives no matter what. Christianity is more sober in assessing the possibilities of human nature than Marxism.

322 Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, p. 187. Said recognizes American anti-imperialists, in his view, vocal but ineffective (p. 287). He mentions the philosopher William James, a critic of American policy in the Philippines. In a letter, in 1900 James wrote about the "great yankee bunco-steering confidence game played on the philipos." (*The Correspondence of William James*, vol. 9 (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 2001), pp. 167-68). In his *I Tell Everything: the Brown Man's Burden (a Book on India)* (1931) James's nephew, the journalist Edward Holton James (1873-1954) has a picture of a brown man carrying a steamer trunk on his head above the caption, the brown man's burden.

adaptation, but it is not clear what were his sources. It was edited and republished in 1905 in Lithuania after the lifting of the press ban. But political pressure was still felt by publishers. The 1893 version concludes with the question: "When will we Lithuanians be like they are? When will we chase out the Muscovites from our harassed homeland?" These sentences are not found in the 1905 version. Reference is to the readiness of the Swiss to rise as one man to defend their country.

It was not always thus. Centuries ago, the Swiss were under Austrian rule. The Austrian kings did whatever they pleased, much like the Muscovites are still doing in Lithuania. But then the Swiss revolted. The learned hold that William Tell never existed, but the Swiss still build monuments to him. It is not entirely clear whether Grinius agrees with the skeptics. But for him, whether legend or fact, Tell is an inspiration. For generations children have been taught to love their country and freedom just like Tell did. Historians like Snyder do not understand the educational value of myths and suppose their creators to have been more naive, or dishonest, than some in fact were.

The Swiss are an industrious, orderly, peaceful people, inured to hardships, living as they do in a rugged and dangerous country. Those familiar only with "our hills and rises" cannot even imagine their mountains, white with snow even in summer! It takes twelve hours to climb a mountain, in that span experiencing all seasons! Yet, they are prosperous and have good roads. They have tunneled under the mountains and built devices to protect themselves from avalanches.

Good roads alone would have made readers reflect on connections between prosperity, roads, self-government. Could Lithuania be impoverished because of the roads? Could the roads be terrible because decisions are made in remote places by rulers who rank the needs of the empire above local ones?[323] Could governments do more than levy taxes and force young men to leave their sweethearts never to be heard from again, perishing in places no one has heard of? We should recall the demand of the Slavic youth meeting in Prague for universal military training and militias instead of standing armies. Simplistic but alluring: militias defend homes, while armies—empires. However that may be, the Swiss have militias and no dreams of conquest. Every man receives military training. Everyone has a carbine, which he keeps in good order, fearing mockery if for no better reason. Marching drills are not important: they need to know how to climb and where the ravines and passes are. Of course, he adds, even militias are expensive and it would

[323] There still is no direct railway link between Kaunas, a major industrial and commercial center, and Klaipėda, the one seaport. This economic anomaly is a vestige of nineteenth century imperialism.

be better if there were no soldiers, so that the young men could engage in productive work and did not have live off the labor of others.

Grinius was not a pacifist, but he was very uneasy about soldiers and wars. Many in Lithuania owned weapons and hunting was a favorite sport of the upper classes. I have seen nothing to suggest that he owned a gun or hunted.

Given his interest in ethnography, we find many details about their customs, their way of life. When in spring upland pastures are ready, cows are lined up with the most beautiful one, adorned with flowers, at the head, while a bull carries a milking stool between his horns. Surrounded by herdsmen, with pipes and trumpets blaring, the cows bellowing and cow-bells ringing, the procession marches off for a summer in high places. There is a cauldron for making cheese. They make so much that after everyone gets a share, some remains for export. The Swiss are known for their cheese, for their watches and wooden toys. There are many things in Switzerland we have not even heard off, things which "would be useful among us." Thus, an ingenuous people who live well even in a country prone to flash-floods and avalanches and with little arable land. Material for reflection: why are we poor even though we have land enough and encounter fewer of the destructive forces of nature?

There are several other themes important in any project to educate subjects into self-reliant citizens. Growing up among dangers, the Swiss develop into "strong and brave men," acknowledging no superiors. In Switzerland, unlike Lithuania, you see no one humbling himself before another. In fact, they acknowledge no superiors but think of everyone as an equal. Grinius devotes much space to describing how in Switzerland ordinary people are involved in public decision-making, emphasizing that this would be very useful in Lithuania. Decisions about taxes and expenditures are made by everyone at community meetings. There is compulsory education and illiteracy is rare. The poor are helped by their communities. They see to it that the land is not deforested and cuttings are replanted. They have good schools, housed in the finest buildings, nothing at all like the wrecks housing the few school we have. There is a dig aimed at Catholic clergy, who charge fees for wedding and funerals, which even the poorest have to pay. In Switzerland, communities pay their clergy and there are no fees.

There is another lesson for Lithuanians. There are several nationalities in Switzerland, but they all think of themselves as Swiss. One nationality does not attempt to assimilate the others, but each has schools and conducts public life in its own language. A far cry from the Russian empire! We should recall, that

Grinius's own party changed its name from the Lithuanian Democratic Party to the Democratic Party of Lithuania, thereby moving their vision in the direction of Switzerland.

This tract advances the argument for direct democracy one step further. It emphasizes the advantages to the community when the assembled citizens have power to levy taxes and decide on budgets. In the Russian empire, at this time, village and town meetings could only petition. After 1905, local powers were increased, although less than someone like Grinius hoped for. Evidently, people were not sufficiently educated to discharge their new responsibilities properly. According to Schrad, the powerful and wealthy could get their way with free drinks.[324] Lithuanian newspaper accounts confirm this. For example, in 1906 in Šiauliai, the elected representatives agreed to build three schools, but also raised the pay of several town officials, after they bought several barrels of beer. According to the correspondent, "it was a jolly meeting."[325] Of course, the corrosive mixture of alcohol and politics was at work not only in Lithuania. Many American states ban the sale of alcoholic beverages on election days.

American tracts on liberty have pride of place. They were written a hundred years earlier and for a more sophisticated audience. They owe more to philosophy than to political experience. Grinius was not philosophically inclined. He devoted his energies not to analysis and argumentation but to the gathering of facts. He worked with instructive examples: Bulgarians, Czechs, The Swiss. The United States offered for reflection a century of democratic life. And much like American theorists of the eighteenth century, he concluded that people live best when they govern themselves. He was not attracted to anything approaching libertarianism, with its individualism and tendency to identify law and order with oppression. Nor was he attracted by the other extreme, at least implicit in Marx and explicit in Lenin, that the best government is government by philosopher kings. (Soviet writings declared Lenin to be the greatest of philosophers.) As far as I know, he was not familiar with the anarchism of Bakunin. I think he would have found Bakunin's stress on self-governing communities a good beginning, but only a beginning, because for Grinius central governments play an important role. Thus, the Swiss have not only communities, but also cantons and all of them together establish a central government which is in charge of affairs beyond the scope of individual cantons. This includes establishing a currency, organizing an army, and conducting foreign relations.

---

324 Schrad, *Vodka Politics*, pp. 102-104.

325 *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 June, no. 6, pp. 82-83.

Among remote places, the United States played an important role in Lithuanian imaginations. Educated Lithuanians had heard of reformist writers such as Harriet Beecher Stowe,[326] Henry George. *Varpas* in 1892 published Edward Bellamy's (1850-1898) story "Užsimerkus" ("With the Eyes Shut"), (1889) in Kudirka's translation of a Polish translation.[327] The story hails technological progress: a railway passenger instead of dozing and bored, listens with eyes closed to a recording of a book. A Lithuanian translation of Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888), a utopian vision of an industrialized society with equal distribution of wealth, was serialized in *Vienybė lietuvininkų* in 1897.

Emigration accounts for some of this interest, since many emigrants ended up in the United States. It is suggestive that in 1894, of the 22 periodicals in Lithuanian, seven were published in America. Many of these circulated in Lithuania. Perhaps a 100 or so of Grinius's own pieces appeared in *Vienybė lietuvininkų*, published in Plymouth, Pa. Another factor was the role of Tadeusz Kosciuszko (1746-1817) in the American Revolution, with emphasis on his Lithuanian connections. For example, in 1883 *Aušra*, exploiting the ambiguities of the name Lithuania, claimed that Kosciuszko was Lithuanian. The article emphasized that in 1794 some of his proclamations were published in Lithuanian, aimed as they were at the peasantry.[328] In 1896 some 120 Lithuanians—including about 15 women—gathered in Minersville, Pa. to mark the 150th anniversary of Kosciuszko's birth. The main speaker conceded that as a soldier he can be claimed by Poles, because he fought for Poland, but was Lithuanian in his origins.[329] In such contexts, Kosciuszko is depicted as the harbinger of revolutionary ideas of liberty and equality in Lithuania.

But it would be a mistake to think of Grinius as a starry-eyed innocent when it comes to the United States. Thus, in 1894, perhaps exaggerating in order to discourage immigration, in a survey of events in foreign lands, he noted that there is widespread unemployment in America. "Many of our Lithuanian brothers suffer from hunger." The article is interesting also because Muscovy and Poland are included among the foreign countries. Grinius does not pass up the opportunity to censure Russia for corruption. Many of the privately built

---

326 She and Mark Twain were the first American writers I heard of, except that I thought of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as a book for children.

327 *Varpas,* 1892 January, no. 1, pp. 3-5; 1892 February, no. 2, pp. 19-21.

328 "Tadeuszas Kasciuska buvo lietuvninkas" ("Tadeusz Kosciuszko was Lithuanian"), *Auszra*, 1883, no. 5, pp. 136-38.

329 *Vienybė lietuvininkų*, 1896 July 7, no. 28, pp. 334-35.

railroads are deeply in debt, and the government is forced to assume ownership, yet the developers are making huge profits. A better system could have been built at half the cost.[330] He returns to the suffering of the unemployed in America several months later. More are leaving America than arriving. And more would leave if they had money. But where can they get it if they are starving to death? Workers are losing to the "capitalists (the moneyed)" because of scabs (Grinius Lithuanianizes the English word). The scabs are mostly recent arrivals who, driven by want, are always willing to replace strikers. "For poor workers America is now a disaster. Many choose to end their lives because of hunger."[331]

Among the deadlier of many confrontations between workers and owners is known as the Lattimer Massacre of September 10, 1897. Of the 19 (Grinius counted 21) victims, four were Lithuanians shot outright, while another died from wounds. Listing them by name, Grinius adds that one left behind a wife and three children (not clear whether the family had remained in Lithuania). Many wanted to lynch (the word is Lithuanianized and is at times still used) the sheriff, but he went into hiding and surrounded himself with guards.[332] Perhaps by coincidence, after the massacre story, there is a brief unsigned item about the rise of American nativism. Employers are beginning to hire only those who speak English. Grinius, while reporting that there were three Poles among the killers, does not note that the confrontation pitted foreign-born workers and native-born owners. Michael Novak, in *The Guns of Lattimer* (1978) brings out that the marchers carried American flags as protection and knew little English.

For comparison, we should take note of the Kražiai massacre, which played an important role in mobilizing Lithuanian (and even Polish) opinion and is still frequently remembered. On November 22, 1893 a Cossack regiment attacked a crowd in Kražiai, a town in western Lithuania, protecting a church which the government was attempting to close and raze. Eventually, nine protesters were killed, some whipped to death. Four of the survivors were sentenced to 10 years of penal servitude. There was talk that the governor-general in Vilnius had deliberately provoked the confrontation as a career-move. He wanted to portray himself, as an iron fisted ruler capable of defending the empire no matter how serious the threat.[333]

---

330 Klapas, "Iš svetimų šalių" ("From Foreign Lands"), *Ukiniķas*, 1894 March, no. 3, pp. 22-23

331 "Iš svetimų šalių," *Ukiniķas*, 1894 September, no. 9, p. 72 (unsigned).

332 Uoga, "Amerika," *Ukininkas*, 1897 November, no 11, pp. 173-74.

333 R. U., "Vilniaus Orževskio žabangai" ("The Snares of Orzhevsky of Vilnius"), *Ukininkas*, 1896 June 1, no. 11, p. 85. Pyotr Orzhevsky was governor-general in 1893-1897. For an account see the *Times* (London), January 4, 1894, p. 5.

Grinius often urged Lithuanians to learn from Americans how to defend themselves. In 1894 it was announced that beginning in 1896, the distilling and sale of alcohol would become a government monopoly. "The Jews in our taverns will be replaced by *burlaks*," Grinius wrote. Local officials will gain even more power. There will be more Russians because *burlaks* will be appointed to serve as retailers, bar-tenders. Lithuanians should resist. They should imitate the people of Lombardy who boycotted cigars after the Austrians established a tobacco monopoly. Also Americans. As Grinius saw it, the Boston Tea Party and others protests against the royal tea monopoly played an important role in galvanizing Americans to struggle for independence. He then made a proposal which likely he would not have made in a country with established law and order. Many of our young men like to brawl. Would it not be better if they used their surplus energies to benefit their country? Perhaps, after the monopoly is in place, they should go around destroying liquor supplies? And in the meantime, why not teach some especially obnoxious "dog-face" a lesson?[334]

Years later, and from another perspective, Grinius formed a different opinion of the monopoly. It is good that profits accrue to the state and not to private individuals. It also good that state vodka is of better quality. Many, especially Jews, began to establish ale-houses and some drinkers changed from vodka to beer, thereby reducing alcohol consumption.[335]

A detailed account of American democracy is found in a longer essay from 1906, "Kaip valdosi amerikiečiai" ("How Americans Govern Themselves"). While this violates chronology, it is convenient to make note of it here. What most strikes Grinius is American liberty: people live as they please as long as they do not harm their neighbors. "In America, no one will ask you to show your passport, nor will the police search you, nor harass you for a Lithuanian newspaper or a careless word." A naïve view, to which many immigrants and African-Americans would have objected and could still object. But we should remember that he is writing for a minimally literate audience, used to thinking in broad-strokes with no interest in precision. And, even after necessary adjustments, the contrast between life in America and in czarist Muscovy remains.

---

334 "Maskolių vyriausybė žada pati degtinę šinkuoti!" ("The Muscovite Government Plans to Pour Drinks Herself") *Ukiniķas*, 1894 July, no. 7, pp. 49-50. A *burlak* is a person who made his living by hauling barges upstream. Lithuanians used the word in derogatory references to Russians.

335 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 21-22.

During the years of independence, seeing similarities, Lithuanians tended to view liberation movements in the Middle East, Africa, with sympathy. Many understood the aspirations of the Catalonians and Zionist Jews to live their own lives. But in the essay under discussion Grinius refers to Native Americans as "savages" who "vagabond" in the forests and prairies. He seems to understand that in resisting European settlements, the Indians were defending their way of life: "they did not want their hunting grounds to fall into the hands of white-faced newcomers." But in the end, he seems to favor the advance of civilization view of the conquest of the American continent. I might add that many Polonizers saw themselves as spreading a superior culture, witness Pilsudski's approval of assimilation.

There was one thing bad in the early years: there were many Negro slaves whom Americans used to work their fields as if they were animals.

Why is America so fortunate, so prosperous? Because there are no czars. Because she is governed by governments elected by the people. Only a congress of elected representatives can impose taxes. Declarations of war are not at the whim of the czar and his courtiers. Congress cannot take away the liberties granted by the constitution. Americans are free to speak, read, write, organize. There are very few political prisoners, while prisons in Lithuania are packed with political offenders. He provides a detailed account of elections and the work of the congress, details which need not concern us. But he emphasizes that in America, unlike many countries in Europe, there is no established religion: every American can profess whatever faith he likes, or if he prefers, no faith at all, and the government does not interfere. America has a civil registry and people cannot be forced to marry in church or have their children baptized. Furthermore, there is equality because there are no counts, dukes, princes. No reader could have failed to notice how far behind Muscovy lags.

It is suggestive that in the late 1890s, Grinius argues that even in Russia people have rights and encourages Lithuanians to demand them. Grinius invited his readers to reflect on some of the broader issues dealt with in political philosophy. Without using the words, he is aware of the differences between presidential and parliamentary democracies. In the United States, government ministers are not members of congress and the president has many powers, especially in foreign affairs. There is a division of powers, with the Supreme Court playing a very distinctive role. There is also a division of powers between the federal government and the member states. And the states do not want to secede because they are better off in a union. Curiously, he makes no mention of the

Civil War in which, for better or worse, power prevailed over the wishes of some of the states. No doubt he knew enough history and was not ignorant of the Civil War. But his failure to mention it bring into focus a question which Lithuanians were beginning to face: should they push for independence and risk a crushing military response? By then, few educated Lithuanians doubted that democracy was the best way to bring about progress and prosperity—the evidence of history was overwhelming, except in the eyes of those enchanted by Marxism. But was it better to accept the risk and struggle for independence or, bowing before the realities of power, try to transform the empire into a federation and hope for the best? For obvious reasons, it is more difficult to get a sense of still another alternative, perhaps represented by Pilsudski, that of joining forces with the Poles and accepting a revival in some form of the old Commonwealth. However, this path was also risk-laden, considering Madame Pilsudska's inability to distinguish between Poland and the Republic of Two Nations.

In "Kaip valdosi amerikiečiai," Grinius is describing America's Gilded Age, an era noted for the concentration of wealth and the political power of plutocrats. According to him, Republicans, now in power, are the party of industrialists, while Democrats—of land owners. The former work to make manufactured goods more expensive, the latter—grain. He draws from this an important conclusion, marking him as one of the progressives: democracy is not enough to insure general well-being, a just distribution of wealth is also necessary. He writes: "From this we can conclude that the democratic and republican governing of a country does not suffice for the happiness of the people. Many injustices persist. In addition to good government, the just distribution of wealth is necessary, so that one person could not have billions of dollars while millions of working people have barely enough for food."[336] In the Lithuania of that time, wealth was closely linked with land-ownership, a problem to which Grinius devoted much attention.

He did not follow American developments closely. Someone with more detail at his finger-tips would have mentioned Theodore Roosevelt and trust-busting, one of the early initiatives to force capitalism to take on a human face. But from his point of view, broad strokes were all that were needed since in 1906 Lithuanians were only beginning to discuss and evaluate specific policies. In later years, from time to time, he returned to American questions, but mostly in connection with the Lithuanian diaspora and hopes that it would contribute to the rebuilding of the country.

[336] Kazys Grinius, *Kaip valdosi amerikiečiai* (Vilnius: Lietuvos ūkininkas, 1906), p. 21.

VIII Established in Life

Late in 1893, or early in 1894 new style, having completed his nine-months on the Caspian Sea, Grinius returned, with 200 rubles in hand after paying off debts and shopping for necessities. After visiting parents and friends, he established himself in Marijampolė and in February began to receive patients. The flat, above a tavern, was small, perhaps 500 square feet, in an unsanitary neighborhood: in the street and yard stood piles of horse manure. But it was conveniently located, in the center of town, near the market place and the pharmacy. He hired an aged "*davatkėlė*" (diminutive of *davatka*) to cook and clean.

At times, his practice yielded a comfortable living, 1500-3000 rubles a year. But because he relocated several times, there were some financially troubling stretches. For office visits he charged 30 kopeks, 50 kopeks for house calls in town and more in the country, depending on distance. Considering that a three-four room flat with kitchen, storage shed for firewood, basement, but without heat or light, cost 120-150 rubles annually, he became one of the wealthier residents. Officials of lower-grade earned 15-25 rubles monthly. Curiously, he makes no mention of a horse. He must have been able at least to borrow a horse and buggy for night calls in the country. His was a general practice, treating all comers, but occasionally referring them to specialists. There was a hospital, with 32 beds, built about 90 years before by the Prussian government during the Prussian occupation. It was in the charge of a Polish "patriot," a man of good will,

who played the piano, chess, organized Polish amateur theater groups, and in his library had some of Kant's works in German, but disliked medicine. As a result, the hospital was much neglected. There were no specialists in Marijampolė. The nearest ones were in Koenigsberg, Vilnius, Warsaw.[337] When decades later Grinius himself needed eye-surgery, he traveled to Koenigsberg.

As Grinius recalls, in matters of health, the Russian government left Marijampolė and its surroundings mostly to fend for themselves. In 1894, some 600,000 inhabitants of Suvalkai Province were served by five hospitals with about 227 beds, that is, one bed for 2,500, when a reasonable minimum was one for 500. (The Jewish hospital had about 50 beds.) The ratio of physicians was one to 10,000, when the optimum was one to a 1000. In such circumstances it is not surprising that there was an endless supply of "medical specialists," including homeopaths, exorcists, and healers with untranslatable names, offering herbs, massages, elixirs, incantations. Grinius remembers a German-made "pain expeller," peddled in bottles labeled in Lithuanian, but printed in Gothic letters. He noticed an ad for the same remedy in a Lithuanian newspaper published in Chicago in 1945.[338]

This is not untypical of Grinius: even in his memoirs he avoided what he deemed personal and private. But he had an ear for amusing anecdotes, suggestive of deep-seated attitudes which he had to overcome. He remembers Dr. Tomas Smolskis, the son of serf, fluent in his native Lithuanian dialect, but married to a Polish woman and thus with a Polish family. It happened that at a funeral dinner Smolskis was seated next to a bishop who declaimed that scientific medicine was worthless, that even peasants do better. Pretending to agree, Smolskis told the story of a Jew who swallowed a silver ruble: Smolskis tried everything with no luck. However, after the Jew swallowed a potion from a healer, the ruble came out as small change. With some relish Grinius notes, that it took time for "his excellency" to catch on. Another time, Smolskis encountered a Pole, a braggart bon-vivant, who told tall tales of conquests and wonders. Once, he displayed his wonderful false teeth, unmatched anywhere. Smolskis responded that in his practice he had encountered more amazing things. There was a Jew who upon contracting a venereal disease lost an important part of his body. The replacement was so good that the man contracted the disease for a second time. We also

337 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 67-68. Grinius moved several times. While his account is not clear, likely he is describing the overall growth of his practice and not just his years in Marijampolė.

338 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 86-95.

meet Dr. Bronius Pavalkis (1858-1918), his future brother-in-law, a "well-known humorist." (The plundered pants in Kislovodsk were his.) One day Pavalkis was called to a difficult birth and noticed a herring inside the birth-canal. The birth attendant--an untrained mid-wife--complained that inserting a herring was her usual way of easing birth, but that this time it had not helped. Pavalkis explained that herrings are good only when served with onions and pepper. Who is to say how much her practice suffered from mocking laughter? Pavalkis, expelled from the university in Warsaw for participating in student protests, complained that when the czar died, he had to get up early and in church swear allegiance to the heir. As Grinius recalls, Pavalkis was equally unhappy about having to go to church, swear allegiance, and get out of bed. And then there was another Polonized Lithuanian doctor, who urged Grinius to take up cigar smoking: this would prevent the throat from drying out and would make the nerves less sensitive.[339]

In 1982, as the Soviet Union was collapsing, I and my family spent a month in Vilnius: politics was confined to anecdotes and jeering about the epoch of lavish state funerals. (The Party proclaimed it the epoch of mature socialism, with true communism as the next and final stage.) In Grinius's account of Lithuania of 1894 I find something similar: an impotent people. Citizens can discuss reforms and laws to minimize the harm done by cranks and charlatans, both political and medical. Subjects can only mock when the authorities are not listening.

The identification of persons as Jews, Poles, Russians need not be viewed as signs of prejudice. In a sharply stratified society it is convenient to identify persons by membership in a group. The practice is informative when status--political, social, economic, religious—is closely correlated with group membership. Thus, Grinius's attitude towards Jews is better indicated by his advice to a local Jewish doctor. The man's son was detected in a brothel and expelled from school. Grinius recalled that an acquaintance was a teacher in a secondary school in the North Caucasus. Upon Grinius's advice, the boy transferred to the distant school and completed it with a silver medal.[340] Perhaps, some of the anecdotes were not politically correct. But when a boy's future was at stake, Jewishness was of no consequence.

Grinius was aware that the Russian government persecuted Jews. In his memoirs, describing his life in 1894, he devotes seven pages to the Jewish question, beginning with the various expulsions and restrictions. They explain why the

339 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 73-82.

340 *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 83-84.

1897 census found Jews to make up nearly 20% of Lithuania's population. In 1892 Jews were expelled from Moscow: train after crowded train moved westward.[341] The Jewish district in Moscow was no more: Lithuanians used to tour it for a taste of home, out of nostalgia. But, unwittingly, the government also expelled capital, business experience, contacts and Moscow's economy declined while that of Poland began to grow rapidly. Thus, Jews did not suffer economically because they simply moved their businesses elsewhere: money is portable. In 1894, in Lithuania, Jews were complete masters of the economy. The grain trade was exclusively in their hands. He guesses that there were some 7,000 taverns, all operated by Jews. Jews were the money lenders, at high interest, and advised the peasants on legal and other matters. In Marijampolė, when he was a student, all the shops were Jewish-owned and it was impossible to hire a carriage on Jewish holidays.

When in the last years of the nineteenth century, the government established a monopoly on alcohol, Jews began to emigrate, mostly to the United States and South Africa. The Jewish percentage declined even more, when after the evacuations and expulsions during World War I, many Jews opted to remain in the future Soviet Union. Thus, during independence, they made up only 7-8% of the population. There were economic conflicts, but in the main, as the country prospered so did Jews. According to Grinius, Lithuanian Jews were never as well-off as they were during the two decades of independence. Statistics support his impressions on this point.

Kudirka was anti-Semitic. Grinius recognizes this, but softly: for Kudirka, Lithuanian and Jewish interests differ and Jews have no interest in the country except as a place of business. Grinius continues that Jews took no part in the awakening: while they carried much contraband across the border with Prussia, they did not smuggle books, but more profitable goods. But he adds that there are those who disagree, finding that Jews sometimes smuggled banned books.[342]

---

341 Grinius appears to be mistaken as to dates. A major expulsion of Jews from Moscow was planned for 1891. According to the *Times* (London), April 23, 1891, p. 5, to be expelled were "Jew artisans, mechanics, distillers, brewers, and in general all Jews following trades and arts." But it is difficult from newspaper reports to establish how many were expelled. The *Times*, May 5, 1891, p. 5, mentions an expulsion order dated April 9 and describes the ensuing situation in the Jewish quarter. In a report on the condition of Jews prepared for the government of the United States, the 15 provinces making up the "pale of settlement" are described as "barren and unproductive for the most part" (*Times*, November 25, 1892, p. 9).

342 In the index to Merkys, *Draudžiamosios lietuviškos spaudos kelias*, there are a few Jewish names. Probably, Jews were involved in under one percent of the more than 2,000 cases. Some cases involved not Lithuanian but social-democratic literature.

In these reflections, written after World War II, he recalls that in 1894 he was not much interested in the Jewish question. The claim is supported by his bibliography, with only one extensive discussion to that date, the 1892 unsigned article "Kaunas," previously cited. In the main, he is also correct in claiming that during the years of independence most educated Lithuanians viewed Jews with tolerance, sympathized with their troubles, saw no need to war upon them. They understood that Jews posed no risk to Lithuanian identity, while economic conflicts, even though Lithuanians often were at a disadvantage, given time, would sort themselves out. The two remained separate and distant, but tolerant. There were very few mixed marriages, but the number was growing. And Jews were beginning to use Lithuanian more extensively and contribute, especially in the fields of law and medicine.[343]

It is interesting that at this late stage of his life, Grinius has a strong interest in heredity, a subject of which there few earlier signs. He notes that in the eighteenth century Lithuanian aristocrats and Jews intermarried extensively, that there few upper-class families without some Jewish "blood." And there is evidence that mixing the two yields good results. By contrast, Lithuanian and Belorussian mixtures are not promising. In the Vilnius region, where there has been much intermarriage, he himself noticed that people are shorter than elsewhere where purer types predominate. These scientifically naïve remarks are redeemed by a disclaimer: they are not scientific results, but only hypotheses suggesting possible lines of anthropological research. It is possible that such differences could be results of differences in diet, given that around Vilnius the soil is sandy and poor.[344]

---

[343] Broad and accusatory generalizations about Lithuanian anti-Semitism are widespread, even among Lithuanians. I have read extensively the three national dailies of the years of independence and have found only two clearly anti-Semitic articles. In the early 1930's, the government newspaper typically depicted Jews as loyal citizens: on independence day they gather in synagogues to sing the national anthem in Hebrew. There is more tension in the late 1930's, often provoked by articles in American Jewish newspapers alleging discrimination. In late 1900, there were attacks on Jews in five-six towns in northern Lithuania. *Ukininkas*, 1900 October, no. 10, pp. 145-46, in an editorial conceded that Lithuanians had suffered much from dishonest Jewish shop-keepers. But smashing Jewish shops does no good. Lithuanians should recall that Jews are much more experienced in matters of trade, should learn from them, and open up their own shops. In some cases, Jews are merely taking advantage of "our stupidity." Furthermore, there are Lithuanians who cheat and deceive as much. In the end, we should understand that Jews are our brothers. For a brief account of one incident see *Times* (London), August 8, 1900.

[344] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 122-29.

Grinius separated sharply the private from the public, even in his memoirs hiding the former from inquisitive biographers. Also, with some exception in the case of Polonizing priests, he preferred facts and descriptions to broad and judgmental generalizations. Thus, disapproval is absent from his account of several Lithuanian doctors who showed no interest in the awakening and persisted in their Polish ways. Grinius knew that educated Lithuanians were scarce. He believed that they should stay and work to lift their countrymen. Yet, his descriptions here are matter of fact—one, he notes, upon retirement moved to Poland with his three "attractive" daughters and a son. No condemnation, no note of regret about the good which an educated family could have done at home. Nor does he censure the Jewish boy's interest in prostitutes, although in sexual matters Grinius was a traditional conservative, upholding marriage and disapproving of promiscuity.

There are few good Russians in the writings of Kudirka, Grinius's mentor. In Lithuanian journalism of the awakening, Russian officials are bribe-taking, malicious, incompetent drunkards, intent on destroying anything distinctively Lithuanian. No doubt, there was much of that: generally able individuals prefer to serve near the centers of power and not in some remote and alien backwater. In some cases, transfer to Lithuania was punishment. There is less recognition that competent officials acting in good faith can do the greater harm to group interests: assimilating minorities is what empires do. Typically, the interests of an individual are best served by acquiring the manners and culture of the dominant group—to get an education, pursue a career, one has to learn Russian, inevitably interacting less and less with the people and land of one's birth. In empires, minorities undergo brain drain even in the absence of malice or policy. Lithuania's situation was complicated by the presence of Poles and Jews, many of them reasonably well intentioned. Grinius mentions a Polish library in Marijampolė which he suspects was supported by Polish "patriots" in Warsaw for the sake of Polonization. I reread these texts time and time again and still cannot get a clear sense whether he suspects an underlying imperial ambition. After all, libraries are good things and a Pole would, even without a hidden agenda, stock them with Polish books, especially at a time when there was little in Lithuanian to inform or entertain secular readers.

Grinius notes the Polonizing work of several educated Poles in the area. They organized plays, concerts, social gatherings. They encouraged the use of Polish. They distributed Polish publications. The glitter of Polish nobles

contributed to the sense of Polish superiority. He recalls how, when they were students, they stared mouths open, at the splendid carriages, magnificent horses, as landowners made their way to church. Polish propaganda laid emphasis on Poland's civilizing mission: they brought Christianity and literacy, and never did harm unlike the Russians or the Germans.[345] Themes, not without some truth, familiar in all apologies for imperialism. But there are counter-narratives, among them, "How European colonialism impoverished large parts of the world." In *Why Nations Fail*, Acemoglu and Robinson argue that social distortions resulting from the slave-trade and colonialism are much reflected in the problems facing present day Africa.[346]

Explanations here can fall into one of four categories: Lithuanians suffer because of malice and incompetence on the part of officials; or because of imperial policies; or because of different class interests; or because of natural social processes, that is, processes which are at work no matter what else obtains. Grinius was not theoretically inclined: he records facts and details, making no effort to generalize and categorize as a sociologist would. My sense is that in reference to Russians he inclines towards the first and second explanatory categories. In the case of Jews—towards the third. In the case of Poles—towards the third and fourth. Independence could even exacerbate problems connected with incompetence with a flood of inexperienced newcomers, and by itself do little about class conflicts. But it would change policies and could reverse brain-drain.

In the end, facts on the ground rarely yield to exclusive categories. For example, he discusses Polonization in Suvalkai Province. He mentions one "rigid Polish patriot" who was a real "devourer of Lithuanians." He mentions another

---

345 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 71.

346 I quote their summary of the contents of chapter 9, suggestively titled "Reversing Development," from the table of contents (p. x). They emphasize policies to keep the natives poor so as not to run short of cheap labor (pp. 264-65). There is no economic history of Lithuania. But given the advantages of cheap labor, it can be assumed that many landowners did their best to keep the peasants impoverished and uneducated. Likely, a Lithuanian-speaking aristocracy would have behaved in a similar way. But one can at least speculate that in a more Lithuanian Lithuania class divisions would not have been as rigid. And if urban life had not been dominated by Jews, Poles, Russians, Lithuanians migrating into cities would not have been lost. The formation of a Lithuanian urban middle-class would not have had to wait for independence. Acemoglu and Robinson mention the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth briefly, with emphasis on what the authors call "extractive institutions" blocking development (*Why Nations Fail*, pp. 101, 107). In Lithuania, extractive institutions, czarist, German, and Soviet, were not the only economic barrier to general prosperity. During the twentieth century, because of wars and occupations, most of Lithuania underwent seven currency changes, the Vilnius region--eight, and Klaipėda—six. There were also stretches for all practical purposes with no monetary system at all, and two periods when only scrip was available.

who dreamed of helping Poles from Poland to settle on parceled out estates. But his emphasis is on the shortage of labor, due to many factors, including emigration to America. Thus, we find at least three categories, namely, malice, imperialism, and social processes, with emphasis on the latter.[347] His greater interest in social processes is shown by his remark that in an independent country they would work in Lithuania's favor. Thus, after remarking on the Polonizing effect of splendid carriages and horses, he adds that during independence the impressive War Museum in Kaunas affected Poles in a similar way, of course, in the opposite direction.[348]

Surveying his surroundings in 1894 Grinius notes how little Lithuanian is heard in clerical residences: even the few patriotically inclined priests generally use Polish among themselves. Nor are there many examples of dedication and piety. Thus, he notes, that the chaplain during his days as a student in Marijampolė, "achieved his goal," namely, accumulated wealth amounting to several ten-thousand rubles and acquired two large brick buildings. In spite of pressure and public criticism, this priest steadfastly advanced towards his chosen goal, the amassing of capital so as to enjoy a comfortable old age. But once again, in what are supposed to be his memoirs, there are factual observations about clerical vices, but nothing about his own religious beliefs. In addition to the avaricious priest, he mentions another who encouraged his parishioners to beat up the pastor of a small schismatic church.[349]

Especially in the 1920's, when the Vilnius question was the center of attention, Grinius saw the Vatican as favoring Poland, with Lithuanian Catholic clergy subservient to what in effect was a foreign government allied with Lithuania's enemy. In this context, there was talk of a national church, Catholic in doctrine and liturgy, but independent of Rome. It is not known whether Grinius was involved. But the fact that here he mentions the persecution of the Mariavites is suggestive—the pastor to be assaulted was a Mariavite.

In 1894 Grinius was approaching thirty. He could have taken stock of his situation with satisfaction: he had left his peasant childhood far behind, while remaining loyal to his family and countrymen, in a respected profession assuring him of a reasonably comfortable life. In the main, his political views were established. He was to act as one of the *Varpininkai*, support the separation of church and state, work to undermine autocracy and establish democracy, favor

347 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 119

348 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 71.

349 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys,* 1: 136; 1: 133.

reforms rather than all-or-nothing revolutions. And he was to be a Lithuanian patriot, enlightening his own people, rejecting utopian dreams of a world revolution. In his memoirs he recalls that as a student in Moscow he studied Polish and Russian revolutionary literature and hoped for a democratic Russia, believing that such a Russia would be best for Lithuanians, that they would be freer and live better.[350]

He was busy, with an established daily routine. Getting up about seven-thirty, he received patients in his home from nine to two in the afternoon, seeing perhaps 15-25. The next four hours, after lunch, were spent in walks, reading newspapers, making house-calls in town and in villages. After supper at seven, he spent his evenings reading, writing articles and letters. Of course, there were disruptions: night-calls, visits from friends. At times he traveled on *Varpininkai* business.

Apparently, 1895 passed in much the same way. Except that his sister, Ona Bacevičienė, then in her late teens, in a farm accident, severed the palm of her hand, and lived with him for several months while recuperating. Clearly, he was proud of her: she adapted to her injury and was able to weave and sow. Well married, around 1930 she lost her husband in another farm accident. She continued to manage her 33 ha. farm and educate six children. One became an agronomist, one a bookkeeper, one an engineer, one a military officer. One daughter completed an agricultural school, while another in 1944 began to study dentistry. [351] As already mentioned, this sister along with two of her daughters ended up in Siberia. Of course, when writing his memoirs in 1947, because even ordinary communication with Lithuania was rare, most likely, Grinius had no current information about his relations. Even if he had, he would have been reluctant to make it public, fearing that they would suffer reprisals for having relatives abroad.

Also in 1895, he established some contact with Lithuanian social democrats, but of that in a later chapter.

Inevitably, as one of the *Varpininkai*, Grinius engaged in activities which imperial authorities deemed subversive. Even articles about constipated horses and milk yields, harmless enough from the point of view of content, could attract unwelcome attention for using Latin orthography in violation of imperial policy. But a confusing array of pen-names sufficed to insure safety in most cases. The risks were minimal. Something similar could be said about his presence at conferences, which to all appearances were social gatherings and left no

[350] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys,* 1: 139.

[351] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 206-207.

incriminating paper-trails. But early in 1896 he took steps which exposed him to more substantial risks. On *Varpininkai* business, he crossed the border, in Tilsit registered in a hotel under a false name, and on the return trip, hidden in his clothing, carried contraband pamphlets and periodicals. His luck held. At the border-crossing, the gendarmes merely opened his briefcase.[352]

The Okhrana and other czarist security agencies have drawn their share of attention, but most of the time, ignoring their efforts to smother national awakenings, while emphasizing the suppression of Russian revolutionaries. Again, small nations are overlooked: many more Americans have heard of imprisoned and exiled Bolsheviks than of Lithuanian book-smugglers who by the hundreds suffered a similar fate. This to an extent is understandable: the disasters which followed Lenin's seizure of power affected hundreds of millions and the course of world history. Unrest, and its consequences, among small nations in empires is trifling by comparison. Thus, it is easy to overlook the fact, that the empire was threatened not only by political radicals but also by national awakenings. Whatever the proportions may have been, a complete explanation of why the empire collapsed has to take account of Grinius, and many like him, of different nationalities. By far, Lenin and Trotsky were not the only ones undermining the foundations of czarism.

Lenin, Stalin, pamphlets on the nationality question notwithstanding, followed a policy of restoration and expansion, disguised as proletarian internationalism. Subject nationalities enjoyed their revenge, playing important roles in the defeats of 1941-1942 and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In 1896, security agencies of the two empires at times exchanged information. This explains why Grinius in Tilsit registered at the hotel under a false name and why he identified himself as a landowner living in Kaunas Province. His mission was to review *Varpininkai* accounts, which he found in good order. Debts to January 1, 1896 amounted to about 1,000 marks.[353] Considering that they published two major periodicals, *Varpas* and *Ukininkas*, it is clear that they were operating on a shoestring, relying heavily on contributions. Thus, in 1895, 20 contributors, most identified by initials or pseudonyms, donated a total of 401 rubles.[354]

---

352 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 216-21.

353 In 1890, annual subscriptions of *Varpas*--twelve issues--, including postage, were four marks in Germany, five—in the United States, six rubles in Russia (mailed in sealed envelopes). Advertising was 20 pfennigs or 10 kopeks per line, in the first issue of 1890 a total of 19 lines, for books and periodicals with addresses in Prussia.

354 *Varpas*, 1896 January, no. 1, p. 12.

While the accounts were in good order, the January issue of *Varpas* was late, because the editor, editing both periodicals without pay, was overworked. Furthermore, there was a shortage of contributions, in part because priests and socialists were beginning to go their own ways. Grinius was forced to assemble an issue from the little that was available. It was four pages short.

In later years, there was much controversy as to who first called for an independent Lithuania. In his memoirs, Grinius disputes claims to priority made by social democrats. While at their gathering in the summer of 1895, the social democrats did raise the question of independence, Grinius doubts that they were serious. Perhaps, fearing competition from Pilsudski and his socialist party, whose program included a call for an independent Poland, the Lithuanian social democrats did raise the question, but it was risky for orthodox Marxists. Later, Grinius learned that the Lithuanians were under pressure from Rosa Luxemburg to abandon the idea of national independence as a bourgeois conceit.[355] She, we should recall, was both Polish in culture and a Marxist.

In any case, in January 1896, Grinius penned six short paragraphs, among them: "Firmly believing that the time will come when Lithuania, having discarded the foreign yoke, will govern herself, we emphasize that Lithuanians should even now begin to look after their own affairs, winning new rights from the Russian government and defending the ones they already have."[356] In his memoirs, aware that he is interpreting "broadly," he presents this as a call for Lithuanians to prepare for the future by gaining experience in governing. There is no mention of past glories. Emphasis is "improving our condition" and preparing the country for a "happier" future. Years later, in the 1919 letter to his brother already cited, while proud of what has been achieved in a short time, he expresses regret: "For freedom fell upon us unexpectedly and we were not prepared."

The *Varpininkai* treasurer in Tilsit was a vainglorious medical doctor, possibly practicing without a license, with strong tendencies towards quackery, seeing himself as a victim of anti-Lithuanian intrigues. Also an amateur historian, he tried to persuade Grinius that Homer mentions some place-names in the Lithuanian part of Prussia. Grinius responded with skepticism: how could in those years a whole tribe make its way to Troy? Evidently, compared with his student days in Moscow when he contributed to romanticized history, he has matured intellectually.

---

355 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 220.

356 "Pradedant naujus metus" ("Beginning the New Year"), *Varpas*, 1896 January, no. 1, p. 1.

The eccentric doctor was wealthy, but reluctant to contribute to the cause. As Grinius recalls, at some point the doctor contributed 800 marks, but after explaining that he could not take on responsibility for the whole of Lithuania, withdrew from the enterprise.[357] The episode underscores how slim were Lithuanian resources, both intellectual and financial, keeping in mind that independence was only two decades away, not much more time than it takes to educate a university graduate.

The border region in which Grinius found himself was a smuggler's paradise. Textiles and other manufactured goods flowed from the German to the Russian side, paths greased by bribes and contacts. (What in Soviet times came to be known as *blat*.) Some smugglers asked for and received sexual favors in payment. Alcohol played an important role: a few drinks sufficed for gendarmes and customs officials to look the other way. A lucrative sideline was escorting emigrants across the border, including draft dodgers and fleeing revolutionaries. In Grinius's own case it helped that the mayor of Virbalis—the first railway station after crossing the border from Germany—was his classmate, the very one with whom in the back row they composed *Prieaušris*. He supplied Grinius with travel documents. Grinius estimates that several towns on both sides of the border would have collapsed economically had customs regulations been successfully enforced. He recalls visits by a Lithuanian woman from the German side who smuggled tea in her roomy boots. This woman also carried Lithuanian books and other small items. A point important to make: for many of the book-smugglers patriotism and profit coincided, making printed matter more expensive than it otherwise would have been.[358]

In May 1896, abandoning his established practice in Marijampolė, Grinius moved to the border town of Virbalis where his classmate served as mayor, more convenient for travel to Tilsit. Once again he crossed the border and on the return trip under his clothes and in his briefcase carried contraband literature. It happened that on the train a German gendarme stared at the bulging briefcase. Could it be, Grinius wondered, that spies had been at work and the German was suspicious? But the gendarme only wanted the briefcase for a pillow and the trip ended well. The incident serves as a reminder that not only the Russians but also the Germans were dangerous. The two sides at times worked hand in hand. It also shows how precarious the whole enterprise was: several well-placed spies, several arrests, and two important Lithuanian periodicals cease to exist.

---

357 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 298-99.

358 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 257-58.

On July 29 of that year, he married Joana Pavalkytė, the woman murdered by plundering Bolsheviks in Kislovodsk. She was approaching thirty-one, about a year and a half older than her groom. Like Madame Pilsudska, she was a modern woman, full of initiative, willing to take risks. She became Grinius's private smuggler, carrying corrected proofs to Tilsit and bringing back correspondence, manuscripts, and printed matter. Her family belonged to the small gentry, Polish in culture, but familiar with the awakening and at times willing to defend the Lithuanian side. Many of them knew Lithuanian. They could be considered soft Poles. Probably, they counted as Polish for census purposes, but were ready to call themselves Lithuanians should the circumstances change. As has been noted, the census made national identity more definite than it in fact was.

Educated at home, she completed a private secondary school for girls in Marijampolė, and passed the examination for a license to teach in primary school. She was not licensed, because one brother had been expelled from university in Warsaw for taking part in a student riot. The family was politically suspect. Seeking her independence, she moved to Saint Petersburg where she worked in a library and in a currency printing house. Returning to Marijampolė, she worked in an office and then opened a laundry, ignoring gossip that such menial work was beneath her station. Attractive, judging from photographs, described as above average in height, she was unusual for her time and place, but not as much as present day stereotypes suggest. In the awakening, especially in the later stages, several women had prominent roles.

Educated Lithuanian males had difficulty finding suitable wives, especially Lithuanian ones. A few peasants managed to send their sons to school, many hoping that they would become priests. Practically none sent their daughters because girls could never become priests. And if not that, schooled or not, they would give birth, nurse babies (six-twelve was not unusual), cook, sew, clean. Why then the expense and bother? In the eyes of some, educated men who were not priests were wastrels, whose fathers had spent money for nothing. In a nineteenth century subsistence economy there were few jobs outside the home for women, or men for that matter. Thus, educated young men of peasant background stood little chance of finding wives of similar background. At the same time, class barriers blocked access to educated women of the gentry. Many married Russians or Poles and disappeared in distant imperial outposts. Grinius was lucky: there is nothing to suggest that her mother, a widow, objected to the misalliance. The bride's brothers attended the wedding. Only Grinius's father

was absent, staying behind to guard his home. The young couple signed the register in Lithuanian—he as Grinevičius. The two witnesses, one of them the bride's brother, signed in Polish, the priest—the pastor of the parish—in Russian. After the wedding feast at the bride's home, the next day the newlyweds returned home to resume their ordinary occupations [359]

They were married in church by one of Grinius's Marijampolė classmates. My understanding is that there were no civil marriages. Even if there had been, because of fierce social pressure, only the bravest of agnostics and atheists would have taken that route, unafraid of being scorned for living in sin. Even Jonas Šliūpas, the apostle of atheism already mentioned, in 1931 bowed to social pressure and married his second wife in church.[360] Thus, their religious marriage reveals nothing about their religious beliefs and attitudes.

There is an amusing footnote to the wedding, additional evidence that biology generally triumphs over ideology. For some years there was an ongoing discussion whether or not educated Lithuanians should marry. Just six months before his own wedding, Grinius took the side of the negative. His argument seems compelling: a Lithuanian activist is at risk. One wrong word, one suspicious official, perhaps an ambitious rival, and he is jobless, or worse, imprisoned or exiled. Because he is the primary means of support, in case of misfortune his family would be left destitute. Thus, he would constantly be forced to choose between family and activism, and as a consequence Lithuanian interests would suffer.[361] The argument, while not without foundation, ignores attraction and a willingness to share risks. We have little information about the former. But there is no doubt that she cast her lot with his and fully accepted the dangers. In 1905, she became in effect a revolutionary. Stasys Matulaitis, then a very close friend, reminded him of this article when Grinius introduced his betrothed.[362] We do not know whether the friend was censorious, envious, or amused.

---

[359] Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, pp. 69-70.

[360] Independent Lithuania inherited the czarist legal code: the issue of civil registry was one of the more divisive issues of the decades of independence, dividing even practicing Catholics. Šliūpas could have gone to Klaipėda, where a different legal code was in effect and civil marriages were allowed, or to Latvia.

[361] R. U., "Da keli žodžiai prie senojo klausymo" ("Several Words More about the Old Question"), *Varpas*, 1896 January, no. 1, p. 9.

[362] Matulaitis, *Atsiminimai*, pp. 121-22. Matulaitis disliked her intensely, blaming her for breaking up their friendship, and in his published memoirs accused her of having an affair with a priest and of pretending to be deeply religious. Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 79, thinks both accusations are false. Matulaitis writes about her with such deep hatred, as to make his account suspect.

In his memoirs, with reference to 1905, Kapsukas says that she helped the revolutionaries a great deal. But he describes her as drunk on revolutionary fervor, an intoxication which did not last. Supposedly Grinius frowned on her enthusiasm, but felt helpless, unable to stop his "padūkusią bobą." The expression is untranslatable. "Crazy old lady" comes close. But much depends on the tone of voice, because "padūkusi boba" can express amused admiration. Kapsukas was writing this in Moscow in the mid 1920s, having lost any chance of real power and to add to the humiliation, to persons who did not believe in Marx and had never met Lenin. In his view, both husband and wife did not believe in the victory of the revolution, in fact, feared its triumph, with Grinius pouring "cold water" on the very idea.[363]

As has been said, Grinius kept his private life private. Perhaps, we would know more had there been a diary or his buried papers escaped water damage. And it is impossible to tell how much his sense of privacy reflects his character and how much the time and place—we live amid so-called reality shows where nothing is sacred, not counting tax returns. In 1919, fleeing her murderers, on a ship for Marseilles, he began to sketch out her biography. "In 1896 she married doctor Kazys Grinius" is the closest he comes to violating her privacy. The rest is about her activism. We learn that she smuggled books hidden on her body. That she organized Lithuanian demonstrations, theater groups, educational societies. That in 1905 she looked after the revolutionary treasury, with some of the funds requisitioned from the government alcohol monopoly.[364] We learn nothing about her appearance, her likes and dislikes, her taste in clothes, or that they loved each other. He refers to himself by his last name and expresses no emotion. He does mention their children.[365]

According to Felicija Bortkevičienė, Griniuvienė was not interested in ideological haggling: caught up in the moment, she sided with those who appeared abler, more active, more likely to reach their common goal. She was independent minded and comitted herself fully to whatever task she undertook. For a time,

---

363 Vincas Kapsukas-Mickevičius, *Caro kalėjimuose* (*In the Czar's Prisons*) (1928), reprinted in his *Raštai* (Vilnius; Vaga, 1962), 4: 26-31.

364 There are numerous reports of locals attacking liquor shops, smashing their equipment and taking what money they found. The sums were quite small, several dozen rubles perhaps.

365 "Joanna Pavalkytė-Griniuvienė (1865-1907)," *Varpas,* 1926, pp. 250-58. This as a special issue in honor of Grinius's sixtieth birthday. The article is unsigned, attributed to Grinius by the editor, with an account of its origin. The ending "ienė" indicates a married woman, "ytė," an unmarried one. I do not know why he spelled her first name with a double n. This is not the ordinary spelling.

she became a social democrat, in spite of the fact that the social democrats and her huband's group were at odds.[366]

She was a person of initiative and enterprise. In 1910, some members of *Šviesa*, an educational society she helped organize, were put on trial. She traveled to Saint Petersburg, and with the help of a friend and bribes, was able to examine the prosecution's files, also lobbying on behalf of the accused. Upon learning that Pyotr Stolypin, then prime minister, was vacationing on his estate in Lithuania, she called on him. He was not receiving visitors and she did not see him. But she persuaded Stolypin's aide that the gendarmes in Marijampolė who initiated the prosecution were stupid. In the end, the prosecution failed to prove its case and the accused were released.[367]

It would be a mistake to conclude that they had no private lives or that it was a loveless marriage—four pregnancies in ten years suggest otherwise. The few surviving accounts by friends indicate that they were a fashionably dressed, handsome couple, about equal in height, enjoying each other's company. One friend recalls hearing her address Grinius in a caressive form, suggesting closeness, affection.[368] And she was not above doing menial household chores, washing, cleaning, cooking.

Her first pregnancy ended tragically in still-birth. Her second pregnancy nearly ended as badly, but the boy, named Kazys, born on September 8, 1899, survived and was the only one of her children to reach adulthood. We met him riding with the Cossacks. A daughter named Gražina was born on November 8, 1902. The apple of her mother's eye, she was murdered when sixteen. A third boy, Jurgis, born in 1906, died in southern France. Jurgis had a weak heart from the beginning. Grinius suspected that this was the result of several weeks in prison which his mother spent while pregnant. A visiting friend recalled the calm way in which Grinius explained that the boy was not expected to reach his tenth birthday. But the two older children respected their father, looking at him with eyes filled with admiration.[369] This was in 1909, when the family was living in Vilnius.

The infant Kazys could digest neither his mother's milk nor that of a wet-nurse. In the case of the mother, Grinius theorizes, it was because she smoked. But he improved when they tried goat milk. In his context, we get a more intimate

366 Bortkevičienė, "Senam draugui!", *Varpas*, 1926, p. 187.
367 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 70-72.
368 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 68.
369 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 142.

glimpse of family life and the conflict between family and public responsibilities. A telegram arrived with news that Kudirka had died. Grinius felt obliged to attend the funeral. But the boy was vomiting and appeared on the point of death. The mother in deep depression sat staring at the wall: her second child was about to die. Nonetheless, after arranging for a wet-nurse, Grinius departed for the funeral. He learned that in great pain Kudirka was taking heavy doses of morphine and perhaps it was this that hastened his death. Years later there were reports that Kudirka had died a reconciled Catholic, reports which Grinius denied. Kudirka did received the last rites, but was unconscious, unable to talk.[370] According to Grinius, Kudirka was a liberal, in the European sense, and considered religion to be a private matter.

The son Kazys was a boy: at fifteen, instead of preparing for his Latin and algebra exams, he would disappear to try his luck at fishing. In Kislovodsk, caught up in the revolution, he marched around with a rifle on his shoulder and with his classmates took part in disarming the local gendarmes. One of his classmates was the czar's bastard son. For a time, young Kazys worked in an office established by Bolsheviks for locating hidden capital, with former dukes and governors as his colleagues. But the Bolsheviks were a threat. Two of the son's classmates were shot, perhaps because they were well dressed and the Chekist who arrested them envied their clothes. At this point, father suggested that in time of war the army was a safer place and the son joined Shkuro's Cossacks. His first assignment was to break in wild horses, bareback, because saddles were in short supply.[371]

In line with his interest in ethnography, Grinius provides considerable detail about the various tribal divisions in Shkuro's force. But one remark is worth noting: the Cossacks turned against the Bolsheviks not for ideological reasons. It was because a Bolshevik force at one point took away their weapons. According to Grinius, at this time, Kislovodsk favored the Bolshevik side.

The son rose to the rank of colonel on the general staff of the Lithuanian army. From 1937 to the Soviet occupation he served as military attache in Berlin. He arrived in the United States on April 15, 1941 as a temporary visitor, but in time became a permanent resident, perhaps, even a citizen. After teaching Russian at Syracuse University, he became program editor for the Voice of America., serving in Munich. He received a *New York Times*, May 31, 1965, obituary, with the

370 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 76.

371 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 130, 3: 178, 3: 181, 3: 200.

newspaper, as in the case of his father, having difficulties getting it right. The son died at 66 and not 76, his father was president in 1926 and not 1922, prime minister in 1920-1922, not 1921-1922. But the most glaring error is found in the following: "Colonel Grinius … fought with the Czarist armies during the Russian Revolution of 1917." For all I know, Shkuro could have been a traditional monarchist, but many who fought the Bolsheviks favored a Russian republic or a constitutional monarchy. In any case, in late 1918 when young Grinius joined the Cossacks, there were no czarist armies because there was no czar. I cannot resist pointing out that the *New York Times* still has problems: on the hundredth anniversary of the February revolution, the paper published a picture of Lenin haranguing a crowd, but in February 1917 Lenin was in Switzerland, had not been in Russia for years, and read about the czar's abdication in the papers.

I have seen nothing to suggest that this son met his father at the Manhattan dock. In fact, there seem to have been few if any contacts between the two in later years. Did the father object that the son continued to serve Smetona's dictatorial regime? The son, to the second marriage? In any case, in 1942 the son was involved in several initiatives, rejected, or more likely ignored, by the Roosevelt administration. Had the father known about them, he would have been more pessimistic about Lithuania's political future, expected less support from the international community. The son offered to join the American army, provided that he remain an officer and after the war be transferred to the Lithuanian army. He was also involved in plans, proposed in a letter to Roosevelt of February 22, 1942, to form an "armed Baltic force," which would eventually provide nuclei for the three national armies. It is understandable that nothing happened. The numbers were too small to be worth antagonizing the Soviet Union. But there was also a futile humanitarian initiative. The United States was asked to intervene so that the International Red Cross could provide relief to Lithuanians in the slave camps.[372] At the time, the Soviet Union was in dire straights and the United States had leverage. But once again the realities of power settled the matter: what were the chances of this administration doing anything revealing what Stalin and the Soviet Union were like?

But to return to 1896: several months after the wedding, the newlyweds abandoned Virbalis. The position of town doctor which Grinius sought went to a Lithuanian homeopath, recommended by the governor general in Warsaw. At

[372] Papers of the Lithuanian Legation in Washington, Lithuanian Central State Archive, 656/2/1175, folios 90, 114, 129.

the same time, his practice was not flourishing while his family obligations were increasing. And the police were on his heels. A Lithuanian in Tilsit stored radical political literature, including that of Pilsudski's Polish socialists. *Varpininkai* publications were involved because Grinius had arranged to use the same attic. An acquaintance of Grinius, protected by the uniform of a Russian civil servant, transported filled suitcases across the border. By accident a German prosecutor stumbled upon the attic and wrote it up in a newspaper, about a large cache of "anarchic literature" in Russian, Polish, German, Lithuanian. Shortly thereafter in a border railroad station, Grinius and the acquaintance recognized the Warsaw governor general's agent and learned that customs agents had descriptions of several visitors to the attic. Grinius was a "tallish man, wearing a cloak and cape and a top hat." He went home, packed his possessions on a cart and moved to another police jurisdiction.[373] Thus, another brush with the law, with more to follow. For a Lithuanian activist of that time, settling in life included moving frequently from one town to another. To the war and his fateful flight to Russia in the fall of 1914, he moved back and forth at least seven times, several times assisted by the the authorities.

Recalling those days years later, he remembers being told that in about 1895 the authorities did not think he was dangerous. In his police file there was the notation: "Grinius sings patriotic songs, but is not known for anything else." In the same piece, he describes what gendarmes do: seemingly idle, they stroll around, striking up acquaintances, listening for suspicious words about politics, religion, or officials who solicit bribes. Any sign of disrespect towards the czar or the Orthodox Church was recorded. Receiving letters and books from abroad aroused suspicion. But of the gendarmes, very few were energetic and able. Most were lazy, lacking initiative, and half-baked, because intelligent men did not become gendarmes. There was much drinking, corruption. As a result, reports submitted by gendarmes were mostly filed and ignored. One wonders how anyone managed to get arrested. Grinius explains that there were many informants and they were dangerous because the authorities took them more seriously.[374]

When on a rainy day in October 1896 Grinius with his bride left Virbalis for a new border town, they settled in what is now known as Kudirkos Naumiestis

[373] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys,* 1: 144-46.

[374] Kazys Grinius, "Varpas' ir varpininkai" ("The Bell and the bell-ringers"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1939 February 25, February 27. Like English, Lithuanian is rich in words indicating stupidity. The word I have translated as "half-baked" translated literally would be "blunt-minded," with overtones suggesting that such a person should not be taken seriously.

(Kudirka's Newtown). Then called simply Naumiestis, it had some 4500 inhabitants, roughly half of them Jews. Many of the Jews prospered because they controlled the trade, various crafts, and major smuggling. They were the bankers and money-lenders. Because of high Russian tariffs and general inefficiency, manufactured good were cheaper in Prussia, goods such as clothing, shoes, metal objects, alcoholic beverages, perfumes, devotional articles such as rosaries and holy pictures. It was profitable even to smuggle firewood. Agricultural products, grain, eggs, cheese, geese, pigs, horses traveled in the opposite direction. Smuggling emigrants and draft-dodgers was profitable. (Even at present, there is smuggling—mostly cigarettes. Of course, this border now separates Lithuania from the Russian enclave of Kaliningrad.) But in other respects the town was duller then Marijampolė, since there was no secondary school or military garrison. The farmers were wealthier, having learned much from the Prussians. But the estates were declining, heavily indebted to "usurious Jews," because their owners were unable to adjust to changing times. Grinius mentions one exception who was well-off, owning a brick factory in addition to his estate.

The young couple lived in Naumiestis for almost two years. Grinius recalls several colorful characters who took part in the *Varpininkai* struggle. Historians attend to the leaders: there are countless biographies of Washington and few of his foot soldiers, though without them Washington would have accomplished nothing. Grinius is more democratic.

There was Antanas Baltrušaitis (1865-1949), somewhat older that Grinius, lame, a beggar by profession when Grinius met him, generally known as Little Anthony. Not a drinker, likable, he would stand on the Lithuanian side of the bridge to Prussia collecting alms. Without any schooling, he eventually learned to read and write. Few knew that this in appearance tramp published pieces in *Ukininkas* and organized the smuggling and distribution of banned books. In the late 1930s, the Lithuanian government recognized his contributions with a pension. He died a displaced person in Germany. He became Grinius's trusted friend.

Baltrušaitis also dealt in devotional materials. Noticing that the prayers were in Polish, Grinius and his wife translated them and arranged to have them printed in Leipzig. Little Anthony peddled them, became wealthy, bought a brick house in a good area of town, married, and became one of the prominent citizens. His bad leg was amputated in Koenigsberg. He walked on crutches and protected his business by being generous with drinks. But his brother converted to Orthodoxy and served as a policeman.

Another activist was a woman, hunchbacked, in her sixties, Polish in upbringing, who made her living by preparing children for secondary school. She also smuggled contraband, including type for Pilsudski's secret printing shop, and published translations in *Varpas*. But she too had an unfortunate relative, a brother who was an officer in the Russian cavalry. One day, after a parade, the czar called him over and asked whether he was Orthodox. Upon hearing an affirmative reply, the czar congratulated him on his promotion to major general. The brother converted to Orthodoxy the same day. After this, the sister refused to accept his letters.

Another woman, described by Grinius as attractive, looked after Kudirka in his last years. Speaking only broken Lithuanian, she carried Kudirka's manuscripts to Prussia and returned with printed matter. Kudirka once said that he should have married her.[375]

At this point in his memoirs Grinius introduces several other activists, among them Kapsukas, the future leader of Lithuanian Bolsheviks. Kapsukas, then sixteen, dismissed from the seminary for having Lithuanian literature, suffering from consumption, came to Grinius for medical help. They talked and Kapsukas described his dealings with an intelligent and friendly Russian gendarme, who advised him when interrogated to say as little as possible, to plead ignorance and forgetfulness. After the interrogation, shaking hands, the gendarme said, "learn how to control your tongue, my dear."

These anecdotes, trivial in themselves, make more vivid the conditions under which Grinius lived and worked: beggars, smugglers, chance encounters, officials mostly corrupt and incompetent, but with a few who sympathized with the awakening and some zealously serving the empire, alert for any sign of subversion. And much was accomplished by bribes, alcohol, and luck.

From the beginning of 1897 into 1899, Grinius edited *Ukininkas,* receiving some pay for his work.[376] He doubled the number of his contributions. In 1896 some 50 items in *Ukininkas* are attributed to him, in 1897—about 100. He wrote just about anything, for example, that raising chickens is profitable, that Lithuanian lawyers can prosper at home, about the proposed alcohol monopoly, how to milk cows, political arrests, spies, trials, corruption, the workers' movement in Vilnius, the war between Greece and Turkey, the census, improvements in the Lithuanian language, and the need for caution when responding to

375 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 236-40.

376 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 242-43, 1: 231.

requests for money from America because some are fraudulent. They agreed to reduce the number of issues of *Varpas* to six per year, and turn *Ukininkas* into a monthly (the number of pages remained the same). This change reduced the debts and *Varpininkai* financial conditions improved.

At the same time, Grinius became more involved in illegal activities. He describes how late in 1896 or early 1897, he and his wife smuggled an unnamed Russian revolutionary on his way to Switzerland. They rented a large and wide sleight, hid the revolutionary under a rug and crossed the border. Customs agents at the time were not searching those crossing into Prussia. The revolutionary reached Switzerland and continued to send them greetings. In this context he notes that the *Varpininkai* twice helped Pilsudski escape across the border.[377] These incidents show that the awakening was part of Russia's ferment.

[377] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 246.

IX The Revolutionary Alternative

The revolutionary alternative is alluring: good people seize power, destroy bad people, and everybody lives happily ever after. This is the appeal of Marxism, stripped of philosophical language and the pretense of knowing the laws of history: the workers—the good people of Marxist ideology—seize power, eliminate capitalists and the bourgeoisie (Lenin: "How can you make a revolution without firing-squads?"), build socialism and paradise on earth is inevitable. For Lenin, a revolution without killing is mere talk and a "bowl of mush."[378] National socialism shares the same underlying structure, with the good and bad people delineated not in terms of class but of race. The fallacy of both utopianisms was disclosed by Thomas More in *Utopia*: no matter how many thieves are hanged, as many remain. (And for pickpockets, public executions were business opportunities.) Utopian eliminationism overlooks the fact that thieves, scoundrels, exploiters, murderers come from all classes and races; that new ones are produced no matter what the social or racial conditions; that revolutions themselves create opportunities for charlatans, sadists, imperialists; that possibilities for improvement are limited by biology; that much human misery is a product of ordinary human activity. Catholicism holds that every newborn faces the problem of

[378] Sebag Montefiore, *Young Stalin*, p. 352.

salvation, and can succeed or fail. This theological insight is very much in line with ordinary experience. There is also prudential wisdom in relegating salvation to the afterlife: should sacraments and blessings be no more than ordinary gestures and words, the error would not be on public display.

Robert Service notes that many nineteenth century social theorists, including Marx, were in the enlightenment tradition of making assumptions "about the basic rationality" of human beings.[379] Grinius is different, in my view being influenced by the Catholic doctrine of original sin, believing in a fundamental human propensity towards evil. In his memoirs he mentions Lenin's 1917 speech about expropriating the expropriators, but gives it no political meaning. Rather, he comments: "It is astonishing how quickly human beings turned away from the ten commandments which priests have been teaching for hundreds and thousands of years! Apparently, at bottom modern man is as rapacious and evil as man was in ancient times."[380] Thus, not the rational agent of the age of enlightenment, but Old Adam, at times succeeding and at times failing to overcome the pull of original sin.

While most of us think that the times we live in are extraordinary, conditions in the late nineteenth century were especially conducive to this belief. Why should progress not end history, history understood as suffering and strife? Productivity was increasing: surely, there will be abundance, surely the day will come with wealth enough to satisfy all human needs? Medical knowledge was advancing rapidly: perhaps, one day disease and pain will be eliminated? There was much more knowledge than there had been only a few years ago: why not a new kind of politics, based on science and reason and not ignorance and greed? Democracy and education were spreading: why not a time when enlightened persons govern themselves, eliminating the need for governments to enforce laws and punish? And yet, in such a time, if anything, the situation seemed to be getting worse, as workers crowded into cities creating slums. Capitalists seemed no better than the aristocrats they were replacing, just as greedy, just as wasteful, just as indifferent to the misery of others. Surely, persons with an understanding of history had an obligation to seize power and steer modernization in the right direction? Was there not a serious risk that the opportunity would be lost?

Lenin's Russia, Ulam writes, "would be, first of all a country of hard work, of strict industrial discipline and organization, where socialism would turn into

379 Service, *Lenin*, p. 202.

380 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 116n.

a cult of production unmatched by the most exacting capitalism."[381] An optimistic vision, naïve in supposing a radical transfomation of human behavior, but in the nineteenth century there was little experience suggesting that a centrally planned economy would be at least as wasteful, as inefficient, as anarchic capitalism, as apt to create inequlities and injustices.

The program sketched out in *Woodpeckers' Uncle* could be carried out by democratic means, by persuasion. Even the wealthy could be converted by explaining that educated and contented workmen are more productive, with reminders of mobs and guillotines. Thus, that a prosperous and contented society is in their enlightened self-interest. It is obvious, in any case, that the lower classes are not only makers but also consumers, while rising productivity requires adequate demand. In 1895, Lithuanian students in Moscow translated and published another pamphlet not obviously Marxist, but more radical in its proposed program. The central idea is that people can own only what they themselves make. Thus, it condemns hiring labor. It also proposes collective ownership of land. Since at best, these proposals appeal only to ideologues, they cannot be enacted without revolution and violence. It is not known what Grinius contributed, but likely he edited this pamphlet, at least smoothing out verbal rough-spots. The sources are also not clear. The pamphlet is called *Krumplių Jonas* (*John Krumplys*). In the end, John's wife dies in poverty while he himself becomes a revolutionary agitator.

The protagonist is an enlightened and enterprising peasant. In Vilnius, seeking relief from crushing taxes for himself and his fellow villagers, he gets into an altercation with a gendarme and is imprisoned. There he meets a socialist and with other inmates begins to discuss the causes of their misery. Some blame taxes, others--drinking, greedy clergymen, Jews, landowners, ignorance. The socialist agrees that all of these are factors. But the underlying cause is the distribution of land. If everyone owned enough, all would be able to pay taxes, educate their children, even cover their bar tabs. The argument thus far is much in line with major concerns of the day: historians have often pointed out that land hunger, for decades, had been undermining the social hierarchy of the empire. There is a reference to industrial workers as future allies, but the dreams of ordinary peasants dominate. The discussion then turns philosophical, to the question what makes something mine. The socialist responds that mine is what

[381] Ulam, *The Bolsheviks*, p. 294. Ulam notes Lenin's interest in labor-saving devices and their role in making socialism possible.

I myself make: the calf I am bringing to market is mine because I fed and tended it; the clothes I am wearing are mine because my wife weaved and sewed. This conception of ownership implies that those who hire labor are thieves, stealing the fruits of the labor of others. It also makes private ownership of land morally pernicious: nobody should own land because nobody makes it. And this leads to communes in which all share in the fruits of cooperative labor.

The argument pits moral intuitions against ordinary experience. At the time, many associated prosperity for peasants with the breaking up of traditional villages. The aforementioned Pranas Mašiotas, traveled from Latvia to Lithuania. On the Latvian side prosperous homesteads, scattered here and there, with many brick farm buildings, and on the Lithuanian side—poverty stricken villages.[382] It is not surprising to find in newspapers of the time the following: "The well-being of farmers is linked with self-sufficiency, something possible only when living in separate homesteads." In 1910, villagers near the border with Latvia, hired a surveyor and divided the land into individual holdings.[383]

Policy during the years of independence was to redistribute land and encourage breaking up villages. As we know, the Soviets pushed in the opposite direction and collectivization in the Soviet Union is one of the great crimes of the century. Its roots were ideological: one should not absolve Marxism by concentrating on Stalin's character flaws. Lithuania is fortunate in that Grinius and other leaders of the awakening did not succumb to the revolutionary temptation, the dream of solving problems once and for all. Grinius was aware of much that was going on, especially of democratization, progress in science and medicine. And while he was not an economist and did not write about capital formation, he was aware that increases in productivity, especially in agriculture, were necessary to improve the standard of living. But there is no suggestion that he saw himself as living in the Last Days, to use a religious expression. In this he differs from Lenin and Trotsky.

Probably Grinius's is an 1895 essay with a utopian ring. There are those in Europe, he writes, who have come to realize that there will be no equality as long as capital remains in private hands. This conclusion follows a survey of what has

---

382 *Prano Mašioto Šviesa*, pp. 58-59.

383 *Rygos garsas* (*The Voice of Riga*), February 24, 1910. Northern Lithuania belonged to Riga's economic zone. Likely, more Lithuanians were living in Riga than in any city in Lithuania. Riga was a more developed industrial center. In an era of wood-burning stoves, buildings of wood posed a serious fire-hazard. In the 1930s, "Lithuania of masonry" became one of the progressive battle-cries. The slogan has a more inspiring ring in Lithuanian.

been accomplished. Clearly, Lithuanian is used more widely and many now take pride in the language. Less successful has been the effort to improve farming, but peasants are beginning to adopt modern farming methods. The need for a modern, urban Lithuanian culture has been recognized, but that is a long-term goal. But then he asks: what good is all this if many will still suffer in poverty? The French Revolution proclaiming equality and universal rights aroused hope. But, it turned out, that only the wealthy gained, while the condition of workers became even worse. At fault is the unregulated market: before the Revolution power was in the hands of nobles and clergymen, now it is in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Government and law serves only the interests of the wealthy. This is why there are now voices insisting that capital be public and that labor be the only source of well-being. He concludes with remarks about the Lithuanian situation: there are only a few factories, but there are many impoverished estate laborers.[384]

The essay is evidence that Grinius was aware, at least in general terms, of developments in radical socialist thought. But there were few if any traces of such utopianism in his mature views. The need to eliminate poverty remains. But as to means, in the end, he comes to prefer education, enlightenment, making people less dependent and more self-sufficient. His often repeated argument for democracy is that it is the form of government which is most conducive to individual initiative.

By 1917, Kapsukas was convinced that Grinius was a hardened counterrevolutionary, deserving of death. A friend of Grinius visited Kapsukas in Moscow in about 1918. He told her that Grinius deserved arrest for claiming that Bolshevism will restore slavery, impoverish the country, and eventually collapse. According to Kapsukas, Lithuanians will not be permitted to return from the Caucasus and should support the Bolsheviks because under their rule workers will enjoy a happiness hitherto unheard of on this earth.[385] In his view, Grinius was a hypocrite : although a notorious atheist for many years, when becoming president, Grinius attended church and kissed the cross. "Even now he remains godless, although he must present a different face to the public. The bourgeoisie must use all means, including religion, to maintain their hold."[386]

I will add one story about Kapsukas for the sake of general history. Supposedly, in 1939, Stalin told a Lithuanian diplomat: "When I directed him

---

384 M. R., "Mūsų reikalai" ("Our Affairs"), *Varpas*, 1895 August, no. 8, pp. 130-33.

385 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 180.

386 Kapsukas's unpublished diary, Lithuanian Special Archive, 4182/4/5, fol. 84-85.

[Kapsukas] to work in Lithuania, he, having some 30 officials surrounded himself with Jews."[387] Stalin was referring to the Communist government Kapsukas headed in the Vilnius region from late 1918 to July 1919, at first called the Lithuanian Soviet Republic and later, the Lithuanian-Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. Soviet propaganda maintained that this was a Lithuanian creation, expressing the will of Lithuanian workers, but interrupted by so-called independence, and restored after 1940. For obvious reasons, historians disagree. Stalin's remark supports the serious historian version, that Kapsukas was only a facade for hiding Moscow's imperial ambitions, especially in the war with Poland.[388]

There were only several Jews in his government, which included several left-leaning but patriotic Lithuanians. In fact, if anyone had surrounded Kapsukas with Jews it was Stalin, because Moscow's emissary in Lithuania was Adolph Joffe (1883-1927). But Joffe belonged to the Opposition and supported Trotsky.[389] I may add that in December 1926, during the military coup which ousted Grinius, Kapsukas and Bukharin, then head of the Comintern, discussed the situation. Kapsukas's diary leaves the impression that in the end there was little they could do.[390]

All biographers face the challenge of penetrating deeper, discovering what lies underneath the public poses. This is especially difficult in the case of Grinius, in the absence of diaries, private letters. But there is one 1923 editorial in which, to my mind, we can discern the inner workings of his mind, as far politics is concerned. The editorial—authorship is not in doubt—makes clear that in the three decades intervening between his flirting with radicalism in the 1890s, he

387 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 244.

388 Service, *Lenin*, pp. 385-86, holds that Lenin opposed outright incorporation, but many Communists insisted on it. According to Service, Lenin favored independent states, but controlled by Communist parties which were only regional organizations of the Russian Communist Party. In effect, independence would be a facade.

389 On the website In Defense of Marxism I read Joffe's suicide letter, addressed to Trotsky, again showing how little ideologies, no matter how egalitarian their rhetoric, change ordinary human responses. Joffe was ill. The authorities suggested 1000 dollars for a cure abroad. Joffe replied: am I worth so little after decades of revolutionary work? At the time, that amount was beyond the wildest dreams of a Russian worker. In Lithuania, one dollar was worth about 10 litas, while the poverty line was set at 1356 litas annually for one person (*Statistikos biuletenis* (*Statistical Bulletin*), 1926 December, no. 12, p. 19.) In about 1918, several persons who had visited Kapsukas in Moscow reported that he was living in a comfortable three-room apartment, with two young female servants wearing white aprons, looking after him (Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 180). As noted, on his tour Wallace enjoyed unlimited quantities of good wine. It did not occur to him that in these regions wine is an upper class privilege, with symbolic value like that of servants wearing white aprons.

390 Lithuanian Special Archive, 4182/4/5, fol. 112.

developed a firm conviction that, its flaws notwithstanding, democracy is the best form of government because it is most conducive to the flourishing of individual initiative. Notice that he does not rely on abstractions such as natural rights, or provide us with a discourse on human dignity, or the laws of history. His claim is consequentialist, the kind of claim which experience can confirm or reject. There is a historical thesis: democracies arose because the masses have emerged into the public arena. There is the factual thesis: democracies are more conducive to individual initiative than other political systems. There are Lithuanians, he writes, who want to replace democracy with saviors. There simply are and will never be potentates capable of solving all problems: for that we need the labor and initiative of everyone in the country.

Besides noting the enlightenment belief in human rationality, for contrast, Service lists social theorists who hold that the human condition can be improved only when "great men lead their societies." Grinius rejects this alternative, I suspect, because he believes that leaders share the same vices and propensities with everyone else. In that sense, for Grinius there are no great men, no saviors. The contrast between this and the claims made by and for Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin is glaring. Sebag Montefiore attributes "world-historical arrogance" to Stalin.[391] The same could be said about many of the other Bolsheviks, including Kapsukas. Nothing like that could be said of Grinius. One may add that the American separation of powers reflects a skeptical view of would be saviors.

I may add that while Grinius was aware of revolutionary developments, there is no evidence that he was familiar with Lenin's name before 1917. According to Service, while Lenin was known to a select circle of revolutionaries, he was not known to a broader reading public.[392] The fact that Grinius was unaware of Lenin supports Service's claim. At the same time, it suggests that most Lithuanians were not in close touch with Russian revolutionary circles.

There is a vast difference between submitting to and following a leader, and taking initiative on one's own. Grinius's piece impresses me with its coherence, maturity. It is the product of much reflection. Perhaps, these reflections begin with memories from childhood of authority figures—priests, nobles, government officials—who were more pretense than substance. Perhaps, the mother imposing a senseless ritual is the starting point? Likely, a mistrust of quasi-religious salvanionist ideologies is also at work.

---

391 Simon Sebag Montefiore, *Stalin: the Court of the Red Tsar* (New York: Alfred A.Knopf, 2004), p. 526.

392 Service, *Lenin*, p. 207.

In any case, in the 1923 editorial under discussion, Grinius notes the rise of dictators in Europe. In Russia, there is the "Trotsky-Dzerzhinsky dictatorship." There are dictators in Greece, Italy (Mussolini), and Spain. In Europe democratism and republicanism are undergoing a crisis. But the dictators will pass away: "Democracy is too deep-rooted, the masses are too deeply interested in public affairs and government, people are too educated, the press is too widely available." Dictators cost too much. They are prone to extravagant adventures—Grinius includes Napoleon. They are supported only by those disenfranchised by the rise of democracies, nobles, generals, priests, persons who used to enjoy many comforts and the services of unpaid workers. In Spain the dictator-general was met by a galaxy of bemedaled dignitaries. but "the workers were not represented." The dictatorship in Spain began with censorship of the press.[393]

Of course, Lenin could not count on the support of many counts and marquises. On the other hand, the Soviets, if anything, distributed more medals than the czars. After Lenin's death, Grinius published a more speculative meditation on Lenin's life. He considers, on the whole skeptically, that Lenin suffered from brain damage. But the revolution unleashed the worst elements in the Russian character. To reach his goals, Lenin made use of the lowest human instincts and now we find little more than "universal kleptomania and sadism." Lenin died knowing that he had failed: Russia was not even socialist. While he does not say it explicitly, Grinius represents Russia as the work of several leaders, Lenin, Trotsky, Bukharin, Dzerzhinsky, who use the masses to their own ends. He speculates that Lenin did not bring about lasting changes, but merely replaced for a few years the aged and creaky aristocracy and bureaucracy. But Lithuania benefited: fearing communism, the "clericals" agreed to a far-reaching land redistribution, something they otherwise would not have agreed to.[394]

Too harsh: Stalin was still some years away. Russia at Lenin's death was more orderly than Grinius's experiences in Kislovodsk would suggest. But at least he was not starry-eyed, trapped within his own romantic vision of revolution. In his memoirs, I do not find the boast that his rejection of revolutionary utopianism helped save Lithuania from much misery.

---

393 K., "Diktatūros," *Lietuvos žinios*, 1923 September 29. The paper reprinted the piece on February 4, 1927, over his full name, not quite two months after the military coup which ousted him. Felix Dzerzhinsky, founder under Lenin of the terror apparatus, was active in Lithuanian-Polish social democratic circles. Grinius met him at least once, in 1896.

394 K. "Raudonasis Šventasis" ("The Red Saint"), *Lietuvos žinios,* February 3, 1924.

I have referred several times to his reading of Herbert Spencer while a student in Moscow. In fact, Grinius says somewhat more than I have suggested. He writes: Spencer showed that under socialism all will become slaves of the central government, bound by socialist dogmas and centralization. He explains that then he belonged to a Lithuanian-Polish circle for the study of socialism. It was in that context that Spencer saved him from a "complete commitment to the teachings of Marx-Engels." He also writes that he found much support in the critique of socialism offered by Karl Kautsky (1854-1938) and that in Moscow he subscribed to Kautsky's *Die neue Zei*t, without disruption from censors. There must be some confusion here. Kautsky is generally seen as an orthodox Marxist. He did become a critic, but mostly after Lenin's seizure of power.[395] In the article on Lenin just cited, Grinius says that he agrees with Kautsky's view that socialism is possible only in a developed country.

Socialism, especially in the present time, is a broad term, covering a variety of political programs. The socialist British labor party, after the war, nationalized various industries, a program which few if any present day socialists favor. In this context, it is hard to think of socialism as having dogmas. But dogmas are characteristic of Marxist communism. This suggests that in the end Grinius responded to Marxists in much the same way he responded to clergymen: they preach about loving their neighbor and the joys of heaven, but they eat, drink, lie, steal, carouse—his father used to say that—just like everyone else, and do nothing to relieve misery here and now. From the point of view of outsiders, religions are mostly talk, drowned out by opulent churches and splendidly outfitted bishops. Only believers can assign to religions a deeper meaning. Marxists stand in a similar position. They preach about revolution, class struggle, the laws of history and the blessings awaiting under true communism. But how does revolution increase milk yields and reduce infant mortality?

The present verdict of intellectual history favors Marx. Spencer gets an occasional footnote, while Marx is still read, discussed, still viewed by a few as a true prophet. Grinius was not a philosopher. Nowhere does he offer a developed intellectual critique of Marxist dogmas. Given his childhood encounters with religion, the simple fact that there were dogmas would have repelled him. But

---

395 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 141. Service, *Lenin*, pp. 123-24, states that Lenin idolized Kautsky into the early 1900s. But in the end, Kautsky did not believe that the Great War would erupt into world revolution (p. 238). Lenin's pamphlet, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* appeared in 1918.

there is a germ of an intellectual approach. He remembers that as a student he could not reconcile the socialist promise of freedom for all with the *Communist Manifesto's* call for class warfare, for the destruction of rich people and their progeny, and all those who think differently. Would it not be better if socialists abandoned the idea of class warfare and the dictatorship of the proletariat?

The memoirs about Kautsky I am citing were written in old age: he would not have been human if his assessment of Bolshevism in 1947 had not been colored by Kislovodsk, the terror of 1940-1941, the occupations destroying what he had spent his lifetime building. He could not have evaded something like the following question: how much carnage would have been avoided had intellectuals and political leaders followed the verbose, dull, common sense of Spencer instead of the intoxicating visions of Marx? Thus, while not entirely dismissing distortions of memory, I believe that he is more or less accurate in describing his student days. There is no question, that as a student and later, he was exposed to distinctively Marxist ideas. Revolutionary radicalism was swirling around him. Yet, something held him back: reform—yes, revolution—no. We can only guess what that something was. Likely, his practical bent. A peasant with common sense would have reflected: I will worry about the course of world history once I have taught my children to read and write.

Grinius respected Marx, but did not follow him. His sister recalls that in 1904 a portrait of Marx decorated their parent's parlor, along with those of Copernicus and several Lithuanian princes and activists.[396]

The greater risk in Grinius's case was not ideological intoxication. It was associating with people who were drifting in the direction of Lenin and Bolshevism by way of becoming revolutionaries (rather than reformers). In his memoirs, Kapsukas divides his development into three stages. In 1905, when he came into conflict with Grinius and his wife, he was a revolutionary, but not yet even a Marxist. At the time, he had not yet shaken off "the narrow Lithuanian, in essence petty bourgeois, reticence." In 1907, during his second imprisonment, he read Marx, Engels, Kautsky, Plekhanov, and even some Lenin, and became a Marxist. But he became a full-fledged Bolshevik only in the course of the war. He met Lenin in 1914 in Cracow.[397]

---

396 Unpublished memoir, Marijampolė Public Library.

397 Lenin lived in Cracow from June 1912 to September 1914. The city belonged to Austro-Hungary. Only several miles from the border with Russia, it was teeming with political refugees and was a center of revolutionary activity (Service, *Lenin*, p. 209). In effect, while Lenin stayed there, the city served as the Bolshevik headquarters.

Kapsukas's scorn for confining Lithuania suggests another line of thought, that by way of Marxism, Leninism, Bolshevism he began to think of himself as a world historical agent, with tiny Lithuania too small a stage. This interpretation is supported by an undated letter from 1913-1914, in which Kapsukas complains of the insignificance and "flatness" of the nationalists.[398] He names no names, but seems to have in mind persons like Grinius. Kapsukas died before the great purges, but other Lithuanian communists lived long enough to became victims of Stalin's version of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is obvious that with the exception of a handful, one can become a world-historical agent only in imagination. I find nothing suggesting that Grinius was attracted by visions of affecting the course of world history, no signs that he imagined himself a political grandmaster.

After the October coup, Kapsukas became the Bolshevik Commissar for Lithuanian Affairs. Late in 1917, in an interview, he declared that the Bolsheviks favored national self-determination, but with a but, based on the true interests of the proletariat, something known only by Bolsheviks: "Because in an independent Lithuania the interests of the proletariat can suffer, we reject independence and will fight against this idea. Lithuania would win only if there is world revolution."[399] Thus, Lithuanians are denied the right to think for themselves in the name of two Marxist dogmas, the unity of the international proletariat and the inevitability of the world revolution. If these words express Kapsukas's own beliefs, and not just government policy, we have someone who sees himself as having ascended to the larger stage. There are no biographies of Kapsukas and the question cannot be decided: the best hypothesis is that he was voicing the views of the Bolshevik leadership which he accepted.

The socialist scene in Vilnius was confusing, with some inclined to work within their own national communities and others looking for broader horizons. As we have seen, also divisive was the question of exactly how national communities are constituted. First on the scene was Pilsudski's Polish Socialist Party, founded in 1892 in Paris, but with many of its activities centered around Vilnius. The next year, reflecting differences on the nationality question, a group split off and adopted the ungainly name of Social Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland (adding "and Lithuania" a few years later.) Pilsudski was a nationalist

398 Special Lithuanian Archive, F 94-55/1.

399 Interview, *Lietuvių balsas* (*The Voice of Lithuanians*), December 23, 1917, no. 68. *Lietuvių balsas* was first published in Saint Petersburg but at about the time of Lenin's coup was moved to Voronezh, Russia, to which many Lithuanians had retreated from the Germans. Kapsukas claims that Lithuanian Social Democrats have agreed to join with him, but that the *Liaudininka*i refused.

while the offshoot, with Rosa Luxemburg as its most prominent figure, moved towards internationalism. In 1896, the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party was founded during a secret conference in Vilnius, attended by Grinius. There was also the Jewish Bund and another group headed by the young Dzerzhinsky. It goes without saying that most of these groups experienced further splits, with some ending up as Bolsheviks. Sectarianism flourished.

In May 1896 Grinius and two other *Varpininkai* were present at what came to be called the founding conference of the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party. Some 15 were present, including Dzerzhinsky. Among the more contentious issues was that of Lithuania's political future. The social democrats were under pressure from two directions. Orthodox Marxists—Grinius singles out Rosa Luxemburg—were demanding that they make class struggle their priority, with national struggles secondary at best. Pilsudski's socialists pushed in the opposite direction, at the same time dismissing Lithuanian interests for the sake of the dream of Greater Poland. Grinius is somewhat hesitant concerning the two leading Lithuanian social democrats : were they advocating Lithuanian independence for tactical reasons, hoping to strengthen their appeal among Lithuanians, or out of conviction?

At the conference, Grinius reported on the awakening and book smuggling, no doubt proud of the progress made in the six years since the founding of *Varpas*. The social democrats at the time had few resources and were eager to accept help from the *Varpininkai*, while the latter hoped that these social democrats would help the Lithuanian cause among industrial workers. The conference agreed that Lithuania should become a democratic republic, federated with Poland and other neighbors that became independent. While he is not entirely sure, he thinks this was the first definite statement of what a future Lithuania should look like.[400]

Augustinas Janulaitis (1878-1950), the first Lithuanian academic historian, was a radical social democrat in his youth. In 1904 he published a Lithuanian translation of the *Communist Manifesto* and in 1908, a short account of Marx's life and writings. After joining the party in 1901, likely he heard much gossip about the heated disputes among the various socialist strains. In any case, on the basis of Pilsudski's published letters, he concluded that in the 1890s Pilsudski was especially fearful of Lithuanian socialists establishing themselves in Vilnius. Apparently, rural folk did not threaten his dream of a "heart to heart." But

[400] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys,* 1: 207-209.

cities were to be reserved for Poles: he bitterly opposed socialist agitation in Lithuanian among urban workers, but encouraged such agitation among peasants. Janulaitis suggests that Pilsudski found Vilnius a convenient site for Polish conspiracies: the authorities tended to think that nothing of importance, especially where Poland was concerned, could take place in Lithuania. He finds some cooperation at the beginning, but clashes and disagreements later. According to Grinius, in open competition Pilsudski lost to his Lithuanian rivals and had to withdraw from Vilnius. He adds the usual Lithuanian comment with which Poles disagree: Pilsudski returned to Vilnius only by way of the treacherous assault led by Lucjan Zeligowski [401]

Present at the conference was Andrius Domaševičius (1865-1935), deemed by Grinius to be the winner in his rivalry with Pilsudski. Domaševičius established a medical practice in Vilnius in 1893 and became the leader of Lithuanian social democrats. From 1899 to 1905, he was mostly in prison or Siberian exile. Not a practicing Catholic, he was prominent in efforts to introduce Lithuanian into Catholic services in Vilnius. In 1907 he was among the founders of the Lithuanian Learned Society.[402] According to Grinius, Domaševičius did not know Lithuanian well, was a poor organizer, stubborn and erratic. This side of his character appears in 1919 in Vilnius, when he organized the Lithuanian Communist Party, which however was not part of the official Lithuanian Communist Party. He had extensive foreign ties, especially with German social democrats. In independent Lithuania, he was tried several times in political cases.

The other social democrat was Alfonsas Moravskis (1868-1941). A member of the petty gentry, he became an economist and university professor in independent Lithuania. Supposedly, as a child he knew little or no Lithuanian. Imprisoned for political activities in the early 1890s, shortly after the 1896 conference, fearing arrest, he fled, ending up studying in Switzerland. There, he organized social democratic circles among Lithuanians and issued appeals in various languages on behalf of Lithuania. He left the social democrats in 1902. Grinius characterizes him as a hard worker who enjoyed writing, but difficult to get along with and very fearful of spies and gendarmes.[403]

[401] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 138; Augustinas Janulaitis. "Domaševičius ir Pilsudkis," *Mūsų senovė* (*Our Old Days*), 1940, no. 1, pp. 53-62. The treachery aspect is this: a truce was signed at Suvalkai on October 7, 1920, while Polish forces attacked the next day. Stamp collectors are aware of an oddity called "Central Lithuania" which survived for a time after the invasion.

[402] Lithuanian Science Society is the more usual name. Lithuanian Learned Society is better because the society was mostly concerned with humanities.

[403] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys,* 1: 141.

Domaševičius and Moravskis, as well as Janulaitis, were important in steering the awakening towards political demands. All three were shaped by European socialism and owe little or nothing to literary romanticism.

It is not always clear at this time whether the authorities were more concerned with separatism inspired by national revivals or or the spread of democratic and socialist ideas. Perhaps, the former in the case of Poland, the latter--Lithuania. As we saw, as late as 1904, Sviatopolsk-Mirskii, the governor-general in Vilnius, did not think that Lithuanian national development threatened the empire. It is also possible that there was no coherent policy, with the organs of repression following their own imperatives. There is a published list of 53 persons in two counties in Suvalkai province listed by police as politically unreliable. On it there are 34 Lithuanians, judging from the names, with 20 peasants, 3 workers, 7 craftsmen, and 4 in fields requiring some formal education. Only three are connected with Lithuanian activities, while the rest are mostly social democrats, with one said to be especially dangerous. There are 19 Jews on the list, all described as town dwellers, but without further details. The list was compiled in 1907, but reflects involvement in 1905 events. Even a police report on Grinius, written in 1912, when Lithuanian separatism was more advanced, places emphasis on his alleged ties with social democrats. He is said to have belonged to the party in 1905, corresponded with members of the party, and contributed to "leftist" periodicals in Vilnius. In another report, he is alleged to be a member of the Bund.[404] A glance at the biographies of Domaševičius and Moravskis suggests that the distinction is somewhat forced: Grinius is hesitant as to whether they were patriots or radicals, trying to expand their influence in rivalry with Pilsudski and his socialists.

My guess is that the police were using the term "social democrat" broadly, so that the list should not be understood as showing that the social democrats were winning against the *Liaudininkai* who claimed to represent the interests of the peasants. Two on the list were informants.

The weakness of the social democrats in 1896 is shown by their failure to establish their own newspaper. Dated May 1, 1896, the first issue of *Lietuvos darbininkas* (*The Worker of Lithuania*) appeared. The second was dated May 1, 1898. The third and last—1899--announcing that it was to appear twice a year. Probably, they abandoned their plans because of police pressure, the arrest of

[404] V. Steponaitis, "Iš žandarų archyvo" ("From the Gendarme Archive"), *Mūsų senovė*, 1922, no. 4-5, pp. 644-71.

Domaševičius and the flight of Moravskis. Of each issue, there was to be Polish and a Lithuanian version. There are at best only faint signs of Marxist ideology. Grinius himself says that he translated the first issue. He showed it to Kapsukas, without revealing that he was the translator, and Kapsukas replied that he had already read it and liked it. This reference to Kapsukas is curious: Grinius devotes several paragraphs to the history of consumption in Kapsukas's family—Kapsukas died of complications from tuberculosis--and only a sentence to his politics. We learn that in 1903, when Kapsukas assisted the editor of *Varpas* and *Ūkininkas*, while remaining a socialist he wrote as one of the *Varpininkai*, becoming a "genuine" Bolshevik later.[405]

Friedrich Engels died in 1895. The first issue of *Lietuvos darbininkas* is dedicated to him. The sketch of his life describes the suffering of workers, but without any distinctively Marxist touches.[406] The introductory statement by the editors does take a tentative step in that direction: "they will strive to tear off the mask of hypocrisy from all those who under the cover of nice words exploit workers no less than do open enemies." But it is not clear whether exploitation is seen as ordinary misbehavior or is understood in the Marxist sense, as constitutive of the relation between capitalists and workers. More informative is an unsigned reflective piece on changes taking place in Lithuania. The unknown author probably was familiar with Marx, but deriving from him not dogmas and battle-cries, but an analytical framework. I wish Grinius had recorded his thoughts and reactions as he translated this short essay! There is emphasis on the abolition of serfdom: farmers are better off because the farms are bigger. But Lithuania is a backward land, still very traditional and conservative, but undergoing fundamental economic changes. We still find the same soot in huts and cabins, fields overgrown with weeds, the same roads, ancient traditions, constrained and petty lives. At the same time, Lithuania is moving from a subsistence and barter economy to a money economy in which more and more are producing for the market. Because of the new railways, there is more dependence on international prices. Society is differentiating itself into modern social classes. The power of the landed gentry is passing into the hands of the bourgeoisie. The gulf separating the haves and have-nots is growing, as is the number of the latter.

---

405 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 243-44. Kapsukas's wife was executed in 1937 and there are doubts about the official version of his death. Their three children were placed in an orphanage and later adopted by a relative.

406 "Priderikas Engels," *Lietuvos darbininkas*, May 1, 1896, no. 1, pp. 1-3.

Our beautiful people, whom the poets describe in loving tones, are giving birth to more and more exploiters! But the author suggests little by way of a political program, no more than a call for workers to organize and defend themselves.[407] He overstates the role of railways. River routes were important. As we saw earlier, international grain prices had some effect on Lithuanian incomes.

There is nothing in this issue that Grinius and like minded reformers could object to. Most of the pages are devoted to recording the sufferings and struggles of workers, both industrial and estate, and not only in Lithuania, but throughout the empire. We learn, for example, of a strike in 1895 in Jaroslavl involving some 6000 workers, suppressed by the army with three workers killed, and several other strikes involving the army, but without casualties. By contrast, strikes in Lithuania were small and scattered. For 1894 seven strikes in Vilnius are noted, involving only several hundred. In one case, female workers in a textile mill had their work day reduced from 17 to 12 hours.[408] There are several complaints of verbal abuse and, perhaps, physical. Working conditions were terrible, dirt, noise, dust, poor ventilation, little regard for safety.

In this issue, workers and owners are not identified by nationality. Owner names are mostly Germanic, suggesting that the owners were either of German origin or were Jews. In the second issue, May 1, 1898, in several cases workers are identified by nationality. One factory in Kaunas employs 200, mostly Lithuanians with a few Germans. The work day is 13 hours. There is child labor, including four year-olds earning 35 kopeks per day. The bosses are cruel and abusive—one is known as Herod, another—Pilate. Another factory in Kaunas employs 560, mostly Lithuanian speakers. Workers are fined often: 50 kopeks for "smoking in the outhouse," one ruble for smoking on the factory floor. Earnings range from 5-24 rubles every two weeks. Working conditions are terrible. There are many injuries, many suffer from lung diseases.[409] Worth recalling at this point, that when he began his medical practice, Grinius charged 50 kopeks for house calls.

Similar conditions were widespread in the United States. Lithuanian immigrants in Chicago depicted in Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle* were not better off. But at home, since almost no shops and factories were Lithuanian-owned,

---

407 "Draugijines sanlygos Lietuvoje" ("Conditions in Lithuania for Associations"), *Lietuvos darbininkas*, May 1, 1896, no. 1, pp. 3-5.

408 *Lietuvos darbininkas*, May 1, 1896, no. 1, pp. 15, 9. Probably, the 17 hours includes time for meals. There probably is a misprint and the word I understand as meaning textiles could mean something else.

409 *Lietuvos darbininkas*, May 1, 1898, no. 2, pp. 9-12.

it is likely that labor conflicts at times were seen as national conflicts, pitting Lithuanians against "foreigners," often Jews. We read for example of a Jewish owned leather factory in Šiauliai. The work day is from four in the morning to nine in the evening. Older workers are fired, when younger, stronger, and cheaper help can be hired. The workers are not described by nationality, but are said to be persons fleeing rural poverty, that is, in that region, Lithuanians.[410] It is not unlikely, that some of the blame was placed on Jews, even though in another factory, Jewish workers were being treated in a similar way.

In 1897, Grinius published several pages about a new political force which has been active in Lithuania for several years. He provides summaries of various articles which have appeared in social democratic publications, mostly in Polish. The social democrats demand a minimum wage, equal pay for men and women, abolition of child-labor, medical insurance, improved working conditions. They call for an 8-hour workday—in 1897 the government reduced the workday for industrial workers to from 10 ½ to 12 hours, depending on the industry. Nothing radical from the point of view of the present—most of these demands have been met in most industrialized countries. But Grinius also mentions two dogmas, likely of Marxist origin. The first is the assertion that the proletariat is the only truly revolutionary class because workers will never content themselves with the gains already made. The second is the call for the abolition of the private ownership of land and of the means of production. Unfortunately, Grinius simply reports without indicating his own point of view.[411]

Grinius's first arrest as an activist was still some years away, but by helping the social democrats he was taking substantial risks. In April of 1897, at the request of Domaševičius, he carried a bundle of May Day posters, in Polish and Lithuanian, to Kaunas. Unfortunately, because the name of the street had been changed, he had trouble finding the shoemaker who was to receive them. A stranger with a bundle asking passersby for directions could easily draw attention from the authorities. Grinius was lucky. He found the shoemaker, exchanged passwords, made the delivery, and returned home. Then as now, smuggling has its theatrical side. Grinius recalls that once Domaševičius sent a young lady to pick up a consignment. She packed so much printed matter around her waist that she could not tie her corset. Grinius had to help, since his wife was away. One wonders what gendarmes would have thought had they blundered

410 *Lietuvos darbininkas*, May 1, 1898, no. 2, p. 4.

411 Ugis, "Naujas apsireiškimas" ("A New Presence"), *Varpas*, 1897 July-August, no. 4, pp. 54-55; September-October, no. 5, pp. 69-70.

upon a male in his mid-thirties assisting a young woman with her corset? He later learned that on the train to Vilnius, she suffered great pain and nearly fainted.

Perhaps, Joana Griniuvienė was doing some legal shopping across the border. More likely, she was risking arrest by smuggling manuscripts and returning with loads of *Varpininkai* publications. Grinius at the time was editing *Ukininkas*. The risks were real. In Prussia, one had to avoid detection by informants and Russian agents. Then decide whether to cross illegally or risk a thorough inspection at customs. Some two kilometers from the border, border patrols watched the roads. There were also mounted patrols and customs agents posted in railway stations, not to mention spies in plain clothes who could be anywhere.[412] My sense is that some of this vigilance was blunted by the human factor: functionaries eager to supplement their incomes.

In 1899 several issues of *Aidas Lietuvos darbininkų gyenimo* (*Echo of the Lives of Workers of Lithuania*) were published, perhaps in Zurich, with the first issue edited by Moravskis. Grinius is said to have translated it from the Polish, but I was not able to confirm this. In the first issue dated January 1, 1899, there is only one claim likely of Marxist origin, although Marx is not mentioned. The unknown author is explaining capitalism and its vices. But, he argues, workers can look forward to the day when everyone will be equal because that used to the the case in the past. This I take to be an allusion to primitive communism, the secular edition of the Garden of Eden story related by Marxists, when there was equality, sharing, and no hired labor. With one exception, in accounts of working conditions, workers are not identified by nationality. The exception is an account of a brawl between Lithuanian and Latvian workers in Liepaja, Latvia. In that city, Latvians who work for no less than a ruble a day, attacked Lithuanians willing to work for 60 kopeks. This suggests that the Lithuanians were migrants, ready to accept anything, while the Latvians were more established and organized. Industrialization was more advanced in Latvia than in Lithuania. But similar conflicts can be found in Lithuania. In 1898 a strike in Kaunas was broken by villagers willing to work for any wage. This news item concludes by noting that Poles in Germany, "Russian Jews" in England, and Walloons in France also are used as strike breakers.[413]

An unsigned review of *Aidas Lietuvos darbininkų gyvenimo*, in *Varpas*, 1900 May, no. 5, pp. 55-57, is appreciative but critical. The reviewer agrees that

[412] Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, pp. 95-97. Arguably, competent and honest administration would have blocked the awakening. Corruption was a major factor in bringing down the Soviet Union.

[413] *Lietuvos darbininkas*, May 1,1898, no. 2, p. 34.

only informed and active workers can improve their condition, but argues that there are other important groups, for example, farmers. Furthermore, much remains to be done in creating a Lithuanian culture. According to the reviewer, to limit oneself to workers and their needs is to miss much of human life.

Likely, by way of his involvement with social democrats, Grinius had an opportunity to drift towards revolutionary radicalism. If so, he did not make use of it.

There were friendly contacts between Grinius and social democrats at least into 1905. But the social democrats were still primarily reformers, with only traces of Marxism. Kipras Bielinis (1883-1965), was one of the rising generation of social democrats, joining the party in 1902, having been expelled from secondary school in Riga for distributing Lithuanian publications. His first meeting with Grinius was early in 1905 at a meeting near Marijampolė arranged by the two sides to discuss their differences. Bielinis was prepared to attack the democrats—*Varpininkai* were referred to by that name at the time—and Grinius as their mainstay. Grinius's wife burst into the room, as Grinius embellished, with whip in hand and still covered with snow. Grinius and his wife left the meeting and rushed home, some 6-7 kilometers in the sleigh. It turns out that customs officers in a border town had stopped several butter barrels stuffed with contraband literature, with the sender identified as Dr. K. Grinius. At home, certain of a visit from the authorities, they cleaned things up. Nothing happened. Several days later, Kapsukas showed up. It was he who had written in Grinius's name, but, fortunately, indicating that Grinius the sender was from a different town. According to Grinius, Kapsukas's scheme was poorly thought out. By then, Grinius was well-known as a "Lithuanian patriot" and simply his name could have attracted the attention of customs.[414]

Grinius recalls that at the meeting he was a calming influence. Bielinis was urging insurrection, claiming that weapons could be obtained easily from military stores. But Grinius replied that should the rising fail, the consequences would be disastrous. Lithuanians alone, he argued, could not defeat the czar. Thus, any rising has to be coordinated with other awakening nations. Afterward, when fleeing the authorities, Bielinis was hidden by Grinius and his wife several times.

Another social democrat was Steponas Kairys (1879-1964), an engineer, one of the signatories of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. He became

414 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir minys*, 1: 244-45; Kipras Bielinis, "Atsiminimai iš 1904-6m." ("Memoirs from 1904-1906"), *Varpas*, 1926, pp. 214-16.

a social democrat in 1900. In 1944, to evade the Gestapo, he assumed a false name. He has been recognized by Yad Vashem for rescuing Jews. Grinius met him in the summer of 1904, at a conference in Vilnius. Kairys urged armed resistance to the czar. In response, Grinius urged caution, advocating passive resistance: the government will respond with force. As it is, we have too few of the educated and cannot risk their loss. In his me-moirs, Kairys is skeptical of Grinius's account of his dealings with social democrats. In his view, Grinius misunderstood the social democratic approach to the question of language among workers in Vilnius. They did not push the question, but expected time and the expansion of Lithuanian culture to produce results. Grinius also did not understand Domaševičius, who was young, sympathetic, cheerful and became a welcome guest in Polish society in Vilnius.[415]

The social democrats were moving towards insurrection, but not towards Marxist ideology. From 1901 to 1906 they published *Darbininkų balsas* (*Workers Voice*).[416] The slogan workers of the world unite appears on the cover of every issue, but there are no articles explaining Marx's views. They had a fund for the purchase of weapons—most of the contributions came from Lithuanians in the United States. Another sign of radicalization: they published the names and descriptions of spies. They saw themselves as part of the international socialist movement, but also insisting on a democratic and independent Lithuania, maintaining federal ties with Russia. By Lithuania, they made clear several times, they meant a territory inhabited by different nationalities. Kapsukas was an occasional contributor. They received some support from the *Varpininkai* offices in Prussia. But Grinius had no special connection with this group.

There is a statement by the central committee of the party casting light on Lithuanian-Polish relations. The committee accused Pilsudski's socialists of boycotting them by refusing to sell publications in Polish needed by social democrats who do not understand Lithuanian. Even worse, when in about 1901 the social democrats were in decline, the Pilsudski group published the false claim that the social democrats had merged with them. In 1902, the Poles published a newspaper aimed at Lithuanian workers, in more than a year managing to publish one issue of 12 pages. They proclaimed that there was no awakening and that no one was organizing workers in Lithuania. The committee expressed the hope that such views were not representative of Polish socialists, but only of a handful

415 Steponas Kairys, *Lietuva budo* (*Lithuania Was Awakening*) (New York: 1957), pp. 243, 266.

416 Apparently, published in Prussia, but showing editorial offices in London and several times in Paris.

of "patriot Poles" who under the cover of socialism were pushing the out-dated, traditional, views of Polish gentry.[417]

Clearly, these social democrats shared with many Lithuanians the wound which had not healed, memories of contemptuous glances, condescension, exploitation, impoverishment, at the hands of Polish-speaking landlords. Kairys believes that by 1906 the rivalry between the social democrats and Pilsudski's socialists ended, with the latter abandoning the field.[418]

It is important not to lose sight of persons like Bielinis and Kairys. Timothy Snyder notwithstanding, they show no traces of literary romanticism. The ease with which they passed from culture to culture shows that they were not stereotypical nationalists, unable to understand and appreciate differences. Yet, their contributions to the awakening are as important as that of poets who sang of past glories, their commitment as profound and sincere.

Since Grinius left behind no diaries, no personal letters, his development can only be guessed at. We know from his account of the 1905 meeting that he held few hopes for a successful rising: too much was at stake to make the risk worthwhile. His remarks about Domaševičius and Moravskis suggest that they were allies rather than co-workers. On June 24, 1904, the *Varpininkai* conferred under the cover of a large picnic. On that occasion, Kapsukas passionately defended revolutionary tactics, arguing that only those fully committed to the overthrow of the czar should be counted as genuine members. Others countered that gradual evolution was more promising. The position Grinius took at that time is not recorded.[419] But his relations with Kapsukas could not have been improved by the mislabeled butter barrels, even though in his memoirs Grinius mentions the incident with amusement. A more telling clash occurred on May 28 of that year. Grinius and his wife had organized an evening of Lithuanian theater—amateur theater groups were important in creating a Lithuanian ci-vil society. The evening featured patriotic surprises, a white-bearded bard with *kanklės* and the singing of what was to become the national anthem. Kapsukas was present and distributed some revolutionary leaflets. But he also wanted, after the performance, to get on the stage and deliver a revolutionary oration. Grinius credits his wife, who gathered several young men and explained to Kapsukas that he would be thrown off the stage. In the crowd of some 900 there were several

---

417 *Darbininkų balsas*, 1903 January-February, no. 1, pp. 11-12.

418 Kairys, *Lietuva budo*, p. 273.

419 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p.112.

officials, including the local chief of police.[420] It is perhaps because of this incident that in his memoirs Kapsukas claims that the wife's revolutionary ardor cooled.

The evening was for charity, raising 800 rubles. They would have raised more, but ran out of tickets and allowed people in for free until the barn was full. The list of possible recipients had to be approved by the governor himself, not counting numerous local functionaries. Grinius complained: "Unhappy was the hour when my wife's suggestion to hold a benefit for poor peasants was accepted by the government." But the evening encouraged many imitators.

In fact, there were two radical alternatives. The two questions of this chapter can be posed starkly: why did Grinius not become a revolutionary and why did he not become a Marxist Communist? In the first case, he was aware of disparities of power, how easily revolutions can be crushed, undoing the gains of decades. He was not a pacifist. In his view, there were times when force was justified. But he was aware of the great risks, both in case of failure and of success. His son Liūtas once asked why he had not resisted the 1926 coup. He replied that "even presidents do not have rights over human lives."[421] Of course, the testimony is second hand and comes late in life. But my sense is that even in his early years he would have been reluctant to authorize killing. In the second case, he did not become a Marxist Communist, partly, because he never imagined himself on the world stage, but was content to work for the well being of those around him. Partly, because he could not turn living human beings into abstractions, could not think of them as mere members of a social-class, acting as Marxist theory predicted. Partly, because he was skeptical of religions and ideologies, unwilling to force beliefs upon others.

The main reason was his concern for those here and now. In an 1905 essay about the just distribution of land, he mocks those who expect help from the czar: the czar's expression of concern for the peasants only arouses laughter. Fortunately, the number of those who believe this is decreasing every day. Neither can peasants expect help from the clergy, although there are a few good priests: most of the clergy side with the wolves and not the sheep. The social democrats are not much better. They propose to establish communes, with great benefits accruing to future generations. Grinius responds: "This is what social democrats prophesy. None of the learned can tell when that time will come.

420 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 117.

421 Liūtas Grinius, "Ką sūnus apie tėvą pasakoja" *Varpas*, 1967, no. 7, p. 30-31.

In the meantime, social democrats can promise little for working people."[422] Compared with Wallace and Neruda, with the romantic fantasies of Marxist intellectuals, Grinius stands out with his sober common sense. The American Communist Angela Davis, in her autobiography writes: "When I learned about socialism in my history classes, a whole new world opened up before my eyes. For the first time, I became acquainted with the notion that there could be an ideal socioeconomic arrangement."[423] By his early thirties, Grinius knew better.

[422] Laumės vaikas, "Teisingas žemės valdymas Lietuvoje" ("The Fair Distribution of Land in Lithuania"), *Varpas*, 1905 November-December, no. 11-12, pp. 114-20.

[423] Hollander, *Political Pilgrims*, p. 216.

X The Land Question

Grinius dreamed that Lithuanians take part in the progress sweeping Europe, both as beneficiaries and as contributors. Timidity, ignorance, tradition, discrimination, poverty were holding them back, not to mention incompetent and corrupt officials and imperial policies. He believed that the land question was central: Lithuanians had to acquire farms of sufficient size to support themselves and educate their children, while without an educated and active citizenry reforms were impossible. At the same time, he argued, Lithuanians would be pushed off the land by more productive newcomers if they clung to traditional ways, instead of becoming knowledgeable, modern farmers. Typically, he responded to questions what comes first, increasing productivity or educated farmers, by insisting on both.

There is a 1900 essay on the new era in Lithuanian agriculture, linking demographic, economic, cultural, and educational questions. It is attributed to Grinius, but with question marks. On the other hand, the essay reflects his concerns and his thinking.

It begins by taking note of a shortage of labor, reported by farmers and estate owners. The shortage results from emigration, both internal and external: prevent emigration and labor will become plentiful and cheap, or so some say. There are proposals, for example, not to issue passports or bar recruiters, but such measures will be ineffective. Emigration will not stop as long as wages in

Lithuania, both farm and factory, are noticeably lower than elsewhere. We can be sure that rumor of easier money elsewhere will reach even the most isolated homestead, no matter how much the government tries to suppress the information. Furthermore, farm machinery will not help as long as wages remain low. It will remain more cost-effective to hire field hands than to tie up capital in machines.

We should remember that this is being written more than a century ago, when elaborate statistics were not available. But while the argument is based only on common sense, the reasoning has been amply confirmed by more recent data. No doubt, restrictions and border walls have some effect, but do not solve the problem of migration unless they approach the level of the Iron Curtain. Is there a solution? Increase productivity and raise wages accordingly. In a primarily agricultural economy this can be done only by increasing per acre yields, while yields can be increased only by adopting modern farming methods. Our farmers are held back because they follow tradition. They need to become lite-rate, get into the habit of reading books and journals, so that they benefit from what the science of agronomy offers. The author is explicit that schooling children is not enough. Adults also must become educated. The new era calls for specialized books and journals, machines and modern tools, fertilizers both na-tural and manufactured, agricultural alliances offering libraries and museums, classes in farming methods, agricultural fairs. The author adds that surplus farm labor would remain in the country if more Lithuanians engaged in retailing and manufacturing—both entirely in the hands of Jews—or became skilled craftsmen—leather workers at present are arrivals from "deep Muscovy."[424]

Especially if we distinguish between refugees and migrants, something which the *New York Times* did not do in the case of Grinius, who was a refugee and not an immigrant, it is clear that migration is the product of economic disparities. In the case of Lithuania, only economic development could prevent a drop in population because of emigration. To that extent, the author is right. But I find nothing suggesting that he was aware of a problem: developed countries do not stand still and the difference is likely to remain. There is also the problem of individuals reaching their full potential in a small country with limited resources. On the other hand, the fact that present day Lithuanians face these questions is evidence of how much progress there has been.

---

424 Ukininko Sunus (Son of a Farmer), "Nauja gadynė Lietuvos ukininkystėje" ("A New Era in Lithuania's Farming"), *Ukininkas*, 1900 November, no. 11, pp. 161-64.

Grinius first raises the land question in the context of Russification, an imperial policy advancing both Russian national and religious interests, the empire being both Russian and Orthodox. In the 1891 essay "Maskoliu norai ir darbai," already cited, he argues that the Muskovites make no secret of their goals: they want us to adopt their language, their customs, and in the end—their religion. No mention is made of colonization, but it is obvious that large numbers of Russian settlers would speed assimilation. However, he does note that in 1864 Alexander II made it more difficult for Lithuanians to acquire land. He prohibited the sale of land to Polish Catholics in Kaunas Province, a measure which in effect prevented Lithuanians from buying land, since the government considered educated Lithuanians to be Poles. And peasants were not much better off, since they had to prove their loyalty and overcome bureaucracy.

But in spite of various provisions favoring colonists, tax relief, loans on favorable terms, grants for the purchase of seed and livestock, colonization was not proceeding well. This was his conclusion in 1892, relying on reports in Russian newspapers and government statistics. He sets aside Russians dwelling in cities, officials, military personnel, old-believers who settled fleeing religious persecution, and finds that between 1864 and 1884, 1697 Russian families and more than 300 demobilized soldiers received land. Twenty years later, 25% of the settlers had departed. Some were homesick, others wanted to be nearer their own churches, some could not adjust to the climate or found that the allotted land was not enough to support families. Some turned out to be thieves and fled to avoid reprisals. Many turned their land over to Lithuanians and Jews on long-term leases, thereby evading various restrictions. Grinius's essay is interesting for the information. But also because of his modern approach. He wants to rely on actual numbers, at times indicating their deficiencies, thereby avoiding impressions, gossip, and vague generalizations. He shows considerable familiarity with the applicable laws and decrees.[425]

A few years later he returned to the theme of colonization. Soldiers who helped suppress the rising of 1863, were granted land with entailments: the land could not be sold but had to stay in the hands of the family. The hope was that such Russian enclaves would grow. But this did not happen: the recipients leased out their estates and returned to Russia. A proposed law would allow selling, but only to those who were both Russian and Orthodox. The intent was to encourage

425 K. Gr., "Maskolių naujokai Lietuvoje" ("Muscovite Newcomers in Lithuania"), V*arpas*, 1892 April-May, no. 4-5, pp. 74-76.

Russian settlers. In some ways a small question, since few would be affected by the proposal. But it is another example of a decision made in remote imperial centers, blocking progress in Lithuania. Likely, some readers drew the conclusion that Lithuanians would be better off if they governed themselves. In this piece, Grinius urges people to organize and petition the czar not to bar Lithuanians from purchasing the land in question. But should the petition fail and Russians begin to move in, people should use threats and stronger measures, if needed, to prevent colonization.[426]

The issue of entailed estates in Lithuania—most of the them were in Suvalkai Province--was still alive in 1909. According to Grinius, very few of the holders lived on their lands: most of the entailed estates had been leased out. The government is considering weakening or removing the entailments and Grinius urges Lithuanians to be aware and prepare for the day when they will become eligible buyers.[427] The essay brings out again a side of the awakening often overlooked: people were provided with useful information which they could act upon.

In 1909 Grinius published a longer essay on the history of Russian colonization in Lithuania. Although there have been many failures, that year 41,330 Russians were living in Kaunas Province, many of them old-believers. In recent years, there have been more efforts with the Peasants' Land Bank playing a central role. The policy is to purchase estates and sell parcels to arrivals from Russia on favorable terms. The hope is to establish Russian villages, complete with schools and Orthodox churches.[428]

Americans tend to be aware of discrimination targeting Jews. But it is important to keep in mind that, in different degrees, others were also targeted. Discrimination is part of the experience of many small nations in empires. It is one of the factors historians tend to overlook in explaining the rise of nationalism among small nations: Lithuanians were not the only ones whose growth was retarded by discriminatory provisions. It is also important to keep in mind that intentions and consequences do not always coincide. Establishing a pale of Jewish settlements, while discriminatory in intent, helped to maintain compact Jewish communities and establish Jews in urban centers. But preventing Lithuanians from buying land had the intended consequences, namely the weakening of

---

426 J. Grambolis, "Nežiopsokime!" ("Let Us not Stand Idle!"), *Ukinįkas*, 1894 December, no. 12, pp. 91-92.

427 K., "Apie majoratus" ("About Entailed Estates"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1909 February 4, no. 5, pp. 43-44.

428 Unsigned, "Apie Lietuvos kolonizaciją" ("About the Colonization of Lithuania"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1909 December 5, December 8, December 16, December 19.

Lithuanian presence in Lithuania, by way of external and internal migration and Russian colonization. The twentieth century not being kind to small farms, by most measures, in Lithuania Jews were better off than Lithuanians.

Concerns about foreigners moving in can be viewed as evidence of small-minded nationalism, a failure to appreciate diversity. Grinius certainly has ethnic concerns: colonists make it more difficult for his group to survive. But one should keep in mind that these colonists are both like and unlike immigrants to the United States or present day refugees in Europe. Colonists, immigrants, refugees seek a better life. In that all three groups are alike. But refugees are fleeing persecution—as we saw, the *New York Times* had a difficult time distinguishing between immigrants and refugees. Immigrants also differ from colonists. They are seeking better jobs and have no other mission, while colonists are there also to advance imperial interests which in the case of Russia included not only language and culture, but Orthodoxy and autocracy as well. Especially the last would have been troubling to a believer in democracy like Grinius: the chances that small Lithuania would establish democracy were better. And even if Russia became democratic, Lithuania would be too small to have effective representation to defend local interests. As will be seen later, with his interest in numbers, Grinius calculated how inconsequential the Lithuanian presence in the Duma would be.

Grinius is aware of the threat posed by colonists. But in the end, the land question for him revolved around poverty and distributive justice. He was aware of social democratic arguments in defense of communes: large farms are more amenable to machinery, thereby reducing labor and increasing yields. As he understands the social democratic proposal, there is to be a transitional stage. During that phase, small land holders would sell their land to estate owners and hire themselves out as laborers.[429] Both sides would benefit. Because of machinery, yields would increase making the land owners even wealthier, eventually resulting in the concentration of wealth in a few hands. But working hours would also decrease to the benefit of the laborers, who in the meantime would be organizing and becoming more aware of their needs and interests. And in time, great and fundamental changes would come, never before seen in human history.

I do not know who are the social democrats in question and whether Grinius is representing their position fairly. And, apart from noting the

[429] That peasants were becoming rural proletarians, that is, persons who hire out their labor, was a claim advanced by Lenin in the late 1890s, see Service, *Lenin*, p. 122.

uncertainty of the promised future, he does not indicate what his objections are. But common sense suggests some obvious concerns: industrial laborers would remain laborers, while the small, independent, farmers would become like them, dependent on the wealthy and powerful. Would they eat better and work shorter hours? It depends on the good will of landowners, a class not known for its regard for peasants. Such concerns have a social context, memories of serfdom and of estate laborers working long hours for little more than food. And furthermore, in that part of the world, status was strongly linked with owning land. Thus, for a peasant to surrender his land was to climb down the social ladder. We should also remember that Grinius is writing when capitalism was mostly in its war of everyone against everyone phase, more like what Marx described than present day regulated capitalism.

As is known, the Soviets decided to skip the intermediary stage, with results which more than confirm any fears Grinius might have had. Lithuania was collectivized mostly in 1948. The promised increases in yields did not materialize: in 1955 per acre yields were roughly a third of pre-war levels. Ten years after the war, much of the blame must be placed on collectivization, imposed by brute force, disguised by propaganda images of exuberant peasants. Conditions were not as bad as in the Ukraine in the early 1930s, but certainly bad.[430]

But in the 1905 essay being discussed, Grinius approaches the problem in statistical terms: there is enough land, given a fair distribution, for every farm household to support itself adequately. In Kaunas Province there are about 4,000,000 hectares. There are 80,000 members of the gentry. Counting five to a family, each family owns about 110 hectares. There are 1,100,000 peasants, with every family of five owning about 7.5 hectares. But there are 210,000 who own no land at all and have no choice but to become estate laborers, a social status not much above that of beggars. A few of the buildings in which such laborers were housed survive: one could argue that plantation slave cabins were no worse. Another 200,000 peasants own some land, but not enough to support themselves Thus, out of every 11 peasants, five were in need of land. Similar situations prevailed in the other provinces.

---

430 In 1948 Lithuania was isolated. Little by way of news reached the outside world. But research shows that there was much resistance to collectivization. Vladas Terleckas, *Priešinimasis Lietuvos nukryžiavimui, 1944-1953 (Resistance to the Crucifixion of Lithuania, 1944-1953)* (Vilnius: V. Terleckas, 2017), has collected much information about the extent of the resistance to collectivization and the violence used to suppress it.

The plight of the peasants is even greater, because the government controls all forests. People need firewood, lumber to repair their homes. They like berries, mushrooms. For all this they have to pay exorbitant prices. In the meantime, the forests are being cut for export at a great rate, with none of the profits going to the peasants.

There can be no doubt that the present distribution of land in unjust. Grinius claims that land ought to belong to those who work it, having in mind private ownership and not collective ownership which, in Soviet practice, turned out to be no more than make-believe cooperatives. (Wallace was not the only one deceived.)[431] Redistributing the land, with everyone receiving an equal share, a family of five would receive 16-17 hectares, enough land to support itself. There are those, Grinius adds, who preach that the present division of mankind into the rich and the poor is part of the divine plan. Nonsense, he replies, as shown by much fairer distribution in other countries such as Denmark, Holland, New Zealand. And we cannot expect that the czar will introduce the needed reforms: "From the czar, we can expect not land, but whips, bullets, prisons, Siberia."[432] In his memoirs, Grinius explains that the pamphlet was based on the literature of the Russian social revolutionaries.

Grinius is writing this in 1905, caught up in revolutionary fervor. He argues that a just distribution is possible only when people govern themselves and this can occur only after the czar has been overthrown and Lithuania enjoys self-government. He does not say whether he means independence or a broad autonomy within the empire. In any case, a Lithuanian congress should meet and redistribute the land so that none profit from land without working it. Land redistribution, generally known as land reform, was the cornerstone of Lithuanian politics. It was one of the first questions taken up by the Constituent Assembly. The two major parties, the *Liaudininkai* and the Christian Democrats, both favored nationalizing estates, creating a land fund, and redistributing, with priority to the volunteers in the wars of independence.[433] There were disagreements between the two as to how much compensation the estate owners should receive and how much land they should be allowed to retain, with the *Liaudininkai* taking the more radical side. After the 1926 coup, the Nationalists to some extent

[431] Even if he dismissed reports, ordinary common sense should have made Wallace suspect that the collective farmers he met were not zealous pioneers as represented by his amiable hosts. Are we to believe that a vice-president of the United States was unaware of the famine of 1932-1933?

[432] Laumės vaikas, "Teisingas žemės valdymas Lietuvoje", *Varpas*, 1905, no. 11-12, p. 117.

[433] For a sketch see Kiaupa, *History of Lithuania*, pp. 260-61.

back-tracked. In 1940-1941, the Soviets redistributed some land to the landless and small-holders.

The advantages of large farms in the machine age were widely understood. Although some pressed economic arguments, redistribution was foremost a political necessity, not an economic one. At the same time, cooperatives which came to dominate the Lithuanian economy compensated for some of the shortcomings of small farms. The land question had much to do with Lithuanian-Polish relations, with many believing that there would be no land reform in any union with Poland.

Dated June 27, 1907, the first issue of *Žemė* (*Land*), a monthly supplement to *Lietuvos ūkininkas* (*The Lithuanian Farmer*) appeared. The latter was the legal off-spring of *Ūkininkas,* the former came about at the Grinius's urging and some of the 1907 issues were edited by him. His involvement with the supplement underscores the importance of the land question, both as political and as economic. In the first issue, the editors—not otherwise identified—explained that farming as conducted at present is not very productive. Many have come to understand this and in response have formed societies for the improvement of agriculture. What is now called for is a public forum for the discussion and evaluation of various proposals and the dissemination of useful information. Perhaps Grinius did not write these words. But they are very much in line with his emphasis on enlightenment, reform, and individual initiative. Even non-Marxist social democrats emphasized the political struggle: people should understand their plight, organize, act. Grinius does not reject the political approach. Political changes are much needed. But in the end, prosperity for farmers depends on yields and to increase these, farmers must change from traditional to modern methods. The goal of *Žemė* was to promote such development.

Žemė was a legal publication, thus, the first issue carried advertising. There were three larger ads, one for a dealer in photographic paper and stationary in Vilnius, a second—a distillery and warehouse in Latvia, the third—for a dealer in farm machinery and chemical fertilizers also in Latvia. Only the third would contribute to the improvement of agriculture and it was not located in Lithuania. Ads for the December 1907 issue offered more encouragement. There was an ad for a brewery in Šiauliai, for three bookshops, one in Marijampolė, one in Rokiškis, one in Vilnius, and two periodicals published in Vilnius, one liberal, the other social democratic. These are signs that the lifting of the ban and the mostly failed revolution of 1905 opened up opportunities. It is a fact that

Lithuanians had to wait for the twentieth century to enjoy bookshops selling books in their own language, owned and operated by their countrymen. The fact that what by ordinary standards are trivial events serve as landmarks is another indicator of a small nation's plight in an empire.

The first issue of *Žemė* is entirely by Grinius. The main article is his account of land-ownership in Suvalkai province. He also contributed articles about the growing of Jerusalem artichokes and a meeting of the Farmer Alliance of Marijampolė, besides short notes on future grain prices, the amount of gold mined in 1906, colonization plans, and changes in taxes on buildings. Also published were three short notices of pamphlets on chemical fertilizers, raising pigs, and equipment for churning butter. Of the pamphlets, one was published by a Lithuanian in Lithuania, one in Tilsit (by the major publisher of contraband books), and the third in Warsaw. All three are said to be worth buying. The article on artichokes is said to be an adaptation from Polish sources. We learn, that artichokes are useful because they withstand cold weather, can grow in sandy soil, and in good soil produce abundantly, both food and fodder The longest article is on land ownership in Suvalkai Province. About 55% is owned by peasants. Of the 600,000 inhabitants, about 130,000-140,000 are either landless or own not enough to support a family. The article includes several tables. Percentages are calculated. One wonders what those who had never been to school made of it. In this case, Grinius draws no political conclusions, content with simply presenting data. But he does note that there is enough land to support everyone and emphasizes one fact which makes the redistribution of land an urgent priority. He claims, using government data, that farms show significantly higher per acre yields than estates. The latter are deeply in debt, many beyond the value of the land. The owners are in much too much distress to worry about good farming practices. In his view, this is the main reason why estates are not productive.[434]

Žemė, devoted as it was to the improvement of agriculture, also reflects Grinius's broader concern with citizenship, in line with his emphasis on self-government. In a modern Lithuania everyone is to be a citizen, involved in deciding the broader questions of public life. Thus, in a 1907 piece, he complains in angry tones that while Suvalkai Province has had institutions of self-government for more than forty years, they have accomplished nothing. We still have the same bad roads, fallen bridges, few schools, lack community doctors, nurses,

[434] K. Gr. "Žemės valdymas Suvalkų gubernijoje" ("The Control of Land in Suvalkai Province"), *Žemė*, 1907 June 27, no. 1, pp. 1-4; July 25, no. 2, pp. 9-10; August 29, no. 3, pp. 17-18.

hospitals, veterinarians, have done nothing to improve plant varieties or animal breeds. Many still do not understand that there are better animal breeds, better seeds. Minutes of meetings in Lithuanian are now allowed, as are public signs, but we do not have them. Current law obliges a community, the smallest administrative unit, to hold assemblies at least four times a year and elect a prefect. But many prefects, often incompetent and corrupt, elected because of generosity with drinks, merely follow government orders and blindly sign whatever papers are placed in front of them. Given such flaws, people should ask the Duma to consider various reforms. Grinius suggests that the franchise should not be limited to property owners, but be extended to all 25 years of age or older, who have lived in the community for at least a year. Instead of a prefect, a governing board of seven should be elected, charged with the responsibility of serving the interests of the community. But we should also understand that government is not the main culprit: much can be done even now. The fault is mostly ours: we moan and complain and do not realize that much is our responsibility. "We need to pay attention to public interests and not just to our own pockets and well-being. When the community is better off, everyone lives better."[435] People need to understand that the responsibilities of citizenship extend beyond one's own immediate interests.

Citizens can do little unless they are informed. In this vein, he describes the regulations of March 29, 1907, concerning the purchase of trees and lumber. These can now be bought without special licenses and special arrangements can be made for those who need to rebuild because of fire.[436] In another piece, Lithuanians are urged to move into cities and establish themselves in various crafts. Several decades ago, for example, book-binding was dominated by Jews. Now it is dominated by Lithuanians. He urges people to learn the craft and establish themselves in Kaunas and Vilnius.[437]

Once more a reminder that the reference to Jews need not be read in an anti-Semitic way, but could simply reflect a society in which class and nationality coincide. The question of Lithuanian-Jewish relations, although not mentioned, arises in the next piece, given Grinius's view that cooperatives help farmers by eliminating middle-men, who in Lithuania were overwhelmingly Jewish.

---

435 K. L. "Truputi apie vaitus ir gminas" ("A Little about Prefects and Communities"), *Žemė*, 1907 July 25, no. 2, p. 12.

436 K. L., "Girios atpinga" ("Forests are Becoming Cheaper"), *Žemė*, 1907 September 26, no. 4, p. 28-29.

437 Kr. "Musų amatninkai" ("Our Craftsmen"), *Žemė*, 1907 September 26, no. 4, p. 30-31.

Learning from others is important because Lithuanians are behind. To that end, Grinius describes agricultural societies in Finland. We learn that in 1899 the Russian bureaucracy tightened controls, but failed to stifle an energetic and industrious people. Since then, there has been a spectacular growth in the number of agricultural societies. These have formed central associations, with sufficient capital for the purchase of large machines, chemical fertilizers, and for extending credit. Farmers have benefited because cooperatives have eliminated many middle-men. While Lithuanians have begun to form cooperatives, they are still far behind. Grinius suggests that part of the problem is moral, a tendency to envy those better off. By contrast, the Finns do not hesitate to help each other.[438]

I cannot resist mentioning in the same issue an article, not by Grinius, about raising turkeys, in my view, a warning that good intentions can take one only so far and are not a substitute for knowledge. The unknown author writes that poults should have their heads washed with ordinary whiskey to prevent disease and can suffer concussions should they strike a hard surface while pecking. His language makes one smile: after several weeks, the young birds should be taken for walks, but only if it is sunny and not raining. And what about advice, offered without explanation, to make sure that each one swallows one grain of black pepper soaked in vegetable oil?[439]

Over the years, Grinius contributed perhaps 100 pieces to *Žemė*, some longer, some shorter. He also published similar contributions in other periodicals. But agriculture was not his field, since he had no training in agriculture. As others, some with training, took up these subjects, his own attention shifted to questions of public health. In 1909 he initiated and for a time edited another supplement to *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, called *Sveikata* (*Health*) devoted to medical topics. Both supplements bring out his concern to improve the lives of those here and now. They are as much part of the awakening as Basanavičius's theorizing about Lithuanian origins. And the more effective part, appealing to a broad audience and making being a Lithuanian beneficial.

If we go back to 1890, there is little by way of Lithuanian civil society. The temperance societies of bishop Valančius had been destroyed and little had

---

438 K., "Ūkininkų draugijos Finliandijoj (Suomijoje)" ("Agricultural Alliances in Finland"), *Žemė*, 1907 December 23, no. 7, p. 51-52.

439 A. K—mas, "Šis-tas apie kurkinus" ("This and That about Turkeys"), *Žemė*, 1907 December 23, no. 7, p. 51.

replaced them. When Grinius surveys the situation in 1906, he finds that much has changed. To his regret, temperance is lagging, but in other areas Lithuanians are showing initiative and energy. There is now an association of Lithuanian teachers, amateur theater groups, publishing societies, educational societies, even rudiments of political parties.[440] Grinius and his wife helped to establish some of them. Relevant to the land question is the Marijampolės ūkininkų draugovė (The Farmer Alliance of Marijampolė), registered in late 1906. The Alliance survived to the war, but Grinius was less active during its last years. In 1913, it had 608 members.[441]

At Alliance meetings, Grinius touched upon many subjects, among them plant and animal diseases, fire-proof roofs, discriminatory railroad tariffs. There were talks about insurance and credit. The Alliance at times functioned as a cooperative, for example, in making a large purchase of chemical fertilizers. There was talk of buying a large scale which, according to Grinius, would cost 500 rubles.[442]

In the autumn of 1911, an agricultural fair was held in Marijampolė, in which Grinius and his wife played major roles. With a peasant's suspicion of the authorities, his mother scolded him: "why show the Muscovites our wealth, they will only raise taxes. From such people, we have to hide our wealth, not display it." But others exulted. Years later, Grinius recalled a priest's congratulatory letter: the fact that Lithuanians are now able to organize an event of this magnitude shows that we have fully awakened.[443] An exaggeration, but also recognition that Lithuanian development had reached an important landmark.

At the time, Lenin lived mostly in Paris, immersed in sectarian conflicts. Both Grinius and Lenin must be considered when trying to make sense of the political ferment sweeping the empire. But while the former was organizing a country fair, the latter was struggling to form and control a band of conspirators. The contrast is stark. Grinius believed in reform from the bottom up, Lenin in revolution from the top down. Grinius's approach to politics revolved around his concern for and confidence in ordinary people. Lenin's—that only he and not the workers themselves understood their true needs. It is not surprising that

440 K. Grinius, "1905-tieji metai" ("The Year 1905"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 January 5, no. 3, pp. 37-40.

441 *Lietuvos žinios*, 1913 March 7.

442 K. Gr., "Marijampolės Ūkininkų Draugovės Susirinkimas" ("A Meeting of the Farmer Alliance of Marijampolė"), *Žemė*, 1907 August 29, no. 3, pp. 22-23

443 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 143. Ilgūnas provides some numbers concerning expenditures and attendance, based on Grinius's recollection thirty-five years later. I am using contemporary records.

Grinius pushed in the direction of democracy, while Lenin—towards autocracy, of course, based not on pedigrees but on the one true reading of Marx's texts. As we saw, Kapsukas recalled Grinius pouring "cold water" on the very idea of revolution.

Lenin, an intellectual theoretician, resembles a chess grandmaster deploying social classes as if they were pawns and bishops on a chess board. In fact, he played chess, perhaps at a high level, where gambits and sacrifices are part of ordinary strategy.[444] Hence terror to make reality conform to theory. After all, living individuals of all social classes rarely behave as various Communist theories demand and predict. Generally, class loyalties proved weaker than national ones, individual interests prevailed over class solidarity and socialist morality. While for Grinius, ordinary human interests and needs provide the starting point. One may add, that few if any peasants enjoyed the leisure to learn chess or play croquet on the family lawn.[445]

Keeping this contrast in mind, we can better appreciate the importance of the event in Marijampolė. Nothing like that would have been possible in 1890: an event, organized by Lithuanians, attracting 15,000 visitors, with some 700 farmers exhibiting, 220 horses on view, prizes in many categories, accompanied by lectures, music, theatrical performances. Lithuanians had advanced far towards a democratic polity, from the days when they thought of themselves as a simple people for whom outhouses were too good. Democracy needs citizens interested in public matters, who take initiative and are capable of organizing. Clearly, by 1911 there was at least a rudimentary Lithuanian civil society, something without which democracy is impossible. This was recognized at the time. Grinius recalls being congratulated: a major milestone in the awakening, showing that Lithuanians are capable of organizing on a large scale.[446]

The theater performances were organized by Grinius's wife. She also exhibited a theater curtain designed and made by her. Promised was a craftsman from "Grodno Province" to teach weaving of useful objects from willow branches. At the time, Grinius was promoting household industries. Most surprising is that the fair was in part supported by the government, which donated 2250 rubles towards a budget of about 5500. Profit amounted to about 500. The fact

444 Service, *Lenin*, p. 72.
445 Sebestyen, *Lenin*, p. 36.
446 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 111.

that only 2200 rubles in entrance fees were collected suggests that the 15,000 visitors is a generous estimate.[447]

But it was impossible to avoid politics. According to Grinius, instead of *cherchez la femme* local Lithuanians used to say, *cherchez les polonais*. A theater curtain was needed, but the only one in town was owned by a Polish club. When the Poles refused to lend it, Grinius's wife improvised. She had a collection of woven aprons which she sewed together to form an attention grabbing curtain. Polish farmers had been invited, but very few exhibited.[448]

[447] *Lietuvos žinios*, 1911 September 6, October 4. The first item is signed "Kg.", the second--"K." Both are by Grinius. *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1911 September 22, no. 38, p. 359, author unknown.

[448] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 110.

XI An Underground Activist

Several chapters ago we left the newlyweds in Naumiestis, with Grinius earning a living by practicing medicine. Both he and his wife were more and more coming to engage in activities which in many parts would not have been deemed criminal or subversive. In June of 1898 they moved to Pilviškiai, a town of some 2,000, roughly 15 miles away from the border. The population was mostly Jewish. The town is at times noted as a center of Jewish learning. Grinius was to take over the practice of Stasys Matulaitis, who was being exiled for three years under police supervision, in connection with the *Sietynas* (The Pleiades) case. Some thirty members of the organization, established for the purpose of distributing Lithuanian publications, were on trial. Matulaitis after several months in Saint Petersburg where he married was exiled to Siberia. Politically to the left of Grinius, in later years he lived in the Soviet Union. Grinius could have been a victim, since he was connected with *Sietynas*. He was not arrested because none of the accused named him.

In April 1902, Stalin was arrested for inciting a crowd to attack a prison, a crime by most standards. Thirteen were killed in the ensuing melee. And even though Stalin continued to organize and agitate while in prison awaiting trial, he was sentenced to only three years of Siberian exile. According to Sebag

Montefiore, exile resembled "dull reading-holidays," but Stalin escaped tedium by fathering children.[449] Sebag Montefiore makes clear that had Stalin fallen foul of the authorities under Lenin or himself, he would not have gotten away so lightly. By normal standards, Stalin had committed a serious crime, while those in the *Sietynas* case had not. Yet, the punishments were similar, and if anything, more severe in Lithuania. I do not know how much of the disparity in the offense and the punishment is to be explained by local factors and how much by imperial policy. But both in the *Sietynas* case and in Stalin's, the sentences were approved at the highest level.

We learn about *Sietynas* from an 1897 news item attributed to Grinius. It was a society for education in Lithuanian, with members buying Lithuanian books and subscribing to newspapers, *Varpas*, *Ukininkas*, and two published in the United States, none Catholic. At the March meeting, a member began to collect money for building a Catholic church in deep Muscovy. Objections were raised, arguing that once we have funds enough for our own needs, we can begin to support distant churches. But at present, there are many imprisoned Lithuanian "martyrs" in dire straights, some near starvation. And those who are suffering for Lithuania are also suffering for Catholicism. The item is followed by an editorial note insisting on priority for Lithuanian needs.[450]

He devoted two reports to the outcome of the case. Both are interesting not only for the information, but for the portrait of Lithuanian society, at least the part with an interest in public issues. The case began in April 1897 when a German in Marijampolė informed the police that the mailman was delivering banned publications. A search confirmed the report. Carelessly, the postman kept notes with names and amounts which the gendarmes followed up. At least 34 were arrested. The mailman and his wife, after several months in prison awaiting trial, were sentenced, each to six months in prison and two years of exile. Another nine received the same sentence. The longest prison term was one year, with one so punished. Another unfortunate was sentenced to three months in prison and two of exile, after his son refused to compensate a servant girl he had deflowered. Her demands refused, she informed. Most of the rest were exiled for several years. Several awaited trial in prison for about 20 months. One arrest led to others because, as Grinius pointed out in his conclusion, people did not understand that it was best when interrogated to keep silent.

---

449 Sebag Montefiore, *Young Stalin* , pp. 111-12.

450 N., *Ukininkas*, 1897 April, no. 4, p. 63.

Three of the accused were medical doctors, two were priests. The absence of members of other learned professions shows how unbalanced was Lithuanian society, no journalists, no humanists, no scientists. Of the remainder, three were students, two—merchants, two—soldiers, while most of the rest were farmers with a sprinkling of townsmen.[451]

Given such organizations, it is difficult to estimate the audience for Lithuanian publications: in some cases one subscription served dozens if not hundreds of readers. Also to be noted is the division between the more religious and the more secular, even though some of the latter were still at least occasional church goers.

The *Sietynas* case was the work of A. Vonsiackij, the new police chief in Marijampolė, arriving from Warsaw in 1896. According to Grinius, the Vonsiackij "pogrom" paralyzed the *Varpininkai* for several years, because the targets included educated Lithuanians. For a time, he remained the sole member of the *Varpininkai* steering committee.[452] Fortunately, there were several youn-ger activists to step into the breach.

Grinius believed it likely that the eager police chief had volunteered for service in Lithuania enticed by the opportunity to rise in the ranks, to be seen as the empire's savior. However that may have been, he replaced a more passive functionary compromised by the fact that his wife's lover fought a duel over her with an army officer. Grinius recalls meeting Vonsiackij twice. The first, much too intricate for summary, is a fine example of bureaucratic morass. In the end, Grinius on the advice of the treasurer, solved the paperwork problem by forging the signature of the elderly woman he was helping. The woman had posted bond for a friend in a political case and was entitled to a refund. On that occasion, Vonsiackij explained that his son had difficulties mastering Russian. Vonsiackij confronted the son's tutor, only to receive the response, "I realized from the beginning that your son was a real ass." Vonsiackij had his revenge. The tutor, a local official, did not have the proper uniform and was coerced into spending about 100 rubles to satisfy czarist dress codes. The second meeting was in 1897 at his brother-in-law's in Marijampolė. Vonsiackij was in town being treated for foot troubles by the French teacher in the secondary school. The cure was complicated, but he had to wear two pairs of socks at a time and change them every two days. Vonsiackij could have

---

451 Ožiukas, "Musų kankintiniai" ("Our Martyrs"), *Ukininkas*, 1899 April, no. 4, pp. 59-60; Stalius, "Argi ne gėda" ("Is it not Shame"), *Ukininkas*, 1899 May, no. 5, pp. 71-73.

452 Grinius, *Atsiminiai ir mints*, 1: 214. According to Grinius, Vonsiackij was assassinated in about 1905 by a member of Pilsudski's Polish Socialist Party. (The assassin has a Lithuanian sounding name,)

learned Lithuanian: his health is said to be declining because he spends his nights studying revolutionary and Lithuanian literature. But the remark which Grinius claims he overheard could have been meant sarcastically.[453]

How could an empire governed by such clowns survive? Grinius surmises that czarist security agencies had many defects: "The leadership was ill educated, did not know local languages and was unfamiliar with local conditions. The gendarmes had few paid local informants." In the entire Kaunas Province there was only one translator from Lithuanian into Russian.[454] Reading about Vonsiackij, I have to force myself to keep in mind that Grinius was selecting for color and overstating. But he suggests that at the time he believed in their power by noting that even the revolutionaries themselves did not expect that the empire would expire so soon. As for Lithuanians, "with their meager revolutionary intelligentsia and revolutionary cadres, their lack of resources, had even less hope of soon becoming independent." Happily, the empire did not survive for long: "Sic transit gloria mundi."[455] Or so he probably thought in the hopeful spring of 1917.

Judging from Grinius's own journalistic pieces, anti-czarist broadsides were becoming popular, plastered on walls or passed around in church yards after services and other places where crowds gathered. Grinius made several contributions to the genre. One in the spring of 1898 is addressed to "Brothers, Lithuanians"-- a later one also calls upon sisters. In broad strokes, this broadside sets out Grinius's program. Lithuanians are urged to speak and read in Lithuanian; keep to their religion and avoid Orthodox churches, shrines, icons; understand that there is local self-government and elect only those who are Lithuanians and honest; demand that some instruction in Lithuanian be allowed in schools; not read Lithuanian books in the Russian alphabet. It ends with an appeal for unity—we can win if we stand united. There is as yet no call for political change, no call for Lithuania's independence, in fact, not even for a modest autonomy. The reference to "our religion," Catholicism, is likely instrumental, and not an indication of his own views. An openly secular program would have stood no chance. In any case, Orthodoxy and Russification went hand in hand.[456]

---

453 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 233-35 Vonsiackij's son became a military officer, fought in the civil war and boasted of having nearly captured Trotsky, then minister of defense and commander in chief (1: 235). Likely Vonsiackij's grandson, Anastasy Vonsyatsky (1898-1965), lived in the United States and was a leader of a Russian fascist group. In 1942 he was arrested and charged with having secret contacts with Nazi Germany.

454 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 110.

455 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 235-36.

456 "Broliai Lietuviai!" *Ukininkas*, 1898 May, no. 5, p. 65.

One from the spring of 1899 is more strongly worded. Emphasis is on the harm being done to children in Russian schools—even vicious dogs do not attack such innocents. There is a call for vigilantes to punish spies and informants. The broadside is illustrated, a sketch of two young men, one in clerical garb, led away by bearded gendarmes with swords at their sides, while children cry and women in despair watch.[457] Another appeared in the fall of 1900, perhaps the most militant. Emphasis is on taxes, open and disguised: taxation keep Lithuanians barely above starvation, while the government provides nothing. The title is taken from the book of *Revelations*: let those who have ears hear! Woe to the Lithuanians not marked by the Mark of the Beast! Their lot is that of servants and slaves to those who are so marked, that is, those who become Russians and Orthodox.[458] The Biblical quotations, apocalyptical allusions, colorful rhetoric make me uneasy that the attribution to Grinius is in error.

To continue the chronological account of his confrontations with the authorities, we have to take notice of the Lithuanian coastal resort town of Palanga, administratively part of the Province of Courland. When after a short tour in Siberia Vonsiackij established himself in Liepaja, in present day Latvia, Palanga came under his charge.[459] Another political trial followed, centered around another medical doctor, Liudas Vaineikis (1869-1938), Grinius's friend from their student days in Moscow, practicing in Palanga. According to Grinius, Vaineikis's first arrest was due to carelessness: the police found a letter, critical of the czar, which fell out of Vaineikis's pocket.[460] He was exiled for two years. Arrested for the second time in 1900, after spending two years in prison in Liepaja, Vaineikis was exiled to Siberia. Once, his recent bride returned home after visiting her inprisoned husband. Upon learning that her daughter's husband was in prison, her mother scolded her: had I known that he read banned books I would not have allowed him in the house.[461] The belief, that authority is always right, was widespread and worked to retard the spread of the awakening hand in hand with the belief that Lithuanians are a simple people.

---

457 "Broliai ir Sesers! Nepasiduokime Maskoliams!" ("Brothers and Sisters! Let Us not Surrender to the Muscovites!"), *Ukininkas*, 1899 April, no. 4, pp. 49-50.

458 Kl., "Kas turi ausis teklauso!" ("He Who Has Ears Let Him Hear!"), *Ukininkas*, 1900 September, no. 9, p. 129

459 A note in *Ukininkas*,1898 August, no. 7, p.109, states that Vonsiackij was removed from his post in Lithuania because of misbehavior.

460 Starta, "Palanga," *Ukininkas*, 1898 November, no. 11, p. 171. Grinius intended the piece as a warning.

461 Stasė Vaineikienė, *Iš praeities kovų* (*From Past Battles*) (Kaunas: 1935), p. 21. This is a memoir by Vaineikis's wife.

One can argue that Lenin exploited the exaggerated respect for authority, an educated aristocrat, thus an authority figure, explaining to simple people what their true needs were. Sebag Montefiore notes that Lenin and Stalin did not want too many of the proletariat in the party, preferring oligarchy.[462] I would argue that top-down structures are inevitable in organizations centered around ideological correctness: there being many different interpretations of the Bible or of Marx, someone must decide authoritatively which ones are correct. The Communist decades represent the triumph of ideology over ordinary human hopes and aspirations, and such triumphs can only be the work of authoritative leaders. If anything, Grinius was an enemy of ideologies and labored so that ordinary people could think for themselves. Could this be a case where Marxist emphasis on the explanatory power of class origins is helpful? Lenin, Trotsky, Dzerzhinsky and many other Bolshevik leaders came from privileged backgrounds. Sebestyen writes: "Most of the Bolsheviks were from the urban intelligentsia, which generally despised the muzhiks for being part of superstitious, illiterate Old Russia."[463]

In October 1900, *Ūkininkas* published a brief note from Pilviškiai, signed Kirvis (The Ax), likely Grinius, to the effect that in late August the home of Dr. Kazimieras Grinevičius has been searched in connection with the Vaineikis case.[464] They confiscated everything in Lithuanian, including letters from patients and the edition of the works of Kristijonas Donelaitis, published by the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg. In his memoirs, Grinius provides more detail. In the attic the gendarmes found a 144 volume set, left behind by Matulaitis, of translations into Russian of major novelists, Flaubert, Balzac, and others. He at the time subscribed to the Russian *Physicians Gazette* and the German *Excerpta Medica* in Latin. There were also many Polish books. He read extensively "in the dark long evenings." The gendarmes were surprised that doctors read and eventually gossiped widely about Grinius's literary tastes. Grinius learned later that the search had been order by Vonsiackij. It turns out, that one of Grinius's brothers-in-law and the gendarme conducting the operation were drinking buddies. There is a vague hint that the searchers made sure not to find anything incriminating. In any case, the gendarme expressed satisfaction

462 Sebag Montefiore, *Young Stalin*, p. 113n.
463 Sebestyen, *Lenin*, p. 393.
464 No. 10, p. 153.

that the two could continue sharing a bottle. A more likely explanation is that Vaineikis had warned Grinius in advance of the search.[465]

A silly prohibition from which the empire gained nothing, Grinius reflected in an 1938 memoir of Vaineikis. The press ban "repeated a mistake made by countless bad governments." Many innocents suffered, the empire gained nothing, but made many fierce enemies. How could those bootlickers, obscurantists, men of little knowledge and education, expect Lithuanians to surrender and adopt the Russian alphabet after centuries of using Latin letters?

He provides a list, including Valančius, of those who hesitated, acquiescing at first. The list suggests that the empire consolidating policy had a real chance of success.[466]

Strong language was unusual for him. In that regard, the 1938 memoir is an exception. He allowed himself another outburst in 1927, after having been removed from the presidency by the military coup. In an article ostensibly about facilities for treating the mentally ill, he wrote: "half-wits, who sometimes rise to positions of authority do not allow themselves to be treated and for many years govern others." He mentions a "half-brained" Hungarian dictator and Lenin, whose autopsy revealed brain damage. Smetona is not named, but it takes little imagination to think of him as the target.[467]

His strong preference for local government can be seen as a reaction against the wasteful, destructive, and in the end self-defeating ambitions flourishing in remote imperial centers. His confrontations with czarist authorities, going back to his Moscow days, were lessons in what governments should not become. Lenin drew a different conclusion: half-measures in police work are always a mistake.

Using a pen-name he shared with Grinius and several others, Žmogus (Man), Kapsukas provided more detail concerning the Vaineikis case. He claims that Vonsiackij left Lithuania because of threats on his life, that after a short tour in Siberia he was posted to Latvia to quell rising unrest among workers, that Vaineikis was targeted also because of his role in staging several Lithuanian plays. Kapsukas names Janulaitis and several others imprisoned in the case. He ends with a somewhat masked call for the assassination of Vonsiackij. Kapsukas

465 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*,1: 283-84.

466 Dr. K. Grinius, "Atsiminimų pluoštas apie dr. L. Vaineikį" ("A Handful of Memories about Dr. L. Vaineikis"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1938 January 20; January 21.

467 Dr. K. Grinius, "Lietuvos respublikos bepročiai ir silpnapročiai" ("The Insane and the Weak-minded in the Republic of Lithuania"), *Sveikata,* 1927 September, no. 5, pp. 1-2.

is evidence that the rising generation was more militant.[468] Grinius did not issue such calls.

Vaineikis was sentenced to five years of Siberian exile.[469] In reporting this, Grinius is combining two year in prison and three years of exile.

There is wisdom in the saying about the best laid plans. But in the Russian empire, instead of mice and men it would be more accurate to speak of mice and czars. Emperors issue edicts, but everything depends on the lowest ranks. In Marijampolė, Vonsiackij was replaced by a gendarme with a Greek name, after a brief stint by another. The newcomer was bored: nothing revolutionary, exiting, only an endless stream of almanacs and primers. He explained once that the ban was stupid: those "geniuses" should first have adapted the Russian alphabet to Lithuanian needs and published some interesting books. Grinius surmises that the gendarme recalled the Greek struggle against the Turks and sympathized with the Lithuanian side. In any case, he was the first policeman Grinius encountered who understood the pointlessness of massive effort to eradicate harmless Lithuanian texts. For obvious reasons, this functionary did little to advance imperial interests.

He was replaced by a "young, unmarried, handsome, tall, brown-haired" Russian, who suffered from migraines and spent much time in bed moaning, his head covered by hot compresses. He was a follower of a Russian theosophist, a defrocked Orthodox priest and an enemy of czarism, who taught something like Tolstoyan pacifism, He was also something of a coward who, in 1905, much dreaded attacks from rebels and believed Russia to be doomed. In 1906, while searching the Grinius home, he explained to Grinius's wife that he was hoping not to find anything.[470]

Forbidden books were not the only occasions for unpleasant encounters with the authorities. He recalls that the local gendarme placed himself in charge of the knives needed by Jews for ritual slaughter. A profitable sideline. Upon learning that as a doctor he was entitled to examine all animals destined for slaughter, Grinius insisted that no animal be killed without a certificate from him. The gendarme had no choice but to agree. Grinius does not say by how much that functionary's income was reduced. Or again, he agreed to tutor two sons of friends, preparing them for the examinations to enter Marijampolė secondary school. But Grinius had accepted as a boarder a man who otherwise

468 Žmogus, "Kratos šių metų" ("Current searches"), *Ukininkas*, 1900 December, no. 12, pp. 178-80.
469 no. "Nauji kankintiniai" ("New Martyrs"), *Lietuva*, 1902 May 9.
470 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 290-92.

would have been homeless. The gendarme accused him of operating an illegal school and—likely hoping for a bribe—threatened to take action. Grinius responded by issuing his own threat: he would go to the gendarme's commanding officer, a friend, and complain that the gendarme was invading his privacy.

The reference to an illegal school calls for an explanation: parents were allowed to teach their children, but were not permitted to hire teachers. In spite of the prohibition, after the shutting down of Lithuanian schools and the press ban in 1864, parents would get together and hire a *daraktorius* to teach their children the rudiments of reading and maybe of arithmetic. In 1900 the ban on home schools, in effect in other areas, was extended to Suvalkai Province and in the winter of 1901, according to Grinius, the authorities were especially diligent in searching out offenders.[471] Increased police activity could be connected with plans by the authorities to establish a system of rural primary schools. It was reported in 1901 that government agents were urging villagers to sign up, with part of the needed funds coming from local sources. Perhaps 100 such schools were planned for Kaunas Province. The author of this news item, the writer Jonas Biliūnas (1879-1907), using a pen-name, urges Lithuanians not to sign up, unless the agents place on record their demand for schools conducted in Lithuanian.[472] To this issue Grinius contributed a short piece urging people to take pride in the native language. Otherwise, we will never become a nation with culture. The English are a fine example: they speak English even when traveling abroad. The French and the Germans do the same.[473]

Policing was rife with corruption. The gendarme willing to see and do nothing could become wealthy by accepting bribes from Jews and local farmers. The amounts could be substantial. At a time when many factory workers were earning under 25 rubles a month, a health inspector could pocket 50 for not mentioning in his report a rotting rat found in a pharmacy. Grinius adds a barely credible detail: the pharmatist tried to soften the inspector by reminding him of the sufferings of an animal starving. At the same time, over zealous functionaries could always be removed by accusations of bribery, the safe assumption being that they were not paid much and temptation was not resisted.[474]

---

[471] Daraktorius, "Apie daraktarius, lementorius, ir žemskius," ("About Daraktoriai, Primers, and Gendarmes"), U*kininkas*, 1901 September, no. 9, pp. 73-74.

[472] Jonas Barzdyla, "Maskoliškų mokyklų veisimas" ("The Breeding of Muscovite Schools"), U*kininkas*, 1901 September, no. 9, pp. 74-75.

[473] K., "Kalba" ("Language"), U*kininkas*, 1901 September, no. 9, p. 75.

[474] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 293-95.

But it would be a mistake to reduce Grinius's life to plotting and laughing at imperial folly. There was that, but he also continued to see patients and developed several hobbies. He began work on his collection of medical terms, noting both the Lithuanian and the Latin names. He continued this project for most of his life and ended up with a collection of some 10,000 terms. I have already noted that some of this work perished in an allied bombing of Berlin. Furthermore, as a doctor making rural house calls, he had opportunities for collecting folklore. For obvious reasons, his special interest was folk medicine, charms, incantations, potions. Late in his life he published a sample of what he had collected during this period. It is a brief prayer, of no literary merit, for protection against snakebites used by snake collectors. Captured snakes were placed in bottles filled with vodka and sold in Pilviškiai market as tonics for humans, horses, and other animals. Supposedly, after drinking some snake water, horses enjoyed better appetites and had shinier coats.[475] Grinius also learned about a potent and bitter concoction of 27 herbal extracts called *trejos devynerios* (three-nines)—it is still sold as a stimulant to improve digestion.[476]

The interest in folklore and traditions survived for a long time. Thus, in 1938, while traveling by train in Samogitia, he noticed some unusual fences and later learned that they were similar to fences known in Sweden and Finland. He suggests photographing them and establishing the area in which they are found. Perhaps, they are signs of an ancient people? Or relics of the Swedish wars of centuries ago?[477]

His wife collected folk art. Even into the twentieth century, weaving was widespread in rural areas. Many of the women weavers were artists, creating intricate patterns. Joana Griniuvienė collected aprons: some of them were exhibited at the World's Fair in Paris in 1900. Between pregnancies, nursing, childcare, cooking and cleaning, she remained an activist. She continued to smuggle books and organize fundraisers for the *Varpininkai*. In 1899, she organized a lottery which netted 130 marks for the cause. Tickets had to be sold secretly, only to trusted individuals. The prizes were trinkets bought in Germany and smuggled in, mirrors, tea spoons, candle holders, wallets, watches.

On June 13 1907, Stalin, lurking in the shadows and letting his bandits take the risks, organized a bank robbery, netting Lenin's treasury perhaps

---

475 Grinius, "Apie gyvačių dievaitį Atžingį," *Naujienos*, 1949 October 29

476 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, pp. 77-78.

477 Dr. K. Grinius, "Žemaitiškos tvoros" ("Samogitian Fences"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1938 August 27.

250,000 rubles,[478] a large sum, the annual income of some 1,000 factory workers. Grinius was not a bandit chieftain and the awakening had to be financed by, among other small projects, lotteries offering trinkets. Likely, his major backer was Bortkevičienė, who upon becoming a widow sold their home in Vilnius and gave 6,000-7,000 rubles to the cause.[479]

Sietynas, destroyed by the above mentioned arrests, was replaced by *Artojas* (The Plowman), also a society for disseminating literature, but more numerous and bolder according to Grinius. The group maintained a small library of some 70 books. He was somehow involved with the group, but it is not clear how. His brother Jonas Grinius was an active member. In the spring of 1901, a number of young people, members, visited Grinius to discuss their plans. He advised them not to accept heavy drinkers.[480] As he recalls, in 1903 there were arrests and searches, the work of a vindictive mother. The group organized dance parties. One evening, no one asked her daughter to dance and the mother informed the authorities. The *Artojas* case collapsed with the lifting of the press ban.[481]

In September of 1902, the family moved back to Marijampolė which, according to Grinius, had become more Lithuanian during his absence. There were many young enthusiasts who regarded Grinius and his wife as leaders. In November, his home was searched once again. The authorities suspected Matulaitis in whose possession they found a letter from Grinius. But the case turned out to be just more sloppy police work. While by then Grinius and Matulaitis were at odds, they still had time to agree to an innocent explanation, although the letter in fact was not innocent by czarist standards. Furthermore, forewarned, Grinius had time to clean up his home. Perhaps, it helped that the searcher was the handsome Russian who suffered from migraines. In 1906, the same officer searched Grinius again, but this time was required to arrest both husband and wife.

September of 1902 marks a turning point in Grinius's life: he took a turn towards serious, organized politics. Up to this point he was at some risk, but most of it could be deflected by bluster, talk, and for all we know, although he does not mentions that, a few judiciously dispensed rubles, by his wife, if anyone. That month he participated in the founding meeting of the Lithuanian Democratic

478 Sebag Montefiore, *Young Stalin*, p. 179.
479 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 29.
480 Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, p. 103.
481 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys,* 1: 291.

Party and was elected to the committee to draft its program. The Party was moderate when compared with Lenin's social democrats, but dangerously subversive of imperial authority.

It is unusual in the awakening to encounter counts, but Vladimiras Zubovas (1862-1933) was one, and was willing to host the meeting on his estate. While studying chemistry in Saint Petersburg, Zubovas became a revolutionary. He studied veterinary medicine in Germany and upon returning, settled on his inherited estate, using it both for farming and as a center for Lithuanian and revolutionary activity. He founded several schools, underground and legal ones conducted in Russian but with secret classes in Lithuanian. He established a lending library which in 1913 had some 9,000 books. He allowed secret societies of high-school students to meet in the manor house. He sheltered Kapsukas when the latter was a fugitive. After the lifting of the ban, he became involved in establishing legal newspapers. In 1904, under the guise of a picnic, he hosted a large Lithuanian political conference. Grinius suggests that Zubovas's role in northern Lithuania was similar to that of Kriaučiūnas in Marijampolė.[482]

There is nothing in Zubovas's biography to suggest that he was shaped by the romantic movement in literature: his Lithuanian activism was part of his commitment to revolution. Nor did he want Lithuanians to remain a peasant nation. His life is additional evidence that Timothy Snyder does not understand Lithuanian history.

The draft of the program touches upon all the major themes of the awakening. After a brief survey of history concluding that Lithuania politically is still moribund, the draft insists that Lithuania must be for Lithuanians, that is, it must be autonomous within ethnographic boundaries. There must be local self-government and a national legislative assembly. Public life, including street signs, public notices, must be in Lithuanian and government officials must know the language. There must be a Lithuanian school system, including secondary schools. At this point, the draft provides more detail than is needed, by discussing questions of student housing and school uniforms. Where peasants are concerned, there is a call for equal rights, some redistribution of public lands, and tax relief. Colonization must be prohibited and emigration discouraged.

---

[482] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 1: 186. It is possible that in spite of his socialism, Zubovas treated his workers no better than others. *Ukininkas*, 1898 December, no.12, p. 188 published a scathing note, that his workers in summer have 16 hour work days, that he pays no attention to labor laws, and that the government inspector instead of examining working conditions visits the count for "tea."

The Democrats, as the *Varpininkai* began to call themselves, declared that, except for one point, they agree with the social democrats: they also demand better pay, better working conditions, shorter hours for factory workers. But they do not want to abolish private property and reorganize society on a new and different basis. In other words, one could say, they are reformers and not revolutionaries. At the same time, they recognize that as things stand, reforms depend upon the "bureaucracy which has entrenched itself beneath the wings of the eagle." The czar and his bureaucrats must be replaced by a government accountable to the people. This is the goal of various Russian movements which have arisen as well as the goal of the many nations struggling for their freedom. Thus, the Democrats see themselves as one of the reform and revolutionary movements swirling throughout the empire. The rights of Lithuanians will not be acknowledged as long as the present system remains. The Democrats are clear about that much. But in this draft I find nothing suggesting that their ultimate goal is complete independence, that they are striving for the disintegration of the empire. It is less clear whether their willingness to settle for the more modest goal of autonomy is simply the recognition of the realities of power. It would have been helpful had Grinius added that independence would be better but that no Russian, monarchist or revolutionary, would accept anything less than the Russian empire, while Lithuanians lack power to win independence by force.[483] I can find no such clarification. There are at least two 1905 pieces by Grinius which envision Lithuania as autonomous within a federal structure. But a statement published in late 1903 committed the Democrats to full independence, within ethnographic boundaries. Once again a reminder that the new Lithuania makes no territorial claims based on the Grand Duchy. As we saw, Madame Pilsudska had difficulty in distinguishing a modern Polish nation-state from the medieval Kingdom of Poland.

The 1902 draft is silent as to the franchise. The aforementioned 1903 statement calls for a secret and universal ballot, all votes counting equally and without the intervention of electors. Both the draft and the statement are silent as to the status of minorities, except for the claim in the former that minorities must respect and not oppose Lithuanian aspirations. Poles are named: they must cease imposing their will upon Lithuanians. Following the text of the draft, there is an

[483] My sense is that few Russians mourn Communism. After all, Stalin has been rehabilitated as the man who won the Great Patriotic War but not as Lenin's one true disciple. Many Russians, from Putin downwards, cannot reconcile themselves to the loss of empire.

editorial note pointing out that the draft is silent about religion. From the point of view of influencing the public, this is an oversight. The 1903 statement makes explicit that for the Democrats the political and cultural interests of the community are as important as the interests of a class.[484]

Given that the government expected Lithuanians to melt away and become Russians, it was hard for the authorities to distinguish between innocent cultural events and subversion. On June 29, 1903, Grinius and his wife organized an event which served both purposes. Grinius described it at some length in *Ukininkas*, of course, without mentioning any names. The occasion was the twentieth anniversary of the appearance of *Aušra* and the fiftieth anniversary of the birth of Petras Arminas (1853-1885), a minor and now little known patriotic poet, translator of Mickiewicz, but also of Pushkin. After mass, perhaps some 300 people invited by Grinius marched to Arminas's grave, bearing a wreath and his portrait. There was an oration assuring Lithuanians that victory was now certain, something that could not have been said when Arminas lived. Fortunately, the authorities heard of the event only a few days later. But according to Grinius, there was wild talk and rumor about atheists urging people to disobey priests and the czar. The local pastor planned to preach a sermon condemning one of the speakers, allegedly an oddly dressed man wearing a horn on his head, until some younger priests convinced him not to make a fool of himself.

Hard to say who was exaggerating, the gossips or the reporter. But likely there was talk among the church goers, evidence that Grinius, his wife, and their friends were suspect. Finger pointing and visions of hell-fire would have served the interests both of Russians and of Poles.

That same evening, a crowd gathered in a nearby farmhouse to continue the celebration, with recitations of poetry and speeches by several students. One of the students was Pijus Grigaitis (1883-1969), a leaders of the *Artoja*s society, an anti-communist social democrat, arrested in late 1905, beaten and condemned to death. But he escaped, reached the United States where he founded and edited *Naujienos*, a Lithuanian socialist newspaper. When Grinius became president, Grigaitis was rather critical. Something of a hothead, perhaps he did comment injudiciously about priests, supporters of czarist tyranny. In any case, we have another patriotic socialist.

---

[484] "Programas Lietuvių Demokratų Partijos (Projektas)" ("Draft of the Program of the Lithuanian Democratic Party") *Varpas*, 1902 December, no. 12, pp. 257-66; statement by the central committee of the Lithuanian Democratic Party, *Varpas*, 1903 September-October , no. 9-10, p. 201.

Grinius notes that while there was much merriment, no one was drunk. Most of the participants were farmers. Many women were present.[485] The mention of women is likely not incidental, but expresses a felt need to broaden the awakening. Thus, in the lead article of this issue of *Ukininkas*, it is claimed that there is a great need for educated women. Women are urged to become activists, and parents—to school not only their sons but also their daughters. After all, it is mothers who have more influence on a child's beliefs and attitudes.

The demonstration is evidence that the awakening was spreading, was becoming a popular movement. In 1898, *Ukininkas* published some 180 news items. There is only one about Lithuanians organizing something, a theater evening in Riga. In the rest, they are passive, mostly victims of the police, priests, landlords. Five years later, in 1903, in addition to the demonstration and poetry reading organized by Grinius, five theater evenings are mentioned. There are many references to anti-czarist broadsides pasted on fences and walls, with the advice to scatter them so that they can be taken home. Several Lithuanians are reported to have established their own businesses. Not very much, but signs that society was changing, that Grinius and others like him were being heard. Modernity was seeping in other forms as well: people were entertained by a magic lantern show, in Russian of course. Perhaps several dozen attended. Only a few Lithuanians, because the priest and the pastor decided not to announce the event. Just as well, because the evening was devoted to "sacred Muscovy" and her rise with God's help.[486]

More difficult to gauge tone, but Kate the Slut instead of the more usual Catherine the Great could be a sign of growing militancy.[487] In 1903 Nicholas II traveled by train through Vilnius. The report claims that usually he was called Mikey and that the gendarmes and spies were primarily concerned about "pranks" on the part of Vilnius workers, now more militant and better organized, adding that for their three-month travels, the imperial couple wasted an uncountable sum earned by the bloody sweat of ordinary people.[488]

The authorities were concerned. In one town, they arrested and interrogated several, alleging that they were members of a secret society "working to undermine the present order of the Russian empire and establish an independent Lithuania." Evidence included their participation in local theater evenings.

---

485 Ateivis, "Apvaikščiojimas tautiško Lietuvos atgimimo šventės" ("Celebration of an Anniversary of Lithuania's National Awakening"), *Ukininkas*, 1903 August, no. 8, pp. 210-13.

486 *Ukininkas*, 1903 April-May, no. 4-5, p. 128.

487 *Ukininkas,* 1903 December, no. 12, p. 354.

488 *Ukininkas,* 1903 December, no. 12, p. 354-55. The author could be Kapsukas.

The authorities were also concerned to discover who is distributing broadsides. Ten of the accused were "measured" for height, length of arms and legs, identifying marks, so that would be easier to find should they escape. Grinius is likely the author of this report.[489]

On April 24, 1904, May 7 according to the present calendar, the press ban was lifted. Lithuanians responded triumphantly, but joy was mixed with uneasiness and suspicion: Exactly why are we being granted this boon? Lithuanians congratulated themselves: no matter how hard the authorities tried, the Lithuanian press was growing in numbers and influence. The lifting was seen as in part a surrender. And it was obvious that a legal press and at home had obvious cultural and economic advantages. Eliminating costs, including bribes associated with smuggling, would make publications more affordable. Eliminating risks would lead to an increase in both readers and contributors. On the other hand, censorship would make it impossible to criticize the government. Some suspected that this was the real motive: a legal but censored press was less dangerous than an illegal one free of censorship. There also was rumor of bribes.

After the lifting of the ban, Kapsukas published a pamphlet offering an explanation of why it was lifted, beginning with a warning that those who are taking credit should not be believed. The ban was not lifted because of bribes, law-suits, petitions. It was because the government, at last realizing that it was powerless to stop it, wanted to take control of the awakening and make it serve imperial interests. To prove his point, he quotes a number of czarist officials. Informative is an 1899 report to imperial ministers. According to this, while the ban was intended to drive a wedge between Lithuanians and Poles, Polish influences are stronger than ever. Furthermore, school attendance is declining because parents are refusing to send their children to schools, avoiding Lithuanian books printed in Russian letters. But most important is that the banned press, free of censorship, is spreading revolutionary ideas. Kapsukas criticizes the Democrats (the former *Varpininkai*) for plans to move their publishing to Lithuania, emphasizing that the "younger" revolutionary generation refuses to submit to censorship and will continue to publish abroad. This generation sees the world in terms of the class-struggle. Its minimum demand is a democratic Lithuanian republic. Its ultimate goal is the abolition of private property.[490]

---

489 Y. Z., *Ukininkas*, 1903 December, no. 12, pp. 345-47.

490 V. Kapsukas, *Spaudai leidus* (*After the Allowing of the Press*) [1904].

In fact, for seven months nothing much changed. Lithuanians applied for licenses, perhaps as many as fourteen, while the government moved slowly. At last, dated December 10, 1904, the first issue of *Vilniaus žinios* (*Vilnius News*) appeared, the first daily in Lithuanian. It survived into 1909 and reached a circulation of about 6,000.[491] Grinius is known to have contributed some 60 items. His first signed piece appeared on April 6, 1905, an invitation to help establish a Lithuanian bibliography with several suggestions for inclusion. But the Democrats remained cautious: what good is a press without freedom of the press? Thus, *Ukininkas* published nine issues in 1905 in Prussia, with the last three, on the first page, identifying it as the organ of the Lithuanian Democratic Party. The 1905 issues are very different from earlier ones, filled as they are with news of the revolution. *Varpas* published seven issues in 1905. It was revived in 1913, once again across the border in Tilsit, to allow freer discussion of sensitive political matters.

At least to the lifting of the press ban in 1904, the awakening had to remain underground, out of sight of the authorities, to avoid searches, confiscation, prison, Siberian exile. Conditions improved further after the revolution of 1905, although the police remained vigilant, censorship was heavy, and licensing requirements burdensome. While much could be discussed openly, political questions remained an exception. Nonetheless, in spite of the many limitations, a legal press, published locally, has obvious advantages compared with publications smuggled in as contraband. To make the point, I have selected, arbitrarily—others would have done as well–, a 1911 issue of *Lietuvos ūkininkas*. The first number of this Democrat weekly, appeared in Vilnius in December 1905. It was to serve the working people of Lithuania, especially those who work the land. While it replaced *Ūkininkas*, nothing like Grinius's early piece on constipated horses appeared in it. It was too sophisticated. After all, farmers were not only grubbers of the soil, but also citizens concerned with broad public issues. In any case, after the late summer of 1907, the supplement *Žemė* was available.

No. 37, dated September 15, 1911, following an editorial on the need for accurate and timely reports of local events, there is an article, based on statistical studies by several European scientists, on the correlation between the consumption of alcohol and infant mortality. In the case of hard drinkers, only 68% of

[491] Ulam, *The Bolsheviks*, p. 230, notes that Lenin's *New Life*, which published contributions by Gorky and some of his literary friends, reached a circulation of some 50,000. If one takes into account differences in population size, Lithuanian circulation figures were better.

infants survive, moderate drinkers—77%, abstainers--86%. There is also data linking drinking and premature births. The author of the next article, on the cost of armaments, is too optimistic considering that only a few years remained to the Great War. However, the article is informative not only about the expense of maintaining armies even in peace time, but also about the recent history of Germany, the formation of alliances and blocks, the role of diplomats, and the hope of resolving disputes through arbitration. We also learn that workers are coming to understand how much of the burden of war they must bear and are beginning to take action to prevent wars. This, to repeat for emphasis, is a far cry from the travails of constipated horses.

There is some science popularization. For example, an item reporting that races differ not because of innate differences in ability but because of environmental factors. And another, an installment in a series on the social sciences, on the origin of agriculture. The explanation is reasonably modern: the first discoveries probably were accidental and made by women, who stayed home to look after children while the males were roaming the woods hunting. Likely, the first animals were domesticated for amusement and not for work or transportation. Nowhere is God invoked. The Garden of Eden is not mentioned, suggesting that mankind has evolved over a long period of time.

Raising political questions was still dangerous. But much could be conveyed in small news items, especially to readers skilled in drawing inferences. In Vilnius, to continue with no. 37, there was a trial of a woman, the nominal editor of *Naujoji gadynė* (*The New Era)*, a legal social democratic periodical, at one point edited by Kapsukas. (Of the 32 issues published, 11 were confiscated.) She was accused and sentenced to imprisonment for a year because in the paper workers were urged to overthrow the government, officials were described as thieves. Her defense was that she was only the nominal editor and had no idea what was being written. Her defense attorney was Petras Leonas. We can surmise that some readers learned for the first time that persons accused can be defended by lawyers. The next item is trivial, but indicative of social conditions. On trial, also in Vilnius, was an official who arrested two beggars because one did not have a passport and held them tied up until they came up with 22 kopeks "for a bottle." The official was punished. In a section titled "What is Heard in the World" we read that in Russia last week newspapers were fined a total of 800 rubles, issues of four different newspapers confiscated, one editor placed on trial, and another given a prison sentence of three months. Six persons have

been sentenced to death. In Kiev, the Jewish assassin of prime minister Pyotr Stolypin has been hanged. In a section of news from "abroad," we are informed about strikes in Spain and inflation in Austria. In Italy, things are not going well: severe storms and Mount Aetna has erupted. The river of fire destroyed many vineyards and left 4,000 homeless. There is a railways strike in Ireland, revolution in China, fighting in Macedonia and Persia.

Not professional journalism, but enough to leave readers with a sense that they are part of a larger world. By then, many had seen maps and had some idea of how far away were these places. Grinius and others of his generation could take satisfaction that their decision to emphasize enlightenment in the vernacular was bringing results.

1905 was an eventful year for Lithuania, the empire, and Grinius. It was, among other things, the year of his first arrest, if we do not count his Butirka interlude in Moscow. The year opened with strikes in Saint Petersburg, which spread to Vilnius and Kaunas. Surveying the previous year, with emphasis on the disastrous Russo-Japanese war, *Ukininkas* came close to arguing that the awakening should broaden out into a tax-payers revolt and an anti-war movement. Everywhere in Muscovy, Poland, Finland, Courland crowds are fighting for their rights and calling for constitutional government. But Lithuanians are still half-asleep, timid, obsequious, collecting funds so that the government can continue wasting wealth by pursuing war, continuing to kill. Especially at fault is the Catholic clergy, but that is to be expected since for many years bishops and priests have bowed to the powerful and oppressed the weak. According to this assessment, Lithuanians are failing the test of political and national maturity. They should be out in the streets demanding their rights and an end to the war.[492]

Again signing his own name, early in 1906, Grinius surveyed eventful 1905. The economy declined: there was a shortage of labor because many of the ablest were away on military service, while others had fled to escape the draft, forcing some landowners to import workers from Poland.[493] Manufacturing and

---

[492] "Svarbųs atsitikimai" ("Important Events"), *Ukininkas*, 1905 January-February, no. 1-2, pp. 3-8.

[493] Among those fleeing the draft in late 1904 was Jacob Loewenberg. In *Thrice-Born*, p. 25, he writes: "Avoidance of military service seemed almost a duty." Some, anticipating a medical examination, would starve themselves so as to "look too pale and too emaciated to be taken." Bribery played a central role. Eventually, he escaped to Prussia, wearing a peasant jacket and pretending to be a wood-cutter, "in a rickety cart dragged by a tottering horse under the charge of a Lithuanian peasant" (p. 28). Cohen, *A Dreamer's Journey*, p. 15, notes that some Jews falsified birth-records of male children to make it easier to evade the draft.

trade also declined. To this we should add the harm done by martial law, the soldiers, Cossacks, harassment, looting.[494] But the distribution of wealth became somewhat more equal, because the strikes which engulfed almost all of Lithuania in the summer have resulted in a rise in wages. However, should the government persist in pacifying the country by force and extracting taxes no matter what, Lithuania's future would be bleak. But on the whole, he is optimistic: in the twenty years of the awakening much progress has been made and it will continue if Lithuanians continue to work with dedication and self-sacrifice.

According to Grinius, in February 1905 people were granted the right to petition the czar. Lithuanians responded by asking for schools and offices in Lithuanian, fairer taxes, better regulation of lands and forests, an end to arrests and harassment, self-government, an end to the war. The government responding with repressions: the police were granted additional powers. Lithuanians replied by destroying alcohol monopolies, driving out gendarmes, assaulting public officials, although there was less violence than in Russia. The October manifesto granted the freedoms of speech, press, assembly, conscience. People could no longer be held without trial. But this is when a new wave of repression began. Now, "bands of soldiers with weapons and cannon roam our country, beating up people, destroying homes, property. Prisons are overcrowded. No one goes to bed secure." Yet, we can be sure that this suffering will establish a foundation for real freedom, equality, and autonomy.

During the year, Lithuanians have established perhaps 20 primary schools, mostly for children but with several evening schools for adults. Some government schools have also changed: foreign teachers have been driven out and now are conducted in Lithuanian. Plans are being made to admit Lithuanians into teacher training seminaries.[495] In this context, Grinius expresses his fundamental conviction: everywhere schools are the foundation of well-being. And, of course, they have to be conducted in a language which people understand:

---

494 Howard D. Mehlinger and John M. Thompson, *Count Witte and the Tsarist Government in the 1905 Revolution* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972), pp. 106-109, describes two punitive expeditions in the Baltics. The soldiers flogged and executed peasants, burned the homes of rebels. Lithuania suffered much less than Estonia and Latvia. The several Lithuanians killed by punitive expeditions were in Latvia, see Kipras Bielinis, *Penktieji metai* (*The Fifth Year*), (New York: 1959), p. 555. *Vilniaus žinios*, 1906 March 30, published an extensive account of the "flying squads" ravaging Latvia and Estonia, sparing not even women or children. By then, the squads had withdrawn, but were replaced by martial tribunals, arrests, hangings.

495 From 1864 Lithuanians were not admitted into teacher training seminaries in Lithuania. All teachers had to be Orthodox; see Staliūnas, "Lietuvių tapatumas," pp. 95-98.

everything must be done so that everyone of our young people learns to read and write.

I have been emphasizing that Grinius is, among other things, an enlightenment figure. It is thus not surprising that in this survey schools receive most of the attention. But he is also pleased that the Association of Lithuanian women has begun establishing small local libraries, perhaps as many as 29. Priests and others have begun to do likewise. Amateur theater groups are very active. He has counted at least 25 such evenings, with plays, singing, readings, dances. More and more church services are now in Lithuanian. We now have several newspapers and have published many books. The short list he provides includes four-five which still are staples in schools, with three of the authors being women. We still have few textbooks and the founding of the Lithuanian Learned Society has been delayed. But a group of "enlightened men" has formed and is working towards establishing a Lithuanian University in Vilnius.

Lithuanian emigrants in the United States can be considered a reserve, called upon for funds and other support in times of need. They have established a fund for awarding prizes to authors of textbooks, five prizes at 200 rubles each. But Lithuanians in Prussia are still dozing and continue to become Germans.

Grinius also notes differentiation into political parties. There are now five: his own Democratic Party of Lithuania, the Social Democratic Party of Lithuania, the Peasant Union of Lithuania (eventually merged with the Democrats), the Lithuanian National Democratic Party, and the Christian Democratic Party of Lithuania, still in its early stages. I may add that the Nationalists grew only after the 1926 coup, while the Social Democrats remained a small group throughout.[496]

Modest gains, but impressive when compared with the situation when *Aušra* appeared, especially keeping in mind police harassment and the absence of wealthy backers or Stalin style bandits. The brain drain, inevitable under imperial conditions, also cannot be ignored. In 1905, on the basis of subscribers to *Vilniaus žinios*, Grinius estimated that about 1000 educated Lithuanians live abroad, including 128 in the United States. In all, there were 5613 subscribers, with 743 priests among them.[497]

Grinius estimates that the Russo-Japenese War cost the empire some 3 billion rubles. This is an important part of the picture of an incompetent, wasteful,

---

[496] K. Grinius, "1905-tieji metai" ("The Year 1905"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 January 5, no. 3, pp. 37-40.

[497] Kl., *Varpas*, 1905, nr. 11-12, p. 131

and, of course, oppressive empire with arrests, strikes, shootings. But more telling is what he writes about other countries, countries in which conflicts are resolved peacefully and governments act with intelligence. Thus, Norway has split off from Sweden, without "spilling a drop of blood." People voted in favor of a limited monarchy and this form was adopted. Montenegro, up to the present, had blindly followed Russia. But then, entirely on his own, without waiting for unrest to break out, the prince established a constitution and granted various liberties. Unlike the czar, he acted wisely! There is unrest in Austria and Hungary, but the "wise" prime minister responded by establishing a universal franchise. The two likely will separate, as did Norway. The French have separated church and state: the government no longer gives money to churches or pays the salaries of priests. In England, prime minister Balfour, who began the Boer War and placed restrictions on foreign residents, has resigned. His replacement will be more liberal. Only Germany fails to make the grade of good government. She has forced Russia into an unfavorable customs treaty. She is quarreling with France over Morocco. Some newspapers are suggesting that she should occupy parts of Russia. But there is fear that in case of war the social democrats will declare a general strike and England attack, since the English already are uneasy about growing German power.[498] Thus Grinius makes full use of another opportunity to urge Lithuanians to became parts of the modern world.

It would be a mistake to conclude that 1905 ended without bloodshed. In Suvalkai Province martial law was declared on December 4, old style. In the two months since then, seven have been killed, including two revolutionaries, two policemen, two alleged spies, and a postmaster. Perhaps 20 have been badly beaten and some 250 imprisoned. Labor is hard to find because young men are in the army or in hiding. There is no order: robbers do whatever they please. Many Russian schools have been closed, post offices looted, alcohol monopolies shut down, telephone poles cut down and many public records torn to pieces (mostly tax records, making tax collecting more difficult). In this overview, Grinius makes no effort to parcel out responsibility between revolutionaries, criminals and government. But he thinks that it was the declaration of martial law which led to the chaos.[499]

---

498 K. Grinius, "1905-tieji metai kitur" ("The year 1905 Elsewhere"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 January 12, no 4, pp. 53-57.

499 K. G., "Du mėnesiu karo meto Suvalkų gubernijoje" ("Two Months of Martial Law in Suvalkai Province"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 February 9, no. 8, pp. 108-109.

While several terrorist organizations were formed, on the whole 1905 in Lithuania is marked not by armed insurrection but by a widespread slide into anarchy and activism. The following news report of events in northern Lithuania is typical. In mid-October the city of Šiauliai was paralyzed by strikes. Students in both secondary schools joined in. On October 19, several students on a street corner were approached by three drunken Cossacks on horseback. When the students refused to go home, one Cossack began waving his sword, but was stopped by the others before anyone was injured. That evening, outraged townsmen gathered on the estate of count Zubovas, the revolution minded aristocrat mentioned earlier, and listened to speeches by Jewish Bundists and Lithuanian social democrats on unrest in Russia. The crowd marched to town, perhaps 10,000 strong and listened to more orations in Lithuanian, Yiddish, and Russian. The next day there were meetings in the synagogue demanding that political prisoners be released and striking students not expelled. Suggesting that at work was a curious mixture of social radicalism and Lithuanian nationalism, the item ends by noting that a Lithuanian theater evening will be held in November to raise funds for a public library.[500]

In Kaunas Province, government ceased to exist in 82 out of 145 townships. The same can be said about 33 out of 80 townships in the Lithuanian part of Suvalkai Province. There was less unrest in the Polish part and in Vilnius Province.[501] In an effort to regain lost ground, the government responded with arrests. Thus, an 1906 report on Ukmergė prison indicates that 11 were arrested for participation in local self-government. There were about 100 political prisoners, nine Jews, the rest—Lithuanians. About 30 were charged with acts of violence, attacks on police, smashing windows of an Orthodox church. Jews were especially prominent in attacks on police. But anarchy should not be identified with petty vandalism. For example, in one township in Kaunas Province the men gathered and decided to build a school and establish a library. Much agitation revolved around schools: people demanded schools in their own language and drove out Russian teachers. Those demanding their rights included Muslims: in Vilnius there were 20-25 students who should receive religious instruction in their own language. However, in many places, urged on by police

500 *Vilniaus žinios*, 1905 November 4. Šiauliai had a number of Jewish-owned leather factories in which, according to social democratic newspapers, working conditions were terrible. Although the newspaper report makes no mention, likely some of the participants demanded better pay and shorter working hours.

501 Aleksandravičius and Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje*, p. 156.

and soldiers, townships were reopening Russian schools and calling back the dismissed teachers.[502]

Vilniaus žinios, the one daily in the country, and especially the social democratic *Darbininkų balsas*, published many short items reporting strikes, confrontations, demands. One gets the sense that Lithuania was more Lithuanian, including the cities of Kaunas and Vilnius, than census figures suggest. In 1906, *Lietuvos ūkininkas* published about 170 names of political prisoners in Kaunas, Lithuanians with only several exceptions.[503] In 1909, Grinius noted that in Vilnius, out of some 200 political cases, 120 involved Lithuanians. Many of the others involved Bundists.[504] Perhaps, in these more assertive revolutionary times people were less likely to attempt passing. In any case, 1905 was an eventful years for the empire, Lithuania, and Grinius. It is not surprising that in his memoirs he devoted more pages to 1905 than other years. The most important outcome, reflecting changing conditions in the empire, is his emergence into public life. At the time, he was nearly forty.

---

[502] News items in *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 April 20, no. 18, p. 233-34; *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 February 9, no. 8, pp. 109-110. For the meeting of Muslims in Vilnius see *Vilniaus žinios*, 1905 November 17. According to this anonymous writer there were 15,000 Muslims in the "Lithuanian Provinces."

[503] *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 March 23, no. 14, p. 185; March 30, no. 15-16, p. 201.

[504] K., "Kame mūsų galybė" ("Wherein Is Our Power"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas,* 1909 gegužės 20, no. 20, pp. 177-78.

XII A Public Figure

While much of American abolitionism had to remain out of sight, the cause had many public figures: their names were known, they could attract followers and co-workers, appear in public before crowds, the only way of reaching a larger audience to the advent of radio. To 1905, nothing like that was possible in Lithuania. With the exception of Basanavičius and one or two others, the awakening was the work of anonymous persons, hiding under many pseudonyms. Many of them were known to the authorities and, of course, to small circles of activists, but not to the larger public.

The Abolitionists could call upon supporters in government: there were senators and congressmen sympathetic to the cause. Furthermore, there was private wealth to support individual initiatives, in some cases forcing states to take on new responsibilities.[505] To 1905 in the empire there were no legislators, no spokesmen for local interests and reflecting local conditions, but only the imperial court and its agents. There was some private wealth, but very little of that was available to Lithuanian activists since almost no Lithuanians owned estates or engaged in business on a large scale. Richard Pipes calls czarist Russia a patrimonial state, roughly, one in which the monarch owned all persons and

[505] The public library system in the United States owes much to the philanthropy of Andrew Carnegie. At about the same time, Lithuanians were also establishing local libraries, but at local initiative and on a much more modest scale because there were no wealthy backers.

properties. This, he writes, "had profound bearing on the absence in tsarist and imperial Russia of any effective regional loci of power, able to stand up to central authority."[506] Under such conditions, there can be only one public center of initiative, namely, the imperial government. The Duma opened up some possibilities which Grinius and other Lithuanian leaders tried to exploit. But I reserve the Duma for the next chapter. The present one will deal with the emergence of Grinius as a public figure, of course, much limited by imperial power, but still able to appear and act publicly, albeit cautiously.

The Manifesto of October 17, establishing a legislature, also recognized the right of assembly, although with reservations. The authorities had to be informed in advance and reserved the right to prohibit assemblies deemed contrary to public order. I may add, that the Manifesto, as published in Lithuanian newspapers proclaimed the czar to be emperor of all Russia, King of Poland, Grand Duke of Finland, etc., etc., etc.

Of course, there were skeptics, rumors that the czar signed with his eyes full of tears. Critics pointed out that all the oppressive laws remained in effect, that the police--"the gang of thieves"--were still in place, as were the "executioners" known as gendarmes, the "wild beasts" known as Cossacks. As evidence that the situation, if anything, is worse, the unknown author claims that in the week following the Manifesto, in at least 49 towns, the police instigated pogroms against Jews. We need to recognize that "Jews are doing much good in the struggle for freedom." We need to support them and treat them as neighbors. Once they win the freedom to live anywhere in Russia, it will be better for them and for us." And Jews are not the only ones suffering. In Baku, the police and the army are looting and burning Armenian homes.[507] On the other hand, on the authority of Count Sergei Yulyevich Witte (1849-1915), the newly appointed prime minister, it was reported that the czar signed willingly, after making the sign of the cross twice.[508]

---

[506] Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974), p. 67. Acemoglu and Robinson, *Why Nations Fail*, p. 390 incudes the absence of property rights among the reasons why Marxist Communist regimes became despotic.

[507] A-s, "Naujos caro malonės" ("The Czars New Boons") *Ukininkas*, 1905, no. 10, pp. 270-72. *Vilniaus žinios* published reports of many pogroms throughout Russia. Among the worst occured in Odessa in late October—*Vilniaus žini*os, 1905 October 28—with about 350 killed, including children torn apart and old people thrown out through windows. Looting was widespread. On October 30, the paper published a short item, that in Moscow a committee for Jewish relief was formed, raising 30,000 rubles the first day.

[508] *Vilniaus žinios*, 1905 October 26. Sebag Montefiore, *Romanovs,* pp. 525-27, does not comment on the czar's facial expression, but leaves no doubt that the czar signed reluctantly.

Albeit skeptical and uneasy, people rushed to take advantage of their new freedoms. As soon as reports of the Manifesto reached Marijampolė, the Jewish Bund held a rally during which one of the speakers, in Yiddish, assessed the new development pessimistically: monarchists will make sure that much of the Manifesto remains on paper. In this context, Grinius recalls his own speech, likely his first public oration, without making clear whether he spoke at this rally or on some other occasion. In any case, as he recalls, he stressed the need to continue the struggle, to defend the gains achieved and pursue additional ones. Much has been gained with the lifting of the ban. But that is not enough. The Manifesto opens the door for various associations, for freedom of the press, and inviolability of persons. But, he explains in his memoirs, fearing spies, he made no mention of independence although by then he believed that independence was best. He expected the authorities to regain lost ground because the Russian masses were not mature enough for liberties. At this rally, a fourteen years old secondary school student kept shouting that socialism is coming. According to Grinius, this shows both the popularity of the word and the meager understanding of it. For the boy, the term was simply a synonym for liberty.

He recalls another rally in Marijampolė which shows that he was not an average politician willing to hide under pat phrases which he knows the crowd wants to hear. On the other hand, perhaps, it was only inexperience. In any case, his wife had to rush in and improvise, thereby saving the day. The rally attracted about 1000. For the occasion, he borrowed two red flags from the social democrats, but prudently covered up the slogan "down with czarism" inscribed on them. After he finished his explanation of the promises of the Manifesto, a shoemaker in the crowd asked about taxes. A politician would have responded with a bromide or two, while Grinius explained that taxes are inevitable in any political system. After all, schools, roads, public health, the training of agronomists requires money. In fact, as new needs arise, taxes could well have to be raised: "I finished. Silence." It fell upon his wife to explain, using colorful examples, progressive taxes: the poor would pay no taxes, while the wealthy would pay more. A voice in the crowd cried out: "Mrs. Doctor, you have been reading the *Woodpeckers' Uncle*." She agreed but since it was already sunset, proposed to end the rally. The crowd applauded shouting "Good, you speak truly."[509]

According to Grinius there were more rallies in Marijampolė organized by Bundists and socialist Zionists. But rallies soon became repetitious and tiresome,

[509] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 147-51.

pointing out the same flaws in the Manifesto and demanding autonomy and a republican Russia. Many historians have argued that the Manifesto did not calm the situation, but led to greater radicalization. Grinius's recollections of events in Marijampolė supports such accounts.

Grinius admits that in 1905 he, much like other Lithuanians, did not "understand the art of politics," that is, lacked the experience and skill in soliciting support, bargaining, compromising, schmoozing. After all, to this point Lithuanians had conspired, but had had few if any opportunities for wheeling and dealing.

On November 6, a zemstvo congress, a conference of some 400 town and country activists, opened in Moscow, oganized by constitutional democrats at Witte's suggestion. Grinius was one of three Lithuanian delegates. Another sign of changing times: *Vilniaus žinio*s published a number of reports, but borrowing them from Russian newspapers, providing no information of specifically Lithuanian interest. Not surprisingly, much of the conference revolved around the need to support Witte's cabinet. But the conference opened on a discordant note, when one of the Russian delegates proposed sending a groveling letter of gratitude to the czar for the Manifesto.

Apparently, there was no opportunity to raise the Lithuanian question at the conference. But the Lithuanians met with several prominent leaders of the Constitutional Democratic party, who advised caution. Pavel Nikolayevich Milyukov (1859-1943), founder of the Constitutional Democrat Party, in a "paternal tone," explained that Lithuania is much too small to demand autonomy and should wait to raise the question until the country was ready. No doubt, Grinius's memory was selective. But, as he recalls, discussing autonomy was counterproductive, only encouraging fears that the empire would shatter.[510] At about the same time, Basanavičius and several others raised the question of autonomy in a memorandum to the czar. Russian newspapers responded with arguments that the Manifesto should be repealed and Russia return to the old order.

On November 13, *Vilniaus žinios* informed that numerous Lithuanian petitions for autonomy were discussed at a cabinet meeting: the cabinet decided to prepare a statement explaining why autonomy was impossible. The paper also published the text of the memorandum by Basanavičius and several others, dated November 2. Much space is devoted to history, that Lithuanians

[510] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 155. Reports in the *Times* (London) focused on the question of support for Witte's government, for example, the report of November 20, 1905, p. 5.

are an ancient people with an ancient language and have been much harmed by Polish influences, while the Russians, upon inheriting Polish policies have been very egoistical. Likely, the long history would have annoyed Grinius. Perhaps, he would have noted critically the unpolitic reference to Russian egoism. But he would have agreed with the claim that the Lithuanians were awakening in part because of the "fruitful influence of European progress." And he would have been pleased by the reference to economic backwardness, resulting in massive emigration. The memorandum asks that in official documents the czar should postpone the etceras to include his title of Grand Duke of Lithuania. I like best the implicit repudiation of one-cause explanations of broad social processes. For the memorandum's authors, Lithuanian developments have to be understood in historical context, discriminatory Russian policies, European progress, economic crisis, and no doubt other factors as well.

But to return to the conference in Moscow. Readers should remember that Grinius was dealing with Russian liberals, reformers, not with conservatives. They should also recall that in the end Lenin's position was even less promising. In words, the Bolsheviks proclaimed the right of national self-determination, but adding in fine print that all that would have to wait for the world revolution and just in case it served the international proletariat. As we saw, this view was expounded by Kapsukas in 1917.

Both Grinius's recollections and newspaper accounts leave little doubt that the Polish question was important. The very first evening of the conference, a well-known lawyer in Moscow, probably Polish, approached Grinius with effusive compliments, suggesting that without his support, the Poles would accomplish nothing. After all, Grinus represented Suvalkai Province and the conference would agree with whatever he suggested. The problem, of course, was that while the majority of the inhabitants of Suvalkai were Lithuanians, administratively the Province was part of the Kingdom of Poland. Thus, autonomy for Poland as constituted at the time would damage Lithuanian interests. A compromise was reached: the Poles would ask for autonomy, but leave the question of boundaries open, while the Lithuanians would keep silent about Suvalkai. Polish delegates argued that autonomy would only benefit the empire. She would be stronger in face of the growing power of Germany and lead Poles in Austro-Hungary to regard Russia more favorably. Others saw a bright economic future for autonomous Poland. Some argued, that without autonomy, Poles would revolt. The conference agreed that Poland should be autonomous but this remained empty

words since the government followed its own course. In the meantime, martial law had been declared in Poland and several of the Polish delegates faced exile.

It turned out that not only non-Russians but also some Russian regions demanded autonomy, resenting Moscow's dominance. Grinius calls them separatists, Lithuanianizing the word.

In this context, he tells a story, showing how little Lithuanians counted in imperial centers. In 1917, a Lithuanian serving in the Russian army was detailed to guard the exiled czar, known to his guards as Colonel Romanov. Occasionally, he and the czar talked. "Do Lithuanians still speak Lithuanian at home?" the czar asked in surprise. Receiving an affirmative reply, befuddled, he blamed his memory. Grinius cites this as evidence of how little the czar knew about the inhabitants he ruled, although he would have heard of Lithuanians when questions concerning the press ban had been raised

Grinius did not think well of Basanavičius. Perhaps a year later, in a hotel in Vilnius, the two met. Basanavičius recounted how at a meeting of Russia's Constitutional Democrats he explained Lithuanian autonomy. Milyukov was pleased that at last he understood, adding that at the 1905 conference there was only confusing talk. Basanavičius suggested that the three delegates had mishandled the question and that Basanavičius himself should have been delegated to the conference of town and country activists.[511]

For Lithuanian history, the important 1905 event was the gathering of some 2000 Lithuanians in Vilnius, on December 4-6, new style, which came to be known as the Great Vilnius Assembly. In Lithuanian historiography, it is often noted as a sign of political maturity. The assembly called for Lithuania's autonomy, universal suffrage, an elected congress meeting in Vilnius. It urged people not to pay taxes, shut down the alcohol monopolies, not send children to Russian schools, evade military service, avoid contact with governmental agencies. It demanded the use of Lithuanian in schools and in all local government. It defined Lithuania as the area inhabited by Lithuanians, that is, defined the country in ethnographic terms. It limited its demands to autonomy, fearing that a small independent country would become prey.

---

[511] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 157-62. On November 22, p. 7, the *Times* (London) reported the willingness of the Polish delegation to support the government provided martial law was lifted and the use of Polish in schools was allowed. The question of autonomy was shelved, to be decided by the "Russian people." Some Russians saw in the "Polish rebellion" a very serious threat. According to the *Times*, November 15, p. 5, some proposed stationing 200,000 soldiers in Poland and another 200,000 in Lithuania.

Grinius did not take part, having just been released from prison. Many years later he explained that after four days in jail he was tired and lacked clean clothes. But the Assembly was also evidence of Lithuanian political inexperience: on the one hand, it encouraged attacks on Russian officials, on the other, did not call for a Lithuanian army. As he recalls, guiltiest were the clergy, who insisted on revolution, but without bloodshed. Latvians were better organized. The Assembly also failed to demand the redistribution of land, perhaps in the mistaken belief that abject poverty can be relieved by Christian charity. Criticism of the clergy is not unusual. The heavy sarcasm is.[512]

Liberalization made possible what several years earlier would have been out of the question: several ten thousand copies of the Assembly's declaration were printed, in Vilnius in Lithuanian. Agitators far and wide read it before assembled crowds, with those nearer the speaker repeating the words to those behind. What the outskirts heard and understood is another matter. There are reports of dragoons breaking up meetings.

In its first issue, *Lietuvos ūkininkas* published a candid, but on the whole favorable, account of the Great Assembly. The author was Povilas Višinskis (1875-1906), journalist and editor, closely associated with Grinius. Višinskis notes that there were representatives from all the Lithuanian provinces, from Moscow, Saint Petersburg, Riga, Warsaw, Odessa, even Prussia. But there were only a few women, and those mostly living in Vilnius. The call, he argued, had not been clear and many misunderstanding, entrusted delegates with petitions, complains, expecting response and resolution. In the first minutes, there was much noise, shouting, chaos, until officers were elected. Without naming them, he claims that much of the shouting was done by social democrats who claimed to be leaders of working people, criticized others, and praised themselves. Several times the meeting nearly broke up. Also there was much controvery concerning delegates who did not understand Lithuanian: it was agreed to provide them with accounts of the proceedings.

It was generally agreed that Lithuania must become self-governing: as things stand, decisions are made by people faraway, most of whom have never so much as met a Lithuanian. It was also agreed that Lithuanians must work together with other nations struggling for the same goals.

---

[512] Dr. K. Grinius, "Apie Didiji Vilniaus Seima 1905 m. (40 m. Sukakčiai paminėti)" ("About the Great Vilnius Assembly (Marking its Fortieth Anniversary)"), *Mūsų viltis*, (*Our Hope*), 1946 January 5, no. 1, pp. 1-2; January 12, no. 2, p. 3; January 19, no. 3, p. 2; January 26, no. 4, p. 2.

Given prevailing stereotypes of nationalism among historians, it is especially important to note the recognition that Lithuanians share the land with others. Višinskis notes that one speaker was Jewish, but addressed the assembly in Lithuanian, calling everyone to work together. In the same vein, the assembly resolved that the franchise should extend to all, regardless of nationality or religion. Clearly, in a congress elected in this way, minorities would be represented. Perhaps on his own account, Višinskis argues that tax revenues should be distributed proportionally to Jews, Poles, Russians, for the support of their schools and other cultural institutions.[513]

Grinius was not in Vilnius, but, no doubt, heard much talk about the Assembly. In his memoirs he notes that it became Lithuania's political center: had the government not crushed the revolt in Moscow, Lithuania would have won much autonomy. For months, many townships governed themselves, proving that Lithuaniana are able to govern themselves, without the Muscovites. The government was surprised by such unheard of solidarity. Grinius agrees that much noise was made by Kapsukas and his followers. He also thinks that Basanavičius did not want the Assembly to be political, but the first step towards the dreamed of Lithuanian Learned Society. It is this which enraged Kapsukas, who the night before held a rally and agitated that learned papers not be allowed.[514]

Suvalkai was under martial law. Several days after his return from Moscow, he was arrested at night and informed that he was being exiled to Poltava for the duration of martial law. Grinius's account of his arrest and imprisonment again makes one wonder how the empire survived as long as it did. The carriage, with Grinius, the driver, and four soldiers paused for rest at a roadside dive. Grinius treated the soldiers to tea and booze. Mellow, they began to complain comparing military service with *katorga,* and about generals who only know how to retreat and the rotten, stinking government. Arriving at the Kaunas prison, Grinius discovered that meals were at near starvation levels in part because the head warden stole. But he was examined by a doctor, an old friend, who discovered an imaginary ailment and had Grinius moved to the hospital were conditions were better. In the meantime, his wife called on the governor of Kaunas Province and found

513 Povilas Višinskis, "Pirmutinis Didysis Lietuvių Susivažiavimas Vilniuje" ("The First Great Lithuanian Assembly in Vilnius"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1905 December 1, no. 1, pp. 3-7. During the first years of independence minorities enjoyed considerable autonomy. Even in the last years before the war, minority aspirations received more governmental support than, for example, in the United States. Some minority schools received support from taxes.

514 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 172-74.

out that martial law, in the Kingdom of Poland, across the Nemunas, was about to be repealed. She returned to Marijampolė and obtained papers ordering Grinius's release. In the Kaunas railway station he met many on their way to Vilnius, but decided not to join them, exhausted by his ordeal and suffering from a cold.

It gets even worse. His wife in Kaunas went for advice to the headquarters of the council of worker's staffed by in the main by revolutionary students. They gave her a letter to the governor and two students accompanied her to his office who received them courteously. The governor agreed that Grinius should travel to Poltava by himself and not be transported under guard. Grinius surmises that at the time in effect there were two governments, the official one and the one represented by the council of workers and it was not clear which would triumph.[515]

The Soviet government was at times called the brothers-in-law government. We see the same in Grinius's account of life under the czars, friends and relatives exchanging favors, off the books so to speak. But in 1905, under brothers-in-law, we have to include governors and revolutionaries, in a friendly atmosphere discussing travel arrangements of a not very important prisoner. The Lithuanian term, borrowed from the German *schwager*, which I have translated as "brothers-in-law," is more evocative. In any case, while Grinius in Kaunas prison was eating soup which included "chopped intestines and scrapings," Lenin was back in Russia and money "was pouring in, much of it from rich manufacturers, for the Socialist newspapers and pamphlets." I may add, that while still in Geneva, as Russia was burning in the flames of revolution, Lenin spent much time complaining that not enough copies of his journal were being sold in Russia.[516]

One of Lenin's angels was Maxim Gorky. In 1906, Gorky was on a fundraising tour of the United States, spending most of his time on the Adirondacks estate of a wealthy American. There he encountered William James: "James is a wonderful old man, but he is also an American. Oh, to hell with them."[517] History

---

515 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 170-72. Grinius was referring to what are known as soviets which were springing up. According to Ulam, *The Bolsheviks*, p. 230, Lenin feared spontaneity and was not sure how the Bolsheviks should respond.

516 Ulam, *The Bolsheviks*, pp. 230, 225. Sebag Montefiore, *Young Stalin*, p. 132, writes: "In Russia itself, the plutocrats, … were the biggest Bolshevik contributors, while among lawyers, managers and accountants 'it was a status symbol to give to the revolutionary parties." But he cautions that not all these contributions were voluntary because "Stalin had probably learned the lucrative art of protection-racketeering …."

517 *The Correspondence of William James,* vol. 11 (Charllottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2003), pp. 270-71. It would be an interesting study in human psychology to determine how much of the Bolshevik program reflected contempt for money-grubbers lacking spiritual depth, the stereotype of the "bourgeoisie," widespread among landed gentry.

does not record whether Gorky explained to James that Russian peasants were "half-savage, stupid and heavy," destined to die out.[518] Lithuanians also raised funds in the United States, but were not invited to luxurious resorts.

Several other events will help to fill out the picture of 1905. On May 15, mostly thanks to efforts of Joana Griniuvienė, in Marijampolė there was a performance of a comedy *Amerika pirtyje* (*America in the Bathhouse*), about a clever swindler. He persuades a young woman to steal 200 rubles so that both can go to America, but after she hands over the money, locks her in a bathhouse and departs for the New World alone. The comedy was first performed in 1899 in Palanga, the first in public in Lithuanian during the years of the ban. Palanga was part of the Province of Courland. The performance would not have been licensed in any of the Lithuanian provinces. Thus, for forty years, imperial policy deprived several million citizens of the ordinary pleasure of theater which they could understand.

The white-haired old man playing the zither, whom we met some pages ago, was there. Because he was not listed on the program, his appearance was a surprise: the enthusiastic crowd standing on benches applauded without end. The poem by Kudirka which was to become the Lithuanian anthem was sung. The performance was followed by dancing to the sounds of a 32 piece military orchestra. Nine hundred tickets were sold. To find room for such a crowd they renovated a decrepit barn, buying the needed lumber from a liberal minded Russian forester at a low price. Profits went to help farmers who had suffered losses from hail, some 800 rubles. Grinius adds that because of inexperience he failed to obtain invoices from his suppliers and had difficulty settling accounts.

There is no question that Grinius saw the staging as a political act. In his memoirs, he refers to a Hungarian author who claimed that the Hungarian awakening was much advanced by theater. At the same time, Grinius was cautious. Kapsukas wanted to jump on the stage, make a speech, and distribute revolutionary broadsides, thereby attracting unwelcome attention. But Griniuvienė rushed to the rescue: she quickly organized a guard and kept Kapsukas away. Perhaps, this is the incident Kapsukas had in mind when claiming that her revolutionary enthusiasm did not last. In any case, Grinius's license to stage a second play was withdrawn when the governor learned that seditious leaflets had been found.

Grinius traces the roots of public theater in folk traditions: "after all, weddings at least in part, were theatrical performances." In fact, village life abounded

[518] Ulam, *The Bolsheviks*, p. 450.

in traditional short plays, marking the end of harvests, the beginning of Lent, the new year. To make his point clearer, let me mention one example: even now at many weddings the bride has to rescue the matchmaker who, accused of lying, is about to be hanged. Often, this tradition is embellished by more imaginative participants. According to Grinius, folk traditions during the awakening developed into plays performed in secret in parlors and barns, to eventually emerge as formal, public theater.[519] Likely, Grinius shared the widespread belief, that to be Lithuanian, the culture should be grounded in folk traditions. A good example in American culture would be Aaron Copland, with compositions such as *Rodeo* or *Billy the Kid,* sophisticated works with musical and thematic roots in American lore, and thus said to be distinctively American. Incidentally, Copland comes from a Jewish family of Lithuanian origin.

But to return to the stage in Marijampolė: there were objections to the second play—not performed--raised by the local Catholic priest because it, also a comedy, suggested that there was no devil. In discussions with the priest, Grinius tried to explain and, exasperated, offered to revise the offending passages. But the priest stood his ground. The matter was important because without his approval secondary school students would be unwilling to take part. Of course, the matter became moot when the license was withdrawn. In general, Grinius was critical of clergymen, especially Catholic ones. 1905 created new opportunities for criticism, with emphasis on the "mortal sin of our Catholic priests, their opposition to Lithuanian aspirations for independence." I need to emphasize that I am merely reporting Grinius's views, leaving for others the question as to whether he was right. Likely, something he himself at times recognized, there was a difference between generations, with the older priests inclined one way and the younger—the other.

The ever practical and more militant wife took the lead. The choir which she had organized one Sunday in May, apparently without permission, assembled in the choir loft and began to sing in Lithuanian, although the services were in Polish. The Lithuanians in the congregation joined in while the priest was outraged. But, choosing the lesser evil to avoid scandal, he began to conduct some services in Lithuanian.

There is a news item by Grinius, without names or details, that in Marijampolė some services are in Lithuanian. But, he adds that local Poles are outraged, complain of being mistreated, and plan to appeal to the diocese.

[519] Grinius, *Atsimimai ir mintys*, 2: 109-120.

According to Grinius, if anything, all services should be in Lithuanian because most of the Catholics in town are Lithuanians, most local Poles know the language, and the church is supported by the land tax, which is paid mostly by Lithuanians. Perhaps, Grinius is overstating. But, if he is anywhere near the truth, Marijampolė was much more Lithuanian than it had been when Grinius arrived as a student.[520]

The language of services was a constant source of friction: often the clergy insisted on Polish even in predominantly Lithuanian congregations. Altercations were not unusual. But, in more militant times, Griniuvienė deliberately disrupted church services. In July of that year, she organized another disruption, this one undoubtedly political. Dated July 10, the administrator of the diocese issued a letter to be read during mass, instructing the faithful to ignore the "servants of Satan" and obey the czar, in accordance with the precept of giving to Caesar what is his. Even strikes were said to be contrary to Christian teaching: workers wanting better pay should petition in the proper Christian manner, in the meantime fulfilling their obligations to their employers. I would have protested because the letter is long and repetitious—perhaps 2000 words. The theology is suspect. Whatever her motives, she, in peasant dress, walked from village to village organizing a group to come to Sunday mass and shout "down with priests traitors." She was cunning. To avoid arrest, she herself did not appear and her activists were not local and thus, not identified.[521] In his short note about the event, Grinius did not write that the protest was organized, but emphasized that no one was injured or identified. Soldiers on horseback arrived in an hour, but the crowd had already dispersed.[522] The fact that soldiers were sent suggests that authorities were nervous.

Ukininkas published the offending letter, adding a long commentary not by Grinius, but approved by him. The diocesan administrator dreams of becoming a bishop and needs the czar's approval. He is urging everyone to inform and help the gendarmes. He condemns the smashing of monopolies to protect the czar's treasury. He does not care about the misery of those drowning in drink. He is "the czar's lackey, servant of the police, spreader of ignorance, distorter of the teachings of Christ." There are few if any minced words. But perhaps the most telling criticism, expressive of the passions of 1905, is this: in the old days,

520 K., "Senapilė," *Vilniaus žinios*, 1905 April 29.

521 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 121-22.

522 K., "Senapilė," *Vilniaus žinios*, 1905 July 20.

workers were treated as if animals, to be bought, sold, slaughtered. Times are changing, but the cleric now treats workers as if they were little children. For reformers like Grinius, at the heart of the revolution was the demand for equality: workers are demanding to be treated with dignity, respect. To fall back on language used earlier: ordinary people are insisting that they are citizens and not mere subjects.

In 1905 it was difficult to predict that Marxist Communists would exploit this passion in order to preserve hierarchical authority, of course, with themselves as beneficiaries. People like Grinius, although at times tempted, saved Lithuania from misfortune. Unfortunately, in his memoirs, he does not explain why he did not follow the same path as Kapsukas and others.

The commentary provides a mocking account of the origin of the ruling dynasty, demystifying imperial authority. A long time ago, the people asked a *žmogelis* (ordinary man, using the derogatory diminutive) with the last name of Romanov to rule them. After his death, his children pushed and shoved their way to the top. Then priests declared that Romanovs ruled by the grace of God.[523] Thus, nothing more profound than the daily elbowing by kids to get more treats, which greedy priests declared to be God at work. The author emphasizes that he is not advocating anarchism: authority must be obeyed as long as it is properly established and just. He just wants to strip away the pretense. And everyone is free to believe in angels or devils, as long as they separate church from state. The commentary ends with a call for an autonomous Lithuania governed by a legislature sitting in Vilnius.[524]

One incident on June 18 resulted in Grinius's brother Jonas fleeing to the United States. At a rally in a town near Marijampolė, two policemen, brandishing revolvers (or merely keeping their hands near their holsters) attempted to arrest an agitator. Several shots were fired: one policeman fell dead, the other was wounded and fled. Several were arrested, including Feliksas Bacevičius, Grinius's brother-in-law. The police began to inquire after Jonas Grinius who, after living disguised and under an assumed name, fled the country. Bacevičius was found not guilty after one of the witnesses was threatened with death should

---

[523] The account is misleading by what it overlooks, namely, that the Romanovs while untitled were prominent and that Michael was reluctant to accept the throne; see Sebag Montefiore, *The Romanovs,* p. 13. He emphasizes that the czars claimed a religious basis for their authority.

[524] For the letter, see *Ukininkas*, 1905, no. 10, pp. 280-83; the unsigned commentary is found on pp. 284-94.

he testify. Not surprisingly, at trial the witnesses agreed that the killer in no way resembled the accused.[525]

There is evidence that the police were keeping their eyes on the whole Grinius family. In 1904, Grinius described how his brother Jonas, his father Vincas, Bacevičius, and several others were searched. In somewhat mocking tones, he notes that the authorities, looking for seditious leaflets, found nothing. In the end, Grinius suspected that one of those searched was an informant.[526] There is a somewhat earlier account of police ransacking Grinius households, although it is not clear whether it was the operation described above. In any case, according to Grinius, the police were searching for weapons and printing equipment, but found only several harmless books. The Griniuses were scolded for having a sign in Lithuanian and were warned not to travel without notifying the police.[527]

It is a simple matter for historians to mislead unintentionally: it is natural in revolutionary times to ignore the majority who carried on with their ordinary lives. In fact, there were many who, out of habit or fear, continued to bow to the authorities. In the same issue of *Ukininkas* there are several news items helpful towards a more balanced picture. Thus, in a small village a Lithuanian invited a functionary, Russian, to his home. The girls danced with him and kissed his hands out of respect and gratitude. The report is censorious: the "bloodsucker" should not have been so much as invited. Another case, in another town, illustrates the traditional respect for authority which both reformers and revolutionaries had to overcome. A man's home was searched: he invited the police to come in and did not insist to see a warrant. And what is worse, the search completed, he courteously drove the officers to the railroad station, a trip of five-six miles, sparing them a tiring walk. And in the city of Šiauliai, several secondary school students, girls, decided to march down the street singing the anthem *Bozhe, Tsarya khrani*. The Catholic girls refused, but they found willing Russians, Germans, Jews, and eventually some Lithuanians. After being joined by a group of boys, they reached a club where army officers were celebrating. Drunk on champagne, led by a brass band, they marched to the railroad station to bid the officers farewell. The school's principal—his daughter was one of the

525 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 126-28.

526 Barzdinėlio Brolis, "Skriaudžiai," *Vienybė lietuvninkų*, 1904 August 7, no. 36, p. 426; Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 131-32.

527 Kamputis, "Sasnavos parapija" ("The Parish of Sasnava,"), *Ukininkas*, 1904, no. 6, p. 183.

organizers—was so pleased that the next day he let the school out early. Likely, the unknown author, female, perhaps one of the older students, added highlights to leave no doubt as to her own goodness of character. But it is credible that many would have devised ways to demonstrate loyalty. And it is always possible that the principal instigated the show in hopes of a raise.

Grinius was cautious, unwilling to risk what had been achieved by ill-devised and premature risings. There was an infantry regiment stationed in Marijampolė, with many of the soldiers inclined towards revolution, hoping that afterwards land would be redistributed to the landless. Kapsukas and other Lithuanian social democrats wanted to assemble the regiment in the market square for an oath of loyalty to the revolution. Kapsukas was in contact with Latvian revolutionaries. The scheme would have prevented the deployment of the regiment in Latvia, where events seemed to be moving towards organized military confrontation. Grinius was glad that the plan failed: the revolt would have been crushed and the revolutionaries hanged, at least those who had not succeeded in fleeing abroad. But planning had advanced far enough so that, while Grinius was away, his medical office had been turned into a first aid station, apparently with the help of his wife. He guesses that the plan failed because in the end, the Bundists decided not to support it.

In the meanwhile, Lithuanians were engaging in "small war," harassing officials, attacking post offices, destroying government alcohol retailers, shutting down Russian schools. He speculates that "big war" did not come about because Lithuanians lacked money, weapons, and, most importantly, experienced military officers.[528]

The experience of revolutions in the twentieth century is sobering: the names at the top change, but it makes little difference whether the Kremlin houses a Nicholas or a Vladimir. As Sebag Montefiore puts it forcefully and economically, "Red Tsars/White Tsars,"[529] all insisting on the non-human origin of their authority. The rhetoric changes, but the underlying pathologies remain, notwithstanding the deaths and the destruction. As I have emphasized, Grinius was a reformer believing that deep changes can be brought about only by an enlightened citizenry not shackled by a state religion or an obligatory ideology.

---

528 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 175-77.

529 Sebag Montefiore, *Romanovs*, p. 654. He emphasizes the continuities from Michael to Putin. He cites Stalin's telling remark: "The people need a tsar, whom they can worship and for whom they can live and work" (p. 655).

He at least tolerated the small war in hopes that the empire will collapse, making possible an independent and democratic Lithuania.

By contrast, Lenin was doing everything he could to encourage violence in hopes that he and his small sect would be able to seize power. Lenin returned to Russia from Switzerland in November 1905. Service writes: "His purpose as ever was to guide and control his Bolshevik faction and maximize its influence in the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. He was not, and did not aim to be, the tribune of the people."[530] In a sense, neither did Grinius see himself as a tribune, a champion of the people. But instead of trying to impose an ideology, he labored to create conditions in which people would become their own tribunes.

According to Service, Lenin returned in the belief that the Manifesto opened the doors for public political activity. He was disillusioned when Okhrana agents, "who had no talent for disguising themselves" surrounded his residence. Grinius was disillusioned more emphatically. In mid-December, he was invited to call on the governor of Suvalkai Province who in a friendly manner advised him to leave Marijampolė because "unexpected events" were possible. Grinius understood this to mean that soon there would be preventative arrests. Besides, he had heard that the local chief of police was planning to "teach him a lesson." Grinius celebrated Christmas in Vilnius.

Several other officials were present and joined the discussion. The governor agreed that the press ban was a sorry misunderstanding and that once the Duma was established, similar violations of judicial norms would not take place. He expressed his belief that Grinius should be the first Duma candidate from Suvalkai. They agreed that Lithuania was not only on the verge of political revolution, but also religious reformation. Young people are distancing themselves from Catholicism and becoming indifferent. The clergy favor dictatorships while students—democracy.[531] Grinius took the opportunity of explaining that people were destroying anything Russian, irritated because officials continued to deal with them in a language they did not understand.

At this distance and with nothing more than Grinius's memoirs to work with, we can only speculate. Could the interview have been not only a stick but also a carrot? Staged in hope that with visions of life as a Duma deputy, Grinius would moderate his position? If this was the reason, it would be evidence that

---

530 Service, *Lenin*, p. 176.

531 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 181-83.

the authorities now considered him a leader, whose services would be useful to the empire. Grinius was also surrounded by spies, additional testimony that the government considered him a serious threat. In one case, pretending to be sick, an agent came into his office and in a whisper promised to pay well for a revolver. Another, complaining of sharp pains, would arrive late in the evening, hoping to find visitors. The third, a former schoolmate, a drunkard, would tail him at a distance.[532] One was Polish, the other two—Lithuanian. Not competent professionals, but no worse than those spying on Lenin, if Service is to be believed. Nevertheless, they are evidence that the Manifesto promised more, but gave less. Grinius's emergence into public view had its drawbacks.

In any case, while Lenin and his wife in Saint Petersburg were plotting and dreaming of power, Grinius and his wife were founding *Šviesa* (Light), an educational society in Marijampolė. The initiative belonged to Griniuvienė. As a result, for a number of years, Grinius's office doubled as a library, with Grinius checking out books to members at set hours. In late December the society opened an unlicensed primary school, attracting some 40 pupils, after purchasing desks, textbooks. Of course, it was conducted in Lithuanian. Some Sunday afternoons, Petras Vitkauskas gave talks on physics, about magnetism, measuring the mass of the earth, and similar topics. Grinius himself gave a talk on personal hygiene. The Society was officially registered in 1907, but shut down by the government the next year, and completely liquidated in 1911.[533]

"Power to the people" proclaim Marxist revolutionaries. Measured by that standard, the Bolsheviks were counterrevolutionaries, all the while positioning themselves to rule over the people. After they had power firmly in hand, little reflecting local initiative and spontaneity was possible. Dzerzhinsky, his chekists and heirs, would have crushed *Šviesa* swiftly. Service's account of Lenin pushing and shoving his way to the top is instructive, reminding one of tourists elbowing for the best seats on the bus. After all, in Russia, Lenin was more of a tourist because of the many years spent abroad and the few interactions with the lower classes, that is, the majority of Russians, the people of Communist lore. In revolutionary times Lenin was not out in the streets. Rather he lived isolated in a small circle of like-minded conspirators: "He wrote newspaper articles and booklets and sat through the endless discussions of party committees.

---

532 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 187-88.

533 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 184-86.

Occasionally, moreover, he gave speeches to party congresses."[534] Unlikely that Grinius was aware of Lenin at this time—Lenin was known only to members of the future inner circle. No doubt, Grinius would have been appalled by Lenin's insistence that one and only one person posseses the Keys to the Kingdom.

In the meantime, Grinius was seeing patients, including several spies, and listening to the gripes and woes of library patrons. *Šviesa* grew to 19 chapters and several hundred members. He counted *Šviesa* among the fruits of the revolution. In this he is quite consistent. After all, for him, education which enables people to take charge of their own beliefs and affairs is the first condition of social progress. Grinius published some 20 items concerning this society, 12 of them are signed with his full name. Two are also signed by his wife.

Robert's Rules of Order were first published in 1876, supposedly after the author had attended a chaotic and fruitless meeting. I do not know whether there were Russian or Polish procedural manuals available to Grinius. There was nothing like that in Lithuanian. Early *Varpininkai* meetings must have followed some order, but they could not risk a paper trail. There were no published agendas, written reports filed for future reference, minutes of meetings read an approved. For these reasons, an organized civil society cannot form underground. Because it operated publicly, *Šviesa* was an important step forward. In *Vilniaus žinios* Grinius was able to announce meetings and publish minutes. Thus, on November 25, 1906, the paper published a report, signed by Grinius, of the founding meeting of the society, held on November 19 (December 2). Twenty nine members, enough for a quorum, and 10 guests were present. Grinius was elected to chair the meeting. A central committee of seven was elected, including Grinius and his wife. He explained that the society was founded on November 27, 1905, but had to suspend operations because of martial law. The school was open for only three weeks because the government demanded that it be closed. After the lifting of martial law, the society was registered on October 26, 1906 and can now "work openly." The society is fully democratic and anyone of good character can become a member, regardless of religious beliefs, nationality, or gender. Its sole aim is to spread enlightenment and improve the lives of the inhabitants of the Province. Schools were a priority: estate owners were encouraged to establish schools on their estates and several had agreed to do so.

The meeting was asked to answer a question which plagues all societies committed to freedom of thought, namely whether libraries should make "bad"

[534] Service, *Lenin*, p. 176.

books available to the public. In our time, there is a tendency to exclude racist material, several generations ago—sexually explicit content. The meeting decided to exclude "black hundred" publications. The origin and ideology of such groups is well known. They were extreme Russian nationalists, monarchists, defenders of empire, anti-Semites, given to violence and terror. They were not especially active in Lithuania, but the term was used broadly to refer to similar groups. Grinius used it in a broad sense when commenting on *Lietuvos balsas* (*The Voice of Lithuania*), published in Kaunas: it is the voice of reaction and foe of the movement for Lithuania's liberation. He suspected that it received government support and scolded Basanavičius for becoming a contributor. In Lenin's usage, "black hundred" became a curse word.[535]

Likely, Grinius was in favor of keeping out "bad" books. Late in 1906 he wandered into a tearoom in Marijampolė. The government was establishing tearooms as part of its campaign against excessive consumption of alcohol. He doubts the government's sincerity—it is much too zealous in protecting the monopolies. He also noticed some "black hundred" literature, commenting upon two "worthless pamphlets" in an especially derogatory manner. The first is an attack on those proclaiming that land should belong to those who work it. The second—an especially disparaging attack on the Paris Commune. Grinius cites a number of examples to rebut the woman author's claim that standing armies are always better than militias. He expresses the hope that few read such trash.[536]

An alert reader would have concluded that it is important to keep up the pressure on the government: when the authorities were fearful, *Vilniaus žinios* was available, while now, when they feel confident, the tearoom no longer subscribes. Difficult to avoid larger questions: whose interests are served by depriving Lithuanians of news about the larger world? Why fear a legal newspaper approved by censors? And why should such small matters be decided by people so far away?

By no means was Grinius and his group the only ones pushing their way into the public sphere. Catholics in Suvalkai established *Žiburys* (A Source of Light), an educational society in rivalry with the secular *Šviesa*. *Žiburys* lasted to

---

535 Laumė, "Juodašimčių laikraštis" ("A Black Hundred Newspaper"), *Varpas*, 1905, no. 11-12, p. 125; Service, *Lenin*, p. 227. The Soviets were quite thorough in removing subversive material from libraries, destroying some and storing others in special collections. They banned all Lithuanian pre-war periodicals. This practice had unintended consequences. After the Soviet collapse, in a special library in Kaunas, a very extensive collection of pre-war periodicals became very conveniently available.

536 K. Lapas, "Marijampolė," *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 August 30, no. 44, p. 524.

the Soviet occupation in 1940 and played an important role in establishing the country's school system. Vilnius had *Vilniaus kanklės* (The Zither of Vilnius), a society emphasizing the arts. Part of a conscious effort to establish a Lithuanian presence in the city, the society staged plays, among other things. Similar oganizations were springing up in other places, evidence that by this time the awakening was a broad and popular movement. But it should not be forgotten that in empires, anything minorities do has political significance.

The fact that the school founded by *Šviesa* was allowed to operate for only several weeks serves as a reminder that Lithuanians were opposed not only by Russians but also by Poles who, after all, had ambitions of their own. Grinius surmises that a Polish woman was somehow involved. Her petition to open a Polish school in Marijampolė was rejected because there were too few Poles in the area. She alleged discrimination: why is the Griniuvienė school allowed? At that point, the authorities had no choice but to shut down the Lithuanian school.[537]

Much like everyone else, Lithuanians called for unity in battle against shared enemies, but could not avoid internal quarrels. Grinius and his group were not militant atheists, like the Bolsheviks were. But they were secularizers, disgusted by the Church's authoritarianism and the non-religious authority of priests. When young Lenin moved to Kazan, hardly "a street existed without its church," proclaiming to one and all who was in charge: "The official authorities had also built magnificent churches because they worried about the significance of Kazan as the greatest centre of non-Christian faith in the empire."[538] Churches at the time were not simply houses of prayer, but also testaments to wealth, power, authority. The situation in Lithuania was more complicated, but anyone working to create a modern polity had to be concerned about the linkages between religion and politics.

In turn, some clergymen could not avoid suspicion observing the rise of educated laymen, especially those not noted for piety nor asking for clerical advice and approval. No doubt, some were sincere, while others feared the loss of influence and wealth. For many in the clergy, *Šviesa* would have been the first institution they encountered in which they did not have the last word, in which they had no *ex officio* standing. And *Šviesa* undertook to involve young people, thereby drawing them into a secular world, away from the watchful eyes of clergymen.

---

537 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2: 185.

538 Service, *Lenin*, p. 67.

Theater evenings, followed by dances lasting until dawn, attracted the young. In 1907, for use by *Šviesa*, Grinius tanslated from the Russian four short pieces, described as comic, although, from my point of view, belonging to the you-had-to-be-there genre of humor. Three were monologues, the fourth—*A Marriage Proposal*, a one-act farce by Anton Chekhov. Of the four, only one of the monologues is politically suggestive, depicting as it does a foolish official, who also pockets 10 rubles in the process.[539]

In time, Grinius and his wife became the targets of rumor and calumny, that they encouraged a student to desecrate a consecrated wafer, that at *Šviesa* social gatherings young men danced with women of ill repute, some of them carriers of venereal diseases. Grinius and his wife had to issue a public denial.[540] That some students experimented with a host to see whether what had been bread was now flesh is possible. After all, the priest did say that this was now the body of Christ. But it is out of the question that Grinius or his wife would have approved. There is nothing in his biography indicating a willingness to ridicule religious beliefs and practices. Perhaps, his conception of the religious sphere was too narrow. Perhaps, he was too insistent that faith belonged in church and nowhere else. But nothing suggests that he was a militant atheist. It is also out of the question that he would have sought to corrupt morals. As has been said, on sexual matters he was quite traditional and as a doctor understood the harm done by venereal diseases. In any case, how would the critics know that the women were infected? The charges would have been more credible had he been a Bolshevik, but by 1905 for him that was a dead option.

Grinius heard that the clergy were trying to hurt him economically, using pious *davatkos* to spread rumors and persuade his patients to seek medical help elsewhere. These efforts failed and he felt no loss of income, continuing to earn some 3,000-4,000 rubles annually.[541]

Perhaps it is only coincidence, but in September 1908 the homes of Grinius and other *Šviesa* members were searched. There was talk that the society would soon be shut down and members brought to trial. The search was thorough. They took away perhaps as many as 100 books from the *Šviesa* library, showing special

---

539 *Senapilės "Šviesos" teatrėlis*. (*The Little Theater of Šviesa of Senapilė*) (Vilnius, 1908). One of the translations is signed with his fulll name, the rest—with initials.

540 K. Grinius, J. Griniuvienė, L. Ciplijauskas, "Dar 'dokumentas'" ("Another 'Document'") , *Vilniaus žinios*, 1908 July 31. Included are excerpts from a letter accusing the Griniuses, together with excerpts from a sermon preached against them.

541 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 40.

interest in books with red covers.[542] Grinius succeeded in concealing the list of borrowers and the minutes of *Šviesa* meetings. This is the search, mentioned earlier, in which their son asked whether everything had been hidden. He and his wife were arrested and held in prison for about two months. Upon their release, they were exiled from Suvalkai and moved to Vilnius.

In his cell, he heard about a former prisoner who had counterfeited coins, melting down the metal using a device disguised as a cage for pet mice. A friendly jailer marketed the coins on the outside. Grinius was accused of membership in the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party, working to overthrow the established government and detach Lithuania from the empire. Of course, he denied this. The interrogator inquired whether it was true that Griniuvenė had attended the funeral of a revolutionary, Jewish, and had made a speech. Grinius responded that attending Jewish funerals was not a crime. And was Grinius involved in erecting a monument to Kudirka? Yes, adding that Kudirka believed in democracy and held views similar to those of Russian constitutional democrats. Grinius's "anthropological measurements" were taken, using instruments of the finest quality. The interrogation concluded with the suggestion that all of his troubles would go away if he became an informant. It was clear, Grinius recalls, that the prosecution had found nothing incriminating and had no evidence.[543]

In February 1909 fifteen of the accused were still in prison. When they demanded a trial, they were told that they could not be tried because they had done nothing. Their arrest was preventative.[544] Probably in June, the case was at last resolved. Twenty were exiled from Suvalkai or Poland, two were released counting time served as sufficient punishment, five were found innocent. But it is possible that *Šviesa* simply went underground. The same issue of *Lietuvos ūkininkas* described a successful evening of theater in Marijampolė: many of the actors and organizers were supporters of the "deceased" *Šviesa*. And the searches and arrests did not end.[545] A reminder: these were not armed revolutionaries assaulting policemen or robbing banks, but people who enjoyed theater in their own

---

[542] I am unfamiliar with Communist publishing from that time. But during the Soviet occupation, Communist texts often were bound in red and at a glance could easily be mistaken for prayer books.

[543] Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 63-66.

[544] Kalinys (Prisoner), "Kalvarija," *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1909 May 20, no. 20, p. 179. Grinius is probably the author.

[545] X, "Marijampolė. Šviesiečių dalykai" ("Marijampolė. Concerning Šviesa"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1909 July 2, no. 26, p. 235. Two other notes cited, probably not by Grinius, appear on the same page.

language. Of course, under the czars and later, the commisars, it was difficult for ordinary people to avoid sedition.

For the collapse of the case Grinius credits the ingenuity and resourcefulness of his wife. It was she who traveled to Saint Petersburg, made full use of acquaintances and relatives, bribed those who needed to be bribed—three rubles to the doorman, ten to the functionary handling the case. She made notes concerning the charges. She made approaches to Stolypin, who was vacationing on his estate in Lithuania and managed to meet with Stolypin's assistant. It helped that Bulota, the Duma deputy, discussed the case with Stolypin and made a speech on the floor. Grinius surmises that Stolypin preferred to shut down *Šviesa* and similar organizations, but was uncomfortable in pushing such an obviously weak case. The gendarme who had initiated the proceedings later complained that he had dropped on the promotions list from 17th to 151st place.[546]

There is irony in all this, a reminder of unintended but predictable consequences. Like many of the others, Grinius and his wife were exiled from the Kingdom of Poland, but not from the Northwest provinces. They simply moved to Vilnius. Thus, the authorities in Warsaw rid themselves of headache, at the risk of creating migraines for others. Vilnius was developing into a center for Lithuanian activism. *Lietuvos ūkininkas* and *Vilniaus žinios* were published there. There was an active Lithuanian theater. There were many consultations and meetings preparatory to the founding of the Lithuanian Learned Society.

Basanavičius himself, now established in Vilnius, renewed the call for a learned society in June 1905. His call is worth noting because of its sober assessment of Lithuanian culture: we have many learned men, but no scholars in any field of learning. Even our historians are only "dilettantes and compilers." He emphasizes the study of the language, collection of folklore, historical research, the need for libraries and manuscript collections. The list reflects his personal interests and his sense of what is most urgent and possible. But there is a broader context, the hope and expectation that in time Lithuanians will establish themselves in all fields, in both the humanities and the sciences. To an extent, Basanavičius was a preservationist: we must not allow the distinctively Lithuanian folk culture to disappear without a trace. At the same time, in his view, preservation is only a first step towards a fully developed modern Lithuania.[547] This is something which writers like Timothy Snyder fail to understand.

546 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 70-72.

547 Jonas Basanavičius, "Dar kartą apie įsteigimą, mokslo' draugijos" ("Once again about the Founding of a, Scientific' Society"), *Vilniaus žinios*, 1905 June 24.

The Society was at last founded in April 1907, and Grinius became a member. At various time, he colleted not only folklore but also objects suitable for a museum which the Society hoped to establish.

No doubt, Grinius spent his several months in Vilnius talking of artichokes and kings. He mentions at least a dozen activists, including three women, whom he met frequently. Basanavičius is not mentioned in this context. It is during this stay that he wrote the previously mentioned pamphlets about American government, the fair distribution of land, and other pieces. But his main accomplishment was the program of the Democratic Party of Lithuania, no longer the Lithuanian Democratic Party, although only in name and aspiration, but not in membership. There are conflicting claims as to authorship. Most likely, while many offered suggestions, most of the work was done by Grinius. In any case, there is no doubt that Grinius fully accepted the program as his.

The change of name was motivated by a growing realization—Grinius does not say how widespread—that other inhabitants of the land should have a role, and can be helpful, in establishing a democratic Lithuania.[548] Excluding some Jews and Belorussians, this was more wishfull-thinking than political realism, especially where Poles were concerned. Also lacking in realism was the distinction between the ultimate goal, an independent Lithuania linked by federal ties with democratic neighbors, and the immediate goal—autonomy within the empire. As if with broad smiles on their faces Russians would help those working towards their empire's eventual disintegration.

Seton-Watson provides a sketch of the 1906 program, but he overlooks the change in name and confuses it with the party which Basanavičius tried to found.[549] And more detail would have been helpful.

The program emphasizes two broad themes which form the backbone of the present biographical study. The first is that Europe is changing and Lithuanians cannot afford to fall behind. The second—most Lithuanians labor for a living and much must be done to improve their lives. Thus, the Party undertakes to represent the interests of peasants and farm laborers. It is not a spokesman for the gentry and clergy, but does expect them to take part in the awakening. Then, after noting the progress which has been made, the program tackles constitutional questions. Of course, independence is the long range goal, but for the present, Lithuania needs autonomy. The central government would

548 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 30-31.

549 Seton-Watson, *Decline of Imperial Russia*, p. 238.

be in charge of defense, currency, foreign affairs, while autonomous Lithuania would control education, land distribution, roads, railroads, waterways, develop her own criminal code and even organize a militia. All, regardless of religion and nationality, would enjoy the full range of rights and liberties. The program was to be published in the last issue of *Varpas*, but for reasons unknown to Grinius, was published only as a pamphlet across the border in Tilsit. The names of the authors were not revealed.[550]

With pride, when in 1939 he published the text in *Lietuvos žinios,* he emphasized that the program helped shape the first and democratic constitution of independent Lithuania. But he did not explain why independence was merely the ultimate goal. Seton-Watson explains it as follows: the leaders understood that the people were not ready for independence, making autonomy "a necessary stage for the political education of the Lithuanian people." Perhaps so. But the realities of power had to play a role. The authors of the program placed their hopes in the Duma: autonomy would be won by parliamentary means. Not a hopelessly unrealistic assessment: representatives of small nations, acting in concert, joined by some Russian liberals, could have undertaken to restructure the empire. But it would have been unrealistic to hope that the Duma would approve full independence. As things turned out, only military defeats and revolutions created enough of a power vacuum to make independence possible. Lithuania gained, when America's and Britain's ally was overwhelmed by disasters.[551]

In the last issue of 1906, *Lietuvos ūkininkas,* to familiarize Lithuanians with the Democratic Party of Lithuania, listed its publications and expenses, including amounts paid to editors and received from donors. Other issues list donors to other Lithuanian causes, including aid to "martyrs" (prisoners), with several using their real names. The amounts are small, in some cases not even a ruble. But a noteworthy advance towards public life.

Grinius's busy interlude in Vilnius, the center of Lithuanian activism, lasted only several months, to the middle of March 1906. Once again earning

[550] "Lietuvos demokratų partijos programa" ("Program of the Democratic Party of Lithuania"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1939 March 29, March 30, March 31.

[551] Great power bias is evident in this assertion by Sebag Montefiore: "Lenin and Trotsky had signed their peace treaty with Germany at Brest-Litovsk that ceded Ukraine and the Baltics to puppet regimes, controlled by the triumphant kaiser" (*Romanovs*, p. 637). Lenin could not cede Lithuania: by Brest-Litovsk Lithuania had been under German occupation for four years. And they were not puppets but people probing for small openings in a difficult situation. Furthermore, German troops offered some protection against Lenin's restorationism. In any case, for a small nation even a puppet regime would be better than no regime, which is what Lithuania had under the czars.

a living as a doctor in Marijampolė, he pursued his hobby, collected botanical terminology. In 1910, to avoid duplication of effort, he announced that he was preparing a work on botanical terminology, but nothing came of this effort, although others did use in their publications some material collected by Grinius.[552] At the same time, he continued to observe and report on the "small war." In the course of 1906 he published at lest 40 reports on various aspects of the ongoing revolution, as well as finding time for pieces on problems in farming, the founding of *Šviesa*, the Duma, and other questions.

We see a land descending into anarchy and signs of growing reaction. But also more Lithuanian than it was just several years ago. Among other things, there are more signs in Lithuanian, alongside the Russian ones. One longer piece, published while Grinius was still in Vilnius, also casts light on relations between Lithuanians and Jews. In Vilnius Province, a group of Jews, using a Lithuanian as a front, bought an estate which including a large forest. For a number of years, the lumber was sent to Vilnius, while local Lithuanians earned extra money by felling trees. The land in the region was poor and the farming plots small. When the locals demanded an increase in pay, the boss—also Jewish—had them arrested, twelve in all. They were still in a prison in Vilnius at the time of writing.[553] In March, he published a short note on conditions in Suvalkai prisons: spies, like bats in the night, can be found everywhere. Conditions are harsher. It is harder to communicate with those in prison, but fewer are being imprisoned.[554]

Revolutionaries were not the only ones to agitate using leaflets. According to Grinius, near the church in Marijmpolė, a leaflet was distributed accusing socialists of teaching that God does not exist, that matrimony is not a sacrament, that private property is theft, that socialists work for Jews and plan to take away the last ruble from farmers. He explains that such accusations are false and recommends a pamphlet by Wilhelm Liebknecht (1826-1900) for understanding what socialists teach. Unfortunately, there is little comfort for the religiously minded: Liebknecht writes that Christianity by moving the kingdom of heaven to the afterlife, took away "virile energy," in effect castrated men, while socialists struggle to improve conditions on earth. But socialists do not advocate promiscuity. On the contrary, once great economic disparities are eliminated, women will

[552] Dras K. Grinius, "Botanikos morfologija ir fizijologija" ("Botanical Morphology and Physiology"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1910 November 3.

[553] K. "Miško darbas ir 'maištininkai'" ("Lumbering and 'Rebels'"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 January 26, no. 6, p. 84.

[554] K. L., "Kalvarija," *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 March 16, no. 13, p. 173.

no longer be forced into prostitution and marriages will be based on love, not calculation, as they are now. Thus, Christians talk and promise, while socialists alleviate. Concerning Jews, Grinius adds on his own account that the Democrats propose to treat Jews as equals but not cater to them. After all, Christ, Jews, pagans, Islam, teach that men are equal before God.[555] Historians could well quibble concerning the last: often there is an emphasis on the different fates awaiting the chosen people and outsiders. But in a time of revolution, in a Catholic country, it was more politic not to be too critical of religion.

Other notes give information about arrests and releases of political prisoners, strikes, the czar's portraits torn to pieces, postmasters ordered to open letters, draft evasion, people beating up informants. One item is worth attention because it reveals Grinius as a moderate who supports revolutionary goals but is circumspect as to means. A Jewish estate owner leased his lake to two other Jews, who caught fish and sold them, also allowing others to fish for half of their catch. Several young men, in the name of the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party demanded that the owner allow everyone to fish, because the waters belonged to everyone. When the owner did not comply, death threats were posted. According to Grinius, the Party had not authorized such action, and the young men were pretenders, simply doing harm to the good name of the Party—his wife, at the time an active social democrat, could have reassured him. Social democrats do propose to abolish private property, but only when people are organized and ready.[556]

One item could well have been intended as a warning that the government was regaining control. Even minor offenses would be handled under martial law and a person could be hanged on the mere word of an offended policeman. There are savage beasts who devour humans. Now there are savage courts, without defense lawyers or appeals: the condemned must be hanged within 24 hours. Doctors in Koenigsberg fear crossing the border to treat patients.[557] According to Ulam, the use of what came to be known as "Stolypin's necktie" was "savage in some regions, half-hearted in other places."[558] In Lithuania it was half-hearted.

---

555 K, "Biaurus atsišaukimas" ("A Terrible Leaflet"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 March 16, no. 13, p. 174. Reference is to Wilhelm Liebknecht, *Rejkaluose teisybės* (*On Behalf of Truth*), (1896). The pamphlet is a translation from the Polish and was published by the Polish Socialist Party.

556 K. L., "Gudeliai," *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 September 16, no. 48, p. 559.

557 K. L., "Marijampolė," *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 September 16, no. 48, pp. 558-59.

558 Ulam, *Bolsheviks*, p. 258.

But even in such times Grinius remembers that without general education little will change. In 1906 he published at least six notes indicating that more instruction in Lithuanian was available in elementary schools. But even here not everything was as it should be: in one school, the instructor appointed to teach Lithuanian, a Pole, knew little of the language.[559] On the same page, there are reminders of confusing and revolutionary times: we learn of rumors that in Kaunas and Vilnius Provinces, Lithuanians could not become teachers but could only serve as teachers' assistants. But there are also published reports that the Ministry of Education will allow Lithuanian in elementary schools in Kaunas, Vilnius, and Grodno Provinces. And what is really the case no one knows. At the same time, in one school in Vilnius Province, the students demanded a reduction in fees from 15 rubles to ten. Also, that Old Church Slavonic no longer be taught. They declared a strike and together with students from the Jewish and Russian schools as well as from the school for girls formed a procession of perhaps 1000, singing revolutionary songs. Soldiers dispersed them. Now several students and teachers have been dismissed. The remaining teachers are of the black-hundreds kind and can only turn students into fools.

In June 1906, the Democratic Party of Lithuania held a conference in Vilnius, with important implications for Lithuania's political future. Several younger members were dissatisfied with *Lietuvos ūkinikas*, then edited by Antanas Smetona. They called for a more revolutionary spirit, sharper attacks on the czar. Grinius agreed with them, Smetona resigned and several years later formed his own party which became the Nationalist League, taking power in the 1926 coup. The Nationalists favored large farms and fared poorly in democratic elections.

In September of that year Grinius and his wife were once again arrested, suspected of hiding pistols: years later Grinius admitted that his wife had become involved in smuggling and stockpiling weapons. The searchers found nothing, evidence of incompetence since the weapons were not hidden especially well, in buckets and covered with ashes. After two weeks in prison, because of a lack of evidence, they returned home to be greeted by the children and a recently acquired puppy. Griniuvienė was expecting their third child. As has been said, Jurgis was weak in health and died in France. They speculated that the mother's stay in prison contributed to his difficulties.[560]

---

[559] Darbininkas, *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 May 4, no. 20, p. 264. The other two items mentioned are not by Grinius.

[560] Ilgūnas, *Kazys Grinius*, pp. 133-35.

It is convenient to summarize Grinius's encounters with the authorities, The first, as has been noted, took place while he was a student in Moscow. The second was his arrest in November 1905, followed by several months of exile in Vilnius. The third was the arrest mentioned in the previous paragraph. The fourth was in 1908 in connection with Š*viesa*. Upon his release he was once again exiled to Vilnius, where he lived with his family for almost two years. In November 1911, back in Marijampolė he was arrested for the fifth time, charged with insulting the czar, spending nearly six weeks in prison. He was interrogated but not arrested in February of 1913. Only in 1906, suspected of stockpiling weapons, was he accused of engaging by normal standards in illegal activity. There is not enough information about the Moscow affair. But in the case of the other three arrests he was punished for praiseworthy initiatives or what would have been praiseworthy had he not been a member of a minority.

In the fall of 1906 the Farmer Alliance of Marijampolė was registered, as has been mentioned. This is the society which in 1911 organized the agricultural fair, certainly among the largest events staged by Lithuanians up to that time. Years later, Grinius claims that he founded the society in fear that *Šviesa* would be shut down and liberals would have no organization to turn to. In his later view, competition is good: once *Šviesa* was closed, its rival, the Catholic *Žibury*s also slowed down. What he thought about the stimulating effects of rivalry while in prison in 1908 we do not learn. But unlikely, that he did not blame clerical intrigues for his misfortune.

It goes without saying that his 1907 piece, based on Russian sources, about Jerusalem artichokes has not attracted the attention of historians. Jerusalem artichokes are easy to grow, resistant to cold, have high crop yields, and can be used not only as fodder but also as food for humans. Yet in Lithuania they are not cultivated, perhaps, because once harvested they decay rapidly. According to Grinius, the storage problem can be dealt with and farmers would benefit if they began to cultivate them.[561]

The piece is very much in line with Grinius's reform program. In a land with few natural resources, little industry, only improved farming practices can raise the general standard of living. But rural poverty is a function not only of an unjust distribution of land, but also of blind adherence to tradition, the habit of merely repeating what one's ancestors have done. Thus, in advocating

[561] Unsigned, "Žieminės roputės arba bulvės" ("Winter Tubers or Potatoes"), *Žemė*, 1907 June 27, no. 1, pp. 4-5.

the cultivation of new crops, Grinius is urging farmers to abandon tradition and try something new. In the same vein, he urges farmers to feed horse dung to pigs. This is done in one region of Estonia: the pigs fatten up quickly and the meat is good.[562] Farmers should also abandon the practice of setting aside part of the crop for sowing and planting: botanists are developing new and better strains. In the piece about a new variety of potatoes, readers also learn that there are perhaps a thousand varieties, that "learned men" are constantly producing new ones. Readers also learn about cross-pollination and where to buy new strains, best suited for the local soil and climate.[563]

Lenin's antics during this period defy summary. Reasonably safe in a Finnish *dacha*, he quarreled and conspired, verbally bludgeoning dissenters, traveling from party congress to party congress. And when it came to revolutionary action, according to Service, his "imagination ran wild." Revolutionary detachments should use paving stones, boiling water, acid, and anything that came to hand, to confront trained and armed soldiers! In his spare time, he devised agricultural policy, "casually" assuming that "it would be a simple administrative task for the revolutionary regime to ensure that the peasants ... would adopt efficient farming techniques." Service remarks, correctly in my view: "In truth Lenin woefully underestimated the dangers of bureaucratic degeneration."[564] Lenin's distance from actual life is brought out by Ulam: his "lack of practical knowledge accounts...for Lenin's intermittent optimism that with a little training the worker could run the most complex machinery."[565]

Of course, Grinius was also concerned with the larger questions. He advocated the redistribution of land and at least autonomy for Lithuania, both changes intended to move the country towards self-government and democracy. He also understood the importance of capital:

"Capital is power, before which even cannon bow" he wrote in 1910.[566] According to Grinius, Lithuania suffers because there are no Lithuanian

---

562 Unsigned, "Arklių mėšlas—kiaulėms maistas" ("Horse Dung—Food for Pigs"), *Žemė*, 1907 July 25, no. 2, p. 13.

563 K. Gr., "Nauja ropučių veislė" ("A News Strain of Potatotoes") *Žemė*, 1907 November 28, no. 6, pp. 44-45.

564 Service, *Lenin*, pp. 177, 179.

565 Ulam, *The Bolsheviks*, p. 482.

566 K., "Lietuvių kapitalų koncentracija" ("The Concentration of the Capital of Lithuanians"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1910 August 28.

capitalists. Thus, in the 1910 article he wrote that Lithuanians can create capital only by pooling small sums, that is, by forming cooperatives and micro-credit societies.

On the question of capital, there is an amusing contrast between Grinius and Lenin, between one who believed in patient building from the ground up and another committed to grand gestures. In 1920, Lenin fell victim to an American confidence man, pretending to be a billionaire of great political influence. At a party congress Lenin urged that Kamchatka be leased to the supposed capitalist, who would pay his workers in scrip redeemable at the company store, thereby reviving some of the worst abuses of early capitalism. The United States would build a naval base on Kamchatka and enter into war with Japan.[567] By contrast, at about the same time, in l921, Grinius wrote: "Cooperatives are the stairs for climbing out of slavery."[568] That Lenin fell for the con reflects his experience: when in need of funds, he was able to call upon wealthy sympathizers and hold-up men. In the meantime, Grinius and others in the awakening acquired the habit of pooling pennies, a more promising habit if your aim is to establish democracy. After all, they could never appeal to wealthy Lithuanians because there were none, at least none with sympathies for the awakening.

One 1926 incident brings into focus the direction in which Grinius's thoughts and character were moving. Several weeks after becoming president, he presided over a meeting of the Society for the Prevention of Tuberculosis. It was suggested that the Society ask for government funds. Grinius disagreed. What other politician, having reached the highest office, would refuse to display his new influence and power? Grinius refused, thereby remaining true to his faith in an active and involved citizenry.[569] In the sense of a fixer and doer, while active in politics for most of his life, he never became a politician. At the time, he believed that infant mortality and premature deaths because of consumption were major barriers to Lithuania's development. Several times he calculated the economic costs, in the case of infants, including expenditures for the baptismal celebration.

In Grinius's bibliography there is a noticeable shift away from broad encouragement to the treatment of concrete problems. In the years 1914 and 1915,

---

567 Ulam, *The Bolsheviks*, pp. 484-85.

568 K. Grinius, quoted by the editor, *Talka (Assistance)* 1921 December 18, no. 19-20, p. 3.

569 Ignas K. Skrupskelis, "Kazys Grinius—politikas iš reikalo, gydytojas iš pašaukimo" ("Kazys Grinius, a Doctor by Calling, a Politician by Need"), *Kultūros bara*i, 2014 March, no. 3, pp. 78-83.

for example, among other things, he wrote about the need for insurance societies in cases of fire (a frequent occurrence in wooden houses with open flames), for more post offices, explained how to build outhouses, rebuild homes to insure ventilation and hygiene, bury battlefield casualties, write wills bequeathing part of the estate for public needs. Thus, no pretense to knowing the laws of history, no grand gestures, nothing theatrical, nothing to inflame the imaginations of journalists and historians. Just prosaic details to help ordinary people, here and now, live better. As the history of Communist revolutions shows, there is much to be said for the dull and the ordinary. Grinius did not suffer from "economic incompetence, wholesale ignorance, ivory-tower utopianism."[570]

[570] Jean-Louis Margolin, "China: A Long March into Night," in *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), p. 487. Said about Mao, but applicable to Lenin. Noteworthy is the sacrifice of the present in the name of a glorious future. One of Mao's slogans: "Three years of hard work and suffering, and a thousand years of prosperity" (p. 488).

XIII On the Fringes of Politics

As long as the Russian empire endured, autonomy was the best Lithuania could hope for. Accordingly, Grinius recalled, there was talk about proposing in the Duma a law establishing Lithuania as an autonomous part of the empire. But it remained talk, because Lithuanian deputies, scattered among Russian political parties, failed to draft such a law. In any case, just about all the Russian deputies would have opposed it, likely supported by many of the Polish. According to Grinius, the Duma did nothing for Lithuania.[571]

His assessment is supported by historians: at best, Lithuania was a footnote to the Polish and peasant questions. For example, Geoffrey A. Hosking has six entries for Lithuania in his index, but mostly in the context of Stolypin's effort to introduce zemstvos, institutions of local self-government, in the western provinces, but rig the elections so as to weaken Polish influence.[572] In the biography of Stolypin by Abraham Ascher, Lithuania, while mentioned in the text, does not so much as appear in the index, while the most prominent Lithuanian in the Duma, Andrius Bulota (A. A. Bulat), is mentioned once, but not identified as Lithuanian. Ascher's extensive account of Stolypin's work in

---

[571] Dr. K. Grinius, "1914 metai Lietuvoje" ("The Year 1914 in Lithuania"), *Naujienos*, 1949 March 19. In this article Grinius surveys the progress made in the decade after the lifting of the press ban.

[572] Geoffrey A. Hosking, *The Russian Constitutional Experiment: Government and Duma, 1907-1914* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1973).

Lithuania has to be located under the entry for Kovno Province.[573] Even for historians, Lithuania is just one of the etceteras.

While there are exceptions, I sense a widespread lack of appreciation for the fact that Russia (and the Soviet Union) was an empire, that is, lacked the cultural cohesiveness which in times of crisis does much to insure survival. The many national awakenings were weakening whatever imperial loyalties there might have been. Since much of the focus is on revolutionary movements, especially Lenin and his Bolsheviks, and other Russian developments, in general histories many forces tearing the empire apart do not receive enough attention. According to Seton-Watson, the 1897 census found some 16 nations numbering over 1,000,000, and many smaller ones. Lithuanians, at 1,650,000, made up 1.4%.[574]

Although in time he became involved in Duma politics, Grinius was skeptical from the start. In June of 1905, in an unsigned article, he surveyed the state of affairs in the empire, noting that revolution was just over the horizon: it is no longer possible to blame a handful of agitators and ignore the nearly universal discontent. The czar responds with a two-fold strategy. On the one hand, he promises many liberties and forms commissions which pretend to draft laws needed to secure them. On the other, he has his police incite conflicts between the various nationalities and social groups, urging ordinary people to assault the educated, Tartars to attack Armenians,[575] Christians to storm Jews. People should respond by learning to love each other and in unity attack the czar and czarism. It goes without saying that Lenin was not calling for peace and unity between classes.

---

573 Abraham Ascher, *P. A. Stolypin: The Search for Stability in Late Imperial Russia* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001). The Stolypin family owned estates in Lithuania, and to 1902, Stolypin held various posts there. Mary Schaeffer Conroy, *Peter Arkad'evich Stolypin: Practical Politics in Late Tsarist Russia* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1976), a professor of history, makes an amusing blunder (p. 114). After listing the various western provinces, including Kaunas and Vilnius, she writes: "Throughout the Kievan era the area had been governed by Russian princes. ... But Lithuanian and Polish rulers began acquiring the territory in the fourteenth century... ." But if Kaunas and Vilnius provinces were Russian, did the Lithuanian rulers descend from another planet? In any case, Lithuanians play no role in her account of "The Poles in the Western Provinces."

574 Seton-Watson, *Decline of Imperial Russia*, p. 31. On pp. 30-40, he provides accounts of the non-Russians who made up somewhat more than half of the population. But he begins with "Russia was a multinational state," instead of the more forceful, in keeping with the title of his book, "Russia was an empire." There are sketches of national movements throughout the book.

575 Seton-Watson, *Decline of Imperial Russia*, pp. 162-63 describes Armenian developments. Armenians appear to be more militant, more prone to political violence, than Lithuanians.

Russians are demanding a constitution, something which many others already enjoy. There would be a parliament to legislate, a cabinet of ministers answerable to parliament, while the czar would have no role. But a single parliament for the whole empire, something which Russians are demanding, would not benefit Lithuania. If one deputy represented 100,000, there would be 1,300 deputies of whom only 30 would be Lithuanians (Grinius is counting generously). Thus, decisions concerning Lithuania would be made mostly by people who have neither interest in nor knowledge of her affairs, while Lithuanians would be deciding about people they have barely heard of. And what if Lithuanians were to elect someone intimately familiar with her needs, highly qualified, who knows little or no Russian? This deputy would have to remain silent and inactive. And what about Poles and Russians who have their own designs on Lithuania? The 30 Lithuanians would be too few to defend themselves against 500 Russians and the parliament would legislate against Lithuanian interests. Russians have oppressed Lithuanians in the past and could decide to continue. The upshot is obvious: Lithuania must have her own parliament, sitting in Vilnius, her capital. A local parliament would mean that each deputy would represent a smaller electorate, an important advantage from Grinius's point of view.

He emphasizes that elections should be direct, by secret ballot, and all adults should enjoy the franchise, regardless of religion, social class, nationality, gender. He also raises the problem of border regions with mixed populations: such questions should be revolved by plebiscites. Thus, a naive proposal where disputed borders are concerned: border disputes are resolved by armies and not plebiscites. In later years, as prime minister, he himself opposed settling the Vilnius dispute by plebiscite, fearing that Lithuania would lose.

But Grinius also recognizes the realities of power. While by this time convinced of the advantages of independence, he calls only for autonomy. The various nations in the empire share common interests, concerning trade, economics, defense, and such matters should be taken up within a federal structure. In this federal parliament, every autonomous unit should have equal voice, regardless of size.[576]

Setting aside federalism, the program Grinius presented was much like that with which the Russian Constitutional Democrats, nearly a year later, entered the First Duma. For both Grinius and the Kadets, the land question was central. In their Address to the Throne, to satisfy land hunger, the Kadets

[576] Unsigned, "Mūsų reikalavimai" ("Our Demands"), *Ūkininkas,* 1905 June, no. 6, p. 141-49.

demanded a law for the requisitioning various state and monastery lands and the "compulsory expropriation of privately owned lands." According to Hosking, the First Duma was dissolved because of the land question, the Kadet proposal being seen as too radical. In Lithuania it became centrist, with the two major parties, Grinius's *Liaudininkai* and the Christian Democrats, differing only as to details. Grinius was explicit in his call for a Constituent Assembly to draw up the new governmental structure. The Kadets were hesitant, at one point calling for an Assembly but later dropping the proposal. As noted, they also differed on the question of federation, the Kadets declaring that only Finland and Poland should enjoy autonomy. Had Grinius entertained delusions on this point, he would have been disillusioned at the zemstvo congress in Moscow. And over everything there was the shadow of Russification: Grinius suspected that some of the proposed changes hid Russian plans to expand and establish new colonies in Lithuania.

Hosking writes: "the October Manifesto had suddenly plunged the emergent political parties from the world of dreams into the world of reality and responsibility."[577] Less so in Lithuania, because the handful of Lithuanian deputies had few chances to raise specifically Lithuanian concerns. At the same time, Lithuanians eventually did become involved in practical politics, organizing, agitating, and even made tentative attempts at polling public opinion.

Vilniaus žinios published the October 17th Manifesto only on the 25th, because Vilnius workers had joined the general strike and the paper did not appear for ten days. The editors stated that because of haste to report the latest events, they reserved commentary for later issues. Much space is devoted to brief items about the strike, including one from Berlin that mail to Russia will not be accepted and that trains from Russia to Koenigsberg, Danzig and Warsaw are nearly empty. But there are signs that the strike is reaching a victorious conclusion. An item from Moscow, dated October 18, reports that people are kissing each other in the streets, that churches are holding services of thanksgiving. But there still are clashes. Thus, a crowd of celebrating demonstrators encountered a wagon-load of political prisoners. Shots were fired and one policeman killed. Promising significant changes was an amnesty decree, dated October 21st, but so detailed that only an experienced lawyer after extensive study could tell what it really meant. A Lithuanian reader would have been even more confused because of uncertainties in the translation. Similar difficulties of interpretation arise in

577 Hosking, *The Russian Constitutional Experimen*t, pp. 17-20.

the case of instructions concerning censorship: censors are to abide by existing laws while new ones are in preparation or so a quick reading suggests. Also published were the czars temporary instructions, dated October 14, concerning public meetings. They were to be registered with the proper authorities in advance, providing full names and addresses of organizers and speakers. Meetings not in compliance with laws and dangerous to the public order are prohibited. There has to be someone at the meeting charged with insuring that the meeting does not deviate from its stated purpose. Thus, many readers would have been hopeful, but uncertain of what these changes really amounted to.

Lithuanian readers would have responded with hope, but also uncertainty, to two decrees, dated October 22, concerning Finland, published in *Vilniaus žinios* on the 26th. The decrees repealed several provisions restricting Finnish autonomy and called for a special congress to meet in Helsinki on December 7th. The congress would decide on the budget and laws needed to establish a congress, with the government answerable to it. Suffrage would be universal and equal. Reading this, some Lithuanians must have asked themselves, if Finland, why not Lithuania? True, Finns were more numerous, but with a more modest history, at least in Lithuanian perceptions.

The promised commentary, unsigned, under the heading "Beginning to Live" appeared on the 26th. It was cautious but optimistic: the Manifesto is only a beginning but in the right direction. It marks a great victory for the millions who took part in the revolution, in numbers without precedent in history, but much remains to be done. Where Lithuanians are concerned, without specifying what that is, the writer states that what is most needed has not been attained. Thus, the present victory opens up opportunities and calls upon all Lithuanians, villagers and townsmen, rich and poor, to struggle even harder.

Witte became prime minister on October 20. On the 26th, *Vilniaus žinios* quoted several paragraphs of an interview with him from a Russian newspaper. On the one hand, the interview leaves room for optimism: the czar is sincere that freedom is best for the Russian people. Thus, there can be no doubt, that there will be freedom of speech, of the press, amnesty, that abolition of the death penalty will be considered. But on the other hand, there are disquieting overtones. According to Witte, there are dark, "reactionary" forces eager to "play the role of saviors of government and order." Obviously, everything depends on who these supposed reactionaries are: extremists of the right or left, or both, or reformers

whose views clash with those of the government. And perhaps, for Witte, it is nationalist reformers like Grinius who should be regarded with suspicion.

Not surprisingly, social democrats, while conceding that some irreversible changes have taken place, urged workers and peasants to keep up the pressure. Reorganized as the Social Democratic Party of Lithuania, they declared that a Duma in Moscow would never grant Lithuania autonomy. Finland was an exception: Russian control was never strong and noticing that the Finns were arming themselves, the government restored her autonomy. In the meantime, Jews are being slaughtered in the Ukraine and Russia: to divert attention from itself, the government is trying to place the blame on those different in faith and nationality. It has tried but failed to do so in Latvia, Lithuania, Poland. Witte, appointed to head the government, avoids direct involvement, but praises those who incite bloodshed. Liberals are beginning to side with the government: while filled with mistrust, but fearing the workers more, they are falling into the "embrace of evil doers."[578]

I have mentioned the memorandum of Basanavičius and others petitioning the czar to use Grand Duke of Lithuania among his titles. This memorandum is dismissed with scorn: the emphasis on Lithuania's ancient glories is only evidence of the impotence of a fading class, as if penniless heirs of an ancient family boasting of the family's coat of arms. "A rising class knows no family crests, mocks superstitions and relies upon its own power."[579] In the meanwhile, there are signs of growing reaction, including searches and arrests among Vilnius social democrats.

In its last issue in Prussia, *Ukininkas*, the organ of the Lithuanian Democratic Party, concluded that the Manifesto will remain only a piece of paper, unless the revolution puts its provisions into practice. Until then, we will have to put up with the "same gang of thieves" and executioners. At present, unity with all those opposing the czar claims precedance: "Jews are our neighbors and we must act towards them as with human beings and neighbors. Now they must be dearer to us than others, because most of them are laying down their heads for freedom, for human rights."[580] This piece is followed by a translation of the Manifesto with scathing commentary, emphasizing in keeping with

578 Unsiged, "Paskutinės despotizmo dienos" ("The Last Days of Despotism"), *Darbininkų balsas*, 1905 November-December, no. 11-12, pp. 335-38.

579 Unsigned, "Nauji 'Tautos' Gelbėtojai" ("New Saviors of the, Nation'"), *Darbininkų balsas*, 1905 November-December, no. 11-12, pp. 341-43.

580 A-s, "Naujos caro, molonės" ("New ‚Favors' from the Czar"), *Ukininkas*, 1905, no. 10, pp. 270-72.

the revolutionary program that the Romanovs were elected by men. Why then does he lie by proclaiming himself czar by the grace of God? Is he afraid that the people who elected his ancestor will dismiss him? The commentary, in fact, is a catalogue of the lies found in the Manifesto, a catalogue which need not be repeated here. But emphasis on the Finns arming themselves should not be passed over. "Do not believe the czar! Away with him!!!"[581]

As voting days approached, consensus among educated liberals was that the Duma would accomplish nothing. It is not surprising that so mistrustful, the Democratic Party decided to boycott elections to the First Duma. As Grinius recalls, this was to protest martial law and the special regulations then in effect.[582] The electoral law did not provide for universal and equal suffrage, nor for direct elections. But the last worked to Grinius's advantage: he became involved in practical politics without becoming a deputy.

And inevitably, elections in Lithuania were haunted by the Polish question, sharpened by the status of the Province of Suvalkai, administratively separated from the rest of Lithuania. For example, in connection with elections to the Second Duma, Grinius noted reports in Polish newspapers that Poles would vote for Lithuanian candidates only if they favored autonomy for the Kingdom of Poland. This meant, that any effort to divide the Province into Polish and Lithuanian parts would be reserved for the Duma. "We will try to unify Lithuania into one strong body any way we like. Let the Poles not try to restrict us."[583]

The electoral law promulgated on December 11, 1905 was complicated. According to Ascher, "the population was divided into four curiae: landowners, peasants, town dwellers, and workers. Each curia chose electors who then made the final selection of Duma deputies."[584] In addition, larger cities were to elect their own deputies. In Lithuania, the last provision applied only to Vilnius, which was to have one deputy. The workers' curia was of little moment in Lithuania. It existed only in Vilnius: the city's workers were to have one elector alongside 91 representing the other three curiae in the Province. In some cases, there was an intermediary stage. For example, in the case of the peasants' curia, each township was to elect representatives to a county meeting which would then elect representatives to the provincial conclave. No doubt unintentionally,

581 Juronis (pseudonym), "Naujasai caro manifestas" ("The Czar's New Manifesto"), *Ukininkas*, 1905, no. 10, pp. 273-76.

582 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 38.

583 K., *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 March 9, no. 10, p. 157.

584 Ascher, *P. A. Stolypin*, p. 86. Ascher provides numbers and percentages.

the law discriminated against Lithuanians and favored Poles. Thus, Kaunas Province was to elect 90 electors, with 39 elected by peasants, 35 by landowners, and 16 by townsmen.[585] Because class and nationality to a large extent coincided, 1 elector was to represent about 25,000 Lithuanians and one - 3,000 Poles. Similar discrepancies could be calculated for Suvalkai and Vilnius Provinces. This calculation does not take into account that proportionately more Lithuanians were disenfranchised because more were landless agricutural laborers.

The complicated and extended voting, combined with journalistic inexperience, makes it difficult to get an accurate picture of the electoral process—Lithuania's first experience of the ballot, other than in gatherings of the gentry. Skepticism was widespread: why take the time and trouble over bad roads when the Duma would not amount to anything anyway? Thus, it is reported that in Šiauliai, out of 1043 electors elected at a lower level, only 67 gathered to elect representatives to the provincial conclave. From among themselves, they selected 21 representatives, including 13 priests.[586] In the end, the three provinces of Kaunas, Vilnius and Suvalkai sent 14 deputies to the First Duma, seven Lithuanian, four Polish, two Jewish, and one Belorussian.[587] One Jewish deputy was from Kaunas Province, the other, a rabbi, represented the city of Vilnius. He was supported by Jews and Lithuanians and defeated the Polish candidate.[588]

Lietuvos ūkininkas, the organ of Grinius's party, depicted the opening ceremonies in I suspect mocking tones. The czar did not go to the Duma: the deputies had to assemble in the Palace. He did not enter alone: he came in the company of his wife, mother, uncles, followed by a long "glittering entourage." He was met by numerous clergymen and services were held. He then ascended the throne and seated himself. The Lithuanian word used here is ambiguous: formally, it indicates that on which one sits but informally, the appropriate part of

---

585 Unsigned, "Dumos rinkimai" ("Duma Elections"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 March 2, no. 11, pp. 146-47.

586 Unsigned, "Dumos rinkimai" ("Duma Eelections"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 March 23, no. 14, pp. 181-82.

587 Editor's annotation to Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 39. Also Aleksandravičius and Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje*, p. 97. According to their calculations, the vote of one estate owner carried the same weight as that of 3 townsmen, 15 peasants, and 45 workers (p. 96). Women were not allowed to vote and there were property qualifications.

588 *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 April 13, no. 17, p. 219. According to this report, there were 51 Jewish electors and 29 Poles in the city of Vilnius. But the word Poles is in quotation marks, adding that most Catholics call themselves "Poles." There were many Jewish electors in the townsmen curia in Vilnius Province.

the body. Whether or not intended as mockery, the account suggests that nothing much has changed, wealth and power remaining where it has always been. Sebag Montefiore also mentions the czars sisters in "gowns and tiaras." He does not mention religious services.[589]

There is no doubt that the land question was dominant, at least from the Lithuanian perspective. In *Vilniaus žinios*, most of the reports about the Duma dealt with it. Grinius reached much the same conclusion. In his memoirs, he mentions only the speech by Juozas Girnius (b. 1876), a farmer, deputy from Suvalkai, advocating the redistribution of land. Grinius speculates that had the Duma carried out land reform, Lenin and his Bolsheviks would never have come to power. Thus, likely, it was Stolypin who played the role of Russia's "evil genius."[590] Ascher's conclusion is somewhat like that of Grinius, but less judgmental: "Given more time for implementation, the agrarian reform might have contributed to a more moderate resolution of the political crisis than the one of 1917."[591]

The afore mentioned deputy, Juozas Girnius, was involved in a loose association of minority deputies calling themselves the "autonomists." But, he writes, attendance at autonomist meetings is declining and there are many long and empty speeches. Most minority deputies remain focused on their own concerns. Lithuanian deputies have joined forces with the Latvians and the Estonians, but they are still too few to have much effect. It was agreed to form a commission on languages to draft recommendations on the use of local languages in schools, courts, government offices.[592] But in the end, nothing came of such initiatives.

Likely, they foundered also on the Polish question: autonomy, but whose autonomy? The Polish linguist, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1845-1929) addressed a gathering of Kadets in Saint Petersburg: autonomous Poland should have her ancient boundaries restored and once again extend from sea to sea, or so Lithuanian newspapers reported. Of course, he emphasized, that the various nationalities would enjoy all rights and freedoms. To this guarantee, the Lithuanian correspondent responded dismissively: how generous of Poles to grant to others freedoms which they themselves do not enjoy. It is surprising that a man known for his liberal views, who even protested against the press ban,

589 Unsigned, "Caro prakalba į Valstybės Tarybos ir Valstybės Dumos atstovus" ("The Czars Adress to the State Council and Duma Deputies"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 May 4, no. 20, pp. 258-59; Sebag Montefiore, *Romanovs*, p. 532.

590 Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 3: 39.

591 Ascher, *P. A. Stolypin*, p. 164.

592 J. Girnius, "Autonomistų taktika" ("Autonomist Tactics"), *Vilniaus žinios*, 1906 June 25.

should voice such nationalistic chauvinism. And how can he believe that the social conditions which led to the collapse of the Commonwealth would meet the needs of the proposed Greater Poland? He may be a good professor of philology, but is a bad politician who does not understand that in the present time states must be built on national foundations.[593]

There are Lithuanian reports that the Polish deputies were not supporters of land redistribution because most of them were members of the gentry. *Lietuvos ūkininkas* in sumarizing more than a week of debate, noted that according to the Poles farmers in Poland have just about enough land. In any case, the matter should be reserved for an autonomous Poland. But, observed the writer, what can you expect, when most of the deputies are owners of estates?[594] This and similar reports fueled Lithuanian fears that in any union with Poland there would be no sigificant social changes, that the gentry would contiue to run things and smallholders and the landless would remain mired in poverty.

The second Lithuanian deputy from Suvalkai was Grinius's friend, the engineer Petras Vitkauskas. In his view, in its first month the Duma has done nothing: "The deputies engage in much talk, but up to this point have accomplished nothing, have not passed a single law. There is no amnesty. Martial law remains in effect as of old. The death penalty has not been abolished." The Duma is important, however, but only because it educates the public in political matters and does it better than countless agitators.[595] Of course, sophisticated discussions of Duma affairs could not appeal to a broader audience. But at lest they helped to convey the idea that policy matters are not by divine will prerogatives of a small circle of uncles and cousins.

Of course, different deputies received different impressions. Juozas Kubilius (1878-1917), representing Kaunas Province, recalled that the Lithuanians were unified. But more importantly, he claims that he felt himself bound by the resolutions of the Great Vilnius Assembly, in effect, thought of himself as representing the whole country. He sympathized with the Democratic Party of Lithuania, but was not a member. Some years later, he was one of the founders of what

---

593 J. Gabrys, "Lenkų autonomija ir Lietuva" ("Polish Autonomy and Lithuania"), *Vilniaus žinios*, 1906 June 20.

594 Unsigned, "Kas girdėti Dumoje apie žemę" ("What is Heard in the Duma about Land"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1906 June 1, no. 24, pp. 309-310.

595 Petras Vitkauskas, "Dūmos politika" ("Duma Politics"), *Vilniaus žinios*, 1906 June 9.

became the Nationalist League. He had been involved in book smuggling and was investigated for operating a school in secret.[596]

Elections to the Second Duma, held early in 1907, were as intricate as those to the First, but with Grinius playing a more active role. Lithuanians entered this election divided along religious lines, a division which, to emphasize once again, haunted Lithuanian politics for decades. On January 22, the County of Marijampolė elected four electors to the provincial conclave. The four "clericals"—christian democrats, one of them a priest, won, each receiving over 200 votes. The three "radicals"--liberals--lost, each receiving about 100 votes. Initially, Grinius had been among the liberal candidates, qualified because his father owned land. But at the last minute, the government crossed out his name. Grinius surmises that this hurt the liberal cause, because he was the most prominent of the liberal candidates. And there was rumor that the other liberals would also be barred. In his view, there was a hard political lesson: during local elections, confident of victory, the liberals did not engage in much agitation. As a result, "people once again surrendered to the influence of clergymen."[597]

Brief reports from many localities suggest that local voting was disorderly and corrupt, much like American big-city machine politics of the nineteenth century, with priests and alcohol doing their best to secure outcomes. Reportedly, some clergymen agitated for non-existent candidates, apparently, in an effort to split the opposition votes. In another locality, while there were better candidates, "free drinks decided the issue." Of the two elected, one had some education but was a "coward," while the other could barely sign his name. In Vilnius Province, winners of local elections gathered in the city to elect delegates to the Provincial conclave. Peasants were treated to hotel rooms, lavish banquets, and drinks, organized by various political parties, while priests hired carriages to drive them from place to place.[598] For many, barely literate, in a city for the first time, rubbing elbows with fashionably dressed VIPs, the reception must have been overwhelming.

But in spite of everything, the seven Lithuanians in the Second Duma were all progressives. Kaunas Province was represented by six, five Lithuanian and one Jewish. The Lithuanians were social democrats. After the election,

---

596 Juozas Kubilius, letter to the editor, *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 April 4, no. 14, pp. 215-16.

597 R. K., *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 February 8, no. 6, pp. 86-87.

598 "Vilniaus gubernijos atstovų rinkimai" ("Election of the Deputies from Vilnius Province"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 February 22, no. 8, pp. 115-17.

they published a declaration proclaiming their affiliation and invited everyone, regardless of nationality or religion, whether Lithuanian, Jewish, Polish, Belorussian, Russian, to write them expressing their concerns. The group also published their platform, progressive but not radical by present day standards. They demanded an end to martial law, amnesty for political prisoners, abolition of the death penalty, the full range of liberties, equality of men and women, free health care for those in need, compulsory elementary education, free education up to and including university, the introduction of a progressive tax on profits. They argued that the present system of taxation falls most heavily on the poorest and such taxes should be abolished. Lithuania should enjoy autonomy. Government and church lands, forests, should be declared common property. Large estates should be broken up. But the final resolution of the land question should be left up to the Lithuanian parliament. All nationalities should have the right to schools in their own language.

Both the declaration and platform were published in *Skardas* (*Echo*), a social democratic weekly published in Vilnius for several months.[599] The relevant issue was confiscated by the censors and the publication eventually shut down, only to continue publishing into 1908 under a different name. The group also published some ten issues of *Dumos darbai* (*The Works of the Duma*). After dissolution of the Second Duma, these deputies were arrested and served various prison terms. Two of the five left few traces, but the other three played significant roles in independent Lithuania, one serving as minister in several governments. While social democrats, they were neither Bolsheviks nor Mensheviks.

They were sharply and bitterly anti-clerical, going farther in criticism of clergymen than Grinius and his Democrats were willing to go. Some stories of misbehaving priests *Skardas* published are hard to credit. Did a priest claim seriously that advocates of equality propose to shorten the legs of tall people? Did he really urge his parishioners to drink more so that the government not lose revenue? So that they would have no money to spare for perverting books? Supposedly, he condemned science and learning as useless, deserving divine punishment.[600] More credible are often repeated claims that priests portray socialism as anti-religious, a Jewish plot.

None of the five are mentioned in Grinius's memoirs. By then, relations between the two groups were strained: there is considerable sniping back and

[599] *Skardas*, 1907 February 27, no. 9, pp. 129-32.

[600] *Skardas*, 1907 March 6, no. 10, p. 157.

forth. The Democrats suspected the Social Democrats of indifference to specifically Lithuanian concerns, who in turn accused the Democrats of backsliding into reaction.

There were no Lithuanians from Vilnius but the two deputies from Suvalkai Province were Lithuanians, maintaining close ties with Grinius. Petras Leonas joined the Kadets. He is sometimes described as circumspect, inclined to take into account details and consequences. Judging from newspaper accounts, he stayed in the background and rarely made speeches. The most active, prominent, Lithuanian was Andrius Bulota, said to be impulsive, quick to react. In his views a Social Revolutionary, he was among the leaders of the Trudoviks, the labor faction in the Duma. In his memoirs Grinius remembers him for his meeting with Stolypin on behalf of those arrested in the *Šviesa* affair and for lobbying so that local authorities would not block the Marijampolė agricultural fair. He was a member of the Marijampolė Farmer Alliance. Bulota often defended the accused in political trials.

Inauspicious were the first days of the Second Duma: the deputies spent several days wrangling over organizational matters and credentials and then, early in the morning of March 2 (March 15), the ceiling of the meeting hall collapsed. Had the Duma been in session, some of the deputies would have been crushed and others trampled in the inevitable panic. When the Duma met in another venue, a speaker alleged that the government had been aware of the bad ceilings, had spent 900,000 rubles on supposed repairs, but in fact had done nothing. His words were greeted by a loud outburst of protest and the speaker apologized. Another speaker urged adjournment because the deputies were too upset. To this Bulota responded: Russia has more serious problems than deputies with weak nerves. Russian newspapers studied seating arrangements and speculated as to who would have been killed: mostly Kadets, Poles, and deputies of the right, including two Orthodox bishops. Later investigation revealed more fraud: the contractor who had installed the seats promised to use oak, but used a cheap wood hiding it beneath oak veneer.[601]

Particularly during the years of the ban, Lithuanian newspapers depicted Saint Petersburg as a den of corruption and stupidity. No doubt, the collapsing

[601] *Vilniaus žinios*, 1907 March 7; March 8. *Times* (London), 1907 March 16, p. 7, reported the collapse at length, speculating that half of the deputies would have been killed. The cause: beams were attached by short smooth nails, loosened by vibrating generators. That morning, Stolypin was to read the government's declaration.

ceilings of Tauride Palace reinforced the impression. But from a Lithuanian perspective, the Second Duma also knew better days, especially the session of May 15 (May 28). That day, two Lithuanians addressed the Duma, concerning education. Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Tartars, explained that schools do not educate but Russify. The Ukrainian was insistent: there must be schools in the Ukrainian language, appropriate textbooks, while Ukrainian universities must begin to train Ukrainian teachers. One of the Kaunas Social Democrats, Antanas Povylius (1871-1961), later a member of the Constituent Assembly, summarized the decades of persecution, the harm done by the press ban. Lithuanian activists have been imprisoned, exiled, fined. Even now, the government is reluctant to appoint Lithuanian teachers to schools in Lithuania. He was followed by Bulota: the literacy rate in Lithuania is 52%, higher than that of Russia, because of underground schools which the government still is trying to eradicate. In 1905, he continued, when the freedom movement began, people demanded that Russian teachers leave the country. But now, with the help of gendarmes and Cossacks, they are returning.

A censor's dilemma: how can one censor an official speech by a duly elected deputy? Yet, the government is depicted in the darkest colors, sending Cossacks to trample on rights and liberties promised by the czar himself. In Lithuanian lore, Cossacks constituted the lawless arm of government, with whips and swords leaving behind a bloody mass.

On May 16th, the Duma held its 39th session, the ninth devoted exclusively to the land question. When debate was finally closed, 80-90 deputies were prevented from expressing their views. Three Lithuanians spoke. Povylius explained that while Lithuania has not known famine in recent decades, many subsist on bread and potatoes, while milk and meat are rarities. For this he blamed the authorities in charge since the revolt of 1863: while the intent was to weaken Polish influences, Lithuanians also suffered from repressive measures. Bulota objected to Polish arguments that the land question in Suvalkai Province be reserved for autonomous Poland. On the contrary, he argued, it should be resolved by the Duma in all Lithuanian provinces. (His list of Lithuanian provinces is longer than the usual one, including the provinces of Vitebsk and Grodno). He was seconded by Leonas: while Lithuanians heartily support Polish autonomy, given political uncertainties the land question in Suvalkai must be resolved by the Duma. Because there is little government land in the province, estate lands must

be seized and redistributed. Forests in the province are small and everything must be done to preserve them.

We also learn that on May 11th the seven Lithuanian deputies sent a congratulatory telegram, in French, to the Finnish parliament: it is Finnish resolve and steadfastness which secured her autonomy and won such admirable election laws.[602]

Speeches by Polish deputies were not reassuring. Wladislaw Grabski (1874-1938), a National Democrat, spoke on May 3: the land question, including Suvalkai, should be resolved by the parliament of autonomous Poland in Warsaw. The 300,000 Lithuanians in the province have nothing to worry about: Poles recognize the rights of all nations. To this the correspondent responded: we have heard similar sweet talk from Russians, but the reality is different. In any case, a Lithuanian parliament in Vilnius would be better informed and would better serve the Lithuanians of Suvalkai.[603] The founder and leader of the National Democrats, Roman Dmowski, addressed the Duma on March 19, insisting that there is no one land question, but as many as there are nations in the empire. It can only be dealt with if the economic and social conditions of each are taken into account. In his view, Lithuania is a problematic case because repressive measures have shattered her civil society, the bureaucracy reigns unchecked, and antagonisms between nationalities are fierce. Thus, he concluded, the land question can be dealt with only after the equality of all nations and religions has been fully established.[604]

What are we to make of Dmowski? The correspondent italicizes the conclusion, suggesting that he agrees with it. But at least in later years, Dmowski and his National Democrats became notorious for chauvinism and persecution of minorities. At the time, they were concerned with establishing the largest possible Poland, with Lithuanians as a cultural minority. But the same authors add: "most of their efforts were devoted to spreading Polish culture and strenthening Polish nationalism in Lithuania."[605] This suggests the following interpretation: it is the Lithuanian awakening which is responsible for conflicts. Thus, once Lithuanians stop fussing, admit that they have no culture, reconcile themselves to their Polish destiny, the way will be open for Poles to resolve all questions as

602 *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 May 23, no. 21, pp. 320-22. Seton-Watson writes: Finland "was the first country in Europe to give the vote to women" (*Decline of Imperial Russia*, p. 243).

603 *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 May 9, no. 19, p. 290

604 K. Ž, *Vilniaus žinios*, 1907 March 26.

605 Aleksandravičius and Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje*, p. 316.

suits them best. I think it likely that some Lithuanians interpreted his remarks in just this way.

In the First Duma, 20 Poles represented Lithuanian and Belorussian regions. In the Second Duma—only 11. (All five deputies from Vilnius Province were Poles). Why the decline, with signs that it will continue? Because, a Polish journalist speculated, Polish candidates continue to proclaim the superiority of Polish culture and, unaffected by the spread of democratic ideas, remain indifferent to the concerns of ordinary people. The Poles in these regions live in isolation and do not understand that times have changed. For example in Minsk, Polish candidates allied themselves with reactionaries, but members of the upper class. They could and should have become leaders of reform movements. Instead, they are "digging their own graves" by isolating themselves in their manors (and manners, I would add). But it is not too late: upon understanding the error of their ways, they can change. To this, the Lithuanian summarizing the Polish article responds skeptically, that they will never change voluntarily.[606]

Something like that could have been said by Edward Said about British colonial officials: once a *sahib*, always a *sahib,* no matter how much the world changes. And it is helpful to recall the 1919 anti-Polish rally in Kaunas: the invading armies are fighting to reclaim estates and mansions.

An unsigned editorial in *Vilniaus žinios*, November 18, 1907 provides a more detailed analysis, based on a contrast between developments among Lithuanians and Poles. Polish politics in Lithuania are dominated by the national question, while Lithuanian politics are becoming modern, based on different social and economic interests. As a result, democratic sentiment among Poles in Lithuania is weak: democrats are few, poor, disorganized. This is shown by Duma elections in Vilnius: the National Democrat received three times more votes than the democratically inclined candidate. Polish politics in the region are in the hands of the "Polish bourgeoisie, the estate owners and wealthy townsmen, forming the party of National Democrats.... Accustomed to being the only authorities, the wealthy Polish bourgeois, with fear and hatred, regard the rising Lithuanian democracy." And they have good reason to fear because in Kaunas and Suvalkai they have already been pushed into second place. While Vilnius Province is not named, we can infer that in the author's eyes similar processes

606 Vilniškis (pseudonym: a man from Vilnius), "Susimąstymas po Dumos rinkimų" ("Reflection after the Duma Elections"), *Vilniaus žinios*, 1907 February 23, February 24.

are taking place there, although not as far advanced.[607] The inclusion of estate owners among the bourgeoisie could be the result of misunderstood Marxism. But the emphasis on class-warfare approaches the truth.

Probably exaggerating, the editorial asserts that among Lithuanians democracy is firmly established: there are various political parties, each contributing to the common good. While the Poles still idolize the Lublin Union and their politics revolve around ideas of 300 years ago. This is said about Poles in Lithuania. But the text of the modern Polish constitution quoted many pages ago suggests that nostalgia was widespread in Poland herself.

No reader of Lithuanian newspapers would have gotten the impression of orderly deliberations. While there were occasional speeches described as informative and reasonable, shouts, insults, threats, groups of deputies walking out in protest, dominated the news. Nor were the deputies themselves respected by the authorities. The committee to help unemployed workers of Saint Petersburg was housed in Bulota's apartment. On April 16th gendarmes searched the apartment for the second time, arresting 13 workers for holding an unlicensed meeting. Bulota spent most of one day pleading with various functionaries.[608] One of the Social Democrats from Kaunas, a peasant, was one of three charged with advocating the overthrow of autocracy. The Duma debated whether the three should be suspended until their cases were resolved. Bulota and others argued that it was an internal matter and that no action should be taken until the Duma settled the cases. Many hard words were aimed at Russian courts: there is no justice because the courts are only agents of a repressive bureaucracy. The defenders lost and the three were excluded. The losers formed a strange coalition, with the left demanding an imediate declaration of innocence, and the right—an immediate finding of guilt. The winners were the Kadets, Polish deputies, and various other groups forming the center.[609]

In the absence of polls, one can only guess as to the effect of these reports, often extensive and detailed, on public opinion, keeping in mind that there were few newspaper readers, with most information spreading by word of mouth.

---

607 The dominance of estate owners in Vilnius Province is shown by the electors to the Third Duma: of 76 electors, half were estate owners. That the Polish presence in urban areas was weak is shown by the townsmen electors: 3 Poles and 15 Jews. There were 19 peasants, with fewer than half of them Lithuanians, judging from their names. The one worker was not Lithuanian. See *Vilniaus žinios*, 1907 October 13.

608 *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 May 2, no. 18, pp. 273-74.

609 *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 April 11, no. 15, pp. 234-35.

One can imagine an illiterate peasant, pausing to rest his horse, asking a son for news in the papers from Saint Petersburg. At which point the son, skipping the small parts, replies with rude remarks about long-winded idlers and crushing taxes. After all, even better schooled present day Americans often respond with broad and vulgar generalities. On the other hand, in earlier times, the father would not have so much as asked, confined by feelings of inferiority to local and private matters.

Much like the First, the Second Duma was doomed from the start. According to Sebag Montefiore, it was more radical that the First: "Stolypin and Nicholas immediately started to consider its dissolution, 'but it's too early for that', the tsar told his mother; 'one must let them do something manifestly stupid...Then slap! And they are gone!'"[610] In an attempt to make the Third Duma more pliable, the electoral laws were modified. In his manifesto dissolving the Second, the czar claimed that the Duma's mission was to restore order, understanding thereby the preservation of autocracy. This the Second Duma failed to do and he placed the blame solely on deputies representing minorities. The new Duma must be more Russian: "Other nations inhabiting the Russian state must have their representatives to uphold their interests, but they must not and shall not be so numerous as to sway the Duma in one or another direction on Russian matters." Major historians, focused as they are on great powers and great men, tend to overlook the fact that the empire was threatened not only by Russian radicals, but also by more and more assertive minorities. In his Manifesto, the czar did not make that mistake. But he still insisted that his authority is of divine origin and that in the end, he alone will have to answer for Russia before God's throne.[611]

Suvalkai Province was reduced from two to one deputy. Kaunas was to elect one Russian and five others, while Vilnius—two Russians and five others. The Kingdom of Poland, including Suvalkai, was allotted fourteen, one of whom had to be Russian. Predominantly Latvian and Estonian provinces were allotted 12, none of whom had to be Russian. Russian voters had to be certified by their Orthodox pastors, while anyone Orthodox, or an Old Believer, or a Lutheran had

---

[610] Sebag Montefiore, *Romanovs*, pp. 542-43. According to him, on dissolution, the police arrested "many of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks." This is misleading because they also arrested social democrats who belonged to neither faction. The suffrage was narrowed, but non-Russians were not "excluded," as Sebag Montefiore claims.

[611] The Manifesto of June 3, 1907, in Lithuanian translation, was published in *Vilniaus žinios*, 1907 June 20.

to vote with Russians. (In Lithuania Lutherans were often considered Germans.) On the whole, there is bias in favor of Russians, but not very extensive, less than one would expect from the manifesto. Lithuania was affected more than her neighbors.[612]

Commenting on the election results Grinius was pessimistic: the Third Duma will represent the privileged. With 33 deputies still to be elected, there were 273 reactionaries, 120 progressives, and 19 independents. The Lithuanian situation is bleak. The three Russians elected must be counted among the black hundreds. The three Lithuanians from Kaunas Province were peasants, leftists, but with little education and experience and likely to be ineffective. The fourth—Polish and an estate owner; the fifth—Jewish and progressive. Three of the Poles from Vilnius Province were reactionaries. The fourth—an independent, but an estate owner. Most likely, they will join with deputies from Poland to speak for Polish interests and the privileged. The fifth deputy was Lithuanian, a peasant, but likely to side with his Polish colleagues. In effect, Lithuania will have but one competent voice, namely Bulota. It is thus especially important for the Lithuanians to stand together.

In Suvalkai Province, 32 electors voted for Bulota, 24 Lithuanians and eight Jews, while the 11 Poles voted against him. One Lithuanian elector abstained. Grinius advises those who voted for the abstainer to examine their consciences, but does not attempt to explain why he abstained. More likely, he could not support an enemy of religion. This time the Poles were also divided on religious grounds, only seven of them voting for the Polish candidate. Grinius suspcts that the others were "true" Catholics. Grinius himself, Basanavičius, and another Lithuanian were candidates, but after receiving fewer votes than Bulota the three withdrew. Thus, Grinius lost his best chance at an allowance as a Duma deputy in Saint Petersburg—some 10 rubles a day.

Voting results underscore the tendency among Poles to disregard the new social conditions: while only a minority, especially in face of a Lithuanian-Jewish coalition, they still included Suvalkai Province in their visions of a future Polish nation-state. The Lithuanian electors were vocal in their nationalism. Bulota was instructed to defend the Lithuanians in Vilnius Province, promote Lithuania's autonomy, seek the unification of Suvalkai with the rest of Lithuania, form a Lithuanian caucus in the Duma, work to restore Lithuania's forests. Of course, Bulota was to cooperate with other progressives and work to reform tax laws.

612 *Vilniaus žinios*, 1907 June 20.

There was advice of a more personal kind: he should prepare his speeches with greater care and write more often on public matters.[613]

Grinius's assessment of the Third Duma was pessimistic. After noting election results throughout the empire, he concluded that this Duma would be reactionary. "There can be no doubt that the Third Duma will be a gentry Duma, while the first and second were peasant and worker Dumas."[614]

In these pages of *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, there are reminders of how far away the empire was from a modern, secular, liberal polity. We are informed that an executioner has arrived in Vilnius and had hanged two, probably Lithuanians, accused of killing in Kaunas two policemen and a soldier. Of course, perpetrators of such crimes would have been executed anywhere—the 1886 Haymarket riot in Chicago was followed by four hangings and a wave of arrests. But 11 other names are mentioned, at least four Jewish and the remainder Lithuanian, of persons accused of membership in revolutionary political parties, advocating draft-dodging, non-payment of taxes. Included among the eleven are three Lithuanians punished with two-year prison sentences for advocating civil disobedience and one, likely Jewish, eight years of katorga for calling a judge a bloodsucker. Two Lithuanians were found not guilty.

It is not surprising that the opening of the Third Duma, sometimes called the Black Duma, was portrayed in dark tones. The editorial in the November 14 issue of *Lietuvos ūkininkas* was very pessimistic: "true" Russians (members of the Union of the Russian People)[615] dominate the Duma, while in his opening remarks, the chairman did not even bother to mention the constitution. For true Russians, the small nationalities in the empire are only "sheep to be shorn." Lithuanians will continue to wallow in misery and darkness until the blessed day comes when they become self-governing. There is not even a glimmer of hope for autonomy. In the meanwhile, they will be governed by a small band of bureaucrats, completely unfamiliar with local conditions. Bureaucratic rule has produced only chaos and misery. Even the Russians have not benefited from the exploitation of small nationalities: "At least, the oppression of small nationalities should have made Russia great and the Russian people happy. But this is not the case." The last remark could well be an allusion to the British empire. Perhaps,

---

613 Rinkėjas (Elector), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 October 24, no. 43, pp. 640-41.

614 K. "Rinkimai į trečiąją Dūmą Lietuvoje užsibaigė" ("Voting for the Third Duma in Lithuania has Ended"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 October 24, no. 43, pp. 637-38.

615 See Ascher, *P. A. Stolypin*, p. 210.

he means something like this: the British prosper by exploiting colonies, while Russians exploit colonies and still remain poor and ignorant.[616]

For Grinius, Catholics made up the most conservative segment of society. But about the Third Duma, the Catholic *Šaltinis* editorialized in much the same way as the progressive newspapers. Thus, we read, that few Lithuanian peasants bothered to vote, understanding that the new electoral law was stacked against them. But Lithuanians did better than anticipated, electing five deputies. Of course, they should side with the opposition. If they did not, they would be "forging their own chains." They are too few to accomplish anything, especially in this Duma but they should at least act in concert. And because Bulota is the only one educated and experienced, he should become the leader. The editorial ended with an admonition aimed at Poles in Lithuania: they should forget their pedigrees and estates, and take up the cause of ordinary people. Only then will Lithuanians not view them as enemies.[617]

Here is a case of a Catholic endorsing Bulota, a known freethinker, to my mind, evidence that the nation was maturing. It suggests that all Lithuanians, regardless of their religious attitudes, share common interests and can work together. The alternative is a fiercer version of America's present day culture wars.

Many editorials, to the effect that Russia is abandoning the path of reform, from various newspapers, could be cited. But two, representing very different segments of society, should be enough to to remind historians such as Timothy Snyder that as the awakening matured, romanticized history appeared at most only on the fringes. Nothing suggests that Lithuanians at this time were dreaming of once again riding on horseback into the Black Sea. Rather, they were making hard calculations as to what political arrangements will enable people to live better, in face of Russians who are no more than thieves and fools, and Poles dreaming of reclaiming their mansions and their ancient glories. Hard not to press for independence under such circumstances.

The conviction that the Manifesto of October 17—Manifesto on the Improvement of State Order—had been a ruse was spreading. A news item from *Vilniaus žinios*, November 7, 1907 is suggestive. A group of progressive Muslims proposed to register a political party to unify all Muslims and work to

616 M. Girinaitis (pseudonym) "Lietuvos autonomija ir Trečioji Dūma" ("Lithuania's Autonomy and the Third Duma"), L*ietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907 November 14, no. 46, pp. 677-78.

617 Plunksnius (pseudonym) "Pasibaigus rinkimas į dūmą" ("After the End of Elections to the Duma"), *Šaltinis*, 1907 November 12 (October 30), no. 46, pp. 721-22. *Šaltinis* was published in Suvalkai Province, where the new calendar was in effect.

turn Russia into a constitutional monarchy. The party was not registered on the grounds that in Russia the monarchy is not limited. In fact, it is a punishable offense to so much as propose limiting the czar's powers by a constitution. Thus, the proposed Islamic party cannot be legalized: in Russia one cannot even think about constitutional monarchy. In the same issue we find the budget for 1908 to be presented for consideration by the Duma. Out of a total of 2,515,000,000 rubles, 500,000,000 is allocated for the army and navy, 144,000,000 for the ministry of the interior and only 53,000,000 for education. "Apparently, the bureaucracy is little interested in educating the people." Interest on various debts approached 450,000,000 rubles. However, there is one sign of more progressive thinking: about 65,000,000 were allocated for the building of railways.

The question whether Russia is a constitutional monarchy arose in connection with a letter of gratitude to the czar for the October Manifesto. Some deputies of the right argued that there should be no mention of a constitution since the people do not want the powers of the czar to be limited. In any case, the manifesto of June 3, dissolving the Second Duma, had restored autocracy. Dmowski proposed an amendment, to the effect that the just demands of the various nationalities making up the Russian state should be satisfied. Polish, Muslim, Lithuanian, and Jewish deputies supported him, with the Jewish deputy referring to 6,000,000 "oppressed and impoverished" Jews. (In the text as read, there is no reference to nationalities and Russia is said to be indivisible.) A dispute arose as to whether or not, out of respect for the czar, deputies should stand while the draft was being read. (They could remain seated since this was a letter to the czar and not one from him.) The session degenerated into a shouting match, with some deputies singing the czarist anthem.[618]

Buolota's speech, (taken from a stenographic report of the session) was published in *Vilniaus žinios* on November 17, a fair summary of grievances: officials serving in Lithuania come from remote provinces and know nothing about local conditions (noise from the right); educated Lithuanians cannot get jobs locally (a voice from the right, "nonsense"); because of difficult economic conditions many Lithuanians emigrate to America, with the country losing her best workers; children cannot be educated in their native language (laughter from the right); many churches have been closed and stand empty or turned into Orthodox churches. According to Bulota, many in the Duma are afraid merely

618 *Vilniaus žinios*, 1907 November 16.

of the word 'autonomy'. At the end, there was applause from the left and the center.

The satyrical monthly *Ežys* (*Hedgehog*) published several mock letters by a supposed Duma deputy: the hardest working Duma. Just think, they have decided to pay Orthodox priests and have established a barber shop in the palace! And there is hope that they will tackle the land question: they are merely waiting for snow to melt so that they can tell which land to distribute and which to set aside for themselves. And most difficult of all is uncomfortable travel to Saint Petersburg to collect pay.[619]

In July 1908, on his way home for a vacation, Bulota paused in Vilnius giving Grinius a chance to get his impressions. The Third Duma works very hard, laughed Bulota sarcastically: the deputies make every effort to do exactly what the government tells them. Even shows of independence were staged on government orders. The peasant deputies are becoming disillusioned: unlikely that they will join the reactionaries on the land question. Perhaps, when sessions resume in the fall, there will be realignments, with the peasants moving to the left. But, where the aspirations of Lithuanians and other nationalities are concerned, there simply is no hope, not even for equality with Russians.[620]

At the July 1908 meeting of the Farmers' Alliance of Marijampolė, Grinius posed a number of questions to 15 farmers. All agreed that while the first two represented the people, the Third Duma merely worked for the government. As a result, perhaps only one person out of ten now shows some interest—there had been much curiosity and talk about the first two. All favor the parties of the left, including the Kadets, but especially the socialists because they promise the greatest freedom, a matter especially important to Lithuanians. They approve that the Duma criticized the schools, established a program of Lithuanian studies at the Veiveriai Seminary for Teachers, and did not allocate funds for armored vehicles. They disapprove that several hundred million rubles were allocated for the building of the Amur railway, that there are now more prisons and more spies, that the deputies plan to increase their pay. Ten rubles a day is enough: more would simply attract more shady characters. In general, they condemn any budgetary increases, believing that in the end, they themselves will have to pay for them.[621]

619 *Ežys*, 1908 April, no. 3, p. 7; 1908 May, no. 4, p. 2.

620 M., "Ką sako apie Dumą mūsų atstovas Andrius Bulota" ("What Our Deputy Andrius Bulota Has to Say about the Duma"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1908 July 23, no. 30, pp. 334-35.

621 K. Gr., "Ką ūkininkai kalba apie trečiąją Duma" ("What Farmers are Saying about the Third Duma"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1908 July 30, no. 31, p. 342.

Why is the Third Duma so unpromising, so unlikely to undertake significant reforms? Because it is dominated by the wealthy and the privileged, the intended result of changes in electoral procedures. It differs from the first two. The explanation with reference to class origins was offered by *Vilniaus žinios,* November 21, 1907. The paper counted 117 estate owners, an increase from 27 in the Second Duma; 50 clergymen, an increase from 18; and 30 "capitalists," an increase from 7. At the same time, the number of peasants dropped from 152 to 56, and those in the professions, from 141 to 91. Ascher provides a similar explanation, but gives rather different numbers. These discrepancies are not important, because Ascher's numbers make class an even more important factor. For example, he counts 173 of the landed nobility, that is, nearly 40% of the deputies, but noting that a handful of them did not vote with the right. His understanding of Stolypin is also different: Stolypin was a reformer who, however, had to seek political support from reactionaries. Ascher writes: "when the Duma was about to begin its deliberations Stolypin seemed to be walking a political tightrope."[622]

I have found nothing in Lithuanian newspaper suggesting an appreciation of Stolypin as a reformer or of his political difficulties. But Ascher's great power perspective leads him to make a misleading claim: "the country appeared to be content with the new political arrangements." Perhaps, but mostly the Russian part. And on the great question, that of securing autonomy for minority nationalities, or at least equality, Stolypin believed in making Russia great again.

In 1906, Grinius urged Lithuanians to prepare carefully for the elections: "Especially because they are first steps of our political life."[623] It is suggestive, that in the same issue there is a long article explaining the origin and meaning of the terms "right" and "left," informing readers that supporters of the government in the British parliament sit to the right of the speaker, and opponents—to the left, and change sides with changes in government. Not exactly, but a start. The fact that Lithuanians did not have a developed vocabulary to talk about politics re-enforces Grinius's point that the elections were the first step into politics. In an educational sense, the Duma helped Lithuania mature especially because, in spite of censorship, the press published many criticisms of the government, important in a country with strong traditions of unquestioning respect for authority. Many came to understand that policy questions are public matters and not prerogatives of the elect.

---

622 Ascher, *P. A. Stolypin*, pp. 210-13.

623 Kirvis, "Prie rinkimų" ("With Elections"), *Vilniaus žinios*, 1906 March 30.

In its first issue of 1909, *Lietuvos ūkininkas* published an unsigned article on the work of the Duma in 1908. The deputies raised their own pay—to 4200 rubles a year—besides increasing the pay of Orthodox clergymen, teachers in Orthodox schools, and military officers. They increased the number of spies and policemen, financed the Amur railway, and authorized the government to borrow 450,000,000 rubles abroad. They decided that politically unreliable men will no longer be allowed to serve in the military. Not much more, not counting talk. And national minorities and workers can expect nothing.[624]

Grinius's assessment of 1908 begins with the words: "Rarely do we enjoy good years. 1908 really was a bad and difficult year": the liberties won in 1905 were slowly being taken away. The people who fought for freedom have been either killed, or imprisoned, or exiled and the country once again was in the hands of "bureaucrats and priests." But there are bright spots. There are more Lithuanian schools, although in 1908 government approval was granted less frequently. Also, there have been more theater evenings. His general impression is that in spite of growing repression, Lithuanians were making progress.[625] In any case, by 1908 it was obvious that the Duma would do nothing to protect the rights and liberties of citizens.

Ascher takes the same view. He contrasts Stolypin's speeches to the Second and Third Duma: "Missing from the second speech was any reference to the October Manifesto, whose implementation, he had vowed earlier, would transform the country into a state based on law. Nor did he promise to submit bills guaranteeing civil liberties and religious toleration." This is a side of Stolypin which led Grinius to a pessimistic assessment of the Duma. But Ascher also attributes to Stolypin views which on the surface appear liberal, but in fact pose a serious threat to minorities. According to him, Stolypin's experiences in Lithuania made him an unusual nationalist: "Stolypin's long residence among a variety of ethnic groups seems to have made him quite tolerant of minorities." However, Ascher, after using the inclusive term "minorities," restricts his attention to one minority, namely Jews and anti-Semitism, perhaps the minority least threatened by forced assimilation. This, in spite of attributing to Stolypin views making the survival of whole nations a small footnote to Russia's border problems: "Stolypin

624 "Valstybės Dumos darbai 1908-ais metais" ("The Work of the State Duma in 1908"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1909 January 7; no 1, pp. 3-4.

625 K. Grinius, "1908-tieji metai Lietuvoje" ("The Year 1908 in Lithuania"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1909 January 7; no. 1, pp. 1-3.

came to view this distribution of ethnic groups and of land ownership as a potential danger for Russia because it kept the ethnic Russians in a position of inferiority in an area bordering on the powerful states of Germany and Austro-Hungary."[626] Ascher seems not to realize that his Stolypin is a fine example of imperialist thinking: to create living space, conquer and colonize.

Historians and Grinius agree on the importance of agrarian reform. But inevitably, minorities suspected that fine words concealed a different reality, plans to colonize and Russify. Grinius agreed with Stolypin on the importance of developing a prosperous, land-owning peasantry, in the end, not a peasantry but a class of educated farmers producing for the market. But he noticed that more and more land in Lithuania is passing into Russian hands. In a 1909 article, he began by arguing for the redistribution of land on grounds of equity. Everywhere, wealth and power tend to coincide. But there are also economic problems. In Lithuania, as throughout the rest of the empire, large estates are going into bankruptcy and are being parceled out. This weakens Polish influence, but creates opportunities for dishonest, profiteering middlemen. The Peasants' Land Bank is very bureaucratic, requiring much paperwork and worst of all, favors Russians and the Orthodox. As a result, significantly more land is acquired by Russians than by Lithuanians. His solution is to establish a private bank owned by Lithuanians.[627]

Once again we see that Grinius was not a utopian, but someone committed to reforms possible here and now: let us not conspire dreaming of world-historical revolution, but establish a bank. Of course, a locally owned bank would not solve all problems, but would push development in the desired direction. And implicit is the conviction that a prosperous and educated citizenry will make better political arrangements than a band of fanatics.

In another 1909 article Grinius directly attacks Stolypin's great priority, the introduction of zemstvos, institutions of local self-government, in the Northwest Provinces, including the provinces of Kaunas and Vilnius. According to Ascher, the proposal eventually presented to the Duma was a "masterpiece of complexity," thus, much too complicated for discussion here, except to note that local zemstvos were to elect delegates to provincial gatherings, which in turn were to elect members of the State Council, something like the upper house of

---

626 Ascher, *P. A. Stolypin*, pp. 217, 22-23.

627 Rl., "Apie Lietuvos dvarus" ("About the Estates of Lithuania"), *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1909 March 4; no. 9, pp. 77-79.

Russia's parliament. Because few belonged to the nobility, Lithuanians would not be involved. This is confirmed by Ascher who in his long discussion of the proposed legislation makes no reference to Lithuania, in spite of the fact that Kaunas Province, with a Lithuanian majority, had no chance of being represented by a Lithuanian. But Ascher agrees with Grinius that the proposal posed a serious threat to minorities. Stolypin promised, Ascher writes, to be guided by the "nationalist idea," that is, insure that "the interests of the Russian population would be fully 'protected'." Eventually, the provinces of Kaunas, Vilnius, and Grodno were dropped from the proposed legislation because it was "impossible to guarantee in Kovno and Vilno provinces a majority for the Russian population." The fear was that the majority would be Polish.[628]

In the aforementioned article, after reviewing how voters would be divided into curiae, Grinius notes that all zemstvo councils were required to have Russian majorities and that administrative positions had to be filled by Russians, especially at the upper levels.[629] But, assuming that the article is by Grinius, several days later, he detected a bright side. While Lithuanians would not be in the majority, there would still be openings for educated Lithuanians, doctors, veterinarians and others. Perhaps, available jobs would encourage some Lithuanians scattered through out the empire to return. As everyone knows, Lithuania badly needs educated people.[630] In a later piece, he pointed that that every year several dozen Lithuanians, men and women, complete secondary school. However, many of them do not remain but seek employment elsewhere. Meanwhile, many write to this newspaper that they would like to establish libraries, credit unions, consumer cooperatives but cannot find educated people to help. And because of the shortage, peasants cannot enjoy even the few freedoms that have been granted, because there is no one to explain what they are. Thus, in different words, he expresses his belief that educated people, speaking the local language and not too haughty to work with peasants, stand among the indispensable conditions of social progress. He urges Lithanians to consider business and the crafts, areas dominated by Jews. Otherwise, with a historic opportunity before her, it would be a shame should she fail to become an organized nation

628 Ascher, *P. A. Stolypin*, pp. 335, 332, 334.

629 K. "Prie žemiečių įstaigų įvedimo mūsų krašte" ("About the Introduction of Zemstvos in Our Country"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1909 October 10.

630 K., "Gera proga" ("A Good Opportunity"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1909 October 14. The attribution is uncertain.

(establish civil society in present day language) because the educated abandoned her.[631]

The Duma debated extending the zemstvo system to six Western Provinces, but not to the Lithuanian ones, in May 1910. Bulota delivered a long speech, pointing out another reactionary provision, an elaborate procedure by which a provincial governor, acting on his own, could remove even genuine Russians. He then turned to matters of concern to Lithuanians. According to him, when the Third Duma first met, he had a long conversation with Stolypin who promised democratic zemstvos to protect everyone, including Lithuanians and peasants. But now, because Russian culture in those lands is so weak, as Stolypin with his ties to the region knows, Lithuania will not have zemstvos. With sarcasm he thanks Stolypin for his promise, in a recent speech, to protect Lithuanians from Polish cultural influences and oppression by Polish nobility. But Lithuanians do not need to be protected by a Russifying government. They know how to protect themselves because they have been doing this for some decades. Bulota concludes that the proposal is a sham: genuine local self-government cannot be expected anywhere as long as the present government is in power.[632] Bulota was supported by Pranas Keinys (1870-1940), a deputy from Kaunas Province, who concluded: "I hereby inform my voters that the present Duma of landed nobility, merchants, and clergymen, together with the government, will give them nothing. Lithuanians themselves, together with Russian workers, must defend their rights."[633]

Of course Grinius did not deliver these speeches, but without a doubt he knew of them and approved. This is a side of Russia's problems which western historians tend to overlook: Russia was an empire in a time of awakening and restive minorities which were becoming both more assertive and less inclined to expect anything good from Russians. A Lithuanian who regularly read newspapers with his breakfast had to ask himself who was more dangerous, an average Russian administrator, who could always be plied with drinks or bribed, or a serious and clever imperialistic politician like Stolypin. Latvians, Estonians, and many others likely asked themselves similar questions.

Bulota is an enigmatic figure, little studied and little known—killed in 1941 at Paneriai (Ponary in Jewish writings) for his participation in the Communist

631 Kg., "Inteligentams darbas Lietuvoje," ("Jobs for the Educated in Lithuania"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1910 June 16.

632 For Bulota's speech see *Lietuvos žinios*, 1910 May 15, May 19.

633 *Lietuvos žinios,* 1910 May 22.

government. He adds a cosmopolitan touch to the awakening and, in the end, perhaps skepticism about the independence project, although on this subject it is too early for firm conclusions. In September of 1908 he was one of ten Duma deputies attending in Berlin an international conference of parliamentarians dedicated to the elimination of war. On his return, he talked about the conference at a meeting of *Šviesa*. The association of parliamentarians, founded 20 years earlier, now has 5000 representatives of various parliaments. Over those years 241 disputes have been settled by arbitration. In his talk at *Šviesa*, Bulota emphasized the costs of war: money spent on armies could be used to advance education and for other urgent needs. In Berlin, many had never heard of Lithuania and asked what language appears on Bulota's calling card—Bulota deliberately printed some cards in Lithuanian. The members of *Šviesa* agreed that it is important to have a Lithuanian at international gatherings.[634] Bulota spoke several times before *Šviesa* and the Farmer Alliance, about forests and Samogitian stables.

What once again emerges is the educational value of the Duma, another reminder that Lithuanians are not lowly peasants but citizens with a voice even at international peace conferences. Imagine a member of *Šviesa*, bragging to his wife that he just talked, and not in Polish or Russian but Lithuanian, with a man to whom even the czar listens, who has been to Berlin on equal terms with the greats of this world. And imagine him trying to explain that there is something called international law above even kings and emperors. Bulota had mentioned that the conference called for the codification of international law and the reconciliation of various inconsistencies.

But as far as reforms go, from Grinius's point of view, the Duma accomplished nothing. This is the view of Davies, who in his long history of Poland makes just four references to the Duma. In his reflections in old-age, Grinius wrote: "Bulota had achieved a position of leadership, but Lithuanians neither gained nor lost," adding that just about all Russian parties were opposed to autonomy, not to speak of independence.[635]

Notwithstanding a growing realization that Dumas would accomplish nothing, in 1912 Grinius again served as an elector. As a result of what Grinius suspected was a clerical conspiracy, Bulota was not reelected. In November,

634 K. Grinius, on a meeting of *Šviesa*, *Vilniaus žinios*, 1908 September 28. The *Times* (London) published two sketchy reports on the Inter-Parliamentary Congress, 1908 September 17, p. 3, September 19, p. 6, seeing it as event of little import. Few of the some 900 delegates attended the sessions and many could not understand the speeches.

635 K. Grinius, "1914 metai Lietuvoje," *Naujienos*, 1949 March 19.

Lietuvos ūkininkas published a brief note: former Duma deputy Andrius Bulota has taken up residence in Vilnius, where he will establish his law practice. "Bulota must be counted among the most distinguished lawyers not only in Lithuania but also in Russia."[636] Clearly, some Lithuanian newspapers were less interested. Thus, *Lietuvos žinios*, 1912 November 17 briefly noted the opening of the Fourth Duma on November 15 (November 28): one side shouted "Long live the czar" and the other--"Long live the constitution." Several groups walked out in protest. The Balkan war was more interesting. On November 20, we learn that Arabs on horseback and Kurds are advancing in support of the Turks, while Serbians and Macedonians—in support of the Bulgarians. In this issue, the Duma received some 20 words. The issue of November 22 reports that the Duma is still wrangling over the election of a chairman and secretary. The Balkan war gets more space, including a note that many are withdrawing their deposits from banks in Lvov, for fear of war. Austria and Russia are at odds because someone in Cracow vandalized Russia's coat of arms. Austria apologized.

But, as Grinius notes, Lithuanians were becoming politically differentiated. *Lietuvos žinios* and *Lietuvos ūkininkas* could be considered moderate left. *Viltis* began publication in Vilnius in 1907. In 1912, it could be considered centrist. It devoted a longer report to the opening of the Fourth Duma. The session was opened by the president of the State Council, who shouted "Hail the emperor, autocrat of all Russians," to which deputies responded with "Hurrah," while deputies of the left hailed the constitution.[637] My sense is that *Viltis* over the years showed more interest in Duma affairs.

Elections to the Fourth Duma were held in October. In Kaunas Province Lithuanians, in "traditional coalition" with Jews, elected three Lithuanian deputies, one a peasant and two educated, and one Jewish, a lawyer. Also elected was a Polish estate owner, with a hint that he was a National Democrat. The Lithuanian-Jewish coalition mustered 39 electors, while the landowners side had 36.[638] In Vilnius Province one Lithuanian was elected, a peasant, who voted with his Polish colleagues. Also four Poles and the obligatory two Russians, one of them a member of the clergy.[639] There was talk of bribery. Supposedly one elector was offered 1000 rubles.

---

636 *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1912 November 7; no. 45, p. 447.

637 *Viltis*, 1912 November 21.

638 *Lietuvos žinio*s, 1912 October 27.

639 *Lietuvos žinio*s, 1912 October 23.

Grinius and Bulota were among electors in Suvalkai, but in the end, joined by two other Lithuanians, they abstained. In a collective letter, they explained that clericals, because they were opposed to Bulota, did not attend the general meeting of Lithuanian electors, but held one of their own. They accused Basanavičius of joining the clericals and departing only when he was not nominated.[640] Basanavičius disputed this claim.[641] In any case, elected as deputy from Suvalkai was Juozas Laukaitis (1873-1952), a priest. He was arrested in 1947 and died in a Soviet prison.

On June 5, 1913, in a speech firmly insisting that Lithuanians had a right to education in their own language, Laukaitis noted that the authorities are very reluctant to assign priests to teach religion in elementary schools. They suspect Lithuanian priests of disloyalty, but their suspicions are groundless because priests are not "separatists" and in fact, helped suppress the violence and chaos in 1905-1906.[642] The Lithuanian left responded that he was currying favor with the government in expectation of rich rewards. In an unsigned piece, *Lietuvos žinios*, 1913 June 20, thanked him for unmasking insatiable clerical appetites. *Varpas* published a mocking piece, attributed to Grinius, which alleged that Laukaitis rarely resisted old wine and young women, like many other priests preaching celibacy and temperance but not practicing either, and had embezzled money meant for *Šaltinis*. Worst of all, Laukaitis no longer advocated autonomy for Lithuania, thus repudiating the program of the Great Vilnius Assembly. Lithuanians should be ashamed of having elected such a deputy.[643]

In response, *Viltis,* 1913 June 21, Laukaitis explained that he distinguished between the struggle for freedom and criminal excesses, supporting the former and doing his best to eliminate the latter. In his view, cutting down telegraph poles, destroying documents, killing innocents are not ways of fighting for freedom. In fact, many priests suffered because they supported genuine revolution. He did not mention the question of autonomy. I do not know whether for prudential reasons or because he did not believe in it. But in other speeches he was quite vocal about the right of Lithuanians to use their own language in education and public business. In the Duma he aligned himself with the progressives.

---

640 Dr. K. Grinius *et al*, *Lietuvos žinios,* 1912 October 23.

641 *Viltis*, 1912 October 28.

642 His speech was published in *Viltis*, 1913 June 12.

643 X, "Bėda ir gėda" ("Trouble and Shame"), *Varpas*, 1913 October 15; no. 2, p. 71-72. The attribution to Grinius is uncertain.

In Suvalkai Province, the language question was inevitably part of the Polish question. The Duma proposed that even in towns with Lithuanian majorities and only a handful of Poles, the two languages would be treated equally for public business. Laukaitis responded that the same rule should apply to Polish cities, including Warsaw, with substantial Lithuanian minorities. After all, there is even a Lithuanian church in Warsaw.[644] The Lithuanian population in that city is much larger than the Polish population in Marijampolė.

My sense is that the left, including Grinius, overreacted, although without a detailed biography of Laukaitis firm conclusions are out of the question. But the controversy underscores the deep mistrust dividing Lithuanian progressives and religious traditionalists. Likely, in Ginius's case, there is also bitterness that his friend Bulota was not reelected, the victim of what he believed was a clerical plot, that some priests accused him of encouraging young people to desecrate communion wafers and labored to undermine *Šviesa*. However, when reading about such resentments, misrepresentations, misunderstandings, seemingly insurmountable differences, it is well to remember present day American politics. There is no Lithuanian exceptionalism.

It is a reasonable conjecture that the election of Laukaitis for Grinius was the last straw. A clerical boasting of helping crush the hopes of 1905, on top of a Duma indifferent to Lithuanian needs and interests and working to restore autocracy, with no hope of significant and pressing reforms, was more than he could tolerate. He shows no interest in the Duma in the few years remaining before the war. No doubt, he would have agreed with Hosking's verdict: "the burial or emasculation of reform legislation, the conservative obstructionism of the State Council, the splits in the political parties, the dissensions in the Council of Ministers—all these phenomena brought Russian politics by the summer of 1914 to a point where the already ambiguous constitution of 1905-6 no longer meant very much."[645] But while agreeing, Grinius would have insisted on something else: the Duma failed to establish a federal structure which would have satisfied many rebellious minorities. Like some modern historians, the Duma did not understand that the empire could not survive as Russia always and everywhere. In Lithuania, the Duma's insensitivity to minorities helped Lithuanians distance themselves from all things Russian (except literature and music) and push the country towards independence.

644 *Viltis*, 1913 June 19.

645 Hosking, *Russian Constitutional Experiment*, p. 213.

Postscript

Sebag Montefiore is better than many historians because he succeeds in depicting politics not as the work of great men in devoted and honorable service of great ideals, but as a human activity with fatal decisions made by men, often ignorant, fanatical, dogmatic, envious, prejudiced, stupid, superstitious, corrupt, greedy, ambitious, lecherous. His approach is reflected in his frequent use of nicknames, including "Fat Orlov" and "Lovesick Creature." "Be more autocratic my very own Sweetheart. ...Never forget what you are and must remain autocratic Emperor!" the empress Alexandra (Alix, Sunny) wrote in 1915 urging her husband to take charge of military affairs as Russian defeats piled up. And we ask, what qualifications, what experience did she have? Sebag Montefiore answers: "Beneath the crippling shyness and royal chilliness, she concealed a surprising combination of dogmatism, obstinacy and a tendency utterly to misread people and situations. Neither intelligent nor well-educated, she possessed an 'iron will.'"[646]

Sebag Montefiore correctly emphasizes that autocracy survived the revolution, even more stifling, more destructive of ordinary human aspirations and hopes. The Bolsheviks did not overturn autocracy, but merely replaced Orthodox dogmas with Marxist ones, heaven with true communism, czars, their uncles and cousins, with party functionaries, their retainers and relatives.[647] The futility of

[646] Sebag Montefiore, *Romanovs*, pp. 585, 477.

[647] For many details see Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). As early as the 1930's privilege and *blat* were so widespread that even some American sympathizers were concerned, however, escaping reality by rationalizing that it will all go away once scarcity is eliminated (pp. 104-105).

the whole enterprise is captured in a witticism of the late Soviet period: under capitalism man is exploited by man, but once socialism has been built, it will be the other way around. And in estimating the cost of Marxist Communism, we should count not only the dead, but grandparents deprived of the pleasure of watching grandchildren at play, instead of comfortable old age laboring away on collective farms, boys and girls removed from classrooms to herd sheep in far away places, widows in arctic fishing collectives mourning children perishing in blizzards, having lost their way returning from outhouses.

The collapse of the Soviet Union proves, if proof were needed, that Marx did not discover the laws of history, that Lenin, Stalin, Mao were not History Incarnate. Soviet historiography testifies to the autocratic nature of Soviet Communism: had there been no Lenin, Russian masses would not have emerged victorious, Soviet propagandists repeated without end. This, in the name of an ideology which proclaimed that classes are the primary agents in history. In a deeply ingrained autocracy such as Russia, whether blessed by God or History, important decisions often reflect the whims of a few individuals, in power by virtue of an accident of birth, marriage, or clever enough to find powerful patrons. Proverbial is the role of Rasputin, a lascivious charlatan, in the decline and collapse of Russia. And how much of Lenin's politics reflects an understanding of Russia's needs and how much bitterness that his brother was hanged for attempting to assassinate the czar?[648]

A leading Lithuanian communist writes about Lenin's stop-over in Vilnius in the fall of 1895: it "was an especially significant year in the revolutionary movement of Lithuanian workers. ...Lenin's visit to Vilnius was decisive in the development of the workers revolutionary movement in Lithuania."[649] Perhaps, several railroad workers noticed an elegantly dressed gentleman stretching his legs—did he enjoy a nice cup of tea? But the workers of Lithuania neither knew nor cared and would not have made much sense out of Marxist philosophizing, concerned as they were with better wages, schools for their children, oppressive taxes. Perhaps, Lenin's stop-over was important in Dzerzhinsky's biography, as the author of the article claims, but Iron Felix played a minor role in Lithuanian history and Lenin's visit left no traces that historians have uncovered. And never

---

[648] For Lenin's reaction see Sebestyen, *Lenin*, pp. 47-48.

[649] Antanas Sniečkus, "F. Dzeržinskis—proletarinio internacionalizmo idėjų propagandistas Lietuvoje" ("F. Dzerzhinsky—the Propagandist of Proletarian Internationalism in Lithuania"), *Revoliucinis judėjimas Lietuvoje* (*The Revolutionary Movement in Lithuania*) (Vilnius, 1957), p. 15.

mind that the "workers' movement" did not enjoy broad support in 1918-1920, but was lifted to power decades later by the Red Army. The visit, trivial in itself—the train from Berlin to Saint Petersburg made a scheduled stop in Vilnius—had to be glorified to link Lithuania with the autocrat of the revolution, a man so great that a few minutes in a railway station was an event of historic proportions. Luba Brezhneva, Brezhnev's niece, recalls: "At the age of three, we already knew that Russia had moved from darkness into light thanks to Lenin, our wise leader and teacher."[650]

Lithuania was fortunate that no Lenin style narcissists emerged - "a paranoid, conspiratorial and fundamentally undemocratic man" according to Applebaum.[651] But assuming that narcissists are made and not born, one can argue that social conditions called for more men like Grinius, repelled by dogmas and fanatics, insisting that it is best for human beings to seek happiness each in his own way, of course within a framework of law and morality. Consistently with this conviction, Grinius's political program emphasized education in a broad sense, the formation of a civil society, general prosperity, in the belief that an educated, organized, and prosperous citizenry will create democratic polities and flourish. Unlike Lenin, Grinius did not sacrifice the present in the name of a glorious, but imaginary, future. He understood that only in fairy tales, once wicked witches and stepsisters are slain, everyone lives happily ever after.

While Lithuanian Communists had to place a brief stop-over at the center of history, Grinius emphasized education, the press, the formation of a civil society in a broad sense. In old age, already in the United States, he recalled the decade of progress from the the lifting of the press ban to 1914. Nothing about bands of conspirators, visits by great men. Lithuania has grown because there are more schools, newspapers and other periodicals, educational, cultural, agricultural societies. He mentions various political parties, their programs, calls for autonomy, understanding that unanimity is possible only in autocracies. By contrast, Communist historiography damns every rival, much like an inquisitor consigning heretics to an eternity in hell. In another article in the above mentioned *Revoliucinis judėjimas Lietuvoje* (p. 479) we read that the entire non-communist press of independent Lithuania was controlled by those who served the one who paid better, was in the hands of men "without principles, without conscience." No doubt, like everyone else, Lithuania had her political chameleons

650 Brezhneva, *World I Left Behind*, p. 101.

651 Applebaum, *Red Famine*, p. 19.

(seasonalists, to use a term from the 1930s), but many journalists and editors were honorable men, some paying for their integrity with their lives, condemned by the Soviets as enemies of the people.

According to Sebestyen, in Geneva Lenin instructed his followers how to treat political opponents, socialists with whom they disagreed: "when you see a stinking heap in your path, you don't have to touch it to know what it is. Your nose tells you it's shit and you pass by."[652]

In his memoir, Grinius mentions Lithuanian social democrats, who in accordance with Marxist principles, pledged to work for the interests of the working class and to seek independence for Lithuania. Thus, his rivals are not those with horns and pitchforks, excrement, but people with whom on some issues he disagrees. I have often noted his disdain for clericals: in his memoir he names Laukaitis and one other. But he also notes that after 1905 there was more freedom of religion, that the clergy had more freedom to work and organize, that there was a growing Catholic press. He does note that these organizations tended to be dangerously exclusive,

In 1914, he published an extensive evaluation of the year just ended. This series of eight articles is interesting, because it is detailed. The first surveys agriculture.[653] We learn that the summer of 1913 was wet: many roads were impassable for weeks. Probably, compared with 1912, farm income declined. On the other hand, farmers purchased more machinery and fertilizer, evidence that more were investing and understanding modern farming. Thus, not Soviet history about great men steering mankind to Truth and Glory, but a mundane account of how ordinary people were struggling to make their lives better.

Jerusalem artichokes have yet to inflame anyone's imagination. No one would title a book about increasing crop yields, *Ten Days that Shook the World* (1919). John Reed filled his memoir of Lenin's coup with romanticized, imaginary, larger than life revolutionaries and ignored the reality which the coup unleashed. This is not surprising: after all, he was a flamboyant journalist. As his biographer concludes, "Reed had been that unusual kind of man whose needs, energies and talents are strong enough to carry adolescent fantasies into adult reality." Reed acted on the vague sense that a revolution should prevent any social order from "locking men into rigid forms of consciousness, into values that

652 Sebestyen, *Lenin*, p. 153.

653 K. Gr., "1913 metai" ("The Year 1913"), *Lietuvos žinios*, 1914 January 15.

remain unquestioned."[654] He never understood that Lenin's goal was a society in which no one dared question the Party and her Leader.

Lenin approved of Mussolini as a strong leader. A number of historians have pointed out that Lenin's Communists and Mussolini's Fascists were organized on the same principles: "Neither had any faith in the spontaneous organization of the working classes."[655]

After a hundred years it is clear that it was Grinius who was right: while the romance of revolution captures the imaginations of journalists[656] and graduate students, deep reform is not so theatrical. How much suffering would have been avoided if Lenin had paid attention to artichokes and improving varieties of potatoes? Romantic imagery hides the fact that the Russian revolution, as the search for dignity and autonomy by millions of ordinary people, perished in Lenin's and Stalin's prisons. Lithuania was fortunate, thanks in part to Grinius, in escaping some of the worst decades.

---

654 Robert A. Rosenstone, *Romantic Revolutionary: A Biography of John Reed* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975), pp. 385, 388.

655 Stanley G. Payne, *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), p. 83, quoting A. James Gregor. Payne's account of Lithuanian politics after 1926 is reasonably accurate: the regime "strove to develop a semibureaucratic semifascist movement from the top downward but normally failed in the enterprise" (p. 469). The democratic opposition, a coalition of Young Catholics and *Liaudininkai*, played an important role.

656 Ian Frazer, "Whatever Happened to the Russian Revolution," *Smithsonian*, October 2017, pp. 48-80. Frazer relies heavily on Reed and ends up with only a human interest story, with one or two vague hints about the crimes and disasters for which Lenin's coup established the political conditions. His conclusion is pretentious: "Lenin showed the world how well not compromising can work. A response to that revolutionary innovation of his has yet to be figured out." As if Lenin was the first fanatic! And the proper response has been known at least since the Age of Enlightenment: it is an educated, informed, prosperous, and active citizenry.

Selected Bibliography

Primarily, my work relies upon the writings of Kazys Grinius: his pieces in newspapers and periodicals are not repeated in the present list. Also not included are books and articles cited incidentally.

Acemoglu, Daron and Robinson, James A., *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty* (New York: Crown Business, 2012).

Aleksandravičius, Egidijus and Kulakauskas, Antanas, *Carų valdžioje: Lietuva XIX amžiuje* (*Under the Rule of the Czars: Lithuania in the XIX Century*) (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1996).

Applebaum, Anne, *Between East and West: Across the Borderlands of Europe* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1994).

Applebaum, Anne, *Red Famine: Stalin's War on Ukraine* (New York: Doubleday, 2017).

Ascher, Abraham, *P. A. Stolypin: The Search for Stability in Late Imperial Russia* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001).

Bielinis, Kipras, *Penktieji metai* (*The Fifth Year*) (New York: 1959).

Biržiška, Mykolas, *Anuo metu* (*In That Time*), (Kaunas: 1938).

Borzęcki, Jerzy, *The Soviet-Polish Peace of 1921 and the Creation of Interwar Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).

Brezhneva, Luba, *The World I Left Behind* (New York: Random House, 1995).

Butėnas, Julius, *Vincas Kudirka: Biografinė apybraiža* (*Vincas Kudirka: a Biographical Sketch*) (Vilnius: Vyturys, 1988).

Cohen, Morris Raphael, *A Dreamer's Journey: The Autobiography of Morris Raphael Cohen* (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1949).

Davies, Norman, *God's Playground: A History of Poland*, 2 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982).

Davies, Norman, in *Rising' 44: The Battle for Warsaw* (New York: Viking, 2004).

Dogelis, Povilas, *Mano gyvenimo prisiminimai* (*Memories of My Life*) (Kaunas, 1936).

Dziewanowski, M. K., *Joseph Pilsudski: A European Federalist, 1918-1922* (Stanford, Cal.: Hoover Institution Press, 1969).

Eidintas, Alfonsas, *Kazys Grinius* (Vilnius: Mintis, 1993).

Garlicki, Andrzej, *Josef Pilsudski, 1867-1935,* transl. by John Coutouvidis (Scolar Press, 1995).

Grinius, Kazys, *Atsiminimai ir mintys* (*Reminiscences and Thoughts*), volume 1 (Tübingen: Patria, 1947).

Grinius, Kazys, *Atsiminimai ir mintys,* volume 2 (Chicago, 1962).

Grinius, Kazys, *Atsiminimai ir mintys,* volume 3 (Marijampolė: Piko valanda, 2016).

Grinius, Kazys, "Atsiminimai: 1866-1878" ("Memoirs: 1866-1878"), *Varpas*, 1926, pp. 64-145. In spite of the title, the narrative extends to 1893.

Hollander, Paul, *Political Pilgrims: Travels of Western Intellectuals to the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981).

Hosking, Geoffrey A., *The Russian Constitutional Experiment: Government and Duma, 1907-1914* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1973).

Ilgūnas, Gediminas, *Kazys Grinius* (Vilnius: Pradai, 2000).

Ivanauskas, Tadas, *Aš apsisprendžiu* (*I Make up My Mind*), 2nd ed., (Vilnius, 2010).

Kairys, Steponas, *Lietuva budo* (*Lithuania Was Awakening*) (New York: 1957).

Kapsukas-Mickevičius, Vincas, *Caro kalėjimuose* (*In the Czar's Prisons*) (1928), reprinted in his *Raštai* (Vilnius; Vaga, 1962).

Kiaupa, Zigmas, *The History of Lithuania* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2005).

Landsbergis-Žemkalnis, Gabrielius, *Raštai* (*Writings*) (Vilnius: Vaga, 1972).

Loewenberg, Jacob, *Thrice-Born: Selected Memories of an Immigrant* (New York: Hobbs, Dorman & Company, 1968).

Luxemburg, Rosa, *The National Question: Selected Writings by Rosa Luxemburg*, Horace B. Davis, editor (New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1976).

Makauskas, Bronius, *Lietuvos istorija* (Kaunas: Šviesa, 2000).

Masaryk, Thomas G., *The Spirit of Thomas G. Masaryk (1850-1937): An Anthology*, ed. George J. Kovtun, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990).

Matulaitis, Stasys, *Atsiminimai ir kiti kūriniai* (*Memoirs and Other Writings*) (Vilnius: 1957).

Mazover, Mark, *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000).

Mehlinger, Howard D. and Thompson, John M., *Count Witte and the Tsarist Government in the 1905 Revolution* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972).

Merkys, Vytautas, *Draudžiamosios lietuviškos spaudos kelias, 1864-1904* (*The Pathway of the Lithuanian Banned Press, 1864-1904*) (Vilnius: 1994).

Merkys, Vytautas, *Motiejus Valančius* (Vilnius: Mintis, 1999).

Merkys, Vytautas, *Tautiniai santykiai Vilniaus Vyskupijoje 1798-1918* (*Relations between Nationalities in the Diocese of Vilnius 1798-1918*) (Vilnius: Versus Aureus, 2006).

Moravskis, Alfonsas, *Lietuvos darbininkų judėjimo istorija* (*History of the Lithuanian Workers' Movement*) (Kaunas, 1931).

Nettl, J. P., *Rosa Luxemburg*, 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1966).

Pearson, Michael, *Lenin's Mistress: The Life of Inessa Armand* (New York: Random House, 2001).

Pilsudska, Aleksandra, *Memoirs of Madame Pilsudski* (London: Hurst & Blackett, 1940).

Pipes, Richard, *Russia under the Old Regime*, (New York: Charles Sribner's Sons, 1974).

Prano Mašioto šviesa (*The Light of Pranas Mašiotas*), ed. Reda Tamulienė and Kęstutis Urba (Vilnius, 2013).

Rimka, Albinas, *Lietuvos ūkis: statistikos tyrinėjimai* (T*he Lithuanian Economy: Statistical Investigations*), 2nd ed. (Kaunas: Švyturys, 1922).

Rosenstone, Robert A., *Romantic Revolutionary: A Biography of John Reed* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975).

Said, Edward W., *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994).

Schrad, Mark Lawrence, *Vodka Politics: Alcohol, Autocracy, and the Secret History of the Russian State* (Oxford University Press, 2014).

Sebag Montefiore, Simon, *Young Stalin* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007).

Sebag Montefiore, Simon, *The Romanovs, 1613-1918* (New York: Vintage Books, 2017).

Sebestyen, Victor, *Lenin: The Man, The Dictator, and the Master of Terror* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2017).

Service, Robert, *Lenin: A Biography* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000).

Seton-Watson, Hugh, *The Decline of Imperial Russia, 1855-1914* (New York: Praeger, 1956).

Šliūpas, Jonas, *Lietuviai ir lenkai* (*Lithuanians and Poles*), ed. Arūnas Vyšniauskas (Vilnius: Vilnius University Press, 2016).

Snyder, Timothy, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

Staliūnas, Darius,, "Lietuvių tapatumas, kalba ir rašmenys Rusijos tautinėje politikoje" ("Lithuanian Identity, Language and Orthography in Russian Nationality Policy," *Raidžių draudimo metai* (*The Years of Banned Letters*), ed. Darius Staliūnas (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2004).

Statistical department, *Statistinės žinios apie Lietuvą ligi karui 1914 m*. (*Statistical Information about Lithuania to the War in 1914*) (Kaunas, 1919).

Stone, Daniel, *The Polish-Lithuanian State, 1386-1795* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2001).

Taylor, S. J., *Stalin's Apologist: Walter Duranty, The New York Times's Man in Moscow* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

Toliušis, Zigmas, *Mano kalėjimai* (*My Prisons*) (Vilnius: Mintis, 1991).

Ulam, Adam B., *The Bolsheviks* (New York: Collier Books, 1968).

Vakar, Nicholas P., *Belorussia: The Making of a Nation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956).

Wallace, Henry A., *The Price of Vision: The Diary of Henry A. Wallace, 1942-1946*, John Morton Blum, ed. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1973).

Weeks, Theodore R., *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1996).

Index of Personal Names

Acemoglu, Daron 86, 202, 280, 348
Adamkus, Valdas 7
Alekna, Antanas 140
Aleksandravičius, Egidijus 4, 114, 118, 120, 129, 277, 318, 325, 348
Alexander II 114, 182, 243
Alexander III 114, 134, 182
Almenas, Kazys 63
Applebaum, Anne 25, 45, 52, 345, 348
Armand, Inessa 18, 350
Arminas, Petras 268
Ascher, Abraham 311, 312, 317, 319, 330, 334, 335, 336, 337, 348
Avižienis, Algirdas 35
Bacevičienė, Ona 41, 164, 204
Bacevičius, Feliksas 291, 292
Bakunin, Michael 190
Balfour, Arthur James 276
Baltrušaitis, Antanas 215
Balzac, Honoré de 260
Basanavičius, Jonas 118, 119, 120, 122, 126, 160, 251, 279, 282, 284, 286, 297, 301, 302, 316, 329, 341
Baudouin de Courtenay, Jan Niecisław 319
Bellamy, Edward 191
Bethell, Nicholas 42
Bielinis, Kipras 236, 238, 274, 348
Biliūnas, Jonas 263
Biržiška, Mykolas 72, 73, 76, 348
Błaszczak, Tomasz 60
Blum, John Morton 10, 351
Bortkevičienė, Felicija 161, 162, 164, 210, 211, 265
Borzęcki, Jerzy 52, 59, 60, 348
Brezhnev, Leonid 63, 86, 345
Brezhneva, Luba 43, 86, 345, 348
Brown, Archie 10
Browning, Christopher 11
Büchner, Ludwig 125
Bukharin, Nikolai 223, 225
Bulota, Andrius 104, 169, 301, 311, 323, 324, 327, 329, 331, 332, 333, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342
Butėnas, Julius 70, 143, 151, 348
Byron, George Gordon, Lord 138
Carlyle, Thomas 118
Carnegie, Andrew 279
Catherine the Great 108, 269
Čepėnas, Pranas 58

Chekhov, Anton 299
Churchill, Winston 10, 26,
Cohen, Morris Raphael 12, 171, 348
Conquest, Robert 43
Conroy, Mary Schaeffer 312
Cooper, James Fenimore 107
Copernicus 119, 227
Copernicus 119, 227
Copland, Aaron 289
Darwin, Charles 125
Davies, Norman 26, 28, 34, 38, 51, 53, 60, 139, 339, 349
Davis, Angela 240
Davis, Horace B. 84, 349
Denikin, Anton 45
Dewey, John 29
Dickstein, Szymon 171
Dieckmann, Christoph 53
Dmowski, Roman 31, 138, 139, 325, 332
Dogelis, Povilas 68
Domaševičius, Andrius 230, 231, 232, 234, 237, 238
Donelaitis, Kristijonas 121, 260
Draper, John William 125, 126
Duranty, Walter 46, 341
Duš-Dušeuski, Klaudzi 60
Dzerzhinsky, Felix 225, 229, 260, 295, 344
Dziewanowski, M. K. 24, 74, 349
Dziewanowski, Marian Kamil 24, 74, 349
Eastman, Mary 23
Eidintas, Alfonsas 16, 349
Engels, Friedrich 17, 226, 232
Fitzpatrick, Sheila 343
Flaubert, Gustave 260
Ford, Henry 131
Fortunatov, Filipp Fedorovich 134
Franko, Ivan Yakovich 163, 177
Frazer, Ian 347
Gabrys, Juozas 320
Gaigalaitė, Aldona 56
Garibaldi, Giuseppe 138
Garlicki, Andrzej 24, 349
George, Henry 110, 191
George, Henry 110, 191
Gimbutienė, Marija 35
Girnius, Juozas 319
Gorky, Maxim 162, 271, 287, 288
Grabski, Wladislaw 325
Gregor, A. James 347
Grigaitis, Pijus 268
Grinius, Jonas (brother) 35, 36, 42, 97, 265, 291, 292
Grinius, Jurgis (son) 41, 45, 211. 306
Grinius, Kazys, see p. 357-358
Grinius, Kazys (son) 35, 36, 41, 42, 46, 211-213
Grinius, Liūtas 19, 34, 35, 36, 39, 47, 239
Grinius, Vincas (father) 94, 95, 208-209
Griniūtė, Gražina (daughter) 41, 46, 211
Griniuvienė, Joana Pavalkytė (first wife) 27, 41, 43, 46, 70, 86, 208, 210, 211, 215, 227, 235, 236, 238, 239, 253, 264, 265, 268, 281, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 293, 295, 296, 298, 299, 300, 301, 305, 306
Griniuvienė, Kristina Arsaitė (second wife) 19, 34, 36
Griniuvienė, Ona (mother) 95
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 27, 184
Herod 233
Hitler, Adolf 38, 44, 50, 93
Hollander, Paul 39, 240, 349
Homer 206
Hoover, Herbert 24, 46, 74, 349
Hosking, Geoffrey A. 311, 314, 342, 349
Hroch, Miroslaw 29
Ilgūnas, Gediminas 16, 22, 27, 37, 39, 41, 43, 47, 48, 147, 209, 211, 212, 235, 238, 239, 252, 264, 265, 306
Ivanauskas, Tadas 71, 72, 349

Jablonskis, Jonas 73, 124, 130, 134
Jagiello 50, 51
James, Edward Holton 187
James, William 7, 29, 30, 86, 107, 187, 287, 288, 347, 348
Jankus, Martynas 142
Janulaitis, Augustinas 158, 229, 230, 231
Joffe, Adolph 223
Jonikas, Petras 117
Jurėnienė, Virginija 32
Kairys, Steponas 236, 237, 238, 349
Kant, Immanuel 197
Kapsukas-Mickevičius, Vincas 137, 210, 349
Kautsky, Karl 226, 227
Keinys, Pranas 338
Kennan, George 181, 182
Kennedy, Randall 62
Kerensky, Alexander 42, 144
Khrushchev, Nikita 181
Kiaupa, Zigmantas 22, 54, 247, 349
Kipling, Rudyard 30
Klimas, Petras 107
Korolenko, Vladimir Galaktionovich 134
Kosciuszko, Tadeusz 191
Kovtun, George J. 6, 31, 349
Kriaučiūnas, Petras 90, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 116, 118, 120, 125, 128, 141, 146, 147, 168, 266
Kubilius, Juozas 320, 321
Kudirka, Vincas 62, 69, 70, 71, 97, 110, 118, 126, 137, 141, 142, 143, 145, 147, 151, 153, 156, 159, 160, 191, 199, 201, 212, 215, 216, 288, 300, 348
Kulakauskas, Antanas 114, 118, 277, 318, 325, 348
Landsbergis, Vytautas 74
Landsbergis-Žemkalnis, Gabrielius 67, 74, 349
Lasalle, Ferdinand 171
Laukaitis, Juozas 341, 342, 346
Lenin, Vladimir Illich 11, 18, 19, 25, 27, 28, 43, 45, 85, 86, 97, 110, 136, 144, 161, 162, 163, 171, 186, 190, 205, 210, 213, 218, 219, 220, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 245, 252, 253, 256, 260, 261, 264, 266, 267, 271, 283, 287, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 303, 308, 309, 312, 319, 344, 345, 346, 347, 350
Leonas, Petras 104, 105, 106, 131, 145, 157, 158, 272, 323, 324
Leonavičius, Juozas 105, 106
Liebknecht, Wilhelm 304, 305
Lietuvninkaitė, Nijolė 31, 67
Lingis, Antanas 64, 349
Liulevičius, Vėjas Gabriel 44
Loewenberg, Jacob 12, 273, 349
Luxemburg, Rosa 83, 84, 85, 206, 229, 349, 250
Mačiulis-Maironis, Jonas 165
Makauskas, Bronius 51, 349
Mao Zedong 11, 310, 344
Mapu, Abraham 76
Margolin, Jean-Louis 310
Mark Twain 191
Marx, Karl 17, 26, 53, 125, 137, 162, 190, 210, 219, 226, 227, 229, 232, 235, 237, 246, 253, 260, 344
Masaryk, Thomas Garrigue 6, 30, 31, 32, 157, 177, 349
Mašiotas, Pranas 127, 128, 130, 140, 221, 350
Massie, Robert K. 108
Matejko, Jan 50
Matthaüs, Jürgen 11
Matulaitis, Jurgis 115
Matulaitis, Stasys 91, 125, 126, 138, 153, 209, 255, 260, 265, 349
Matulionis, Povilas 74
Mazover, Mark 27, 28, 349
Mehlinger, Howard D. 274, 350
Mekas, Jonas 35

Merkys, Vytautas 57, 58, 60, 67, 82, 83, 110, 111, 168, 199, 350
Mickiewicz, Adam 71, 118, 119, 127, 156, 268
Milton, John 118
Milyukov, Pavel Nikolayevich 282, 284
Moravskis, Alfonsas 67, 230, 231, 232, 235, 238, 350
More, Thomas 218
Mussolini, Benito 225, 347
Napoleon 91, 113, 225
Neruda, Pablo 39, 172, 240
Nettl, J. P. 85, 350
Nicholas II 269
Nordau, Max 69
Novak, Michael 192
Nowak, Andrzej 61
O'Konski, Alvin 37
Opolais, Kristine 62
Orwell, George 12
Orzhevsky, Pyotr 192
Paderewski, Ignacy 31
Palukaitis, V. 145
Park, Robert Ezra 70
Parnell, Charles Stewart 158, 184
Pasteur, Louis 158
Pavalkis, Bronius 198
Payne, Stanley G. 347
Pearson, Michael 163, 350
Pilate 233
Pilsudska, Aleksandra 20, 21, 22, 24, 53, 59, 65, 77, 100, 118, 138, 139, 161, 181, 195, 208, 267, 350
Pilsudski, Josef 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 30, 60, 61, 66, 74, 75, 77, 92, 103, 109, 138, 142, 178, 181, 194, 195, 206, 214, 216, 217, 228, 229, 230, 231, 237, 238, 257, 349, 350
Pipes, Richard 279, 280, 350
Pivoras, Saulius 75
Plekhanov, Georgi Valentinovich 85, 86, 227
Pliuraitė-Andrejevienė, Nijolė 14
Pol Pot 11
Povylius, Antanas 324
Pranckevičius, Matas 106
Price, Leontyne 62
Proulx, E. Annie 14
Pushkin, Alexander 127, 268
Putin, Vladimir 40, 267, 293
Putna, Vytautas 74, 75
Rasputin, Grigori Yefimovich 344
Reed, John 346, 347, 350
Rimka, Albinas 52, 56, 57, 59, 63, 79, 350
Robinson, James A. 86, 202, 280, 348
Römeris, Mykolas 61
Roosevelt, Franklin Delano 10, 26, 213
Roosevelt, Theodore 195
Rosenstone, Robert A. 347, 350
Said, Edward W. 13, 17, 26, 30, 187, 310, 326, 350
Sand, Shlomo 55
Sanders, Bernie 179
Šapoka, Adolfas 54, 77, 119
Schrad, Mark Lawrence 15, 81, 82, 154, 171, 190, 350
Sebag Montefiore, Simon 11, 13, 126, 172, 174, 218, 224, 256, 260, 265, 280, 287, 291, 293, 303, 319, 328, 343, 350
Sebestyen, Victor 19, 136, 253, 260, 344, 346, 350
Service, Robert 10, 85, 86, 162, 163, 219, 223, 224, 226, 227, 245, 253, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 308, 350
Seton-Watson, Hugh 25, 55, 57, 58, 302, 303, 312, 325, 350
Shkuro, Andrei Grigor'yevich 42, 212, 213
Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, Jurgita 76
Sienkiewicz, Henryk 22
Sinclair, Upton 233

Sirutavičius, Vladas 76
Skirmunt, Konstancija 140
Škirpa, Kazys 11
Skrupskelis, Ignas K. 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 29, 66, 69, 80, 309
Šležas, Paulius 77
Šliūpas, Jonas 25, 26, 31, 122, 123, 146, 148, 149, 209, 350
Smetana, Bedřich 157
Smetona, Antanas 35, 39, 40, 176, 213, 261, 306
Smolskis, Tomas 197
Sniečkus, Antanas 344
Snyder, Timothy 53, 54, 64, 66, 77, 117, 118, 119, 126, 127, 139, 149, 156, 160, 188, 238, 266, 301, 331, 350
Sobieski, Jan 97
Solovyov, Vladimir 181
Solzhenitsyn, Alexander 136
Spencer, Herbert 17, 125, 127, 176, 226, 227
Stalin, Josef Vissarionovich 10, 11, 13, 25, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 75, 86, 126, 161, 171, 172, 205, 213, 218, 221, 222, 224, 225, 228, 255, 256, 260, 264, 265, 267, 275, 287, 293, 344, 347
Staliūnas, Darius 20, 76, 274, 350
Staugaitis, Jonas 98
Steponaitis, V. 231
Stolypin, Pyotr Arkadievich 211, 273, 301, 305, 311, 312, 317, 319, 323, 328, 330, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 348
Stone, Daniel 53, 351
Stowe, Harriet Beecher 110, 149, 191
Stulginskis, Aleksandras 35, 40
Sutherland, Joan 62
Sužiedėlis, Saulius 53
Sviatopolk-Mirskii, Pyotr Dmitrievich 49
Tamulienė, Reda 128, 350
Taylor, S. J. 46, 86, 351
Tell, William 188
Tercijonas, Vincas 44, 98
Terleckas, Vladas 246
Thompson, John M. 274, 350
Toliušis, Zigmas 20, 40, 351
Totoraitis, J. 100
Trotsky, Leon 205, 221, 223, 224, 225, 258, 260, 303
Truman, Harry S. 10, 34
Tumelis, Juozas 51
Ulam, Adam 85, 86, 219, 220, 271, 287, 288, 305, 308, 309, 351
Urba, Kęstutis 128, 350
Urbšienė-Mašiotaitė, Marija 22
Urmana, Violeta 62
Vaineikienė, Stasė 259
Vaineikis, Liudas 259, 260, 261, 262
Vakar, Nicholas P. 60, 61, 137, 138
Valančius, Motiejus 81, 82, 83, 95, 111, 251, 261, 350
Verne, Jules 107
Višinskis, Povilas 285, 286
Vitkauskas, Petras 130, 131, 133, 295, 320
Vonsiackij, A. 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262
Vonsyatsky, Anastasy 258
Vyšniauskas, Arūnas 26, 350
Vytautas 50, 139
Wallace, Alfred Russel 131
Wallace, Henry A. 10, 38, 39, 41, 131, 223, 240, 247, 351
Webster, Noah 143, 144
Weeks, Theodore R. 49, 351
Weinberg, Gerhard 40
Wellek, René 31
Witort, Jan 25, 26
Witte, Sergei Yulyevich 280, 282, 315, 316
Yende, Pretty 62
Zauniūtė, Morta 20
Zeligowski, Lucjan 26, 75, 230
Žilius, Jonas 69
Zubovas, Vladimiras 266, 277
Žymantienė-Žemaitė, Julija 73, 164

Subject Index for Kazys Grinius

Grinius, Kazys: and enlightenment, 16-17, 150, 154-55, 158-59, 174, 275; and socialism, 17, 171, 227; and Spencer, 17, 125, 127, 226, 227; birth and education, 17-18, 87; family, 18, 97; in Kislovodsk, 18, 41-43; political career, 18-19, 144; in United States, 19, 33-37; bibliography, 19-20; and democracy, 28, 172-73, 186, 187, 190, 194, 215, 223-25, 261; and language, 31-32, 68, 159, 160, 179-80, 186; arrests and searches, 36, 136, 260-61, 273, 285, 286-87, 292, 299-300, 306, 307; and liberation, 37-39; and Soviet occupation, 39; and World War I, 43-46; and German occupation, 46-48; and Jews, 47, 80, 152-53, 154, 155, 175-76, 197, 198-99, 202, 250, 262, 281, 304, 305, 337; and the Holocaust, 48; and Poles, 53, 138-39, 201-202, 202-203, 283-84, 289-90; and small nations, 54; and boundaries, 56, 78, 84; and the census, 57, 61-62, 65; and religion, 58-59, 62, 95-97, 112, 113, 124, 126, 150, 226, 258, 298, 299, 305, 331; and nationality, 62-63; and urbanization, 64, 88; and Vilnius, 66-67, 69, 140, 301, 302, 303; and Kudirka, 69, 70-71, 140, 145, 212; and Pilsudski, 74, 75, 77; on infant mortality, 80; and petitioning, 83; and communism, 86, 227, 291; family name, 87; and Kriaučiūnas, 90, 104-106, 108, 111, 115, 125, 141; childhood, 90-94; parents, 95; education, 98-100, 103, 113-15, 127-30, 242, 306; and Marijampolė, 100-102, 196-97, 252, 253-54, 265, 281-82, 288, 289, 291, 304; likes statistics, 102; and Polish culture, 102-103; on the awakening, 104-106, 110, 146, 167-68, 181, 266, 269, 275; and independence, 108, 206, 258, 302, 303; on Switzerland, 108-109, 187-90; on manners, 109; and citizenship, 109, 162, 189, 249-50; and Basanavičius, 116-17, 118, 283, 284, 286; and folklore, 120; and the practical, 120-21; and Aušra, 122, 123-24, 268; and Marxism, 125, 127, 226-27, 232, 239; and Mickiewicz, 127; and Vitkauskas, 130; and mathematics, 131; medical studies, 131-34; and student protests, 135-37;

a reformer, 137, 162-63, 170, 179, 238-39, 241, 291, 293-94, 307-308, 309-10, 336, 345; and Kapsukas, 137, 216, 222, 232, 236, 238-39, 253, 286; on the national idea, 139, 183-86; and history, 139-40; a patriot, 140; tours Lithuania, 141, 155-56, 175; and Liaudininkai, 144; and Varpininkai, 145, 147, 148, 203, 204, 205-206, 207, 267; and Šviesa, 146-47; and Varpas, 147, 156, 157, 159, 205-206, 207; and Ūkininkas, 147-48, 149-50, 151, 159, 163-64, 216, 235; and Naujienos, 148; and Vienybė lietuvninkų, 148; on dysentery, 151; on bribes, 154; and science, 158-59; on Europe, 159-60; on promiscuity, 160; and women, 160-61, 269; and Mariavites, 161, 203; on emigration, 163, 241-42; on backwardness, 164-65; on self-reliance, 164; on milk yields, 167; on imperialism, 168-70, 176-78, 181-82, 187, 188; and authority, 172, 259-60, 291; and the land question, 173, 241-42, 243, 246-48, 313-14, 319, 336; and crime, 174-75; a progressive, 179-80; role of education, 181, 274-75, 337; and roads, 188; on United States, 191-95; medical practice, 196-97, 204; values privacy, 197, 201, 210; remembers anecdotes, 197-98; and anti-Semitism, 199-200; on heredity, 200; avoids judgments, 201; on clergy, 203, 290-91, 294, 298, 299, 342, 346; and politics, 203-204, 281-82, 283, 288, 309, 310, 334; and smuggling, 205, 207, 217, 234-35; in Virbalis, 207; marriage, 208-209, 211; children, 211; police file, 214, 231; in Naumiestis, 213-15; on human nature, 219; and ownership, 220-221; and capital, 221-22, 308-309; on poverty, 222; and utopias, 222; and Lenin, 224, 225, 226, 252-53, 261, 294, 295-96, 308, 309; on dictators, 225; and Kautsky, 226; and world history, 228; and social democrats, 229-30, 232, 234, 235, 236-38, 239, 245-46, 322-23, 345; and revolution, 239, 293; and colonization, 243-45; and Žemė, 248-51; and societies, 252; organizes fair, 252, 253-54, 307; in Pilviškiai, 255-56; and Sietynas, 255, 256-57; and Vonsiackij, 257-58; on security agencies, 258; broadsides by, 258-59; and Vaineikis, 259-61, 262; and illegal schools, 263; on corruption, 263; and folk traditions 264, 288-89; and Artojas, 265; and Democratic Party, 265-68, 302-303, 306; and Arminas, 268; and Vilniaus žinios, 271; surveys 1905, 273-78; on emigrants, 275; on parties, 275; first speech, 281; and zemstvos, 282, 336-37, 338; and autonomy, 282, 283, 311, 313, 319; and the Vilnius Assembly, 284-85, 286; meets governor, 294-95; and Šviesa, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299-300, 301, 307; and bad books, 296-97; and theater, 299; and the Learned Society, 302; on artichokes, 307; on cooperatives, 309; and the Duma, 311, 312, 313, 314, 317, 319, 321, 329, 330, 331, 333, 334, 339-40, 341, 342; on the empire, 312, 313, 338; and Bulota, 323, 333; surveys 1908, 335; on social progress, 337-38; surveys 1914, 346.

Ignas K. Skrupskelis

Emancipating Lithuania:
The Early Years of President Grinius
Monograph

Layout design by: Aldona Bagdonienė
Cover design by: Rasa Švobaitė

26 06 2020. A run of 300 copies.
Issuance by Order No. K20-018.

Published by
Vytautas Magnus University
K. Donelaičio g. 58, LT-44248 Kaunas
www.vdu.lt | leidyba@vdu.lt

Printed by
UAB Vitae Litera
Savanorių pr. 137, LT-44146 Kaunas
www.tuka.lt | info@tuka.lt