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The Labor Scene in Lithuania, 1988-1993

Alfred E. Senn

Executive Summary

In the five years since the chaotic days of 1988, Lithuanian trade unions have undergone a fundamental change. Gone are the days when they served as "schools of communism" and constituted "the largest non-party social organization" in the republic. Now the trade union movement is broken up into a number of competing organizations -- as of June 1993 there were 59 unions, associations, and other collective workers' organizations registered with the Lithuanian Ministry of Justice -- representing the entire political spectrum of Lithuania, and although the number of union members is disputed, the unions obviously command the loyalty of only a minority of Lithuanian workers.

The unions do not have clear constituencies. In Soviet times the unions drew together all those working in a particular "branch" of the economy, regardless of their specific trades. The first major new union insisted on observing territorial principles of organization. In the post-Soviet period some of these unions, such as the Journalists' Union, insisted on uniting workers with a specific set of problems, the journalists themselves as opposed to printers and other employees of the publications. Some intellectuals objected to being joined with workers, and some workers wanted to exclude intellectuals. The picture seems unlikely to settle into one pattern in the near future.

The government has had its own impact on the development of unions. In 1990-1992, the Landsbergis-Sajudis administration struck heavily at the trade union structure left over by the old regime and thereby at the same time probably hindered the development of new trade unions. After the election victory of the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party (LDLP), the former independent Lithuanian Communist Party, in the fall of 1992, the activity of the trade unions revived. On the one hand, the new administration was more inclined to cooperate with the unions, and on the other, union leaders who had supported the Landsbergis administration were more ready now to tap possible sources of opposition to government policies.
In the summer of 1993 the largest trade union organization was the Lithuanian Free Trade Union Center, organized in March 1993 as a cooperative effort of fourteen "branch" unions. It claims 250,000 to 270,000 members, including forest workers, light industry, chemical industry, agricultural workers, and auto transport, railway and water transport workers. Many of the branch leaders are members of the LDLP -- as are many of the "captains of industry" running the enterprises that have not yet been privatized. The President of the Trade Union Center is Algirdas Kvedaravicius, and its office is at J. Basanaviciaus g. 29a, 2600 Vilnius, telephone 614888, fax 226106. (The Center now expects to regain control of former trade union property and may move.)

The Alliance of Lithuanian Trade Unions, headed by A. Sysas of the Metal Workers' Union, also stands on the Left of the Lithuanian political spectrum, cooperating with the Social Democratic Party of Lithuania. Participating unions include the local services' workers, communications workers, and radio and television workers. Alliance leaders insist that unions wishing to join their coalition must have clearly "reformed" themselves from their old ways and leadership. The Alliance publishes a xeroxed monthly entitled "Aktualijos" (Actualities). At the beginning of the summer of 1993, the Alliance was located in the parliament building, but it had orders to vacate the premises by July 1. I do not have its current address.

The leading opposition union is the Lithuanian Workers' Union (LWU), founded in 1989 as a counterforce to the heritage of the Soviet union structure. Its current chairperson is Aldona Balsiene, and its honorary president is Kazimieras Uoka, who was one of its founding fathers. The Landsbergis administration gave special attention to the LWU, in 1991 allowing it to take over the Trade Union House that had been taken away from the old union organizations. The LWU has also received considerable aid from American sources, including a printing press that is now publishing Lithuanian Worker: Lithuanian Workers' Union Information Bulletin (a monthly in both Lithuanian and English), and it also has a consulting arrangement with the University of Wisconsin School for Workers.

Balsiene has insisted that the LWU has pursued economic rather than political goals since 1991, but Uoka indicated to me that the LWU had begun to emphasize economic goals only in 1992. (The LWU hymn, entitled "The Flag [Dearest Colors]," illustrates the
organization's values.) Address: V. M.-Putino 5, 2600 Vilnius, Telephone 612858, Fax 615253. (In the redivision of former trade union property, the LWU may be hardpressed to hold on to its building.)

At its founding the LWU wanted to structure itself on a territorial basis, by region, rather than by branches, but recently it has agreed to include some branch-type organizations. The LWU's membership is the subject of dispute: Balsiene claims 100,000 members; Uoka speaks of 50,000 although he insists that 200,000 would take to the streets in the event of a strike; critics and cynics offer estimates ranging from a few hundred to 5-10,000. Uoka claims that in the atomic energy station in Visaginas (Snieckus) 400 workers belong to the LWU.

Allied with the LWU but nevertheless distinct is the Community of Lithuanian Trade Unions, headed by G. Paliokiene. Registered with the Ministry of Justice only on May 11, 1993, the group nevertheless participated in the agreement signed with Prime Minister Bronius Lubys on February 26. It is located at V. M.-Putino 5, the same address as the LWU.

A third force on the Right of the political spectrum is the Lithuanian Federation of Labor, an organization laying claim to the heritage of the Christian Democratic Federation of Labor (Darbo federacija) that had functioned in independent Lithuania before World War II. The group's president, Lionginas Radzevicius, admits that it has a small membership, numbering in the hundreds, but he explains that it wants to rally people devoted to Catholic ideals. Registered in 1992, the group has no office, but it hopes to regain the pre-World War II property of the Darbo federacija. For now Radzevicius runs it from his home, Zirmunus 48-25, 2051 Vilnius, telephone 737-944, fax 229351.

The remaining catch-all organization of unions is the "Trade Unions not Entering into Trade Union Centers," in whose name A. Gedgaudas signed the February 26 agreement with the Lithuanian government.

One more organization playing an important role in the trade union picture is the state agency for social insurance, known by its Lithuanian acronym "Sodra." Formally established in May 1991 it took over many of the functions administered in the past by trade unions --
health benefits, pensions, aid, unemployment compensation, etc. Financed by a 30% tax on the wage fund of enterprises, Sodra has developed into a mammoth organization about which union leaders complain bitterly. Its address is Ukmerges g. 12, 2600 Vilnius, telephone 354875, fax 229351.

The prospect that the government would redivide the property seized from the trade unions in 1990 was a major factor in bringing the competing union leaders to sit around a common table. As Kvederavicius described the process, they had an unwritten agreement not to talk about politics and not to argue about the past but rather to concentrate on current economic and social problems. In the summer of 1993 the maneuvering for position in the proposed redversion of property seemed to dominate the thoughts of most union leaders.

Some labor leaders predicted workers’ actions in the fall of 1993 -- Kazimieras Uoka predicted that there would be more activity in the fall, while Dainius Paukste of the local industry and service workers warned that winter would be "unusually difficult." Others, to be sure, thought that the Lithuanian national character militated against forceful action. Lithuanian workers have as yet displayed little zeal for strikes, as opposed to political demonstrations: the local industry and service workers struck and demonstrated in 1992 in protest over government plans to privatize their enterprises, and 1993 has seen strikes by teachers and by transport workers. No one could be sure of what would happen in the fall.

Political action seems assured: rumors abound of plans for mass meetings by the Rightist organizations, urging the workers to demonstrate against the government. The prospect of local strikes, as opposed to republican-wide strikes, seems to be the more likely. In any case, the workers of Lithuania have yet to recover from the consequences of a half-century of Soviet rule.

July 26, 1993
The Labor Scene in Lithuania, 1988-1993

Alfred Erich Senn

Introduction

Before the Lithuanian national movement became a public phenomenon in 1988, "the workers" were the "imagined community" to which the Soviet authorities appealed in seeking endorsement of their policies and practices. As the historian Henrikas Sadzius wrote in 1980, "The working class of Soviet Lithuania -- one of the detachments of the multinational working class of the Soviet Union -- passed through a long and complicated path of struggle until, led by the Communist Party, it prepared the conditions for socialist revolution in Lithuania and carried it through. The working class also played a decisive role in the creation of socialism in the republic. It is the leading force of our society in the period of developed socialism."¹ The Lithuanian Communist Party had itself given favored consideration to workers applying for membership.²

The image of "the workers" was so strong that when the Initiative Group of the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroika (Sajudis) emerged in June 1988, some skeptics declared that nothing would come of it because there were no "workers" among its members; the group consisted only of intellectuals. A conservative member of the group, the writer Vytautas Petkevicius, argued to the contrary that Lenin's dictum that "any cook could be a minister" was nonsense, but the image of the workers as the ruling class had established a deeper imprint on the minds of Soviet citizens than many realized.

At the same time, the mystique of a party that understood and resolved all conflicts in the "imagined community" of the Soviet system left the Lithuanian working class without a strong consciousness of its own interests. In 1988 the absence of private enterprise as a focus for action by workers facilitated the mobilization of "the nation" against Moscow's arbitrary rule.³ Soviet ideology had emphasized the "collective," and the new rulers of Lithuania took the basic structure of Soviet social thought while changing the content.

A study of the "workers" in Lithuania must therefore deal with the disestablishment of myths as well as consider the problems associated with uncertain lurches toward a market economy. The new political forces in Lithuania brought with them new social priorities, and the intellectual environment deeply affected both the position and practices of the workers as well as governmental policies concerning them.
Moscow's Appeal to the Lithuanian Workers

In dealing with Lithuania during the last years of the Soviet system, 1988-1991, Moscow failed to understand that its "workers' state" was collapsing along with its myths; it considered its problems to be the result of irrational behavior by the intelligentsia. To be sure, Mikhail Gorbachev at first evidenced some sympathy for the new currents. In August 1988 his advisor Aleksandr Iakovlev assured Lithuanian Communist Party leaders that "perestroika began as an intellectual explosion" and that it would have been impossible without the "forceful activity of the civic-minded intelligentsia." The intelligentsia, he argued, "is the expression of the self-consciousness of the people." Two months later, however, he retreated and denounced Sajudis leaders as "performers and musicians and people of this sort." Moscow henceforth considered the Lithuanian intelligentsia unreliable while believing that the working class naturally supported the Soviet center.

A corollary of the myth of the workers as "the leading force of our society" was the thought that national identity counted for little and that national peculiarities did not affect the essence of the political and social order. As Gorbachev himself declared in September 1989, "These problems have a general character, but in the conditions of our country they have acquired a national coloring." The "national question," Gorbachev and his supporters vainly argued, was not "the most important thing in life."

When the political Right in Moscow attacked Gorbachev and especially Iakovlev for having encouraged the Lithuanians, Gorbachev's camp insisted that the new national movements represented reactions to old failures of the central authorities. This again showed the center's belief that the national movements could be defeated by education. The Right perhaps showed less faith in the myth of "workers' state" in its insistence on stronger repressive policies, but in any case in Lithuania national consciousness overwhelmed "working class" consciousness.

When the authorities in Moscow decided to oppose the Lithuanians actively, they appealed to the "workers" of Lithuania, but when the Lithuanian workers rejected their calls, they sought to arouse national antagonism. As Vadim Bakatin, Gorbachev's last KGB chief, wrote, the KGB "stood at the source of the formation of the 'international fronts' in the union republics showing obstinacy toward the center." Here, as elsewhere, Soviet leaders, faced by crisis and challenge, actively contributed to the breakup of the Soviet system.
In Lithuania the "international front" took the form of a group called "Edinstvo." which "poured compliments on the working class." At its founding congress in May 1989, held in the Trade Union Building in Vilnius, however, the group lost much of its credibility. Shouting, "The Socialist fatherland is in danger," leaders came to pushing, shoving, and even blows as they fought each other for physical control of the stage. Their "internationalism" seemed far more concerned with denouncing the Lithuanians than with organizing workers.

On his visit to Lithuania in January 1990, Gorbachev tried to wean the workers from the errant intelligentsia, warning them against schemes hatched "in professorial circles." When he visited a fuel equipment plant in Vilnius, Lithuanian reports emphasized his challenge -- "Who wrote that for you?" -- to a worker with a sign demanding independence, but Russian commentaries insisted that he was communicating well with the workers. Gorbachev even pictured the workers as criticizing him for having encouraged too much freedom of discussion. The people, he concluded, "our people, both the workers and the peasants, throughout the country, the union, and here, must know what is what -- and let them decide, let them decide." Gorbachev denied that he was pitting "the intelligentsia against the working class": "I have already said that I cannot imagine the political process within a socialist country without the participation of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia. No, we must not only not set them against one another, but we must also not separate them... Our system enables the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia all to participate in the entire political process... My attitude toward the intelligentsia is well known... My dear young worker, consider everything and do not succumb too much to other people's blandishments." He kept returning to his theme that the Lithuanian "philosophers," i.e. the intellectuals, must trim their ideas to the demands of practical politics and pay more attention to "Communists, all the working people, representatives of all nationalities."

After the Lithuanian Supreme Council had announced the reestablishment of Lithuanian independence on March 11, the pro-Moscow forces in Lithuania at first stuck by the old formulas -- a rally in Vilnius on March 18, held under the leadership of the LCP-CPSU, proclaimed multi-national working class solidarity and demanded the formation of "workers' brigades" [druzhiny] to protect "socialist property" -- but Soviet authorities also called for strikes by Russian and Polish workers in protest against the Lithuanian government. When this move had proved inadequate, the Soviet military intervened directly, sending tanks rumbling...
through the city, dropping broadsides from helicopters, and seizing buildings claimed by the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

During Gorbachev’s blockade of Lithuania, extending from April to the end of June
1990, Moscow’s propaganda machine pictured the workers of Lithuania as supporting the
action. An odd statement in Moskovskaia pravda of April 6, 1990, allegedly an open letter
written by workers of the Vilnius factory for radio parts, repeated stock arguments about
Sajudis’s representing only a minority of the population of the republic, but it misspelled both
Russian and Lithuanian names that were prominent in Lithuania, thereby suggesting that it had
been written by someone not living in Lithuania. On April 18, as Gorbachev’s blockade of
Lithuania got under way, the Soviet army newspaper Krasnaia zvezda wrote of “the mood of
ordinary workers among whom the ‘political games’ of Mr. V. Landsbergis are evoking a lack
of faith in tomorrow.”

In January 1991 the Soviet authorities called out the Russian workers in Vilnius as a
battering ram. On January 8 workers marched on the Supreme Council and broke down the
front door in protest against a rise in prices. As the Soviet army moved to support a nebulous
Committee for the Salvation of Lithuania, Russian workers at Vilnius airport closed the facility
-- except of course for planes bringing in personnel from Moscow -- railroad workers closed
the train station in Vilnius, and workers at the atomic energy plant in Snieckus threatened to
close their facility. By January 14, after Moscow drew its military forces back, these work
actions dissolved, and the Committee for the Salvation of Lithuania, supposedly centered at a
Vilnius factory, vanished into thin air.

The Lithuanian workers had rallied to the tricolor flag of the republic; they tended to
identify their own future with that of the nation. A significant part of the Lithuanian working
class had been formed of persons returning in the late 1950s and 1960s from exile in Siberia,
who refused to live on collective farms and found intellectual careers closed to them; these
people bore the Soviet system no love. In addition, most Lithuanian workers still had extensive
ties with the countryside, and national solidarity prevailed over any other "imagined
community."

Russian and Polish workers presented more fertile ground for Gorbachev’s efforts.
Edinstvo leaders had risen from the ranks of workers in Lithuanian factories; impressionistic
accounts of their backgrounds indicate that they were for the most part recent immigrants or
even workers bussed in on a daily basis from Belorussia. With the collapse of Soviet rule, this
element disappeared, and the remaining workers seemed more ready to share the lot of their Lithuanian coworkers. Gorbachev's bid to win over the workers of Lithuania ended in fiasco, and he was left dependent on the military to assert his will.

"Restructuring" Lithuania

Gorbachev's policy of perestroika (restructuring) had stimulated local initiative to reexamine the institutions of the Soviet order -- including the trade union structure -- and had opened the way for the development of a new national consciousness. Soviet ideologists had argued that "socialist statehood," in the form of a union republic within the USSR, constituted a qualitatively higher form of political organization than "bourgeois [i.e. national] statehood." In 1989 and 1990, while the center clung to the idea of "socialist statehood," Lithuanian nationalists turned the theory on its head and endorsed "national statehood" as their goal.

In practice, under Soviet rule there had in fact been a "pragmatic" middle ground, and the intellectuals who created Sajudis in 1988 had come from it. Their first thoughts aimed at reform of the system, not its destruction. The pressure of the two extremes, however, pulled the group apart: while criticizing the explosion of national consciousness, Moscow began to write off the reformers as nationalists or at least dupes of the nationalists; the nationalists in Lithuania criticized the would-be "reformers" as dupes, tools, stooges, and even agents of Moscow. In the struggle, the supporters of "national statehood" prevailed, taking over first Sajudis and then the Lithuanian Supreme Council.

The decision of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, on March 11, 1990, announcing the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state, represented the triumph of the idea of "national statehood." The council refused to claim the right of secession under the Soviet constitution. This would have amounted to recognizing Soviet rule, and Soviet rule, the Lithuanians insisted, had in fact constituted occupation. With this, the political leaders in effect denounced the work of the "pragmatists" as collaboration with the occupation authorities. This action created institutional chaos in Lithuania as it challenged the legitimacy of all social and political institutions except the Supreme Council itself. The institutions of the Soviet order -- including the trade unions -- continued to function, but their futures remained in doubt.

The key issue became power -- who was in charge. Institutions were replaceable at the judgment of the people in power. Vytautas Landsbergis, the newly elected chairman of the Supreme Council, at one point admitted that the parliament probably did not have the
constitutional authority to be doing what it was doing -- on this occasion addressing a letter to the Soviet government -- but he explained, "We decided that for now the Supreme Council, though perhaps not the proper adekvatus organ, should act in such an important question as the most authoritative organ empowered by the people." A year later he repeated this thought: "In fact, one must evaluate democracy in relationship to the concrete situation -- what sort of people and their mutual relationships, how they relate to the laws of the land. The forms of administration and structure still really need improvement." Convinced that they represented the "will" of the Lithuanian people, the nationalist majority in the Supreme Council claimed the power to intervene in all the governmental and social organizations of the republic, including the trade unions.

Restructuring Lithuanian Trade Unions

Trade unions constituted fundamental building blocks of the Soviet system. An official account called them "the largest non-party social organization" in the Lithuanian SSR. "Workers, peasants, and employees" of all professions belonged to them, and the unions concerned themselves with "improvement of production, bettering working conditions, organizing socialist competition and the movement for communist labor, the daily life of working people and their families, social welfare, health, and organizing their recreation." The unions' supreme organ was the Congress of Trade Unions, and the congress's executive organ was the Republican Council of Lithuanian Trade Unions.

Some 80-90% of all workers and employees belonged to unions, and the unions wielded considerable control over their lives. Unions provided health insurance and gave vouchers for use of the sanitoria and resort homes; they also maintained libraries, theaters, and educational institutions. In Vilnius in 1989, trade unions contributed more to support cultural events than did the city itself. The union structure also played a major role in Lithuanian sports: physical exercise, it was argued, produced better workers and soldiers, and a passion for elite sport followed naturally from a program of mass physical culture. Legend had it that on the day after a major victory by the popular basketball team Zalgiris of Kaunas, representing the construction union, production improved throughout the republic.

In the old system, the trade unions had been "schools of communism." fostering unity in support of the Communist Party rather than representing the workers as an interest group. At any given enterprise, the trade union leader constituted the third member of the ruling
triumvirate, behind the director and the party secretary. (While some union leaders were
genuinely elected, many were second-level party officials who were out of favor with the
current party leadership.) In a collective with an exceptional number of young people, such as
a student group, the Komsomol secretary might outrank the trade union leader.\textsuperscript{19}

For trade union officials, the transition to the new order would prove to be very
difficult. In the first stage of "restructuring," 1988 to March of 1990, the old economic order
creakily tried to adjust. In its time, the Lithuanian Communist Party had made significant
efforts to promote Lithuanians to leading positions in the economy. Algirdas Brazauskas, who
became Party First Secretary in 1988, wrote in his memoirs, "They constantly criticized me in
Moscow: why out of a hundred factory directors, are 97 Lithuanians?"\textsuperscript{20} As a result of such
policies, a considerable number of Lithuanians sat in positions of economic power in 1989 and
1990, and therefore, although they claimed to be native, they nevertheless became targets of
nationalist reformers.

The trade unions almost immediately began to split along a variety of fault lines.
Sajudis supporters demanded changes, but the directions to be taken were not clear. Workers
might not want to be tied with intellectuals, or for that matter, intellectuals with workers.
Should unions be organized on shop, trade, or territorial principles? Should the unions
maintain a centralized structure? If not, what degree of decentralization might be possible?
The ultimate question was whether the old structure was worth saving in any form or should
workers create a completely new union structure?

The old leadership of the Republican Council of Lithuanian Trade Unions, elected in
January 1987, proclaimed its enthusiasm for change but moved at a glacial pace. Lionginas
Maksimovas, whom Moscow had earlier "designated" as chairman of the council, proclaimed
that "our inherent function is to protect the rights and interests of the working people" and
admitted that the unions had done the job inadequately in the past.\textsuperscript{21} The problem of breaking
with the old structure involved first of all undoing the strings tying them to Moscow, and then
undoing the strings through which the Communist Party had controlled their activities.\textsuperscript{22} Even
once these goals had been identified, government officials continued to sit in the meetings of
the council, and sounding like Gorbachev, Maksimovas urged workers to follow his lead while
he took a moderate position toward the activities of the Edinstvo organization.\textsuperscript{23}

In the spring and summer of 1989 Kazimieras Uoka, a bulldozer operator from Kaunas
with a degree in history, led the formation of a new group, the Lithuanian Workers’ Union
Uoka complained that Sajudis leaders had paid too little attention to the special needs and interests of the workers, and he described his organization as "not the representatives of the working class." but rather "delegates chosen by the workers themselves." He urged workers to use the potential of the intellectuals as advisors, and he insisted that in contrast to the spirit of cooperation pursued by the old trade unions, a workers' union must be opposed to the government. The LWU, he declared, "will find its place in the social-political life of the Republic."24

As approved at the founding congress on July 1, the LWU's program called for a 25% increase in wages of workers and employees, a higher official poverty level with improved pensions, a 50% bonus to workers toiling in dangerous conditions, vacations of 24 working days, more consumer goods and better food, limitation of the development of heavy industry, a final resolution of the housing problem, free trips to sanatoria, and criminal action against persons guilty of pollution.25

For the time being, the LWU cooperated with existing unions, but it quickly won positive publicity abroad as a new force on the trade union scene. At Uoka's urging, it supported the strike of Soviet coal miners during the summer of 1989, and in the fall Uoka himself came to the United States to receive an award from the AFL-CIO. There followed a series of moves by American labor and governmental authorities aiding the LWU, but the size of its membership has remained rather controversial. In the summer of 1993, Aldona Balsiene, its chairperson, puts its membership at 100,000, although Uoka, now its "honorary president," spoke of 50,000, at the same time insisting that in the event of a strike it could call out 200,000 workers. Critics, on the other hand, suggest numbers as low as a few thousand or even a few hundred.26 Nevertheless, the LWU has profited greatly from the support offered by Americans.

While the LWU was organized on territorial principles, uniting workers within a given region, the old Lithuanian trade union structure was breaking up into its constituent branches, such as the metal workers or local industry and service workers, which began to reorganize themselves independently of the Republican Council. (Sajudis support groups sprang up in almost all unions, but in many cases elections simply returned the old leadership to power.) Calling for general reorganization of the trade union structure, a plenary session of the 115 member council, meeting in January 1990, unseated Maksimovas and established the
Provisional Coordinating Committee of the Lithuanian Trade Union Movement, charging it with the task of convening a special congress of trade union representatives.

The transformation of the unions stumbled over the tensions with Moscow. In March 1990, when Gorbachev launched his attack against the Lithuanian declaration of independence, the Provisional Coordinating Committee denounced Moscow's efforts to "provoke unrest" in Lithuania and the group appealed "to the trade unions of the Soviet Union and of the world, to all people of good will, and to democratic movements," asking for support "against the use of force, this demonstration of military power." As Igor Sedykh reported in a Moscow Novosti agency dispatch of April 24, the Lithuanian economy seemed paralyzed, the threat of unemployment loomed, but somehow the population was lining up against Moscow.

On April 19-20, just as Gorbachev's blockade began, a trade union congress reorganized the union structure as the Confederation of Free Trade Unions of Lithuania. About 800 delegates proclaimed the end of the Trade Union Council and claimed its property. In the words of Lionginas Radzevicius, who was elected president of the confederation, the task of the unions was "to protect the physical and spiritual health of the person, to defend him." The concepts involved in forming free trade unions escaped many of the participants. Among other decisions, "employers" could no longer be members of the union at the same job site, but when Radzevicius spoke of protecting the "worker" from the "employer," a delegate asked: who was the employer and who was the employee on a collective farm? Others posed questions about property and workers' rights and obligations. Some questioned whether forming a "confederation" before the individual unions had established their own characters did not constitute putting the cart before the horse.

Additional controversy arose when Uoka warned that the meeting would not change the character of the old union structure but only the facade. The old structure seemed to be changing, but the breakup into branches was in fact only strengthening the power of the old leaders within each branch. The LWU accordingly refused to join the new Confederation.

The ten-week Soviet blockade struck heavily at the Lithuanian economy and hamstrung the unions, but the Lithuanians responded with shows of unity. As Brazauskas had told working class party members in April, there "can be no talk of going back on the decisions of March 11." The LWU supported the government and the idea of independence enthusiastically. The confederation, however, while supporting Lithuanian independence, also had other priorities. Even apart from political preferences, having just achieved their own
independence of the Communist Party, the group had no desire to take up the same old functions under a new government.

The new administration in Lithuania would have nothing to do with the shibboleths and formulas of old, but it raised its own new set of demands. In April 1990, when Uoka insisted that the new Minister of Social Protection should have the endorsement of the LWU, Aloyzijus Sakalas, a Social Democrat, declared, "I would not want to juxtapose workers against peasants, intellectuals, and employees. Therefore, I would think, to single out the working class would be an obsolete model." Uoka did not pursue his point. The political Right insisted that the Lithuanians must be mobilized for the confrontation with Moscow, and in the summer of 1990 the slogan, "Independence first, then democracy," became fashionable.

On July 27 the Right carried its offensive against the old trade union structure into the parliament, proposing that the state take over trade union property and use it to help the new union organizations. Picketers outside the parliament denounced this "nationalization" of trade union property, insisting that their dues had gone into the purchase and construction of the property. Counterdemonstrators carried signs saying, "We greet the first picketing by bureaucrats." Aleksandras Abisala, speaker of the parliament, stopped to argue with the picketers, insisting that there was "no nationalization, no dissolution of the trade unions, no confiscation or anything like that," but as one reporter wrote, this was "not the best place for clarifying such serious problems."

Sponsors of the bill argued that the property in question really belonged to the state, and therefore they were simply calling things by their right name. "The state never nationalizes its own property," declared the bill's rapporteur, Liudvikas Rasimavicius. This, he went on to assure the deputies, was not a "crusade" against the old unions, but he insisted that international practice condemned closed shops with check-offs of union dues. Uoka spoke of his meetings with international labor officials and of how the American labor leader Lane Kirkland had slapped him on the back and told him to go ahead.

Although the bill had the endorsement of the Supreme Council's Presidium, it had not been discussed by the appropriate parliamentary commissions although its sponsors had sought the advice of the new unions. Nor had there been any detailed study of the actual source of funding of each piece of property; there was general agreement, it was argued, that all the property belonged to the state. After heated and confusing debate, the deputies referred the bill to committees.
The bill came back to the parliament on July 30, and heated debate resumed. Trade union defenders carried reprints of international agreements on union rights and also copies of Radzevicius's speech, dated July 26, in which he insisted that governments must not interfere in the functioning of trade unions. They were ready to agree to the inventory of union property but demanded that the unions keep property "created with the contributions of their members or by other legal means." The radicals, on the other hand, failed in an effort to add to the preamble the sentence "The trade unions were called a school of communism, and for that the communist government let them divide up and appropriate state property." The bill finally passed by a vote of 86-10 with ten abstentions.

In its final form, the act read, "Trade unions functioning in the Lithuanian SSR, collecting compulsory workers' payments sanctioned by the state, represented the ruling state partocratic system and not the interests of the people of Lithuania. Such trade unions were governmental and not social organizations. Clinics, sanitaria and other wealth were constructed from the funds collected in their name and from government contributions. These cannot be the property of just one group or association of people, since they belong to all the people of Lithuania. Part of this wealth should be transferred to newly arising or newly founded professional associations." Therefore the government had to inventory such property, and pending completion of the process of review, the property could not be released to any other juridical or physical persons. The parliament also banned check-offs of dues and declared that "dues of union members can be collected only by the free will of the members." Inventorization of trade union property proved to be a more difficult task than expected. The leadership of the Trade Union Confederation resisted, and a member of the inventorization commission later compared his task to that of NATO investigators seeking out Saddam Hussein's secrets in Iraq. Nevertheless the parliament persisted in its campaign, and after the Right had succeeded in putting one of its own, Gediminas Vagnorius, in the post of Prime Minister, the government pursued a still more confrontational policy with the old unions.

Contributing significantly to the campaign against the unions was a new agency for Social Insurance, known by its Lithuanian acronym "Sodra." Conceived already in February 1990 before the Sajudis era and formally established in May 1991, Sodra administered health services, unemployment compensation, pensions, vouchers for trips to resorts, and other benefits that had previously been in the domain of the trade unions. (Employers contributed
30% of their wage funds to Sodra.) The agency grew quickly into a massive structure, and its functioning reduced the potential of the unions. The government itself struck hard at the unions. In July 1991 it allowed the LWU to move into the Cultural House of the former Trade Union Council, and in January 1992 it evicted the Trade Union Confederation from the Trade Union Building adjoining the parliament building. When Marijonas Visakavicius, Radzevicius's successor as the head of the Confederation, signed an agreement with Russian trade union leaders asserting the confederation's claim to former trade union property, he was accused of being a Judas. Under attack, the old union structure disintegrated. As head of the confederation, Radzevicius tried to maintain the old structure while breaking with Moscow and removing the old party nomenklatura from posts of leadership. Branch unions began to drop out of the system, and in November 1990, Radzevicius was forced out of office. His replacement, Visakavicius, a worker from the chemical plant Azotas in Jonava, had no better success in dealing with the branch leaders, and in January 1992 he too had to leave office. The unions in general were unable to find a new basis for cooperation until after the parliamentary elections in the fall of 1992.

At the same time, union membership dropped drastically. By 1993, in the estimate of one union leader, some two-thirds of the working people saw no reason to belong to a union, and the activity of local unions varied accordingly. Many enterprises had no functioning trade union; with dues now voluntary, most workers paid none. In the Vilnius Electrical Measurement Devices Factory, on the other hand, 85% of the workers belonged to the union (a branch of the Metal Workers Union) because its leadership aggressively pursued a policy of benefits for its members. On the whole, the picture of trade union activity was bleak.

**Government Economic Programs and the Workers**

In 1988-1990 the "workers" [darbininkai] of Lithuania generally followed the lead of Sajudis. According to Lithuanian sociological surveys, "workers" constituted ten percent of the mass gathering in Vingis Park on July 9, 1988. At the Sajudis Constituent Congress, they constituted twenty percent, 202 of the 1021 delegates. According to a survey made in December 1988 to January 1989, one-quarter of the workers questioned listed "Lithuania's sovereignty" as the question about which they were most concerned, another quarter listed "daily life," twenty percent said "economics," and seventeen percent said "ecological
questions." Thirty-one percent at that time listed Vytautas Landsbergis, the leader of Sajudis, as one of their favorite political leaders, and 30% named Brazauskas. Of the eight figures who received the strongest support among workers, only Brazauskas, the popular party leader, had not been a member of the Initiative Group that founded Sajudis.40

When Sajudis leaders formed their own government in March 1990, the first Prime Minister was Kazimiera Prunskiene, an economist who had spent considerable time studying ideas of economic transformation from the Soviet system. She conceived of a program somewhere between the "shock therapy" advocated by American visitors and the "step-by-step" approach advocated by conservative economists in Lithuania. Given the circumstances of 1990, however, she had little opportunity to put her ideas into practice before being forced out of office at the beginning by the January events that culminated in the violent actions of Soviet troops.

It fell to the cabinet of Gediminas Vagnorius, Prime Minister from January 1991 to July 1992, to direct the economy into independence. He promised rapid privatization, restitution of property seized by the Soviet authorities, and the breakup of the collective farms. One of his major concerns was price reform, which he called "the fundamental impulse for the Lithuanian economy moving to market relations." As he explained, "the deformed policy of prices and excessive money created a general shortage of goods and replaced trade by natural exchange, allotment and division of goods." The government would gradually allow government-controlled prices to rise to meet market prices.

The government's wage policy was a function of its price policy, but "wages, pensions, aid, and other payments should rise before prices." As prices rise, Vagnorius predicted, "the income of profit-seeking subjects will grow rapidly," and "funds designated for salaries will also increase significantly." Left uncontrolled, this would work to the disadvantage of workers in government and non-profit institutions, and therefore, he declared, the government will raise payments to match wages in private enterprises. Once prices have stabilized, "such compensation to public employees will be ended."

The government, he declared, would make a special effort to improve the position of people "below the poverty line," and it would pay less attention to those above that level: "That should weaken and stabilize inflation." The government would also provide more extensive social services to the poor. "A new minimum wage has been set and the pay of government workers has been increased." The government would furthermore establish a Cost
of Living Index in order to track the course of prices and the minimum cost of living. "When
prices rise," he promised, "workers' wages, pensions, and other regular payments will rise
faster."

At the same time he warned workers that "unemployment will grow in the transition to
the market. Some will have to retrain." In the interests of regulating the job market, the
government established a Lithuanian employment office [darbo birza] in the Ministry of Social
Welfare to help unemployed find new jobs or to retrain and also set up an employment fund to
help create jobs. Workers losing their jobs would receive compensation for six months.41

Despite the government’s promises, the Lithuanian economy deteriorated, in no small
part due to the destruction wrought by the Soviet blockade and by Soviet military violence.
The blockade of 1990 brought the first unemployment: by the middle of June Vilnius radio
reported that 18,200 persons were not working and another 22,000 had taken vacations earlier
than planned. As of August 21, 1990, 50,631 persons were reported to be unemployed, 28,000
in the city, 22,000 in the countryside. Through 1990 and 1991 economic production in
Lithuania fell as Gorbachev himself worked to weaken the traditional markets that the
Lithuanians had served in the East.

In 1992 the inflation rate became catastrophic. A decline in production limited wages,
and prices soared. The Vagnorius cabinet hindered the rationalization of industrial production
by prohibiting large enterprises from firing workers for a period of three months, and it broke
up the collective farms. A drought in the summer of 1992 added to the disruption. The
government long ignored the problem -- "it was not in fashion to talk about an antiinflationary
policy in Lithuania," wrote one journalist.42 In October 1992 the government introduced a
provisional national currency, the talonas (coupon), in place of the Russian ruble, but this had
little effect on inflation.

Prime Minister Aleksandras Abisala (July to November 1992) tried to slow inflation by
freezing wages and pensions. Having received a month's warning of the order, enterprises
raised wages, but the freeze struck hard at the so-called "budget" workers, i.e. those dependent
on the government budget for their pay. (By the end of 1992 private enterprise comprised
some 22% of the national economy.) Rising energy prices wrought further havoc, and the
government ignored a promise to raise wages if inflation in November exceeded 14% (the
actual figure was 29%).
Critics insisted that the government had no anti-inflationary policy. Prunskiene, who elsewhere voiced a variety of suspicions about Vagnorius, said of his stewardship, "It might be difficult for a layman to distinguish between what Gediminas Vagnorius did out of incompetence and what he did consciously seeking to ruin Lithuania’s economy, because the general result was social and political chaos." The privatization program, she argued, had made no distinction between the needs and possibilities of large as opposed to small enterprises. The policy of "restitution of property" also interfered with privatization. She considered the government’s wage, price, and tax policies a fiasco.43

At the end of 1992 and the beginning of 1993, Lithuania reported only some 30,000 unemployed but behind that figure lay much higher hidden unemployment, concealed by part-time work, forced vacations, and low wages. (A report in July 1993 spoke of 30,000 officially unemployed and 100,000 persons seeking employment.) A part of the population, to be sure, thrived: a Mercedes dealership could open in Vilnius, but most workers saw their wages go almost entirely for daily needs. At that they might not receive their pay on time; enterprises might well not have the necessary cash on hand to pay their workers. (Bank transfers and checks were unknown practices.) Discussions of expenditures had to revolve around choosing what bills to pay rather than thoughts of discretionary purchases. By the beginning of 1993, an estimated 70% of the population lived below the poverty level, and the inflation ravaged the life savings of the older generation.44

A pattern had evolved in which workers clung to their jobs, accepting low wages in exchange for the security of work. Even when a collective assumed ownership of a privatized enterprise, its members might well indicate more concern about saving their jobs than about making production more efficient. Employers, on the other hand, were loath to fire workers because of the high costs of severance pay; instead, the employers had an interest in keeping wages low so that workers might leave their jobs at their own volition. The system fairly screamed for reform.

A Profile of the People of Lithuania, 1988-1990

According to the Soviet census of 1989, Lithuania had 3.675 million inhabitants, 79.6% of them Lithuanians, 9.4% Russians, and 7% Poles. By 1993 these figures had changed: Lithuanians constituted 80.6% of an estimated 3.737 million inhabitants, Russians had declined by almost 19,000 persons to 8.7% of the population, and Poles had risen by 4,800 to 7.1%.
The other major national groups -- Belorussians, Jews, and Ukrainians -- all declined a tenth of a percent in their proportion of the republic's population.45

In 1989 some 68% of the population of Lithuania lived in the cities (as opposed to just 39% in 1959). In 1990 and 1991 the rural population declined, but in 1992 and 1993 it began to grow, constituting 31% of the population at the beginning of 1993. Although the urban population had a lower birthrate than the countryside, 14.6/1000 as opposed to 16.1, it also had a lower deathrate, 8.0 to 15.2, and therefore it had a significantly higher natural growth. The rural population was on the average older than the cityfolk, the men 35.5 to 31.3, the women 40.7 to 35.2. The percentage of pensioners in the countryside was almost twice as high as in the city.

The difficult conditions of life in 1988-1993 had a devastating effect on life expectancies. In 1989 women constituted 52.6% of the population and had an average lifespan of 76.6 years as opposed to the men's average of 67.7. By 1993, the death rate came to exceed the birth rate in the republic. The average lifespan for men declined by 1992 to 65.1 years, but the lifespan for women remained at just over 76. (Some 70% of pensioners were women.) Most of the increase in deaths came among people of "working age," defined as 15 to 60.

In 1989 there were 1.6 million persons in the cities and 526,000 in the countryside of working age; 1.36 million city dwellers (including pensioners and underage children) and 506,000 countrypeople were actually working (over 70% in "material production"). About 75% of all workers worked for "state and social enterprises and organizations." Industry employed about 22% of the labor force. 374,000 persons (164,700 of them women) -- 199,900 (99,900 women) working at machines, 128,700 (63,300 women) working with their hands without machines, and 45,400 (1,500 women) in repair work; construction employed 107,800 persons (9,500 of them women). Women, who constituted 53% of the labor force, were particularly strongly represented in industry, in "trade and food industry" (78,400 of the 93,900 employees), and in "daily service of the population" (23,500 of 37,500 workers).

In 1989 the typical household budget assigned just under 30% to food -- the figure was of course higher for lower incomes, lower for higher incomes -- 35% for "nonfood goods," 17% for clothes, 9% for services, 4% for alcohol (higher for lower incomes), and 10% for taxes. The average person consumed 84 kilos of meat per year, 454 kilos of milk products, 154 kilos of potatoes, 109 kilos of bread products, and 47 kilos of sugar. Lithuanians
consumed an estimated 3400 calories per day. In March 1989 there were 99 radios and 108 television sets (half of them colored) for every 100 families, 94 refrigerators or freezers, 75 washing machines, 39 cars, and just one VCR. Urban dwellers were more likely than country dwellers to maintain savings accounts in the banks by a ratio of 4.5-1, but the rural account was on the average larger, 2,773 rubles to 2,439 at the end of 1989.

By 1993 the distribution of the typical household budget had changed drastically. In April 1993, as a result of inflation in 1992-1993, 67% of an urban household’s disposable income went for food -- food prices had risen by 7600% since 1989. As a result of another sudden price rise at the beginning of April, the consumption of meat dropped 10% from just March to April. The consumption of milk byproducts, vegetables and fruits also dropped, while the consumption of potatoes rose. Another 20% of the household budget went for other consumer goods, such as clothes and shoes, and the remaining went for services.46

The decline in the standard of living, the decline in urban population, and the decline in the life expectancy of men all reflected growing economic problems. From 1989 to 1992 the GDP of Lithuania halved: industry declined by 55%, agriculture by 39%, animal husbandry by 38%. The period of 1989 to March 1993 saw an inflation of almost 10,000%; real income declined by 74%; pensions and aid programs had risen from 11% of total income in 1989 to 18% at the end of 1992; only two percent of the population could say that life had improved for them. According to government figures, which even some officials referred to as "rosy," the average take-home pay in May 1993 was an estimated 12,700 talons (coupons), while in March an arbitrary "minimal standard of living" had been set at 2210 coupons and a "real standard of living" at 8136 coupons.47

In "objective" terms, Lithuanian workers had much cause for complaint in 1993, yet they remained curiously inactive. According to a doctor who was treating psychological problems among the unemployed, "The stereotypical thought of 'homo soveticus' lingers among us to this day. We calculate that, having received a diploma and a workplace, it is enough to sit out the hours at work and everything will be fine." To combat the problems of daily life, he suggested things like "cold showers," exercising every morning, eating vitamins. The fundamental problem, as he saw it, would seem to be "By nature our people are lazy." In conclusion he noted that people were becoming "increasingly apathetic toward the authorities... especially older people." Older people faced the choice of paying for food or for housing, and among younger people one could see a growing desire to emigrate.48
Prospects

In the years 1990 to 1992, the Landsbergis-Sajudis administration in Lithuania had campaigned against the trade union structure left behind by the Soviet system and had thereby hindered the development of new unions. (To be sure, as in the case of its dissatisfaction with the Lithuanian Journalists' Union, the Landsbergis administration fostered the formation of more friendly organizations, in this case the Lithuanian Journalists' Society.) On the one hand the centralized traditions of the Soviet system had established an expectation that the authorities would look out for the citizens, and on the other the administration had taken away from the unions many of the weapons by which they could have rallied the workers. As a result, trade union policies seemed to revolve around questions of property, and "the workers," rallying to support national independence, undertook almost no collective actions on their own behalf.

The trade unions began a new era after elections in the fall of 1992 had returned to power the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party (LDLP), the successor to the Lithuanian Communist Party that had broken with Moscow in 1989 and 1990. The new government, headed by Acting President Algirdas Brazauskas and Prime Minister Bronius Lubys, showed considerably more readiness to work with the trade unions that had survived the turmoil of the last several years, and on February 26, 1993, after Brazauskas had been elected President of Lithuania, Lubys signed an agreement with representatives of six union centers and organizations, recognizing their right to negotiate on behalf of their members.49

In March 1993 two trade union alliances agreed to form the Lithuanian Free Trade Union Center, uniting fourteen branch unions with a total of 250,000 members and claiming to represent seventy percent of all trade union members in the republic. Algirdas Kvedaravicius, who had been head of the Trade Union Confederation became the chairman.

Kvedaravicius made clear his resentments about the past several years. Speaking about government policies in 1990 and 1991, he declared, "Whoever agreed with the government and supported its baseless economic reform got donations of millions, as Vagnorius gave the Workers' Union." The government had not seen fit to negotiate with the trade unions, and therefore employers dealt with them arbitrarily. As a result of this economic anarchy, he complained, "over half the economy is working illegally," adding, "In the course of three years there was not one rational person who could correctly foresee the path of economic and social reform." He committed his center to work with the government, and in turn he expected the government to consult and cooperate with the unions.50
The government itself had little room to maneuver now. Adolfas Slezevicius, who became Prime Minister in March 1993, spoke of raising wages but quickly discovered that restrictions imposed by the international Monetary Fund severely limited his use of credits obtained from abroad. He agreed to establishing a grievance procedure for communications between his government and the unions, and in the spring the parliament, dominated by the LDLP, agreed to restore property to the unions or at least to compensate them for their losses.

The prospect of a redivision of the trade union property helped to bring union leaders to meet together. As Kvederavicius described it, they had an unwritten agreement not to talk about politics and not to argue about the past but rather to concentrate on current economic and social problems. In the summer of 1993 the maneuvering for position in the proposed redivision of property seemed to dominate the thoughts of most union leaders.

The politics of the trade unions ran across the political spectrum of the republic. The Trade Union Center, many of whose leaders were former members of the LCP and the LDLP, had committed itself to working with the government. The Alliance of Lithuanian Trade Unions, which included the metalworkers and local industry and service workers, worked most closely with the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party. On the right the LWU set itself in opposition to the government: as Uoka put it, it had been difficult for the union to oppose the rightist government headed by Landsbergis and Vagnorius, but the task was easier now that the LDLP was in power. The Federation of Labor advocated Catholic values but was not clearly tied to the Christian Democratic Party.

At the same time, underneath the organizational surface, some rumblings of labor unrest could be heard. On April 2, on the occasion of general European demonstrations in favor of the right to work, speakers representing the Workers' Union attacked government policies, and a mob besieged the parliament, denouncing the government and shouting, "Communists out!" On May 25, another mass demonstration surrounded the parliament building and demanded firmer government action to improve wages and to oppose unemployment.

Two strikes in May threatened trouble for the government, but they both failed for lack of general support. A teachers' strike in Vilnius, called without a strike vote and poorly organized, failed in the face of determined government opposition and criticism of the thought that teachers could strike. A three-week strike by transportation workers in Klaipeda presented more of a threat to the authorities, but in the end, it, like the teachers' strike, was declared illegal. Lithuania as yet had no strike law, but it did have an establishing procedure for settling
grievances, and the courts declared that on both occasions the strikers had not properly appealed to this channel.

As of the summer of 1993, no one could be sure of the future actions of the workers. The unions had yet to win the respect and loyalty of the workers. Some labor leaders predicted workers' actions in the fall of 1993; others declared that the Lithuanian national character militated against forceful action. In any case the workers of Lithuania had yet to recover from the consequences of a half-century of Soviet rule.
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