Valiušaitis

Controversy over his appointment
https://www.lrt.lt/naujienos/lietuvoje/2/1218603/valiusaicio-paskyrimas-i-naujas-pareigas-papiktino-ir-istorikus-ir-zydu-bendruomene

date of publication 2020.08.26
content:
Jewish community
"We remind that in the publications of the last few years V. Valiušaitis deliberately distorted and provided the public with untrue facts regarding the anti-Semitic actions of the LAF and the Provisional Government. Even more - p. Valiušaitis essentially denied the conclusions of the Commission of the Republic of Lithuania for the Investigation of Nazi and Soviet Crimes, which clearly stated about the anti-Semitic views of the above-mentioned organizations and their leadership and actions directed against Lithuanian Jews, ”the Lithuanian Jewish community said in a statement.

"The Lithuanian Jewish community does not support the appointment of a public supporter of anti-Semitism in Lithuania, whose essence contradicts V. Valiušaitis' public view - a person publicly defending anti-Semites who directly or indirectly contributed to the extermination of Lithuanian Jews should not be considered a candidate for any office , which is basically called to impartially investigate the manifestations, ideology and crimes of the genocide in Lithuania related to the massacres, ”says the Lithuanian Jewish community.

They also point out that the presence of such staff in the LGGRTC raises questions about the institution’s independence from staff manipulating history.
According to the job description published on the LGGRTC website, V. Valiušaitis curates the centre's website, analyzes public relations publications about the centre's activities, represents the center in relations with other institutions on behalf of the LGGRTC director, etc.
Historians
“Such information was spread until a new manager was appointed. As a result, the community of historians was very skeptical that it could become a state policy, some tendencies that are so personal, but not based on research, ”A. Streikus told the LRT.lt portal.

storyteller Nerijus Šepetys also criticized the decision to appoint V. Valiušaitis to the position of advisor to the head of the center. According to N. Šepetis, the name LGGRTC alone betrays that the center is first and foremost a research institution.
"Unfortunately, the Seimas, dominated by a political force that specifically looks at science and understands science, has appointed a person to this position who does not really stand out in any way within the limits of the Centre's competence," commented N. Šepetys.
“Dear V. Valiušaitis, during all the years of Independent Lithuania, he has been very active in the field of history, especially in the field of perpetuating the history of freedom struggles, but in a sense his activities are completely opposite to scientific research. <...> Under normal circumstances, the study of history is not a struggle and not a romantic glorification of real or supposed heroes, a whitening of their uniform.
The absolute majority of the World War II and post-war researchers and specialists I know are very skeptical about the publications of the respected V. Valiušaitis and especially about the activities of historical policy, ”said N. Šepetys.
Valiušaitis:

Asked about the statement of the Lithuanian Jewish community, V. Valiušaitis said that he had to read the document and he noticed that no one had signed the statement.

"Nobody dared to put their signature, to introduce themselves, on whose behalf it is spoken. It is anonymous, which is a relic of the totalitarian regime, which, unfortunately, is also used in independent Lithuania, although it should not be, ”said V. Valiušaitis.
"I am not afraid of any historian or any other person who would go and deny my facts. <...> No one has denied my facts, just for some reason I don’t like it, someone doesn’t like it. But you deny the facts, all my texts are open, the books available. Deny the facts, not blame for some non-existent things broken from your finger. <...>
I haven't taken any steps here yet. If I make any decision, there is a matter-of-fact criticism when it comes to evaluating actions, words, decisions, resolutions. Then I realize that a mistake can be made. But here is a complete ad hominem blow, below the bar. This is what you can discuss and consider, ”V. Valiušaitis told the portal LRT.lt.
Let's examine whether the Lithuanian Jewish community and historians who doubt V. Valiušaitis' suitability to work at LGGRTC are right.

https://slaptai.lt/vidmantas-valiusaitis-insinuacijos-j-luksai-daumantui-del-holokausto-lyg-padegtas-siaudu-kulys/

Date publication 2020-07-10

content content evaluation:

Paragraph 1
a) Valiušaitis calls a historian an army analyst, a public relations specialist. A. Ūsienė. Here is her popular description found in the internet: "Auksė Ūsienė is an analyst of the Strategic Communication Department of the Lithuanian Armed Forces, who has been working in the field of propaganda recognition, publicity and civil resistance for more than six years, lecturing the public on information, hybrid war." understanding of history.
b) A. The content of the foreign record is propaganda, in no way related to the scientific understanding of history.
c) the content is reminiscent of agitated incitement against people criticizing the country’s policy of historical memory.
d) In the post without arguments, we try to a belittle two people R. Vanagaitė and E. Zuroff who deserve history problems, research and their popularization because they have criticized the Historical Memory Policy measure and it is in a country where The constitution of which provides: Article 33
... “Citizens are guaranteed the right to criticize the work of state institutions or officials, to appeal against their decisions. Prosecution for criticism is prohibited. "

Paragraph 2
Valiušaitis calls the disagreement with the policy of historical memory policy J. Lukša's proclamation of the year an "anti-Lithuanian propaganda attack", such assessments of the official restrict academic discussions.

Paragraph 3
V. Valiušaitis calls the disclosure of information unfavorable to the reputation of A. Ramanauskas -

Vanagas during his year “dirt spill” showing intolerance of a different opinion and inability to discuss tolerantly.

Paragraph 4
Valiušaitis teaches the motivations for writing an article, it could be called a controversy, but he does not indicate with whom he is arguing, so it is impossible to check or correctly present the opponent's position.

Paragraph 5
Valiušaitis promises to tell what he knows about J. Lukša 's connections with the Holocaust (although it is not clear, maybe just what he knows about J. Lukša.

Paragraphs 6-10 write about the family of J. Lukša's wife, their participation in rescuing Jews. It is not very clear what this has to do with J. Lukša's position, because when the Jews of Kaunas were killed. They met and got married already after the Second World War and not in Lithuania. Valiušaitis's assumption that "Nijolė would never have married the killer if at least the slightest shadow of suspicion had passed to her" is not substantiated by any indications that she knew in detail about J. Lukša's activities in 1941. The emphasis that the Bražėnai family were Christians is still null and void because the absolute majority of Lithuanian Jewish murderers were Christians, most Catholics.

Paragraphs 11-13 deal with the belittling of J. Mealamed. It is said that
"In that" Melamed list ", practically all the most prominent persons who led or more actively manifested themselves in the Lithuanian anti-Soviet and anti-national resistance are listed. Embrace, among other things, the scariest epithets. Without any facts or justification. Just: that's what the author looked like. "
it should simply be borne in mind by the historian that J. Melamed and a number of members of his association were witnesses to the Holocaust. Lithuania was unable to obtain the sources of their investigation because the tactic of threatening witnesses was chosen instead of scientific discussion or tactics of criminal investigation. It is a wrong methodology for a historian to reject the opinion of a witness of events without serious arguments.

Paragraph 14 The author rejects A. Ramanauskas and J. Lukša's connections with the Holocaust and conceals widely known facts - A. Ramanauskas according to his service sheet belonged to the National Labor Protection in Druskininkai until August 1941. This formation has committed a number of Holocaust-related crimes in the conclusions of the commission investigating the crimes of the occupation regimes. Ramanauskas' connections with those crimes are, no matter how unattractive to Valiusaitis, the historian's duty not to forget them. J. Lukša has fewer connections, but there is, one of them he left Kaunas prison together with the murderers raging in the garage, so it does not mean that he was there, but it is possible to suspect and we do not know or did not have J. The compilers of the Melamedlist also have other testimonies of interfaces.

In paragraph 15, he refers to a critical list of LGRTC employees. Well, Valiušaitis is loyal to the center, only forgot to mention that the center was not able to publish its list, admitted that there are over a thousand names on their list, but no one can verify their conclusions. Work like J. Melamed is not verified by scientific methods. There is no basis for criticizing Mr Melamed's list on the basis

of the LGGRTC 'list', all the more so as Mr Melamed's list contains real surnames and it is possible to try to find data on the persons mentioned in it in other sources. There are no surnames in the LGRTC list…

Paragraph 16 with cited source and Ch. Bargman, however, the link does not contain Bargman's statement that the list is "nonsense." Just Valiušaitis demonstrates his tendency to quote unfairly. In addition, the statement contains a number of anti-Semitic statements.

Paragraph 17 refers to where Mr Melamed's list can currently be found and states that the list "caused damage". This is not a scientific assessment. The list became a starting point and this prompted the LGGRTC to undertake research, sparking a whole series of discussions with a larger or smaller scientific context. I don't know why Valiušaitis calls it "damage"

Paragraph 18 is a rather banal methodological insight into history, one can only regret that Valiušaitis himself does not apply them in his essay.

Paragraphs 19 - 20 give a derogatory comment on Menasch Chien, Kostas Šmigelskis and Edvardas Uldukis.
"There can be no doubt that those 'guilt' would have been happily blamed on him if there had been at least the slightest reason to do so." a lot.

20 highly appreciates A. Anušauskas' fiction (it is true that the author is often called a historian), the film script and the book written according to it. To compare two propaganda historical works written on historical topics and to draw historical conclusions from it, hardly a scientific method

Paragraphs 21-24 discuss the work of A. Anušauskas and the stories contained in it as how the KGB ‘did not investigate’ the garage massacre. Maybe Valiušaitis forgot his assumption about the propaganda significance of the garage massacre for the Soviets? It would be scientific to correct your assumption if there is evidence to refute it.

Paragraph 25
mentioning the skeptical attitude of the Holocaust people in Washington towards Anušauskas' "research" only again, as these people remain anonymous and it is not possible to verify whether Valiušaitis expresses their position honestly.
At the end, a few paragraphs promise to write a sequel to that article.

An examination of the first part of these articles leads to the following conclusions. For Valiusaitis, public relations is much more important than history. His way of analyzing historical events and the works of other authors on the specified topic is not scientific, he does not always quote honestly, without discussion he gives references to anti-Semitic sources, Valiusaitis's assumptions are not supported by the facts presented. Moreover, the assessment of some facts contradicts the conclusions of the authoritative scientific commission to investigate Nazi crimes. The accusations of the Jewish community and historians are correct.