

Translation from:

<http://www.lrytas.lt/-13011232231300281464-fašistuojantys-demonstrantai-rimta-lietuvos-ateities-problema.htm>

Fascist Demonstrators: A Real Problem for Lithuania's Future

by Mečys Laurinkus

26 March 2011

The fascist demonstration of March 11 was provided with the use of the capital's Gedimino Prospect, while those protesting the economic policies of the government are given remote, fenced-in sites that are guarded like ghettos.

Neo-Nazi marches are nothing new in the EU, and at the least their patriarchs can take pride that the ideas of the new Aryans have begun to sprout in the soil of the EU newcomers.

The worn-out thoughts of the fascist characters in the Vilnius march, however, sounded somewhat different than they did when once upon a time the followers of Mindaugas Murza bore them on primitive signs. The reaction by the government was also different.

Conservative member of parliament K. Uoka, pretender to the role of ideologue and one of the marchers, was the most frank in stating: "Whatever they say about the march, it won't be possible to ignore this phenomenon in the future."

The conservative is right, Lithuania really will have many serious problems in the future, if not because of a politician seeking a new niche of activity for himself, then because of extreme nationalism.

K. Uoka is of those social movements which do not beat around the bush. He is a specialist and a master of this sport, and knows the audience that he is addressing.

That's why, without ceremony, he told the artist A. Vinokuras, of Jewish origins, sitting right next to him that Jews rule the world. And with the sincerity of a Kaunasite this is how he concluded his exposition of his views: "We are not against traditional ethnic communities, but we don't want new immigration."

This is much more serious than celebrating Hitler's birthday. And the listeners are different. The supporters are more serious, too.

It wasn't very long ago at all that philosopher A. Juozaitis, who spoke to three sisters who do not communicate back during the time of Sajudis [Lithuanian independence movement] about his resolve to follow the example of R. Kalanta [who immolated himself in protest against Soviet rule], spoke from the tribunal of the Baltic Assembly about Islam's threat to Europe.

Conservative K. Uoka expressed a similar position on the skinhead "culturalists" [probably "subculture"] who led the march and who in their spare time when they're not perfecting their patriotic feelings work as loan collectors: "I would like there to be more culture in the marches." ["I would like the marches to be more cultured."]

Without applying it directly to Uoka or any other specific person I know, the situation itself reminds me of the camp doctor portrayed in Balys Sruoga's [book] *In the Forest of the Gods*: "Not only did he not beat, he didn't swear. In two years he never uttered a single profane word, which was certainly unlike an SS officer. He quietly covered for all of the homicides of the camp in his name."

The cultured politicians of Lithuania, watching the fascist march while they themselves stood on the sidewalk, subtly but approvingly waving white gloves, knew what was going on in the middle of the street, what the attempt to justify "Lithuania for Lithuanians" with empty arguments signify, and how that ended, when housewives once upon a time applauded the brownshirts.

The ruling party, Homeland Union/Lithuanian Christian Democrats, also condemned the appearance of the “higher race” in the center of Vilnius, as well as Uoka, who is still voting in favor of the ruling coalition’s decisions.

It wasn’t easy for Homeland Union to do this because the nationalists belonging to the party itself supported by this signatory [to the Lithuanian Act of the Restoration of Independence in 1990, K. Uoka].

The attempt by the pseudo-patriots to connect their roots with the post-war Lithuanian partisans has annoyed and angered [former Soviet] political prisoners and deportees. Is that condemnation and dissociation a facade just because that’s what Brussels wants, or does it reflect the attitudes and views of supporters of the conservatives? Apparently even the party leaders can’t answer this question for themselves.

One thing is clear: K. Uoka has suffered the least from that humble rebuke by the party. Perhaps he himself doesn’t believe in his new political role, and for that reason knows very well the weight of his vote in the coalition. What to choose: Uoka’s vote, or the views of conservatism? For the conservatives this problem doesn’t exist.

Also clear is the future of political confusion: grumbling a bit, Landsbergis will go to Brussels, while Kubilius, who himself was enthusiastic over the trappings of nationalism during the time of Sajudis, will carefully count each and every vote.

Furthermore, Uoka will always maintain the alleged high numbers of people who support him. And he’s right.

The president made two statements about the march. When she realized that her first reaction could be interpreted as support, she made a firmer statement. And she [said she] was glad because a discussion of the topic of patriotism had begun.

Discussions are fine, but it’s by no means clear who’s preparing to discuss with whom. Neo-Nazis don’t recognize the empty talk of intellectuals.

They suggest solving problems through force. Against Gypsies, non-Lithuanian inscriptions, immigrants. It is possible to enter into discussions with Euro-skeptics, and many of the older Community countries are full of

them, but in Lithuania the people purveying such views, such as R. Čekutis, work in government agencies. Mainly in those which use up as much EU aid as they can, incidentally.

Attempts to stimulate artificially discussions of nationalism, whose positive and negative aspects people fully understand without the new-fangled philosophy are also based on hypocrisy.

The March 11th march was dominated not by patriots longing for discourse, but by fascist skinheads, and judging them shouldn't be complicated for people who have even a little knowledge of history.

Naturally, this is most frequently done by politicians who are afraid of their own shadow. Nor did the conservatives overcome the fear of speaking clearly. They said that the xenophobic slogans “demonstrate an anachronistically distorted patriotic caricature of ‘Lithuania for Lithuanians.’”

Did someone actually understand what Homeland Union was trying to say there?