

On What Grounds Should I Not Be Adversarial?

An Open Letter to Consul General Sandra Brikaitė

Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations, or the dictates of our passions, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence.

— [John Adams](#), Boston Massacre trial, December 1770

Dear Consul General Brikaitė,

The Word You Chose

On [April 13, 2026](#), you wrote to Dillon Hosier of the Israeli-American Civic Action Network in reply to his [March 17 inquiry](#) regarding the prosecution of Artur Fridman. Mr. Hosier had asked twelve specific questions about Lithuania's conduct in the case and the institutional architecture behind it.

You addressed eight questions on process. The four substantive questions you did not answer.

Mr. Hosier asked whether your government regards criticism of Jonas Noreika as protected historical discourse. You did not say.

He asked whether your government distinguishes Holocaust denial from criticism of Holocaust collaborators it honors. You did not say.

He asked whether your office disputes the factual record. You did not say.

He asked whether Lithuania will state its current position on the honors of Noreika and Juozas Ambrazevičius-Brazaitis. You did not say.

You did answer one matter Mr. Hosier had not asked about. You wrote about me.

My published work, you said, has been characterized by “a consistently adversarial position toward Lithuanian state institutions, a selective use of historical material, and a tendency to present complex historical and legal matters in a one-sided manner.” My article, you continued, “continues this pattern, offering interpretations that are not grounded in the full evidentiary record of the case and omitting relevant legal context.”

You used the word adversarial. The title of this open letter uses your word.

I am adversarial to falsehood, not to Lithuania. I am adversarial to euphemism, not to dialogue. I am adversarial to honors for murderers, not to the Lithuanian people. I am adversarial to state deception before Jewish audiences, not to diplomacy.

On what grounds should I not be?

Nothing Personal to You

Nothing in this letter is personal to you. The conduct it addresses is institutional and predates your appointment. I am the descendant of Lithuanian Jews murdered by Lithuanians on Lithuanian soil. I am not looking for an adversarial relationship with you. You and I can treat each other with respect.

I am never adversarial first. The trigger is specific: when Lithuanian state actors approach Jewish audiences with historical deception, and I have advance knowledge of it, it is my obligation as a Jew to inform those audiences of the facts. That obligation does not yield to diplomatic comity.

I have always welcomed engagement with Lithuania, and I welcome it now. The predicate for engagement is honest acknowledgment of facts that cannot be amended after the event.

I have done this work with Lithuanians. With Dr. Darius Udrys, then [Chair of the Lithuanian American Community, Los Angeles Chapter](#), I co-organized joint events calling for dialogue and reconciliation. The record exists. The pattern of state response that follows in this letter stands against it, not in place of it.

The Record Before This Letter

The longer arc of my engagement with official Lithuania belongs on the page before this letter addresses the recent record.

In 1989, in Los Angeles, I met Vytautas Čekanauskas, then in his twelfth year as Lithuania's Honorary Consul to this city. The chair you now occupy is the institutional successor to his. I told him I wanted to learn more about my Lithuanian heritage. He told me, emphatically: "A Jew cannot be a Lithuanian, and a Lithuanian cannot be a Jew."

I reported this in [Malice, Murder and Manipulation](#) and again in [It's Only Now We Begin](#). I did not understand the doctrine then. I do now.

His daughter, Daiva Valerija Čekanauskas Navarrette, currently serves as Honorary Consul to Santa Barbara. She now publicly represents herself as Jewish. I knew her parents as deeply Catholic, and I knew her as Catholic. She will not disclose to me when or how that changed. Public self-presentation as a Jewish voice, paired with refusal to clarify the basis for it, is the same lack of transparency Lithuanian state representation has consistently shown me.

I make no disparaging allusions against Daiva herself. The doubt is institutional. Lithuania has earned it. The same consular line that once told me a Jew could not be Lithuanian now seeks Jewish legitimacy when convenient. If a Lithuanian state representative presents herself publicly as a Jewish Lithuanian voice, transparency on the basis for that representation is not an attack. It is a request for candor in a field where candor has been absent.

In the years that followed, I applied for citizenship to both Latvia and Lithuania. Latvia answered honestly and respectfully. My engagements with the Latvian and Estonian governments have, across decades, been warm and cooperative. I have extended myself to assist both governments many times, on many projects. The same relationship with Lithuania would have been welcome. Lithuania has not permitted it.

Lithuania answered dishonestly.

My first inquiries went out to Consul Čekanauskas in 1989. My first application followed in 1991, my next in 2004. In 2008, the Migration Department denied my application on the asserted ground that Lithuania's own military, archival, and passport-register records were insufficient to prove that my grandfather Samuel Gochin was my grandfather.

The denial deployed the same documentary theory Lithuania had used against my great-grandmother Chaie Gochin and her family in 1922 to bar their return from Russian Imperial deportation. The earlier application of that theory killed many members of my family. Out of respect for her, I had to litigate. I did not need Lithuanian citizenship. The application began as an act of attachment to family memory. Lithuania's response turned that attachment to poison.

Five lawsuits between 2008 and 2011 dismantled what came to be known as Lithuania's [No-Jew citizenship system](#). The Lithuanian High Administrative Court reversed in 2011. In 2016, the Lithuanian Parliament amended the law to ensure Litvak descendants could obtain the citizenship Lithuania had spent decades denying.

Lithuania has since gained thousands of new highly qualified citizens through that change — Litvak descendants who have brought tourism, investment, and human capital to Lithuania. The state did not arrive at the policy on its own. It was forced to it. The full record is in [Samuel Gochin Existed](#), [The Documents Lithuania Demanded Twice](#), and [When Litvaks Became Useful Again](#).

During the same period, I served as Chair of the [Maceva Project](#), which mapped, documented, and restored more than fifty abandoned Jewish cemeteries in Lithuania, and on the Board of [LitvakSIG](#), the international body that generates Lithuanian Jewish genealogical research. The Maceva Project's work has contributed materially to the Lithuanian tourist economy, drawing Litvak descendants from around the world to visit ancestral sites. I have written publicly about how the cemetery work was impeded in Raguva at its earliest stage. Restoration of Jewish heritage was, even at the outset, treated by local Lithuanian actors as something to obstruct.

For three decades, I have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of my own money — researching, litigating, hiring advisors, funding translations, archival labor, and field work — for one purpose: simple, objective truth. From the Lithuanian state I have received only hostility and fraud in return.

Lithuania could have treated this record as an opening for repair. It could have recognized what the work had actually produced: restored heritage, genealogical research, Litvak-tourism infrastructure, and the kind of reconciliation no diplomatic mission could engineer. Instead, it treated documented correction as hostility. That choice, repeated over decades, created the adversarial relationship Lithuania now complains about. Lithuania has fought truth so hard, for so long, so vigorously, that the choice has become its own answer.

The pattern across that decade — administrative dishonesty, evidentiary inversion, procedural obstruction, public denial — is the pattern Lithuania has applied since 2015 to the Holocaust accountability file.

[Forty-nine documented formal submissions](#) to Lithuanian state bodies follow. Every refusal is on file. Your April 13, 2026 letter belongs in the same continuous record.

Why the Letter Is Open

I write because Lithuania publishes.

Lithuania publishes its claims on state platforms, in diplomatic correspondence, in court filings, and in international forums. The claims have been false. They have been issued to Jewish audiences whose unfamiliarity with the Lithuanian record makes the false claims credible. Lithuania has lied to Jews who do not know they are being lied to. The only counter to a public lie is a public record.

That is why this letter is open.

My standing offer to engage with you directly is on the record. I have offered to sit with you, factually and respectfully, to walk through the documentary file. You have not accepted. I have offered you the link to [J'Accuse](#), the documentary by Michael Kretzmer that places the Lithuanian Holocaust and Lithuania's institutional treatment of it on screen. To the best of my knowledge, you have not watched it. I have been wholly rebuffed.

On what grounds should I not be adversarial?

The Euphemism Problem

Lithuania's diplomatic register has, for years, described what was done to my family in language the documentary record does not allow.

Your government's officials use the verb *lost*. They use *perished*. They name Lithuanian killers *collaborators*, a word that assigns primary agency to Germany and reduces the operators of mass murder to subordinate participants in someone else's crime. I have addressed the architecture of euphemism in [A Seder for Lithuania](#).

These are not neutral substitutions.

Approximately 220,000 Lithuanian Jews were murdered. The destruction reached approximately 96.4 percent of the prewar Jewish population on Lithuanian territory. Most in the first six months. Most by Lithuanian neighbors, Lithuanian police, Lithuanian organizers, on Lithuanian soil.

They were not lost. Lithuania did not misplace them. They were murdered. When your office uses the verbs of natural disaster to describe the work of human hands, the offense lands fresh each time.

Lithuania did such a complete job of murdering us that there are now very few of us left to speak. The Litvak diaspora that holds the documentary record at first hand is small. Each Litvak who has the facts and the will to put them on the page carries the responsibility of all who cannot. That is the responsibility I am exercising now.

Lithuania has gone further. The Lithuanian state has collectivized the Holocaust as Lithuania's tragedy. In one sense, it is. What might Lithuania have been today with that talent pool? Litvaks built much of what Lithuania now claims as its cultural and economic patrimony. Their absence is a wound to the country itself.

But Lithuania honors the murderers. By honoring the men who carried out the slaughter, the state has repudiated the loss as its tragedy. Lithuania cannot claim the loss and celebrate those who caused it at the same time. The diplomatic claim of shared tragedy with Jews is structural Holocaust inversion. The victims are appropriated. The murderers are honored. The architecture is laundered through both. Your characterization of my work is the most recent entry in that continuous file.

The State's Pattern of Personal Characterization

When Lithuania cannot answer the documents, it characterizes the person who placed them on the table.

In [November 2015](#), the Lithuanian Genocide and Resistance Research Centre — the LGGRTC, your state's Holocaust-history institution — answered a petition by nineteen Lithuanian intellectuals asking Vilnius to remove the Noreika plaque by classifying the petitioners as “Agents of the East (enemies of the State), Jews and other stupid people.”

In July 2018, the LGGRTC published an [eleven-page accusation](#) on its official site naming me by name and asserting that my conduct in asking Lithuania to correct documented Holocaust distortions “possibly violat[ed] the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania and the Criminal Code.”

In March 2019, the LGGRTC branded my submissions on Delfi.lt as “vulgar pressure” and “uncivilized pressure.” Three weeks later, in the Vilnius County Administrative Court, the same Centre filed a state legal defense asserting that my research “should be assessed as copying Nazi propaganda that the responsibility for the Holocaust in Lithuania lies with Lithuanians and not Germans.”

In Los Angeles, your predecessor at this consulate, Ambassador Laima Jurevičienė, told other foreign diplomats that I am a Russian agent. The Foreign Ministry did not retract. The chair you now occupy carries the file forward. The record is in [Criminal, Trash, and Enemy of the State](#).

On April 1, 2021, on the floor of the Seimas, [MP Mindaugas Puidokas](#) described me as the *etatinis Lietuvos juodintojas* — the staff blackener of Lithuania, the salaried defamer of the Lithuanian state.

In February 2025, at Lithuania's Independence Day commemoration in Butrimonys, Laurynas Kaščiūnas — later Minister of Defense — said in front of witnesses that I am a Russian agent and trash, and physically pushed the historian who had researched the Noreika file on my behalf seven times.

Your April 13, 2026 letter belongs in this catalogue. The vocabulary changes register. The function does not.

The Rule-of-Law Claim

Your letter rests its substantive defense on the rule of law. The record on file with your own state institutions does not survive that representation.

In October 2015, the LGGRTC declared that Jonas Noreika — Šiauliai District chief, signatory of 1941 orders consigning Jews to ghettos and confiscating Jewish property — could be separated from the mass murder his orders prepared.

In December 2019, the same Centre issued the Stančikas memorandum declaring Noreika the organizer of a Jewish rescue network. The memorandum was authored by a geologist serving as the Centre's data protection officer. Your own Presidential International Commission rejected it.

On February 28, 2019, the Lithuanian state filed in court, at taxpayer expense, the legal escape route Adolf Eichmann tried to raise in Jerusalem before he was hanged. A Vilnius University Faculty of Law professor of practice, [Liudvika Meškauskaitė](#), signed the filing on Lithuania's behalf. Noreika, the state argued, "could not have possibly understood" that his ghettoization and confiscation orders would lead to Jewish deaths. He was, the state said, "yet another cog caught in the Nazi machine." The full record is in [The Eichmann Defense](#). The state has not retracted. Vilnius University Faculty of Law has not distanced.

Lithuanian state institutions have repeatedly asserted that the United States Congress "completely exonerated" Juozas Ambrazevičius-Brazaitis, head of the Provisional Government of 1941. Congress did no such thing. Congressman Brad Sherman has written [four letters](#) to Lithuania saying so. Lithuania has not retracted.

Lithuanian state institutions did not stop with Brazaitis. They extrapolated the same false American "exoneration" claim to Kazys Škirpa, using a congressional non-exoneration of one Provisional Government figure as if it supplied American absolution for another. Congressman Brad Sherman has now written four letters correcting Lithuania's false claim. Lithuania has not retracted.

Your own letter completes the demonstration. You write that Mr. Fridman is charged under [Article 170-2\(1\)](#) for "crimes committed by the USSR against Lithuania." The statute by its terms covers Nazi crimes and Soviet crimes against Lithuania and its inhabitants. Lithuanian Jews were inhabitants. Your government has used the statute against a Jewish citizen for one Facebook post and refused to use it against the LGGRTC for the institutional record above.

That is not rule of law. That is directional law.

Lithuania now uses Article 170-2 against a Jewish citizen while refusing to apply the same statute to a state institution whose published Holocaust record has been challenged repeatedly by formal submissions, international experts, Jewish institutions, and Lithuania's own Presidential Commission. The directionality is the system.

Fridman, May 9, and Jewish Reality

There is something especially offensive in being rebuffed repeatedly under Article 170² §1, only to watch Lithuania later deploy that same statute against Artur Fridman and then be told, with diplomatic composure, that Lithuania is a country of independent courts and the rule of law. Seven years before Lithuania selected Fridman, I asked Lithuania to apply its Holocaust-denial statute to a state institution whose Holocaust record had been formally challenged, repeatedly, on documentary grounds. Lithuania refused. It refused again. And again. Then, when the statute was useful against a Jewish citizen, the machinery suddenly worked.

That is not a technical disagreement over legal process. It is an insult to the intelligence of the audience being addressed. It asks Jewish readers to forget the refusals, ignore the asymmetry, overlook the Puidokas confession from the Seimas tribune, and accept the phrase “rule of law” as if the phrase itself can erase the record. It cannot.

When a Lithuanian diplomat invokes judicial independence after this record, the words do not reassure. They display contempt for the documentary file and for the people who have read it. The implication is that we will accept institutional vocabulary in place of institutional conduct. We will not. We are not children. We are not uninformed. We are not supplicants waiting for Lithuania to explain its own record to us. The facts are plain enough for any honest reader: Lithuania refused Article 170² when the target was its own Holocaust-history institution, used it when the target was a Jew, and then asked Jewish audiences to call that rule of law.

Lithuania’s Foreign Ministry appeals to Jewish audiences and then asks those same audiences to negate Jewish reality. That is the deeper offense in the Fridman prosecution and in the “Soviet” accusation repeatedly placed over Jewish memory. Lithuania wants Jews to remember Soviet crimes in the only form convenient to Lithuania: as a category that absorbs everything after 1944 and erases Lithuanian crimes that continued after the Nazi collapse. Jewish vulnerability did not end the moment German power receded. Jewish returnees, survivors, property claimants, witnesses, and families still faced Lithuanian murder, hostility, violence, theft, and denial. Even Lithuanian rescuers were persecuted by other Lithuanians after the war. Lithuania now asks Jews to place all of that under the Soviet rug and call the result historical responsibility.

That demand is offensive. It requires Jews to subordinate their own victimization to Lithuania’s preferred national calendar. It asks us to forget the narrow interval between the collapse of Nazi power and the May 9 date; to forget that Lithuanian perpetrators, informers, thieves, and neighbors did not become innocent because Moscow returned; to forget that Jewish survival was minuscule and fragile; and to forget that for some Jews, the defeat of Nazi Germany meant the interruption of Lithuanian opportunity to complete what Lithuanian murderers had begun.

Honoring May 9 is not necessarily a celebration of Russia. It can be, for a Jew, recognition of the near-miraculous survival of the remnant of our people after Lithuanian murderers, German occupiers, and local collaborators had destroyed almost everything. I do not need to admire Stalin to recognize that Nazi defeat mattered to Jews. I do not need to deny Soviet crimes to refuse Lithuania’s demand that Soviet crimes erase Lithuanian crimes. That is the point I made in [May 9 and Lithuania’s Memory War](#): neither Russia nor Lithuania owns Jewish memory. Lithuania’s fraud is to permit Soviet crimes to be named with specificity while Lithuanian crimes disappear into abstraction.

This is why the criminalization of Fridman is so dangerous. His formulation may offend many people. It may offend me. But the proper answer to contested memory is open historical argument, not a 220-page criminal file against a Jew. If Lithuania truly wanted dialogue, this is exactly the issue it would discuss openly: what May 9 means to Jews, what it means to Lithuanians, what Soviet

victory did and did not absolve, and why Jewish memory cannot be conscripted into Lithuanian innocence.

Instead Lithuania prosecutes. It criminalizes the contested Jewish memory and then tells Jewish audiences, with diplomatic solemnity, that it is a rule-of-law state with an independent judiciary. How are we to find common ground for dialogue when Lithuania cannot recognize even this minimal act of Jewish self-respect: the right of Jews to remember their own survival without first asking Lithuania which category of Lithuanian innocence the memory must serve?

So much has already been taken from Litvaks: families, property, cemeteries, memory, language, citizenship, and the simple right to have the murder of our families described truthfully. Now even the truths spoken by Artur Fridman are criminalized. I do not see how Jews and Lithuania move forward after this prosecution.

The point is not only what happens to Mr. Fridman. The point is that every possible outcome now convicts Lithuania.

If Mr. Fridman is convicted, Lithuania confirms that an EU and NATO member state has criminalized historical dissent by a Jewish citizen for a single Facebook post about Holocaust memory and anti-Nazi family history.

If he is acquitted, Lithuania confirms that the Prosecutor-General mobilized seventeen months of investigative resources and a 220-page criminal pleading on a foundation that could not survive trial.

If the prosecution is withdrawn, Lithuania confirms that the apparatus was activated against a Jewish citizen and abandoned only after the public record exposed the state.

If the case ends in a suspended sentence, fine, or other partial punishment, Lithuania confirms that criminal stigma was always the objective. The Jew leaves marked, the warning has been delivered, and the next critic learns the cost.

If the case is resolved through apology, settlement, procedural compromise, or some other face-saving disposition, Lithuania confirms that the indictment was a coercive instrument, not an honest application of criminal law.

No outcome leaves Lithuania clean. The indictment itself is this injury. The prosecution itself is the confession. Lithuania has converted one Jewish citizen's Facebook post into a permanent documentary record of its own conduct.

Against that record, your invocation of Lithuania's independent judiciary and rule of law is not reassuring. It is another insult layered on top of the injury, because it asks Jews to ignore what Lithuania has already done in plain sight.

It will take skilled diplomats to navigate what Lithuania has created after the Fridman trial concludes. Lithuanians and Litvaks cannot live forever in conflict. That is not a future I seek, and it is not a future Lithuania should want. But reconciliation cannot be built on euphemism, prosecution, selective memory, and diplomatic photographs. Truth is the only path by which Lithuanians and Litvaks can move forward.

Notice, Refusal, Persistence

I have placed [forty-nine documented formal submissions](#) before Lithuanian state bodies since 2015.

Eight lawsuits and international filings, including the European Court of Human Rights and a United Nations treaty body submission filed on International Holocaust Remembrance Day 2022. Eleven submissions to LGRTC. Five Article 170-2 §1 prosecutor complaints, every one declined. Eleven

institutional submissions. Two complaints to the Journalist Ethics Inspector. Twelve formal letters. Every refusal is on file.

Lithuania has not been left in ignorance.

Your own Presidential International Commission, on April 11, 2019, called the LGGRTC's Noreika treatment "utterly unacceptable." The [IHRA expert chairs](#) issued grave concern in April 2019. Yad Vashem Chairman Dani Dayan told the Seimas on [September 21, 2023](#) that the names of Noreika, Škirpa, and Krikštaponis "do not add" to Lithuania's honor. On April 1, 2021, on the floor of the Seimas, [Speaker Viktorija Čmilytė-Nielsen](#) said universities and the Lithuanian Institute of History had refused to work with LGGRTC because the Centre's activities did not meet scholarly standards.

Lithuania heard. Lithuania persisted.

Silence is not neutrality. Refusal is a position. Avoidance is state policy when repeated across years, institutions, and audiences.

Mr. Hosier asked you four direct substantive questions. You did not answer them.

Eugene J. Levin's [The Silence Lithuania Chose](#) documents the technique: when the state refuses to answer, the refusal is the answer. The non-answer is the answer — not just to Mr. Hosier, but to every body that has addressed Lithuania and asked. In 2019, a litany of objection from international Jewish and Holocaust-memory institutions arrived in Vilnius and went unanswered, as Eugene J. Levin has set out in [How Lithuania Converts Holocaust Evidence into State Innocence](#).

The consistency of the non-answer across questioners, across years, across institutions, is itself the answer.

I have asked the Lithuanian state, repeatedly, to clarify whether criminal charges are pending or contemplated against me, whether the government considers me a Russian agent, and whether I face regulatory or criminal-charge risk if I return to Lithuania. The state has not answered. The non-answer is the answer.

This makes it impossible for me to return to Lithuania.

Diplomacy Without Questions

The Lithuanian Foreign Ministry has perfected an art of avoidance. It engages only with audiences who cannot push back on facts and answers those who can with personal characterization rather than factual rebuttal. Your April 13 letter is the written form. The events your office sponsors in Los Angeles are the public form.

The Lithuanian Foreign Ministry's safest audience is the uninformed audience. Its safest format is the no-question format. Its safest Jewish partner is the institution that does not know the file deeply enough to test the claims being made in its name.

On September 3, 2025, your consulate co-hosted an event in Calabasas titled "An Evening of History, Heritage & Diplomacy: Lithuanian and Jewish Communities Gather in Los Angeles." Rabbi Li-Paz told me in advance that no questions would be permitted. Without the ability to question, this becomes a propaganda delivery, not a conversation. I declined to attend on those terms.

The same posture defines the Lithuanian state's public Holocaust narrative more broadly. As I have set out in [An Alibi for Genocide](#), Lithuanian officials present the 0.04 percent of Lithuanians who were Righteous Among the Nations as if that fraction explained the conduct of the population. They do not present the 99.96 percent who were not.

The relentless presentation of the smallest cohort and the abnegation of the largest is propaganda, not education. Do you see how offensive this is to a seeker of the truth? Do you see how this is substitution of the facts? Can you not see how offensive this is to people who know the truth?

The architecture extends beyond your consulate. Lithuanian diplomats attend Holocaust memorial days in foreign cities while their government honors Holocaust perpetrators back home. The contradiction is structural. Lithuanian officials use our tragedy as their marketing. If they were sincere, they would tell the truth about the Holocaust at home. They have chosen otherwise.

Ambassador Gaidys built this technique into a method. He approached small Jewish institutions in the United States proactively, persuaded their leadership to adopt Lithuania's three-word state formula — Nazis, Soviets, and their collaborators — and flew them to Lithuania for cultivation. They returned spewing Lithuanian disinformation to American Jewish audiences.

The deception sits in the third word. By naming Germans and Soviets as principal actors and Lithuanians as collaborators, the formula assigns primary agency for the Holocaust on Lithuanian soil to someone else. The Lithuanian Holocaust was executed by Lithuanians, against Lithuanian Jews, on Lithuanian soil. To enlist Jewish voices to repeat Lithuania's denial back to Jewish audiences — wearing Lithuanian honors, flown by Lithuanian sponsorship — is Orwellian.

The May 1 American Jewish Committee event followed the same methodology. Jewish NGO leaders without specialized expertise in the Lithuanian Holocaust file were invited. The institutions that would have brought that expertise — Yad Vashem and the Simon Wiesenthal Center — were not in attendance. AJC did not bring into the room people with deep institutional knowledge of Lithuania's frauds.

A photo op serves propaganda. It does not serve legitimacy. It does not serve facts. The American Jewish Committee, Lithuania's financial partner in the United States, served as host. The full record is in [*AJC & B'nai B'rith: The Jewish Community Is Entitled to the Record*](#).

I encourage relations between Israel and Lithuania as nation states. I cannot bear the constant infliction of Lithuanian presence at Jewish events pretending sincerity while Lithuania celebrates our murderers back home. That presence is a deep insult to the victims and to the generations that follow.

The methodology is consistent. Audiences without expertise. Formats without questions. Personal characterization in lieu of factual rebuttal.

Lithuania repeatedly seeks Jewish institutional photographs from organizations that do not specialize in the Lithuanian Holocaust file, while avoiding institutions and individuals able to test the record. That is not dialogue. It is reputational laundering.

Selective on What?

You wrote that my work is selective.

Selective on what? Where? Identify the document I have published that omits material the record requires. Specify the omission. Your letter declined to do so. A charge of selectivity that names no specific selection is not a rebuttal. It is the absence of one.

You called my work selective. Lithuania selected Noreika for honor and selected Fridman for prosecution. Lithuania selected rescuers for display and selected perpetrators for euphemism. Lithuania selected AJC for photographs and avoided Yad Vashem and the Simon Wiesenthal Center for accountability. The selectivity is not mine. It is state policy.

You wrote that my work presents matters in a one-sided manner. How many sides are there when 220,000 Lithuanian Jews were murdered, when 96.4 percent of the prewar Jewish population on

Lithuanian territory was destroyed, and when no Lithuanian has been punished for the murder of any of those Jews?

The number is the side. The record is the side. There is no second side that survives examination.

You wrote that my interpretations are not grounded in the full evidentiary record. The full evidentiary record is the file I have placed before your government forty-nine times. Your government has refused to examine it. It is your government, not me, that has avoided the record.

I do not accuse Lithuanians collectively. I accuse Lithuanian state institutions that possess the record, receive corrections, refuse correction, and then repeat the same claims before foreign Jewish audiences.

What Engagement Would Require

I have proposed in published writing, repeatedly, the constructive path.

Lithuanian historiography on the Holocaust file has been institutionally captured and cannot adjudicate the file from within. The credible structure is an Independent International Fact-Finding Commission, separated from Lithuanian state bodies in conduct, not in nationality.

Composition: scholars from the United States and Germany whose work on the Lithuanian and Eastern European Holocaust file is established; Lithuanian academics whose work has stood outside institutional capture; Israeli Holocaust historians of standing.

The names exist.

Saulius Sužiedėlis, Professor Emeritus at Millersville University of Pennsylvania, author of *Crisis, War, and the Holocaust in Lithuania* (2024).

Christoph Dieckmann, Yad Vashem International Book Prize laureate for *Deutsche Besatzungspolitik in Litauen 1941–1944* and member of your own Presidential International Commission, at the University of Bern and the University of Haifa.

Havi Dreifuss, Professor at Tel Aviv University and Director of the Center for Research on the Holocaust in Poland at Yad Vashem.

The Lithuanian Institute of History qualifies. I propose it not on my own authority but on the authority of [Speaker Viktorija Čmilytė-Nielsen](#), who said on the Seimas floor on April 1, 2021 that the Institute had refused to work with LGRTC because the Centre's activities did not meet scholarly standards.

Vilnius University Faculty of Law does not qualify. The Faculty continues to host as Professor of Practice [Liudvika Meškauskaitė](#), who signed the state's February 2019 filing placing Eichmann's defense on the Lithuanian court record. The Faculty has not publicly distanced. Until that occurs, the institution cannot supply members.

The choice for Lithuania on Jewish relations is the same fork. Lithuania may continue its sycophantic, financial-partnership relationship with the American Jewish Committee, the curated Calabastas evenings, and the no-questions formats. That is the route Lithuania has chosen.

The American Jewish Committee has no standing to represent Litvaks. None whatsoever. Lithuania chooses AJC because AJC will not push back without coercion. Even Faina Kukliansky, Chairwoman of the Lithuanian Jewish Community (LZB), has on the record criticized Lithuanian Holocaust dishonesty. AJC has done so only when public pressure made silence untenable, a pattern I have set out in [AJC & B'nai B'rith: The Jewish Community Is Entitled to the Record](#). A statement extracted

under pressure is not advocacy. It is reputation maintenance. That is exactly why Lithuania chooses AJC.

The pattern is documented across three continents.

When I was in Israel, Ambassador Lina Antanavičienė invited Silvia Foti in for a conversation and barred me from the room. I was a Lithuanian citizen at the time. Silvia was not. The selection criterion was not citizenship. It was her perception of whether the interlocutor could be managed.

When Silvia Foti and I were in Australia, we invited Ambassador Darius Degutis to every one of our events and offered to Zoom in any member of the Lithuanian government. Not a single Lithuanian official appeared.

When the Simon Wiesenthal Center invited Ambassador Laima Jurevičienė to a meeting in Los Angeles, she did not respond.

The Lithuanian state's only safe engagement is with the American Jewish Committee. That is the operating principle.

Or Lithuania may choose relations with Litvaks. Truth is the only path to the second.

Silvia Foti, the granddaughter of Jonas Noreika, has documented her own grandfather's role in the murder of Jews in [*Storm in the Land of Rain: A Mother's Dying Wish Becomes Her Daughter's Nightmare*](#). Lithuania has not retracted its honors for him.

The catalogue this letter has set out is collective. It is not personal to me. It is not personal to you.

All I have ever wanted is truth. All I have ever encountered is lies.

I remain open to engagement. I will sit with you, and with any member of your government, factually and respectfully, on the documentary record. The conditions are not difficult. Facts on the page. No euphemism. No personal characterization in place of substance. Respect for the dead. Respect for the file.

The Foreign Ministry's standing methodology — selected audiences, no-question formats, personal characterization in lieu of factual rebuttal — is not engagement. These issues will not go away until they are addressed.

I ask you to answer, publicly or in writing, the four questions Mr. Hosier asked and your April 13 letter avoided. I ask you to identify any document I have misused, any fact I have misstated, and any legal context I have omitted. General characterization is not a rebuttal. Specific correction is.

A Letter for the Future

I have been doing this work for four decades. The pattern has not changed.

Letters are received and not answered. Filings are made and dismissed. Documentary corrections are submitted and ignored. Given the long history of non-answers, I am resigned to the fact that this administration of the Lithuanian Foreign Ministry will do what every prior administration has done. The questions will be deflected. The file will be moved to the next desk. The next consul general will arrive with no obligation to answer questions put to her predecessor.

Fine. The letter will outlast the administration.

I do not care what readership my articles have. They are there to preserve the record for future generations. That is why I publish in the Times of Israel. The record cannot remain hidden in musty library books, inaccessible archives, untranslated filings, or state-controlled institutions. It must be public, searchable, durable, and available to every Jew, every Lithuanian, every diplomat, every

journalist, every court, and every future consul general who inherits this file. This open letter will also form part of that historical record. It will be saved and indexed. The URL can be sent to your successor, and to her successor, and to the consul general who will hold this office in 2040 and in 2050.

The questions do not expire. Each year of non-answer is itself an additional entry in the record. The consistency of the avoidance indicts Lithuania year after year. With every refusal to engage the documentary file, reconciliation between the Lithuanian state and Litvak descendants moves further out of reach. That is not a position I prefer. It is a position the Lithuanian state has produced.

There is one institution that has, in recent years, continued to provide Lithuanian diplomats with a Jewish photograph and a Jewish handshake when nothing else was on offer. The American Jewish Committee has performed that function. It will likely perform it again.

AJC's value to Lithuania is the appearance of Jewish endorsement. The appearance of endorsement is not endorsement. It cannot rewrite a documentary record AJC itself does not control. The Jäger Report exists. The Koniuchowsky testimonies exist. The signed Noreika orders sit in the LGGRTC's own archive. No photograph alters them. The diplomatic value of the AJC handshake stops at the archive door.

I have always been open to dialogue. I will be open to dialogue tomorrow, next year, and in ten years. Truth is the precondition. There is no reconciliation that begins with the perpetrator's myth intact.

I do not blame the Lithuanian people. They have been kept from the documentary record by their own state, deliberately, for decades. The LGGRTC is the instrument of that withholding. The Lithuanian public is the victim of its own government's decision to manufacture a false past.

The members of the Lithuanian government, however, know. They have access to the files. They have read the orders. They have received the international objections. They have absorbed the corrections and chosen to do nothing.

President Dalia Grybauskaitė was once overheard at a YIVO event saying to a companion that eventually the Lithuanian people will need to be told the truth. That account came to me from the person who said he overheard it directly. She knew. She held the office and she knew.

Eventually has not yet arrived. It will. The only question is whether Lithuania reaches that moment by its own decision or after the international record has rendered the alternative impossible.

I would prefer the former. The Lithuanian state has, so far, chosen the latter.

John Adams was correct. Facts are stubborn things. They cannot alter, no matter Lithuania's wishes, inclinations, or the dictates of its passions.

On what grounds, Consul General, should I not be adversarial?

Sincerely,

Grant Arthur Gochin