

REVISED AND UPDATED SUBMISSION

FOR TRANSMISSION TO THE INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE ALLIANCE

The Brazaitis “Exoneration” Claim

*American administrative record, Lithuanian state attribution, repeated notice, partial correction,
and rehabilitation after ministerial concession*

Submitted by Grant Arthur Gochin | 24 September 2026

To	Arvydas Daunoravičius, Head of the Republic of Lithuania’s Delegation to the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania
Email	arvydas.daunoravicius@urm.lt
Applicant	Grant Arthur Gochin, citizen of the Republic of Lithuania
Purpose	Transmission to the IHRA Chair, Secretary General, and relevant expert bodies for internal consideration
Status	Revised Brazaitis-only evidentiary submission. It supersedes the factual presentation of the 19 August 2026 Brazaitis supplement, but does not withdraw the petition of 28 May 2026. It is submitted through the Lithuania-delegation route established by the formal request of 24 September 2026 and should be read alongside, but separately from, the revised Škirpa submission transmitted the same day.
Language	English
Requested handling	Transmission without alteration or endorsement; preservation of the record; written confirmation of registration and route taken.

Executive request

I ask Lithuania’s Head of Delegation to transmit this revised Brazaitis submission, without alteration and without any requirement that the Lithuanian delegation endorse it, to the IHRA Chair, the Secretary General, and the expert bodies competent to consider Holocaust distortion, rehabilitation, historical research, and archival access. I ask that it be registered with the documentary sequence that began with my petition of 28 May 2026 and that I receive written confirmation of the registration number and route taken.

The submission is deliberately narrow. It does not ask IHRA to decide whether Juozas Ambrazevičius-Brazaitis was criminally guilty. It asks what the United States actually decided in 1974–1975, what Lithuanian state institutions later said the United States decided, how that proposition was used, what happened after repeated documentary notice, and whether the public record was adequately corrected after Lithuania’s Foreign Ministry acknowledged in May 2026 that the “complete exoneration” formulation was legally imprecise.

The record has materially changed since the 19 August filing. On 26 August 2026 LGGRTC actively edited one passage on its public page No. 3058 and marked the change “pataisyta 2026 08 26,” but another statement on the same page continued to say that Brazaitis had been rehabilitated by the United States Department of Justice, while page No. 2969 continued to carry the same categorical rehabilitation proposition. A new criminal-law complaint concerning those 2026 acts was filed on 13 September; the Prosecutor General’s Office declined to open a pre-trial investigation on 24 September. Separately, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has registered a signed records request concerning the diplomatic and legal file as No. 2-15744, and the 2009 state-award file is being pursued through the Lithuanian State New Archives.

This filing is part of a single procedural sequence but a separate evidentiary file. The 24 September formal request asks Lithuania’s national delegation to route documented complaints into IHRA without requiring the delegation to endorse them. The revised Škirpa submission addresses a distinct source-method record. This Brazaitis submission addresses the American-exoneration and rehabilitation record. The two matters overlap only where the supposed American exoneration of Brazaitis was itself used as favorable evidence in the Škirpa file.

Formal request to Lithuania's IHRA delegation, 24 September 2026:

https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/IHRA_Lithuania_Formal_Request_BILINGUAL_LT_AUTHENTIC_2026-09-24_signed.pdf

Original Škirpa supplemental submission, 19 August 2026:

https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/08/IHRA_Supplemental_Submission_Skirpa_Determination_2026-08-19.pdf

I. Scope and express limits

- No criminal conviction or finding of criminal guilt concerning Brazaitis is requested.
- No claim is made that the 1974–1975 United States inquiry was exhaustive or that it consulted every relevant archive or source.
- No claim is made that Brazaitis's death was the formal reason for the INS disposition; the controlling proposition is that the surviving disposition is administrative, conditional, and non-adjudicative.
- No private dishonesty or criminal intent is attributed to any named Lithuanian official. The complaint concerns state attribution, source use, correction practice, disclosure, and reproducibility.
- The 24 September 2026 prosecutorial refusal is treated as a criminal-procedure disposition, not as validation of the historical proposition that Brazaitis was exonerated or rehabilitated.
- The existence of a state honor or ceremonial commemoration is relevant to materiality and public rehabilitation; it is not by itself proof of Holocaust complicity or of a violation of IHRA standards.

I am not a lawyer. Legal references identify standards invoked in Lithuanian state records and IHRA instruments; this is principally an evidentiary and institutional-method submission.

II. Procedural route to Lithuania's IHRA delegation

IHRA's current Lithuania country page identifies Arvydas Daunoravičius of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as Head of Lithuania's national delegation. Earlier correspondence from the IHRA Secretariat stated that there is no process for external submission of petitions. I am a citizen of the Republic of Lithuania and therefore ask my national delegation to place this documentary record inside the Alliance's internal structure.

I do not ask the Lithuanian delegation to sponsor or endorse allegations against Lithuanian institutions. If it considers that it cannot advocate a complaint concerning those institutions, I ask it to forward the submission without endorsement to the IHRA Chair and Secretary General and request identification of the appropriate internal procedure. The identity of the Member Country whose conduct is challenged should affect conflict handling, not block transmission.

IHRA Lithuania country page: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/countries/lithuania>

Original Brazaitis supplemental submission, 19 August 2026:

https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/08/IHRA_Supplemental_Submission_Brazaitis_2026-08-19.pdf

Original petition, 28 May 2026: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/IHRA-Petition-Gochin-5-28-26.pdf>

III. Applicable IHRA framework

The Working Definition of Holocaust Denial and Distortion identifies, among the forms of distortion, intentional efforts to excuse or minimize the impact of the Holocaust or its principal elements, including collaborators and allies of Nazi Germany. The 2020 Statement on Rehabilitation condemns attempts to rehabilitate the reputations of persons complicit in Holocaust crimes and calls for research, public awareness, political responsibility, and accurate engagement with national histories.

The 2020 Ministerial Declaration is especially relevant after 2020: Member Countries accept responsibility to counter denial and distortion, safeguard the historical record including the role of collaborators, make archival material available, and encourage open and accurate engagement with national pasts. I ask IHRA to apply those instruments to the documented state method rather than to accept my characterization as a conclusion.

IHRA's expert leadership had already addressed LGGRTC in April 2019. The signatories expressed grave concern about the Centre's treatment of Jonas Noreika, described the Centre's text as part of a series of attempts to rehabilitate his reputation, invoked the Working Definition's collaborator language, and invited Lithuania and the Centre to engage in open dialogue and joint research. That statement did not decide the Brazaitis matter, but it established prior IHRA notice concerning rehabilitation methodology at the same institution.

IHRA Working Definition of Holocaust Denial and Distortion: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/resources/working-definition-holocaust-denial-distortion>

IHRA Statement on Rehabilitation: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/statements/ihra-statement-on-rehabilitation>

2020 IHRA Ministerial Declaration: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/resources/2020-ihra-ministerial-declaration>

2019 IHRA expert statement concerning LGGRTC: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/statements/statement-center-study-genocide-resistance-lithuania>

III-A. Membership-compliance framework and temporal control

This submission does not treat every event under the same legal or institutional standard. Lithuania joined IHRA in 2002. The 2018–2019 state formulations are therefore assessed against the Stockholm Declaration and the Working Definition of Holocaust Denial and Distortion, which IHRA Member Countries adopted in 2013. Conduct after 2020—including the continued publication of the rehabilitation claim, the 2026 correction practice, and the 2026 ministerial concession—is also evaluated against the 2020 Ministerial Declaration and the 2020 Statement on Rehabilitation. The 2009 decoration and 2012 reburial are used as commemoration context and materiality, not retroactively as violations of later IHRA instruments.

IHRA’s current Membership and Application Procedure describes adherence to the Stockholm Declaration and the 2020 Ministerial Declaration, open Holocaust-era archives, and academic, educational, and public examination of a country’s Holocaust past as elements of the membership baseline it now articulates. I use those criteria as a current compliance reference, not as a claim that the exact present application procedure governed Lithuania’s 2002 admission or that any later defect automatically terminates membership. I have located no published IHRA procedure that makes suspension or expulsion an automatic consequence of a single finding. The process requested here is therefore graduated: expert review, document-specific response, production and correction first; any status consequence only if IHRA itself finds material, continuing, uncured non-compliance and determines that its rules permit a further measure.

The relevant conduct is institutional state conduct for this submission. LGGRTC is a Lithuanian state budget institution created by law, with the Seimas exercising the owner’s rights and duties. Its publications, formal letters, litigation positions, archival work, and historical assessments are issued under delegated public functions. The question for IHRA is therefore not whether an individual historian is entitled to an opinion. It is whether a Member Country’s official historical institution has used, corrected, and disclosed evidence in a manner consistent with the open and accurate treatment of Holocaust history to which the Republic has committed.

- Stockholm Declaration: uphold the truth of the Holocaust, strengthen research and remembrance, and illuminate obscured aspects of the record.
- Working Definition: scrutinize intentional efforts to excuse or minimize the Holocaust or its principal elements, including the role of collaborators and allies of Nazi Germany.
- 2020 Ministerial Declaration: counter distortion; safeguard the historical record, including the role of collaborators; preserve and make archives available; and encourage open and accurate engagement with national histories.
- Statement on Rehabilitation: oppose attempts to rehabilitate persons complicit in Holocaust crimes and promote research, public awareness, and political responsibility.

IHRA Membership and Application Procedure: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/who-we-are/member-countries/membership-and-application-procedure>

Stockholm Declaration: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/resources/stockholm-declaration>

Current LGGRTC statute (e-Seimas): <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.40706/asr>

IHRA, Understanding Holocaust Distortion: Contexts, Influences and Examples:

<https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Understanding-Holocaust-Distortion-Contexts-Influences-and-Examples-IHRA.pdf>

IV. The United States record: what was actually decided

The surviving American administrative record does not contain an acquittal, judicial exoneration, rehabilitation, or adjudication of innocence. In December 1974, INS Commissioner Leonard F. Chapman Jr. reported that the sources contacted had produced no information of an evidentiary nature sufficient to justify further active

investigation at that time. The names of Brazaitis and Jonas Šlepetyš were removed from the active list and the investigations deactivated, while the record expressly preserved the possibility of reactivation if new meaningful information emerged.

On 13 January 1975, Representative Joshua Eilberg transmitted the INS result to Stanley A. Gecys of the Lithuanian-American Community. That congressional covering letter hardened the administrative result rhetorically, but it was not a judicial or Department of Justice adjudication of innocence. The complete underlying INS file CO 703.951 has not been recovered into the present corpus, so this submission does not claim to possess the entire investigation.

Eilberg to Stanley A. Gecys, 13 January 1975 — TOI preservation copy: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/1975-letter.pdf>

Four private American legal opinions obtained in late 2018 rejected the inference that the surviving 1974–1975 documents constituted legal exoneration or rehabilitation. They are important as notice and legal interpretation, not as United States governmental determinations.

IV-A. Falsifiable core proposition

If Lithuania identifies an authentic United States adjudication by a competent body formally exonerating, acquitting, or rehabilitating Brazaitis, this submission’s central American-record proposition must be revised. No such adjudication has been identified in the record presently held.

IV-B. The strongest limitations in the American record

The American file contains several limitations that matter before it is used as affirmative historical clearance. Brazaitis was never questioned in the inquiry. The surviving INS material records that he was hospitalized after a fourth heart attack and could not be interviewed; Šlepetyš, by contrast, appeared and testified under oath. Brazaitis died before the final Chapman disposition was issued. I do not rely here on a disputed exact death date and do not claim that death was the formal legal basis of the deactivation. The narrower point is that the principal subject whose conduct was later declared “completely exonerated” was never examined by the agency in testimony before the administrative file was closed from active investigation.

LGGRTC 2012 publication (records Brazaitis death date as 28 November 1974 and reproduces the Eilberg letter in English):

https://www.genocid.lt/UserFiles/File/Titulinis/2012/20120525_brazaiti.pdf

The source memorandum attached to the surviving INS material lists roughly seventy numbered organizations, archives, and individuals, plus additional sources. It demonstrates breadth of outreach, but it does not establish how many recipients responded, what records were actually searched, or that every listed institution supplied responsive evidence. No Lithuanian archive or repository appears on that list. Lithuania was under Soviet occupation in 1974; the authentic Provisional Government protocols later published in Lithuania were not part of the archival environment described by this source list. The absence of a Lithuanian repository proves only that none is listed—not that investigators possessed no other information.

There is also a basic source-control problem in the later Lithuanian use of the Eilberg letter. Eilberg addressed his 13 January 1975 transmittal to Stanley A. Gecys of the Lithuanian-American Community. LGGRTC later identified the recipient as “Algimantas Gečys” in a court pleading. That error does not by itself invalidate a historical conclusion, but it is significant where the document is being treated as the central foreign authority for an affirmative rehabilitation proposition: the institution misidentified the addressee of the very document on which the proposition rested.

MFA/INS nine-page package transmitted to Representative Sherman: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/08/Letter-to-Rep.-Sherman.pdf>

LGGRTC litigation pleading, 1 October 2018: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/lt-govt-defense.pdf>

V. How Lithuanian state institutions converted the American record

From 2018 onward, LGGRTC used stronger language than the American administrative record supports. Letter No. 55R-21 of 26 February 2018 described Brazaitis as having been completely exonerated after American review. Public page No. 2969 attributed his rehabilitation to the United States Department of Justice. Letter No.

14R-82 of 11 October 2018 elaborated the Centre’s interpretation of the Eilberg/INS material. The same premise appeared in litigation and later public defenses.

The disputed American proposition was not merely biographical. LGGRTC acknowledged in the Škirpa oversight record that favorable circumstances not stated in the published Škirpa conclusion included the supposed complete American exoneration of Brazaitis. The Seimas Ombudsman found a transparency failure in the handling of that Škirpa request. This cross-file use matters because it shows the Brazaitis proposition functioning as favorable evidence in a second state historical determination.

Certified Seimas Human Rights Committee response package / official file produced in September 2026:

https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Seimas_HRC_Response_2026-09-22_Gochin_with_English_Translation.pdf
LGGRTC Letter No. 55R-21: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/Gonocide-Reply-2018-02-26-Holocaust-interpretation.pdf>

LGGRTC page No. 2969 — live page: <https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/2969/a/> | TOI preservation capture: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/Regarding-the-provision-of-information.pdf>

LGGRTC Letter No. 14R-82, 11 October 2018: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/4.-2018-10-11-Lietuvos-gyventoju-genocido-ir-rezistencijos-tyrimo-centro-rastas-Nr.-14R-82.pdf>

LGGRTC litigation pleading, 1 October 2018: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/lt-govt-defense.pdf>

Seimas Ombudsman report, 2 February 2018: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/4D-2017-1-1558-3D-317-2018-02-02.pdf>

The proposition also crossed institutional files. In Letter No. 14R-51 of 11 July 2018, LGGRTC repeated the Brazaitis “complete exoneration” premise inside its substantive response concerning Kazys Škirpa while reproducing on the same page the narrower American language that names had been removed from an active list and the investigations deactivated. The stronger Lithuanian proposition and the narrower American administrative wording therefore coexisted in the same state instrument. This is important because it shows operative use, not merely a loose biographical description.

Page No. 3058 also has a traceable publication history. The underlying public defense appeared in DELFI on 8 March 2019 and was republished by LGGRTC on 13 March 2019. The official version framed criticism of the Brazaitis account as part of a wider dispute about alleged falsification of Lithuanian history, repeated the American rehabilitation theory, and displayed the American correspondence as supporting proof. The date distinction matters: the DELFI publication and the LGGRTC republication are separate publication events.

DELFI publication, 8 March 2019: <https://www.delfi.lt/news/ringas/politics/lggrtc-genocido-tyrimo-centras-nepasiduos-vulgariam-spaudimui.d?id=80566671>

LGGRTC 2019 archive listing (records Centre republication under 13 March 2019): <https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/3149/a/>

LGGRTC Letter No. 14R-51, 11 July 2018: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/GC_reply_Skirpa_20180711-1.pdf

VI. Repeated notice: the source defect was specifically identified

By December 2018 the Centre had received a formal complaint accompanied by four U.S. legal opinions challenging the exoneration theory. Representative Brad Sherman then wrote to Lithuania on 25 September 2019 asking for specific and credible references to the asserted exoneration and rehabilitation or a public retraction of the claim.

The strongest prior-notice document is the Lithuanian prosecutorial refusal of 2 December 2019 in investigation material M-2-02-01142-19 / AP-31212. Prosecutor Benediktas Leišys recorded that the 1975 congressional correspondence relied upon by LGGRTC did not state either an exoneration or a rehabilitation fact. He nevertheless declined to open a pre-trial investigation because the criminal-law intent and purpose required under Article 170² were not established. Those propositions must remain separate: the defect in the source characterization was recorded; criminal intent was not found.

Further notice followed through the 26 November 2020 correction demand, LGGRTC’s 22 December 2020 refusal, Representative Sherman’s 2021 follow-up, and his renewed 20 March 2026 intervention. LGGRTC’s 2020 response treated the congressional intervention as a politician’s opinion rather than as a new historical source or circumstance.

Representative Brad Sherman correspondence compilation, 2019–2026:

<https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/Congress-on-Brazaitis.pdf>

Vilnius prosecutor refusal, 2 December 2019: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/04/2020-05-20_035122-Decision.pdf

VI-A. The notice chain is cumulative, not a single disagreement

The notice record predates the 2018–2019 public dispute. In September 2012, Representatives Brad Sherman, Henry Waxman, and Howard Berman protested the government-supported repatriation and ceremonial reburial of Brazaitis. That correspondence did not decide the historical merits, but it placed the commemoration controversy before the Lithuanian Government years before the later “complete exoneration” formulation.

In 2018, the challenge became document-specific. A 16 March Ombudsman communication and a 12 December Ombudsman filing placed the American-record issue before Lithuanian institutions; the latter attached four independent U.S. attorney opinions—Stuart L. Leviton (27 November 2018), Bryan Barnet Miller (29 November), Gary D. Labin (5 December), and I. Mark Bledstein (6 December)—each rejecting the proposition that the surviving U.S. material constituted legal exoneration or rehabilitation. Those opinions are private legal interpretations, not U.S. government adjudications. Their significance is notice.

The issue then entered law-enforcement and diplomatic channels. AP-31212 / material M-2-02-01142-19 resulted in the 2 December 2019 refusal that expressly recorded that the source stated neither an exoneration nor a rehabilitation fact. Sherman wrote on 25 September 2019 to Prime Minister Saulius Skvernelis, again on 25 May 2021 to Ambassador Audra Plepytė, and on 20 March 2026 to Ambassador Gediminas Varvuolis. The 2026 letter asked Lithuania either to identify the U.S. authority for the exoneration claim or correct it. This is therefore not a record in which the State lacked repeated, specific notice of the legal and documentary objection.

A renewed administrative correction demand was made on 17 July 2026 seeking withdrawal, correction, and reissue of the relevant LGGRTC instruments. The Brazaitis IHRA supplement was then filed on 19 August 2026. LGGRTC made the marked edit to page No. 3058 on 26 August—seven days later. I draw no inference about why that timing occurred. It establishes only sequence. I have not identified a formal written response to the 17 July demand that explains the scope or rationale of the edit.

2012 Sherman/Waxman/Berman letter: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/2012-Congress-letter-on-Brazaitis.pdf>

Four U.S. legal opinions — Leviton: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/Leviton.pdf>

Miller: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/Miller.pdf>

Labin: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/Labin.pdf>

Bledstein: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/Bledstein-letter.pdf>

26 November 2020 correction demand: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/On-Brazaitis-Exoneration_Grant-Arthur-Gochin_Nov-26-2020.pdf

VII. The 12 May 2026 Foreign Ministry concession

On 12 May 2026, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs Vidmantas Verbitskas replied to Representative Sherman under Ref. (19.2.3)3-2806. The letter stated, on information supplied by LGGRTC, that the earlier “complete exoneration” formulation was legally imprecise, expressed regret for that wording, and stated that it had since been corrected. The same letter expressly distinguished administrative discontinuation of an investigation from formal judicial exoneration under United States law.

That governmental concession narrows the present dispute. This submission does not ask whether the original 2018 wording could have begun as error. It asks what correction actually followed the State’s 2026 acknowledgment, what LGGRTC told the Ministry had been corrected, and why stronger rehabilitation language remained in public and official records after that acknowledgment.

MFA reply to Representative Sherman, 12 May 2026: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/06/Letter-to-Rep.-Sherman.pdf>

VII-A. The Ministry’s legal clarification is independent; the historical briefing supplied to it requires independent verification

The 12 May 2026 letter is entitled to substantial weight for what the Ministry itself decided as a matter of legal characterization. The Vice-Minister acknowledged that the earlier “complete exoneration” formulation was

legally imprecise and that an administrative discontinuation is not formal judicial exoneration under United States law. For purposes of this submission, I treat that legal clarification as an official position of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and accord it independent evidentiary weight.

A different question arises from the historical account transmitted through the Ministry. The letter expressly states that its clarification was based on information supplied by LGGRTC. That makes it necessary to distinguish the Ministry's own legal conclusion from historical propositions originating with the institution whose work was under challenge. I do not independently credit those historical propositions merely because they appeared in a ministerial reply; they remain subject to source-level verification against the underlying American and Lithuanian records.

The temporal scope of the American inquiry is especially important. The Chapman/INS letter describes the relevant Provisional Government period as 23 June through 12 July 1941. The Provisional Government continued until 5 August. Significant surviving acts involving Ambrazevičius fall after the period stated in the INS summary, including the 29 July university measure, the 1 August Regulations on the Status of Jews, and the 2 August property decision. An inquiry whose own summary closes the relevant period before those acts cannot, without further evidence, support a comprehensive factual conclusion about them.

I do not allege that the Ministry knowingly transmitted an inaccurate historical account, nor do I allege that LGGRTC deliberately misled it. The narrower, testable concern is whether the Ministry was given a complete and accurate evidentiary presentation when it prepared its response to Representative Sherman. The appropriate remedy is production and independent review: the Ministry should examine the full LGGRTC briefing chain, the underlying American records, and the Lithuanian records that fall outside the temporal window stated in the INS summary, and determine for itself whether the historical account placed before it was complete and accurate.

The Ministry is therefore respectfully asked to produce the communication by which LGGRTC supplied the factual account used in the 12 May reply, together with its attachments, source list, internal legal or historical review, and any drafts or approvals. That record would allow the Ministry, IHRA, and the reader to distinguish what the Ministry independently verified from what it received from LGGRTC.

Congressional correspondence compilation, including Sherman's 20 March 2026 letter:
<https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/Congress-on-Brazaitis.pdf>

VIII. The 26 August 2026 selective correction and the surviving contradiction

On 26 August 2026, LGGRTC edited page No. 3058 and marked the relevant sentence “pataisyta 2026 08 26.” The revised sentence says that after the American inquiry Brazaitis and Šlepetys were removed from the list of suspects because evidence of crimes had not been found. That edit is a real correction of one formulation and should be credited as such.

The correction was not complete. Earlier on the same live page, the Centre still states that Brazaitis was “reabilituotas JAV teisingumo ministerijos” — rehabilitated by the United States Department of Justice. Page No. 2969 likewise continues to state categorically that he was rehabilitated by the U.S. Justice Department. The current page No. 3058 therefore contains both the surviving rehabilitation proposition and the later, narrower corrected formulation.

This creates a concrete reproducibility question rather than a semantic abstraction. After the Ministry said the stronger legal characterization was imprecise and LGGRTC demonstrated the ability to edit its page, which proposition is the Republic asking readers and institutions to treat as the State's current position?

LGGRTC page No. 3058: <https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/3058/a/>

LGGRTC page No. 2969 — live page: <https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/2969/a/> | TOI preservation capture: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/Regarding-the-provision-of-information.pdf>

Annotated August 2026 correction comparison:

https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/08/LGGRTC_Annotated_Exhibit_2026-08-30.png

IX. The claim is embedded in a Holocaust-responsibility narrative

Page No. 3058 does more than state a disputed American legal result. It places the Brazaitis proposition inside a defense of the Provisional Government against claims concerning responsibility for the Holocaust in Lithuania. The page presents the alleged U.S. rehabilitation as an important historical fact in answering criticism of the Centre's treatment of Lithuanian responsibility.

That placement is why the issue falls within IHRA's distortion and rehabilitation tools. The Alliance need not decide Brazaitis's criminal guilt in order to examine whether a non-adjudicative foreign administrative outcome has been converted into an exonerating state-memory proposition and retained after the foreign-law characterization was formally corrected.

X. The criminal-law warning and its institutional context

LGGRTC page No. 2969 published the rehabilitation proposition alongside a statement that the research challenging the Centre might have violated the Lithuanian Constitution and Criminal Code. This submission does not characterize that language as a criminal offense and does not infer the private purpose of any author. Its relevance is institutional and procedural: the state historical body defended the disputed favorable proposition while simultaneously raising possible criminal-law consequences in relation to the research challenging its historical conclusions.

The 2019 prosecutor later recorded that the American correspondence did not state exoneration or rehabilitation, but declined prosecution for lack of the required criminal intent. That history is part of the notice record and the correction environment in which the 2026 edit occurred.

XI. Current domestic procedural posture: AP-29972 and the 24 September refusal

On 13 September 2026 I filed a new criminal-law application focused on the 2026 factual sequence: the 12 May Foreign Ministry concession, the 26 August active edit, and the surviving rehabilitation statements. The filing expressly distinguished those new acts from the older 2018–2019 publications and asked prosecutors to identify the responsible decision chain rather than presume responsibility from office or title.

On 24 September 2026 the Prosecutor General's Office declined to open a pre-trial investigation in the joint decision addressing AP-29927 and AP-29972, material No. M-2-01-00074-26. The decision treated LGGRTC's historical publications as historians' assessments for criminal-law purposes and recognized the 26 August correction. The disposition does not adjudicate whether every surviving historical proposition is accurate, whether the correction is complete, or whether the State should reissue the earlier official instruments.

The decision was subject to appeal. I have elected not to appeal it. I present it to IHRA as the current domestic criminal-procedure endpoint, not as proof for or against the underlying historical claim.

24 September 2026 prosecutorial refusal, preservation copy:

https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Lithuania_Prosecutor_Refusal_AP-29927_AP-29972_2026-09-24.pdf

XI-A. The prosecutorial refusal confirms the documentary contradiction but does not resolve it

The 24 September decision is relevant beyond its criminal disposition because it independently reproduces the state of LGGRTC's public record. It quotes the continuing statement that Brazaitis "was rehabilitated by the U.S. Department of Justice" and separately quotes the 26 August corrected sentence stating only that Brazaitis and Šlepetys were removed from the list of suspects. The same decision nevertheless characterizes the amendment as having "clearly removed" the rehabilitation proposition. The decision's own recitation therefore preserves the unresolved contradiction: one formulation was corrected while another substantively stronger formulation remained.

This does not make the prosecutorial refusal erroneous as a criminal-law disposition. The prosecutor applied the statutory threshold for opening a criminal investigation and found the required objective and subjective elements absent. The decision also described LGGRTC's publications as conclusions of historians, "not lawyers." That distinction reinforces the importance of the Foreign Ministry's own legal clarification: the legal meaning of a foreign administrative disposition cannot be established merely by repeating a historian's characterization of it.

After finding the criminal threshold unmet, the prosecutor expressly declined to undertake the additional clarification measures requested. The refusal is therefore not a documentary audit of the correction process. It does not establish who drafted or approved the 26 August edit, what LGGRTC communicated to the Foreign Ministry, what source set the Ministry received, why the separate DOJ-rehabilitation formulation was left unchanged, or whether records outside the INS inquiry's stated temporal window were considered.

Those unresolved questions strengthen the case for an independent institutional review while remaining outside the criminal-law conclusion. I accord independent weight to the Foreign Ministry's legal clarification of 12 May 2026. I do not automatically extend that weight to historical propositions supplied to it by LGGRTC. The appropriate next step is production of the LGGRTC–MFA briefing record and an independent Ministry review of the complete documentary chronology.

XII. Active production route: the Foreign Ministry's file

On 16 September 2026 I submitted a QES-signed revised request to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs seeking the diplomatic and legal file concerning the alleged American "complete exoneration": correspondence with U.S. agencies and Congress, internal legal opinions and talking points, material supplied by other Lithuanian institutions, the Sherman correspondence file, and the 2026 documents underlying the Ministry's statement that the formulation had been corrected.

On 17 September the Ministry confirmed that the request was received and registered as No. 2-15744 and transferred according to competence. That request remains an active production route. I do not treat the absence of a merits response as of 24 September as non-production or refusal; the request is included so IHRA can see that the missing communication underlying the May concession has been sought through ordinary Lithuanian administrative channels.

Separately, on 13 September 2026 I sent LGGRTC a QES-signed records request seeking the Centre's Brazaitis holdings, source-use records, internal drafting and approval materials, correspondence, and correction history, and expressly requested registration. I have not located a registration acknowledgment or merits response as of 24 September 2026. I therefore treat that request as a pending production route, not as a refusal or as proof of non-production.

Applicant's QES-signed LGGRTC data request, 13 September 2026: Prasymas_LGGRTC_Brazaitis_duomenys_2026-09-13.pdf (held by applicant; transmitted to LGGRTC on 13 September 2026).

XII-A. Research completeness, institutional responsibility, and the missing full-file inquiry

On 5 September 2026 I submitted a Freedom of Information Act request to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services for the complete Brazaitis administrative file, CO 703.951 / AS 222 100 S/CJ (C), including the underlying request forms, identifying data, internal memoranda, source responses, investigative summaries, and disposition materials. The complete file is therefore being sought directly from the United States.

In the documentary record presently held, I have not identified evidence that LGGRTC requested, obtained, or reviewed the complete CO 703.951 file before issuing categorical statements that Brazaitis had been 'completely exonerated' or 'rehabilitated by the U.S. Department of Justice.' The surviving Lithuanian record instead identifies a limited group of American documents, including the Chapman administrative disposition and Eilberg correspondence. This is a deliberately limited proposition: it does not establish that LGGRTC never sought the full file. If a request, receipt, complete copy, or source-use memorandum exists, production of it would narrow or defeat this concern.

The question is institutional because the Centre's legal mandate is not merely to comment on history. The current LGGRTC Act expressly emphasizes that genocide and persecution cases are to be investigated by collecting and analyzing all archival and historical material in Lithuania and outside Lithuania. The Centre's current Regulations, approved by Seimas Resolution No. XIV-2987 and effective from 1 October 2024, make the retrieval duty concrete: §8.1.5 directs the Centre to search in Lithuania and foreign states for documents concerning war crimes, genocide, and other crimes against humanity; arrange their return or acquire copies; and

manage, collect, preserve, research, and disseminate them. The Centre's 2025 activity report, especially the section “Istorinių šaltinių atvėrimas ir tyrimų tęstinumas,” describes continued archival work and source publication; the same report states that difficult historical narratives should be grounded in research and sources rather than preconceived positions or political interpretations.

I therefore do not ask IHRA to infer that the Centre's statutory purpose is exculpation, and I make no claim about the private motive of any historian. The narrower, testable question is whether the source method used in the Brazaitis matter had an exculpatory effect: a non-adjudicative subset of a foreign administrative record was converted into affirmative clearance and rehabilitation language, reused in other state historical work, and defended publicly, while the record now before IHRA contains no evidence that the complete underlying American file had first been obtained and reviewed.

The institutional asymmetry is relevant to method, not identity. The dates make the sequence concrete: LGGRTC's formal “complete exoneration” formulation appears in Letter No. 55R-21 of 26 February 2018; on 5 September 2026, more than eight years later, an individual external researcher filed a U.S. FOIA request seeking the complete underlying American administrative file. The question for IHRA is why comprehensive source retrieval appears, on the present record, to have followed categorical state pronouncements rather than preceded them, and what research-control mechanism should prevent that sequence in future Holocaust-related historical determinations.

Current LGGRTC Act — preamble (all archival and historical material in Lithuania and beyond):

<https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.40706/asr>

Current LGGRTC Regulations, Seimas Resolution No. XIV-2987, §8.1.5:

<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/608ec1607bffa1efabdbb4a1fc8b0b63>

LGGRTC 2025 activity report — section “Istorinių šaltinių atvėrimas ir tyrimų tęstinumas” and discussion of source-grounded historical interpretation: <https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/4914/a/>

Applicant's USCIS FOIA request: 5 September 2026, CO 703.951 / AS 222 100 S/CJ (C) (held by applicant; sent through the USCIS FOIA channel). No separate USCIS control number has been located in the applicant's Gmail record as of 24 September 2026.

XIII. State honor and the pending 2009 award file

By Presidential Decree No. 1K-1907 of 26 June 2009, Brazaitis was posthumously awarded the Grand Cross of the Order of the Cross of Vytis. The decree described him as, among other things, a resistance ideologue, an organizer and leader of the June 1941 Uprising, Minister of Education, and Prime Minister of the Provisional Government.

On 14 September 2026 the Office of the President, response No. 1D-2902, directed my request for the award file to the Lithuanian State New Archives. A signed request then sought the nomination, historical/reputational/legal vetting, inter-agency consultation, drafting and approval chain, objections, and any later review. That process is pending. I draw no inference from the present absence of the file.

The award matters only to materiality: the disputed American exoneration proposition concerns a person whom the Republic has formally honored. IHRA is not asked to decide whether the decoration should be retained or revoked.

Presidential Decree No. 1K-1907, 26 June 2009 (public legal text): <https://www.infolex.lt/ta/32397>

XIII-A. Domestic historical counterweight and state-supported commemoration

The state record is not institutionally uniform. A 2010 memorandum by Lithuanian Institute of History scholars Česlovas Laurinavičius and Gediminas Rudis, prepared for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is a potentially important domestic counterweight. The project copy records a materially adverse assessment of the Provisional Government and of Brazaitis's later representation of its wartime role, and did not support the highest-level reburial treatment. I use this memorandum only as corroborative notice and institutional context because the precise original bibliographic/provenance record still requires verification. It should not be elevated above its present source status until that is fixed.

Brazaitis's remains were repatriated and ceremonially reburied in Kaunas in May 2012 with documented state support. The U.S. Department of State's 2012 International Religious Freedom Report recorded that the

Lithuanian Government funded the transfer of his remains from Connecticut to Kaunas and that, as required by law, an official ceremony was held with a ceremonial honor guard; it also recorded that no serving central-government officials attended the ceremony or participated in related events. The commemoration triggered domestic scholarly objection and the September 2012 congressional protest. Those events do not establish criminal responsibility. They show why a claimed American exoneration was materially useful to the favorable public standing of a person already formally honored and commemorated by the Republic.

U.S. Department of State, 2012 International Religious Freedom Report — Lithuania (ECoi mirror):

<https://www.ecoi.net/en/document/1342475.html>

2010 Laurinavičius–Rudis memorandum and honors material — project scans:

<https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/Brazaitis-scans.pdf>

2012 Lithuanian open letter concerning the reburial: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/8.-Atviras-laiskas-del-J.-Ambrazeviciaus-B.kilmingo-perlaidojimo-Bernardinai.lt_.pdf

XIII-B. A repeated one-direction exoneration method: Brazaitis, Gewecke, Bub, and Schleef

The Brazaitis formulation is not an isolated vocabulary error. The same state institution has used the language of exoneration, acquittal, or equivalent clearance in several separate Holocaust-related records where the underlying foreign procedural outcome did not support that description.

The four comparators now documented are materially different in their underlying procedure. The American Brazaitis matter was an administrative investigation that was deactivated and expressly capable of reactivation. Hans Gewecke was convicted in Lübeck and sentenced to four years and six months. Ewald Bub's proceeding was discontinued; the published and archival German record does not record a merits acquittal. Hermann Schleef's Oldenburg proceeding ended for insufficient evidence, not with a trial acquittal or affirmative finding of innocence.

LGGRTC nevertheless converted these differing procedural outcomes into a common exculpatory vocabulary. In the Brazaitis record, administrative deactivation became 'complete exoneration' and rehabilitation by the United States Department of Justice. In the Gewecke-Bub record, Bub was described as wholly or completely exonerated and the German proceedings were generalized into the proposition that German courts had exonerated the 'actual builders and commanders' of the Šiauliai ghetto and concentration-camp system. In the same 11 February 2020 response, LGGRTC added Schleef and stated that the Oldenburg court had exonerated him, although the German order rested on insufficient evidence.

The significance is not merely that several procedural labels were inaccurate. The resulting exoneration narrative was used downstream in Lithuanian historical memory. The Gewecke-Bub-Schleef formulations appeared in LGGRTC's continuing defense of Jonas Noreika, and the supposed American exoneration of Brazaitis was used as favorable context in the Škirpa file. The foreign procedural outcome was therefore not simply misstated; the enlarged exculpatory description became evidence supporting a favorable Lithuanian historical conclusion.

Within this identified comparator set, the direction of the error is consistent. A conviction, a discontinued proceeding, an insufficient-evidence disposition, and an administrative deactivation are each enlarged toward exoneration or rehabilitation. I have identified no converse example in this same record in which procedural ambiguity or non-conviction was enlarged into culpability against a Lithuanian historical figure. This bounded directional pattern is more probative of method than any one mistaken word viewed in isolation.

The applicant's inference is that the consistency is compatible with an ideological exculpatory function: foreign procedural outcomes are selected or reframed in ways that reduce the apparent responsibility of Lithuanian actors or strengthen defenses of them. The submission does not ask IHRA to infer private dishonesty, bad faith, or ideological motive from consistency alone. It asks IHRA to test whether the repeated one-direction transformation of non-exonerating outcomes into exculpatory historical evidence, particularly after notice and access to contrary primary records, is compatible with the open and accurate engagement with national history required by IHRA's distortion and rehabilitation framework.

LGGRTC response No. 14R, 11 February 2020 (English translation): https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/Atsakymas-Gochinui-i-01-16_en.pdf

LGGRTC memorandum on Jonas Noreika, 17 December 2019: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/Annex-No-46-GRRCL-2019-December-memorandum-second-memorandum-on-Jonas-Noreika.pdf>

Justiz und NS-Verbrechen, proceeding No. 722 (Gewecke/Bub): <https://junsv.nl/junsv-01/junsv/brd/brdfiles/brd722.htm>
Bundesgerichtshof, 26 January 1971, 5 StR 631/70: <https://dejure.org/1971,6855>

Signed Gewecke-Bub submission to the Prosecutor General, 18 September 2026:
https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/LT_General_Prosecutor_Gewecke_Bub_LGGRTC_Statement_2026-09-18_signed.pdf

Signed Schleef supplement, 24 September 2026: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/AP-30803_M-2-02-00837-26_Schleef_Papildymas_2026-09-24_signed.pdf

Schleef preservation record: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Schleef.pdf>

XIV. Materiality: why the American attribution matters

The Provisional Government sat from late June to early August 1941. Its own records include anti-Jewish governmental measures and institutional decisions relevant to the Holocaust-era record. A preserved copy of the 1 August 1941 Regulations on the Status of Jews bears Ambrazevičius's signature, although the precise archive leaf number should be verified before definitive scholarly citation. Lithuania's International Commission and the Dieckmann–Sužiedėlis research provide the broader official and scholarly baseline for the Provisional Government, TDA, segregation, expropriation, and the anti-Jewish regulatory regime.

LGGRTC 2001 source edition — Lituanistika bibliographic record: <https://www.lituanistika.lt/content/21407>

The present submission does not ask IHRA to infer personal criminal liability from those institutional records. Their relevance is to rehabilitation: a claimed foreign exoneration has been invoked as external authority in the public treatment of the head of that government, despite the absence of an identified American adjudication and despite the Foreign Ministry's later concession about the legal character of the U.S. record.

The materiality of the exoneration claim can be tested against the Provisional Government's own record. LGGRTC itself published the principal source edition of the Government's protocols in 2001. Among the relevant items are the 5 July 1941 decision concerning requested support for the TDA Battalion and the Seventh Fort detention operation; the 1 August 1941 Regulations on the Status of Jews, on the preserved project copy bearing Ambrazevičius's signature; the 2 August resolution concerning restoration of bank-held valuables, which contained a discriminatory exclusion; and the final meeting minutes recording Brazaitis's reference to excesses including executions of Jews in Kaunas and the provinces. Each proposition must be read at the level the source supports: institutional acts and contemporaneous awareness are not automatically individual criminal liability.

The 1 August Regulations also expose the temporal problem in the American summary. The INS disposition described the relevant Provisional Government period as ending 12 July; the Government continued into August. The 1 August Regulations and the 2 August decision therefore fall outside the window written into the American summary itself. A later state institution may still assess the American inquiry as historically relevant, but it cannot reasonably treat that three-week description as affirmative clearance of acts occurring after the period the summary said it examined without identifying additional evidence that closes the gap.

Christoph Dieckmann and Saulius Sužiedėlis, "The Persecution and Mass Murder of Lithuanian Jews during Summer and Fall of 1941: Sources and Analysis": https://www.komisija.lt/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/S.SuziedelisC.Dieckmann_Mass-Killings_United-version.pdf

International Commission conclusions, approved 20 April 2005: https://www.komisija.lt/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Approved-Conclusions_Persecution-and-Mass-Murder-of-Lithuanian-Jews.pdf

1 August 1941 Regulations on the Status of Jews — preserved scan: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/5.-Zydu-padeties-nuostatai-LCVA-f1075-a2-b5-l54A.pdf>

Finnish diplomatic materials concerning Lithuania in 1941 provide an additional contemporaneous external record for the broader governmental environment. The file identified here is the September 1941 Finnish diplomatic report preserved as "5C10-Liettuano-oloista." It is included for source completeness only; this submission does not derive a Brazaitis-specific finding from it unless a particular passage is separately cited and its evidentiary limits are stated.

XIV-A. The present applications are themselves part of the historical record

The requests, complaints, archival applications, ministerial replies, corrections, refusals, and non-corrections generated by this matter will themselves become part of the long-term historical record. Future researchers will not evaluate only what Lithuania said about 1941. They will also be able to evaluate what Lithuanian institutions did after the underlying primary records, source limitations, and correction requests were specifically placed before them in 2018–2026. These files will form part of the record by which Lithuania’s treatment of Holocaust history is assessed for generations.

This submission therefore distinguishes error from conduct after notice. An initial historical or legal mistake can be corrected. Where a state institution is placed on specific documentary notice that a material proposition is false or overstated, verifies enough of the objection to make a partial correction, and nevertheless continues to publish the stronger proposition, the issue is no longer adequately captured by the word “mistake.” The allegation presented for IHRA determination is that continued maintenance after notice and partial correction can amount to knowing historical distortion. In this submission, “knowing” means institutional knowledge evidenced by the documentary record — including the 2 December 2019 prosecutorial acknowledgment of the source defect, the 12 May 2026 Foreign Ministry legal concession, and the 26 August 2026 partial edit — and does not attribute a private state of mind, dishonesty, or intent to any individual official. That institutional allegation is to be tested against the documents and the institutions’ own explanations.

I therefore ask IHRA to invite the Republic of Lithuania to consider the archival record its institutions are creating now and, where the record warrants it, to make a dated, transparent correction accompanied by a complete source audit and published reasoning. Future researchers will be able to see both the challenged historical proposition and the manner in which the State responded after specific documentary notice. A correction would form part of that record; so would a decision to leave a proposition standing after its evidentiary basis has been shown to be incomplete, non-adjudicative, or temporally narrower than the conclusion drawn from it.

XV. Findings stated by confidence level

Established on documents held or publicly preserved

- The surviving 1974–1975 American documents identified in the present corpus record administrative deactivation and possible reactivation, not a judicial acquittal, exoneration, or rehabilitation.
- LGGRTC used stronger American-exoneration and U.S.-Department-of-Justice rehabilitation language in formal letters, litigation, and public pages from 2018 onward.
- A Lithuanian prosecutor stated on 2 December 2019 that the congressional source relied upon did not state either an exoneration or a rehabilitation fact, while declining criminal investigation for lack of the required intent and purpose.
- The Foreign Ministry stated on 12 May 2026 that the “complete exoneration” formulation was legally imprecise and that administrative discontinuation is not formal judicial exoneration under U.S. legal standards.
- LGGRTC actively edited page No. 3058 on 26 August 2026 and marked that edit, but a separate U.S.-Department-of-Justice rehabilitation statement remained on that page and page No. 2969 retained the categorical rehabilitation proposition.
- The 24 September 2026 prosecutorial refusal did not adjudicate the historical truth of the surviving rehabilitation proposition or whether LGGRTC’s correction should extend to earlier letters and public pages.
- The MFA records request concerning the correction and diplomatic file was registered on 17 September 2026 as No. 2-15744 and remains pending.
- The 2009 Presidential decree awarded Brazaitis the Grand Cross of the Order of the Cross of Vytyis; the underlying award-vetting file is the subject of a pending archive request.
- LGGRTC Letter No. 14R-51 used the Brazaitis “complete exoneration” proposition inside the Škirpa file while reproducing narrower U.S. deactivation language in the same instrument.
- The surviving INS source list records broad international outreach but identifies no Lithuanian archive or repository; the complete CO 703.951 file remains sought under U.S. FOIA.

- The present record does not show that LGGRTC obtained and audited the complete CO 703.951 file before publishing categorical exoneration and rehabilitation formulations.
- In the documented comparator set, LGGRTC's exculpatory terminology extends beyond Brazaitis: Gewecke's conviction, Bub's discontinued proceeding, and Schleef's insufficient-evidence disposition were represented within an exoneration/acquittal narrative and used in the Centre's defense of Lithuanian historical figures.

Supported institutional inference

Even if the original 2018 formulation is assumed to have begun as error, the documented sequence supports a narrower institutional inference that the record has not yet been fully corrected or made reproducible after notice. The source defect was formally recorded by a Lithuanian prosecutor in 2019; the Foreign Ministry conceded the legal imprecision in May 2026; LGGRTC then made a partial edit in August 2026; yet stronger rehabilitation language remained publicly accessible. This inference concerns institutional correction practice. It does not require or assert private dishonesty by any named official.

The cross-case directionality strengthens the institutional inference because the identified category errors do not randomly enlarge or diminish culpability. Within the comparators presently documented, they run toward exculpation and then enter favorable Lithuanian historical narratives. That consistency supports, but does not by itself prove, an inference of ideological selection or institutional bias. IHRA is asked to test that inference against the complete production and any counterexamples Lithuania can identify.

Unresolved

- The complete INS administrative file CO 703.951 and whether it contains any additional disposition material.
- The exact correction or internal communication on which the Foreign Ministry relied when it wrote that the wording “has since been corrected.”
- Who initiated, drafted, reviewed, and approved the 26 August 2026 edit and why the surviving rehabilitation statements were left unchanged.
- Whether Letters Nos. 55R-21 and 14R-82 remain operative without qualification after the May 2026 concession.
- The full contents of the 2009 state-award file and whether the claimed American result was part of any historical or reputational vetting.
- Whether LGGRTC ever requested or obtained the complete U.S. administrative file CO 703.951 before publishing its exoneration and rehabilitation formulations; the present record does not establish either proposition.

XVI. Pre-registered correction and falsification conditions

- If an authentic United States adjudication is produced showing that a competent U.S. body formally exonerated, acquitted, or rehabilitated Brazaitis, the central American-record finding must be revised.
- If the complete U.S. file materially alters the present understanding of the administrative disposition, the description of the U.S. process must be revised to the extent the primary record requires.
- If LGGRTC produces a dated, complete correction made before this filing that removes the U.S.-Department-of-Justice rehabilitation proposition from every relevant public and official instrument, the persistence finding must be narrowed from the date of correction.
- If the Ministry produces the communication showing exactly what LGGRTC said had been corrected before 12 May 2026, that communication must replace inference about the Ministry's informational basis.
- If the Ministry produces records showing that it independently reviewed the full 1941 documentary record, including material and acts after 12 July 1941, before issuing the 12 May 2026 letter, the concern that its historical account depended materially on an incomplete LGGRTC presentation must be narrowed or withdrawn.
- If page No. 2969 or the surviving rehabilitation statement on page No. 3058 is corrected after this filing, the record should be dated and the correction foregrounded rather than treated as if it had never existed.
- If the 2009 award file shows that no American-exoneration proposition was considered in the decoration process, no such linkage will be inferred.
- If IHRA determines on a reasoned record that the documented conduct does not fall within its distortion or rehabilitation tools, the IHRA characterization sought here must be narrowed or withdrawn to the extent of that determination.

- If LGGRTC produces a pre-2018 request for, receipt of, and documented review of the complete CO 703.951 file, the concern that its categorical American-exoneration language rested on an unretrieved partial file must be narrowed to whatever source-use or interpretation issue remains after that production.
- If Lithuania produces materially comparable LGGRTC examples in which procedural ambiguity, non-conviction, or insufficient evidence was consistently treated with equal caution when the result was adverse to a Lithuanian historical figure, the claimed one-direction methodological asymmetry must be narrowed.

XVII. Requested IHRA process

1. Register and preserve this revised submission as the current Brazaitis evidentiary statement linked to the petition of 28 May 2026 and the Brazaitis supplement of 19 August 2026.
2. Refer the matter to the Academic Working Group, the Committee on Antisemitism and Holocaust Denial, and the Committee on the Holocaust, Genocide, and Crimes Against Humanity, or to the expert bodies the IHRA Chair and Secretary General consider appropriate.
3. Invite a document-specific written response from the Republic of Lithuania addressing the U.S. administrative disposition, the 2019 prosecutorial acknowledgment, the May 2026 ministerial concession, the 26 August edit, and the surviving public statements.
4. Encourage preservation and production of the non-privileged working files and inter-institutional communications needed to reproduce the correction history, recording non-production only as an evidentiary boundary and not as proof of intent.
5. Invite Lithuania to state whether Letters Nos. 55R-21 and 14R-82 and public pages Nos. 2969 and 3058 remain authoritative, and if not, to identify the correcting instrument and effective date.
6. Ask Lithuania to explain what it understands the 1974–1975 United States proceedings to have established and to identify any American adjudication it says supports the words exoneration or rehabilitation.
7. If IHRA finds non-compliance with its distortion or rehabilitation standards, invite a defined corrective process and transparent reissuance or correction of the relevant public and official instruments.
8. Preserve the right to supplement if the MFA, LGGRTC, prosecutor, archive, United States agencies, or other custodians produce documents that materially narrow or alter this record.
9. Ask the Republic of Lithuania to state whether it considers the documented Brazaitis correction history compatible with the Stockholm Declaration, the Working Definition, the 2020 Ministerial Declaration, and the Statement on Rehabilitation, distinguishing standards by date.
10. If IHRA identifies a compliance defect, use graduated measures first: source production, independent expert review, dated public correction, and a defined opportunity to cure before considering any further status-related consequence permitted by IHRA's rules.
11. Invite a cross-case methodological audit of the Brazaitis, Gewecke, Bub, Schleef, Noreika, and Škirpa records to determine whether LGGRTC applies a consistent rule to acquittals, dismissals, discontinuances, insufficient-evidence dispositions, administrative closures, and convictions, regardless of whether the procedural outcome supports or undermines a favorable Lithuanian national-memory narrative.

XVIII. Document-specific questions for Lithuania

- What United States adjudication, if any, is said to have exonerated or rehabilitated Brazaitis? Identify the issuing authority, date, docket or file reference, and text.
- What exact correction did the Ministry of Foreign Affairs mean on 12 May 2026 when it wrote that the legally imprecise “complete exoneration” wording “has since been corrected”?
- What communication did LGGRTC provide to the Ministry to support that statement, and on what date?
- Did the Ministry independently review the full 1941 documentary record, including acts after 12 July 1941, before issuing the 12 May 2026 reply? If so, identify the records reviewed and the officials or experts who performed that review.
- If the Ministry relied materially on an LGGRTC factual briefing, will it now review that briefing against the complete documentary chronology and state whether the information supplied to it was complete and accurate?

- Why does page No. 3058 still state that Brazaitis was rehabilitated by the United States Department of Justice while a later sentence on the same page was narrowed on 26 August 2026?
- Why does page No. 2969 continue to state that Brazaitis was rehabilitated by the U.S. Justice Department?
- Do Letters Nos. 55R-21 and 14R-82 remain in force without qualification? If not, identify the withdrawal, correction, or reissue.
- Who authorized the 26 August 2026 edit, what sources were reviewed, and what rule determined which formulations were changed and which were retained?
- What is the current governmental position on LGGRTC's 22 December 2020 description of Representative Sherman's correction as a politician's opinion rather than a new historical source or circumstance?
- What action, if any, did Lithuania or LGGRTC take in response to the April 2019 IHRA expert invitation to acknowledge and condemn the relevant wartime conduct and engage in open dialogue and joint research?
- What historical, reputational, or legal vetting supported the 2009 state decoration, and did that vetting rely on a claimed American exoneration or rehabilitation?
- What is the status of MFA request No. 2-15744 and what records can be produced concerning the May 2026 correction and the underlying U.S. file?
- Before publishing the 'complete exoneration' and U.S.-Department-of-Justice rehabilitation claims, did LGGRTC request, obtain, or review the complete INS/USCIS administrative file CO 703.951? If so, produce the request, response, file inventory, and source-use record.
- If LGGRTC did not possess the complete CO 703.951 file, what research methodology justified converting the surviving subset into categorical exoneration or rehabilitation language?
- What written source-completeness, peer-review, or quality-control rule applies when LGGRTC uses a foreign criminal or administrative proceeding as favorable historical evidence concerning Holocaust-era actors?
- Will LGGRTC or the Ministry now seek the complete American file independently and reassess the public record if the full file materially changes, narrows, or complicates the partial record previously relied upon?
- What documentary completeness standard did LGGRTC apply before treating the U.S. administrative record as affirmative exoneration or rehabilitation, and where is that standard recorded?
- Did LGGRTC review the 2001 edition of the Provisional Government protocols it had itself published, including the post-12 July acts, before using the American inquiry as favorable evidence?
- What weight did Lithuania give, if any, to the 2010 Laurinavičius–Rudis memorandum when later state institutions presented the American result as favorable historical authority?
- What institutional mechanism now exists to ensure that a state historical pronouncement is revisited when later archival retrieval or official legal clarification materially changes the evidentiary record?
- What written methodological rule does LGGRTC apply when converting foreign criminal or administrative outcomes into historical propositions such as 'acquitted,' 'exonerated,' or 'rehabilitated,' and can Lithuania identify comparable cases where that rule operated in a direction adverse to a Lithuanian historical figure?

XIX. Positionality and disclosure

I am the complainant in the Lithuanian notice and prosecutorial record described above, the petitioner in the IHRA sequence beginning on 28 May 2026, and a litigant in related Lithuanian proceedings. I am not a neutral observer and do not present myself as one. Documents authored by me are used to establish notice, chronology, requests, and procedural posture; the principal factual findings are tied to governmental, prosecutorial, archival, or other independently identifiable records.

I am also a doctoral candidate in Holocaust and Genocide Studies at Gratz College. If this matter is referred to an IHRA expert body whose chair or member has an institutional connection to Gratz, I request whatever disclosure, reassignment, or recusal step IHRA considers appropriate. I seek no favorable consideration from that relationship.

I applied for the post of Director General of LGGRTC in February 2026 and again in July 2026 and was not selected. I disclose that interest here.

XX. Principal documentary source map

Original IHRA petition, 28 May 2026: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/IHRA-Petition-Gochin-5-28-26.pdf>

Original Brazaitis supplemental submission, 19 August 2026:

https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/08/IHRA_Supplemental_Submission_Brazaitis_2026-08-19.pdf

LGGRTC Letter No. 55R-21, 26 February 2018: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/Gonocide-Reply-2018-02-26-Holocaust-interpretation.pdf>

LGGRTC Letter No. 14R-82, 11 October 2018: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/4.-2018-10-11-Lietuvos-gyventoju-genocido-ir-rezistencijos-tyrimo-centro-rastas-Nr.-14R-82.pdf>

LGGRTC page No. 2969 — live page: <https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/2969/a/> | **TOI preservation capture:** <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/Regarding-the-provision-of-information.pdf>

LGGRTC page No. 3058: <https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/3058/a/>

Representative Brad Sherman correspondence compilation, 2019–2026:

<https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/Congress-on-Brazaitis.pdf>

Vilnius prosecutor refusal, 2 December 2019: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/04/2020-05-20_035122-Decision.pdf

MFA reply to Representative Sherman, 12 May 2026: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/06/Letter-to-Rep.-Sherman.pdf>

Annotated August 2026 correction comparison:

https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/08/LGGRTC_Annotated_Exhibit_2026-08-30.png

24 September 2026 prosecutorial refusal, AP-29927/AP-29972:

https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Lithuania_Prosecutor_Refusal_AP-29927_AP-29972_2026-09-24.pdf

2012 congressional protest concerning Brazaitis reburial: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/2012-Congress-letter-on-Brazaitis.pdf>

Ombudsman complaint, 16 March 2018: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/Letter_Ombudsman_Brazaitis_20180316-1.pdf

Ombudsman filing challenging 55R-21 and 14R-82, 12 December 2018:

https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/20181212_Letter_Brazaitis_Ombudsman_GC.pdf

LGGRTC litigation pleading, 1 October 2018: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/lt-govt-defense.pdf>

Formal correction demand, 26 November 2020: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/On-Brazaitis-Exoneration_Grant-Arthur-Gochin_Nov-26-2020.pdf

Presidential Decree No. 1K-1907, 26 June 2009: <https://www.infolex.lt/ta/32397>

IHRA Working Definition of Holocaust Denial and Distortion: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/resources/working-definition-holocaust-denial-distortion>

IHRA Statement on Rehabilitation: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/statements/ihra-statement-on-rehabilitation>

2020 IHRA Ministerial Declaration: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/resources/2020-ihra-ministerial-declaration>

2019 IHRA expert statement concerning LGGRTC: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/statements/statement-center-study-genocide-resistance-lithuania>

IHRA Lithuania country page: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/countries/lithuania>

Current LGGRTC Act — preamble / current consolidated text: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.40706/asr>

LGGRTC 2025 activity report: <https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/4914/a/>

Applicant's USCIS FOIA request for complete Brazaitis administrative file: 5 September 2026, CO 703.951 / AS 222 100 S/CJ (C), held by applicant.

LGGRTC Letter No. 14R-51, 11 July 2018: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/GC_reply_Skirpa_20180711-1.pdf

LGGRTC court pleading, 1 October 2018: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/lt-govt-defense.pdf>

2012 Sherman/Waxman/Berman protest: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/2012-Congress-letter-on-Brazaitis.pdf>

2010 Laurinavičius–Rudis memorandum / honors scans: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/Brazaitis-scans.pdf>

2012 Lithuanian open letter concerning reburial: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/8.-Atviras-laiskas-del-J.-Ambrazeviciaus-B.kilmingo-perlaidojimo-Bernardinai.lt_.pdf

IHRA Membership and Application Procedure: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/who-we-are/member-countries/membership-and-application-procedure>

Stockholm Declaration: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/resources/stockholm-declaration>

Eilberg letter to Stanley A. Gecys, 13 January 1975 — TOI preservation copy: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/1975-letter.pdf>

DELFI publication, 8 March 2019 — “Genocido tyrimo centras nepasiduos vulgariam spaudimui”:

<https://www.delfi.lt/news/ringas/politics/lggrtc-genocido-tyrimo-centras-nepasiduos-vulgariam-spaudimui.d?id=80566671>

LGGRTC 2019 archive listing (page 3149): <https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/3149/a/>

LGGRTC 2001 Provisional Government source edition — Lituianistika: <https://www.lituanistika.lt/content/21407>

1 August 1941 Regulations on the Status of Jews — preservation scan: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/03/5.-Zydu-padeties-nuostatai-LCVA-f1075-a2-b5-l54A.pdf>

International Commission conclusions, 20 April 2005: https://www.komisija.lt/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Approved-Conclusions_Persecution-and-Mass-Murder-of-Lithuanian-Jews.pdf

Dieckmann–Sužiedėlis study: https://www.komisija.lt/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/S.SuziedelisC.Dieckmann_Mass-Killings_United-version.pdf
Finnish Foreign Ministry file 5C10 — “Lietuan oloista”: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/5C10-Lietuan-oloista.pdf>
Certified Seimas Human Rights Committee response package, September 2026:
https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Seimas_HRC_Response_2026-09-22_Gochin_with_English_Translation.pdf
U.S. Department of State 2012 International Religious Freedom Report — Lithuania (ECoI mirror):
<https://www.ecoi.net/en/document/1342475.html>
IHRA, Understanding Holocaust Distortion: Contexts, Influences and
Examples: <https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Understanding-Holocaust-Distortion-Contexts-Influences-and-Examples-IHRA.pdf>
LGGRTC 2012 Brazaitis publication: https://www.genocid.lt/UserFiles/File/Titulinis/2012/20120525_brazaiti.pdf
MFA/INS nine-page package with American enclosures, August preservation copy:
<https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/08/Letter-to-Rep.-Sherman.pdf>
Current LGGRTC Regulations, Seimas Resolution No. XIV-2987, §8.1.5:
<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/608ec1607bff11efabdbb4a1fc8b0b63>
LGGRTC response No. 14R, 11 February 2020 (English translation): https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/Atsakymas-Gochinui-i-01-16_en.pdf
LGGRTC memorandum on Jonas Noreika, 17 December 2019: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/Annex-No-46-GRRCL-2019-December-memorandum-second-memorandum-on-Jonas-Noreika.pdf>
Justiz und NS-Verbrechen, proceeding No. 722 (Gewecke/Bub): <https://junsv.nl/junsv-01/junsv/brd/brdfiles/brd722.htm>
Bundesgerichtshof, 26 January 1971, 5 StR 631/70: <https://dejure.org/1971.6855>
Signed Gewecke-Bub submission to the Prosecutor General, 18 September 2026:
https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/LT_General_Prosecutor_Gewecke_Bub_LGGRTC_Statement_2026-09-18_signed.pdf
Signed Schleef supplement, 24 September 2026: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/AP-30803_M-2-02-00837-26_Schleef_Papildymas_2026-09-24_signed.pdf
Schleef preservation record: <https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Schleef.pdf>

Respectfully submitted,

Grant Arthur Gochin

Citizen of the Republic of Lithuania

24 September 2026