

105 Events. Eight Tests. One Pattern.

A Quantitative Documentary Audit of Source Treatment at Lithuania's Genocide Centre

Grant Arthur Gochin | Companion study to “Ten Doors, One Question” | 10 October 2026

The record does not show a simple source blacklist. It shows exculpatory conclusions repeatedly surviving with a lighter burden of verification, attribution and correction.

Executive finding

The frozen 8 October 2026 matrix contains 105 rows, E01-E105. One row, E85, is a retired reconciliation row merged into E94-E95 and retained only for audit history. Eighty-four unique active events carry at least one of the eight methodological C-codes. Because some events bear on more than one question, those 84 events produce 118 overlapping test assignments: C1 19, C2 6, C3 8, C4 17, C5 19, C6 11, C7 23 and C8 15.

Eighty-three of the 84 counted events have a public source path in the companion Public Reproducibility Appendix; E53 is flagged as under source verification. The audit is a purposive accountability corpus, not a random sample of all LGGRTC work, and it makes no probability claim about dishonesty or motive.

Source-treatment rule

Based on the record I have documented over decades, I do not regard the Lithuanian Genocide and Resistance Research Centre (LGGRTC) as an independent historical authority for purposes of establishing contested historical fact.

Its institutional authorship supplies no evidentiary presumption of accuracy, reliability, neutrality, or historical authority. Publication by the LGGRTC is not corroboration. It establishes only that the Centre made the assertion.

In my assessment, the Centre's publications have repeatedly functioned as instruments of national historical advocacy and, in material instances, as vehicles for distorted or fictionalized history. The documented record now includes instances in which the Centre made categorical historical or legal claims without first examining the primary records capable of establishing whether those claims were true.

Accordingly, I assign no independent evidentiary weight to a material historical proposition merely because it originates with, is endorsed by, or is repeated by the LGGRTC. Every such proposition must stand or fall on independently verified primary documentation or credible external historical scholarship.

Until that verification is completed, an LGGRTC assertion is treated as an unverified claim by an interested institutional source, not as historical evidence supporting itself. Particular scrutiny is required for omission, selective quotation, exculpatory reframing, changes in legal or procedural characterization, reliance on derivative sources where primary records are available, and factual distortion.

The rule is simple: LGGRTC publication proves that the LGGRTC said something. It does not prove that what the LGGRTC said is true.

1. The eight tests

The eight tests are the tests defined in the frozen 8 October matrix. One event can carry more than one code; the 118 assignments are therefore not independent observations.

Test	Assignments	Question	Result
C1	19	Foreign procedural outcomes	Different foreign dispositions were repeatedly translated into more exculpatory language than the underlying procedures support.
C2	6	Selective chronology / scope	A time-limited U.S. inquiry was made to carry a broader historical clearance.
C3	8	Certification before verification	The strongest branches show categorical certification before inspection of controlling primary records.
C4	17	Soviet-era evidence treatment	The crude provenance thesis fails: Soviet-derived records are used in both directions.
C5	19	Attribution and burden	Favorable and adverse evidence can face materially different corroboration, attribution and inference burdens.
C6	11	Criminal-standard substitution	Historical or administrative responsibility is narrowed by tests

			more appropriate to criminal guilt.
C7	23	Persistence / partial correction	Notice and correction do not reliably produce withdrawal, reissue or propagation.
C8	15	Transfer / governmental adoption	LGGRTC conclusions move into diplomatic, political, commemorative and governmental contexts.

2. Foreign proceedings: the conclusion was defended by weakening the proposition

Ewald Bub. LGGRTC response No. 55R-951 states that the Centre [had not examined the 1970 Lübeck judgment](#) because it was not digitized, and says the formulation that Bub was 'completely acquitted' was probably not legally correct.

The same letter quotes the 2019 memorandum as saying that the court 'rejected the charges concerning the Holocaust' against Gewecke and Bub and dates the court's ruling to 1969. It then defends the 'essential statements' with a weaker proposition: the broader accusations did not end in convictions for all of the alleged persecution and mass killing. The Centre defended the old conclusion by replacing it with a narrower one. The same letter also records that Gewecke was sentenced to four and a half years.

The chronology is itself revealing. The 2019 memorandum dates the court's ruling to 1969; the judgment is dated 27 January 1970. The Centre later acknowledged that it had not examined that judgment.

Hermann Schleef. The 27 April 1970 Oldenburg order ended his proceeding 'aus dem tatsächlichen Grunde des mangelnden Beweises' - for insufficient evidence. That is not a merits acquittal or adjudication of innocence. LGGRTC's 11 February 2020 exculpatory German-court formulation predates the documented 2021 acquisition of the Oldenburg scans by the Lithuanian Embassy. That proves publication before documented Lithuanian state possession at Embassy level; it does not prove later LGGRTC receipt.

Juozas Ambrazevičius-Brazaitis. LGGRTC used 'complete exoneration' and rehabilitation language for an American administrative record. A Lithuanian prosecutor [recorded on 2 December 2019](#) that the 1975 letter stated neither an acquittal nor rehabilitation fact. [The 12 May 2026 Verbickas letter](#) relayed the Centre's acknowledgment that 'complete exoneration' had been legally imprecise and said the formulation had been corrected.

3. Scope: a limited inquiry cannot clear acts outside its period

The U.S. administrative inquiry described in the Chapman material was framed around alleged conduct from 23 June through 12 July 1941. The later Lithuanian use of that record carried a broader historical effect.

The clearest out-of-scope act is the [1 August 1941 Regulations on the Status of Jews](#), reproduced by Z. V. Rekašius in Akiračiai No. 8 (332), September 2001, p. 7, as "PRIEDAS NR. 1." That reproduction carries the signature block "L. e. Ministerio Pirmininko pareigas J. Ambrazevičius [parašas]" (acting Prime Minister J. Ambrazevičius [signature]). Rekašius also notes that the minutes of the 31 July and 1 August sessions did not survive, although some annexes did. The project archive identifies the record as LCVA f. 1075, ap. 2, b. 5. The narrow point does not depend on a surviving meeting minute: a regulation dated 1 August lies outside an inquiry period ending on 12 July.

4. Verification: the Centre certified what it had not examined

The Bub branch is an institutional admission, not an inference. The Centre says the judgment was not digitized and had not been examined, yet in the same letter maintains that its essential historical effect was accurate. That is certification without primary verification.

Schleef adds chronology. The 2020 exculpatory formulation preceded the documented 2021 Embassy acquisition of the Oldenburg file. Taken together, the two branches show that published certainty did not wait for controlled access to the foreign judicial records on which the certainty depended.

5. Soviet-derived evidence: the easy accusation fails

LGGRTC does not simply accept Soviet-derived evidence when it helps an honored figure and reject it when it hurts. In the Krikštaponis record, Rukšėnas used [postwar criminal-case files](#) adversely. The same LRT account also records wartime commandant records that he distinguished from Soviet-era material that could be attacked as fabricated. The adverse finding therefore did not rest on Soviet files alone, but those postwar files were part of the adverse evidentiary chain.

The surviving question is harder: whether the same attribution, corroboration and inferential rules are applied after a source is admitted, whichever way it points.

6. Burden: favorable and adverse evidence do not always face the same test

Inside one [2016 Rukšėnas article](#), a favorable episode in which 'our captain' warns a Jewish family is used, with a hedge, to support an inference about Noreika and his comrades. Pakalniškis's adverse account is tested against postwar files and

historical works, rejected on attribution grounds, and then rejected more broadly on the proposition that Lithuanian commandants lacked independent authority to organize the mass killing on their own initiative.

The issue is not that one witness is believed and another disbelieved. It is that the route from evidence to favorable inference is materially shorter than the route from adverse evidence to historical responsibility.

Absence is also used exculpatorily. In LGGRTC letter 11R-12, [the absence of a Soviet genocide charge](#) against Adolfas Ramanauskas received favorable weight. On page 55 of the Rukšėnas article, the absence of testimony from men convicted after the war that Noreika organized the killings is likewise used favorably. Twice, absence in Soviet-era proceedings becomes evidence for the honored man.

7. Criminal-law standards can narrow historical responsibility

The [17 December 2019 Noreika memorandum](#) invokes criminal-law concepts of intentional destruction and then concludes that 'J. Noreika nesuprato, kad getai yra vienas iš Holokausto etapų' - Noreika did not understand that ghettos were a stage of the Holocaust.

Those questions can matter in criminal adjudication. They are not the only questions in historical or commemorative analysis. Noreika's administrative acts concerning Jewish concentration and property remain historical acts whether or not the evidence proves that he personally conceived the policy, physically moved victims or possessed the mens rea required for a genocide conviction. When criminal guilt becomes the gate for historical responsibility, documented administrative participation can disappear from the commemorative conclusion without disappearing from the record.

8. Correction: what the prosecutor confirmed, and what the captures show

The [24 September 2026 prosecutorial refusal](#) quotes the corrected page-3058 formulation replacing rehabilitation with removal from a suspect list and records the marker '(pataisyta 2026 08 26)'. It does not independently confirm every surviving sentence on the page.

The surviving claim comes from the page captures themselves. The [9 October capture of page 3058](#) still contains a separate sentence saying that Brazaitis was rehabilitated by the U.S. Department of Justice. The [9 October capture of page 2969](#) also continues to state that he was rehabilitated by the U.S. Department of Justice.

The operative unit is propagation: whether a correction reached every sentence, page, letter, report and derivative state use that carried the earlier claim.

9. Transfer: the Centre's conclusions leave the Centre

On 22 April 2020, [Ažubalis and Kasčiūnas](#) urged that the LGGRTC Noreika conclusion 'būtų perduota visoms Lietuvos diplomatinėms atstovybėms' - be passed to all Lithuanian diplomatic missions.

Six years later, the Foreign Ministry's Verbičkas letter transmitted the Centre's clarification and retained historical position to a member of the U.S. Congress. These records do not prove that every mission adopted every Centre claim. They prove that LGGRTC conclusions were proposed for, and in at least one documented case used in, foreign-facing state communication.

10. The strongest defenses, including the prosecutor's refusal

Different sources deserve different weights. Correct. The audit does not demand equal weight for unequal sources. It asks for a stable rule explaining the difference. The Krikštaponis control defeats the idea that Soviet provenance alone determines admissibility.

The foreign proceedings contained favorable material. Some did. The study separates favorable evidence from procedural labels. Administrative deactivation, insufficient-evidence closure and a mixed criminal judgment do not become complete acquittal, rehabilitation or comprehensive historical innocence merely because they contain favorable components.

Historians are entitled to interpret evidence. Yes. Interpretation does not answer why a controlling judgment was not read before its effect was certified, why a time-limited inquiry was made to carry a broader conclusion, or why correction did not propagate across related outputs.

A prosecutor found no crime in the 2026 Brazaitis/Škirpa correction complaints. Yes. Prosecutor Sergejus Stulginskis declined criminal investigation on 24 September 2026, calling Report 9R-598 an historiographical, not legal, assessment and describing the Centre's texts as historians' opinion. That decision tests criminal liability and intent; it is not a research-integrity audit. The same decision records the correction from 'rehabilitated' to removal from a suspect list. Failure to meet the criminal threshold does not establish that the earlier historical or legal wording was accurate.

The Centre corrected the wording. Partly. The study credits the correction. The 9 October captures show that the rehabilitation formulation survived elsewhere, including on the same corrected page and on page 2969. Partial correction is not full propagation.

This is a hostile sample. It is a purposive accountability corpus. That is why the study makes no population-frequency or probability claim. Its force depends on source-controlled contradictions, direct institutional admissions and same-document comparisons that remain after adverse testing.

11. Quantitative conclusion

The companion Public Reproducibility Appendix contains all 105 rows. It identifies E85 as retired, preserves the full 84-event C1-C8 universe, and provides a public source path for 83 of the 84 counted events; E53 is flagged as under source verification. The densest tests are persistence/correction (23 assignments), foreign procedural characterization (19), attribution/burden (19), Soviet-era evidence treatment (17), and transfer/governmental adoption (15).

The defensible headline is documentary, not probabilistic: LGGRTC's exculpatory historical conclusions repeatedly survive with a lighter burden of verification, attribution and correction than the adverse evidence used to challenge them.

The strongest counterexample is kept in the study rather than hidden: Soviet-derived evidence is used adversely as well as favorably. The institutional problem is therefore not a simple source blacklist. It is the rule applied after the evidence enters the record.

12. Public headline

105 Events. Eight Tests. One Pattern: Lithuania's Genocide Centre Gives Exculpatory History the Easier Burden of Proof.

Methodological limits

- The eight tests are the tests defined in the frozen 8 October matrix; they are not claimed to have been specified before the underlying historical disputes arose.
- The corpus is purposive and dispute-generated. It is not a random sample of all LGGRTC publications.
- Counts are descriptive. No p-value, posterior probability or population-frequency estimate is claimed.
- One event can map to multiple tests; assignments therefore overlap.
- The study distinguishes historical responsibility, commemorative fitness, administrative accuracy and criminal guilt.
- Eighty-three of the 84 C1-C8 counted events have a public source path in the appendix; E53 is under source verification. Context-only rows may retain an archival locator where no public copy is known.
- No documentary finding establishes private motive, conspiracy, fraud, criminality or collective Lithuanian guilt.

Selected public source spine

- [LGGRTC response No. 55R-951, registered 2 Oct 2026.](#)
- [Rukšėnas 2016 Noreika article.](#)
- [LGGRTC Noreika memorandum dated 17 Dec 2019.](#)
- [Vilnius prosecutor decision of 2 Dec 2019, material M-2-02-01142-19, p.3.](#)
- [Vice-Minister Vidmantas Verbickas to Rep. Brad Sherman, 12 May 2026.](#)
- [Prosecutor Sergejus Stulginskis, refusal of 24 Sep 2026.](#)
- [LRT, 15 Jun 2021, Krikštaponis / Rukšėnas source-treatment report.](#)
- [Ažubalis / Kasčiūnas public letter, 22 Apr 2020.](#)
- [P-01 signed filing, 9 Oct 2026.](#)
- [Archived LGGRTC page 3058, captured 9 Oct 2026.](#)
- [Archived LGGRTC page 2969, captured 9 Oct 2026.](#)