eSGN

This document is signed with eSGN

To check its signatures, open this PDF using Adobe Acrobat Reader.

For more information, visit the Adobe Acrobat's Learn & Support section.

verified by Digidentity

Signature Types

- Signed by a natural person
- Signed by a natural person with a registered profession
- Signed by a legal person or registered organisation

Levels of Electronic Signature

- Simple Electronic Signature
- Advanced Electronic Signature
- Qualified Electronic Signature

G. Gochin

Los Angeles, 22 October 2026
eIDAS Qualified Electronic Signature

GRANT ARTHUR GOCHIN
10900 Winnetka Avenue, Chatsworth, CA 91311, USA
+1 818-625-6513 | ggochin@gmail.com
Citizen of the Republic of Lithuania

22 October 2026

His Excellency Gitanas Nausėda
President of the Republic of Lithuania
Office of the President, S. Daukanto a. 3, LT-01122 Vilnius
Through the Chancellor of the Lithuanian State Orders and the State Awards Council

SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATION: KAZYS ŠKIRPA

Review and withdrawal of state awards; independent historical evaluation; production of the complete award record

Re: Supplement to my application of 27 September 2026, signed with a qualified electronic signature, requesting review of the state awards of Kazys Škirpa (1895–1979) under the Law on State Awards. The application was transmitted to the Presidential Chancellery (kanceliarija@prezidentas.lt) on 27 September 2026 at 10:35 PDT, with annexes at 12:27–12:28 PDT, and as a single consolidated QES-signed PDF at 22:17 PDT. I have not received a registration number or reply. Please register this supplement under the original file, or independently if that number cannot be located, and inform me of both.

I. Why this supplement is filed today

1. Two developments, neither addressed in my application of 27 September, prompt this supplement. The first is the letter the Genocide and Resistance Research Centre of Lithuania (LGGRTC) sent me today. The second is the Government's action plan of 157 measures against antisemitism, xenophobia and incitement to hatred. Together they place the Škirpa awards in a new light: the Centre has now stated in writing that the program announced in the name of Škirpa's organization has no legal force and is not the Republic's position, and the Government has recognized, as a legislative task for early 2027, that the existing mechanisms for withdrawing state awards are not effective enough.

A. LGGRTC letter No. 11R-12 of 22 October 2026

2. On 22 October 2026 I received LGGRTC letter No. 11R-12, registered 22 October 2026 and entitled “DĖL INFORMACIJOS APIE LIETUVIŲ AKTYVISTŲ FRONTO DOKUMENTUOSE IŠDĖSTYTUS TEIGINIUS.” It was signed electronically by Acting Director General Arūnas Bubnys at 13:45 (its metadata also records the signature of chief specialist Jolita Bernotienė at 16:27) and copied to the Government Chancellery. It answers my request of 18 September 2026, which the Government Chancellery forwarded to the Centre by letter No. PSG-1730 of 21 September 2026. The letter has no annexes. (Exhibit C1.)

3. The Centre states:

> *“LAF buvo nevalstybinė politinė ir rezistencinė organizacija. Jūsų nurodyti LAF dokumentai ir juose išdėstyti teiginiai nėra Lietuvos Respublikos teisės aktai ir neturi teisinės galios Lietuvos Respublikos teisinėje sistemoje. Juose paskelbti teiginiai apie žydų teisių „atšaukimą“ negali būti laikomi teisiškai galiojančiu šių teisių panaikinimu ar oficialia Lietuvos Respublikos pozicija.”*

4. The Centre invokes the statement of the Supreme Council–Reconstituent Seimas of 8 May 1990, “Dėl žydų tautos genocido Lietuvoje hitlerinės okupacijos metais,” and Article 29 of the Constitution. It concludes:

> *“Atskiro dokumento, kuriuo būtų tiesiogiai atmesti konkretūs LAF teiginiai, nenustatymas savaime nereikštų šių teiginių pripažinimo Lietuvos valstybės pozicija ar jų teisinės galios.”*

5. Working translation: the failure to identify a separate document directly rejecting specific LAF statements would not in itself mean that those statements are recognized as the position of the Lithuanian state or as having legal force. The letter speaks in the present tense, about today's legal system. It says nothing about the legal or practical effect of the LAF documents in 1941, and I do not read it as doing so. It does not say that the Centre searched for a repudiating act; it identifies none. It does not say what the leaders of the Lithuanian Activist Front (LAF) did to Jews, and it supplies no historical analysis. I accept its limited legal proposition for the purposes of this application.

6. The letter matters to this application because it fixes, in the Centre's own words and over the signature of its acting head, that the program revoking Jewish rights — the program issued in the name of the organization Škirpa founded and led in Berlin — carries no state authority and is not the Republic's position. The letter does not mention Škirpa; the connection to the organization he led is mine. If, as the official sources indicate, Škirpa remains listed as a holder of state awards, the question I put to the President follows directly: once the program is disowned, on what evidence and under what standard does the Republic continue to honor its leader?

B. The Government's 157-measure action plan

7. By Government Resolution No. 33 of 21 January 2026, the Twentieth Government, led by Prime Minister Inga Ruginienė, approved the Kovos su antisemitizmu, ksenofobija ar bet kokios kitos formos nesantaikos kurstymu ir žydų gyvenimo puoselėjimo veiksmų planas, a plan of 157 measures, published as a nineteen-page framework and a thirty-one-page implementation appendix. The Twenty-First Government, sworn in on 14 July 2026 under Prime Minister Mindaugas Sinkevičius, inherited it. Implementers report in writing by 31 March each year to a government-appointed coordinator, who publishes annual information on results. Its three objectives are the prevention of and fight against antisemitism, xenophobia and other incitement to hatred; the nurturing of Jewish life; and, as objective 3, “Holokausto atminties puoselėjimas.”

The plan's first objective expressly addresses Holocaust denial and minimization (“Holokausto neigimu ir menkinimu”). (Exhibits C2–C4.)

8. Measure 3.4 of the plan reads:

> *“3.4. Pakeisti teisės aktus, siekiant sukurti veiksmingus viešųjų objektų, kuriais propaguojami totalitariniai, autoritariniai režimai ir jų ideologijos, šalinimo mechanizmus, palengvinti laisvės kovų dalyvio teisinio statuso panaikinimą ar valstybės apdovanojimų atėmimą, kai atsiranda patvirtintų faktų dėl atitinkamų asmenų, turinčių minėtą teisinį statusą, kolaboravimo su okupacinių režimų represinėmis struktūromis ar jų dalyvavimo civilių gyventojų žudynėse …”*

9. The principal implementers of measure 3.4 are the coordinating institution, the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Culture; LGGRTC is a participating institution; the indicator is “Parengti įstatymų projektai”; the deadline is the first quarter of 2027. By adopting measure 3.4, the Government has accepted three propositions that bear on this application: that the withdrawal of state awards is a legitimate instrument of Holocaust-memory policy; that the existing mechanisms need to be made more effective; and that withdrawal should follow from established facts about collaboration.

10. Three further measures place LGGRTC at the center of the plan's Holocaust-memory work. Under measure 3.1 the Centre, with municipalities, is the principal implementer of decisions removing public objects that promote totalitarian or authoritarian regimes, expressly including “nacistinį režimą, vykdžiusį Holokaustą” (2026–2029). Under measure 3.2 it leads the commemoration of rescuers. Under measure 3.27 it is the principal implementer for analyzing the Holocaust exhibitions of municipal museums and assessing whether they need updating (2027–2029). In the official consultation table the Centre itself proposed that the Vilna Gaon Museum of Jewish History lead measure 3.27, with the Centre participating. The Government partly accepted the proposal but kept the Centre as lead, answering: “Manytina, kad būtent Lietuvos gyventojų genocido ir rezistencijos tyrimo centras turi šioje srityje daugiau kompetencijos.” (Exhibit C3.)

11. Measure 3.12 directs the coordinating institution, with the institutions that appoint members of the IHRA delegation participating, to set Lithuania's long-term objectives in the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance and the principles, rights and duties of its delegation, by the second quarter of 2027. The measure does not name the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as its lead. It concerns how Lithuania presents its Holocaust record abroad; it does not provide for any independent assessment of the record being presented. Measure 1.48 provides for state awards to Lithuanian and foreign citizens who have contributed significantly to combating antisemitism, xenophobia and hatred in Lithuania, to Righteous Among the Nations, and to participants in resistance to the Nazi occupation. The plan therefore treats state awards as an expression of the values it promotes.

12. The Centre's most recent Škirpa assessment, Report No. 9R-598 (2024), was itself prepared for the interinstitutional commission that decides on public objects under the law prohibiting the propagation of totalitarian and authoritarian regimes — the process that measure 3.1 now assigns to the Centre (Part VI below). The institution whose Škirpa assessments I challenge is thus a participating institution in the very measure that would facilitate withdrawal of awards, and the lead institution in the measures that judge public Holocaust memory. The Škirpa awards are a test of whether the plan's commitments apply to the Republic's own honors.

C. Further LGGRTC statements since 27 September

13. Since my application, the Centre has made three further written statements that bear on the reliability of its historical characterizations:

- Letter No. 55R-951, dated 29 September and registered 2 October 2026, signed by Acting Director General Bubnys and addressed also to Darius Jakavičius, chair of the Seimas Commission for Freedom Fights and State Historical Memory: “Centras nėra ištyręs 1970 metų Liubeko teismo nuosprendžio, nes jis nėra įskaitmenintas, todėl tikėtina, kad teiginys ‘E. Bub'as buvo visiškai išteisintas’ nėra teisiškai korektiškas…” The Centre nonetheless maintained that its “essential” statement — that the court rejected the Holocaust charges against Gewecke and Bub — was accurate. (Exhibit F1.)
- Letter No. 55R-1093 of 19 October 2026, in which the Centre stated that its records do not establish why its 11 February 2020 letter used the word “išteisino” (acquitted) for Hermann Schleef, and that it found no preparatory records and no correspondence with German courts or prosecutors on the matter. (Exhibit F3.)
- Letter No. 55R-1016 of 13 October 2026, refusing to correct its 2018 letters 55R-21 and 14R-82 describing the American disposition concerning Juozas Ambrazevičius-Brazaitis. (Exhibit F5.)

II. The awards, the competent authorities and the legal question

14. My application of 27 September identified three awards. The Centre's own Report 9R-598 records them precisely: on 25 October 1919 Škirpa was awarded the Cross of Vytis, fifth degree, “už narsumą” (for bravery); on 7 February 1930 he was presented with the Volunteer Medal; and on 8 September 1935 the President of the Republic conferred on him the Order of Vytautas the Great, third degree, “už nuopelnus Lietuvai.” Where my application described the first two differently, these particulars control, subject to the Chancellor's certification. I ask the Chancellor of the Lithuanian State Orders to confirm each award, its conferral act, its current legal classification and its entry in the award lists that the Chancellor maintains, and to supply the decrees, recommendations and award files.

15. Under Article 42 of the Law on State Awards, the Founder-Volunteers Medal is conferred by the Minister of National Defence. If the President is not competent to decide its status, I ask the Office to forward that part of this request to the competent minister and to inform me.

16. I do not assume that a reburial, a street name, a military ceremony and a presidential decoration are the same legal act. I do not allege that the restored Republic conferred these decorations after 1990. The Republic's post-1990 acts concerning Škirpa were of a different kind. On 16 June 1995 Škirpa and his wife were reburied at Petrašiūnai Cemetery in Kaunas in a ceremony organized under a Government order; the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has confirmed that Defence Minister Linas Linkevičius chaired the reburial commission and delivered the cemetery address, and contemporary reporting records Prime Minister Adolfas Šleževičius speaking on behalf of the Government. On 4 February 1998 Vilnius named Kazio Škirpos Alley; on 24 July 2019 the City Council renamed it Trispalvės Alley and repealed the 1998 naming. (Exhibits F7–F9.) These acts are not decorations, and I do not ask the President to review them. They show that the Republic has repeatedly had to decide what in Škirpa's record it honors.

17. All three awards were conferred before the conduct at issue — in 1919, 1930 and 1935. The conduct occurred afterward, in 1939–1941. Article 18(1) of the Law on State Awards, in the consolidated edition in force from 27 October 2020, applies to the conduct of an awardee that disgraces the award, including conduct after conferral. It provides:

> *"Jeigu apdovanotųjų veika žemina apdovanotojo vardą, Respublikos Prezidentas gali išbraukti šiuos asmenis iš ordinų kavalierių ar medaliais, kitais pasižymėjimo ženklais apdovanotųjų sąrašo."*

18. Article 6(4) provides that persons awarded before the Law entered into force have the same rights as those awarded under it. A provision that gives earlier awardees the rights of the lists must also subject them to the lists' conditions; otherwise every award conferred before 2003 would be beyond review, a result the Law does not state. Article 9(3), as I quoted it in my application, empowers the State Awards Council to consider "kitus su apdovanojimais susijusius klausimus" and to advise the President. Article 30 allows the President to withdraw the Order of the Cross of Vytis and its medal where the awardee is convicted of a serious crime or commits a misconduct that disgraces the name of an awardee; the two grounds are independent, so a criminal conviction is not a precondition. Whether Article 30 reaches an interwar fifth-degree Cross of Vytis must be determined from its current classification. I invoke Article 30 only to the extent the Chancellor confirms it applies.

19. Article 18(1) is discretionary. I ask for a reasoned decision, not a predetermined one. I recognize that the Law's provisions on returning insignia (Article 18(3)) were written with living awardees in mind and that the Office may consider whether the Law reaches deceased awardees or awards conferred by the interwar state. If the President concludes that he lacks power over any award, I ask that he say so in writing, identify the legal obstacle and the competent authority, and provide the dates, numbers and legal bases of all post-1990 decisions applying Article 18(1) or Article 30, so far as possible without disclosing protected personal data. Measure 3.4 of the plan approved by Government Resolution No. 33 shows that the Government itself regards the facilitation of such withdrawals as a matter for legislation by early 2027; the President need not wait for it, because Article 18(1) already exists. Nor does measure 3.4 narrow Article 18(1). The

measure describes the cases in which the Government intends to make withdrawal easier — collaboration with the occupation regimes' repressive structures or participation in the killing of civilians. Article 18(1) asks a different and broader question: whether an awardee's conduct disgraces the award. I do not contend that the evidence places Škirpa within the measure's description, and I do not rely on it for that purpose.

20. An award decision under Article 18 is not a criminal judgment and not a historical tribunal's finding of murder. It is a decision about continuing eligibility for state honor. The question is not whether Škirpa was convicted of a crime — he was not, and I do not suggest otherwise — but whether his documented conduct is compatible with the Republic continuing to list him among those it honors. I am not a lawyer and do not offer binding advice on Lithuanian law; I ask the competent institutions to determine it.

21. My position is independent and evidence-bound. In assessing the record I treat the Centre's statements as assertions to be tested rather than as proof: its authorship gives them no evidentiary weight of their own, and every factual proposition in this application rests on primary records, official external records, or independent scholarship.

III. The President's own words

22. At Paneriai on 23 September 2020, the President said, as the English text published by the Lithuanian Jewish Community records, that the only way to come to terms with history is to realize and tell ourselves the truth, however painful it may be, and: “It was difficult for us to admit to ourselves that our country's citizens died at the hands of Lithuanians as well.” (Exhibit C5; the Lithuanian original published by the Office of the President should control.)

23. I ask the President to give practical effect to those words in this decision: to apply them to the awards the Republic still maintains, and not to presume that existing institutional interpretations are conclusive. The Republic's leadership set the same standard in the 1990s. Finnish diplomatic reports record Prime Minister Šleževičius calling in September 1994 for an honest and open assessment of the persecution and killing of Jews and apologizing for Lithuanian participation, and President Algirdas Brazauskas apologizing in Israel in March 1995 for Lithuanians who killed, shot, drove Jews to their deaths and robbed them, with commitments to systematic investigation and review of disputed rehabilitations. (Exhibit F10; diplomatic reports, not exact-quotation authority.) Less than four months after that apology, the Government reburied Škirpa in a Government-organized ceremony.

24. This application concerns the documented conduct of identified individuals and the reliability of identified state institutions. It does not attribute collective guilt to the Lithuanian nation.

IV. Lithuania's international standing, and why the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is copied

25. I am sending a copy of this supplement to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs because the Škirpa awards bear directly on the international image of the Lithuanian state. The Ministry has already carried the Centre's historical characterizations abroad: its letter of 12 May 2026 to a member of the United States Congress relayed the Centre's position on Brazaitis and had to concede that the "complete exoneration" formulation was legally imprecise (Part VI, Section B). Under measure 3.12 of the Government's plan, a strategy for Lithuania's participation in the IHRA is to be prepared by mid-2027, with the institutions that appoint the delegation's members participating. What Lithuania tells its allies and international partners about its Holocaust record must be able to withstand examination of the documents.

26. Russian state propaganda portrays Lithuania as a state that honors Holocaust perpetrators and falsifies its national history. I reject Russian falsification of history on the same principle on which I object to Lithuanian falsification: the evidence determines the answer, not the political interest of the state that tells the story. A Kremlin narrative does not become true because a Lithuanian institution leaves an honor unexamined, and an honor does not become justified because the Kremlin attacks it. But every state honor kept without examination, and every official text that converts a discontinued foreign proceeding into an acquittal, hands that narrative material it did not have to earn. The allegation of falsification I raise in Part X is different in kind from the Kremlin's: it concerns specific, documented characterizations by named institutions, and it asks for an investigation, not a verdict. The answer to both is the same — the documents, examined in the open.

27. The President and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs can give that allegation the strongest documented answer: by telling the truth about the Holocaust in Lithuania, examining the Škirpa record independently, correcting what the evidence requires to be corrected, and showing the work. A state that confronts its own record openly cannot credibly be accused of falsifying it. A state that defends unexamined honors with characterizations it has already conceded are imprecise invites the accusation. An independent review serves Lithuania's security and democratic reputation precisely because its findings are not predetermined.

V. The historical case concerning Škirpa

A. Leadership of the Berlin LAF

28. Škirpa founded and led the Lithuanian Activist Front in Berlin. That is not disputed: the Centre's own assessments identify him as its leader. Leadership is the starting point of an individual inquiry, not a substitute for proof of personal drafting, approval or command. The inquiry must separate organizational leadership, authorship of particular texts, approval, dissemination, contemporaneous knowledge, later actions and retrospective self-description, and must apply one attribution standard to adverse and favorable evidence alike.

B. The documents, by issuer

29. Archival custody is not authorship. LCVA fond 648 is the fond of the Lithuanian Legation in London; the LAF materials discussed below are preserved there in apyrašas 2, files 581 and 582. Their presence establishes custody and provenance, not Škirpa's personal authorship of each document.

30. Document LVIII (LCVA f. 648, ap. 2, b. 582, l. 188–197; EAIS record 1071179), dated 24 March 1941, is marked “VISIŠKAI SLAPTAI” and titled “Lietuvai išlaisvinti nurodymai.” Its opening directs that its contents be passed to uprising centers only orally, through completely trusted couriers. In the uprising-preparation section it calls for intensified anti-Communist and anti-Jewish action and states the objective of making Jews flee Lithuania with the retreating Soviet forces. “Priversti žydus bėgti iš Lietuvos” then appears as a numbered operational task. As the Centre's own 2024 report quotes it, the document says an atmosphere must be created in which “nė vienas žydas nedrįstų net minties prileisti, kad naujoje Lietuvoje jis galės turėti bent minimalių teisių ir bendrai pragyvenimo galimybių,” and states the objective directly: “Tikslas priversti visus žydus bėgti iš Lietuvos drauge su raudonaisiais rusais. Juo jų daugiau šia proga iš Lietuvos pasišalins, tuo bus vėliau lengviau baigti nuo žydų nusikratyti. Savo laiku Vytauto Didžiojo suteiktas Lietuvoje žydams svetingumas atšaukiamas visiems amžiams …” The Centre's report quotes the last sentence without the word “svetingumas” (hospitality), leaving it without its subject. (Exhibit D1.)

31. Document LXIV (LCVA f. 648, ap. 2, b. 582, l. 213–215), the appeal “Amžiams išvaduokime Lietuvą nuo žydijos jungo,” is issued and signed in the name of the Lietuvos Aktyvistų Frontas. It announces an hour of final reckoning with the Jews (“galutinio su žydais atsiskaitymo valanda”), directs every Lithuanian Jew without exception to leave Lithuania, provides for Jewish movable and immovable property to pass into Lithuanian national ownership, denies Jews civil rights and livelihood in the restored state, and declares: “Senoji Vytauto Didžiojo laikais suteikta Lietuvoje prieglaudos teisė žydams yra visiškai ir galutinai atšaukiama.” LVIII and LXIV repeat parallel propositions — anti-Jewish mobilization, collective removal, denial of rights and livelihood, and revocation of the Vytautas-era protection. That repetition supports an inference of institutional continuity between the secret uprising instructions and the public appeal. It does not by itself prove that Škirpa wrote either. (Exhibit D2.)

32. A leaflet dated 19 March 1941 and issued in the name of the Lithuanian Information Bureau in Berlin (Lietuvių informacijų biuras) — known in the scholarship as the LAF appeal of 19 March 1941 — states in point 6, as the Centre's 2024 report quotes it: “Jau dabar „painformuokite“ žydus, kad jų likimas aiškus, todėl kas gali, tegu jau šiandien nešdinasi iš Lietuvos, kad nebūtų bereikalingų aukų. Lemiamu momentu jų turtą perimkite į savo rankas, kad niekas veltui nežūtų.” Stanislovas Stasiulis has shown that the leaflet survives in two versions, that copies reached Lithuania about 23 March 1941, and that the second version contains the sentence: “Išdavikams bus tik tuomet dovanota, jei jie tikrai įrodys, kad likvidavo nors po vieną

žydą.” He places the Bureau within the Berlin LAF circle, leaves the authenticity of that version unresolved for lack of data, and concludes that its authorship could belong to the Berlin LAF leadership or its Voldemarist faction. (S. Stasiulis, “1941 m. kovo 19 d. LAF atsišaukimas: provokacija, falsifikatas ar tikras dokumentas?”, Lietuvos istorijos studijos 38 (2016), pp. 73, 81–82; Exhibit D9.) I do not attribute it to Škirpa personally; the reviewers should establish its provenance.

33. Bronys Raila, head of the LAF propaganda commission, wrote in the brochure “Už ką kovoja aktyvistai,” again as quoted in the Centre's own reports, that the LAF was determined “visiškai atskirti žydus nuo Lietuvos valstybinio bei tautinio kūno ir laipsniškai įvykdyti žydų pašalinimą iš lietuviškos žemės aplamai.”

34. The index of file 582 also lists Document LV, “Svetingumo atšaukimas žydams,” at l. 182–183, marked as a draft (projektas). My complaint of 2017 quoted this text and described it as Škirpa's appeal to the Lithuanian Jews. I now identify it as Document LV, marked as a draft, and I do not attribute it to him personally or rely on it as an issued proclamation. The state nonetheless had specific notice of its content nine years ago.

C. Škirpa's own writings

35. In his manuscript memoir “Kovok! Pastangos gelbėti Lietuvą 1939–1941 m.” (LCVA f. 648, ap. 2, b. 581, pp. 136–137), Škirpa discusses an anti-Jewish appeal issued shortly before the German–Soviet war and directs the reader to “Dokm. LXIV.” The cross-reference establishes his knowledge of the specific appeal and his own linkage of it to his account of LAF activity. It does not prove that he drafted every sentence. LGGRTC letter No. 14R-51 of 11 July 2018 refers to a Škirpa memoir manuscript held at Vilnius University Library; whether that is the same text, a copy, or a different manuscript should be established by the reviewers. (Exhibit D3.)

36. In item 18 of his 1973 documentary volume “Sukilimas Lietuvos suverenumui atstatyti” (beginning at printed p. 165), Škirpa describes an administrative-formation proposal (Administracijos sudarymo pasiūlymas) given to Lt. Col. Graebe. Point 5 names Jews, together with others characterized as pillars of the Soviet regime, for immediate dismissal and, where necessary, arrest and accountability. Immediately after the eighth introductory point, Škirpa states that he inserted all of those introductory points on his own initiative, without Graebe asking him to do so. This is a retrospective statement written three decades later, and I do not ask that more be drawn from it than it says. But if adverse organizational material is discounted unless it can be personally attributed to Škirpa, then his own published first-person statement must be weighed or expressly distinguished. Neither the 2015 assessment nor Report 9R-598 cites printed pp. 165–167, names item 18, mentions Graebe or discusses this statement, although both cite the 1973 volume for other propositions. (Exhibit D4.)

37. At printed p. 171 of the same volume, Škirpa states that he omits the first four sections of the 24 March instructions, including section IV, which he calls orientational. The omission is therefore declared by the editor himself. Where a state institution relies on the participant-edited

1973 presentation, it must check the archival version and say whether the difference affected its assessment.

38. The Finnish Foreign Ministry archive preserves a German-language memorandum (Denkschrift) by Škirpa “betreffend die Wiederherstellung der staatlichen Unabhängigkeit Litauens und seine Wünsche,” distributed on 23 July 1941 and transmitted from Berlin under Finnish legation cover letter No. 2649/829/41. The memorandum sets out a German-oriented program: active cooperation with Germany in the reorganization of Europe, assistance to the entering German army, and a place for Lithuania in a European order led by Germany and its allies. I cite it for Škirpa's political alignment and for provenance, not as proof that he wrote LVIII or LXIV or of culpability for killings. The same archive records a transmission of 23 September 1941 to Finnish envoy Toivo Kivimäki, enclosing Provisional Government Protocol No. 35 and the 5 August 1941 memorandum to the Generalkommissar signed by Juozas Ambrazevičius and ministers; I cite it only to identify the source set. (Exhibits D5–D6.)

D. The 1939 record

39. Two peer-reviewed studies published by Vytautas Magnus University in 2017 report 1939 archival material with exact locators. I have not inspected the originals, and I present these as scholarly reports and retrieval leads. Šarūnas Liekis cites a Lithuanian legation report of 14 December 1939 (LCVA f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2230, l. 5–5a) describing a conversation between Škirpa and Ernst Woermann during the Suwałki refugee crisis, in which, in Liekis's account, Škirpa said that Jews were not loved in Lithuania either, that there were already too many, that Lithuania could not afford refuge especially for Jews, and suggested the Lublin area instead. Liekis also records that Škirpa had earlier intervened, on his government's instruction, against Germany's forcible expulsion of Jewish refugees across the Lithuanian border. Both facts belong in the record. Simonas Jazavita cites Škirpa's report of 13 March 1939 to Foreign Minister Juozas Urbšys (LCVA f. 648, ap. 1, b. 39, l. 155–157), recording that in conversation with Alfred Rosenberg Škirpa said roughly ninety percent of anti-Communist agitation was stirred up by Jews. Jazavita also cites Urbšys's personal letter of 15 August 1939 to Deputy Minister Kazys Bizauskas (cited by Jazavita as MDMMNLL, f. 61, b. 231, l. 7–8), in which Urbšys objected that Škirpa's article in the Berliner Börsen-Zeitung was written in “openly Nazi rhetoric” and asked that Škirpa be warned. Jazavita treats it as an open question whether Škirpa's antisemitic statements were sincere or conjunctural, made to please his German interlocutors, and notes his earlier closeness to politicians well disposed to Lithuanian Jews; that assessment belongs in the record too. He further cites Škirpa's lecture of 17 November 1940, “Sketches of the Lithuanian Activist Front Platform” (LCVA f. 648, ap. 2, b. 582, l. 131). The 1939 items predate the Soviet occupation of June 1940 and therefore bear on whether the 1941 program can be explained solely as a reaction to the occupation. (Exhibits D7–D8.)

E. The strongest case in Škirpa's favor

40. The review must state and test the strongest case for Škirpa. He was a volunteer of 1918, took part in raising the national flag on Gediminas Tower on 1 January 1919, sat in the

Constituent Seimas, served Lithuania as a diplomat, and opposed the Soviet occupation. He was not trusted by the Nazis: the Centre told the Ombudsman that the Gestapo placed him under house arrest after the Provisional Government proclaimed independence, and its Report 9R-598 states that the Berlin police did so, that the arrest was lifted after three weeks, and that he was not permitted to travel to Lithuania. The Centre states that there is no information connecting him to the killings at the Seventh Fort in Kaunas in July 1941 and that he was not the founder or commander of the TDA battalion. The Centre states, citing Liudas Truska and Vygantas Vareikis among other sources, that on the eve of the war the Berlin LAF had no information that the Nazis planned to murder all Jews — while the same report also cites Truska's view that LAF appeals were one of the reasons part of the population joined in carrying out Nazi crimes — and on the distinction between a program of expulsion and a program of extermination. A newspaper report in Draugas of 25 June 1941 states that “pulk. Škirpa uždraudęs žydų persekiojimus Lietuvoje.” He was never charged or convicted. In 2018 the Centre also raised Raila's retrospective suggestion that hostile actors might have inserted antisemitic language into LAF texts. Finally, Report 9R-598 concludes that Škirpa “nebuvo kolaborantas,” applying a definition of collaborator limited to officials of the administration of an occupied state.

41. Each proposition must be tested against the contemporary record. I make no allegation that Škirpa was present at, ordered or directed any killing. His absence from Lithuania does not dispose of possible leadership responsibility for incitement, expulsion and expropriation. The expulsion–extermination distinction is real, but Article 18 asks whether conduct disgraces an award, not whether it amounts to genocide. The Draugas item is evidence that a newspaper reported a prohibition; it is not an authenticated order, and no underlying order, transmission record or source has been produced. The insertion hypothesis deserves testing, but no provenance chain, parallel copy or forensic comparison supporting it has been published, and it does not address LVIII, item 18 or the b. 581 cross-reference. The honors decision need not establish criminal culpability, but it must not hold Škirpa responsible for acts the evidence does not attribute to him. The Centre's “not a collaborator” conclusion answers a different question from the one Article 18 asks: whether he held office in an occupation administration, not whether his conduct disgraces an award.

VI. LGGRTC's 2015–2024 assessments: a reproducibility problem

A. What the Centre acknowledged

42. The Centre's earlier assessments did not ignore antisemitism. In its explanations to the Seimas Ombudsman, its Head quoted the Centre's Škirpa conclusion: “In the activities of K. Škirpa and the Berlin LAF, antisemitism was raised to the political level, and this could have encouraged part of the Lithuanian population to become involved in the Holocaust.” My application of 27 September cites the corresponding passages of the October 2015 assessment at pp. 1, 3–4 and 6. The record contains three dated versions of the Centre's position: letter No. 13R-267 of 25 September 2015, the assessment published in October 2015 (“Dėl Kazio Škirpos

veiklos Antrojo pasaulinio karo metais”), and what the Head described to the Ombudsman as “the Centre's report of 2017-04-04.” The reviewers should identify which text carries each proposition.

43. The favorable conclusion rested on three limiting propositions, which Report 9R-598 repeated in 2024: that the LAF proposed to solve the “Jewish problem” by expulsion rather than genocide; that on the eve of the war the Berlin LAF had no information that the Nazis planned to murder all Jews; and that Škirpa, living in Berlin, had no connection to the killings at the Seventh Fort (2015 assessment, pp. 4–6; Report 9R-598, pp. 5 and 7).

B. The undisclosed favorable premises and the Ombudsman's findings

44. In explanations to the Seimas Ombudsman quoted in Report No. 4D-2017/1-1558 of 2 February 2018 (cover letter No. 4D-2017/1-1558/3D-317), §8.2.4, the Centre's Head stated that in writing the Škirpa report the Centre “also took into account collateral circumstances that it did not mention”: that Juozas Ambrazevičius-Brazaitis, who took over the Provisional Government's duties after Škirpa's arrest, had been investigated in 1974 by the U.S. Congress and the Immigration and Naturalization Service and “was fully acquitted,” and that Škirpa “spent the last 30 years of his life in the USA … without facing any charges.” Neither proposition concerns anything Škirpa did in Berlin or Lithuania in 1940–1941. Both convert foreign silence or administrative inaction into favorable historical evidence. (Exhibit E1; English translation in the certified Seimas copy S-2026-4031.)

45. The Ombudsman found the complaint against the Centre's officials justified; found that the Centre failed to answer the questions raised, did not observe the principle of transparency and did not give the clear, reasoned reply that public-administration law requires; and observed signs of systematic improper implementation of legal requirements in the Centre's handling of requests. In the same proceeding the Ministry of Justice noted that the Centre's regulations confine it to assessments of a historical nature and questioned whether it may issue conclusions of a legal nature at all. These were administrative findings, not a judgment that Škirpa committed a crime.

46. The Centre repeated the “complete exoneration” proposition in its Škirpa-specific reply, letter No. 14R-51 of 11 July 2018, while reproducing on the same page the narrower American wording that the names had been removed from an active list and the investigations deactivated. (Exhibit E2.)

47. The American record shows what actually happened: by letter of 13 January 1975 on the letterhead of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship and International Law (Chairman Joshua Eilberg), the Subcommittee transmitted an INS letter stating that Brazaitis and Jonas Šepetys had been removed from the active list. That was an administrative closure, not a judicial acquittal. On 12 May 2026 Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs Vidmantas Verbickas, Ref. (19.2.3)3-2806, wrote to U.S. Representative Brad Sherman that, on information supplied by the Centre, the “complete exoneration” formulation was legally imprecise, expressed

regret for the wording, and recognized that administrative discontinuation of an investigation is not formal judicial exoneration under U.S. law. (Exhibits E3–E4.)

48. The concession does not prove that every conclusion about Škirpa is false. It means that a favorable premise the Centre itself said it used in its Škirpa assessment has been conceded to be legally imprecise. No reissued Škirpa assessment showing how the conclusion stands without that premise has been published. On 26 August 2026 the Centre corrected one “rehabilitated” formulation concerning Brazaitis on its page 3058, while a separate statement on the same page and its page 2969 continued to attribute a rehabilitation of Brazaitis to the U.S. Department of Justice; on 13 October 2026 it refused to correct its 2018 letters (55R-1016). (Exhibits E5, F5.)

C. Notice since 2017

49. The documentary problem is not new. My 2017 complaint, preserved in the Seimas Human Rights Committee file produced on 23 September 2026 (S-2026-4031), specifically identified the 24 March 1941 instructions and quoted the text revoking the Vytautas-era hospitality, which it then described as Škirpa's appeal and which I now identify as Document LV, a draft. The notice concerned the documents' content, and the Ombudsman required the Centre to answer. The state therefore had specific notice of these documents seven years before Report 9R-598.

D. Report 9R-598 (2024)

50. Report No. 9R-598, “Dėl Kazio Škirpos asmenybės (istorinė-archyvinė pažyma),” is dated 25 June 2024 and was prepared by Dr. Alfredas Rukšėnas and signed by Director General Dr. Arūnas Bubnys. The Centre's own public file of it is named 20240808_skirpa_pazyma.pdf; it is one document. It was requested by the interinstitutional commission that assesses public objects under the law prohibiting the propagation of totalitarian and authoritarian regimes, which on 28 February 2024 considered a request to approve a plaque at Gedimino pr. 40, Vilnius, describing Škirpa as “1941 metų birželio sukilimo organizatorius.” (Exhibit E7.)

51. The report quotes the 19 March notice, the 24 March instructions including the Vytautas revocation sentence, the Raila brochure and the appeal “Amžiams išvaduokime Lietuvą nuo žydijos jungo.” I do not allege that it concealed them. It concluded that the proposed inscription “atspindi teisingą informaciją” about Škirpa's life, while suggesting that a plaque to the Vilnius military commandant's office would better suit the building. It did not assess fitness for state decorations. It cites no LCVA f. 648 file and does not discuss the b. 581 cross-reference, item 18 of the 1973 volume, the 1939 diplomatic record, or the undisclosed premises acknowledged to the Ombudsman.

52. The report relies on the Draugas item of 25 June 1941 and then frames its own research question on the premise that the prohibition existed: “Kodėl K. Škirpa uždraudė žydų persekiojimus Lietuvoje, nors jo vadovaujamos Berlyno LAF'o organizacijos veikloje stebimos antisemitizmo apraiškos?” A favorable proposition thus enters through a second-hand newspaper report without an underlying order, while adverse LAF material is subjected to strict personal-attribution objections. The report states no single attribution rule applied to both.

53. The Lithuanian Jewish Community, stating that it spoke for thirty-two Lithuanian and foreign Jewish organizations, rejected Report 9R-598 on 26 August 2024, objecting that Škirpa's antisemitic incitement preceded the violence and that the report minimized his role. These objections are the Community's; I attribute them to it. (Exhibit E8.)

54. On 24 September 2026 the Prosecutor General's Office declined to open a pre-trial investigation into Report 9R-598 (AP-29927, material No. M-2-01-00074-26), treating it as a historiographical assessment and the contested passages as historians' opinion. That decision applied the criminal threshold; it did not validate the report's historical method, and I have not appealed it. (Exhibit E9.)

VII. Disputed exoneration chains and the reliability of the Centre as assessor

55. The Centre's treatment of four distinct legal outcomes bears on whether the President can rely on it without independent verification. This is an objection to institutional method. I do not claim that all four cases were cited in Report 9R-598, or that findings about German officials can be transferred to Škirpa. Gewecke, Bub and Schleef chiefly concern the Centre's defense of Jonas Noreika; for Škirpa they are comparators of the Centre's source and correction practice. Brazaitis bears on Škirpa directly, because the Centre said it used his “exoneration” in its Škirpa assessment.

56. Hans Gewecke. The Justiz und NS-Verbrechen index identifies the case as Lfd. Nr. 722, Landgericht Lübeck 2 Ks 1/68, judgment of 27 January 1970, recording Gewecke's sentence as four and a half years; the Bundesgerichtshof decision of 26 January 1971 is 5 StR 631/70. The proceeding concerned the hanging on 6 June 1943 of a Jew who had brought food into the Šiauliai ghetto. The Centre's 2019 memorandum said that the court “atmetė” the Holocaust charges against Gewecke and Bub; the index shows that Gewecke was convicted on the charge tried. What other charges, if any, were brought and rejected can be established only from the judgment, which the Centre says it has not examined. (Exhibit F2.)

57. Ewald Bub. The same index records Bub's proceeding as “Verfahren eingestellt” — discontinued, not acquitted. The Centre's 17 December 2019 memorandum on Noreika said Bub “buvo visiškai išteisintas.” In 55R-951 the Centre conceded that it has never examined the judgment and that the statement is likely not legally correct.

58. Hermann Schleef. On 27 April 1970 Oldenburg authorities removed him from further prosecution for insufficient evidence; that is not an acquittal. A separate 1947 Spruchgericht proceeding resulted in a conviction. On 11 February 2020 the Centre's Director General described him as acquitted (“išteisino”) by the Oldenburg court. In 2021 the Lower Saxony State Archive transmitted the Schleef scans to the Lithuanian Embassy in Germany; that establishes possession by the Lithuanian state, not that the Centre read them. In 55R-1093 the Centre could not say why it chose the word. (Exhibits F3–F4.)

59. Juozas Ambrazevičius-Brazaitis. An administrative closure was described as “complete exoneration” and “rehabilitation”; the Foreign Ministry has conceded the imprecision; the Centre has corrected one page and refused to correct its 2018 letters.

60. Brazaitis: administrative discontinuation became exoneration. Bub: discontinued proceedings became complete acquittal. Schleef: an insufficient-evidence disposition became exoneration. The repeated errors, the undisclosed favorable premises, the Ombudsman's transparency finding, the Foreign Ministry's correction, the Ministry of Justice's observation that the Centre's role is confined to historical rather than legal assessment, and the failure to reissue a reproducible Škirpa assessment deprive the Centre of any presumption of historical reliability in this proceeding. That is an argued conclusion about the weight its views deserve. It is not a claim that the Centre has ceased to exist or lost its statutory competence, nor that every employee or publication is wrong. The Centre must supply its records, have the opportunity to respond, and be independently evaluated.

61. Since the Government has made the Centre a participating institution in measure 3.4 and the principal implementer of measures 3.1 and 3.27, the reliability of its historical characterizations is no longer a matter for this application alone. Its Škirpa work is a suitable first test.

VIII. The national encyclopedia

62. The Visuotinė lietuvių enciklopedija (VLE) is its own editorial institution and must be evaluated as such, not treated as a department of LGGRTC. Its entry for Brazaitis identifies him as one of the LAF's leaders and as Prime Minister and Minister of Education of the 1941 Provisional Government, but does not discuss the persecution of Jews. My comparative work on town entries raises further questions about omissions of identifiable Lithuanian participants in persecution, dispossession and murder. I ask that independent historians evaluate the relevance of these descriptions to Škirpa's commemoration and identify, for each, the absent proposition, the source establishing it, the editorial scope, any earlier notice and the publisher's response. Repeated omissions may establish a pattern of deficient official representation; deliberate intent should not be asserted without evidence of knowledge and editorial choice. Corrections must be addressed to the encyclopedia's publisher, not imputed to the Centre.

IX. A single procedure for independent review and decision

63. I propose one procedure. The Chancellor of Orders certifies the awards and the award files. The State Awards Council considers the matter under Article 9(3). Before the Council concludes, the President requests the International Commission for the Evaluation of the Crimes of the Nazi and Soviet Occupation Regimes in Lithuania to consider preparing an independent historical evaluation, and invites the Faculty of History of Vilnius University and the Lithuanian Institute of History to nominate conflict-screened specialists in 1939–1941 Lithuanian history, Holocaust history, archival diplomatics and legal history. The Council weighs the historical evaluation as

advice, and the President decides and gives written reasons. The President cannot direct an independent university or the Commission to reach a conclusion, and the Commission cannot replace the statutory Council. If the Commission declines, the President can still obtain independent scholarly evidence for the Council.

64. The Commission was established by President Valdas Adamkus on 7 September 1998; its 2019 public statement refers to the President's decree of 16 October 2012 as its current mandate. In that statement of 8 April 2019, concerning the Government's plan to absorb its Secretariat, the Commission invoked “the Commission's principle of independence and unfettered research” and warned against “direct interference by the Government.” Dr. Arūnas Bubnys was among its signatories. That standard should govern this review. (Exhibits G1–G3.)

65. Conflicts must be resolved before the review begins. The Commission's published membership (page last modified 27 January 2026) lists Dr. Arūnas Bubnys — who signed Report 9R-598, letter 11R-12 and letters 55R-951 and 55R-1093 — as a member of its Sub-commission for the Evaluation of the Crimes of the Nazi Occupation Regime and the Holocaust. He must not take part in selecting reviewers, supervising the review, or deliberating on the reliability of his own work or institution. Professor Šarūnas Liekis, a member of the same sub-commission, is the author of a 2017 study cited in this application; I ask that this be disclosed, not that he be excluded, unless the Commission's rules require otherwise. I ask every participating member to disclose any authorship, review, supervision or public statement concerning the Centre's Škirpa texts of 2015, 2017 and 2024, under uniform, pre-published conflict rules. The same disclosure should apply to every member, including those who hold or have held parliamentary or ministerial office with responsibility for state commemorations or publications concerning Škirpa. The Centre may submit evidence and a response on equal terms with other sources, but must not appoint, supervise, edit or veto the reviewers.

66. The reviewers' written terms should require: publication of the source inventory and method; access to the Centre's working files behind the 2015, 2017 and 2024 texts, subject to lawful restrictions; collation of originals, transcriptions and translations; separate findings on Škirpa's personal acts, the LAF's organizational conduct and later commemoration; explicit treatment of the strongest contrary material; and a reasoned public opinion stating which propositions are established, which disputed and which unprovable. They should answer whether the Centre's conclusions survive once the misdescribed Brazaitis disposition and the American-residence premise are removed; whether the Centre applied consistent attribution thresholds to adverse and favorable evidence; and what the 1939, 1941, 1973 and Finnish records establish about Škirpa. They should not be instructed to reach any predetermined verdict. The President, not the reviewers, decides which statutory grounds are met.

X. National values and the duty of presidential leadership

67. This is a decision about the values the Republic of Lithuania chooses to uphold through affirmative state honors. The documentary record of the Lithuanian Activist Front's anti-Jewish

program must be evaluated on its own terms: racial exclusion, proposed removal of rights, and expulsionist aims were incompatible with the democratic principle of equal citizenship. The decision is whether the Republic will continue to honor that program's leader without an independent accounting of his individual responsibility, or apply the historical truth and democratic equality to which the restored Republic has committed itself.

68. More than thirty-five years have passed since Lithuania restored independence on 11 March 1990. I have pursued the documentary record despite sustained institutional opposition. The accumulated contradictions, material omissions, inaccurate characterizations of proceedings as exonerations, and unresolved correction demands support a serious allegation of historical falsification by state institutions: that they repeatedly published inaccurate historical characterizations, including descriptions of discontinued proceedings as acquittals, and did not correct them after notice. I ask the President to investigate that allegation openly, rather than accepting it as proven merely because I assert it. The evidence must determine the scope of institutional responsibility, whether error, negligent misrepresentation, deliberate distortion, or a mixture of these occurred, and which officers and agencies acted.

69. The values choice cannot be evaded through a claim that LAF declarations lack present legal force. A constitutional republic may rightly reject antisemitic proclamations in law while discrediting its own democratic commitments by honoring individuals without critically examining their role in promoting those proclamations. Lithuania must decide what its honors signify: respect for an exclusionary and expulsionist antisemitic program, or respect for equal citizenship, truthful history, and human dignity. Honoring, without examination, individuals whose records include leadership of such a program, as a source of unqualified national virtue, is incompatible with the dignified democratic future that Lithuania professes to build. This is a challenge to state decisions and identifiable historical actors, not an attribution of collective guilt to Lithuanians.

70. For that reason, I respectfully request that the President formally invite the International Commission for the Evaluation of the Crimes of the Nazi and Soviet Occupation Regimes in Lithuania to undertake an independent historical evaluation of both Kazys Škirpa's record and the reliability of LGGRTC's assessments concerning him, with qualified historians nominated by Vilnius University's Faculty of History and the Lithuanian Institute of History. LGGRTC must itself be an object of the investigation and may respond and furnish its records, but must not choose, supervise, or adjudicate the investigators. Any reviewer with material involvement in the disputed assessments — including Arūnas Bubnys — must recuse. The report and the President's reasoned response should be made public, subject to legitimate archival and privacy constraints.

71. I ask the President also to recognize the patriotic purpose of my work. I am a Lithuanian citizen who has spent decades examining difficult chapters of our national history, not to diminish Lithuania, but to help strengthen it through accuracy, accountability, reconciliation and public trust. I hope he will recognize this sustained effort as an expression of loyalty to Lithuania and a commitment to its democratic future. I also hope that, in time, the Republic will recognize

the work of Silvia Foti and me as genuine service to the nation. Ms. Foti has confronted painful evidence concerning her own grandfather, Jonas Noreika; I have continued to place documentary challenges before Lithuania's institutions despite substantial resistance. Rather than defining patriotism by the uncritical commemoration of figures such as Škirpa, Noreika or Brazaitis, Lithuania should value the civic courage required to confront the record, correct official misrepresentation and seek reconciliation. I make no claim to a decoration or other personal benefit in this petition. My formal request concerns the historical review and statutory reassessment of Škirpa's honors; the recognition I hope for is recognition that principled criticism can itself be an act of Lithuanian patriotism. Ms. Foti is copied on this supplement for information; she is neither a co-applicant nor a signatory.

72. As a citizen of Lithuania, I want the truth and the best for Lithuania, and genuine reconciliation between Lithuania and Jews. The President and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have it in their power to answer those who say Lithuania honors Holocaust perpetrators and falsifies its history, by telling the truth about the Holocaust in Lithuania. I stand ready to help: I can provide the President, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the independent reviewers with the documents, archival locators, correspondence and corrections I have assembled over decades, subject to the same evidentiary scrutiny as every other source. I offer that help with documentary verification, not as a demand for any particular scholarly result.

XI. Relief requested

73. I respectfully request that the President:

1. Register this supplement under my application of 27 September 2026; give me the registration number of that application, copies of any replies, and the applicable timetable.
2. Direct the Chancellor of Orders to certify every state award conferred on Kazys Škirpa — including the 1919 Cross of Vytis, the Founder-Volunteers Medal and the 1935 Order of Vytautas the Great, third degree — and to supply the conferral decrees, recommendations, award files, current legal classification and register entries.
3. Forward the question of the Founder-Volunteers Medal to the Minister of National Defence if the President is not competent, and inform me.
4. Refer the matter to the State Awards Council under Article 9(3), together with the documentary material identified in this supplement and my application, not only the Centre's 2015 and 2024 texts.
5. Request the International Commission to consider an independent historical evaluation of the Škirpa record and of the Centre's Škirpa assessments, with specialists nominated by the Vilnius University Faculty of History and the Lithuanian Institute of History, under written conflict rules and with the recusal of Dr. Arūnas Bubnys and of any reviewer materially involved in the disputed texts.

6. Ask the reviewers to assess, as sources, the Centre's work on Škirpa: its 2015, 2017 and 2024 Škirpa texts; letters 14R-51, 55R-21, 55R-951, 55R-1016, 55R-1093 and 11R-12; its working files; its exoneration characterizations; and its correction record.
7. Obtain and preserve the originals identified in Part XII, Section B, and assess both adverse and potentially exculpatory evidence.
8. After that review, decide award by award under the law in force; withdraw any award where the President finds the statutory criteria met; otherwise state the documentary and legal reasons for retaining it.
9. If the President considers that he lacks power over any award because of the awardee's death, the award's interwar origin or another reason, state the legal obstacle and the competent authority, and provide the dates, numbers and legal bases of all post-1990 decisions applying Article 18(1) or Article 30, so far as possible without disclosing protected personal data.
10. Transmit the reasoned decision to the Government and invite it to take the outcome into account in implementing measures 3.1, 3.4 and 3.27 of its action plan, including by ensuring that the Centre does not evaluate its own Škirpa work.
11. Provide the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with a copy of the reasoned decision and any public historical findings, and invite it to ensure that Lithuania's international communications on the Holocaust, including Lithuania's IHRA strategy under measure 3.12 and its correspondence with foreign legislators, reflect the outcome of this review and correct any characterization the review finds inaccurate.
12. Request source-specific corrections by the competent institutions where omissions or erroneous exoneration language are established, distinguishing the encyclopedia publisher's obligations from the Centre's.
13. Give a reasoned written answer to each ground raised, identify any documents withheld and the legal basis for withholding them, and inform me of the available administrative and judicial review routes and deadlines.

74. Separately from the statutory application, I respectfully invite the President to address the nation during the 85th-anniversary year of the destruction of Lithuania's Jewish communities in 1941: to acknowledge the murdered Jews as fellow citizens; to state that Nazi Germany directed the Holocaust and that documented Lithuanian individuals and formations also took part; to name the actors the evidence substantiates without transferring individual responsibility to the nation; and to explain how the Republic reviews disputed honors, what records and independent scholarship inform that review, and what corrective decisions follow.

XII. Documentary basis, candid limits and exhibits

75. This supplement is intended to stand on its own. My application of 27 September 2026 and its annexes, including my revised IHRA submission of 24 September 2026 (“The Škirpa Determination”), remain part of the record; the 24 September submission supersedes the factual presentation of my IHRA submission of 19 August 2026.

76. The record is incomplete in identified respects. I have not obtained the award decrees or register entries. The official URL of the October 2015 assessment is listed (E6), but the Centre's server could not be reached when this text was prepared; I ask for a certified copy. The original German judicial records, the 1939 originals and some letters are held by me only as references, scans or institutional descriptions. I do not infer that any missing document does not exist, and I do not ask that lack of access be converted into an inference for either side. I ask the competent institutions to obtain, certify and assess the records in their custody.

77. My own publications and complaints, where listed, show that I raised an issue or gave an institution notice. They are not offered as proof of the historical propositions, which rest on the archival documents, the Centre's own statements, official external administrative and judicial records, and independent scholarship.

A. Exhibits with public locators

A — Prior filings

- A1. Application of 27 September 2026, QES-signed, principal request: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Prasymas_Prezidentui_Skirpa_Valstybes_Apdovanojimai_2026-09-27_signed.pdf
- A2. Same, consolidated QES-signed PDF with annexes: https://grantgochin.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/09/QES_SIGN_Skirpa_State_Awards_CONSOLIDATED_2026-09-27_signed.pdf
- A3. Revised IHRA submission, “The Škirpa Determination,” 24 September 2026: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/10/Skirpa_IHRA_signed.pdf
- A4. IHRA petition of 28 May 2026: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/IHRA-Petition-Gochin-5-28-26.pdf
- A5. Combined IHRA package: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/08/IHRA-Petition-Gochin-combined.pdf

C — New factors

- C1. LGGRTC letter No. 11R-12, 22 October 2026 (with e-document metadata): https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/10/Nuorasas_Atsakymas-2R-19-fi.pdf
- C2. Action plan, annex of measures: https://lrv.lt/media/viesa/saugykla/2026/1/uo5LGCodiC0.pdf [Approval: Government Resolution No. 33, 21 January 2026; TAR registration 2026-01031; ELI https://data.e-tar.lt/eli/valst/nut/tar/2026/1031/op; official https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/4a1ac670fac711f0ac2aa76febda78c1]
- C3. Action plan, consultation table (derinimo pažyma): https://lrv.lt/media/viesa/saugykla/2026/1/YUPzML76K2Y.pdf
- C4. Government approval, 21 January 2026 (LRT): https://www.lrt.lt/en/news-in-english/19/2813321/lithuania-s-govt-approves-action-plan-to-combat-antisemitism-xenophobia-and-hate

- C5. Paneriai, 23 September 2020 (Lithuanian Jewish Community English text): https://www.lzb.lt/en/2020/09/24/president-gitanas-nauseda-speaks-at-ceremony-to-commemorate-victims-of-genocide-at-paneriai/
- C6. Law on State Awards No. IX-957, e-TAR: https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.F56B1506A5C6/asr Official consolidated print view: https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/it/legalActPrint?actualEditionId=eaMBILVmdL&documentId=TAR.F56B1506A5C6.

D — Historical sources

- D1. LVIII, LCVA f. 648, ap. 2, b. 582, l. 188–197: https://grantgochin.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/09/LCVA_F648_A2_B582_Document_LVIII_1941-03-24_Strictly_Secret_Instructions.pdf (EAIS: https://eais.archyvai.lt/repo-ext/view/1071179)
- D2. LXIV, l. 213–215: https://grantgochin.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/10/LCVA_F648_A2_B582_Document_LXIV_LAF_Anti-Jewish_Appeal_Fols_213-215.pdf
- D3. b. 581, manuscript pp. 136–137: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/10/LCVA_F648_A2_B581_Skirpa_Memoir_pp136-137_Document_LXIV_CrossReference.pdf
- D4. Škirpa, Sukilimas Lietuvos suverenumui atstatyti (1973): https://grantgochin.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/08/Sukilimas-Lietuvos-suverenumui-atstatyti-Kazys-Skirpa.pdf
- D5. Finnish file, July 1941 memorandum: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/10/7-E-Skirpa-muistio.pdf
- D6. Finnish file, 1941 independence efforts: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/7E-Liettuan-itsenaisyyspyrkimykset-1941.pdf; note of 1942–1943: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/7E-Liettuan-nootti-1943.pdf
- D7. Liekis (2017): https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/ISSN2335-8769_2017_N_67.PG_179-189.pdf
- D8. Jazavita (2017): https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/ISSN2335-8769_2017_N_67.PG_191-213.pdf
- D9. Stasiulis (2016), Lietuvos istorijos studijos 38: https://www.zurnalai.vu.lt/lietuvos-istorijos-studijos/article/download/10390/8342/10749

E — LGGRTC record and oversight

- E1. Seimas Human Rights Committee certified file S-2026-4031, with Ombudsman Report No. 4D-2017/1-1558 and English translation: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Seimas_HRC_Response_2026-09-22_Gochin_with_English_Translation.pdf
- E2. LGGRTC letter No. 14R-51, 11 July 2018: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/10/GC_reply_Skirpa_20180711-1.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

- E3. 1975 Subcommittee letter enclosing the INS letter (available on request)
- E4. MFA letter to Rep. Brad Sherman, 12 May 2026: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/06/Letter-to-Rep.-Sherman.pdf
- E5. LGGRTC pages 3058 and 2969: https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/3058/a/ ; https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/2969/a/ ; annotated comparison: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/08/LGGRTC_Annotated_Exhibit_2026-08-30.png
- E6. 2015 assessment (official): https://www.genocid.lt/UserFiles/File/Pazymos/201510_skirpa_pazyma01.pdf
- E7. Report No. 9R-598 (official): https://www.genocid.lt/UserFiles/File/Titulinis/2024/20240808_skirpa_pazyma.pdf ; preserved copies: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/07/20240808_skirpa_pazyma.pdf ; https://www.lzb.lt/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/20240808_skirpa_pazyma-1-1.pdf
- E8. Lithuanian Jewish Community statement, 26 August 2024: https://www.lzb.lt/en/2024/08/26/lithuanian-jewish-community-statement-on-genocide-centers-newest-report-on-kazys-skirpa/
- E9. Prosecutor's decision, 24 September 2026 (AP-29927): https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Lithuania_Prosecutor_Refusal_AP-29927_AP-29972_2026-09-24.pdf

F — Comparator records and commemoration

- F1. LGGRTC letter No. 55R-951 (29 September / 2 October 2026): https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/10/LGGRTC_55R-951_2026-10-02.pdf
- F2. Justiz und NS-Verbrechen, Lfd. Nr. 722: https://junsv.nl/junsv-01/junsv/brd/brdfiles/brd722.htm
- F3. LGGRTC letter No. 55R-1093 with the 11 February 2020 letter: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/10/LGGRTC_Evidence_55R1093-1.pdf
- F4. Oldenburg 27 April 1970 disposition and 1947 Spruchgericht record (originals requested; see Section B)
- F5. LGGRTC letter No. 55R-1016, 13 October 2026 (available on request)
- F7. MFA confirmation of the 1995 reburial commission: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/linkevicius-answer-2018-06-img-626083531-0001.pdf
- F8. 1995 press report (Tėviškės žiburiai, 11 July 1995): https://www.spauda.org/teviskes_ziburiai/archive/1995/1995-07-11-TEVISKES-ZIBURIAI.pdf
- F9. Vilnius decision renaming the alley (2019): https://vilnius.lt/naujienos/del-trispalves-vardo-suteikimo-alejai-ir-jos-ribu

- F10. Finnish diplomatic reports, 23 September 1994 and 16 March 1995: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/5C-VIL0329.pdf ; https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/5C-VIL0096.pdf

G — International Commission

- G1. About the Commission: https://www.komisija.lt/en/about-commission/
- G2. Membership: https://www.komisija.lt/en/about-commission/members-of-the-commission-actual/
- G3. Public statement of 8 April 2019: https://www.komisija.lt/en/the-public-statement-of-the-international-commission/

H — Prior public argument and notice (not offered as proof of history)

- H1. “The Škirpa Report Cannot Stand” (July 2026): https://grantgochin.substack.com/p/the-skirpa-report-cannot-stand
- H2. “Has Lithuania's Revocation Been Revoked?” (18 September 2026): https://blogs.timesofisrael.com/has-lithuanias-revocation-been-revoked/
- H3. “157 Measures, No Credibility” (3 October 2026): https://blogs.timesofisrael.com/157-measures-no-credibility/; “157 Measures, No Independent Judge” (Substack, 4 August 2026)
- H4. “The destruction from within” (September 2026): https://grantgochin.substack.com/p/the-destruction-from-within
- H5. “Lithuania's False Acquittal”; “Lithuania Inherited Its Alibi From the Occupier”; “Lithuania Had the Schleef File”; “The Ally That Forged America's Verdict”: https://grantgochin.substack.com/p/lithuanias-false-acquittal ; https://grantgochin.substack.com/p/lithuania-inherited-its-alibi-from ; https://grantgochin.substack.com/p/lithuania-had-the-schleef-file ; https://grantgochin.substack.com/p/the-ally-that-forged-americas-verdict

B. Originals requested in certified form

- Award decrees, recommendations, award files and register entries for each award (Chancellor of Orders).
- The signed original of 11R-12 and the Centre's file on my 18 September request.
- The complete 2015 assessment, letter 13R-267, the “2017-04-04” text and the working files behind them; the working file behind Report 9R-598.
- The original Ombudsman file No. 4D-2017/1-1558 and LGGRTC letters 55R-21, 14R-51 and 14R-82.
- The original of the MFA letter of 12 May 2026, Ref. (19.2.3)3-2806, and the Centre's information on which it relied.
- The Lübeck judgment of 27 January 1970 (2 Ks 1/68) and the BGH decision 5 StR 631/70; the Oldenburg disposition of 27 April 1970 and the 1947 Spruchgericht record; the 2021 transmission of the Schleef scans to the Lithuanian Embassy in Germany.
- LCVA f. 648, ap. 2, b. 581–582 (including Documents LV, LVIII and LXIV), with verified transcriptions; the Vilnius University Library manuscript referred to in 14R-51.

- LCVA f. 383, ap. 7, b. 2230, l. 5–5a; LCVA f. 648, ap. 1, b. 39, l. 155–157; LCVA f. 648, ap. 2, b. 582, l. 131; the Urbšys letter of 15 August 1939 (cited as MDMMNLL, f. 61, b. 231, l. 7–8).
- The 1973 volume, pp. 165–171, from a library copy.
- The Finnish Foreign Ministry files, with the cover-letter dates.
- The official Lithuanian text of the Paneriai speech of 23 September 2020.
- The current consolidated text of the Law on State Awards and the Government's resolution approving the action plan.

C. Chronology

- 25 Oct 1919 — Cross of Vytis, fifth degree, “už narsumą” (9R-598).
- 7 Feb 1930 — Volunteer Medal presented (9R-598).
- 8 Sep 1935 — Order of Vytautas the Great, third degree, conferred by the President (9R-598).
- 13 Mar 1939 — Škirpa reports to Foreign Minister Urbšys his remark to Rosenberg on Jews and anti-Communist agitation (Jazavita).
- 15 Aug 1939 — Urbšys objects to Škirpa's “openly Nazi rhetoric” in the Berliner Börsen-Zeitung (Jazavita).
- 14 Dec 1939 — Škirpa–Woermann conversation during the Suwałki refugee crisis (Liekis).
- June 1940 — Soviet occupation of Lithuania.
- 17 Nov 1940 — Škirpa lecture on the LAF platform (LCVA f. 648, ap. 2, b. 582, l. 131; Jazavita).
- 19 Mar 1941 — Leaflet in the name of the Lithuanian Information Bureau, Berlin (two versions; Stasiulis).
- 24 Mar 1941 — LAF secret instructions, Document LVIII.
- Spring 1941 — LAF appeal, Document LXIV.
- 22–23 Jun 1941 — German invasion; uprising; Provisional Government proclaimed; Škirpa named Prime Minister but held in Berlin (9R-598).
- 25 Jun 1941 — Draugas report of a Škirpa prohibition on persecuting Jews.
- 4–19 Jul 1941 — Killings at the Seventh Fort, Kaunas (9R-598: 3,027 persons, of whom 3,020 Jews).
- 23 Jul 1941 — Škirpa memorandum distributed in Berlin; Finnish transmittal follows.
- 23 Sep 1941 — Transmission to Finnish envoy Kivimäki.
- 1973 — Škirpa's volume Sukilimas Lietuvos suverenumui atstatyti, including item 18.
- 1975 — INS removes Brazaitis and Šepetys from the active list (Subcommittee letter of 13 Jan 1975).
- 1979 — Škirpa dies in the United States.
- 8 May 1990 — Supreme Council statement on the genocide of the Jewish people.
- Mar 1995 — President Brazauskas's apology in Israel.
- 16 Jun 1995 — Government-organized reburial of Škirpa at Petrašiūnai.
- 4 Feb 1998 — Vilnius names Kazio Škirpos Alley.

- 25 Sep / Oct 2015 — LGGRTC letter 13R-267 and published Škirpa assessment.
- 2017 — My complaint to the Seimas and the Ombudsman; the Centre's "2017-04-04" text.
- 2 Feb 2018 — Ombudsman Report 4D-2017/1-1558.
- 11 Jul 2018 — LGGRTC letter 14R-51.
- 24 Jul 2019 — Vilnius renames the alley.
- 17 Dec 2019 — LGGRTC Noreika memorandum stating Bub was "visiškai išteisintas".
- 11 Feb 2020 — LGGRTC letter describing Schleef as acquitted.
- 25 Jun 2024 — Report 9R-598; 26 Aug 2024 — Lithuanian Jewish Community rejects it.
- 21 Jan 2026 — Government approves the 157-measure action plan.
- 12 May 2026 — MFA letter to Rep. Sherman.
- 26 Aug 2026 — Partial correction of LGGRTC page 3058.
- 24 Sep 2026 — Prosecutor declines AP-29927.
- 27 Sep 2026 — My application to the President.
- 2 Oct 2026 — LGGRTC 55R-951; 13 Oct — 55R-1016; 19 Oct — 55R-1093.
- 22 Oct 2026 — LGGRTC 11R-12.

D. Status of exhibits

- Read for this supplement: A1–A2, C1, C5, D2–D3 (cover and excerpt), D8–D9 (relevant passages), E1 (certified Seimas copy with translation), E7, F1–F2, G1–G3; F3 read in its cover description.
- Public locator confirmed; content held as an image scan not machine-read: E2, E4, D5.
- Located but not opened or not read in full for this supplement: A3–A5, D1, D4, D6, D7, E5, E8, E9, F7–F10.
- Not publicly posted or not obtained: E3, E6 (server unreachable), F4, F5, and all items in Section B.
- Translations from Lithuanian, German and Finnish in this supplement are my working translations unless stated otherwise.

Official legal references

Government Resolution No. 33 of 21 January 2026; officially registered 26 January 2026 as TAR 2026-01031 and effective 27 January 2026. ELI: https://data.e-tar.lt/eli/valst/nut/tar/2026/1031/op .

Law on State Awards No. IX-957, official consolidated print-view edition identifier eaMBILVmdL: https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/it/legalActPrint?actualEditionId=eaMBILVmdL&documentId=TAR.F56B1506A5C6 .

Official Ministry of Foreign Affairs contact: J. Tumo-Vaižganto g. 2, LT-01108 Vilnius; urm@urm.lt; https://www.urm.lt/ministerija/institucija/kontaktai/155 .

Respectfully submitted,

Grant Arthur Gochin
Citizen of the Republic of Lithuania
[Qualified electronic signature to be applied only after review and authorization]

cc (subject to authorization and verification of current office and addresses): Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania, Minister Kęstutis Budrys, J. Tumo-Vaižganto g. 2, LT-01108 Vilnius (urm@urm.lt); Head of the Lithuanian Delegation to the IHRA; Ms. Faina Kukliansky, Chair, Lithuanian Jewish Community; Mr. Emanuelis Zingeris, Chair, and Prof. Saulius Sužiedėlis, Chair of the Sub-commission on the Nazi Occupation and the Holocaust, International Commission, and the Commission Secretariat; Prof. Arūnas Streikus, Chair, LGGRTC Council; Ms. Silvia Foti.