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, 03 November 2026
eIDAS Qualified Electronic Signature

**Grant Arthur Gochin**

10900 Winnetka Avenue, Chatsworth, CA 91311, USA
+1 818-625-6513 | ggochin@gmail.com

Lietuvos Respublikos pilietis

Lietuvos Respublikos Prezidentui Gitanui Nausėdai
Per Lietuvos Respublikos Prezidento kanceliariją
Valstybės apdovanojimų reikalams
S. Daukanto a. 3, LT-01122 Vilnius
kanceliarija@prezidentas.lt

Bendras adresatas: Lietuvos Respublikos užsienio reikalų ministerija — urm@urm.lt. Prašau užregistruoti ir perduoti Lietuvos IHRA delegacijos vadovui.

Kiti sprendimo adresatai: Šiaulių rajono savivaldybės administracija — prim@siauliuraj.lt; Šiaulių rajono savivaldybės Vytauto Vitkausko viešoji biblioteka — info@srsvb.lt (dėl viešojo pagerbimo ir jo šaltinių).

Kopijos informuoti: LGGRTC — centras@genocid.lt; Lietuvos istorijos institutui — istorija@istorija.lt; Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakultetui — if@if.vu.lt; Lietuvos žydų bendruomenei — info@lzb.lt.

**GRU-PRES-001 | 2026 m. lapkričio 2 d.**

**Prašymas ištirti Stasio Motuzo administracijos vaidmenį persekiojant žydus ir jo pagerbimo pagrindą**

**1 Prašymas ir paskelbti tyrimai**

Gerbiamas Prezidente, prašau visapusiškai ištirti Gruzdžių valsčiaus administracijos vaidmenį vykdant 1941 m. žydų sutelkimo, perkėlimo ir turto atėmimo nurodymus, nustatyti viršaičiu nurodomo Stasio Motuzo veiksmus ir įvertinti jo viešojo pagerbimo pagrindą. Prašau nustatyti visus jam suteiktus valstybinius apdovanojimus ir formalius statusus, jeigu tokių yra, ir priimti motyvuotą sprendimą, ar juos išsaugoti, ar pradėti jų panaikinimo procedūrą. Savivaldybės bibliotekos pagerbimo klausimą prašau perduoti nagrinėti savivaldybei ir bibliotekai. [1–4]

Mano visas miestelio tyrimas su šaltinių nuorodomis ir lietuviška santrauka paskelbtas Substack platformoje: Gruzdžiai — Town Research Report (1915–1945). Šiame PDF kaip A priedą pateikiu visą tyrimo kopiją. Prašau vertinti konkrečius jo dokumentus ir išvadas. Mano tyrimų katalogas: Grant Gochin Substack

**2 Dokumentinis tyrimo pagrindas**

1941 m. rugpjūčio 9 d. įsakymas Nr. 657 adresuotas Tryškių viršaičiui. Jame nurodyta per tris dienas iškraustyti Tryškių žydus, susitarus su Gruzdžių valsčiaus viršaičiu. Spausdintas paskirties vietos pavadinimas Pakruojis išbrauktas ir ranka įrašyti Gruzdžiai. Tai konkretus priimančiosios administracijos ryšys su deportavimo sprendimu. Archyvinė nuoroda: LCVA, f. R-1099, ap. 1, b. 2, l. 137. Faksimilė pridedama kaip B priedas. [1, 2]

1941 m. rugpjūčio 22 d. aplinkraštis Nr. 962 adresuotas apskrities valsčių viršaičiams ir burmistrams, o kopijos skirtos policijos nuovadų viršininkams. Jis numato perkėlimą į Žagarę rugpjūčio 25–29 d., transportą, turto surašymą, pasiimamų daiktų ir pinigų ribojimą, geto aptvėrimą ir vykdymo

ataskaitas. Archyvinė nuoroda: LCVA, f. R-1099, ap. 1, b. 1, l. 156. Faksimilė pridedama kaip C priedas. [1, 3]

Damijonas Šniukas monografijos Gruzdžiai pirmos dalies p. 653 nurodo Motuzą vėl vadovavus Gruzdžių administracijai 1941 m. Įsakymo žodžiai „Susitarus su Gruzdžių valsčiaus viršaičiu“ fiksuoja jau sudarytą išankstinį susitarimą dėl Tryškių žydų priėmimo. Kartu su ranka pakeista paskirties vieta tai rodo priimančiosios administracijos dalyvavimą rengiant perkėlimą. Prašau gauti paskyrimo dokumentą, patvirtinantį Motuzo kadenciją būtent rugpjūčio 9 d., nustatyti susitarimo dalyvius ir gauti jo sudarymo bei įgyvendinimo dokumentus. Rugpjūčio 22 d. aplinkraštis papildomai nustato pareigybių paskirstymo ir vykdymo ataskaitų grandinę. [1–3]

Biblioteka Stasį Motuzą pateikia tarp Kovotojų už Lietuvos laisvę. Biografinė lentelė nurodo gimimą 1898 m. vasario 4 d. Valdomuose ir mirtį 1985 m. lapkričio 22 d. Brėmene. Tyrimo viešųjų šaltinių patikroje valstybės apdovanojimo ar formalaus statuso sprendimas nebuvo patvirtintas; prašau oficialios registrų ir bylų paieškos. Bibliotekos kategorijos negalima sutapatinti su teisiškai suteiktu pasipriešinimo dalyvio statusu. [1, 4]

Holokausto Lietuvoje atlaso duomenimis, Gruzdžių žydų moterys, vaikai ir seneliai buvo perkelti į Žagarę ir ten nužudyti 1941 m. spalio 2 d. Noreikos, pasirašiusio nurodymus, valstybinis pagerbimas ir Motuzo pagerbimas bibliotekoje kelia susijusį institucinio vertinimo klausimą. Prašau šioje byloje ištirti Motuzo vadovautos administracijos grandį; Noreikos apdovanojimo peržiūros klausimo čia nedubliuoju. [1]

## 3 Dokumentai, kuriuos būtina gauti ir pateikti

Gauti ir pateikti Motuzo paskyrimo, atleidimo ir pavadavimo dokumentus; įsakymo Nr. 657 originalą, taisymo aplinkybes ir susitarimo su Gruzdžių viršaičiu korespondenciją; aplinkraščio Nr. 962 siuntimo ir gavimo įrašus; abiejų dokumentų vykdymo ataskaitas, transporto sąrašus, apsaugos ir darbo nurodymus bei žydų turto inventorius ir perdavimo dokumentus. Patikrinti LCVA R-1099 fondą, Gruzdžių valsčiaus ir policijos dokumentus bei nustatyti kitus saugotojus. Atskirai gauti apdovanojimų ir statusų bylas, jeigu jų yra, ir bibliotekos pagerbimo šaltinius bei sprendimus. [1–4]

Aplinkraščio Nr. 962 3 punktas numato kasdienį Žagarės geto žydų varymą į darbą su apsauga ir grąžinimą į getą. Tai konkretus prievartinio darbo organizavimo nurodymas; darbo užmokesčio dokumentai šiame pakete nepateikti. Priverstinis darbas be atlygio yra vergovė. Prašau gauti darbo paskyrimo, apsaugos, darbdavių, darbo užmokesčio ir jo išmokėjimo dokumentus ir nustatyti, kaip ši nuostata buvo vykdoma. Administracijos veiksmai turi būti tiriami kaip susijęs persekiojimo, turto atėmimo ir žudymo procesas. Jei dokumentai neišliko arba nerasti, nurodyti paieškos apimtį, apyrašus ir kitus galimus šaltinius. [3]

Šis prašymas susijęs su GRU-001–GRU-005, pateiktais 2026 m. spalį, bet atskirai kelia Motuzo pagerbimo ir jo administracijos vaidmens klausimą. Lietuvos ypatingojo archyvo 2026 m. spalio 27 d. raštas P2-3486 dėl GRU-005 pateikė paieškos ir kopijavimo sąlygas, o ne prašytos bylos medžiagą. Raštas pridedamas kaip D priedas. Prašau, kad tyrimą koordinuojanti institucija pati organizuotų reikalingų dokumentų gavimą. [5]

## 4 Trys atskiri vertinimai

Dėl kiekvieno asmens ir kiekvieno nustatyto apdovanojimo ar statuso prašau atskirai atsakyti: A. Koks buvo pirminio suteikimo teisinis ir dokumentinis pagrindas, kas teikė kandidatūrą ir ką tikrino sprendimą priėmusi institucija? B. Kokie vėlesni individualūs, dalinio ar teminiai tyrimai iš tikrųjų

atlikti, kokia jų apimtis ir rezultatas? C. Kaip dabar, įvertinus šiame prašyme nurodytą medžiagą, sprendžiamas tolesnio pagerbimo klausimas? Pradinės bylos aprašymas nepakeičia atsakymų apie vėlesnius tyrimus ir dabartinį vertinimą.

**5 Nepriklausomas istorinis vertinimas**

Prašau kreiptis į Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakultetą ir Lietuvos istorijos institutą, kviečiant pasiūlyti kvalifikuotus, interesų konfliktus atskleidusius istorikus nepriklausomam vertinimui. Paskelbti tyrimo klausimus, ekspertų atrankos pagrindą, šaltinių sąrašą, išvadas ir reikšmingas atskirąsias nuomones, laikantis teisėtų duomenų apsaugos ribojimų. Jei akademinės institucijos atsisako, nurodyti alternatyvią nepriklausomo vertinimo tvarką. LGGRTC turi pateikti savo turimus šaltinius ir argumentus, tačiau jo ankstesnes rekomendacijas ar publikacijas vertinančių išvadų neturi kontroliuoti vien jų autoriai ar jas priėmusi institucija.

Prašau LGGRTC ir kitų institucijų nurodyti, kokias sovietinės kilmės bylas jos jau naudojo viešoms Gruzdžių biografijoms ir karo metų veiklos vertinimui. Vien dokumento sovietinė kilmė negali pakeisti konkretaus jo turinio tyrimo ar pateisinti skirtingo tų pačių šaltinių vertinimo priklausomai nuo to, ar jie remia pagerbimą, ar atskleidžia veiksmus prieš žydus. Reikalingas nuoseklus autentiškumo, parodymų gavimo aplinkybių, šaltinių priklausomybės ir kitų patvirtinimų vertinimas.

**6 Kompetencija ir tarpukario apdovanojimai**

Konstitucijos 84 straipsnio 22 punktas ir Valstybės apdovanojimų įstatymas Nr. IX-957 yra pagrindas prašyti nustatyti Prezidento kompetenciją dėl valstybinių apdovanojimų. Prašau nurodyti 18 straipsnio ir kitų taikytinų nuostatų reikšmę kiekvienam konkrečiam apdovanojimui, jo suteikimo metu galiojusią teisę ir dabartinę peržiūros procedūrą. Tarpukario medalio, ordino, karinio laipsnio, reabilitacijos, formalaus statuso ir savivaldybės biografinio pristatymo negalima laikyti vienos rūšies sprendimais. [L1]

1990 m. kovo 11 d. Aktas atkūrė Lietuvos valstybės suvereninių galių vykdymą. Atskiru tos pačios dienos įstatymu Nr. I-13 trumpam atnaujintas 1938 m. Konstitucijos veikimas, pabrėžiant valstybės tęstinumą; pats šis įstatymas neatkūrė iki 1940 m. galiojusių įstatymų. Todėl prašau išnagrinėti tarpukario apdovanojimų dabartinį teisinį režimą. Jei jų atėmimo procedūros nėra arba Prezidentas neturi kompetencijos, nurodyti konkrečias priežastis, kitą kompetentingą instituciją ir galimas priemones, įskaitant registrų anotavimą bei viešojo pagerbimo peržiūrą. Taip pat prašau viešai išdėstyti valstybės poziciją dėl dokumentuotame žydų persekiojime dalyvavusių asmenų pagerbimo. [L2, L3]

**7 Prašomi sprendimai**

Prašau paskirti koordinuojantį padalinį ar pareigūną, gauti ir pateikti nurodytus dokumentus, organizuoti nepriklausomą vertinimą ir dėl kiekvieno nustatyto apdovanojimo ar statuso priimti vieną iš aiškiai motyvuotų sprendimų: išsaugoti; panaikinti ar išbraukti iš apdovanotųjų sąrašo pagal taikytiną teisę; pradėti tam reikalingą procedūrą, nurodant veiksmus ir terminus; arba nurodyti konkrečią teisinę kliūtį ir galimas alternatyvas. Jei faktų dar nepakanka, nurodyti, ko trūksta ir kokie veiksmai bus atliekami. Nesutikimą su mano tyrimo išvada pagrįsti konkrečia ginčijama vieta ir šaltiniais. Vien bendro pobūdžio biografija arba išvada apie dalinį neatsako į individualius klausimus. Esminio istorinio vertinimo neperduoti vien LGGRTC; dėl kiekvieno persiuntimo nurodyti adresatą, klausimą ir jo atsakomybę. Savarankišką sprendimą dėl Prezidento kompetencijai priklausančio apdovanojimo priimti pagal nepriklausomo vertinimo rezultatus.

Nuo 1941 m. Holokausto Lietuvoje praėjo 85 metai, nuo nepriklausomybės atkūrimo — 36 metai. Lietuva turi LGGRTC, Tarptautinę komisiją ir universitetų istorikus; nurodyti šaltiniai saugomi valstybės archyvuose arba paskelbti jos institucijų leidiniuose. Kodėl šį darbą turi atlikti privatus tyrėjas iš Kalifornijos? Prašau, kad valstybės institucijos pačios gautų dokumentus, ištirtų čia pateiktus klausimus ir viešai paaiškintų priimtus sprendimus. Praėjus 81 metams nuo 1945 m. ir 36 metams nuo 1990 m. kovo 11 d., Lietuvos valstybė gali užbaigti kovas dėl istorinės atminties viešai pripažindama dokumentuotus faktus, įskaitant lietuvių dalyvavimą persekiojant, apiplėšiant ir žudant kaimynus žydus. Susitaikymui būtina tiesa. Valstybės ir savivaldybių institucijos turi ištirti joms pateiktus konkrečius įrodymus, paaiškinti asmenų pagerbimo pagrindą ir ištaisyti viešus tekstus bei sprendimus, kurių dokumentai nepagrindžia. Nei archyvinių bylų buvimas, nei viešas pagerbimas negali pakeisti šio darbo.

Savivaldybės, muziejaus, bibliotekos ar redakcijos prašau atskirai priimti motyvuotą sprendimą dėl jų valdomo viešojo pristatymo tikslinimo ir pagerbimo pagrindo. Institucinio pagerbimo vertinimas turi atsižvelgti į persekiojimą ir turto atėmimą, taip pat į žudymą. Atsakymą pateikti net jei nėra prezidentinio apdovanojimo. Istorinė tiesa ir dokumentuotų veiksmų įvardijimas yra susitaikymo prielaida.

**8 Registravimas, atsakymas ir dokumentų išsaugojimas**

Prašau atskirai užregistruoti šį prašymą ir pranešti registracijos numerį, datą, viso PDF su priedais gavimą bei koordinuojantį padalinį. Į kiekvieną prašymą atsakyti atskirai el. paštu ggochin@gmail.com per taikytiną įstatymo terminą; pratęsus terminą, nurodyti teisinį pagrindą ir numatomą atsakymo datą. Kompetencijai nepriklausančią dalį persiųsti kompetentingai institucijai ir pranešti persiuntimo datą, adresatą bei perduotą klausimą. Kopijos gavėjai, iš kurių aiškiai neprašoma sprendimo, informuojami pagal jų kompetenciją. Kiekvieno sprendimo adresato prašau pateikti atskirą savo institucijos registracijos numerį ir datą bei atsakyti į jam skirtus klausimus. Užsienio reikalų ministerijos prašau atskirai patvirtinti registravimą ir perdavimą Lietuvos IHRA delegacijos vadovui.

Prašau išsaugoti šiam nagrinėjimui svarbius dokumentus, susirašinėjimą ir dabartines viešų tekstų versijas. Jei dokumento nėra, nurodyti paieškos apimtį ir žinomą saugotoją; jei jo pateikti negalima, nurodyti konkretų pagrindą ir pateikti atskleidžiamą dalį. Mokamų paslaugų mano vardu be išankstinio rašytinio sutikimo dėl konkrečios kainos neužsakau. Nustatę mano tyrimo klaidą, nurodykite vietą ir ją pagrindžiančius šaltinius; pagrįstą klaidą ištaisysiu.

Pagarbiai,
Grant Arthur Gochin
Lietuvos Respublikos pilietis
Holokausto ir genocido studijų doktorantas, Gratz College

**9 Šaltiniai ir priedai**

[1] Grant Arthur Gochin. A priedas / Annex A: complete Gruzdžiai research report, sections 10, 18, 19, 22 and 23; notes 2–4, 16, 37–39.

[2] Order No. 657 of 9 August 1941. LCVA R-1099-1-2, folio 137. Facsimile reproduced as Annex B. Šaltinis

[3] Circular No. 962 of 22 August 1941. LCVA R-1099-1-1, folio 156. Facsimile reproduced as Annex C. Source collection. Šaltinis

[4] Šiauliai District Municipal Public Library. Žymūs žmonės and biographical table; Motuzas entry. See also the linked 2018 calendar in Annex A. Šaltinis

[5] Lithuanian Special Archives. Letter P2-3486 of 27 October 2026 concerning GRU-005. Reproduced as Annex D.

[L1] Law on State Awards No. IX-957. Identify the applicable version and provision for each instrument. Šaltinis

[L2] Act of 11 March 1990 on the Re-establishment of the Independent State of Lithuania. Šaltinis

[L3] Separate Law No. I-13 of 11 March 1990 on reinstatement of the 1938 Constitution, points 3–4. Šaltinis

A priedas yra visa pridėto miestelio tyrimo kopija. Kiti priedai identifikuoti pirmiau. Tyrimo šaltinių nuorodos išsaugotos originaliame PDF. Šaltinių vertinimas nepakeičiamas vien nuoroda į autoriaus publikaciją.

**Grant Arthur Gochin**

10900 Winnetka Avenue, Chatsworth, CA 91311, USA
+1 818-625-6513 | ggochin@gmail.com

Citizen of the Republic of Lithuania

To His Excellency Gitanas Nausėda
President of the Republic of Lithuania
Through the Presidential Chancellery
For State Awards matters
S. Daukanto a. 3, LT-01122 Vilnius
kanceliarija@prezidentas.lt

Co-addressee: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania — urm@urm.lt. Please register and route to the head of Lithuania's IHRA delegation.

Additional decision addressees: Šiauliai District Municipality Administration — prim@siauliuraj.lt; Šiauliai District Municipal Vytautas Vitkauskas Public Library — info@srsvb.lt (public commemoration and its sources).

Copies for information: LGGRTC — centras@genocid.lt; Lithuanian Institute of History — istorija@istorija.lt; Vilnius University Faculty of History — if@if.vu.lt; Lithuanian Jewish Community — info@lzb.lt.

**GRU-PRES-001 | 2 November 2026**

**Application to investigate the role of Stasys Motuzas's administration in Jewish persecution and the basis of his honors**

English control translation of the Lithuanian application

## 1 Request and published research

Dear Mr President, I request a full investigation into the Gruzdžiai rural district administration's role in implementing the 1941 instructions for Jewish concentration, transfer and dispossession, determination of the actions of Stasys Motuzas, identified as its elder, and assessment of the basis of his public commemoration. Identify every State decoration and formal status conferred on him, if any, and give a reasoned decision on retention or commencement of revocation proceedings. Refer the municipal library's commemoration to the municipality and library for examination. [1–4]

My complete town research, with source references and a Lithuanian summary, is published on Substack: Gruzdžiai — Town Research Report (1915–1945). A complete copy is enclosed in this PDF as Annex A. Please assess its identified documents and findings individually. My research catalogue: Grant Gochin Substack

## 2 Documentary grounds for investigation

Order No. 657 of 9 August 1941 is addressed to the Tryškiai elder. It orders removal of Tryškiai's Jews within three days by arrangement with the Gruzdžiai rural district elder. The printed destination Pakruojis is struck through and Gruzdžiai inserted by hand. This is a specific connection between the receiving administration and a deportation decision. Archival reference: LCVA, f. R-1099, inventory 1, file 2, folio 137. The facsimile is enclosed as Annex B. [1, 2]

Circular No. 962 of 22 August 1941 is addressed to the county's rural district elders and mayors, with copies to police precinct heads. It provides for transfer to Žagarė on 25–29 August, transport, property inventories, restrictions on possessions and cash, enclosure of the ghetto and implementation reports. Archival reference: LCVA, f. R-1099, inventory 1, file 1, folio 156. The facsimile is enclosed as Annex C. [1, 3]

Damijonas Šniukas identifies Motuzas as again heading Gruzdžiai's administration in 1941, on page 653 of Gruzdžiai, part 1. The order's words "by arrangement with the Gruzdžiai rural district elder" record a prior agreement to receive the Tryškiai Jews. Together with the handwritten destination change, this shows the receiving administration's involvement in arranging the transfer. Obtain the appointment record confirming Motuzas's tenure specifically on 9 August, identify the parties to the agreement, and obtain records of its formation and implementation. The 22 August circular additionally establishes the distribution and implementation-reporting chain by office. [1–3]

The library lists Stasys Motuzas among Fighters for Lithuania's Freedom. Its biographical table gives birth on 4 February 1898 in Valdomai and death on 22 November 1985 in Bremen. The report's public-source screen did not verify a State decoration or formal status decision; I request an official search of registers and files. The library category must be distinguished from a legally conferred resistance status. [1, 4]

According to the Holocaust Atlas of Lithuania, Jewish women, children and elderly people from Gruzdžiai were transferred to Žagarė and murdered there on 2 October 1941. State honor for Noreika, who signed the instructions, and library commemoration of Motuzas raise a connected question of institutional assessment. This application asks for examination of the administrative link headed by Motuzas; it does not duplicate a separate review of Noreika's decoration. [1]

**3 Records to obtain and produce**

Obtain and produce Motuzas's appointment, discharge and substitution records; the original of Order No. 657, circumstances of its alteration and correspondence arranging reception with the Gruzdžiai elder; dispatch and receipt records for Circular No. 962; implementation returns, transport lists, guard and labor instructions, Jewish property inventories and transfer records for both instruments. Search LCVA fond R-1099, Gruzdžiai municipal and police records, and identify other custodians. Separately obtain award and status files, if any, and the library's sources and decisions concerning commemoration. [1–4]

Clause 3 of Circular No. 962 directs that Žagarė ghetto Jews be taken to work daily under guard and returned to the ghetto. This is a specific instruction organizing coerced labor; wage records are not supplied in this packet. Forced labor without wages is slavery. Obtain labor-allocation, guard, employer, wage and payment records and establish how this provision was implemented. Investigate the administration's actions as a connected process of persecution, dispossession and murder. If records have not survived or cannot be located, identify the search scope, inventories and alternative sources. [3]

This application relates to GRU-001–GRU-005 submitted in October 2026 but separately raises Motuzas's commemoration and his administration's role. The Lithuanian Special Archives' letter P2-3486 of 27 October 2026 concerning GRU-005 supplied search and copying conditions rather than the requested case-file material. It is enclosed as Annex D. The institution coordinating this investigation should organize acquisition of the necessary records. [5]

## 4 Three separate assessments

For each person and each identified decoration or status, answer separately: A. What was the original legal and documentary basis, who nominated the person and what did the deciding institution check? B. What later individual, unit or thematic investigations actually occurred, with what scope and findings? C. How is continued honor now assessed in light of the material identified in this application? Describing the original file does not answer the questions about subsequent research and present assessment.

## 5 Independent historical assessment

Invite Vilnius University's Faculty of History and the Lithuanian Institute of History to nominate qualified historians who disclose conflicts of interest for an independent assessment. Publish the research questions, selection basis, source inventory, conclusions and meaningful dissent, subject to lawful data restrictions. If the academic institutions decline, identify an alternative independent assessment process. LGGRTC should supply its records and arguments; evaluation of its earlier recommendations or publications should not be controlled solely by their authors or the institution responsible for them.

Ask LGGRTC and other institutions to identify the Soviet-era files they have already used for public Gruzdžiai biographies and assessments of wartime conduct. Soviet provenance alone cannot replace examination of a document's contents or justify treating the same sources differently depending on whether they support commemoration or reveal acts against Jews. Apply consistent examination of authenticity, circumstances of testimony, source dependence and corroboration.

## 6 Competence and interwar decorations

Article 84(22) of the Constitution and Law on State Awards No. IX-957 provide the basis for asking the President to establish competence concerning State decorations. Identify the relevance of Article 18 and other applicable provisions to each particular decoration, the law in force at conferral and the present review procedure. An interwar medal, order, military rank, rehabilitation, formal status and municipal biographical presentation are distinct instruments. [L1]

The Act of 11 March 1990 restored the exercise of Lithuania's sovereign powers. Separate Law No. I-13 of that day briefly reinstated the 1938 Constitution to express State continuity; that law did not itself revive pre-1940 legislation. I therefore request examination of the present legal regime for interwar decorations. If no withdrawal procedure exists or the President lacks competence, identify the specific reasons, any other competent authority and possible measures, including register annotation and review of public commemoration. I also request a public statement of the State's position on honoring persons implicated by documented evidence in persecution of Jews. [L2, L3]

## 7 Decisions requested

Appoint a coordinating unit or official, obtain and produce the identified records, arrange independent assessment, and issue one of the following reasoned outcomes for each identified decoration or status: retain; revoke or remove from the recipients' list under applicable law; commence the necessary procedure with identified steps and timing; or identify the specific legal obstacle and available alternatives. If facts remain insufficient, identify what is missing and the actions to be taken. Support disagreement with my research by identifying the precise disputed passage and sources. A general biography or unit-level conclusion does not answer the individual questions. Do not delegate the historical merits assessment to LGGRTC alone; disclose each

referral’s recipient, question and responsibility. Decide honors within presidential competence on the independent assessment’s results.

Eighty-five years have passed since the Holocaust in Lithuania in 1941 and thirty-six since independence was restored. Lithuania has LGGRTC, the International Commission and university historians; the identified sources are held in State archives or published by its institutions. Why must a private researcher in California do this work? State institutions should themselves obtain the documents, investigate the questions presented here and publicly explain their decisions. Eighty-one years after 1945 and thirty-six years after 11 March 1990, Lithuania can resolve its historical-memory conflicts by publicly acknowledging documented facts, including Lithuanian participation in the persecution, dispossession and murder of Jewish neighbors. Reconciliation requires truth. State and municipal institutions must examine the specific evidence presented to them, explain the basis of individual commemoration, and correct public accounts and decisions that the documents do not support. Neither the existence of archival files nor public honors can substitute for that work.

I ask the municipality, museum, library or editorial body concerned to give a separate reasoned decision on correction of its public presentation and the basis of commemoration. Assessment of institutional honor must address persecution and dispossession as well as murder. Answer these questions even if no presidential decoration is identified. Historical truth and acknowledgment of documented conduct are prerequisites for reconciliation.

**8 Registration response and preservation**

Register this application separately and provide its number, date, acknowledgment of the complete PDF and annexes, and coordinating unit. Answer each request separately by email to ggochin@gmail.com within the applicable statutory period; identify the legal basis and expected reply date for any extension. Forward matters outside competence to the competent authority and provide the referral date, recipient and question referred. Copy recipients from whom no decision is expressly requested receive the material for information within their competence. Each decision addressee should provide its own institutional registration number and date and answer the requests directed to it. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs should separately confirm registration and routing to Lithuania’s IHRA delegation head.

Preserve the records, correspondence and current public-text versions relevant to this examination. If a record cannot be located, identify the search scope and known custodian; if disclosure is restricted, identify the specific ground and release separable portions. I do not authorize paid services in my name without prior written agreement to a quoted amount. If you identify an error in my research, specify the passage and supporting sources; I will correct a substantiated error.

Respectfully,
Grant Arthur Gochin
Citizen of the Republic of Lithuania
PhD candidate in Holocaust and Genocide Studies, Gratz College

**9 Sources and annexes**

[1] Grant Arthur Gochin. A priedas / Annex A: complete Gruzdžiai research report, sections 10, 18, 19, 22 and 23; notes 2–4, 16, 37–39.

[2] Order No. 657 of 9 August 1941. LCVA R-1099-1-2, folio 137. Facsimile reproduced as Annex B. Source

[3] Circular No. 962 of 22 August 1941. LCVA R-1099-1-1, folio 156. Facsimile reproduced as Annex C. Source collection. Source

[4] Šiauliai District Municipal Public Library. Žymūs žmonės and biographical table; Motuzas entry. See also the linked 2018 calendar in Annex A. Source

[5] Lithuanian Special Archives. Letter P2-3486 of 27 October 2026 concerning GRU-005. Reproduced as Annex D.

[L1] Law on State Awards No. IX-957. Identify the applicable version and provision for each instrument. Source

[L2] Act of 11 March 1990 on the Re-establishment of the Independent State of Lithuania. Source

[L3] Separate Law No. I-13 of 11 March 1990 on reinstatement of the 1938 Constitution, points 3–4. Source

Annex A is the complete enclosed town report. Other annexes are identified above. Source links are preserved in the original report PDF. Reference to the author’s publication does not replace assessment of its underlying evidence.

GRU-PRES-001
Priedų rodyklė / Annex index

A — Gruzdžiai tyrimas / complete town research report
PDF puslapiai / pages 12–33

B — Įsakymas Nr. 657 / Order No. 657 — LCVA R-1099-1-2, l. 137
PDF puslapis / page 34

C — Aplinkraštis Nr. 962 / Circular No. 962 — LCVA R-1099-1-1, l. 156
PDF puslapis / page 35

D — Lietuvos ypatingojo archyvo raštas P2-3486 / archive letter
PDF puslapis / page 36

Puslapių numeriai šioje rodyklėje nurodo viso PDF puslapius.
Page references in this index refer to the complete PDF.
Pridėtų šaltinių originali puslapių numeracija išsaugota.
Original pagination of the enclosed sources is retained.

# Gruzdžiai — Town Research Report (1915–1945)

Grant Arthur Gochin

Research completed 1 November 2026; revised 2 November 2026

## 1. The police, the grave and the missing children

The murder of the Jews of Gruzdžiai was an organized operation involving a local police force, armed escorts, requisitioned transport, a prepared grave and a shooting party. Damijonas Šniukas's 2009 local history names police chief Vincas Tiknius, policeman Arvydas Diržinskas and guard Vincas Visockas. It describes Diržinskas marking out the grave and Visockas guarding the men forced to dig it. Witness accounts used in that history identify men brought from Joniškis as the shooters, with Germans directing the execution. The victims included women and children. The account records six children, approximately ten to twelve years old, being shot last. These findings require a much fuller public account than an anonymous sentence saying that Jews were shot on German orders.[1]

Gruzdžiai was also a station in a larger deportation system. On 9 August 1941 Jonas Noreika, chief of Šiauliai County, ordered the Jews of Tryškiai removed to Gruzdžiai within three days, stating that arrangements had been made with the Gruzdžiai rural district elder. On 22 August his office instructed the county's local authorities to send Jews to Žagarė, inventory their property, restrict what they could take and arrange their transport. The Holocaust Atlas of Lithuania places women, children and elderly people from Gruzdžiai among those taken to Žagarė and murdered there. The local cemetery grave therefore cannot simply stand for every Jewish person connected with Gruzdžiai.[2][3][4]

Three forms of participation belong together in this history: persecution, dispossession and murder. Police humiliation and compulsory work preceded the shootings; property was separated from its owners before and at the grave; possessions were distributed, acquired cheaply or sold afterward. The offices that issued instructions, the men who guarded the victims and the people who received their belongings must be identified alongside the men who fired.[1][3]

This report covers the community before its destruction, the occupations, the local and county machinery of persecution, the massacre, the Tryškiai–Gruzdžiai–Žagarė connection and the surviving physical and documentary record. A final part examines later public representation and the five submissions already made to Lithuanian institutions. It distinguishes what the documents establish, what witnesses reported and what remains to be resolved.

## 2. The place and its names

Gruzdžiai is the town north of Šiauliai known in Yiddish as Gruzd and in Polish as Gruździe. Historical Russian and English spellings vary. The administrative unit in 1941 was Gruzdžių valsčius, a rural district within Šiauliai County. Town, estate and rural district were different geographic units; figures relating to them cannot be exchanged without explanation.[5][6]

Gruzdžiai must be distinguished from Gargždai, the town near Klaipėda known in Yiddish as Gorzd. This matters because a cemetery webpage headed Gruzdžiai contains a narrative about

Memel, Dovilai and the June 1941 killing at Gargždai. That narrative is geographically incompatible with Gruzdžiai. The JewishGen Gargždai research page explicitly warns against the confusion and also flags a school photograph attributed to Gruzdžiai in Rosin's volume. Neither the displaced narrative nor that photograph supplies reliable Gruzdžiai evidence without independent identification.[7]

Šakyna and Šiupyliai were nearby centers with their own residents and armed groups. Joniškis was a separate town from which witnesses say the Gruzdžiai shooting party came. Žagarė was the destination of the later countywide ghetto concentration. These relationships explain how people could be arrested in one locality, held in another and murdered at a third.

## 3. A community with an archive before it had a mass grave

The community's history extends well before the report's principal period. Šniukas locates Jewish residents in eighteenth-century estate records and gives a named occupational picture from 1795. His 1892 tax list contains 74 household entries representing at least 343 people. It includes shopkeepers, laborers, carters, tailors, shoemakers, a bookbinder, a miller and ritual slaughterers. This was a differentiated society, rather than the undifferentiated handful of families that appears in many short town histories.[8]

The figure most often repeated for 1897 is 482 Jews among 1,160 inhabitants. For 1923, the Jewish community reference work gives 142 Jews and a total population of 1,354; VLE separately lists 1,124 town residents and 230 estate residents, which together produce the same total. Šniukas gives 146 Jews for the rural district. For the eve of the Second World War the published accounts variously give approximately 75 Jews, 27 families or about twenty families. These are different estimates and geographic descriptions, not a stable series from which an exact 1941 victim total can be calculated.[5][6][8]

The decline from the late imperial population was already substantial before Nazi rule. War, the changing estate economy, movement to larger towns and emigration all contributed. It is consequently wrong to subtract a postwar survivor count from the 1897 population and describe the result as the number murdered in 1941. A defensible victim register needs households present at the time, refugees, people deported elsewhere, people who escaped and individual death evidence.

## 4. 1915 and the survival of the community's books

The First World War damaged the social and economic world in which Gruzdžiai Jews lived. Tomas Petreikis's study of Jewish documentary losses provides a particularly useful local distinction: the Gruzdžiai prayer house preserved its books, although three book cupboards were lost. His reference is the Jewish religious community's 1919 statement to the war-loss commission, now identified as LCVA, f. 1738, ap. 2, b. 487, unnumbered leaves.[9]

That is positive evidence of cultural survival. It also identifies a specific archival route for reconstructing the community's losses. Petreikis discusses the larger destruction of Jewish property and libraries along the Šiauliai front, but the regional totals are not Gruzdžiai totals. Likewise, the Russian military's wider deportation of Jews in 1915 supplies the regional setting; it does not establish the departure date or route of every Gruzdžiai household.

The aftermath affected livelihoods as well as buildings. Šniukas describes the loss of estate leases and contracting opportunities as forests and former estate lands changed ownership under independent Lithuania. Emigration continued to South Africa, the United States, Mexico and Palestine. The diaspora became part of the town's surviving historical record, preserving family photographs and names later returned to local researchers.[8][10]

## 5. Named families and public institutions between the wars

The local branch of Ezro, a Jewish charitable, social-assistance and cultural association, provides unusually concrete evidence. Šniukas dates its registration to 16 March 1926, register No. 411/32, following a central-board notification of 10 March. The board included Perecas Fridmanas, Zalmonas Jofė, Bencijonas Šeras, Mauša Šimeliovas and Mejeris Kacas; Šimeliovas was chairman. The supporting reference is LCVA, f. 412, ap. 1, b. 300.[10]

The membership list contained 29 male names. By 1932 the reported board consisted of chairman Mauša or Moizė Šimeliovas, treasurer Chaimas Kacas and Joselis Gruzdas. The records show a community maintaining its own organization and assistance structures even as its population contracted. They do not constitute a list of Holocaust victims: membership in 1926 does not prove residence or death in 1941.

Other sources describe a Jewish People's Bank branch, charitable lending, hospitality and Zionist participation. The Jewish community reference work identifies a five-member council with General Zionist, Tzeirei Zion and independent representation. Its account also names rabbis Moshe Shapira, Yitzhak Eizik Friedman and Zisl Levin. These descriptions should be retained with their dates and source attribution, rather than collapsed into an assertion that every institution operated continuously until 1941. Šniukas's suggestion that the interwar community apparently lacked a rabbi differs from the Jewish community reference work's last-rabbi identification; the reproduced synagogue-board record establishes officers, but does not itself settle the rabbi's tenure.[6][11]

## 6. The synagogue records correct the picture of an anonymous minority

A Ministry of Education document reproduced in the monograph confirms the Gruzdžiai synagogue board in June 1936. It names G. Levas as mokytas, with J. Raizas as candidate; B. Šeras as elder, with A. Kropmanas as candidate; and M. K. Abramavičius as treasurer, with Š. Ulmanas as candidate. The document is reproduced on printed page 700; the accompanying discussion cites LCVA, f. 412, ap. 5, b. 1676, leaves 21 and 31.[11]

The same study identifies a supplementary Jewish vital-registration point in Gruzdžiai headed by Jankelis Samiliovas, whose entries required confirmation through Šiauliai. It records the birth on 8 October 1937 of Giršas, son of merchant Pinkus Ulmanas and Beilė Abramovičiūtė, citing LCVA, f. 412, ap. 5, b. 1743, leaves 76 and 199 for the entries discussed. That child's birth is evidence of a named family. His individual fate requires a death or survivor record; it cannot be assigned solely from the town's general destruction.[11]

The sources disagree about local schooling. Levin and Rosin describe a Jewish school, while Šniukas says that the town had no school of its own and describes Jewish children attending Lithuanian classes or studying in Šiauliai. These may concern different periods or forms of

education. School registers, staffing returns and premises records are necessary to resolve the distinction. The disagreement should not erase the children from the account.[6][12]

## 7. Houses, businesses and ownership before the seizure

The monograph connects named Jewish owners to plots around the market square and Žagarės Street, now Kaštonų Street. It describes the conversion of former estate leaseholds into private property in the 1930s. Mauša Gruzdas received a plot with a 135-litas redemption payment; Chaimas Mauša Šimeliovas's market-square holding was transferred in 1938 without a redemption charge. Pinkus Ulmanas, Mendelis Eljasonas, Joselis Elijas Gruzdas, Levas Motelis and Mejeris Abramovičius also appear in the property account.[13]

These records matter beyond a catalogue of occupations. They establish that the homes, shops and workshops later described as abandoned had identifiable owners and a documentary history. Murder and forced removal did not turn Jewish property into property without a prior owner. An account of dispossession should follow each holding through confiscation, administration, sale, occupation and any later restitution claim.

Šniukas describes timber enterprise, retail trade, agricultural work and a range of crafts. His text also preserves women in savings-account records, including seamstresses and wage earners who disappear from male-only community lists. In 2024 the municipal library documented a visit by Leah Zakh Aharoni, a descendant of Abramas Gruzdas, whose family had operated a tailoring establishment. Surviving buildings around Nepriklausomybės Square and Kaštonų Street remain part of that history.[10][13][14]

## 8. Exclusion before the killing

Economic interaction did not remove antisemitism. Šniukas records mockery of Jewish religious practices, circulation of ritual-murder stories and the exclusion of Jews and local Germans from a football team. These accounts document social hostility before the killing.[12]

Some of the monograph's own language reproduces ethnic generalizations, including claims about innate Jewish commercial talent. Its suggestion that local Jews left no significant intellectual legacy is also too sweeping to substitute for research into education, religious writing, professional life and emigration. The principal local history of Gruzdžiai still uses antisemitic stereotypes while documenting the massacre. That is itself a finding about the representation of the murdered community.

## 9. Soviet occupation and the destruction of civic autonomy

Lithuania came under Soviet occupation in June 1940. Miškinis describes the removal of Gruzdžiai elder Stasys Motuzas and his replacement by Adolfas Loveikis, the consolidation of private shops into a cooperative, the organization of artisans into an artel and the nationalization of mills and the pharmacy. National and religious organizations were closed. These measures disrupted the structures through which Jews and other residents had worked and organized.[15]

The June 1941 attack on the Soviet Union brought another occupation. The killings of Jews that followed cannot be treated as a collective reprisal for Soviet policy. Specific political affiliations,

where established, belong to individuals. Jewish children, elderly people, traders and religious officials were targeted as Jews. Neither a local accusation of Soviet sympathy nor a general statement about the preceding occupation explains away the racial selection of an entire community.

## 10. The police force had names and a command

Šniukas identifies Vincas Tiknius, also spelled Tiknys, a Lithuanian army senior lieutenant from Strazdai, as the organizer of the reconstituted local police. His chronological account places Tiknius in charge during 1941–1942. Later chiefs were Kostas Kaktys from June 1942 to March 1944, Povilas Dragūnas from March to July 1944 and apparently Jonas Gailiūnas in July 1944. Those later appointments must not be projected backward onto the 1941 massacre.[16]

The early force included Rokas Dabrikas, Arvydas Diržinskas, Adolfas Grėbliauskas, Mečislovas Juozėnas, Leonas Pampikas, Kazys Žeimys and Jurgis Žukauskas. Elsewhere the same volume gives Bronius Grėbliauskas, making the Grėbliauskas first-name question one that requires personnel records. It also names Benediktas Vaitkus and Vincas Visockas among the early armed activists.[16]

The local administration was headed again by Stasys Motuzas. Noreika's 9 August order states that arrangements had been made with the Gruzdžiai elder. Read together, the local history and the order identify Motuzas as the head of the receiving administration. His appointment file and the receiving correspondence must complete the person-level documentary chain.[2][16]

## 11. Arrest, confinement, humiliation and slavery

Levin and Rosin describe local Lithuanian nationalists arresting Jews on 29 June 1941 and holding them in the prayer house, followed by release on a German military instruction. Šniukas's suggestion that Jews initially lived without interference conflicts with that account. The June episode requires comparison with the underlying testimony; it should not disappear merely because a later author considered it unlikely.[6][17]

County restrictions then made Jewish identity a basis for compulsory marking, limits on movement and removal to designated places. Šniukas discusses the county chief's order of 23 July, requiring the wearing of the Star of David and limiting public presence to specified hours. For local acts he cites Vincas Baziulis's account of police forcing Jews to sweep the market square and Benediktas Lapeika's recollection of work in gardens. His wider statement about business closures partly rests on analogy with other towns, which must not be silently upgraded to a recovered Gruzdžiai closure order.[1]

Forced labor without wages is slavery. The local evidence establishes compulsion; payroll and employer records are needed to determine remuneration, recipients of the work and its full duration. Public cleaning and gardening imposed by police were part of the degradation and exploitation of people already being stripped of freedom, not evidence of ordinary employment.

The building used for confinement also requires precision. Rosin and the monograph describe the prayer house or shul; the Kalendra finding aid refers to a schoolhouse. Those descriptions might

concern different episodes or buildings. They are not interchangeable merely because each housed prisoners.

## 12. Diržinskas, Visockas and the preparation of the grave

The account on printed page 708 of the monograph gives a concrete sequence. Police called Stasys Nainys, Vincas Preikšas and Adomas Jokubauskas from their homes and stopped Kazys Norkevičius in the market area. Arvydas Diržinskas and Vincas Visockas, who had worked in the Diržinskas family mill, took the men to the mill, issued four spades and escorted them under arms to the Jewish cemetery.[1]

Beyond its eastern wall Diržinskas marked a space approximately two by eight meters and ordered the digging. Visockas guarded the workers. Antanas Beinoras, who approached after hearing the spades, was threatened and sent away. After several hours Diržinskas inspected a grave roughly one and a half meters deep and questioned whether it would accommodate fifty people. The diggers were ordered to leave the tools, return discreetly and remain silent.

The chapter cites LYA, f. K-1, ap. 58, b. 43362/3, including leaves 13, 16, 19, 23, 25, 28, 39, 46 and 47 for the grave-preparation account. The physical planning preceded the arrival of the victims. This was a prepared killing site. The coerced grave diggers must be distinguished from the armed men who compelled them to work.

## 13. Five wagons and a false promise of work

The estate steward ordered five drivers to report with paired-horse wagons: Juozas Gendvilas, Juozas Maižvilas, Juozas Stočkus, Jonas Goštautas and Aloyzas Šleikis. They were directed from the police station to the prayer house. Witnesses described one wagon carrying police and four carrying victims and belongings. Gendvilas recalled twelve to fifteen people being placed in his wagon.[18]

The victims were told they were being taken to work in Šiauliai. The chapter attributes the same explanation to police chief Tiknius when calling armed men to participate. It was an operational deception: people were assembled with possessions they believed they would need, placed under guard and moved in the direction of Šiauliai before being diverted toward the cemetery.

Šniukas’s archival references include LYA, f. K-1, ap. 58, b. P17429, leaves 16, 20, 26 and 37, and b. 1033/3, leaf 16. Kazys Žeimys’s account describes two motor vehicles arriving with Germans and white-armbanders. The precise timing of that arrival relative to the confinement is disputed even within the chapter. The transport arrangements themselves are described in considerably greater detail than the general town summaries disclose.

## 14. The massacre beside the cemetery

In Šniukas’s reconstruction, the convoy turned from the Šiauliai road toward the cemetery and the victims understood what was happening. They were ordered out and made to lie face down. Wagons containing their possessions were sent back to the shul. A German officer used a whip while selecting groups for the grave. Victims were ordered to undress and positioned at the edge; the shooters fired across the pit. People who survived the first shots were killed with revolvers.[19]

The chapter reports approximately ten local armed men escorting and guarding the site, while witnesses identified the shooters as men from Joniškis. It also preserves a driver's mention of policemen from Linkuva and Meškuičiai. These descriptions should be compared, not merged into a single invented battalion. No verified roster of the visiting shooting party or identified German officer is yet available in the materials examined.

The account includes a young Jewish woman being struck when she protested and six children being killed at the end. It also records Maižvilas's statement that Aleksandras Remeika and Kazys Šipkus were among those killed. Another chapter gives different name forms and adds Petras Abakavičius; the discrepancy belongs in the casualty research rather than being resolved by assumption.[19][20]

The armed participants buried the bodies and collected clothing. Maižvilas drove shooters back to town, where the killing was followed by drinking. The local guards' participation remains part of the murder operation even where the firing itself is assigned to the visiting party.

## 15. The women and children omitted by the inscription

The memorial's Lithuanian inscription describes fifty Jewish men. The 2009 monograph explicitly rejects the male-only description, drawing on testimony concerning women and children in the convoy and at the grave. It cites the questioning of participants and witnesses, including LYA, f. K-1, ap. 58, b. 1033/3, leaf 16, and b. P17429, leaf 30.[20]

The account also names people brought from Šakyna to join the confined group: the feldsher Trusfusas and his daughters Cilė, a pharmacist, and Gitė, an engineer. Their names should be checked against the testimony and vital records, preserving their connection with Šakyna rather than presenting them as established lifelong Gruzdžiai residents. The doctor Riva Trusfusaitė, who worked in Gruzdžiai in 1930–1934, is separately documented in the chapter; similarity of surname is not enough to assign her the same fate.[1][12]

This is a substantive defect in public memory. It is not corrected by preserving the same number and adding a candle-lighting ceremony. A visitor reading men only receives a different account of the victims from the one preserved in the local history's evidence. A revised interpretation must identify women and children, explain the count's uncertainty and distinguish those killed here from people deported onward.

Nor does the evidence of children at the Gruzdžiai grave negate the separate evidence of Gruzdžiai children taken to Žagarė. Different groups could have had different routes. A gender division in one summary cannot be used to force every person into a rigid men-here, women-and-children-there formula.

## 16. What can be said about the date and number

Published figures include approximately forty, forty-six, forty-seven and fifty. The monograph preserves witness figures ranging from more than forty to about fifty; one account distinguishes forty-three or forty-four Jews and three or four Lithuanian victims. These are not six independent censuses. They are retrospective estimates, a memorial number and later editorial choices.[4][5][20]

The date also remains disputed. Rosin gives confinement on 5 August and killing on 6 August. The memorial's Yiddish text supplies 6 August, while the Lithuanian text gives August without a day. The Atlas and tourism account give late August. The monograph's Jewish-history chapter accepts 6 August provisionally but admits that the basis of the memorial's exact date was not established. Its earlier occupation chapter prints 8 August. The USHMM Kalendra summary describes a September escort to a killing site near Gruzdžiai, which may concern another episode.[17][20][21]

The English Pinkas translation gives a November confinement date that conflicts with its own subsequent sequence to Žagarė and Yom Kippur. It cannot be adopted as a reliable chronology. The Hebrew original must settle whether that is a translation or underlying textual error.[6]

The secure formulation is that approximately forty to fifty people were murdered beside the Jewish cemetery in summer 1941, with 6 August prominent in local commemoration and competing dates requiring archival resolution. No precise total of all Gruzdžiai-connected Jewish deaths should be derived from that single grave.

## 17. Plunder at the grave and after the killing

The removal of property was built into the operation. The victims brought bedding, clothing, shoes and necessities because they had been told they were going to work. Those belongings were returned under guard while their owners were taken to the pit. The separation of persons from property was deliberate.[19]

Šniukas reports subsequent distribution among participants and guards, acquisition of a radio, purchase of a coat at a reduced price and a family appearing in conspicuously fine clothes. He also records an account of public sale. Some movement of valuables to Šiauliai is presented by him as a supposition, not as a recovered consignment ledger; the report retains that distinction.[22]

The records needed now are identifiable: seizure inventories, sale notices, purchaser lists, receipts, municipal accounts, cooperative records and the property declarations of participants. Police testimony cited in the monograph supplies starting points, including LYA, f. K-1, ap. 58, b. 36067/3, leaves 36, 45 and 46, and b. 45480/3, leaves 10 and 35. A property history should connect objects and buildings to both former owners and subsequent recipients.

## 18. Noreika's order made Gruzdžiai a deportation destination

The surviving facsimile of the 9 August order is addressed to the Tryškiai elder. It states that, by arrangement with the Gruzdžiai elder, Jewish citizens of Tryškiai are to be removed within three days. The printed destination Pakruojis is crossed out and Gruzdžiai inserted by hand. The document bears the county-chief attribution and the date, with reference No. 657. Its archival citation is LCVA, f. R-1099, ap. 1, b. 2, leaf 137.[2]

The order's arrangement with the Gruzdžiai elder connects Noreika's decision to the receiving administration headed by Stasys Motuzas. The appointment record must confirm Motuzas's tenure on 9 August. The correction is material evidence of a specific destination decision. Gruzdžiai was not merely the site of an isolated local shooting; its administration was connected to the movement of Jews from another town. Rosin's Tryškiai account describes women and

children brought to Gruzdžiai, kept in an exposed field, abused by Lithuanian guards and subsequently taken to Žagarė. That narrative supplies an experience of confinement along the route, although its dates must be compared with the order rather than silently treated as an exact execution return.[23]

The Tryškiai account describes the route through Gruzdžiai to Žagarė. The cemetery massacre and these onward deportations require separate victim and transport records. The outstanding documents are the dispatch return, escort orders, receiving acknowledgment, accommodation instructions and onward-transfer lists.

For the wider documentary chain, see my Noreika research report and my earlier discussion of the Tryškiai order.[38]

## 19. The county order combined deportation, property seizure and guarded labor

Circular No. 962 of 22 August addressed the county's rural district elders and mayors, with copies to police precinct heads. It invoked the Šiauliai regional commissar's order and directed Jews to Žagarė between 25 and 29 August. Municipal authorities were to provide transport and inventory property. Families were permitted necessary household items and clothing and a limited amount of cash. The ghetto was to be fenced and its prisoners taken to work and returned under guard.[3]

In Gruzdžiai, the offices addressed were those held by elder Stasys Motuzas and police chief Vincas Tiknius. Noreika's concentration and property instructions were thus issued to Motuzas and Tiknius by office. This is the documentary distribution chain; the local receipt and implementation return must supply the record of execution.[3][16]

The document also made arrangements for non-Jewish residents displaced by the designated ghetto area to receive alternative premises or property. Thus the same administrative instrument governed people's removal, the restriction of what they could retain, the custody of what they left and the accommodation of other residents. This is a documentary link between persecution and material redistribution.

A reporting requirement demanded details of implementation and numbers moved. The Žagarė mayor's surviving response recorded 949 arrivals from other localities by 29 August and requested wire and nails. That figure covers the arrivals from several places, not Gruzdžiai alone. A separate Gruzdžiai implementation return remains necessary to establish the local count and named escorts.[3][24]

## 20. Murder in Žagarė and the limits of the aggregate figures

The Holocaust Atlas identifies women, children and elderly Jews from Gruzdžiai among the people brought to Žagarė. It describes the killing on 2 October 1941 as involving policemen from a Šiauliai self-defense unit commanded by Lieutenant R. Kaloška and Linkuva white-armbanders; Žagarė white-armbanders escorted the condemned, while German SS men supervised and participated. These are the actors assigned to the Žagarė event, not automatically to the earlier Gruzdžiai cemetery shooting.[4]

The Jäger-report total cited by the Atlas is 2,236: 633 men, 1,107 women and 496 children. The components add to the total. An English Atlas transcription gives 663 men, which does not. The figure is a perpetrator-reported aggregate for the Žagarė killing, not a separate Gruzdžiai victim count. Larger numbers appear in other commemorative and narrative accounts and require their own explanation.

Šniukas doubts the onward deportation of surviving local Jews and provisionally places the whole community in the cemetery grave. That conclusion conflicts with the Atlas, the Jewish community histories and testimony cited in the earlier submissions. The monograph's detailed massacre account does not settle this separate disagreement. Its grave-side detail can be used while its all-here conclusion is rejected as unproven.[4][20]

## 21. Stasys Kalendra is a named documentary lead

The USHMM finding aid to RG-26.004M identifies Stasys Kalendra, son of Vincas, born in 1904 in Maželiai in the Joniškis district. On printed page 75, reel 143, his entry is visibly aligned with P17659/BB, P17659/SB and P17659/TB. It describes a principal file of 129 pages and additions of seven and forty-one pages.[21]

The summary attributes to Kalendra guarding Jews, plundering their property, escorting victims in a lorry to a killing site near Gruzdžiai in September 1941 and bringing groups to the pits. It also connects him with the destruction of the Žagarė ghetto and records a ten-year sentence in 1948. This is a finding-aid summary of a Soviet investigation and trial record.

The September date and schoolhouse description raise a specific question: does the file describe a second killing near Gruzdžiai, distinct from the August cemetery massacre? The archive must obtain and produce the file to answer it. All three P17659 references belong in that request.

## 22. The archival response supplied tariffs rather than the file

GRU-005 requested the Kalendra material from the Lithuanian Special Archives. The archive registered it on 22 October 2026 as P1-2629. Director Remigijus Černius's letter of 27 October, No. P2-3486, sent by email on 30 October, states that the archive does not undertake research or evaluate the content of held documents in response to such requests.[25]

The letter describes search and copying as paid services, quoting €21.80 for a specified search within a five-to-ten-year range, €1.30 per digital copy for documents created through 1944 and €0.50 for documents created from 1945 onward, with advance payment required. The reply points to EAIS finding aids but does not identify the requested file's current archival reference, give its full extent or provide its pages.

That disposition should be described accurately. The request received a substantive administrative response about service conditions; the requested evidentiary record was not supplied with it. The next document request can now use all three verified USHMM references and seek the current LYA call number, file extent, itemized cost and copies of the judgment, interrogations, witness statements and later review decisions. Institutions presenting this history publicly must obtain and produce the documents on which their conclusions depend.

## 23. Survivors and rescue require individual identification

Rosin names Pinkhas Ulman as a survivor hidden by Augustinas Mažeikas and his family and later resident in Israel. The English Pinkas account also names Pinkhas Ulman, without all of Rosin's rescue detail. Miškinis gives two survivors; Šniukas refers to a younger Ulman escaping an onward convoy and also notes postwar descendants of the barber Zefas. These references cannot be reconciled by declaring one exact survivor total without specifying who was counted and where they had been in 1941.[12][15][17][20]

A survivor register must distinguish people who survived locally, those hidden outside town, people who escaped eastward, former residents already elsewhere and emigrants who left before the German invasion. The 1937 birth record for Giršas Ulmanas must likewise be connected through documents, not an assumed relationship to a similarly named survivor. Rescue accounts belong in the community's history with named rescuers, dates and testimony; they do not discharge the responsibility of the police and administrators who persecuted other residents.

## 24. The shul after its congregation was destroyed

The prayer house survived the massacre. Šniukas describes its use after the Soviet return as a military airfield club, then a cultural venue and finally a consumers' cooperative warehouse. He places the fire that destroyed it in the 1960s and records an investigation concerning a suspicion that the fire concealed losses of stock.[26]

At the time of his research a private house occupied the plot. He identified surviving boundary construction with Stars of David and a foundation incorporated into the later building; the former Jewish bathhouse had disappeared. The 2024 library visit still identified the former synagogue site in Vilties Street and surviving fence remains. These descriptions establish the reuse of the site and its surviving physical remains.[14][26]

The appropriate record is the land-register and building-file sequence: communal ownership, wartime custody, Soviet transfer, warehouse allocation, fire investigation, demolition and later residential title. The disappearance of the religious use and the survival of the physical site are both part of the town's history.

## 25. Cemetery, memorial and incompatible counts

The old cemetery and the adjacent killing site are distinct places. The tourism center reports 26 surviving inscribed gravestones. Šniukas's account, associated with 2004 photographs, describes more than fifty stones. Maceva's present catalogue shows zero digitized gravestones for its Gruzdžiai entry. That catalogue figure is not evidence that no stones exist.[26][27]

The monograph dates the black-granite massacre memorial to summer 2004, while the earlier submissions repeat an Atlas association with 2002. It explains that a wider British marking initiative began in 2002, providing a possible source of the date confusion. Installation records would settle the distinction. A date for a funding initiative should not automatically become the installation date of this particular stone.[4][26]

The 2024 library account reports a maintained cemetery and mown grass, whereas the earlier monograph criticized intermittent maintenance and described an old access route ploughed up in

the Soviet period. These observations concern different times. They should not be used to describe the present site as either neglected or restored without a dated inspection. Heritage interpretation still needs to explain the named perpetrators and the women and children, regardless of the condition of the grass.[14]

## 26. What the current public accounts leave out

The VLE Gruzdžiai entry still attributes the killing of approximately forty Jews to an order of the German occupation administration without naming the Lithuanian participants. The tourism center describes a Nazi-German-organized execution of forty-seven men. The Culture Centre's notice of 24 September 2024 says that approximately twenty Jewish families lived in town and all were shot. None of these formulations supplies the operational picture preserved in the local monograph.[5][27][28]

The 2021 library commemoration report supplies 6 August and approximately forty victims and recalls shots and screaming, but does not identify the perpetrators. Its 2024 descendant-visit report preserves valuable family and building information but again leaves the killers unnamed. This is the distinction between acknowledging that Jews were killed and explaining who organized, guarded, transported, robbed and killed them.[14][29]

The defect does not depend on resolving whether forty-six or forty-seven people died at the cemetery. Nor must a completed individual casualty list precede the naming of Diržinskas's grave preparation, Visockas's guard duty or Tiknius's command. The dated accounts and the relevant archival references already permit a fuller public narrative. The responsible institutions should correct established omissions while continuing research into contested details.

## 27. Repression registers, honors and the identity test

The same monograph that names Mečislovas Juozėnas as a wartime policeman includes him in its list headed victims of Soviet genocide. On page 829 it identifies his father as Vincas, birth in 1916, residence in Kantminiai and wartime Gruzdžiai police service, followed by arrest in October 1944 and a sentence. This is a direct internal cross-reference, stronger than a name-only match.[30]

The public repression database also contains Mečislovas Juozėnas, born in 1916, from Šiauliai district, arrested in 1944. The monograph gives a fuller account, placing his death in Vorkutlag on 23 August 1946; the online row records death in prison without that detail. Leonas Pampikas, born in 1916 and arrested in 1946, is another candidate for comparison with the police files. An Adolfas Grebliauskas entry requires resolution of the monograph's Adolfas–Bronius variation. The database's Vincas Tiknius, born in 1880, cannot simply be identified with the army lieutenant; the Kalendra born in 1903, son of Juozas, is not the Kalendra born in 1904, son of Vincas, identified by USHMM.[30][31]

The finding is direct: the town's own history lists a member of the 1941 Gruzdžiai police force among "victims of Soviet genocide," and LGGRTC's online register records the same man's Soviet repression without his police service. The printed list itself does identify that service. The two forms of public representation therefore differ; the online biography must include the established wartime role and its sources.

The town's history names Visockas among the men who guarded the grave-diggers (p. 708) and lists Vincas Visockas, a 1941 white-armbander, among the victims of Soviet genocide (p. 843). The latter entry identifies Vincas's son, born in 1913, resident in Gruzdžiai, arrested on 28 January 1948 and sentenced to seven years on 12 June. LGGRTC's register lists Vincas Visockas, born in 1913, Šiauliai district, arrested in 1948. If the identities hold, LGGRTC's register lists him as a victim of Soviet repression without his 1941 role.[37]

The municipal library honors as a "Fighter for Lithuania's freedom" Stasys Motuzas, the elder whose administration received Noreika's deportation order and ghetto circular. Its biographical table identifies him as born on 4 February 1898 in Valdomai, matching the former Gruzdžiai elder in the 1963 profile; its 2018 calendar praises his 1919 leadership, farming, civic work and care of the poor. The public commemoration omits the 1941 administrative connection documented here. No state decoration or formal resistance-status decision for him was verified in the screen.[2][3][16][39]

The screen found no securely identified repression entry, state decoration or resistance-status decision for Arvydas Diržinskas.[37]

For the other named men, the results were as follows. Rokas Dabrikas: no securely identified state award, formal status decision or repression-register match. Kazys Žeimys: a 1909-born Plungė-district deportee appears in the register, but is not identified with the Gruzdžiai policeman. Jurgis Žukauskas: no securely identified match to the Gruzdžiai policeman. Benediktas Vaitkus: the monograph lists a Juozas's son born in 1895, resident in Gruzdžiai, arrested on 25 October 1947; the online register has a same-name, same-birth-year Šiauliai-district man arrested in 1947. If the identities hold, LGGRTC's register lists the early armed activist as a victim of Soviet repression without annotation of his 1941 role. Kostas Kaktys: both the monograph's p. 829 list and the register identify a 1910-born man arrested in 1945 and released on 23 March 1956. If the identities hold, LGGRTC's register lists the June 1942–March 1944 Gruzdžiai police chief as a victim of Soviet repression without Holocaust annotation. Povilas Dragūnas: the register has a 1923-born Anykščiai-district man, not securely identified with the Gruzdžiai chief. Lieutenant R. Kaloška: no securely identified award, formal status decision or repression-register match was found under that initial and surname. The screen verified no state decoration or formal resistance-status decision for these seven men.[37]

These are dated results from the public register, local commemorative pages and targeted searches of public awards and status material. Unresolved identities and unavailable decisions remain questions the responsible institutions must answer. LGGRTC must obtain and produce the underlying biographical and status records.

Noreika presents a different and already documented issue: VLE records his posthumous Grand Cross of the Order of the Cross of Vytis in 1997. His county office's deportation and property instructions must be considered in any assessment of his commemoration. The relevant Gruzdžiai connection is specific and documentary: the 9 August destination order and the 22 August county concentration order.[2][3][32]

## 28. The five submissions and the responses already received

The published submissions comprise GRU-001 on the VLE entry; GRU-002 on municipal, tourism and cultural texts; GRU-003 on the killing-site interpretation and heritage-register record; GRU-004 on local-history publications; and GRU-005 on the Kalendra file. They were sent on 21 October 2026 in California and received or registered in Lithuania on 22 October. The combined public PDF provides the full bilingual texts and annexes.[33]

The municipality registered GRU-002 as GP-1570(3.3 Mr) and GRU-003 as GP-1571(3.3 Mr). The Cultural Heritage Department acknowledged GRU-003 under 1-4570; the Ministry of Culture registered it as G-8555 and routed it to its heritage-policy group. The municipal library registered GRU-004 as G-126 (1.21). LGGRTC acknowledged its copies of GRU-001, GRU-002 and GRU-003 as 7R-1466, 7R-1467 and 7R-1468 respectively.[34]

These acknowledgments establish receipt and notice. They do not establish that a text was corrected, a register entry amended or an archival document supplied. The Special Archives' P2-3486 response is discussed separately above. No completed substantive correction by the other bodies was identified in the correspondence examined through 1 November 2026.

The five submissions predate the present examination of Šniukas's complete chapter. The new evidence strengthens and sharpens them: local police names can be supplied; the male-only memorial wording can be challenged through the local study itself; the grave, transport and property evidence can be tied to specific archival files; and the P17659 references can now be stated confidently.

## 29. The records the institutions must obtain and produce

LYA must obtain and produce the Kalendra file under its current reference, reconciling the USHMM P17659 variants. The other immediately relevant files identified by the monograph include K-1, ap. 58, b. 43362/3 for the grave diggers; P17429 for transport and participation; 1033/3 for command and victim descriptions; 36067/3 and 45480/3 for the property trail; and K-1, ap. 46, b. 1274 for the later investigation. Where copying requires payment, the archive should identify the file and provide an itemized estimate rather than leave its identity unresolved.[1][18][20][21][22]

LCVA must obtain and produce the original and associated correspondence for order No. 657, the receiving elder's acknowledgment, the Gruzdžiai implementation return under No. 962 and property inventories. The town's prewar ownership can be reconstructed through f. 1248 and f. 1250, while the synagogue and association files in f. 412 establish communal persons and institutions. The war-loss statement in f. 1738, ap. 2, b. 487 supplies a separate route back to 1915.[2][3][9][10][11][13]

The municipality and heritage bodies must obtain and produce the memorial's commissioning and installation records, the basis for its number and male-only wording, the current heritage-register descriptions for the grave and cemetery, dated photographs and the legal history of the synagogue plot. VLE and the museum must identify the source of their differing victim totals and the basis for their attribution of actors. The 2002 Bubnys study underlying the Atlas should

be produced with its relevant pages and footnotes, rather than repeatedly cited without examining them.[4][5][26]

A victim-name reconstruction must compare the 1926 Ezro list, 1930s synagogue boards and vital records, household and property files, survivor testimony and Yad Vashem names records. LitvakSIG's Šiauliai research group expressly includes Gruzdžiai; its public Kaunas archival catalogue identifies relevant tax, rabbi-election and registration files, including I-49/1/17525, I-49/1/18541, I-49/1/21909 and I-172/1/3. The ALD town search, run on 2 November 2026 UTC with Town "is Exactly" GRUZDZIAI, all regions and all entries, returned 998 matches: 202 passport and personal-ID applications; 12 directory and book entries; 65 evacuation, exile and return entries; 12 births; 22 deaths; four gymnasium-student entries; 40 marriages and divorces; one overseas connection; 62 revision-list entries; and 578 taxpayer and voter entries. These are record matches, with people potentially recurring across categories, rather than 998 unique residents or victims. The results provide concrete routes for household reconstruction.[35]

## 30. The 1944 return and the surviving record

The Soviet return in 1944 did not restore the murdered congregation. The local police organization broke up or changed hands, some men fled west and Soviet security bodies began investigations. The monograph places the first proceedings as early as August 1944 and later investigative work in 1946, 1949 and 1969. It states that the early investigations did not systematically establish the exact massacre date or create a full victim list.[36]

This explains an evidentiary problem rather than resolving it. Interrogations taken relatively close to the event can preserve names, movements and acts missing from later summaries, while their coercive setting and the interests of accused participants require scrutiny. Separate witness files should be compared at statement level: who saw the grave, who drove, who guarded, who learned an account from another person and which details changed. Multiple later books repeating one interrogation do not create multiple independent witnesses.

The report's post-1945 evidence concerns the consequences and representation of the 1915–1945 history: the 1948 Kalendra sentence, the later Soviet investigation, the use of the shul, memorial construction, published accounts and the present institutional correspondence. These later records must remain distinct from documents created during the crimes.

## 31. Findings that can already be stated

The documentary and published record supports naming the local police and armed structures; identifying Diržinskas and Visockas in the preparation of the grave; describing the false work destination, the five-wagon transport, the visiting shooting party and German direction; including women and children among the cemetery victims; and treating plunder as part of the operation. It also establishes Noreika's order directing Tryškiai Jews to Gruzdžiai and the county order combining deportation, property inventories and guarded confinement in Žagarė.

The unresolved questions are specific: the exact cemetery date and count; the names and unit of the visiting shooters and German officer; the individual fate of each household; the composition and timing of onward transports; the full property distribution; and the outcome of the later

investigations. These questions require documents and responsible institutional work. They do not justify an account in which the victims are visible but the local actors disappear.

Gruzdžiai's Jewish past survives in named associations, registered births, property deeds, photographs, the synagogue site, cemetery stones and the testimony of people who saw the operation. Accurate historical memory must connect those lives to the offices, decisions and acts that destroyed them. Reconciliation requires acknowledgment of documented individual and institutional responsibility and correction of public accounts that omit it.

## Santrauka lietuvių kalba

Gruzdžių žydų sunaikinimas buvo organizuota operacija. Damijono Šniuko 2009 m. monografijoje įvardijamas policijos vadovas Vincas Tiknius (Tiknys), policininkas Arvydas Diržinskas ir sargybinis Vincas Visockas. Aprašoma, kaip Diržinskas prie žydų kapinių atmatavo duobės vietą, o Visockas saugojo prievarta kasti atvarytus vyrus. Liudytojų parodymais paremtame pasakojime šauliai siejami su iš Joniškio atvykusiais vyrais, o vadovavimas žudynėms — su vokiečiais. Tai daug konkretesnis atsakomybės vaizdas negu viešuose tekstuose išlikusi beasmenė žinia, kad žydai buvo sušaudyti vokiečių administracijos įsakymu.[1][18][19]

Monografijoje aprašyti penki poriniai vežimai, kuriuos vairavo Juozas Gendvilas, Juozas Maižvilas, Juozas Stočkus, Jonas Goštautas ir Aloyzas Šleikis. Žmonėms buvo sakoma, kad jie vežami darbams į Šiaulius. Pasukus kapinių link paaiškėjo tikroji kelionės paskirtis. Aukos buvo išrengtos, šaudomos grupėmis, likusieji gyvi pribaigiami. Pasakojime minimos moterys ir paskutiniai nužudyti šeši maždaug 10–12 metų vaikai. Todėl paminklo užrašas, teigiantis, kad čia nužudyta tik vyrų, neatitinka pačios monografijos pateiktų parodymų.[18][19][20]

Persekiojimas, turto atėmimas ir žudymas sudarė susijusį procesą. Policija vertė žydus šluoti turgavietę, jie buvo varomi dirbti daržuose. Priverstinis darbas be atlygio yra vergovė. Prieš žudynes ir jų metu iš aukų buvo atskirti jų daiktai, vėliau dalyti, pigiai įsigyjami arba parduodami. Turi būti nustatyti ne tik šaudę asmenys, bet ir organizatoriai, sargybiniai, turto perėmėjai bei sprendimus priėmusios įstaigos.[1][22]

Gruzdžiai taip pat buvo deportavimo maršruto dalis. 1941 m. rugpjūčio 9 d. Jonas Noreika nurodė Tryškių žydus per tris dienas iškraustyti į Gruzdžius, susitarus su Gruzdžių valsčiaus viršaičiu. Vietos istorija tuo metu Gruzdžių administracijai vadovavusiu viršaičiu nurodo Stasį Motuzą; susitarimas sieja Noreikos įsakymą su jo vadovaujama priimančiąja administracija. Asmens paskyrimo byla turi užbaigti šią dokumentų grandinę. Dokumente Pakruojo pavadinimas išbrauktas ir ranka įrašyti Gruzdžiai. Rugpjūčio 22 d. aplinkraštis Nr. 962 nurodė apskrities žydus perkelti į Žagarę, surašyti jų turtą, apriboti pasiimamus daiktus bei pinigus ir organizuoti transportą. Aplinkraštis pagal pareigas buvo skirtas ir Gruzdžių viršaičiui Stasiui Motuzui bei policijos vadovui Vincui Tikniui. Holokausto Lietuvoje atlasas Gruzdžių moteris, vaikus ir senelius sieja su perkėlimu į Žagarę ir ten įvykdytomis žudynėmis.[2][3][4]

Tiksli žudynių prie kapinių data ir aukų skaičius lieka ginčijami. Šaltiniuose nurodomi maždaug 40, 46, 47 arba 50 žmonių; minimos rugpjūčio 6-oji, rugpjūčio pabaiga, kitame monografijos skyriuje — rugpjūčio 8-oji. USHMM Stasio Kalendros bylos apraše minimas rugsėjis ir žudynių vieta prie Gruzdžių; byla turi atsakyti, ar tai antras žudymo epizodas, atskiras nuo rugpjūčio

žudynių prie kapinių. Šie nesutarimai nepanaikina dokumentuoto vietos policijos dalyvavimo ir nesuteikia pagrindo aukomis laikyti vien vyrus.[20][21]

USHMM aprašo 75 puslapyje Stasys Kalendra, Vinco sūnus, gimęs 1904 m. Maželiuose, aiškiai susietas su numeriais P17659/BB, P17659/SB ir P17659/TB. Santraukoje jam priskiriama sargyba, žydų turto grobimas, aukų lydėjimas ir vedimas prie duobių. Lietuvos ypatingojo archyvo 2026 m. spalio 27 d. atsakymas P2-3486 pateikė mokamų paieškos ir kopijavimo paslaugų sąlygas, tačiau ne pačią bylą.[21][25]

Bendruomenės istorija atkuriama ir iš ikikarinių dokumentų: 1926 m. registruoto „Ezro“ skyriaus, 1936 m. sinagogos valdybos, gimimo įrašų ir žemės nuosavybės bylų. Šie sąrašai negali būti automatiškai skelbiami kaip 1941 m. aukų sąrašai. Reikia nustatyti kiekvieno asmens gyvenamąją vietą, išvykimą, deportaciją, išsigelbėjimą arba žūtį. Taip pat būtina atskirti Gruzdžius nuo Gargždų ir nelaikyti skirtingų vietovių pasakojimų ar nuotraukų vienos bendruomenės įrodymais.[7][10][11][13]

Toje pačioje 2009 m. monografijoje 1941 m. Gruzdžių policininkas Mečislovas Juozėnas įrašytas tarp „sovietinio genocido aukų“. Spausdintame sąraše jo policijos tarnyba nurodyta; LGGRTC viešojo registro eilutėje jos nėra. Ta pati miestelio istorija Visocką įvardija tarp duobkasių sargybinių (p. 708), o Vincą Visocką, 1941 m. baltaraištį, įrašo tarp sovietinio genocido aukų (p. 843). Jei tapatybės sutampa, LGGRTC registre jis pateikiamas kaip sovietinių represijų auka, nenurodant jo 1941 m. vaidmens. Jei tapatybės sutampa, registre taip pat pateikiamas 1942–1944 m. Gruzdžių policijos vadovas Kostas Kaktys be Holokausto anotacijos ir ankstyvasis ginkluotas aktyvistas Benediktas Vaitkus be jo 1941 m. vaidmens anotacijos. Savivaldybės biblioteka kovotoju už Lietuvos laisvę pagerbia Stasį Motuzą — viršaitį, kurio administracijai buvo skirti Noreikos deportavimo įsakymas ir geto aplinkraštis. Šie viešosios atminties duomenys turi būti siejami su nustatytais karo metų vaidmenimis.[30][37][39]

LitvakSIG ALD paieška pagal tikslų vietovės pavadinimą GRUZDZIAI, visus regionus ir visus įrašus pateikė 998 atitikmenis dešimtyje grupių. Tai įrašų, o ne unikalių gyventojų ar Holokausto aukų skaičius.[35]

Penki prašymai GRU-001–GRU-005 jau pateikti institucijoms. Registracijos patvirtinimai rodo, kad institucijos informuotos; jie neįrodo, kad vieši tekstai ar memorialo interpretacija pataisyti. Institucijos privalo gauti ir pateikti šaltinius, įvardyti nustatytus veikėjus bei veiksmus ir ištaisyti pagrįstas spragas. Istorinės atminties tikslumas reikalauja susieti nužudytų žmonių gyvenimus su jų persekiojimą, turto atėmimą ir nužudymą vykdžiusių asmenų bei institucijų atsakomybe.[33][34]

## Sources and notes

**1.** Damijonas Šniukas, “Žydų bendruomenės pėdsakai Gruzdžiuose,” in Gruzdžiai, part 1 (Vilnius: Versmė, 2009), pp. 682–714, especially pp. 707–708. Citations of LYA files are through Šniukas. Publisher’s complete Gruzdžiai volume.

**2.** Chief of Šiauliai County, order No. 657 to the Tryškiai elder, 9 August 1941. LCVA, f. R-1099, ap. 1, b. 2, l. 137. Destination Pakruojis struck through, Gruzdžiai inserted, with an arrangement with the receiving elder stated. Facsimile of the 9 August deportation order.

**3.** Chief of Šiauliai City and County, Circular No. 962, 22 August 1941. LCVA, f. R-1099, ap. 1, b. 1, l. 156. The document covers transport, inventories, permitted possessions and 200 RM per Jewish family, the ghetto fence, escorted labor and implementation reports. Facsimile of Circular No. 962.

**4.** Holocaust Atlas of Lithuania, Vilna Gaon museum, entries 92, ‘Gruzdžių žydų žudynės,’ and 106, ‘Šiaulių apskrities žydų žudynės Žagarėje.’ The relevant texts, counts and source references were preserved in GRU-001, pp. 24–28 and 33–40, and in its annex matrices. The Atlas findings here are attributed to that preserved text. Entry 92 cites Arūnas Bubnys, ‘Šiaulių miesto ir Šiaulių apskrities žydų likimas,’ in Šiaulių getas: kalinių sąrašai. 1942 (Vilnius, 2002), p. 56; entry 106 cites pp. 43–44 and Jäger’s 1 December 1941 report. The 2002 study and original Jäger report were not directly inspected for this report. The 633/663 issue is a transcription discrepancy recorded in the preserved Lithuanian and English Atlas texts. Preserved Atlas quotations and citations in the published submissions.

**5.** Visuotinė lietuvių enciklopedija, ‘Gruzdžiai.’ Current public text checked 1 November 2026, including population, synagogue, Holocaust sentence and bibliography. The 1923 town and estate populations are separately stated. VLE Gruzdžiai entry.

**6.** Dov Levin and Josef Rosin, ‘Gruzdziai,’ Pinkas Hakehillot Lita (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1996), pp. 195–196; English translation by Shimon Joffe, hosted by JewishGen. Hebrew original not inspected. The date ‘November 5th’ is retained as a disputed textual datum, not used as the massacre date. Rosin’s later account is related authorship, not a second wholly independent source. JewishGen translation of the Gruzdžiai community entry.

**7.** JewishGen KehilaLinks, ‘Gargzdai,’ identifies the two separate towns and flags the school-photograph attribution problem. Compare the International Jewish Cemetery Project Gruzdžiai page, whose narrative switches to Gorzd, Memel and Dovilai. The latter narrative is excluded from the Gruzdžiai reconstruction. Gargždai identification and photograph caution.

**8.** Šniukas, pp. 683–695, especially pp. 689–693 and the 1892 household table. His references include KAA, f. I-49, ap. 1, b. 17525, and LVIA, f. 717. Vidmantas Daugirdas, ‘Gruzdžių valsčiaus ir jo gyventojų raida,’ provides a separate geographic and demographic study. The 1892 table is not a 1941 casualty list. Daugirdas demographic study.

**9.** Tomas Petreikis, ‘Žemaitijos žydų dokumentinio paveldo praradimai Pirmojo pasaulinio karo metais,’ Knygotyra 68 (2017), pp. 83–106, especially p. 91 and note 31. DOI 10.15388/Knygotyra.2017.68.10715. Source for the local books and three cupboards: Gruzdžiai Jewish religious community’s 1919 war-loss statement, LCVA, f. 1738, ap. 2, b. 487, unnumbered leaves; that original statement was not directly inspected. Petreikis article in the publisher’s journal.

**10.** Šniukas, pp. 694–699, including reproduced Ezro documents and the account of registration No. 411/32 on 16 March 1926. Archival reference: LCVA, f. 412, ap. 1, b. 300, ll. 1–2. Savings records are referenced to KAA, f. I-172, ap. 1, bb. 4–6. Personal names are given in the source’s Lithuanian forms; variants are not silently harmonized. Gruzdžiai monograph catalogue record.

**11.** Šniukas, pp. 699–700; facsimile on p. 700 of the Ministry of Education's June 1936 synagogue-board confirmation, with accompanying references to LCVA, f. 412, ap. 5, b. 1676, ll. 21, 31. Vital-record discussion: f. 412, ap. 5, b. 1743, ll. 76, 199. The source labels the religious officer mokytas; the report does not automatically equate this office with a rabbinical appointment. Complete monograph with the reproduced board document.

**12.** Šniukas, pp. 702–704 and 713; compare Levin and Rosin, pp. 195–196. The monograph names physician Riva Trusfusaitė and agronomist Zalmanas Giršovičius, and documents local schooling, social interaction, exclusion and antisemitic folklore. Its generalizations about Jewish culture and temperament are the author's judgments and are not adopted as historical facts. Catalogue record of Šniukas's Jewish-history chapter.

**13.** Šniukas, pp. 700–702, especially p. 701, notes 49–54: property and land records in LCVA, f. 1248, ap. 17, b. 370; ap. 8, bb. 2293, 2861 and 2290; f. 1250, ap. 3, b. 8014, ll. 52–54, 98; and associated land records. These references are through the monograph. Publisher's monograph.

**14.** Liongina Šufinskienė, 'Gruzdžiuose lankėsi viešnia iš Izraelio,' municipal public library, 29 August 2024, reporting the 25 August visit of Leah Zakh Aharoni. Used for the family tailoring connection, surviving houses, synagogue site and observed maintenance. The article's statement about the separate Luponiai site is not adopted as a Gruzdžiai victim total. Municipal library's descendant-visit report.

**15.** Algimantas Miškinis, 'Gruzdžių istorinė urbanistinė raida,' publisher's standalone study, p. 23. The study cites the 1999 local account by S. Lukienė and gives a concise description of the Soviet institutional changes and destruction of the Jews. Its figure of two survivors differs from the community reference accounts. Miškinis urban-history study.

**16.** Damijonas Šniukas, 'Paskutinis Gruzdžių valsčiaus dešimtmetis: karas ir trys okupacijos,' in Gruzdžiai, part 1, pp. 637–666, especially pp. 647–648 and 653; compare the Jewish-history chapter, p. 707. The police-chief sequence and Motuzas identification appear on p. 653. The earlier chapter gives Bronius Grėbliauskas where p. 707 gives Adolfas; personnel identity remains to be reconciled. Publisher's complete monograph.

**17.** Josef Rosin, 'Gruzdzia (Gruzd),' in the JewishGen-hosted volume titled Preserving Our Litvak Heritage, volume II, pp. 44–49. Used with attribution for 29 June, the August chronology, the rescue and emigration of Pinkhas Ulman. Rosin and the Pinkas entry share authorship and bibliography. Rosin's Gruzdžiai account.

**18.** Šniukas, pp. 708–709. Five drivers and paired-horse wagons; assembly at the police station and shul; false destination of work in Šiauliai; Tiknius's participation in calling armed men. References include LYA, f. K-1, ap. 58, b. P17429, ll. 16, 20, 26, 37; b. 1033/3, l. 16; b. 30246, l. 14; b. 36067/3, l. 12. Statements and interpretive deductions are distinguished in the report. Monograph transport account.

**19.** Šniukas, pp. 709–710. The visiting shooters, local cordon, German direction, stripping, shooting, finishing shots and six children. Principal references given there include LYA, f. K-1, ap. 58, b. P17429, ll. 21–22; b. 45479/3, ll. 26, 35. A detail attributed to Maižvilas through his son's later recollection must be distinguished from contemporary testimony. The source's

psychological speculation about local men not wanting to shoot acquaintances is not adopted. Monograph account of the execution.

**20.** Šniukas, pp. 648 and 710–712. Page 648 prints 8 August, while pp. 711–712 discuss 6 August and the bilingual memorial. Page 711 rejects the male-only inscription and questions onward removal to Žagarė; the latter skepticism conflicts with the Atlas and community histories. Non-Jewish casualty names vary between pp. 648 and 710. These are retained as unresolved source disagreements. Monograph date victim and memorial discussion.

**21.** United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, finding aid RG-26.004M, War Crimes Investigation and Trial Records from the Former Lithuanian KGB Archives, printed p. 75, reel 143. The Stasys Kalendra entry is aligned with P17659/BB, P17659/SB and P17659/TB. This is a finding aid, not the underlying file or judgment. USHMM finding aid.

**22.** Šniukas, pp. 710–711, including references to LYA, f. K-1, ap. 58, b. 36067/3, ll. 36, 45, 46, and b. 45480/3, ll. 10, 35; also Alfonso Bandoriaus recollections recorded in 2005. The public-sale account is a recollection; the supposed movement of valuables to Šiauliai is the author's inference. Individual purchasers and recipients require the original records. Monograph property account.

**23.** Josef Rosin, Tryškiai account, Protecting Our Litvak Heritage, pp. 341–350, hosted by JewishGen. Used for the movement of women and children through Gruzdžiai and their treatment there. The author cites Yad Vashem O.71, files 68 and 102, among his sources. The original testimonies were not directly inspected. Rosin's Tryškiai account.

**24.** Žagarė mayor's responses of 25 and 29 August 1941, reproduced with Noreika's instructions on Silvia Foti's archival page. The page supplies translations and links to reproductions, including the report of 949 arrivals and the request for wire and nails. Its surrounding narrative is not used to determine an exact Gruzdžiai transport total. Compare the mayor's report cited in the county documentary transcription by Evaldas Balčiūnas. Noreika orders and receiving-authority responses.

**25.** Lithuanian Special Archives, director Remigijus Černius to Grant Arthur Gochin, 27 October 2026, No. P2-3486, concerning GRU-005 and incoming registration P1-2629. Sent by email on 30 October 2026 as P1-2629.pdf. The letter sets out search and copying tariffs and advance-payment terms.

**26.** Šniukas, pp. 711–714, especially p. 712: subsequent shul use, 1960s fire, house and surviving fragments, cemetery condition, the wider 2002 marking initiative and local summer-2004 installation. These are observations and recollections from the study's period, not a 2026 site inspection. The author's reference for the shul building history includes Bandorius's recollections. Monograph material-heritage account.

**27.** Šiauliai District Tourism and Business Information Centre, 'Gruzdžių žydų senosios kapinės ir Gruzdžių žydų žudynių vieta ir kapas,' checked 1 November 2026. Compare Maceva's public cemetery catalogue, Gruzdžiai entry, which shows zero digitized gravestones; that is a database coverage statement, not a physical stone count. Tourism center's cemetery and massacre-site entry. Maceva public cemetery catalogue.

**28.** Culture Centre of Šiauliai District Municipality, ‘Rugsėjo 23-ioji – Lietuvos žydų genocido atminimo diena,’ dated 24 September 2024 on the current page, checked 1 November 2026. The notice says about twenty Jewish families lived in Gruzdžiai and all were shot, without identifying perpetrators or separating sites and groups. Culture Centre’s commemoration notice.

**29.** Jurgita Jasiškytė, ‘Lietuvos žydų genocido aukų atminimo diena Gruzdžių Augustino Griciaus bibliotekoje,’ 28 September 2021. Used for the local event, its date and count, and its citation of the 1999 monograph. This is an account of a commemorative event, not eyewitness testimony to 1941. Municipal library’s 2021 commemoration account.

**30.** Gruzdžiai, part 1, p. 829, list ‘Sovietinio genocido aukos Gruzdžių valsčiuje: politiniai kaliniai ir nužudytieji,’ compiled by Damijonas Šniukas. Juozėnas is explicitly identified there as a wartime Gruzdžiai policeman, son of Vincas, born 1916, resident in Kantminiai, arrested 2 October 1944, sentenced 15 October 1944 and said to have died in Vorkutlag on 23 August 1946. Compare the online repression register’s Mečislovas Juozėnas row. The public row does not resolve the place and date of death. Public repression register Juozėnas entry.

**31.** Lietuviai Sibire, public repression register: Leonas Pampikas, born 1916, Šiauliai, arrested 1946 (row 118989 in the examined sorting); Adolfas Grebliauskas, born 1921, Šiauliai, arrested 1944; Vincas Tiknius, born 1880; Stasys Kalendra, born 1903. Sorting-dependent row numbers are not permanent person identifiers. The latter Kalendra is distinguished from USHMM’s 1904-born son of Vincas. Repression register Pampikas candidate. Repression register Grebliauskas candidate.

**32.** Visuotinė lietuvių enciklopedija, ‘Jonas Noreika,’ checked 1 November 2026, honors section. The 1997 posthumous Grand Cross is the documented state honor cited here. VLE Noreika biography and honor.

**33.** Grant Arthur Gochin, signed bilingual requests GRU-001–GRU-005, sent 21 October 2026, published together as Gruzdziai_Submissions.pdf, 144 pages including signature-information pages and annexes. This compilation is the submission record, not an independent corroboration of its historical claims. Five prior Gruzdžiai submissions with annexes.

**34.** Institutional registration acknowledgments of 22 October 2026: Šiauliai District Municipality GP-1570(3.3 Mr) and GP-1571(3.3 Mr); Cultural Heritage Department 1-4570; Ministry of Culture G-8555; municipal library G-126 (1.21); LGGRTC 7R-1466, 7R-1467 and 7R-1468; LYA P1-2629. Their content establishes registration or routing, not correction or agreement. Correspondence status checked through 1 November 2026.

**35.** LitvakSIG, Šiauliai District Research Group and Kaunas Regional Archives catalogue, checked 1 November 2026. Gruzdžiai is expressly included in the research area. The catalogue lists Gruzdžiai files I-49/1/17525 (1892), I-49/1/18541 (1894), I-49/1/21909 and I-49/1/30210 (1912), I-172/1/3 (1911–1915) and I-106/1/481 (1912–1916). ALD search on 2 November 2026 UTC: Town, is Exactly, GRUZDZIAI; all regions; all entries; no other parameter. Result: 998 matches in ten record groups. The result-page timestamp is 1 November 2026, 19:12:11 −0500. Category counts are reported in §29. LitvakSIG Šiauliai research group. LitvakSIG ALD town search form.

**36.** Šniukas, p. 682, on the investigation record, its provenance, the 1969 renewed investigation and the limitations of the earlier Lukienė account. Compare pp. 711–712 for disagreements about the victims and onward deportations. Soviet file material, testimony, later recollections and the author's deductions are separate evidentiary categories. Publisher's complete monograph.

**37.** Expanded public honors, status and repression screen, 2 November 2026. Šniukas, Gruzdžiai, part 1, pp. 647, 653, 829, 841–843; LGGRTC's Lietuviai Sibire register. The Visockas entry is at the linked Šiauliai-district results page; Kaktys appears at page 2434 sorted by birth year descending, Vaitkus at page 2952 sorted by district ascending. Exact-name searches covered Diržinskas, Visockas, Motuzas, Dabrikas, Žeimys, Žukauskas, Vaitkus, Kaktys and Dragūnas, and the initial-and-surname R. Kaloška, with award, rehabilitation and resistance-status terms. Publicly indexed presidential and LGGRTC material was included. Null results are limited to that screen; underlying status decisions remain to be produced. Visockas's release is dated 31 October 1955 in the monograph (p. 843); the register gives an end date of 27 May 1956. The discrepancy remains unresolved. Vaitkus: row 147552 in district-ascending sorting, birth 1895, Šiauliai district, arrest 1947, Komi, end 18 June 1955. LGGRTC repression register including Vincas Visockas. Kostas Kaktys register entry. Benediktas Vaitkus register entry.

**38.** Grant Arthur Gochin, Noreika research submission, Query Regarding Jonas Noreika's Criminal Gang, with historical inquiry and annexes; and "Seven Years Before Fridman," The Times of Israel, discussing the Tryškiai order of 9 August 1941. These cross-references connect the author's earlier work; the event-specific documents and community accounts are cited separately above.

**39.** Šiauliai District Municipal Public Library, "Žymūs žmonės," section "Kovotojai už Lietuvos laisvę," and "Žymūs žmonės (lentelė)," Stasys Motuzas entry, checked 2 November 2026. The table gives birth on 4 February 1898 in Valdomai and death on 22 November 1985 in Bremen. Compare its 2018 district calendar and the contemporary Karys profile "Ūkininkas, viršaitis ir dievdirbys" (1963, nos. 1–2), which identifies the same birth date, village and former Gruzdžiai elder. Municipal library's freedom-fighter grouping. Library's biographical table.

137

Tryškių valsčiaus Viršaičiui

A/657
1941.VIII.9

Susitarus su Gruzdžių valsčiaus viršaičiu, pavedu Tamstai laike trijų dienų nuo šios dienos iš Tryškių miestelio žydų tautybės piliečius iškraustyti į Gruzdžių miestelį.

Šiauliai, 1941 m.rugpiūčio mėn.9 d.

Apskrities Viršininkas

Sekretorius

ŠIAULIŲ MIESTO IR APSKR?
VIRŠININKAS

m.rugpiūčio mėn.22d.
Nr.462

VIESIEMS ŠIAULIŲ APSKRITIES VALSČIŲ
VIRŠAIČIAMS IR II-EILIŲ MIESTŲ BURMISTRAMS.

(Nuorašas Policijos Nuovadų Viršininkams)

Šiaulių Apygardos Komisaro įsakymu visi apskrities žydų tautybės piliečiai,taip pat ir pusžydžiai turi būti iš apskrities valsčių ir miestelių iškelti ir apgyvendinti viename rajone - Getto.Visas žydų turtas turi būti savivelybių rūpesčiu saugojamas ir surašytas.

Ryšium su šiuo įsakymu:

1. Visų valsčių,antrosilių miestų ir miestelių žydus nuo šio mėn.25 iki 29 dienos perkelti į Žagarės miestą.Perkėlimo priemones perūpina atitinkamos savivaldybės.
2. Palikto žydų turto sąrašus 2 egz.iki VIII.29 dienos pristatyti man.Perkeliamieji žydai gali pasiimti būtiniausius apyvokos daiktus bei drabužius ir iki 200 RM pinigais kiekvienai žydų šeimai.
3. Žagarėje visi žydai apgyvendinami atskirame rajone, kuris turi būti iki VIII.30 dienos aptvertas.Rajono Getto aptverimu pasirūpina Žagarės miesto savivaldybė.Iš rajono Getto žydai kiekvieną dieną po apsauga turi būti vedami prie darbo ir grąžinami į Getto.
4. Iš žydams paskirto rajono esamiems ne žydų tautybės piliečiams leidžiama pasirinkti kitas apskrities ribose esamas vietoves.Jeigu kas iš persikraustomų ne žydų tautybės turėtų palikti savo nekilnojamą turtą,tai jiems leidžiama pasirinkti pačioje Žagarėje arba kituose miestuose bei miesteliuose žydų paliktą atitinkamos vertės turtą.
5. Apie šio įsakymo išpildymą viršaičiai ir burmistrai įpareigojami man iki šio mėn.29 dienos pranešti,nurodant kas ir kaip tuo reikalu padaryta ir kiek žydų perkelta,o Žagarės burmistras dar turi pranešti, kiek iš viso žydų Žagarėje apgyvendinta.

Miesto ir Apskrities Viršininkas

Sekretorius

**Originalas siunčiamas nebus**

**LIETUVOS YPATINGASIS ARCHYVAS**

Biudžetinė įstaiga, Gedimino pr. 40, 01110 Vilnius, tel. +370 5 261 3431,
el. p. lya@archyvai.lt, el. pristatymo dėžutės adresas 193053247.
Duomenys kaupiami ir saugomi Juridinių asmenų registre, kodas 193053247

Grant Arthur Gochin
El. p. ggochin@gmail.com

2026-10-27 Nr. P2-3486
Į 2026-10-22 Nr. GRU-005

**DĖL INFORMACIJOS PATEIKIMO IR PRAŠYMO NAGRINĖJIMO**

Lietuvos ypatingasis archyvas 2026-10-22 gavo Jūsų prašymą (registracijos Nr. **P1-2629)**.

Informuojame, kad Lietuvos ypatingasis archyvas pagal fizinių ir juridinių asmenų pateiktus prašymus neatlieka mokslinių tyrimų, nekomentuoja saugomų dokumentų turinio, neteikia išvadų apie dokumentuose užfiksuotus faktus, netikrina leidiniuose skelbiamų dokumentų ir išnašų tikrumo.

Vadovaujantis Lietuvos Respublikos dokumentų ir archyvų įstatymo 8 straipsniu ir Valstybės archyvų mokamų paslaugų sąrašo, patvirtinto Lietuvos Respublikos kultūros ministro 2022 m. liepos 7 d. įsakymu Nr. ĮV-605 „Dėl Valstybės archyvų mokamų paslaugų sąrašo ir Valstybės archyvų mokamų paslaugų įkainių apskaičiavimo tvarkos aprašo patvirtinimo“, nuostatomis Lietuvos ypatingojo archyvo saugomų dokumentų paieška ir kopijavimas yra mokama paslauga.

Vadovaujantis Valstybės archyvų mokamų paslaugų įkainių sąrašo, patvirtinto Lietuvos vyriausiojo archyvaro 2022 m. liepos 8 d. įsakymu Nr. VE-30 „Dėl Valstybės archyvų mokamų paslaugų įkainių sąrašo ir Valstybės archyvų mokamų paslaugų teikimo tvarkos aprašo patvirtinimo“ (Lietuvos vyriausiojo archyvaro 2025 m. gruodžio 9 d. įsakymo Nr. VE-23 redakcija), nuostatomis, kaina už dokumentų apie vieno objekto (vieną asmenį, vienos rūšies veiksmą, vienos rūšies faktą, vieną vietovę, vieną organizaciją ir pan.) paiešką 5–10 metų ribose yra 21,80 eur. Vienos skaitmeninės XV a.–1944 m. sudarytų dokumentų kopijos kaina – 1,30 eur, vienos skaitmeninės 1945 m.–XXI a. sudarytų dokumentų kaina – 0,50 eur.

Vadovaujantis Valstybės archyvų mokamų paslaugų teikimo tvarkos aprašo, patvirtinto Lietuvos vyriausiojo archyvaro 2022 m. liepos 8 d. įsakymu Nr. VE-30 „Dėl Valstybės archyvų mokamų paslaugų įkainių sąrašo ir Valstybės archyvų mokamų paslaugų teikimo tvarkos aprašo patvirtinimo“ (Lietuvos vyriausiojo archyvaro 2025 m. gruodžio 9 d. įsakymo Nr. VE-23 redakcija), nuostatomis, mokamos paslaugos teikiamos tik iš anksto apmokėjus už paslaugą.

Informuojame, kad Elektroninio archyvo informacinės sistemos (EAIS) Skaitmeninėje skaitykloje (https://eais.archyvai.lt/repo-ext ) galima be apribojimų rasti informaciją apie Lietuvos ypatingojo archyvo saugomus archyvinius fondus ir bylų apyrašus, į bylų apyrašus įrašytų bylų pavadinimus, chronologines ribas ir lapų skaičių bei kitą informaciją apie saugomus dokumentus.

Lietuvos ypatingasis archyvas nedisponuoja Lietuvos gyventojų genocido ir rezistencijos tyrimo centro parengtomis pažymomis, Lietuvos institucijų ir įstaigų, Lietuvos miestų ir rajonų savivaldybių administracijų sudarytais dokumentais bei viešai skelbiama informacija, nevertina ir neatsako už šioje medžiagoje pateikiamą turinį, Lietuvos ypatingojo archyvo saugomų dokumentų ir juose užfiksuotos informacijos naudojimą.

Direktorius Remigijus Černius

Lietuvos ypatingasis archyvas