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: Lietuvos nacionalinė Martyno Mažvydo biblioteka — biblio@lnb.lt (dėl VLE biografijos); Lietuvos Respublikos krašto apsaugos ministerija — kam@kam.lt (dėl tarnybos dokumentų ir jos kompetencijai priklausančio pagerbimo).

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.

RAG-PRES-001 | 2026 m. lapkričio 2 d.

Prašymas ištirti Petro Genio veiklą ir spręsti dėl valstybinių apdovanojimų išsaugojimo ar panaikinimo

1 Prašymas ir paskelbti tyrimai

Gerbiamas Prezidente, prašau visapusiškai ištirti pulkininko Petro Genio veiklą vokiečių okupacijos metais, įskaitant paskelbtą liudytojų pasakojimą apie jo buvimą Pajuostės žudynių vietoje 1941 m. rugpjūčio 23 d., ir priimti motyvuotą sprendimą dėl kiekvieno jo valstybinio apdovanojimo išsaugojimo ar panaikinimo. Prašau nustatyti ir visus vėlesnius statusus, laipsnius ar pagerbimo sprendimus. Klausimas apima vėlesnių veiksmų reikšmę tęsiamam valstybiniam pagerbimui ir jam taikomą teisę. [1, 2]

Mano visas miestelio tyrimas su šaltinių nuorodomis ir lietuviška santrauka paskelbtas Substack platformoje: Raguva — 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

VLE nurodo Petrą Genį, gimusį 1894 m. rugsėjo 27 d. Gailionyse ir mirusį 1969 m. spalio 15 d. Čikagoje. Straipsnis nurodo tris ordinus: Vyčio kryžiaus V laipsnio, 1923 m.; Gedimino III laipsnio, 1928 m.; Vytauto Didžiojo III laipsnio, 1933 m. Prašau gauti pirminius apdovanojimo aktus ir patvirtinti jų istorinį pavadinimą, datą, numerį ir dabartinę apskaitos būklę. [2]

Raguvos tyrime nagrinėjamas žydų perkėlimas į Panevėžio žudynių sistemą. Jägerio ataskaitoje 1941 m. rugpjūčio 23 d. užfiksuotas 7 523 žydų nužudymas: 1 312 vyrų, 4 602 moterų ir 1 609 vaikų. Tyrime, remiantis Arūnu Bubniu, aprašytas 10-ojo bataliono vyrų konvojavimas ir dalyvavimas šaudant Pajuostėje. [1]

Bubnys, aprašydamas šias žudynes, nurodo pasakojimą, kad žudynių vietoje esą buvę pulkininkas Petras Genys ir leitenantas Vladas Aižinas. Prašau gauti visą pasakojimo šaltinį, nustatyti liudytoją, jo stebėjimo galimybes, protokolo datą, vertimą, vėlesnius parodymus ir nepriklausomus patvirtinimus ar prieštaravimus. Paskelbta žinia yra tyrimo pagrindas, o ne išvada apie jo individualią atsakomybę. [1]

VLE Genio vadovavimą Panevėžio savisaugos apygardai datuoja nuo 1941 m. spalio, o 10-ajam batalionui nuo 1942 m. rugsėjo iki lapkričio. Tyrime nurodytas Bubnio apygardos sudarymo datavimas lapkričio pradžia. Prašau patikrinti šių paskyrimų aktus ir jų santykį su atskiru pasakojimu apie jo buvimą Pajuostėje 1941 m. rugpjūčio 23 d. Reikalinga tiksli asmeninė tarnybos ir buvimo vietų chronologija. [1, 2]

LGGRTC žurnalas Genocidas ir rezistencija Genio buvimo žudynių vietoje pasakojimą paskelbė 2010 m. Taigi ši medžiaga valstybės institucijos leidinyje viešai prieinama jau šešiolika metų, o VLE biografija tebelieka be šios žinios, nors joje išvardyti trys ordinai. Prašau nustatyti, ar po publikacijos pradėtas individualus Genio veiklos tyrimas, kas apie ją buvo informuotas, kokios išvados priimtos ir kaip į jas reaguota pagerbimo bei biografijos sprendimuose. [2, 3]

3 Dokumentai, kuriuos būtina gauti ir pateikti

Gauti ir pateikti visų trijų ordinų teikimo ir suteikimo bylas, aktus, komisijų medžiagą, tarnybos ir apdovanojimų registrų įrašus; visus po 1990 m. priimtus pripažinimo ar peržiūros sprendimus, jei tokių yra; Genio 1941–1944 m. paskyrimo, komandiravimo, atleidimo ir pavadavimo dokumentus; Bubnio nurodyto pasakojimo pirminį protokolą ir visą susijusią bylą. Ieškoti LCVA ir kitų nustatytų saugotojų fonduose, LGGRTC, Krašto apsaugos ministerijoje ir Prezidento kanceliarijoje pagal jų turimas bylas. Nurodyti, kas jau tyrė būtent Genio veiksmus ir kokius dokumentus nagrinėjo. [1, 2]

Nacionalinės bibliotekos prašau atskirai įvertinti VLE straipsnį Petras Genys. Biografijoje turi būti aiškiai atskirta jo paskyrimų chronologija, dalinio nusikaltimų istorija ir asmenį liečiantis liudijimas. Siūlau šaltiniais pagrįstą papildymą apie Bubnio paskelbtą pasakojimą. Prašau redakcijos pateikti tikslią siūlomo papildymo formuluotę arba motyvuotą nesutikimą su pirminiais šaltiniais. [1, 2]

Ankstesni prašymai RAG-005 ir RAG-005-S1 susiję su VLE miestelio straipsniu Raguva. Šis prašymas atskirai skirtas Genio apdovanojimams, individualiai veiklai ir jo asmens biografijai. Mano Garrenbloom šeima kilusi iš Raguvos; šis šeimos ryšys paaiškina mano tyrimo interesą. [1]

Bubnio straipsnio p. 86 ir 48 išnaša p. 89 pateikia konkrečias paieškos nuorodas: J. Dzvonkaus 1968 m. liepos 9 d. apklausos protokolas, LYA, f. K-1, ap. 46, b. 1265, l. 10–12; B. Leipaus 1949 m. sausio 27 d. tardymo protokolas, f. K-1, ap. 58, b. 37277/3, l. 13–15; Masinės žudynės Lietuvoje, I dalis, p. 132. Prašau nustatyti, kuris šaltinis pagrindžia būtent Genio buvimo teiginį. Paskyrimų patikrai straipsnio 39 išnaša nurodo LCVA, f. R-1444, ap. 1, b. 20, l. 38 ir 6. [3]

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.

LGGRTC savo žurnale paskelbė sovietinės kilmės parodymais paremtą Genio buvimo Pajuostėje pasakojimą. Negalima šių šaltinių naudoti institucijos istoriniame leidinyje, bet vėliau vien dėl kilmės atsisakyti juos tirti, kai keliamas apdovanojimų klausimas. Gauti Leipaus ir Dzvonkaus protokolus bei susijusias bylas, nustatyti, kuris šaltinis pagrindžia konkrečiai Genio buvimą, ir įvertinti autentiškumą, parodymų gavimo aplinkybes bei patvirtinimus pagal vienodą standartą. [3]

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 Raguva research report, sections on battalion organization, the 23 August massacre and the Petras Genys biography; notes 19, 27–28 and 37. The report identifies the scholarship and archival sources for the reported presence.

[2] Visuotinė lietuvių enciklopedija. Petras Genys. Birth and death data, command dates and three interwar decorations. Šaltinis

[3] Arūnas Bubnys. Lietuvių policijos Šiaulių (14-asis) ir Panevėžio (10-asis) batalionai (1941–1944). Genocidas ir rezistencija, 2010, 1(27), pp. 81–89; pp. 85–86, notes 39 and 48 on pp. 88–89. Šaltinis

[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: Martynas Mažvydas National Library of Lithuania — biblio@lnb.lt (VLE biography); Ministry of National Defence — kam@kam.lt (service records and honors within its competence).

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.

RAG-PRES-001 | 2 November 2026

Application to investigate Petras Genys's conduct and determine whether his State decorations should be retained or revoked

English control translation of the Lithuanian application

1 Request and published research

Dear Mr President, I request a full investigation into Colonel Petras Genys's conduct during the German occupation, including the published witness-based account of his presence at the Pajuostė killing site on 23 August 1941, and a reasoned decision on retention or revocation of each State decoration. Identify any subsequent status, rank or commemoration decisions as well. The question includes the significance of subsequent conduct for continued State honor and the law governing it. [1, 2]

My complete town research, with source references and a Lithuanian summary, is published on Substack: Raguva — 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

VLE identifies Petras Genys as born on 27 September 1894 in Gailionys and deceased on 15 October 1969 in Chicago. It lists three orders: Cross of Vytis, fifth degree, 1923; Gediminas, third degree, 1928; and Vytautas the Great, third degree, 1933. Obtain the original conferral instruments and certify their historical designations, dates, numbers and present recorded status. [2]

The Raguva report examines the transfer of Jews into the Panevėžys killing system. Jäger's report records the murder of 7,523 Jews on 23 August 1941: 1,312 men, 4,602 women and 1,609 children.

Drawing on Arūnas Bubnys, the research describes escorting and shooting by men of the 10th Battalion at Pajuostė. [1]

In discussing these murders, Bubnys reports an account that Colonel Petras Genys and Lieutenant Vladas Aižinas were reportedly present at the site, using the Lithuanian word esą. Obtain the complete underlying source and establish the witness, opportunity to observe, statement date, translation, subsequent statements and independent corroboration or contradiction. The published account is a ground for investigation, not a finding of individual responsibility. [1]

VLE dates Genys's Panevėžys self-defense district command from October 1941 and his command of the 10th Battalion to September–November 1942. The research records Bubnys's dating of the district's formation to early November. Examine the appointment instruments alongside the separate account placing him at Pajuostė on 23 August 1941. A precise individual chronology of service and location is required. [1, 2]

LGGRTC's journal Genocidas ir rezistencija published the account of Genys's presence at the killing site in 2010. This material has therefore been publicly available in a State institution's journal for sixteen years, while the VLE biography continues to list the three orders without this account. Establish whether an individual investigation of Genys's conduct followed publication, who was notified, what findings were reached and how they affected honors and biographical decisions. [2, 3]

3 Records to obtain and produce

Obtain and produce nomination and conferral files for all three orders, instruments, commission material, service and awards register entries; any post-1990 recognition or review decisions; Genys's appointment, posting, discharge and substitution records for 1941–1944; the original statement underlying Bubnys's account and its complete associated file. Search LCVA and other identified custodians, LGGRTC, the Ministry of National Defence and the Presidential Chancellery according to their holdings. Identify any previous investigation specifically into Genys's conduct and the documents it examined. [1, 2]

I ask the National Library separately to assess the VLE article Petras Genys. The biography should distinguish his appointment chronology, the unit's criminal history and the testimony concerning him. I propose a sourced addition recording Bubnys's published account. Please supply the proposed editorial wording or a reasoned disagreement identifying the primary sources. [1, 2]

Earlier applications RAG-005 and RAG-005-S1 concern the VLE town article Raguva. This application separately concerns Genys's decorations, individual conduct and personal biography. My Garrenbloom family came from Raguva; that connection explains my research interest. [1]

Bubnys's article, page 86 and note 48 on page 89, supplies specific search references: J. Dzvonkus's statement of 9 July 1968, LYA, f. K-1, inventory 46, file 1265, folios 10–12; B. Leipus's interrogation of 27 January 1949, f. K-1, inventory 58, file 37277/3, folios 13–15; and Masinės žudynės Lietuvoje, part I, page 132. Determine which source specifically supports the assertion concerning Genys's presence. For appointments, note 39 identifies LCVA, f. R-1444, inventory 1, file 20, folios 38 and 6. [3]

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.

LGGRTC published the account of Genys's presence at Pajuostė in its own journal using Soviet-era testimony. These sources cannot be used in an institutional historical publication and then excluded from examination solely by provenance when honors are questioned. Obtain the Leipus and Dzvonkus statements and associated files, identify which source supports Genys's presence specifically, and assess authenticity, circumstances of statements and corroboration consistently. [3]

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 Raguva research report, sections on battalion organization, the 23 August massacre and the Petras Genys biography; notes 19, 27–28 and 37. The report identifies the scholarship and archival sources for the reported presence.

[2] Visuotinė lietuvių enciklopedija. Petras Genys. Birth and death data, command dates and three interwar decorations. Source

[3] Arūnas Bubnys. Lietuvių policijos Šiaulių (14-asis) ir Panevėžio (10-asis) batalionai (1941–1944). Genocidas ir rezistencija, 2010, 1(27), pp. 81–89; pp. 85–86, notes 39 and 48 on pp. 88–89. Source

[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.

RAG-PRES-001
Priedų rodyklė / Annex index

A — Raguva tyrimas / complete town research report
PDF puslapiai / pages 12–36

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.

Raguva — Town Research Report (1915–1945)

Grant Arthur Gochin • 1 November 2026

Lithuanians destroyed the Jews of Raguva under German occupation. A local Lithuanian unit murdered Jews in the town. Lithuanian police guarded the Panevėžys ghetto, escorted prisoners to the killing grounds and fired into the pits. German security police organized the mass murder and joined the shooting. At Pajuostė the victims included women, children and the sick. Lithuania's national encyclopedia reduces this history to a Nazi order and a murder without named executioners.

The contrast is visible in the state's own records. The Cultural Heritage Register's Pajuostė entry, code 11058, names Hamann's mobile squad, soldiers of the Lithuanian police 10th Battalion, members of the Panevėžys auxiliary police platoon and German soldiers. It describes the battalion's escort and the Lithuanian men who shot. The VLE Raguva entry leaves those Lithuanian formations out.[1]

This history concerns my family's town. My Garrenbloom family lived in Raguva, and my grandmother returned there after the First World War. Her escape to South Africa preceded the destruction of the community. The family connection explains why I ask who persecuted the Jews, who took their possessions and who killed them. The answers belong in the town's public history.

The local unit that murdered Jews

Josef Rosin's Raguva chapter in Pinkas Hakehillot Lita, published by Yad Vashem, describes the German army entering the town on 26 June 1941. A Lithuanian organization was already operating there. The English translation states: "This unit specialized in murdering Jews." Rosin's later account calls the organization "active in the killing of the local Jews." These are explicit statements about Lithuanian participation in murder.[2]

Rosin identifies Jewish youths and people associated in some way with Soviet rule among the first people whom the local organization arrested and murdered. The victims' alleged political associations do not alter the act: armed men arrested Jews and killed them. Rosin also names Rabbi Israel Mel, Raguva's last rabbi, as a man whom Lithuanians murdered during the Holocaust. His account places the destruction of the town's Jews before, as well as at, the destination killing ground.

The contemporaneous Lithuanian administrative account identifies the armed commanders who took control of Raguva and its surrounding district. The report printed in Valentinas Brandišauskas's document collection, pages 132–135, bears the Raguva township head's and secretary's signatures and stamps. The published transcription marks their signatures illegible. Its opening pages name the commanders and describe the insurgents' seizure of the town's offices.[3]

By 24 June, according to the report, units had reached 50–70 men each. In Raguvėlė, teacher Banionis and Petras Vareika led a unit. In Traupis, Antanas Kazlauskas and Petras Strolė led the armed men.

---

1 Cultural Heritage Register, Pajuostė murder and burial site, code 11058, fields 7.5 and 7.1.3.4; VLE, Raguva, history section, checked 1 November 2026.

2 Josef Rosin, Raguva, Pinkas Hakehillot Lita (Yad Vashem, 1996), pp. 628–631, English translation by Shaul Yannai; Rosin, Preserving Our Litvak Heritage, Raguva, pp. 142–151. Both texts have the same author.

3 Valentinas Brandišauskas, ed., 1941 m. birželio sukilimas Lietuvoje: dokumentų rinkinys (2000), pp. 132–135; named commands and signatures pp. 132–133. Archival locator: LCVA R-635/1/1, ll. 92–95. The printed text identifies the signatories' offices and marks their signatures illegible.

Raguva had two units: the Užunevėžiai-area unit under Lieutenant Bikinas, and the Kritižis unit under Petras Skrebys. On 25 June, the report says, insurgents occupied every office in Raguva.

These names identify commanders of armed units in the township at the time Rosin describes the local murderous organization. The June document establishes their commands and the takeover. Rosin supplies the account of the local murders. The published evidence supplies the names, offices and organizational setting of the armed takeover alongside the separate account of local Jewish murders.

The township's own anti-Jewish language

The June report frames the insurgents' initial work as protecting residents' property against local communists and Jews. It alleges that Jews and communists possessed petrol bottles with which to burn villages. In another passage it uses "žydeliai," a diminutive anti-Jewish slur. The report ends by celebrating assistance to the German army, including "valymu apylinkių nuo bolševikų elemento," cleansing the district of the Bolshevik element.[4]

This is evidence of how the Lithuanian township administration represented its Jewish neighbors while praising the armed takeover. Its writers grouped Jews with the supposed enemy and cast the armed men as defenders of property. The people whose homes, shops and belongings the occupation would seize appeared in this account as threats to other people's property.

Joachim Tauber cites the same Raguva report as an example of the equation of Jews with communists. His documentary footnote points to Brandišauskas, page 132, and the report's archival chain leads to LCVA R-635, inventory 1, file 1, leaves 92–95. The relevant evidence is the actual township report, rather than the fictional composite people Tauber uses elsewhere in his article.[5]

VLE records that an interwar Riflemen's Union platoon operated in Raguva. Bubnys identifies former June insurgents, riflemen and former Lithuanian servicemen among the recruits to the Panevėžys battalion. The local riflemen, the named June units and the township administration form the immediate institutional setting for examining local persecution. These institutions connected the armed takeover to the occupation administration.

The local police and occupation administration

Samavičius's occupation chapter identifies P. Chmiliauskas as the Raguva police-station chief and records five policemen and 24 auxiliary policemen. It names the township head as J. Deveikis. The police appointment and strength are cited to LCVA R-729, inventory 1, file 17, volume 1, leaves 29 and 110; the municipal staff to inventory 2, file 4, leaf 42. These names and numbers belong to the documented occupation administration.[6]

---

4 Brandišauskas, 1941 m. birželio sukilimas Lietuvoje, pp. 132–135.

5 Joachim Tauber, Tarp laisvės kovos ir masinių žudynių: 1940–1944 metų fiktyvios lietuviškos biografijos įvadas Lietuvos istorijos metraštis 2002/1 (published 2003), p. 105, note 31. The note quotes the actual Raguva report; the article's fictional composite narrative is not used as a local event record.

6 Raguva, ed. Romaldas Samavičius (Versmė, 2001), electronic edition 30 November 2016: Roza Bieliauskienė, Apie Raguvos žydus, pp. 280–283; Samavičius, Raguvos žydų pradžios mokykla 1919–1941 m., pp. 283–286, and Nacių okupacijos metai Raguvoje, pp. 313–316; Stanislovas Buchaveckas, Žvilgsnis į 1942 m. Raguvos valsčių ir Raguvą, pp. 333–341. Local officials and distribution of property: p. 313, notes 5–7. Housing permits and street lists: p. 340, notes 13–14. Former secretary: p.

Tadas Jaskelevičius's 2020 study supplies another local police name. It identifies teacher and insurgent Petras Andrašiūnas as Raguva township's auxiliary-police chief at the beginning of the German occupation. The passage appears while describing his later role in a Krekenava formation in 1944. The spelling in the published text is Andrašiūnas. The regular police-station chief and the auxiliary-police chief are separately described posts.[7]

The town history also identifies Stasys Jakimavičius, later known as Biežancas, as a former Raguva township secretary in a photograph caption on page 357, corrected by the book's errata. It separately records Klemensas Šulga's appointment as township secretary in 1921 on page 524. Neither passage dates a secretary's tenure to the June 1941 report. The report's two signing officials remain identifiable by office in its printed transcription; J. Deveikis is independently documented as occupation-era head.[8]

A librarian dismissed because he was Jewish

Aldona Blauzdienė's library history names Izraelis Hakas, appointed head of Raguva's public library on 6 January 1941. Under the German occupation he was dismissed because he was Jewish. Jonas Šantaras returned as library head from 16 October. The dismissal is a local administrative act of anti-Jewish exclusion, recorded in the town's own history and cited to LCVA R-629, inventory 2, file 176a, leaf 30.[9]

The same chapter describes the postwar library's poor premises as a Jewish house on Kėdainių Street, later demolished. A Jewish librarian was excluded from the public institution; Jewish residential property subsequently housed that institution. The school and library records make persecution and the reuse of Jewish assets part of the town's ordinary administrative history.

The ghetto and the men who guarded it

The sources disagree about when Raguva's Jews reached Panevėžys. Rosin and the Vilna Gaon Jewish History Museum place the remaining community's transfer in mid-August. The Hebrew University's Holocaust Memorial Monuments record, citing Yosif Levinson's Skausmo knyga, page 134, says that Jews from Raguva, Naujamiestis, Krekenava and Ramygala entered the Panevėžys ghetto with the city's Jews from 7 July, and that the transfer finished on 11 July.[10]

This difference affects the history of persecution. A July arrival would place at least some Raguva Jews in the ghetto during the earlier killing operations. A mid-August arrival would place them there

---

357 and errata; Šulga: p. 524.

7 Tadas Jaskelevičius, 1941 m. Birželio sukilimas Panevėžio apskrities Krekenavos valsčiuje: įvykiai, dalyviai, likimai, Genocidas ir rezistencija 1 (47) (2020), pp. 38–59, at p. 50. Petras Andrašiūnas is identified as early-occupation Raguva auxiliary-police chief in the account of the 1944 Krekenava formation.

8 Samavičius, ed., Raguva, pp. 283–286, 313, 340, 357, 524.

9 Aldona Blauzdienė, Iš Raguvos bibliotekų istorijos, in Raguva (2001), pp. 506–510, especially pp. 507–508. Hakas's appointment: p. 507; dismissal and postwar premises: p. 508. Dismissal source cited there: LCVA R-629, inventory 2, file 176a, leaf 30.

10 Holocaust Memorial Monuments, Center for Jewish Art, Hebrew University, Panevėžys ghetto monument record 52878, citing Yosif Levinson, Skausmo knyga (1997), p. 134; Rosin and the Vilna Gaon Museum give the mid-August Raguva transfer.

later. Both accounts identify the same destination system of confinement and murder. Their disagreement must remain visible while the entire sequence of ghetto operations is reconstructed.

The USHMM Encyclopedia's Panevėžys entry, by Alexander Kruglov and Martin Dean, gives the order to enter the ghetto before the night of 11 July, the closing of its boundaries on 17 July at 6 p.m., barbed wire and armed Lithuanian police guards. It identifies Klaipėda, Krekenava and J. Tilvytis streets and the slaughterhouse as the ghetto area. Lithuanian overseers beat and humiliated Jewish forced laborers.[11]

The authorities took 70 Jewish community notables hostage, ostensibly to prevent escape. Yad Vashem's ghetto encyclopedia states that they subsequently took these hostages to Pajuostė and murdered them. These 70 hostages and the 70 Jews in Bubnys's 21 July execution count come from differently framed accounts; they should not be added as two separate groups without an identification of their members.[12]

Bubnys identifies the officials and formations behind the enclosure. Soldiers of the 10th Battalion and officers of the public police guarded the ghetto. Panevėžys county police chief Jonas Daniūnas was responsible for its external guard. The guards controlled people who had already lost freedom of movement, ordinary work and access to food. Their duties were part of the machinery that kept the victims available for forced labor and killing.[13]

A Jewish committee letter dated 28 July supplies the population figure Bubnys uses: 4,423 Jews, including 1,216 living in yards. USHMM gives 4,457 at the end of July and 1,250 without accommodation. The difference is 34 in both categories. Both accounts describe severe overcrowding and people without proper shelter. The figures describe the ghetto at specified points, rather than the number of Raguva deportees.[14,15]

German orders required Jewish registration and confiscation of radios, cameras, typewriters and duplicating equipment. Lithuanian guards escorted prisoners to road and bridge repairs, loading work, street and barracks cleaning, peat digging and the municipal Staniūnai farm. Bubnys records 100 Jewish workers daily at that farm in July. The ghetto exploited Jewish labor before its guards and execution units destroyed the prisoners.

Yad Vashem names Avraham Rikels and Moshe Levit as the Jewish ghetto leadership and describes Lithuanian abuse, robbery and killing inside this system. USHMM records disease, shortages and Dr.

---

11 Alexander Kruglov and Martin Dean, Panevėžys, USHMM Encyclopedia of Camps and Ghettos, 1933–1945, Volume II, Part B (2012), pp. 1102–1103, including notes 1–7. The carts-with-property passage is in the main text on p. 1103.

12 Yad Vashem, Encyclopedia of the Ghettos, Panevėžys, Hebrew entry 784. The 70 hostages, Lithuanian guards and abuse, barracks deception and hospital deportation appear in this entry.

13 Arūnas Bubnys, Lietuvių policijos Šiaulių (14-asis) ir Panevėžio (10-asis) batalionai (1941–1944), Genocidas ir rezistencija 2010, 1 (27), pp. 81–89, especially pp. 84–87 and notes 36–56. July 28 ghetto letter: LCVA 1264/1/800, l. 150. July 21: note 45. August 4: note 46. August 11: note 47. August 23: note 48. Radzevičius: note 49. Property: note 50.

14 Kruglov and Dean, Panevėžys, pp. 1102–1103.

15 Bubnys, Police battalions, pp. 84–87.

T. Gutman’s attempt to run a small hospital without adequate medicines. The ghetto was a place of continuing violence and deprivation, as well as the collection point for the forest executions.[16,17]

From the auxiliary platoon to the 10th Battalion

Arūnas Bubnys’s study of the Lithuanian police battalions traces the Panevėžys unit to an insurgent platoon formed at the beginning of the war and reorganized as auxiliary police. That platoon supplied men for the police battalion formed in August. Recruits volunteered and signed undertakings to serve for six months. In 1941 the battalion had three companies of approximately 80–90 men, around 280–300 in total; the 29 September return gives 305.[18]

The unit’s published command history names Captain Bronius Kairiūnas as battalion commander. Bubnys’s November 1941 company roster names Captain Jonas Jakubonis, Lieutenant Jurgis Juodėnas of the 2nd Company and Captain Jonas Matulis, whose given name the article marks with a question. Lieutenant Vladas Aižinas commanded the 1st Company for a period. Its platoon commanders included Junior Lieutenants Antanas Gelažėla, Napoleonas (?) Černius and Pranas Grinius.

Colonel Petras Genys commanded the Panevėžys self-defense district, with Major Ernestas Bliudnikas as deputy. Bubnys places the district’s formation in early November, while VLE dates Genys’s district command from October. These autumn command dates identify the administrative structure that followed the summer murders. For the killing itself, Bubnys separately reports testimony placing Genys and Aižinas at Pajuostė on 23 August.

The dated command roster identifies the battalion’s officers and the development of its organization. Bubnys’s account of the summer killings identifies the actions of the formation and records the testimony concerning men present at Pajuostė.

The battalion continued after the destruction of the ghetto. Bubnys records later recruitment, transfers to other Lithuanian units and 360 personnel in August 1942: 21 officers, 135 noncommissioned officers and 204 privates. German police orders dissolved the 10th Battalion in the turn of 1942–1943 and transferred personnel into the 14th Battalion. Its institutional history continued beyond the day on which its men killed the women and children.[19]

The July executions

On 21 July 1941, men of the Panevėžys auxiliary police platoon transported prisoners from the city prison by truck to Pajuostė, also called the Kaizerlingas forest in Bubnys’s account. German soldiers, security police and members of the Lithuanian platoon shot 103 people. Bubnys’s breakdown gives 70 Jews, 23 Lithuanians, nine Russians and one Pole. Afanasij Amosejev and several others escaped.[20]

The platoon’s men were already executing prisoners before the August battalion took its later form. Their role included the journey from prison to the forest and the firing at the destination. The later battalion history therefore begins with an armed body whose members had participated in killing.

---

16 Kruglov and Dean, Panevėžys, pp. 1102–1103.

17 Yad Vashem, Panevėžys, ghetto encyclopedia entry 784.

18 Bubnys, Police battalions, pp. 84–87.

19 Bubnys, Police battalions, pp. 84–87.

20 Bubnys, Police battalions, pp. 84–87.

USHMM identifies four large operations before the final liquidation: 21 and 28 July, and 4 and 11 August. It states that Einsatzkommando 3 and Lithuanian police shot more than 1,220 Jews in those operations, including 115 women. This account adds a 28 July operation to the sequence emphasized in Bubnys's narrative. The earlier murders form part of the ghetto's history and the experience of the surrounding communities concentrated there.[21]

The August executions before the final massacre

Bubnys describes the first large August operation through the testimony of former prison warden M. Bikėnas. German officers arrived at the prison with Lithuanian self-defense soldiers. They ordered at least 200–300 prisoners, mostly young Jewish men, into trucks and took them to the Žalioji forest near the Panevėžys–Vabalninkas road. Battalion soldiers guarded the killing ground while German officers and soldiers shot the prisoners. The 4 August count gives 362 Jewish men and 41 Jewish women, as well as five Russians and 14 Lithuanians designated communists.[22]

The 11 August operation directly involved Lithuanian battalion shooters. According to the participant account cited by Bubnys, eight SS men came to the barracks and selected approximately 20 battalion soldiers to shoot Jews. The Germans took them to the pits and gave the firing commands. The recorded victims numbered 450 Jewish men and 48 Jewish women, together with one Lithuanian and one Russian designated communists, 500 people in all.

Yad Vashem's Pajuostė murder-site narrative places an operation of 403 Jews on 4 August and another of 500 on 8 August, whereas Bubnys and the Jäger report give the second date as 11 August and distinguish the Žalioji site. The accounts agree on repeated murder by German and Lithuanian forces. Their date and site differences are retained in the source notes; they do not justify reducing the battalion's record to 23 August.[23]

These operations systematically reduced the Jewish population before the final massacre of women, children, old people and the remaining men. The victims' political labeling in the perpetrator records changes across entries; their Jewish identity remains explicit. A history that begins only with the final liquidation omits the preceding arrests, labor exploitation, guards, transports and shootings.

Pajuostė and the destruction of the remaining community

A German Gestapo official told the ghetto leadership that the Jews would move to former barracks near Pajuostė, supposedly to improve their living conditions. Jewish representatives inspected the barracks and found them unsuitable. The authorities nevertheless forced a large group out in mid-August. Yad Vashem states that armed Lithuanians murdered the group at prepared pits. The remaining prisoners followed during the final liquidation.[24]

USHMM describes people marching under armed guard and peasant carts carrying the elderly, the sick and small children. It states that Jews from nearby towns, including Raguva, Ramygala and Krekenava, also arrived at Pajuostė on carts with their property and that the killers murdered them in the second

21 Kruglov and Dean, Panevėžys, pp. 1102–1103.

22 Bubnys, Police battalions, pp. 84–87.

23 Yad Vashem, Murder story of Panevezys Jews in the Pajuoste Forest, published Weinstein–Brauner testimony extract, YVA M.1/603. Published testimony extract; archival reference YVA M.1/603.

24 Yad Vashem, Panevėžys, ghetto encyclopedia entry 784.

half of August. The town names and the possessions are part of the published account, rather than an inference from the ghetto's geography.[25]

Bubnys dates the largest operation to 23 August. His account describes two trenches approximately 40 meters long. Before the shooting, an SS Obersturmführer delivered a speech declaring that all Jews must be destroyed on the Führer's order. Bubnys connects the speaker's rank to Hamann, commander of the German Security Police and SD mobile killing squad.[26]

Soldiers of the Lithuanian 10th Battalion escorted groups of Jews from Pajuostė to the trenches. Germans selected some Lithuanian self-defense men to carry out the executions. A participant cited by Bubnys estimated approximately 70 battalion men and 30 Germans among the shooters. Bubnys also reports the alleged presence of Colonel Petras Genys and Lieutenant Vladas Aižinas at the killing site. His wording "esą" marks this as reported presence.

Before the firing began, each executioner received 200 grams of vodka. The Lithuanians fired rifles and the Germans fired automatic weapons. After the shooters killed one group, Soviet prisoners of war had to cover the bodies with earth. The guards drove the next group into the trenches and the shooters repeated the process. The killing lasted all day.

The figure entered in Jäger's report for 23 August is 7,523 Jews: 1,312 men, 4,602 women and 1,609 children. The murder force attacked people as Jews, including children who could not plausibly be recast as political combatants. Lithuanian battalion men escorted Jewish women and children to the pits and took part in shooting the regional group in which the published histories place Raguva's remaining Jews.[27,28]

The women and children outnumbered the men by nearly five to one. The 6,211 women and children in the German tally expose what a general reference to "Soviet collaborators" would conceal. The source counted Jewish women and Jewish children separately because those were the people the killers had set out to destroy. The 7,523 is the regional operation's total, not a separate death toll for Raguva.

The murderers also killed hospital patients and the staff who accompanied them. Yad Vashem describes the staff in white coats and Dr. Gutman encouraging the victims to face death with dignity. USHMM recounts people, including small children, whom the shooters wounded and buried alive. When Soviet prisoners filling the pits tried to conceal a child who was still alive, Lithuanian policemen discovered and shot the child.[29,30]

Survivor testimony and the photograph

Yad Vashem publishes an extract from the testimony of Grisha Weinstein and Boris Brauner, archive reference M.1/603. It describes four pits 100 meters long and eight smaller pits 50 meters long, compulsory undressing and group-by-group killing with Lithuanian machine-gun fire. It recalls Dr.

---

25 Kruglov and Dean, Panevėžys, pp. 1102–1103.

26 Bubnys, Police battalions, pp. 84–87.

27 Bubnys, Police battalions, pp. 84–87.

28 Karl Jäger, Einsatzkommando 3 report, 1 December 1941, operations listed under Lithuanian cooperation; Panevėžys entries 21 and 28 July, 4 and 11 August, 23 August. Published English documentary transcription; RGVA 500-1-25 is cited by the USHMM entry.

29 Kruglov and Dean, Panevėžys, pp. 1102–1103.

30 Yad Vashem, Panevėžys, ghetto encyclopedia entry 784.

Gutman giving a Lithuanian guard a coat with money sewn into it and asking him to make his shot succeed. This testimony puts a named Jewish doctor, his last act and a Lithuanian guard into the account.[31]

The pit measurements and weapons differ from Bubnys's account of two 40-meter trenches and Lithuanian rifles. They are separate descriptions by separate sources, not measurements to be averaged. Both describe organized killing in prepared graves, Lithuanian armed participants and a succession of groups at the pits. Rosin dates the murder of Raguva's group to 24–25 August; Jäger's entry gives 23 August, while the published Weinstein–Brauner extract gives 24–26 August for the final liquidation.

Photographic evidence also survives. USHMM photograph 25737 is captioned as Lithuanian militiamen forcing Jewish women from Panevėžys to undress before execution in the Pajuostė forest, July–August 1941. A scholarly study by Šarūnė Sederevičiūtė reproduces the Pajuostė photograph as figure 7, page 88, credits the USHMM archive and describes an armed Lithuanian police battalion soldier with Jews undressing behind him. The photographed individuals are unnamed.[32]

The photograph records armed control of people at the killing ground and the seizure of their clothing. The testimony explains what followed. The documents identify the formations. Together they supply a history of perpetrators and acts that the town encyclopedia's single sentence leaves out.

Jäger named the Lithuanian participants

Karl Jäger's 1 December 1941 report introduced the operations carried out by Hamann's squad with the words "in cooperation with Lithuanian partisans." It describes Hamann's German mobile detachment as eight to ten men. The Panevėžys killing entries appear within that operational account.[33]

That German squad strength and the participant's estimate of 70 Lithuanian and 30 German shooters at Pajuostė describe different categories: the mobile detachment and the men present for one operation. The testimony's estimate nevertheless makes a direct point about the firing force it describes. Lithuanian shooters formed the majority, approximately seven of every ten shooters in that account.

Jäger's report, the survivor extract, Bubnys's study and the state heritage register all identify Lithuanian participation. The evidence assigns responsibility to German organizers and Lithuanian armed participants through their acts. Replacing that account with a German order leaves the Lithuanian escort, guard and execution roles out of view.

Bubnys's conclusion places the 10th and 14th Battalions within a wider killing record: together with other German and Lithuanian police units, they participated in murders in Šiauliai, Panevėžys and Telšiai counties in which 12,000–13,000 Jews died. This is a regional aggregate for those operations, not another set of deaths to add to Pajuostė. His account says the 10th Battalion took part in no later Jewish killing operations after the summer sequence; it also records Kazys Radzevičius refusing further service at the end of the summer.[34]

---

31 Yad Vashem, Pajuoste Forest, Weinstein–Brauner testimony, YVA M.1/603.

32 USHMM, photograph 25737, catalogue pa1086497, July–August 1941, courtesy of Saulius Berzinis; direct catalogue checked in browser, 1 November 2026. See also Šarūnė Sederevičiūtė, Fotografinės Holokausto reprezentacijos Lietuvos istoriografijoje, Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis 99 (2020), pp. 59–105, figure 7, p. 88.

33 Jäger, Einsatzkommando 3 report, 1 December 1941.

34 Bubnys, Police battalions, pp. 84–87.

The state names heroes and omits killers

VLE's Raguva sentence reads: "1941 vasarą nacių okupacinės valdžios įsakymu prie Panevėžio nužudyti beveik visi Raguvos žydai." It attributes the order to the Nazi occupation authorities and says that almost all Raguva's Jews were murdered near Panevėžys. The verb leaves the people who carried out the murder unnamed.[35]

The same paragraph names A. Aliukas, code name Kuprys; J. Baltušnikas, Vienuolis; and A. Vaičekonis, Šermukšnis, as postwar partisan commanders. VLE has space for three individual Lithuanian names and their aliases when describing the postwar armed movement. For the 1941 destruction of the Jewish community, it supplies no Lithuanian formation or person.

This is a choice about historical specificity. The June report supplies local unit commanders. The published battalion study supplies the escort, shooters and ghetto guard. The national heritage register names the formations. Those sources make explicit attribution possible. Yet the town entry preserves Lithuanian names for the partisan history and omits Lithuanian execution roles from the Holocaust history.

VLE's general articles compound that inconsistency. Its Holocaust article identifies Lithuanian units among the principal killing forces, and its police-battalions article states that those units participated in murdering Jews. The encyclopedia possesses the general category of Lithuanian participation but does not apply the documented local particulars to Raguva. General acknowledgment elsewhere cannot tell this town's reader who guarded and shot its Jews.[36]

Petras Genys and the biography without the murders

VLE's Petras Genys biography records his Panevėžys self-defense district command from October 1941 and his command of the 10th Battalion in September–November 1942. It lists the Order of the Cross of Vytis, the Order of Gediminas and the Order of Vytautas the Great. It says nothing about the battalion's murder of Jews or Bubnys's report of Genys's presence at Pajuostė.[37]

The dates distinguish two findings. VLE identifies a later commander of a unit whose summer record included mass murder. Bubnys additionally reports a witness-based allegation placing him at the earlier killing ground. The public biography omits both the unit's crime and that reported presence. A sourced biography can record the allegation as reported presence, while keeping the appointment dates exact.

The decorations listed by VLE are interwar awards: the fifth-class Cross of Vytis in 1923, the third-class Order of Gediminas in 1928 and the third-class Order of Vytautas the Great in 1933. They document recognition by the interwar state. The battalion's killings belong there because they show what the unit did. A reader who receives only the offices, military service and honors receives an incomplete account of his institutional history.

---

35 Cultural Heritage Register, Pajuostė, code 11058; VLE, Raguva.

36 VLE, Holokaustas and policijos batalionai, compared with the Raguva town entry. The general articles describe Lithuanian participation in Jewish murder.

37 VLE, Petras Genys, checked 1 November 2026. District command dated from October 1941; battalion command September–November 1942; three decorations listed.

Dispossession began with a Jewish town economy

The destroyed community owned houses, shops, mills, workshops and financial institutions. Rosin's 1931 enumeration gives 11 Jewish-owned shops or businesses out of 12. The five clothing, fur and textile businesses were Jewish-owned, as were both footwear and leather businesses, both egg businesses, the sewing-machine and electrical-equipment business and the medicine and cosmetics business. The remaining restaurant or tavern was non-Jewish-owned. The same enumeration gives both flour mills as Jewish-owned.[38]

Earlier Jewish industry included Faivel Pram's leather works and a bristle-and-brush factory. Rosin reports approximately 100 workers across the two factories. Eighteen Jewish artisans appear in the 1937 count. The Jewish people's bank, founded in 1924, had 98 members in 1927. These details describe livelihoods and credit networks, not merely buildings left behind after murder.

The Museum locates most Jewish residents around the market square and north of it. It describes three mills and a sawmill, a different count from Rosin's dated 1931 enumeration. The market was an economic center for residents, peddlers, tradespeople and nearby agricultural producers. Murder removed much of the town's commercial population and left assets that other people could seize, administer, buy or occupy.[39]

Soviet authorities had already nationalized the Jewish flour mills and shops in 1940–1941, according to Rosin. The subsequent German occupation imposed another system of confiscation and racial exclusion. The sequence matters for ownership: the prewar Jewish owner, a Soviet nationalized enterprise, a German-appointed administrator and a later occupier can appear against the same property at different dates. A reconstruction must follow those transactions rather than begin with the post-murder occupant.

The June township report's claim to protect property from Jews belongs alongside this ownership history. Jewish residents were substantial owners and workers in the local economy, while the township's account cast Jews as a danger to that economy. The same administrative apparatus that recorded the takeover is therefore an essential source for investigating inventories, confiscation and distribution.

At the pits and in the local market

USHMM's account places the Jews from Raguva and neighboring towns on carts with their possessions when the authorities brought them to Pajuostė. The murderers then forced people to undress. After the killings, participants searched the piles of clothing and shoes for items they wanted. This was plunder at the killing ground.[40,41]

Bubnys describes a further organized stage. Men brought the murdered Jews' clothes and other belongings to the 10th Battalion headquarters. Germans took some of the more valuable items. Other belongings were sold to local residents. His source is J. Urbonas's interrogation of 29 November 1949, LYA K-1, inventory 58, file 22896/3, leaf 45 verso.[42]

---

38 Rosin, Raguva, Pinkas Hakehillot Lita, pp. 628–631; Preserving Our Litvak Heritage, pp. 142–151.

39 Vilna Gaon Jewish History Museum, Raguva (Rogeve), town history and photographs. Used as a comparison and community-history source.

40 Kruglov and Dean, Panevėžys, pp. 1102–1103.

41 Yad Vashem, Pajuoste Forest, Weinstein–Brauner testimony, YVA M.1/603.

42 Bubnys, Police battalions, pp. 84–87.

The account identifies local purchasers as beneficiaries of a sale of murdered Jews' property. It also identifies the battalion headquarters as a collection point. The available text does not name those purchasers, their prices or the officials who received the proceeds. Those are concrete questions for the sale lists, inventories and accounts. The sale itself belongs in the history now.

Housing redistribution appears explicitly in USHMM's Panevėžys account: non-Jews moved out of the ghetto area and received Jewish houses outside it in exchange. This is a documented destination-city transfer mechanism. In Raguva, the property inquiry must connect the market-square houses and businesses to the local ownership, confiscation and occupancy records.

Stanislovas Buchaveckas's chapter on the 1942 census records the redistribution in Raguva itself. On page 340 he writes that Lithuanians moved into some former Jewish houses in Synagogue Street in autumn 1941 with permits from the township municipality. Other Jewish houses remained empty in spring 1942, in that street and elsewhere. In Laisvės Street many occupants had changed because the pre-summer-1941 owners were Jewish; some buildings still had boarded windows in 1942. The chapter identifies an administrative mechanism for taking over the homes of the destroyed community.[43]

Buchaveckas names household heads in Synagogue Street: Jonas Urbonas, Marijona Dovicionienė, Kazys Stakėnas, Jonas Miliškevičius, Viktorija Baltakienė at number 16 and Augustina Lisauskienė at number 18. This is the street's 1942 occupancy record. The passage does not match each named household to a former Jewish owner. Its underlying preparatory household list is LCVA R-743, inventory 2, file 4209, leaf 2. The Laisvės Street list is in the same file, leaf 3; other town household schedules are in file 4208. These are identifiable records of the town after its Jews had been murdered.

Romaldas Samavičius's occupation chapter, page 313, records the fate of the communal and movable property. Both synagogues lost their interior fittings, were boarded up and passed to the municipality. The Jewish library's 400 books went to the state library. Other Jewish property went to the Traupis and Raguva shelters, the elementary school, the municipality and residents. He cites LCVA R-729, inventory 1, file 74, leaf 9, and inventory 2, file 5, leaves 84, 90 and 102–104. Local institutions as well as individuals benefited from the seizure.[44]

The published plan and its owners

Ina Budrytė's numbered Raguvos planas is printed on page 608 of the 2001 monograph. The accompanying chapter, Inga Levickaitė and Janina Samulionytė's Iš pasakojimų apie Raguvos miestelį, identifies the buildings, businesses and residents. It reconstructs 1938–1940 Raguva from Antanas Čielis's recollections, supplemented by other residents, recorded in July and September 2000. The copy in my family papers is another copy of this published plan. The key names the Jewish town that stood before persecution, confiscation and murder.[45]

The plan's numbers identify objects in the chapter; they are not house addresses. The authors explicitly explain on page 619 that changed and demolished buildings prevented them from using the contemporary building numbers. References to a building still standing or to its owner "now" describe

43 Samavičius, ed., Raguva, pp. 283–286, 313, 340, 357, 524.

44 Samavičius, ed., Raguva, pp. 283–286, 313, 340, 357, 524.

45 Ina Budrytė, Raguvos planas, in Raguva (Versmė, 2001), p. 608; Inga Levickaitė and Janina Samulionytė, Iš pasakojimų apie Raguvos miestelį, pp. 607–619. Object key: pp. 610–617; fieldwork dates and principal informant: p. 609; numbering explanation: p. 619. A copy of the plan is also held in the author's family papers.

the fieldwork period in 2000. Those distinctions make it possible to compare the plan with the census without turning two different numbering systems into a false parcel match.

Vilniaus and Kėdainių streets

On the left side of Vilniaus Street, objects 6 and 7 are Jewish shops, one in a brick building and one in a long wooden building. On the right, object 12 is a Jewish house with a shop. Object 13 is a Jewish-owned brick house in which the owner rented premises to Banaitis's coffin workshop and carpenter Jakubaitis. Object 14 housed a Jewish shoemaker's workshop. These entries record Jewish landlords and Jewish businesses alongside Lithuanian tenants.[46]

On the left of Kėdainių Street, object 16 is Kuncė's house and shop, later rented to the Jewish shopkeeper Kulberis. This is a named Jewish business tenant, rather than a claim of Jewish ownership of Kuncė's building. Kulberis's surname supplies a connection to investigate with the Kulber/Kolber family records in the victim list. The key supplies no given name with which to identify him as Smuel, Muise Perez or Icchak Kulber. Readers can follow the three named family records in the table: Smuel Kulber/Kolber, Muise Perez Kulber/Kolber and Icchak Kulber/Kolber.

Object 18 is a Jewish house partly rented to Zdanavičiūtė for a tea room, recalled as a beer house in 2000. Object 20 is a one-story Jewish-owned brick house in which Pranas Kartanas rented shop premises. Object 21 is a Jewish house rented first to the agricultural bank and subsequently used by the state library. Object 22 is a Jewish dwelling with Rafalka's forge in the yard; the recollections also associate him with an iron shop and apprentices. Objects 23 and 24 are further Jewish shops. Object 25 is the Jewish miller Mauša's house, and object 26 his stone steam mill, described as still standing.[47]

Across Kėdainių Street, object 29 is a Jewish shop selling kerosene and herring; object 31 is Borakas's iron shop. Object 32 is the Jewish miller Naftolka's house, recorded in 2000 as belonging to Steponas Tarabilda. That is the book's dated ownership statement. The chapter provides no transaction establishing when or how Tarabilda acquired it.

The southwest side of the square contained a large Jewish textile shop and rented upstairs apartments at object 33, described in 2000 as the cultural center. Object 34 is Abel's two-story brick house with a Jewish bank. Objects 36 and 37 are Jewish houses with shops; the latter also housed a noted Jewish violinist. Jewish property was the setting for finance, retail trade, rented housing and cultural life.[48]

Dubios Laisvės and Nevėžio streets

On Dubios Street, object 38 housed a Jewish woman who baked and sold buns; object 39 housed a Jewish cap maker. Object 40 is Naftolka's wooden steam mill, earlier a windmill. The key thus locates his house and mill separately, at objects 32 and 40.[49]

---

46 Budrytė, Raguvos planas, p. 608; Levickaitė and Samulionytė, Iš pasakojimų apie Raguvos miestelį, pp. 607–619.

47 Budrytė, Raguvos planas, p. 608; Levickaitė and Samulionytė, Iš pasakojimų apie Raguvos miestelį, pp. 607–619.

48 Budrytė, Raguvos planas, p. 608; Levickaitė and Samulionytė, Iš pasakojimų apie Raguvos miestelį, pp. 607–619.

49 Budrytė, Raguvos planas, p. 608; Levickaitė and Samulionytė, Iš pasakojimų apie Raguvos miestelį, pp. 607–619.

On the left of Laisvės Street, object 44 is Cypkė's vodka monopoly shop. Object 47 is the pharmacy belonging to Girzonas, whose wife was a dentist; the chapter records that the pharmacy building burned during the war. Object 48 housed Jankelis's restaurant and shop. Object 49 is another Jewish shop, and object 50 a two-story Jewish house with a textile and shoe shop below, flax-working space at the rear and rented apartments above.

Object 51 is Dvorskis's large two-story wooden house. Družinskas and Sutkus rented the restaurant on its ground floor; Dvorskis operated an iron shop in another part. The property included a paved yard with enclosures for horses and upstairs apartments. The chapter records the building as gone by 2000. A Lithuanian restaurant operator could therefore appear in the record of a Jewish-owned property before 1941; identifying the operator and identifying the owner are different tasks.[50]

On the left of Nevėžio Street, object 54 is Grosas's wooden house and photographic studio. Čielis recalled piles of negatives scattered outside after the studio was wrecked and closed during the German occupation. Objects 55, 56 and 57 are the wooden synagogue, a Jewish watchmaker's home and the rabbi's house. On the opposite side, object 59 housed a Jewish glazier and glass seller; object 60 a Jewish tar seller. Object 61 is the brick synagogue, and object 62 the bathhouse run by a Jew and used by the wider population. Object 66 is the Jewish tannery in Dambrauskas's mill yard, demolished when that mill expanded.[51]

Workshops and the cemetery

On S. Dariaus ir S. Girėno Street, object 68 is Šulskytė's house, where a Jewish tinsmith worked on roofs and made graters. The account of object 69 preserves Jewish smith Rakmilka as Jonas Bukauskas's teacher and former employer. Object 71 is the Jewish cemetery, described in 2000 as a Soviet soldiers' cemetery and the remains of the Jewish cemetery. Object 74 is the Jewish slaughterhouse.[52]

For object 73, the Bačiulis brickworks, the account says it probably belonged initially to a Jew, after whom Bačiulis's family took over the business. On Vilniaus Street, object 80 is Abuchavičius's forge, described as formerly belonging to a Jewish smith. These entries record earlier business succession within a reconstruction of the prewar town. They provide no basis for assigning either transition to a Holocaust confiscation. Their place in this history is the documented Jewish ownership and labor that later town accounts can otherwise lose.

Comparing the plan with the 1942 households

Buchaveckas's census chapter and the owner key can now be read together. The comparison produces a probable restaurant-operator connection and several specific open matches. The plan uses no street called Sinagogos; its synagogue cluster is placed on Nevėžio Street. A cadastral or street-renaming bridge is needed to connect the 1942 Sinagogos addresses to the individual plan objects. The municipal permits remain direct evidence of Lithuanian move-ins into former Jewish houses in autumn 1941.[53,54]

---

50 Budrytė, Raguvos planas, p. 608; Levickaitė and Samulionytė, Iš pasakojimų apie Raguvos miestelį, pp. 607–619.

51 Budrytė, Raguvos planas, p. 608; Levickaitė and Samulionytė, Iš pasakojimų apie Raguvos miestelį, pp. 607–619.

52 Budrytė, Raguvos planas, p. 608; Levickaitė and Samulionytė, Iš pasakojimų apie Raguvos miestelį, pp. 607–619.

1942 person or household	Prewar comparison in the key	Result
Pranas Družinskas, restaurant and shop, Laisvės Street	Družinskas and Sutkus rented the restaurant in Dvorskis's house, object 51	Probable operator connection; exact 1942 premises open
Elena Zdanavičienė, Laisvės Street 13	Zdanavičiūtė's tea room in Jewish house, object 18, Kėdainių Street	Open; surname forms, streets and business descriptions differ
Kazys Stakėnas, Sinagogos Street	Tanner Stakėnas at object 53 on Nevėžio Street; no given name in key	Open; surname and trade lead without an address bridge
Jonas Urbonas, Sinagogos Street	No matching named owner or tenant in the numbered key	Open
Marijona Dovicionienė, Sinagogos Street	No matching named owner or tenant in the numbered key	Open
Jonas Miliškevičius, Sinagogos Street	No matching named owner or tenant in the numbered key	Open
Viktorija Baltakienė, Sinagogos Street 16	Plan object 16 is Kuncė's shop on Kėdainių Street	Open; equal numbers identify different systems
Augustina Lisauskienė, Sinagogos Street 18	Plan object 18 is a Jewish house on Kėdainių Street	Open; equal numbers identify different systems

The match to test for Jonas Urbonas also reaches the killing-ground property record. Bubnys cites a J. Urbonas interrogation dated 29 November 1949 concerning the collection and sale of murdered Jews' belongings. Jonas Urbonas appears as a 1942 Sinagogos Street household head. The shared initial and surname are an identity lead; the interrogation's biographical details must determine whether these are the same man.[55,56]

The plan and census together change the scale of the dispossession account. They identify Jewish buildings and businesses before 1941, municipal permission to occupy former Jewish homes after the murders, and named people in the town's later occupancy record. VLE's town sentence leaves this material inheritance out along with the Lithuanian formations that killed the community.

53 Samavičius, ed., Raguva, pp. 283–286, 313, 340, 357, 524.

54 Budrytė, Raguvos planas, p. 608; Levickaitė and Samulionytė, Iš pasakojimų apie Raguvos miestelį, pp. 607–619.

55 Bubnys, Police battalions, pp. 84–87.

56 Samavičius, ed., Raguva, pp. 283–286, 313, 340, 357, 524.

LGGRTC publishes insurgent biographies

In 2024 LGGRTC published Tadas Jaskelevičius's 424-page book on the June uprising in the Krekenava, Naujamiestis, Raguva and Ramygala townships. Its official promotional summary emphasizes the uprising, the insurgents' later lives, Soviet persecution of them and their families, their social composition and brief biographies. The public summary says nothing about Jews.[57]

That summary is itself a public representation by the state's genocide research center. It selects the questions through which readers are invited to understand the armed movement. The Raguva township's own report had paired Jews with communists and celebrated cleansing the district. Rosin described the local organization's murders. The published summary foregrounds the insurgents' biographies without confronting those Jewish victims.

The Raguva auxiliary-police roster in appendix 7, page 378, of Jaskelevičius's 2024 book has not yet been obtained; this report will be updated with its names when it becomes available.

LGGRTC should obtain and produce the complete June township report and the Dzvonkus, Leipus, Bikėnas, Strauka, Urbonas and Radzevičius records used in the battalion history. It should explain the named units' acts against Jews, their command relationships, the property chain and the pages on which its Raguva book addresses those subjects. This is the historical work required to connect the state's insurgent biographies to the Jewish community those armed bodies encountered.

Distortion through omission

IHRA's working definition treats efforts to excuse or minimize Holocaust elements, including collaborators, as distortion. Its 2021 Understanding Holocaust Distortion discusses the omission of local collaborators when a narrative presents the Holocaust solely through Nazi German responsibility. My supplement applied that interpretive framework to the effect of VLE's Raguva wording.[58]

The historical contradiction here is specific. The encyclopedia names the authority that ordered murder and removes the Lithuanian implementation documented by other state and scholarly sources. It leaves the reader without the local murderous organization, the Lithuanian ghetto guard, the battalion escort and Lithuanian shooters. A sentence can acknowledge that Jews died while concealing the structure of responsibility for their deaths.

German responsibility remains explicit throughout this account. German Security Police and SD personnel directed operations, selected Lithuanian shooters and participated in the firing. The distortion lies in replacing the whole documented operation with only its German ordering authority. Naming the Lithuanian men and formations restores a part of the crime that the state's own records preserve.

I examined the wider pattern in The Germans Called Them Lithuanians. Lithuania Will Not. Raguva and Pajuostė provide a concrete instance: the German perpetrator named Lithuanian cooperation; the

---

57 LGGRTC, Tadas Jaskelevičius, 1941 m. Birželio sukilimas Panevėžio apskrities Krekenavos, Naujamiesčio, Raguvos ir Ramygalos valsčiuose (2024), ISBN 9786098298512; appendix 7, p. 378, identified in the table of contents; official publisher summary, Naujas leidinys, and published table of contents. This comparison concerns the public summary.

58 IHRA, Working Definition of Holocaust Denial and Distortion (2013); Understanding Holocaust Distortion: Contexts, Influences and Examples (2021), pp. 7–8. Publication year confirmed by IHRA's announcement of its launch at the 8 November 2021 webinar. Interpretive standard applied in the author's supplementary submission of 17 October 2026.

modern Lithuanian heritage register names the battalion; the national encyclopedia's town page leaves the executioners out.

The people whose names remain

A Raguva prewar-residence search in Yad Vashem's Central Database of Shoah Victims' Names returned 105 records, including name variants, repeated documentation, survivors and entries whose fate is unstated. The count is a database result, not a count of distinct murdered people. A preliminary selection of records explicitly marked murdered appears below, each linked to its source.[59]

Fruma Melamed, born in Raguva in 1940, was the daughter of Moshe Yitzkhak and Khana. Her aunt Sara Eliash Gen submitted the Page of Testimony. Yad Vashem records her murder in Panevėžys. The child has a name, parents and a surviving relative who remembered her. She belongs in a town history otherwise reduced to an approximate population and a regional total.

Rabbi Yisrael Mel appears in Yad Vashem record 15239454 as a murdered community rabbi whose prewar home was Raguva. The record names his father as Yitzkhak and his wife as Eiga Mikhla, née Teitz. Its source is collection O.41.3, names of Holocaust victims found in religious books held by the National Library of Israel; the family informant is Mordekhai Pinkhas Teitz. The record identifies his family and murdered status. Rosin supplies the account of Lithuanian responsibility for his murder.[60]

The database also identifies Sonia Guttmann Galant as alive after the war and gives Raguva as her prewar home. Her record names Menahem Monesh and Tzipa Khaia as her parents. Other Raguva search results identify Sara Gen/Eliash and Yaakov Gen as survivors or alive postwar. These records restore survivors to the community's named history.

Name in the record	Birth year	Yad Vashem record
Binjamin Shachman	1895	Record 933143
Shulamit Shachman	—	Record 8915626
Liba Shachman	—	Record 8915625
Mordekhai Eliezer Gen	1891	Record 787192
Ycchak Moshe Melamed	1906	Record 763129
Smuel Kulber / Kolber	1915	Record 661279
Muise Perez Kulber / Kolber	1890	Record 661278
Icchak Kulber / Kolber	1913	Record 659071

59 Yad Vashem Central Database of Shoah Victims' Names, prewar-residence query Raguva with YV synonyms, 1 November 2026: 105 records. Table entries preserve their record IDs and source labels; repeated Chana/Khana Melamed 1908 entry consolidated in this preliminary selection. Individual summary records: Fruma Melamed 14891077 and Sonia Guttmann Galant 16816957. The 105 records have not been fully deduplicated. Rabbi Yisrael Mel, record 15239454, collection O.41.3, checked 1 November 2026.

60 Yad Vashem, prewar Raguva names query, 1 November 2026; individual records linked in the table.

Name in the record	Birth year	Yad Vashem record
Zalmen Levin	1912	Record 638060
Zalman Bar / Baras	1911	Record 5642787
Doba Lipshitz	—	Record 5627658
Chana Narwitz	1898	Record 544501
Khana / Chana Melamed	1908	Record 5258529
Khana Ita Remigolski	1918	Record 517038
Cipa Haja Guttmann	1875	Record 494012
Yisrael Yitzkhak Bloch	1886	Record 418850
Chava Baraitie / Ber	1904	Record 374432
Sara Baraite / Ber	1915	Record 374428
Risa Gen	1920	Record 343180
Doba Eljas	1920	Record 323697
Volf Zeev Gen	—	Record 1998489
Menahem Monesh Guttman	1875	Record 1685770
Mendel Lion Leizer Narvitz	1928	Record 1678180
Marjasa Shachman	1895	Record 1657312
Rivka Lubenshtein	—	Record 15239516
Yekhiel Lubenshtein	—	Record 15239461
Eiga Mikhla Mel	—	Record 15239459
Yisrael Mel	—	Record 15239454
Fruma Melamed	1940	Record 14891077

The list is preliminary and deliberately source-linked. It names documented murdered Jews associated with Raguva; the individual records do not all identify the same killing place. Fruma's record, the regional histories and the massacre sources should be read together without assigning every listed person to a particular pit or date.

A community before its destruction

Raguva, Rogeve in Yiddish and Ragovo in Russian, stood on the Nevėžis and the road between Panevėžys and Ukmergė. Rosin traces Jewish settlement to the seventeenth century and notes that Karaite families also lived there. He describes a cemetery that served Jews from Panevėžys before that city had its own burial ground.[61]

61 Rosin, Raguva, Pinkas Hakehillot Lita, pp. 628–631; Preserving Our Litvak Heritage, pp. 142–151.

The older figures preserve several kinds of record. The 1766 figure of 1,187 concerns Jewish poll-tax payers, whose territorial scope has not been established. The Museum gives 178 Jews in 1776, while VLE records 155 in 1784. The heritage assessment extracts preserved in my supplement give 14 Catholic and eight Jewish homesteads in the late eighteenth century and a 1790 count of 206 Christians and 118 Jews.[62]

Rosin gives 852 Jews in 1847. In 1897 the 1,223 Jews formed approximately 69 percent of the town; in 1923 the 593 Jews formed approximately 58 percent. Around 1940–1941 the community numbered approximately 500. These figures show the scale of the population the killings removed: Jews had constituted a majority of Raguva's inhabitants in the two cited census years.

The wooden synagogue and the brick beit midrash were centers of communal life. The rabbis included Binyamin Rabinovitz, Mordechai Rabinovitz, Shneor-Zalman Hirshovitz and Moshe-Mishel-Shemuel Shapira, who served from 1887 until his death in 1933. Israel Mel was the last rabbi. The synagogue remains carry heritage code 4430. The community also produced emigrant connections to Palestine, the United States and South Africa, including Esther Barsel, photographer Leon Levson and scholar Michael Higer.[63,64]

Russian military authorities expelled Raguva's Jews in May 1915. Rosin places the order on the eve of Shavuot and says the Jews had 24 hours to leave. He estimates that only half returned after the war. They rebuilt homes, commerce and community institutions after that forced displacement.

A nine-member communal committee elected in 1919 functioned until Jewish autonomy ended in 1925. The Tarbut Hebrew school, founded in 1925, taught approximately 100 children. Two libraries initially served different cultural constituencies; one later library held approximately 600 Hebrew and Yiddish books. Ezra, Gemilut Hesed and Linat Zedek organized welfare, alongside study societies, lectures, theater and Zionist youth movements including Gordonia and Dror.

The community also faced Lithuanian antisemitic violence before the German occupation. Rosin describes pogroms in 1927 and 1939, with mobs attacking Jews in streets and homes. The Jewish fire brigade defended the community. He reports economic damage from the merchants' association Verslas and its campaign against buying from Jews. These episodes belong in the history of persecution preceding 1941, rather than disappearing behind the occupation's starting date.[65]

The town monograph preserves the school's people as well as its buildings. Samavičius dates the Jewish elementary school's establishment to 1 November 1919 and its first classes to 14 November, in five rooms rented in Abel Rieznikov's house. The heads listed in its table are Šeinė Gutmanaitė, Geimanas Šachno, Faiba Šapiro, Abraomas Žybucas, Irša Hameris, Chanovičius Zalmanas, Chonė Leizerovičiūtė and Zelmanas Gefenas. The chapter dates Gefenas's headship to 1938–1941 and the

62 RAG-005-S1, Annex A, preserved heritage assessment extracts; cemetery 20646, 9685 m², registration 2015, more than 200 stones and 1948 Soviet soldiers' burial site. ESJF, Raguva Jewish Cemetery survey. Historical variations: 1897 total 1763 (Pinkas) or 1762 (Rosin/VLE); 1859 total 465 is inconsistent with the earlier Jewish count; beit midrash 1864 (Museum) or late 19th century (Pinkas); carved ark assigned to different buildings; telephones 56 or 16 in 1939, with two Jewish subscribers in both accounts; mills are differently dated enumerations.

63 Vilna Gaon Jewish History Museum, Raguva.

64 ESJF, Raguva Jewish Cemetery; supplementary heritage assessment, Annex A.

65 Rosin, Raguva, Pinkas Hakehillot Lita, pp. 628–631; Preserving Our Litvak Heritage, pp. 142–151.

school’s closure to summer 1941. These are named educators connected to Raguva; the chapter does not establish each person’s wartime fate.[66]

Other teachers named in the chapter are Jochelis Vakeris, Leibas Hešelsonas, Irša Bunas, Pesė Levinaitė, Judelis Joselevičius, Motelis Golbickis, Bušmicas and Milšteinaitė; religious teachers include Rabbi Chaimas Milšteinas, Mozė Leibzonas and Joffė Pinchus. Its school foundation date differs from Rosin’s 1925 Tarbut date, and its class statistics describe a smaller enrollment than his approximately 100 pupils. The institutional identities and dates should remain attributed to their sources. Bieliauskienė’s neighboring chapter also names leather-workshop proprietor Faivlas Framas and Raguva writers or scholars Jehuša Pelovičius, Michalas Higeris, Henechas Šteinas and Eliezeris Heimanas. Their lives restore a community history beyond a death toll.[67]

Soviet rule in 1940–1941 nationalized Jewish businesses, closed Hebrew education and dissolved Zionist organizations. The later German occupation and Lithuanian participation in murder destroyed the people themselves. Keeping that sequence in the town history records what different authorities did to the same community.

What neighbors remembered hearing

Anelė Vosyliūtė’s Iš Raguvos apylinkių žmonių gyvenimo istorijų preserves Juostininkai residents’ recollections of their Jewish neighbors. One woman recalled a settlement area beyond the Mileriai called žydmiestis, Jewish shops and land. She remembered visiting Jewish acquaintances in Raguva when reports of shootings had already reached them. A Jewish woman called her inside and asked what was being heard about the Jews. The neighbor recalled hearing that people were being shot and thrown into a pit.[68]

Another Juostininkai resident recalled his Jewish neighbor Šleima Kutnikas, who had rented a five-hectare farm from Pūkus in 1930. He remembered Kutnikas’s widow and four sons, one of whom had served in Lithuania’s army. His account describes one family member being taken away by Germans at the beginning of the occupation and the others later wearing yellow stars before they too were taken. Their livestock remained. A Raguvėlė woman recalled Mauša’s wife asking her mother to take valuables, staying for several nights and finally leaving; the Jewish couple were taken away and did not return.[69]

These are retrospective recollections of neighbors’ knowledge, fear and loss. They preserve what local people remembered hearing while Jews were still alive and asking what would happen to them. The memory of shops, visits, loans, gifts and livestock left behind connects the victims to the social and material life that continued after their removal.

The cemetery and the inheritance of absence

Raguva’s old Jewish cemetery, heritage code 20646, occupies 9,685 square meters. The heritage assessment extracts in my supplement record more than 200 gravestones and overturned and smashed

66 Samavičius, ed., Raguva, pp. 283–286, 313, 340, 357, 524.

67 Samavičius, ed., Raguva, pp. 283–286, 313, 340, 357, 524.

68 Anelė Vosyliūtė, Iš Raguvos apylinkių žmonių gyvenimo istorijų, in Raguva (2001), chapter beginning p. 744, subsection Prisiminimai apie kitataučius, pp. 766–767. Retrospective Juostininkai and Raguvėlė recollections; the chapter does not name these individual speakers in this subsection.

69 Vosyliūtė, Iš Raguvos apylinkių žmonių gyvenimo istorijų, pp. 766–767.

monuments. In 1948 the authorities established a Soviet soldiers' burial ground on part of the Jewish cemetery. ESJF's survey records more than 200 stones or fragments and readable dates from 1845 to 1939.[70]

The cemetery preserves names of earlier generations after the community's murder ended its ordinary care. The surviving synagogue structure, cemetery and streets are physical parts of a Jewish town. A history that lists heritage objects without the community's destruction leaves visitors without an explanation of why those objects stand apart from the people who built and maintained them.

Rosin reproduces memorial captions describing German–Lithuanian fascists and Nazis with their helpers. The state register records an older Russian-language inscription referring to fascist bandits and distinguishes older and later memorial objects. Those differing descriptions should be identified by monument and date. The current register's historical account already names Lithuanian formations; that perpetrator history belongs beside the physical memorial.

The synagogue plaque and the square's partisan stone

Rita Karpavičienė's account records two Jewish-community memorial initiatives in October 1991: a plaque on the former synagogue and a memorial stone in the restored old Jewish cemetery. The initiative came from the Panevėžys Jewish community. The synagogue was then an RBD building; the monograph's abbreviations identify RBD as Raguvos baldų dirbtuvės, the Raguva furniture workshops.[71]

The same printed page records the local Christian Democrats' initiative for a stone in the town square where dead partisans' bodies had been displayed. Dean K. Baronas consecrated it on 2 November 1995. Its inscription commemorates the desecration of the bodies of partisans who fought for Lithuania's freedom in 1945–1952. S. Baltušnikienė and P. Šileika are named as especially active in the work.

The comparison is concrete: the central square received a partisan stone; the Jewish community initiated the plaque on its former sacred building and the stone in its cemetery. The Jewish inhabitants who had constituted the town's majority in earlier censuses had been murdered, while their synagogue served another use. Their descendants and surviving community undertook the work of marking that absence. A town account that honors the postwar dead also owes its readers the names, property and destruction of the Jewish community.[72]

Panevėžys District Municipality's March 2025 account of a schoolchildren's history walk lists visits to the former synagogue, Jewish cemetery and the partisan stone in St. Florian's Square. The sites are within the town's public educational route. The question is what account of persecution, dispossession and murder accompanies them.[73]

---

70 ESJF, Raguva Jewish Cemetery; supplementary heritage assessment, Annex A.

71 Rita Karpavičienė, Atgimimas Raguvoje, in Raguva (2001), pp. 585–591, at p. 590. Jewish-community plaque and cemetery stone: October 1991; partisan-square stone consecration: 2 November 1995. RBD is expanded as Raguvos baldų dirbtuvės in the book's abbreviations.

72 Karpavičienė, Atgimimas Raguvoje, p. 590.

73 Panevėžys District Municipality, Lietuvos nepriklausomybės atkūrimo dienai paminėti – istorinės atminties žygis Raguvoje (March 2025); published heritage list, 2 priedas Nekilnojamosios kultūros vertybės, item 132, p. 9: synagogue remains, code 4430, registered, Nevėžio Street 9; item 133 identifies the Jewish cemetery and Soviet-war-burial complex, code 37964.

The municipality's published heritage list identifies the synagogue building remains at Nevėžio Street 9, code 4430, as a registered heritage object. Budrytė's plan distinguishes the wooden synagogue, object 55, from the brick synagogue, object 61. Salvijus Kulevičius's Lietuvos Malūnai study identifies the surviving Maušiukas mill's Jewish owners in interwar records, including Kovalskis and Levinas, and explains its name through Mauša. That study, updated in 2019, gives no heritage code for the mill. The dated entry establishes the ownership history, rather than a present-day legal finding about protection or signage.[74,75]

Raguva's surviving synagogue was already a furniture works when the Jewish community placed its memorial plaque there in 1991. Today, Raguvos Baldai lists its factory at Nevėžio Street 9, the registered synagogue's address. KAMĖ's own corporate history identifies Raguvos baldų dirbtuvės as the furniture enterprise founded in Raguva in 1990 and renamed Raguvos baldai ir Ko in 2002. The book documents the furniture use in 1991, and the company identifies its factory address today; these sources do not provide the property's title history.[76]

My Garrenbloom family in Raguva

My family's Raguva connection reaches across the cemetery and the house to which my grandmother returned. Moshe Aryeh Lieb, who died on 23 May 1901, was buried in Raguva. His daughter Esther Lieb married Rabbi Moses Garrenblum, also called Moishe Garenbloom, whom my genealogy also records as buried there. Their Raguva house became a refuge for children returning from displacement.[77]

Their children included John Elchanan Chona Garrenblum, born in Raguva on 15 October 1872; Bryna Garrenblum, born there about 1875; Sarah Lea Garrenblum, later Arensohn or Arenson, born there about 1884; and Sonia Garrenblum, later Levin, born there about 1895. My family notes also place Abraham Garrenblum and my great-grandmother Sire Elke Garnblium, called Sirella, among the children who grew up in the house. Esther Lieb belongs to this household history as their mother.

My genealogy identifies Bryna and another daughter, Lube Garrenblum, as Jews murdered in the Holocaust. Bryna later lived in Panevėžys. The family record supplies no precise place or date for their murders, and Lube's entry supplies no separate Raguva residence. Their relationship to the family remains part of this history, with those biographical particulars distinguished from a claim that both died at Pajuostė.

---

74 Panevėžys District Municipality, Nekilnojamosios kultūros vertybės, p. 9, items 132–133.

75 Salvijus Kulevičius, Raguva, Lietuvos Malūnai, updated 27 December 2019, mill history and metadata. Interwar owner variants are attributed there to directories and archival statistics; its record supplies no heritage code. A dated research entry, not a current ownership or protection certificate.

76 Raguvos Baldai, Kontaktai, current factory address Nevėžio Street 9; KAMĖ, Apie mus, corporate history: Raguvos baldų dirbtuvės founded in 1990, renamed Raguvos baldai ir Ko in 2002. Both websites accessed 1 November 2026.

77 Grant Arthur Gochin, 107 Years Late for Dinner (2022), and family genealogy, Ancestors of Bertha (Bee) Lee Arenson (export 1 November 2026), pp. 1–4; return questionnaire LCVA 402/10/43, l. 351, No 18353. Genealogy's narrative calls Sarah's husband Abraham; spouse entry calls him Samuel Arensohn. That identity discrepancy remains unresolved. Photograph and translations do not independently establish every genealogical date. Yad Vashem Braina Liunienė 15191437, personal identity-card documentation, 1910–1934; the record is an identity lead, not a confirmed family match or a death record.

My grandmother Bertha (Bee) Lee Arenson was born Brokhe Leia Novosedz in Biržai in 1911. Her brother Morris Charles Arenson, born Moshe Chaim Novosedz, is recorded as born in Raguva on 16 May 1912. After the children's parents, Iankel Ber Novosedz and Sire Elke, died in Ukraine, their aunt Sonia cared for them. Sonia, her husband Joseph Levin and the children lived in the old Garrenbloom house in Raguva. Sonia and Joseph's daughter Esther later became Esther Barsel.

The return questionnaire, LCVA 402/10/43, leaf 351, number 18353, records Sheine Garenbliumyte, the children Brokhe and Moisejus Novosedz, and Feiga, also called Feyga. The family reconstruction identifies Feiga as the children's step-grandmother. It records Kharkov, travel through Obeliai and Raguva as the intended destination. It also records a house. The family reconstruction identifies Sheine as Sonia. A Yad Vashem personal-document record for Braina Liunienė, from the Panevėžys identity-card papers of Chaimas Liunas and others, provides a further lead for Bryna's later life; its summary gives no fate, so it is not itself evidence of her murder.[78]

Sarah's family in South Africa arranged to bring Bee and Morris out of Lithuania in 1922. My family narrative names Abraham Arensohn as the man who traveled to Raguva to collect them. I told this story in 107 Years Late for Dinner. Their departure preserved a branch of the family before the later killers destroyed Raguva's Jewish community. I have replaced a family gravestone in the cemetery and installed a plaque about the Garrenbloom family.

What I put before VLE

My preserved prior submissions contain the original RAG-005 request and the extensive RAG-005-S1 supplement. The request went to VLE on 8 October 2026; the supplement followed on 17 October, with administrative forwarding on 19 October. LGGRTC registered its copy under 7R-1318.[79]

The supplement requested an immediate correction naming Lithuanian formations and their acts, a separate decision on additional register material, insertion of the Jewish population figures and a researched history of the community. It supplied Lithuanian and English replacement wording and asked eight specific source and editorial questions. Those texts are preserved below so the public can see what VLE was asked to decide.

Panevėžys NOW replied on 12 October to my separate heritage proposal. The reply described existing heritage work and a possible future guide. The Herder Institute scan request of 8 October concerned the 2001 monograph. These correspondence events form the notice record; they do not supply a historical finding about the shootings or a published correction to the encyclopedia.[80]

The contemporary omission is measurable against the material already provided. A reader can compare VLE's sentence with the named formations in the register, the battalion's published history, the June township account and the correction placed before the editors. The institutions hold or cite the evidence. The public text should name the actors and describe what they did.

---

78 Gochin, 107 Years Late for Dinner; Ancestors of Bertha (Bee) Lee Arenson, pp. 1–4.

79 Grant Arthur Gochin, Raguva prior submissions (October 2026). RAG-005, 8 October 2026; RAG-005-S1, 17 October 2026, principal replacement text and questions 3(a)–(h); LGGRTC acknowledgment 19 October 2026, registration 7 R-1318; Panevėžys NOW reply 12 October 2026; Herder scan request 8 October 2026. Signed originals remain in the preserved compilation. The historical-truth section here updates historical memory terminology without altering those originals.

80 Gochin, Raguva prior submissions, October 2026, signed originals.

Historical truth and reconciliation

Lithuania’s reconciliation with its murdered Jewish communities requires an account of persecution, dispossession and murder that identifies the responsible people and institutions. My family’s connection does not substitute for the evidence. It makes the loss personal while the documents establish the acts.

The work must preserve the names of Jews as people who lived in the town and the names of armed men as people whose conduct can be examined. It must follow the houses, the possessions, the guards and the weapons. Reconciliation cannot be built on silence, euphemism or displacement of responsibility. It begins with historical acknowledgment supported by the record.

Santrauka lietuviškai

Raguvos žydus persekiojo ir žudė vietiniai lietuvių ginkluoti veikėjai, o Pajuostėje žudynes vykdė vokiečių ir lietuvių daliniai. J. Rosino aprašytas vietinis būrys dalyvavo žudant Raguvos žydus. 1941 m. birželio valsčiaus pranešimas įvardija Raguvėlės, Traupio ir Raguvos sukilėlių vadus: Banionį, Petrą Vareiką, Antaną Kazlauską, Petrą Strolę, leitenantą Bikiną ir Petrą Skrebį. Dokumentas rodo jų vadovavimą ginkluotiems būriams ir vietinės administracijos vartotą antižydišką kalbą.

Panevėžio getą saugojo lietuvių policininkai ir 10-ojo bataliono kariai. Už išorinę apsaugą buvo atsakingas Jonas Daniūnas. A. Bubnys aprašo pagalbinės policijos dalyvavimą liepos 21 d. žudynėse, bataliono karių vykdytą žudynių vietos apsaugą rugpjūčio 4 d., atrinktų karių šaudymą rugpjūčio 11 d. ir konvojavimą bei šaudymą Pajuostėje rugpjūčio 23 d. Jägerio ataskaitoje nurodyta, kad žudikai nužudė 7 523 žydus: 1 312 vyrų, 4 602 moteris ir 1 609 vaikus. Tai regioninės operacijos, o ne atskiras Raguvos aukų skaičius.

Romaldas Samavičius įvardija okupacijos laikų Raguvos policijos viršininką P. Chmiliauską ir viršaitį J. Deveikį; Tadas Jaskelevičius – okupacijos pradžios pagalbinės policijos viršininką Petrą Andrašiūną. Bataliono vadovybės istorijoje A. Bubnys įvardija Bronių Kairiūną, Joną Jakubonį, Jurgį Juodėną, Joną (?) Matulį, Vladą Aižiną, Antaną Gelažėlą, Napoleoną (?) Černių, Praną Grinių, Petrą Genį ir Ernestą Bliudniką. Jų pareigos ir datos pateiktos pagrindiniame tekste.

USHMM enciklopedija nurodo, kad žydus iš Raguvos ir kitų miestelių į Pajuostę atvežė vežimais su turtu. Žudikai ir vietos gyventojai pasisavino arba pirko nužudytųjų daiktus. S. Buchaveckas dokumentuoja, kad į dalį buvusių žydų namų 1941 m. rudenį lietuviai persikėlė gavę valsčiaus savivaldybės leidimus. R. Samavičius nurodo, kad sinagogas perėmė savivaldybė, o žydų knygos ir kitas turtas atiteko vietos įstaigoms bei gyventojams.

VLE Raguvos straipsnyje nurodo nacių įsakymą, bet neįvardija dokumentuotų lietuvių vykdytojų. Toje pačioje pastraipoje vardais ir slapyvardžiais įvardijami trys pokario partizanų vadai. Petro Genio biografijoje pateikiami postai ir apdovanojimai, tačiau ne bataliono dalyvavimas žydų žudynėse. LGGRTC 2024 m. knygos viešoje anotacijoje pristatomi sukilėliai ir jų biografijos, o žydai neminimi.

2001 m. monografijoje paskelbtas Inos Budrytės planas ir jo paaiškinimai įvardija žydų namus, krautuves, malūnus, vaistinę, fotoateljė ir sinagogas. Plano objektų numeriai nėra namų adresai. Izraelio Hako atleidimas dėl jo žydų tautybės, savivaldybės leidimai apsigyventi buvusiuose žydų namuose ir vietinių gyventojų prisiminimai apie girdėtas žudynes dokumentuoja persekiojimą ir jo padarinius. 1991 m. Panevėžio žydų bendruomenė inicijavo atminimo lentą ant buvusios sinagogos ir akmenį kapinėse; 1995 m. miestelio aikštėje pašventintas akmuo partizanams.

Mano Garrenbloom giminė susijusi su Raguva. Šeimos namai, kapinės, sugrįžusių vaikų istorija ir išlikę vardai priklauso šio miestelio istorijai. Vardais susieti Yad Vashem įrašai grąžina į pasakojimą

nužudytus žmones ir išgyvenusius bendruomenės narius. Šaltinių datų skirtumai turi būti tiriami išsaugant aiškiai dokumentuotus lietuvių veiksmus.

The replacement text already filed

The following Lithuanian wording and English rendering reproduce the principal replacement proposed in RAG-005-S1. They preserve the submission's original mid-August chronology; the July transfer account discussed above is additional evidence requiring reconciliation.[81]

„1941 m. birželio pabaigoje Raguvoje gyveno apie 500 žydų. Žydų bendruomenių enciklopedijos Pinkas Hakehillot Lita ir to paties autoriaus J. Rosino duomenimis, vokiečių kariuomenei 1941 m. birželio 26 d. įžengus į Raguvą, joje jau veikė vietinė lietuvių organizacija, stojusi tarnauti vokiečių okupacinei valdžiai ir dalyvavusi žudant Raguvos žydus; pirmieji buvo suimti ir nužudyti jauni žydai ir asmenys, kaip nors susiję su sovietų valdžia. 1941 m. rugpjūčio viduryje likę Raguvos žydai – vyrai, moterys, seneliai ir vaikai – buvo perkelti į Panevėžio getą ir kartu su jo kaliniais bei kitų Panevėžio apskrities valsčių žydais nužudyti Pajuostės miške (vokiečių Einsatzkommando 3 ataskaitoje ir Kultūros vertybių registre didžiosios Pajuostės akcijos data – 1941 m. rugpjūčio 23 d.; Pinkas Hakehillot Lita ir J. Rosino duomenimis, Raguvos žydai nužudyti rugpjūčio 24–25 d.; šių datų santykis nenustatytas). Žudynės Pajuostės miške įvykdytos nacių Vokietijos okupacinės valdžios įsakymu; Kultūros vertybių registro duomenimis, tarp jų vykdytojų buvo J. Hamanno (Hamann) skrajojantis būrys, lietuvių policijos Panevėžio 10-ojo bataliono kareiviai ir vokiečių kareiviai; žydus į šaudymo vietą konvojavo 10-ojo bataliono kareiviai; registro ir istoriko A. Bubnio duomenimis, dalis vokiečių atrinktų lietuvių savisaugininkų vykdė egzekuciją."

English rendering: "At the end of June 1941 about 500 Jews lived in Raguva. According to the encyclopedia of Jewish communities Pinkas Hakehillot Lita and J. Rosin (the same author), when the German army entered Raguva on 26 June 1941, a local Lithuanian organisation was already active there that had placed itself at the service of the German occupation authorities and took part in killing the Jews of Raguva; the first to be arrested and murdered were young Jews and those linked in some way to the Soviet authorities. In mid-August 1941 the remaining Jews of Raguva – men, women, the elderly and children – were moved to the Panevėžys ghetto and murdered, together with its prisoners and the Jews of other rural districts of Panevėžys County, in the Pajuostė forest (in the report of the German Einsatzkommando 3 and in the Register of Cultural Property the date of the large Pajuostė action is 23 August 1941; according to Pinkas Hakehillot Lita and J. Rosin, the Jews of Raguva were murdered on 24–25 August; the relationship between these dates has not been established). The massacre in the Pajuostė forest was carried out on the order of the Nazi German occupation authorities; according to the Register of Cultural Property, its perpetrators included J. Hamann's flying squad, soldiers of the Lithuanian police Panevėžys 10th battalion and German soldiers; soldiers of the 10th battalion escorted the Jews to the shooting site; according to the register and the historian A. Bubnys, some of the Lithuanian self-defence men selected by the Germans carried out the execution."

The other decisions requested in the supplement

Item 1b asked for a separate decision on two further statements: the register also names members of the Panevėžys auxiliary police platoon among the perpetrators; and a participant cited in the register estimated approximately 70 battalion men and 30 Germans shooting. The separate treatment preserved

81 Gochin, Raguva prior submissions, October 2026, signed originals.

these propositions while requesting examination of their sources. The July platoon action and the final August action are distinct parts of the chronology.

Item 2(a) proposed adding that Jews numbered 1,223, or 69 percent, in 1897 and 593, or 58 percent, in 1923. Item 2(b) requested a full community history, including religious institutions, rabbis, the cemetery, schools, commerce, industry, the 1915 expulsion, autonomy, emigration, antisemitic attacks and destruction.

The supplement’s questions 3(a)–(h) asked VLE to establish:

(a) the name, affiliation, leaders and anti-Jewish acts of the local Lithuanian organization;

(b) the identities, numbers, dates, places, killers and graves of Jews murdered before transfer;

(c) who rounded up, guarded and escorted the Raguva Jews to Panevėžys;

(d) who took over and distributed their immovable and movable property;

(e) when, where and by whom Rabbi Israel Mel was murdered;

(f) the number of Raguva victims at Pajuostė, their murder date and the relation between the register’s auxiliary-platoon attribution and Bubnys’s account;

(g) a copy of the existing VLE scientific methodology for selecting and presenting information;

(h) the source-evaluation, corroboration and length requirements applied to town histories.

These questions remain a public record of what the supplement requested. The June report’s named commanders, the published survivor extract, the USHMM chapter and the names database now add substantive evidence to that record.