

**Bringing the Dark Past to Light**  
**The Reception of the Holocaust**  
**in Postcommunist Europe**

Edited and with an introduction by  
**John-Paul Himka** and **Joanna Beata Michlic**

University of Nebraska Press Lincoln & London

15. For example, J. Lejins, *Latvian-Jewish Relations* (Toronto: World Federation of Free Latvians and Latvian National Federation in Canada, 1975); Vilis Hazners, *Varmācības torni: atmiņas* (Lincoln: Vaidava, 1985).

16. Discussion forums on Russian and Latvian information portals: [www.delfi.lv](http://www.delfi.lv) (in Latvian), [www.rus.delfi.lv](http://www.rus.delfi.lv) (in Russian), and [www.dialogi.lv](http://www.dialogi.lv) (in both Latvian and Russian) (all accessed 4 December 2009).

17. Aija Kehere, *Kultūru daudzveidība un iecietība Latvijā* (Riga: SIA Artekoms, 2003).

18. The Soviet writer and composer Aleksandr Galich (Ginzburg), whose songs were officially forbidden, was forced to leave the country in 1974. Among his most popular songs on Jewish themes were “Tum Balalaika” and “The Ballad of Janusz Korczak.” Alexander Rosenbaum lives in Russia and is mainly popular as the composer of so-called criminal songs. A few of his songs composed in the 1980s, in particular the ballad “Babi Yar,” referred to the Second World War and the Holocaust.

19. In 2008 there were 10,138 in Latvia, according to the Latvian Statistical Bureau, <http://data.csb.gov.lv> (accessed 17 October 2008).

20. Among them are Artūrs Silgailis, *Latviešu Leģions* (Riga: A/S Preses Nama, 2006); and Visvaldis Lacis, *Latviešu Leģions patiesības gaismā* (Riga: Jumava, 2006).

21. Vita on [www.livejournal.com](http://www.livejournal.com) (accessed 17 May 2008) (translated from Russian). The words that are struck through were struck through also in the original blog.

22. Ada's personal blog on [www.livejournal.ru](http://www.livejournal.ru) (accessed 15 October 2008).

23. Sofia, interview with author, April 2003, Riga, in Russian.

24. Hanna, interview with author, June 2004, Riga, in Russian.

25. Riva, interview with author, June 2004, Riga, in Russian.

26. Khaya, interview with author, 1 June 2005, Boston, in Russian.

27. Iosif, interview with author, 26 April 2005, New Jersey, in Russian.

28. V.S., discussion with author, April 2008, Riga, in Russian.

## 11. Conflicting Memories

### *The Reception of the Holocaust in Lithuania*

The Shoah represents the bloodiest page in the history of modern Lithuania. The genocide of the Jews should thus logically occupy a central place in the memory of the nation's twentieth-century experience of wars and foreign occupations. Although perceptions of the Holocaust have changed considerably since the 1990s, the establishment of the Holocaust as a central memory has not yet happened. The history of the vanished Litvak world has evoked interest but has also presented Lithuanian society with controversies, some of which have resonated internationally. Lithuania's Holocaust is situated within a difficult conversation on the history of Jewish-Lithuanian relations and is closely linked to the broader transformation of historical memory of the post-Soviet era. Embedded within this setting are a number of issues: the context of wartime memory; conflicting postwar narratives concerning the Shoah; the emerging national conversation about the Holocaust since the late 1980s in both the academy and the public sphere; and the political dimensions, both domestic and international.

### **Lithuania's Jews: A Brief Historical Sketch**

The ancestors of the mostly Yiddish-speaking Litvaks hailed from Poland and Germany. While there is evidence of earlier Jewish settlement, the first known charters granting privileges were issued by Grand Duke Vytautas to the Jews of Trakai, Grodno, Brest, and Lutsk in 1388–89. There was a brief period of expulsion between 1495 and 1503, but by the mid-sixteenth century it is estimated that there were some 120,000 Jews in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the majority in what is today Ukraine and Belarus. Many Jews were killed or dis-

placed during the rebellion of the Cossack leader Bohdan Chmielnicki (Khmelnysky) and the Muscovite invasions of the mid-seventeenth century.

By the end of the eighteenth century an estimated 250,000 Jews lived in the Grand Duchy. The famous Gaon of Vilna, Rabbi Elijah ben Shlomo Zalman (1720–97), epitomized the high level of Litvak religious scholarship and culture. Historically, Lithuania's Jews constituted a legally defined estate. The social hierarchy of the various estates (ethnoreligious communities) was regulated by law and custom. Included within the Russian empire's Pale of Settlement after the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1795, the Jews found a commercial niche as both agents of the landowners and smalltime traders among the region's villagers.<sup>1</sup> Jews and their Gentile peasant neighbors interacted regularly in the economic sphere but for the most part were strangers culturally. During the later tsarist period, secular Jews and many educated Lithuanians tended to assimilate into one of the "high" cultures: Russian proved attractive to Jews, Polish to Lithuanians.

The 1897 imperial census counted nearly a million and a half Jews in the lands of the former Grand Duchy, less than a third of whom lived in the ethnic Lithuanian gubernias. At the turn of the century, Vilnius had 154,000 inhabitants, a Jewish plurality in the city of 40 percent. The conflict between the rational secularizing tendencies of the Haskala and Orthodox traditionalists, the latter's struggle against Hasidism, are major themes of nineteenth-century Jewish life; meanwhile, the emergence of the Bund and Zionism reflected the influence of socialism and secular nationalism. For its part, the newly assertive Lithuanian national movement exhibited secular and clerical anti-Semitic tendencies, exemplified respectively by Vincas Kudirka (1858–99) and Motiejus Valančius (1801–75), although there were also liberal and social democratic voices advocating tolerance, such as Gabrielė Petkevičaitė-Bitė (1861–1943) and Andrius Domaševičius (1865–1935). The emergence of a small but increasingly assertive Lithuanian-speaking business and professional class proved harbingers of future Lithuanian-Jewish economic rivalry.<sup>2</sup>

The emergence of an independent state (1918–40), in which the Lithuanian-speaking majority ruled the country for the first time

since the medieval period, revolutionized ethnic relations. Many Jewish leaders joined Lithuanians in building the new state, and more than two thousand Jews fought in the ranks of the national army during the independence wars of 1918–20. In August 1919 the Lithuanian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference proposed Jewish political and cultural autonomy, which, however, was short-lived: attacked by rightist parties as a "state within a state," it was finally abolished in 1926.<sup>3</sup> The government census of 1923 counted over 154,000 Jews in the republic, constituting 7 percent of the population, the largest national minority in Lithuania. During the dictatorship of Antanas Smetona (1927–40) the Jews were, with some exceptions, excluded from civil service and the officer corps but still maintained communal autonomy in religious and educational matters. In 1936 there were 108 elementary and some twenty Hebrew and Yiddish secondary schools. Before 1940 the government subsidized Jewish education and contributed to rabbinical salaries. The changing economy and the global depression led to the emigration of nearly fourteen thousand Lithuanian Jews between 1928 and 1939, mostly to South Africa and Palestine.

Between 1923 and 1936, ethnic Lithuanians increased their share of the country's commercial and retail sector from little more than one-eighth to 43 percent. The Lithuanian cooperative movement acquired an increasing share of the agricultural markets previously dominated by Jewish middlemen and merchants. However, Jews still owned a large share of the national economy: over 50 percent of small retail businesses in the late 1930s, about 20 percent of Lithuania's export trade, and 40 percent of the import sector. Jews remained well represented in the professions and the academy: in 1937 over 40 percent of the country's doctors were Jews. During 1935–36, reportedly, 486 out of 3,223 postsecondary students in Lithuania were Jews.<sup>4</sup>

The Jews of interwar Lithuania were predominantly Orthodox and Zionist, with a high degree of proficiency in Hebrew. A small but growing number of Jews came to prefer Lithuanian to Russian as a second language. Jewish cultural life was remarkably diverse, with five daily newspapers and numerous theatrical and sports associations. While there was a noticeable increase in anti-Semitic incidents during the 1930s, largely as a result of economic competition and the proximity of Nazi Germany, violent pogroms were rare. In the Polish-ruled

Vilnius region, the Jews suffered official discrimination but still managed to maintain a vigorous cultural life, including establishment of the world-famous VIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

Lithuania's recovery of Vilnius in October 1939, as well as a flood of refugees from Nazi-occupied Poland, increased the number of Jews under Lithuanian rule from about 160,000 (estimated in 1937) to nearly a quarter of a million. The Soviet occupation of June 1940 exacerbated already strained Lithuanian-Jewish relations, in part because the Soviet-installed Lithuanian Communist Party leadership and cadres included highly visible Jews, providing fertile soil for Judeo-Bolshevik mythology. The resulting intensification of anti-Semitic attitudes occurred despite the fact that the Soviets expropriated Jewish businesses and suppressed the community's cultural organizations.<sup>5</sup>

The outbreak of the Nazi-Soviet war on 22 June 1941 initiated the effective destruction of Lithuania's Jewish community. By the end of July as many as twenty thousand Jews may have been murdered in Lithuania, some in pogroms during the early days of the invasion. The majority, however, perished in mass shootings supervised by the German security police and carried out by German and local armed formations. The massacres reached their peak between mid-August and the end of October 1941. The notorious Einsatzkommando 3 organized the murder of the majority of Lithuania's Jews; on 1 December 1941 the unit's commander, ss colonel Karl Jäger, reported that over 137,000 people, mostly Jews, had been shot by his men and locally recruited auxiliaries. An estimated 125,000 of the victims were Jewish citizens of the Republic of Lithuania.<sup>6</sup>

After this initial phase of destruction, most of the survivors were herded into the ghettos of Vilnius, Kaunas, and Šiauliai where thousands were worked to death during the remainder of the Nazi occupation. Periodically, mass shootings, especially at the killing sites in Paneriai (Ponary) and the Ninth Fort in Kaunas, reduced the Jewish population further until the ghettos were finally liquidated in 1943 (Vilnius) and 1944 (Kaunas and Šiauliai). About twenty thousand Jews escaped eastward in June 1941, and another few thousand were rescued by local Gentiles, but over 90 percent of the Jewish community perished. More than two hundred thousand Jews were killed in Lithuania, including those from other European countries.

Following the reoccupation of Lithuania by Soviet forces in the summer of 1944, thousands of Jews returned, although the total number of Lithuanian Jews continued to decline. In 1970 there were some twenty-five thousand Jews in Lithuania, of whom about three-fourths lived in Vilnius, but less than half had Lithuanian roots. An estimated fifteen thousand to seventeen thousand Jews left Lithuania between 1959 and 1990; in 2009 the Jewish population in Lithuania was estimated at less than five thousand. In 1988 the Cultural Association of Lithuanian Jews was established and began publishing the newspaper *Lithuania's Jerusalem* in Yiddish, Lithuanian, and Russian. The revival of Jewish cultural life has, however, been hampered by continuing emigration.<sup>7</sup>

### **Lithuanian Jews and Holocaust Remembrance**

Commemoration of the Holocaust began in 1944 when the Lithuanian Jewish museum, the only such institution in the USSR, was founded by returning survivors who organized the first postwar exhibition: "The Brutal Destruction of the Jews during the German Occupation." However, in June 1949 the Soviet Lithuanian government's reorganization of cultural institutions effectively liquidated the museum. Consequently, in addition to the numerous local memorials commemorating the annihilation of "peaceful Soviet citizens," the more impressive Paneriai (Ponary) and Ninth Fort memorials provided the sole venues for at least a limited exploration of the Jewish specificity of the Nazi genocide.

The restoration of Lithuanian independence created the conditions for the 1991 reestablishment of the Jewish museum in Vilnius, formally rededicated as the Vilna Gaon State Jewish Museum in 1997. An exhibit featuring the Holocaust was opened in 1991, the first in the former Soviet Union. Other early exhibits of the museum included a memorial to the Lithuanian Righteous among the Nations in 1990, an exhibit on the Jews of Vabalninkas in 1992, as well as that of "Jews in the Struggle against Nazism." In cooperation with the Jewish community, the state museum has marked numerous Jewish cemeteries in Yiddish and Lithuanian. A new registry of Holocaust sites has been created, while new plaques and signs stressing the Jewish specificity of the Holocaust have been installed in many locales with the assistance

of the Jewish community and local governments.<sup>8</sup> A new monument next to the Paneriai Memorial Museum was donated by Holocaust survivor Yeshayahu Epstein.

Lithuania's most important center of Holocaust commemoration is the permanent Holocaust exhibit in the so-called Green House section of the Jewish museum in Vilnius. The main building of the Vilna Gaon State Jewish Museum also houses the Gallery of the Righteous. In September 1999 the Vilna Ghetto Posters exhibit traveled to the U.S. Congress where it was introduced in a program featuring speeches by Rep. Tomas Lantos and Stuart Eizenstat.<sup>9</sup> Another main function of the museum is the preservation of the Jewish cultural and religious heritage destroyed in the Shoah, including the commemoration of the Great Synagogue and the restoration of the Kalvariju synagogue with help from American-donated funds. Other exhibits included a history of Jewish Fighters for Lithuanian Independence (1918–20). The museum has published over thirty books, mainly in English, Russian, and Lithuanian.<sup>10</sup>

A long-sought goal of the Jewish community has been official commemorative recognition of the Holocaust, which was achieved in 1990 with the naming of 23 September as the Day of Commemoration of the Genocide of the Jews. Since 1994, this date, which marks the liquidation of the Vilnius ghetto in 1943, is solemnly remembered at the Paneriai (Ponary) Memorial with an annual service that has been attended by the head of state and other high officials. An awards ceremony at the presidential palace recognizes those who rescued Jews during the war.

### The Political Context of Wartime Remembrance

Conventional wisdom holds that the war in the East, the bloodiest conflict in history, differed dramatically from the Western front in terms of human cost, ideological fanaticism, and brutality. Lithuania's national communities have been emotionally committed to what are often irreconcilable Lithuanian, Russian, Polish, and Jewish versions of the war's meaning and impact. There are also generational and ideological divides. With the exception of the hard right, Lithuania's Western-oriented urban youth culture has tended, on the whole, toward a less nationalistic stance regarding the past and a less apolo-

getic view of crimes committed by indigenous groups. Older veterans who served in the Red Army and some of the rural populace mired in nostalgia for the Soviet period still find comfort in the narrative of the Great Patriotic War. In any case, analysis of the reception of the Holocaust in the Baltic states must take into consideration the violent period between 1940 and the early 1950s. Without this context, the conflicting narratives cannot be properly appreciated.

Most Lithuanians remember the 1940s quite differently from the "good war" narrative prevalent in the West, as exemplified, for example, in the recent emphasis on the heroic deeds of the "greatest generation" in the United States. For one, there are the chronological limits. The usual dates for the Second World War (1939–45) have little relevance to the experience of the majority population: demonstrably more ethnic Lithuanians were killed in the war's aftermath (1945–53) than during the six preceding years, and this brutal period has come to be reflected in the language itself by the term, *pokaris* (literally, "the after-war"). In some locales, total violent deaths after V-E Day exceeded those incurred during the Second World War. The Grand Alliance narrative, with its emphasis on the positive role of the Soviet Union, has little resonance in the Baltics, creating unique political difficulties when dealing with the historic context in which the Holocaust or, for that matter, any aspect of the war must be located.

As one example, in the spring of 2005 Baltic cultural and political elites argued over whether their presidents should accept Moscow's invitation to attend the sixtieth anniversary of the victory over fascism. The majority of the scholars of the Lithuanian History Institute urged President Valdas Adamkus to boycott the festivities. For its part, the Russian Foreign Ministry launched a public relations campaign questioning the very concept of the Soviet occupation of the Baltic states, while Russian president Vladimir Putin, on a visit to Slovakia, defended the necessity of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and the annexation of the Baltic states with the standard explanation of the Soviet Union as the "rejected suitor" during the British-French diplomatic initiatives of the summer of 1939. Unsurprisingly, Lithuania's ethnic minorities, a segment of the less-educated rural population trapped in nostalgia for the stability of the Soviet period, as well as businessmen tied to Russian markets, favored the trip to Mos-

cow; the better-educated and presumably more nationalistic indigenous urban populace and elites supported rejection.

The fact that foreign perspectives and imagery of World War II do not reflect the experience of most Lithuanians encourages a tendency to see the Holocaust as a Western obsession, making it difficult to appreciate the gravity of the Shoah and its centrality to the nation's history. Lithuania's confrontation with the Holocaust, as seen in the stance of the country's political elites and scholarly establishment, as well as the general public's understanding of the genocide of the Jews, is situated in and complicated by wartime memory, the Soviet legacy, as well as the realities of postindependence politics and international relations.

### General Trends in Lithuanian Historiography and Three Narratives of Old

Three views of Lithuania's Holocaust dominated until the late 1980s and are, to some extent, still relevant. Allowing for some simplification, they can be divided into the Soviet, Western, and Lithuanian perspectives. Soviet historical works emphasized the service of Lithuanian "bourgeois nationalism" to the Nazi cause, seeking to discredit both the anticommunist diaspora in the West and the postwar armed struggle against the Soviet Union. The anti-émigré propaganda peaked during the 1960s and 1970s with the campaign to "unmask" Lithuanian refugees and other displaced persons as Nazi war criminals hiding in the West, which coincided with high-profile trials of former police battalion members involved in mass shootings of the Jews.<sup>11</sup>

One aspect of this campaign was a limited recognition during the 1960s of the genocide of Lithuanian Jews, including the publication of a short history of resistance in the Kaunas ghetto as well as an account of Gentile rescuers. Memoir literature by some Jewish authors, including their wartime experiences, most notably that of Marija Ronikaitė of the Vilnius ghetto underground, appeared at the same time, but most of these sources were by party activists who dealt almost exclusively with communist themes.<sup>12</sup> Such publications, however, were exceptions that did not change the main thrust of the Soviet narrative on the Nazi occupation. In general, the Great Patriotic War was presented as a continuation of the heroic struggle, under Russian

leadership, of the many Soviet nations against the historic Teutonic aggressor. While some useful academic works on the German occupation were indeed published,<sup>13</sup> the Jewish specificity of the Holocaust was generally camouflaged as the murder of "peaceful Soviet citizens."

Many Lithuanians distrust the Kremlin's storyline of the heroic antifascist struggle and remain contemptuous toward its commemorative icons. As in some other regions of Eastern Europe, the narrative of the Red Army as liberator plays poorly. During the Putin era, a renewed emphasis on Baltic pro-Nazi collaboration has been evident, albeit minus the ponderous Soviet-Marxist terminology. One recent Russian collection of documents has insinuated that the independence movement of the late 1980s, Sąjūdis, could well nigh initiate another round of genocidal ethnic cleansing against the Russian minority and former communists.<sup>14</sup>

The Soviet version suffers both from its transparent political agenda and selectivity of documentation. An unfortunate side effect of the widespread allergy to the Soviet story is a knee-jerk rejection of even those elements that contain valuable historic insights, for example, the scale of Nazi atrocities. The Soviet system rigorously insulated Lithuanian society from cultural processes in the West, including the transformative narrative on the Holocaust. Thus, as a practical matter, the Soviet legacy left behind significant obstacles to an open-minded reception of the Holocaust in Lithuania.

For their part, Western accounts of Lithuania's wartime history focused on the fate of the Jews, which inevitably shone the spotlight on native collaboration in the Final Solution.<sup>15</sup> Until recently, Western academics paid little attention to the various national struggles and the Soviet occupations of 1939–41 as prelude to both the Holocaust and the interethnic conflicts of 1941–45 that devastated much of Eastern Europe.<sup>16</sup> A continuing problem of Western scholarship is the unfamiliarity of most non-Baltic researchers with the indigenous languages, which denies them two important sources: the mass of primary documents now available on the 1940–45 period and the numerous studies published in Baltic languages, especially since the mid-1990s.

Uninformed Western narratives can lead to confusion about the nature and extent of collaboration and even misstatements of fact.

Several examples will suffice here: Jews were dramatically overrepresented among the thirty-five thousand unfortunates deported by the Soviets in June 1941; the infamous pogrom leader Algirdas Klimaitis was the head of the “anti-Soviet partisans”; some hundred thousand anti-Soviet rebels participated in the uprising of 1941 that coincided with the German invasion. The last myth about the insurgency, depending on one’s perspective or prejudices, can be seen as evidence of either great patriotism (Lithuanian authors) or extensive collaboration (Jewish writers).<sup>17</sup> The actual number of insurgents was at least five times less.

The third narrative on the genocide emerged from within the post-war Lithuanian diaspora. Many Lithuanians, trapped between Stalin and Hitler, prayed that the war would end in a Soviet collapse followed by either a German defeat or Berlin’s rapprochement with the Western powers. The anticipated result was liberation of their homelands by the Americans or British and a return of the status quo ante. This fantasy, based on the experience of the Great War’s final stages, was the one illusion that gave comfort; in fact, only the Baltic refugees who fled west in the summer and fall of 1944 achieved this liberating dream of Western rescue.

The majority of Lithuanian émigrés could not accept the Western narrative of the war, including the enormous sacrifice of the Soviet people in the struggle against fascism, and many failed to fully appreciate Nazism’s genocidal nature. The diaspora proved largely immune to serious analysis of the Holocaust for at least four decades. The émigré story rested on an intensely anti-Soviet attitude and a denial of native participation in the murder of the Jews, accompanied at times by open or disguised anti-Semitism. However, Lithuanian nationalist Holocaust denial differs from that of the so-called revisionists of the Institute of Historical Review and other such organizations: it does not question the fact of the Holocaust, but rather, questions its manner, usually insisting that the native killers constituted but a “handful of rabble.”

Accustomed to a self-perception as victims, the older generation of exiles in particular reacted vehemently to any suggestion of Lithuanian guilt. A not untypical summary of the bloodiest period in the nation’s modern history is found in a brief historical overview published in the

United States in the early 1970s: “In June 1941 Hitler turned on Stalin and German armies attacked Russia. The Nazi armies marched through Lithuania and established a military occupation which lasted until 1944. During all this time the Lithuanians were again forced to feed the invaders. Thousands of Lithuanian young men were deported to Germany for forced labor. Many Lithuanian Jews were executed by the Nazi regime.”<sup>18</sup>

The émigré narrative resonated among anti-Soviet dissidents and has continued to enjoy an afterlife during the post-Soviet period. A minority of Lithuanian American liberals suggested that despite the manipulation of the Holocaust by the Soviet regime and others with political agendas, society needed to own up to an unpleasant past. This viewpoint was met with charges of pro-Soviet bias, if not downright treason to the cause of the nation’s freedom. The collaboration of Lithuanians in the genocide of the Jews proved the most contentious and sensitive issue of wartime history for the diaspora. Resistance to any suggestion of Lithuanian culpability for the Holocaust was further reinforced by the defensive reaction of many émigrés to the denaturalization and deportation cases against a number of displaced persons by the U.S. Justice Department’s Office of Special Investigations, which charged them with concealing their Nazi collaborationist past.

#### **Victims in Opposition: History, Politics, and Nationalism in the 1990s**

Despite their shortcomings, the conflicting histories of the war and the Holocaust served their respective constituencies in the public domain and in scholarly circles not only as providers of conventional interpretation but also as politically useful rhetorical devices. However, the turmoil of the late 1980s brought new elements that challenged these perspectives. Revelations concerning the atrocities of the Soviet occupations of 1940–41 and the postwar period have been characteristic features of Lithuanian public discourse since the late 1980s, thus undermining the legitimacy of Soviet rule. But this emphasis diverted attention from the genocide of the Jews, especially the question of Lithuanian collaboration in the Nazi campaign of extermination.

At first, the dismantling of official censorship during the late 1980s did not bode well for a new openness regarding the Holocaust. The initially positive international press coverage of Lithuania's independence movement reinforced a national self-image of heroes and martyrs. But the good feelings did not last. The popularity of Gorbachev's policies in the West, particularly within certain media and academic circles, soon led to charges that impatient Lithuanian nationalists were destabilizing the USSR and thus endangering perestroika and even world peace.<sup>19</sup>

As the narrative of secessionist radicalism gained ground, the history of Nazi collaboration reared its ugly head. The necessary reexamination of the past, however, was not always accompanied by deference to the facts and was sometimes marked by sensationalism. Lithuanian nationalism and the murder of Jews were essentially synonymous, explained two journalists in the *Los Angeles Times*, alluding to the "dark past" of supposed patriotic heroes, such as the pogrom instigator Klimaitis.<sup>20</sup> It was in this atmosphere that the rehabilitation controversy of September 1991 came as a rude shock to Lithuanian society, which was taken aback at the Western media's image of thousands of elderly former Nazi collaborators walking the streets of Vilnius.<sup>21</sup>

Holocaust history was thus embedded in a turbulent and politicized atmosphere, although in hindsight, the negative publicity had the beneficial effect of providing Lithuanians with a better understanding of how the Shoah was viewed in the West. Beginning in May 1990, public statements by the nation's leaders expressed regret at the participation of Lithuanians in the Holocaust, a process culminating in the 1995 visit of President Algirdas Brazauskas to Israel during which he publicly asked forgiveness for the actions of "those Lithuanians who mercilessly murdered, shot, deported and robbed Jews."<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, President Brazauskas's statement of regret evoked protest by outraged members of the Lithuanian intelligentsia, some of whom actually demanded that the Jews, in turn, apologize for crimes against the Lithuanian nation during the Soviet occupation. However, despite the initial predilection for evasion, underscored by the response to the Brazauskas apology, a growing number of Lithuanian scholars began to investigate the Holocaust on their own.

### Scholarship and Debate in the 1990s: Lithuanian-Jewish Relations as Changing Narratives

Since the restoration of independence a number of Lithuanian historians entered the field of Jewish and Holocaust studies, including younger researchers who began to reexamine questions that much of the previous generation had preferred to let rest. The beginnings were modest. In 1991 the first conference that included Jewish and Lithuanian historians was held in New York and was attended by two scholars who were to play an important role in expanding knowledge of the Holocaust in Lithuania: Egidijus Aleksandravičius of Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas and Alfonsas Eidintas of the Lithuanian Institute of History and later ambassador to Israel. In October 1993 a conference organized by the Vilna Gaon State Jewish Museum on the fiftieth anniversary of the destruction of the Vilnius ghetto provided an opportunity for Lithuanian and international scholars to publicly face the myriad issues of Jewish life and death in Lithuania. A bilingual publication of the conference included sharp exchanges and conflicting points of view.<sup>23</sup>

In January 1995 a young researcher at the Lithuanian History Institute in Vilnius defended a dissertation on the anti-Soviet Lithuanian underground of 1940–41 which included an evaluation of events surrounding the first weeks of the Nazi occupation.<sup>24</sup> Valentinas Brandišauskas punctured myths surrounding the anti-Soviet uprising of June 1941 and noted the anti-Semitic policies that the provisional government established in the summer of 1941. Virtually unnoticed outside Lithuania, this work, while modest in scope compared to studies that have appeared since, was a significant step. In September 1997 an academic conference on the history of the Jews and the Holocaust was held in the seaside resort in Nida, the first such gathering convened at the initiative of Lithuanians and including internationally recognized scholars Jonathan Steinberg, Ezra Mendelsohn, and Dina Porat. On 23 April 1999 a remarkable discussion on the Holocaust, which included politicians, historians, archival researchers, and jurists, took place in the Seimas, the Lithuanian parliament.<sup>25</sup> Serious Lithuanian-language scholarship on the Holocaust ceased to be a novelty.<sup>26</sup>

The conversation about the Shoah had a beneficial effect on the



study of Lithuanian-Jewish relations generally, as younger scholars in particular took an interest in the history of a vanished community: some studied Hebrew and Yiddish to better access the relevant sources. New works appeared on the anti-Judaic policies of the Catholic Church, the emergence of modern Lithuanian anti-Semitism, the development of Jewish-Lithuanian relations between the wars, and the social and political impact of the crises that led to foreign occupations in the 1940s.<sup>27</sup> The years of the First Republic (1918–40) came to be seen as a significant transformation: the first modern polity dominated by ethnic Lithuanians decisively impacted intercommunal relations, especially those between Lithuanians and Jews.

The late 1930s and particularly the first Soviet occupation of 1940–41, which immediately preceded the Nazi invasion, became the focus of considerable attention, but this latter period presented a conundrum. Inasmuch as the persistence of “Judeo-Bolshevik” stereotypes distracts from appreciating the gravity of the Holocaust, academically rigorous study that would demythologize the role of Jews in the demise and sovietization of independent Lithuania would seem essential if only as a credible counterpoint to the so-called theory of two genocides. This theory, which has gained traction among academics and the general public, posits that the collaboration of the Lithuanian rabble in the Nazi murder of the Jews was a regrettable but understandable response to the “genocide” perpetrated by Jewish collaborators during the first Soviet occupation.<sup>28</sup>

The discussion of “Jewish power” under the Soviets has at times taken a dangerous turn in the media and among literati. The accusation that most NKVD (Soviet secret police) torturers were Jews and similar canards in the anti-Semitic arsenal can be rejected outright. On the other hand, the percentage of Jews within the rather small Lithuanian Communist Party during the early months of the Soviet occupation was impressive. The documentary evidence can easily be manipulated to produce contradictory images. The malleable social and ethnic face of Lithuanian communism throughout the Stalinist period presents a constantly shifting mosaic; thus, selective statistical snapshots of the Lithuanian Communist Party can just as easily mislead as enlighten.<sup>29</sup> The problem of Jews and Soviet power in 1940–41, even when conducted in a scholarly setting, is bound to raise fears

that examining the ethnic conflicts of the first year of Soviet rule can serve as an apologia for Holocaust murderers. On the other hand, relegating the subject to the off-limits category simply raises suspicions about a cover-up of Soviet crimes, conveniently reinforcing the tendency to evade discussion of Lithuanian participation in the murders of the Jews. In any case, although only one factor among others, rage at Soviet crimes was an incentive for pro-German collaboration and even for adopting elements of National Socialism’s worldview, including the mythology of “Judeo-Bolshevism.” The collaboration of some Jews with Soviet power was not the cause of the Holocaust, but many perpetrators adopted it as their singular rationalization for participating in the genocide.<sup>30</sup> The issue has continued to reappear in the media and resonates among right-wing academics.<sup>31</sup>

The problem is made more difficult because Soviet rule is tied to the Lithuanian experience of the Nazi occupation in a number of ways both politically substantive and symbolic. The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and the subsequent period of Soviet-German cooperation, for instance, provided a mobilizing historic grievance for the Baltic independence movements, stunningly impressive in the “Baltic Way” of 23 August 1989, whose more than one million participants saw no sharp dividing line between Nazism and communism, between what happened during 1940–41 and what transpired after the German invasion. There are also potent symbols of contrast and connection. The crowds that threw flowers to invading soldiers represent archetypes: the images of Jews welcoming Soviet tanks in June 1940 or Lithuanians cheering the German cavalry a year later (as shown in film at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum). The pictures are ingrained in the memory banks of the older generation. Of course, however indelible as images, the “flower-throwing” themes do not shed much light on popular perceptions of occupiers since the context in which people welcome foreign invaders as liberators is far more complex than any photograph can convey. The connection between the two foreign occupations may provide opportunities for political manipulation, but there is no way to ignore a firmly rooted collective memory. Self-perception as victim and the stereotype of the Other as perpetrator are deeply ingrained within wartime memories.

### Confronting the Holocaust I: Institutions and Educational Instruments

It has been proposed that “the degree to which a particular country has made progress . . . in recognition of the Holocaust is also the degree to which that country has internalized modern European values” and that “understanding of the Holocaust serves as a barometer of the progress of civil society.” If true, then it would seem essential for the Shoah to become part of the national “historical imagination.”<sup>32</sup>

Whether for good or ill, the Baltic governments have become involved in Holocaust research. The difficulty of confronting the half-century of foreign domination, a past rife with charges and countercharges of mass crimes and collaboration, and the clueless speculation that marked much of the discourse about the murder of the Jews in the Baltic, created domestic and international political difficulties. In May 1998 the three Baltic presidents approved in principle the creation of international commissions to investigate the Soviet and Nazi occupations and publish their findings. The new body in Vilnius, with its rather cumbersome title of the International Commission for the Evaluation of the Crimes of the Nazi and Soviet Occupation Regimes in Lithuania (henceforth referred to as “the commission”),<sup>33</sup> was established by presidential decree on 7 September of that year. Emanuelis Zingeris, the only Jewish member of the Seimas, was named chairman of the group, which initially included Lithuanian, American, German, and Russian scholars and community leaders.

The commission was immediately attacked by Jewish survivors in Israel, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, as well as some Jews in the West as both an awkward and offensive conflation of Nazism and communism and a cynical “facade-painting” gambit intended to facilitate Lithuania’s political stature as a candidate for the European Union and NATO. Some Lithuanian émigrés, suspecting (correctly) that the commission would undertake an investigation of native collaboration in the Holocaust, charged that the president’s initiative was a Jewish-financed plot, or at best a sop to the West under American pressure. In fact, the third plenum meeting held on 29 August 1999 committed the commission, as both a practical matter and a point of principle, to handle research on the Nazi and Soviet periods separately by

creating two distinct working groups, in order “to clearly distinguish between the crimes committed by the two occupation regimes and to avoid superficial analogies during their analysis and evaluation.”<sup>34</sup> Following extensive negotiations, a preliminary working arrangement was initiated with representatives of Yad Vashem, with Drs. Yitzhak Arad and Dov Levin participating in the commission’s meetings and conferences from 2000 to 2005.

The commission’s Nazi crimes panel undertook a number of investigations: anti-Semitism during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (before June 1941), the mass murder of the Jews during the summer and fall of 1941 as well as the role of Lithuanian police battalions in the Holocaust, the looting of Jewish assets and property, the persecution and murder of the Gypsies, the mass murder of Soviet prisoners of war, and Nazi persecution and murder of non-Jews. Further research was to include the problems of forced labor, Lithuania’s ghettos, and other aspects of the German occupation.<sup>35</sup>

The work of the commission expanded to an outreach program of conferences and Holocaust education and commemoration, as well as development of school curricula on interethnic tolerance. Several international conferences have been convened, most notably “The Holocaust in Lithuania in the Focus of Modern History, Education and Justice,” in Vilnius on 23–25 September 2002, the largest such scholarly gathering ever held in the Baltic states, which included delegates and scholars from Israel (including the preeminent authority on the Holocaust, Yehuda Bauer), the United States, Germany, Russia, Ukraine, Poland, and other states. The commission has initiated a number of agreements with Lithuanian government agencies and higher educational institutions, including the military academies and police academies, to facilitate instructional programs on genocide.<sup>36</sup>

Another institution that has dealt with the Holocaust is the Genocide and Resistance Research Center of Lithuania. While some have criticized this government institution for focusing primarily on Soviet crimes and the postwar partisan struggle, the center has nonetheless published a number of studies on the Holocaust and sponsors a separate department to conduct Holocaust research. The center’s journal focuses mainly on the 1940–41 and postwar Soviet occupations but has also published a number of articles on Lithuanian police bat-

tations, the 1941 Holocaust in the provinces, and problems of Holocaust remembrance and memory.<sup>37</sup>

A continuous special program of publications and essay contests by middle and secondary schools, "The Jewish Neighbors of My Grandparents and Great-Grandparents," sponsored by the Remembrance House (Atminties namai) organization, seeks to involve students in researching the history of Jewish communities in their locales, including their fate in the Holocaust by interviewing their own relatives and other aging eyewitnesses.<sup>38</sup> In 2006 the Austrian Gedenkdienst volunteer program celebrated a decade of work with the State Jewish Museum, which included visiting Lithuanian schools for lectures and programs on tolerance, anti-Semitism, and the Holocaust.<sup>39</sup> For its part, the commission-sponsored National Holocaust Education Project involves a new generation of teachers, schoolchildren, students, and soldiers. In 2008 the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Anne Frank House, and the Vilnius Yiddish Institute developed a detailed three-step curriculum for secondary schools on the "History of the Jews and Anti-Semitism." Part of the curriculum is meant to deal with discrimination, racism, and anti-Semitism.<sup>40</sup>

The bilingual work of the subcommission on the Nazi occupation coincided with an increase in Lithuanian academic publications including translations of important foreign-language sources and studies.<sup>41</sup> Also appearing were more student dissertations and theses dedicated to the history of anti-Semitism during the interwar period, the role of anti-Semitic propaganda as an incitement during the Holocaust, and the role of Lithuanian collaboration.<sup>42</sup> In 1998 the Lithuanian Catholic Academy of Sciences published a volume of proceedings on the church and anti-Semitism, which included articles on Lithuania's Holocaust. A significant first step, the apologetic tone of some of the contributions nonetheless reflected the tense conversation that the Shoah tends to trigger in Lithuanian society at large.<sup>43</sup> In April 2000 the country's Catholic bishops' conference issued a public apology for those "children of the church who lacked charity towards the persecuted Jews, failed to undertake all possible means to defend them and especially lacked courage to influence those who assisted the

Nazis." The bishops acknowledged "past manifestations of anti-Semitism which burdened the memory of the Church."<sup>44</sup>

During the Soviet period, two films that referred to the Holocaust appeared: Raimundas Vabalas's *Žingsniai naktį* (Footsteps in the night) in 1962, which dealt with the inmates' escape from the Ninth Fort in Kaunas, and Almantas Grikevičius's *Ave vita* in 1969 chronicling anti-Nazi resistance. Characteristically, both films downplayed the Jewish background of the heroes.<sup>45</sup> While independent Lithuania's Ministry of Culture has sponsored publications memorializing the vanished world of Litvak culture, the Jewish experience, especially the Holocaust, has had some exposure in the public sphere of the arts. In 1990 Jonas Vaitkus directed the Lithuanian adaptation of Joshua Sobol's *Ghetto* at the State Academic Drama Theater in Vilnius. In 1994 producer and director Saulius Beržinis presented the documentary on Jewish Vilnius, *Goodbye, Jerusalem*, and produced another film in which he interviewed the aging participants in the massacres of 1941 in 2002. In 2005 director Audrius Juzėnas presented the film version of the Sobol drama. In November 2007 his *Ghetto* won the "Jewish Eye," the main prize in the feature film category, at the Fourth World Jewish Film Festival at Ashkelon. In April 1997 an international art festival commemorating the fifty-fifth anniversary of the Vilnius ghetto theater was held in Vilnius.<sup>46</sup> However, the theme of the Holocaust has not resonated in Lithuanian popular culture and the arts to the extent that it has in the West.

Until the late 1980s Lithuanian perception of the Holocaust, obscured as it was by Soviet mythology, émigré denial, and general indifference to the subject, continued to be hampered by anti-Semitic stereotypes and society's isolation from the West. Since then, at the official levels of government, church, and the academy, the struggle to confront the Holocaust has perceptibly turned the corner. Academic research, literature, and the arts have, to a degree, also reflected a new willingness to engage the Shoah. However, within the broader context of civil society and political life in general, accepting the Shoah as part of the historical imagination has proved more difficult.

An opinion survey conducted by the respected Vilmorus polling agency in 2000 found that when asked to evaluate twenty-five nationalities on a "like-dislike" scale, Lithuanians ranked Israelis (read: Jews)

as the second most disliked nationality (the Roma came in last). The results were striking: Poles, Czechs, and Hungarians showed relatively higher tolerance levels.<sup>47</sup> A report from 2006 found that between 1990 and 2005, the number of Lithuanians who asserted that they would not want to live next door to Jews rose from 18 percent to 31 percent.<sup>48</sup> One can assume that such attitudes are a stumbling block to society's acceptance of the Holocaust as part of the national history.

### **Confronting the Holocaust II: Wedge Politics, Society, and the Other**

Despite the official attachment to liberal democracy and tolerance, anti-Jewish prejudices still play well, noticeably during times of political turmoil. As the impeachment crisis of Rolandas Paksas intensified in 2003–4, the embattled president embarked on a divisive and populist campaign, sometimes accompanied on the stage by a uniformed neo-Nazi, Visvaldas Mažonas. Paksas attempted to rally his most important constituency: the mass of rural and small-town voters most affected by the wrenching economic transformation and vulnerable to xenophobic themes, including anti-Semitic allusions. At the same time, the nation's mass circulation daily *Respublika*, under the controversial publisher and editor Vitas Tomkus, published a special supplement that could easily have appeared in 1930s Germany, replete with anti-American canards, denouncing Jewish world domination and demonizing the gay community.<sup>49</sup> The Internet has allowed the extreme right access to public discourse in websites of the so-called Lithuanian National Front, the Lithuanian National Democratic Party, and skinhead organizations celebrating race. The skinhead metal group Diktatūra, which stresses the message of "Lithuania for Lithuanians," has found some following among the young. While non-European immigration is still a demographic sliver of the population, it has evoked an atavistic response in some quarters: in spring 2008 some Klaipeda foreign students, including two Africans, were assaulted by extremists in but one instance of increasingly brazen and violent behavior by fringe elements.

Although Paksas's removal in April 2004 eventually restored pro-Western Valdas Adamkus to the presidency, problems have continued. The most important points of conflict, aside from the protection

of the country's Jewish cultural and religious heritage, include restitution of communal property; the response, or lack thereof, by the authorities to continuing public expressions of anti-Semitism, made worse by the government's slack attitude toward extreme right-wing movements; and recent attempts by the courts to investigate alleged crimes committed by Soviet Jewish partisans during the war.

A crucial measure of a society's maturity is the degree of public intolerance for hate crimes and public incitement. In 2004 authorities took a lenient view of editor Vitas Tomkus's anti-Semitic and anti-gay ravings: prosecutors initially fined Tomkus three thousand litas, but the verdict was reversed on appeal.<sup>50</sup> On 11 March 2008, as part of the celebrations of the declaration to restore independence, several hundred right-wing extremists, including neo-Nazi skinheads, paraded in central Vilnius, shouting racist and anti-Semitic slogans. The government's response was tepid: the police took no action and the president's office waited ten days before denouncing the marchers. Even though Lithuanian law provides penalties for hate speech, the enforcement mechanism has been lax. Under pressure, the state has at times shown more of a spine. In the aftermath of the March 2008 fiasco, the government reacted swiftly when vandals defaced the Vilnius Jewish Center in August 2008.<sup>51</sup>

### **Lithuanians, Anti-Semitism, and Jewish Partisans:**

#### **History and the Politics of Divided Memories**

While editor Tomkus's hate speech and the neo-Nazi marchers attracted little attention from prosecutors, the same cannot be said of the elderly veterans of the antifascist resistance. In June 2007 the Lithuanian prosecutor's office requested Israeli cooperation in a war crimes investigation concerning the activities of Soviet Jewish partisans, escapees from the Vilnius ghetto, who had been active in eastern Lithuania. The subject of the investigation was Dr. Yitzhak Arad, former director of Yad Vashem, a noted authority on the history of the Holocaust in Lithuania and a member of the commission. The inquiry centered on the massacre of thirty-eight villagers in the hamlet of Kaniūkai (Koniuchy) by a Soviet partisan unit in January 1944.<sup>52</sup>

Not surprisingly, the inquest evoked strong foreign protests, outrage among Jews everywhere, even criticism from President Adam-

kus. The failure of the Lithuanian judiciary to press the investigation of pro-Nazi collaborators, as evidenced by the delayed proceeding against the former head of the Lithuanian security police in Vilnius, Aleksandras Lileikis, and others, gave rise to charges of hypocrisy concerning the motives behind the investigation of Jewish partisans. In one stroke, the prosecutor's office derailed the official research apparatus on Nazi war crimes. The Yad Vashem directorate protested the investigation of a "victim of Nazi oppression" and suspended Israeli participation in the commission. In solidarity with their Israeli colleague, the commission refused to convene any further meetings until the case was resolved.<sup>53</sup>

The Arad affair embodies the difficulties, distractions, and paradoxes that complicate the introduction of the Holocaust into Lithuania's historical imagination. The judiciary's clueless move provided much grist for speculation and conspiracy theories about motives, but it is clear that those encouraging the prosecution of Jewish partisans, as well as the anti-Semitic elements that exploited the situation, had chosen their moment well. Despite the damage to Lithuanian-Jewish relations and Lithuania's image abroad, any action by the president or prime minister to halt the investigations would be countered by charges of unconstitutional interference in judicial proceedings. More important politically and psychologically, the Arad controversy opened a wound at the most painful point of Lithuanian and Jewish historical imaginations, where divided wartime memories are at their most irreconcilable.

Outside Lithuania, the request to question Fania Brantsovskaya and Rochl Margolis, two elderly women survivors and former partisans, as witnesses in the Arad case came across as a cruel exercise in blaming the victims.<sup>54</sup> According to Efraim Zuroff of the Wiesenthal Center, the questioning of the former partisans amounted to a "deliberate campaign . . . to discredit the brave Jewish heroes of the anti-Nazi resistance and help deflect attention from the infinitely more numerous crimes by Lithuanians against Jews during the Holocaust."

In September 2008 the Lithuanian prosecutor's office reluctantly closed the case against Dr. Arad in a clumsily worded announcement, but this did little to mollify critics of "the latest campaign to prosecute Soviet anti-Nazi Jewish partisans."<sup>55</sup> The outside world and even some

Lithuanians viewed the entire case as a contemptible farce. Unwilling to judge Nazi collaborators, the judiciary was preparing a case against Arad, a teenage ghetto survivor who, faced with an existential choice, had fled to the forests and joined the battle against the fascists. And it was obvious that the scale of the killings at Kaniūkai paled in comparison to the Shoah. The Ministry of Justice stubbornly insisted that the investigation of partisan activities as potential "war crimes" rested on objective legal criteria that allow the prosecution of pro-Soviet occupiers and collaborators.

The major authors of the Jewish experience are former partisans whose work relies heavily on memoirs, testimonies, and secondary sources, including Yitzhak Arad, Isaac Kowalski, Lester Eckman, Chaim Lazar, Dov Levin, and others.<sup>56</sup> Numerous literary works of various genres as well as songs have been collected, resulting in impressive documentaries based on these materials. The literature has stressed the Jewishness of the fighters and the Zionist worldview of the movement as a whole. The perspective of Jewish heroes and victims differs radically from the collective memory of most ethnic Lithuanians (much less so from the narrative of the country's Russian minority). The history of the partisans has not resonated widely among scholars publishing in English, despite abundant memoirs and recent films, such as Edward Zwick's 2008 blockbuster film, *Defiance* (ironically, filmed in Lithuania).

The oral histories and memoirs of the former partisan fighters describe regions with divergent popular attitudes toward the Nazis and Soviets, as well as the starkly different wartime environments of Belarus and Lithuania. A closer study of the history of the armed struggle in eastern Lithuania, removed from political noise, reveals a past more nuanced and intractable than one would gather from the fierce rhetorical political battles it has engendered. The historical issue of partisan warfare is particularly vexing in terms of its psychological implications: in Lithuanian collective memory, the antifascist guerillas, whatever their ethnicity, cannot be easily unlinked from their connection to the Soviet cause. Naturally, given their uniquely desperate circumstances, the Jewish fighters can be exempted as a special case. But many Lithuanians cannot view Soviet partisan leaders as other than Stalinists who were, by official definition, "antifascists";

thus, the latter label does not necessarily evoke positive emotional connotations as it does in the West. During the war, the impoverished peasants of eastern Lithuania were inclined to resist forced requisitions regardless of the identity of the armed men and women seizing their food. To complicate matters, the communist-led partisans were in a fierce conflict not only with German forces and their collaborators, but also fought the Polish Home Army, an anti-Nazi resistance movement of an Allied government.

The perspective of most Lithuanian Jews, especially the elderly survivors, is understandably different and is inherent within the straightforward language of the contrasting narrative. On 1 September 2008 the heads of the Lithuanian Jewish community published an open letter to the “leaders of the Lithuanian state” expressing concern with regard to recent anti-Semitic manifestations, but reserving their strongest words on the “persecution of Jewish antifascist partisans.” “Does Lithuania recognize the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition during the Second World War? Does the Republic of Lithuania recognize the decisions of the Nuremberg trials?” the authors asked.<sup>57</sup> These rhetorical questions imply that Lithuanians should adopt the Western and Soviet narrative of the Grand Alliance; perhaps even that the crimes of a certain member of said coalition are beyond the pale. This perspective clashes with Lithuanian wartime memory and its many negative images of the Stalinist past or, for that matter, anything associated with the USSR.

### **Warring Narratives and Distractions**

The acrimony engendered by the Arad partisan case underlines the importance of understanding divided wartime memories and the manner in which they impact Lithuanian society’s ongoing struggle in understanding the Holocaust. One of the persistent themes that has gained new momentum is the rise of anti-Semitism, which, according to some, is now expressed in Lithuania by politicized attempts to equate Nazism with communism. As in the case with the establishment of the commission in 1998, charges of a false symmetry between Nazism and communism as an effort to conceal the scope and extent of Lithuanian criminality during the Holocaust have been raised again.

In May 2009 Dr. Dovid Katz of the Litvak Studies Institute in Vil-

nius published an attack on what he termed the official Lithuanian “genocide industry,” including the commission chaired by Lithuania’s best-known Jewish politician, which he claimed had the sole aim of “Holocaust obfuscation.” The major point of departure for the controversy was the so-called Prague Declaration of 3 June 2008 signed by Vaclav Havel, Vytautas Landsbergis, Emanuelis Zingeris, and a number of other Eastern European politicians and former dissidents. The declaration called on European institutions to evaluate and condemn the crimes of communism based on the Nuremberg trials model and to educate the public on the criminal natures of both Nazism and communism. Katz claimed that the purpose of placing an “equal sign” between the two systems was none other than a crafty attempt to obscure the collaboration of local populations in the Holocaust. Jewish Lithuanians who disagreed with Katz’s position were dismissed as obsequious “show Jews.” Efraim Zuroff also attacked the Prague Declaration in the *Jerusalem Post*, citing it as a threat to the “unique status” of the Shoah and warning against “a new and distorted World War II historical narrative.” Both authors claimed that Soviet crimes were not genocidal in nature.<sup>58</sup> However, their attack on conflating communism and Nazism made no mention of scholarly literature on the topic, nor did it explain why the historiography of comparative totalitarian systems was somehow suspect or illegitimate.

The explosive and politicized issue of the relationship of communism and Nazism has led to a bitter impasse on the international stage. The Bronze Soldier riots of April 2007 in Tallinn show that the memory wars can indeed turn fatal. In February 2009 the Russian Duma began considering legislation that would criminalize the questioning of the Soviet version of World War II; thus legal punch could be given to the twenty-eight-member Commission to Counteract Attempts at Falsifying History to Damage the Interests of Russia announced by President Dmitry Medvedev on 19 May 2009.<sup>59</sup> The debate took a nasty turn at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s Parliamentary Assembly in Vilnius in July 2009 when the Lithuanian delegation successfully proposed a resolution “On Divided Europe Reunited,” condemning both Stalinism and Nazism and designating 23 August as a “Europe-wide Day of Remembrance of the Victims of Stalinism and Nazism.” The Greek com-

munist representative, Costas Alissandrakis, ridiculed the notion of a Soviet occupation of Lithuania and termed any talk of Soviet mass deportations there as "folktales," prompting an angry retort and walk-out by the speaker of the Seimas, Arūnas Valinskas. The Russian delegation denounced the resolution and boycotted the vote while Russia's foreign ministry angrily denounced the vote as an insult.<sup>60</sup>

It is an inconvenient reality that the Western perspective of the Second World War remains largely irrelevant to most Lithuanians. While serious scholars have argued that Soviet communism was the lesser evil of the two totalitarian systems in question, doubtless true for Poles, Jews, Gypsies, and Western Europeans, it would hardly convince ethnic Lithuanians whose experience, both in terms of what they themselves lived through and the statistics of death, was quite different. Little is to be gained in challenging Baltic wartime memories that inform popular sentiment on the past. Addressing the genocide committed by the Nazis and their collaborators in Lithuania would likely be facilitated if the public perceives an approach to the wartime past that does not automatically treat all critical research on the Soviet role in the Eastern Front as a sacrilege.

### Prospects

While Lithuanian elites, the academy, and society have made progress in engaging the Holocaust, it is clear that much still remains to be done. The acceptance of the Holocaust into the nation's historical imagination requires a reorientation of national history to include three essential narrative elements: recognition of Jewish life and culture as intrinsic to Lithuania's past; the understanding, acceptance, and commemoration of the Shoah as a central event in the modern history of the country; and a thorough examination of the behavior of the Lithuanian people during the destruction of the Jews. None of this requires Lithuanians to reject their own historical experience or internalize narratives, such as the Soviet liberation story, which violate their collective memory and historical common sense. The struggle against anti-Semitism can easily coexist with legitimate judicial proceedings and historic research vis-à-vis Soviet war crimes as well as the acceptance of a complex past replete with contradictory memories of heroes and villains.

In addition to the question of enriching the past with new perspectives, there remains the problem of confronting those who trivialize genocide by treating it as a political tool, and the task of countering negative trends of racism, xenophobia, and Holocaust denial. Dealing with the fearmongering and demagoguery associated with issues of compensation and property rights will not be easy. In the end, the police and judiciary must deal with outbreaks of extremism, while economic development and inclusion in the transatlantic community would enable political and cultural elites to strengthen civil society. How this will all turn out is impossible to predict: by definition, societies in transition are moving targets. But one hopes that the journey toward understanding by what were once a few open minds will attract ever more travelers in a changing land.

### Notes

1. A useful brief survey in English is Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, "The Jews," in *The Peoples of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania*, ed. Grigorijus Potašenko (Vilnius: Aidai, 2002), 57–72. A more extensive and updated review is Solomonas Atamukas, *Lietuvos žydų kelias nuo XIV a iki XXI a pradžios* (Vilnius: alma littera, 2007), 21–44. The newest study in Lithuania is Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė and Larisa Lempert, eds., *Žydai Lietuvoje: istorija, kultura, paveldas* (Vilnius: R. Paknys, 2009).

2. See Atamukas, *Lietuvos žydų kelias*, 44–123.

3. See Šarūnas Liekis, *A State within a State? Jewish Autonomy in Lithuania 1918–1925* (Vilnius: Versus Aureus, 2003).

4. Saulius Sužiedėlis, "The Historical Sources for Anti-Semitism in Lithuania and Jewish-Lithuanian Relations during the 1930s," in *The Vanished World of Lithuanian Jews*, ed. Alvydas Nikžentaitis et al. (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004), 125–26.

5. Saulius Sužiedėlis, "Foreign Saviors, Native Disciples: Collaboration in Lithuania, 1940–1945," in *Collaboration and Resistance during the Holocaust: Belarus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania*, ed. David Gaunt, Paul A. Levine, and Laura Palosuo (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2004), 327ff.

6. Christoph Dieckmann and Saulius Sužiedėlis, *Lietuvos žydų persekiojimas ir masinės žudynės 1941 m vasarą ir rudenį* (Vilnius: margi raštai, 2006), 170–77.

7. A comprehensive overview of Jewish life in Lithuania since World War II is in Atamukas, *Lietuvos žydų kelias*, 293–410.

8. See the listing in Josifas Levinsonas, comp., *Skausmo knyga: The Book of Sorrow* (Vilnius: Vaga, 1997).

9. Emanuelis Zingeris, comp., *Vilna Ghetto Posters: Jewish Spiritual Resistance* (Vilnius: Vilna Gaon Jewish Museum, 1999).

10. For a brief history and more information on the Jewish Museum see the institution's website: <http://www.jmuseum.lt> (accessed 30 November 2009).

11. See the "Faktai kaltina" (Facts accuse) series of mini-studies and English-language propaganda publications, as well as more substantial documentary studies such as Eusiejus Rozauskas, ed., *Nacionalistų talka hitlerininkams* (Vilnius: Mintis, 1970). The best example in English stressing the services of the "Nazi fifth column" during the German occupation is Eusiejus Rozauskas et al., eds., *Documents Accuse* (Vilnius: Gintaras, 1970).

12. The more significant publications of the 1960s are listed in Vytautas Toleikis, "Repress, Reassess, Remember: Jewish Heritage in Lithuania," *Eurozine*, 27 November 2008, 2, <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2008-11-27-toleikis-en.html> (accessed 30 November 2009).

13. For example, see Boleslovas Baranauskas and Eusiejus Rozauskas, eds., *Masinės žudynės Lietuvoje: dokumentų rinkinys 1* (Vilnius: Mintis, 1965), and Juozas Bulavas, *Vokiškųjų fašistų okupacinis Lietuvos valdymas 1941–1944 m* (Vilnius: LTSR Mokslų Akademija, 1969).

14. *The Tragedy of Lithuania, 1941–1944: New Documents on Crimes of Lithuanian Collaborators during the Second World War* (Moscow: Aleksei Yakovlev, 2008). Despite the title, this latter collection contains few documents that have not been previously published in Soviet-era compendiums.

15. For example, Raul Hilberg's seminal work, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York: Quadrangle, 1961) and other scholarly accounts that followed. Among more popular surveys, Lucy Dawidowicz's general indictment in *The War against the Jews, 1933–1945* (New York: Bantam, 1975), 541, is not untypical: "[t]he Baltic and Ukrainian populations [our emphasis] collaborated voluntarily with the Germans in murdering the Jews."

16. An exception is Timothy Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), and his recent *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin* (New York: Basic Books, 2010).

17. The number of June 1941 deportees was about eighteen thousand. Klimaitis's extraordinary promotion began as Raul Hilberg's misreading of a German document in his *Destruction of the European Jews* (New York: Quadrangle, 1961), 203. It is probably from here that Sol Littman in *War Criminal on Trial: The Rauca Case* (Toronto: Lester and Orpen Dennys, 1983), 42, promoted Klimaitis to the head of the rebel anti-Soviet Lithuanian provisional government. In fact, Klimaitis was a small-time journalist and killer shunned by even pro-Nazi Lithuanian elements. On the numbers of insurgents, cf. Sara Shner-Neshamit, "Lithuanian-Jewish Relations during World War II: History and Rhetoric," in *Bitter Legacy: Confronting the Holocaust in the USSR*, ed. Zvi Gitelman (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 170, and Valentinas Brandišauskas, *Siekiiai atkurti Lietuvos valstybingumą (1940 06–1941 09)* (Vilnius: Valstybinis leidybos centras, 1996).

18. Joseph B. Končius, *History of Lithuania* (Chicago: Lithuanian-American Community, n.d.), 131.

19. Alex A. Vardamis, "Those Impatient Lithuanian Nationalists," *Chicago Tribune*, 3 April 1990; cf. John B. Oakes, "Mr. Bush, Lean on the Lithuanians," *New York Times*, 21 April 1990.

20. Benjamin Frankel and Brian D. Kux, "Recalling the Dark Past of Lithuanian Nationalism," *Los Angeles Times*, 29 April 1990. For Klimaitis, see note 17 above. Cf. Paul Greenberg, "Rush to Vengeance?" *Washington Times*, 13 April 1990.

21. See Steven Kinzer, "Lithuania Starts to Wipe Out Convictions for War Crimes," *New York Times*, 5 September 1991; Jonathan Alter and Michael Meyer, "An Unpardonable Amnesty," *Newsweek*, 16 September 1991. Cf. the more subdued tone in Marvin Howe's editorial in the *New York Times*, 17 November 1991.

22. As quoted in Adolfas Eidintas, *Žydai, lietuviai ir holokaustas* (Vilnius: Vaga, 2002), 402.

23. Emanuelis Zingeris, comp., *Atminties dienos: The Days of Memory* (Vilnius: baltos lankos, 1995).

24. Published in Valentinas Brandišauskas, *Siekiiai*. For purposes of disclosure: Saulius Sužiedėlis was the chair of Dr. Brandišauskas's dissertation committee.

25. *Lietuvių-žydų santykiai: Istoriniai, teisiniai ir politiniai aspektai: Stenograma* (Vilnius: LRS, 1999). A record of this session held on 23 April 1999 is available also at <http://www.genocid.lt/GRTD/Konferencijos/lietuvi.htm> (accessed 1 December 2009).

26. For an overview of Lithuanian historiography on the Holocaust before 2003, see Liudas Truska, "Litauische Historiographie über den Holocaust in Litauen," in *Holocaust in Litauen: Krieg, Judenmorde und Kollaboration im Jahre 1941*, ed. Vincas Bartusevičius, Joachim Tauber, and Wolfram Wette (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2003), 262–76.

27. On the emergence of modern Lithuanian anti-Semitism, see Darius Staliūnas and Vladas Sirutavičius, eds., *Žydu klausimas Lietuvoje (XIX a vidury)* (Vilnius: LII, 2004); cf. the collection edited by the same authors, *Kai ksenofobija virsta prievarta: lietuvių ir žydų santykių dinamika XIX a—XX a pirmojoje pusėje* (Vilnius: LII, 2005), and their *Žydai Lietuvos ekonominėje-socialinėje struktūroje: tarp tarpininko ir konkurento* (Vilnius: LII, 2006). See also Jonas Boruta, "Katalikų bažnyčia ir lietuvių-žydų santykiai XIX–XX a," in *Metraštis* (Lietuvių Katalikų Mokslo Akademija), 14, ed. Vacys Milius (Vilnius: Katalikų Akademija, 1999), 1–23; cf. Vygantas Vareikis, "Tarp Valančiaus ir Kudirkos: žydų ir lietuvių santykiai katalikiškosios kultūros kontekste," in *Metraštis*, 81–82; see also Vygandas Vareikis and Liudas Truska, *Holokausto prielaidos: Antisemitizmas Lietuvoje XIX a antroji pusė—1941 birželis* (Vilnius: margi raštai, 2004). On the development of Jewish-Lithuanian relations between the wars, see Genovaitė Gustaitė, "Vyskupas Jurgis Matulaitis ir žydai Vilniaus vyskupijoje 1918–1925," in *Lietuvių Katalikų Mokslo Akademija: Metraštis*, XIV, 105–13; Sužiedėlis, "The Historical



Sources of Antisemitism in Lithuania and Jewish-Lithuanian Relations during the 1930s," in *The Vanished World of Lithuanian Jews*, ed. Alvydas Nikžentaitis et al. (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004), 119–54; Raimundas Valkauskas, "Žydų tautinės autonomijos klausimas Lietuvoje," in *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 3 (1996): 64–71; also the essay by Šarūnas Liekis, "Žydai: 'kaimynai' ar 'svetimieji'? Etninių mažumų problematika Lietuvos istorijos moksle," *Genocidas ir rezistencija* 2, no. 12 (2002): 114–20. Cf. Eglė Bendikaitė, "Dvi ideologijos B vienas judėjimas: sionistinis socializmas nepriklausomoje Lietuvoje," in *Darbai ir dienos: Lietuvos tautinės mažumos: lenkai, rusai, Žydai* 34 (2003): 255–71.

28. The idea is summarized in an anti-Semitic tract by the prominent writer Jonas Mikėlinas, "Teisė likti nesuprastam, arba Mes ir jie, jie ir mes," *Metai* 8–9 (1996): 126–63. A more documented study of the "two genocides" without the anti-Semitic baggage is Albinas Gražiūnas, *Lietuva dviejų okupacijų replėse 1940–1944* (Vilnius: Tėvynės sargas, 1996).

29. Several aspects are discussed in Dov Levin, "The Jews and the Election Campaigns in Lithuania 1940–1941," *Soviet Jewish Affairs* 10, no. 1 (1980): 39–51, and in his "The Jews in the Soviet Lithuanian Establishment 1940–1941," *Soviet Jewish Affairs* 10, no. 2 (1980): 21–37. The ethnic makeup of the Lithuanian Communist Party has now been substantially addressed by two studies: Liudas Truska, "Lietuvos valdžios įstaigų rusifikavimas 1940–1941 m.," in *Lietuvos gyventojų genocido ir rezistencijos tyrimo institutas: Darbai* 1 (1996): 3–28, and Nijolė Maslauskienė's two works, "Lietuvos komunistų tautinė ir socialinė sudėtis 1939 m pabaigoje C 1940 m rugsėjo mėn.," in *Genocidas ir rezistencija* 1, no. 5 (1999): 77–104, and "Lietuvos komunistų sudėtis 1940 spalio–1941 birželio mėn.," in *Genocidas ir rezistencija* 2, no. 6 (1999): 20–46.

30. Saulius Sužiedėlis, "Foreign Saviors," in *Collaboration and Resistance*, 329–48. Cf. Joachim Tauber, "14 Tage in June: Zur kollektiven Erinnerung von Litauen und Juden," in *Holocaust in Litauen*, 40–50, and Alfonsas Eidintas, "Das Stereotyp des 'jüdischen Kommunisten' in Litauen 1940–1941," in *Holocaust in Litauen*, 13–25.

31. See Dov Levin, "Lithuanian Attitudes towards the Jewish Minority in the Aftermath of the Holocaust: The Lithuanian Press, 1991–1992," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 7, no. 2 (1993): 247–62.

32. As cited from the Program of the National Convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS) in Philadelphia, 20–23 November 2008, session 6, "The Memory of the Holocaust in Post-Communist Europe: Similarities and Differences."

33. Recently the agency has styled itself in English with the shorter designation of the International Historical Commission without abandoning its formal title. In Lithuanian it is often referred to as *Istorinio teisingumo komisija*, which can translate as the Commission for Historical Justice, or also as the Commission for Historical Truth.

34. "Mission Statement of the Commission meeting of November 17, 1998,"

as well as the "Mission Statement of the meeting of March 2, 1999," Commission Archive (Vilnius). Also refer to the "Outline of the Work Plan" as cited at <http://www.komisija.lt/en/body.php?&m=1173548714> (accessed 1 December 2009).

35. The list of publications and ongoing research projects is available on the commission's website: <http://www.komisija.lt> (accessed 1 December 2009).

36. See International Commission for the Evaluation of the Crimes of the Nazi and Soviet Occupation Regimes in Lithuania, <http://www.komisija.lt/en/body.php?&m=1150465846> (accessed 1 December 2009).

37. See, for example, the Genocide and Resistance Research Center of Lithuania's bilingual edition of concentration camp memoirs, Dalija Epšteinaitė, ed., *Su adata sirdyje (With a Needle in the Heart)*, trans. Diana Bartkute-Barnard (Vilnius: Garnelis, 2003); the translation of Herman Kruk: Hermanas Krukas, *Paskutinės Lietuvos Jeruzalės dienos, Vilniaus geto ir sovoklų kronikos, 1939–1944* (Vilnius: LGGRT, 2004); Dalia Kuodytė and Rimantas Stankevičius, *Išgelbėję pasaulį: Žydų gelbėjimas Lietuvoje 1941–1944* (Vilnius: LGGRT, 2001), also in English with Alexander Fortescue, *Whoever Saves a Life: Rescue of Jews in Lithuania 1941–1944* (Vilnius: LGGRT, 2002). Between 1997 and 2008 two dozen articles in the center's journal, *Genocidas ir rezistencija*, have dealt with the Jews and the Nazi occupation, but this constitutes only about a fifth of the periodical's studies.

38. Linas Vildžiūnas, comp., *Mano senelių ir prosenelių kaimynai žydai* (Vilnius: Garnelis, 2002); Dalia Kuodytė, comp., *Prakalbinta praecitis* (Vilnius: LGGRT, 2002).

39. Vilna Gaon Jewish State Museum of Lithuania, *Newsletter Special Edition*, 15 November 2006.

40. *Europos žydų ir antisemitizmo istorija. Mokomoji priemonė. I dalis: Žydai Europoje iki 1945 m. II dalis: Antisemitizmas—nesibaigianti kova? III dalis: Mokomoji priemonė apie diskriminaciją, rasizmą ir antisemitizmą. III dalis: Išankstinė nuostata. Ka su ja daryti?* (Vilnius: OSCE/ODIHR, 2008).

41. Recent works on the Nazi occupation, in addition to the aforementioned work by Truska and Vareikis, *Antisemitizmas, Holokausto prielaidos*, include the aforementioned study of Christoph Dieckmann and Saulius Sužiedėlis, as well as Christoph Dieckmann, Vytautas Toleikis, and Rimantas Zizas, *Karo belaisvių ir civilių gyventojų žudynės Lietuvoje 1941–1944* (Vilnius: margi raštai, 2005). Two examples of foreign-language studies are the Lithuanian translations of Avraham Tory's *Surviving the Holocaust* and Raul Hilberg's *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders*.

42. One example is available in English: Rūta Puišytė, "Holocaust in Jurbarkas: The Mass Extermination of Jews of Jurbarkas in the Provinces of Lithuania during the German Nazi Occupation" (BA thesis, Vilnius University, 1977), edited and published as "Holokaustas Lietuvos provincijoje: Jurbarkas (1941 m birželis—1941 m rugsėjis)," *Lietuvos archyvai* 13 (1999): 77–85. The English text can also be found at <http://www.shtetlinks.jewishgen.org/yurburg/bathesis.html> (accessed 1 December 2009).

43. The proceedings of the conference and relevant published materials are in

- Lietuvių Katalikų mokslo akademija, *Metraštinis* 14 (Vilnius: Katalikų akademija, 1999), 11–329.
44. Published in Josifas Levinsonas, ed., *Šoa (Holokaustas) Lietuvoje: skaitiniai* (Vilnius: Valstybinis Vilniaus Gaono žydų muziejus, 2001), 231–32.
45. Toleikis, “Repress, Reassess, Remember,” 3.
46. As depicted in the issue of *Krantai*, 1997, 3, devoted to the festival.
47. CBOS, Polish Public Opinion, October 2000, 1, [http://cbos.pl/PL/publikacje/public\\_opinion/2000/10\\_2000.pdf](http://cbos.pl/PL/publikacje/public_opinion/2000/10_2000.pdf) (accessed 1 December 2009).
48. Union of Councils for Jews in the Former Soviet Union, “Study Finds Intolerance Rising in Lithuania,” 2 February 2006, <http://www.ucsj.org/news/study-finds-intolerance-rising-lithuania> (accessed 1 December 2009).
49. Vitas Tomkus, “12 laiškų kurie sukrėtė pasaulį,” *Respublika*, 18 February 2004. We thank colleagues at the Lithuanian History Institute who provided a copy of the publication.
50. See Leonidas Donskis, “Another Word for Uncertainty: Anti-Semitism in Modern Lithuania,” <http://edoc.hu-berlin.de/nordeuropaforum/2006-1/donskis-leonidas-7/PDF/donskis.pdf> (accessed 1 December 2009).
51. See the Anti-Defamation League press release of 12 August 2008, [http://www.adl.org/PresRele/ASInt\\_13/5343\\_13.htm](http://www.adl.org/PresRele/ASInt_13/5343_13.htm) (accessed 1 December 2009).
52. A preliminary outline of the Kaniūkai incident is in Rimantas Zizas, “Žudynių Kaniūkuose pėdsakais,” *Genocidas ir rezistencija* 1, no. 11 (2002): 149–65. A comprehensive account is reported to be near completion. A punitive action against the local population, albeit on a much smaller scale, is described in Arad’s memoir. See Yitzhak Arad, *The Partisan: From the Valley of Death to Mount Zion* (New York: Holocaust Library, 1979), 158.
53. Shalev to Zingeris, 5 September 2007; Zingeris to Shalev, 28 September 2007 (letters from Sužiedėlis personal archive). However, the commission’s educational and commemorative activities in fostering Holocaust awareness have continued.
54. Danielle Singer, “Lithuanian Accuses Holocaust Survivors of War Crimes,” *Jerusalem Post*, 29 May 2008, 7; Andrew Baker, “Europe’s Shameful Honoring of Vilnius,” *Forward*, 26 June 2008; Adam Mullet, “Adamkus Forgives Germany for Nazi Occupation,” *Baltic Times*, 19 June–2 July 2008, 4; Dana Gloger, “The Holocaust Survivors Facing War-Crimes Trials,” *Jewish Chronicle* (London), 6 June 2006; Lana Gersten and Marc Perelman, “Tensions Mount over Lithuanian Probe,” *The Forward*, 3 July 2008; “Prosecution and Persecution: Lithuania Must Stop Blaming the Victims,” *Economist.com*, 21 August 2008, [http://www.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story\\_id=11958563&mode=comment&intent=read](http://www.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story_id=11958563&mode=comment&intent=read) (accessed 1 December 2009).
55. “Wiesenthal Center Protests Lithuanian Judicial Campaign to Discredit Jewish Heroes of anti-Nazi Resistance” (press release, 28 May 2008); “Wiesenthal Center: Closure of Fabricated Case against Dr. Arad” (press release, 25

September 2008) both at [http://www.operationlastchance.org/LITHUANIA\\_PR.htm](http://www.operationlastchance.org/LITHUANIA_PR.htm) (accessed 1 December 2009).

56. See United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Miles Lerman Center for the Study of Jewish Resistance, *Jewish Resistance: A Working Bibliography* (Washington DC: USHMM, Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, 1999), 34.
57. Letter of Simonas Alperavičius, the chairman of the Lithuanian Jewish Community, and Tobijas Jafetas, chairman of the Association of Former Ghetto and Concentration Camp Inmates, to Lithuania’s president, prime minister, and general procurator, 1 September 2008, “Lietuvos žydų bendruomenė išplatino viešą laišką Lietuvos valstybės vadovams,” <http://www.bernardinai.lt/index.php?url=articles/84192> (no longer accessible).
58. Dovid Katz, “Prague’s Declaration of Disgrace,” *Jewish Chronicle*, 22 May 2009, <http://www.thejc.com/comment/comment/prague%E2%80%99s-declaration-disgrace> (accessed 1 December 2009), and more extensively in *Irish Times*, 30 May 2009, “‘Genocide Industry’ Has Hidden Agenda,” <http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/opinion/2009/0530/1224247744866.html> (accessed 1 December 2009). Cf. Efraim Zuroff, “A Combined Day of Commemoration for the Victims of Nazism and Communism?” *Jerusalem Post*, 12 July 2009, <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1246443787714&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull> (accessed 1 December 2009). See the text of the Prague Declaration, <http://praguedeclaration.org/> (accessed 1 December 2009).
59. The decree of 19 May 2009, “Komissia po protivodeistviuu popytkam falsifikatsii istorii v usherb interesam Rossii,” <http://www.kremlin.ru/articles/216485.shtml> (accessed 1 December 2009). Cf. the 17 June 2009 letter of concern to President Medvedev by the American Historical Association, [http://www.historians.org/press/Medvedev\\_Letter\\_June\\_17\\_2009.pdf](http://www.historians.org/press/Medvedev_Letter_June_17_2009.pdf) (accessed 1 December 2009).
60. See “A. Valinksas pareikalavo, kad graikų komunistas atsiprašytų už lietuvių tautos įžeidimą,” *Lietuvos rytas*, 3 July 2009; also “Statement by Communist Members of the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE in Vilnius,” <http://inter.kke.gr/News/2009news/2009-07-parl-assembly/> (accessed 1 December 2009); also “OSCE Resolution Equating Stalinism and Nazism Enrages Russia,” *DW-Worldwide*, 9 July 2009, <http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,4468156,00.html> (accessed 1 December 2009).