

**THE ASSASSINATION
OF SYMON PETLIURA
AND THE TRIAL OF
SHOLEM SCHWARZBARD
1926–1927**

A Selection of Documents

Edited by David Engel

ARCHIV JÜDISCHER GESCHICHTE UND KULTUR Band 2



Archiv
jüdischer Geschichte
und Kultur

Archive of
Jewish History and Culture

Band/Volume 2

Im Auftrag
der Sächsischen Akademie
der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig

On behalf of the
Saxonian Academy of
Sciences and Humanities at Leipzig

herausgegeben/edited
von/by Dan Diner

Redaktion/editorial staff

Frauke von Rohden
Stefan Hofmann
Markus Kirchhoff
Ulrike Kramme

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

The Assassination of Symon Petliura
and the Trial of Scholem Schwarzbard
1926–1927

A Selection of Documents

Selected, translated, annotated, and introduced by
David Engel

The “Archive of Jewish History and Culture” is part of the research project “European Traditions – Encyclopedia of Jewish Cultures” at the Saxonian Academy of Sciences and Humanities at Leipzig. It is sponsored by the Academy program of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Free State of Saxony. The Academy program is coordinated by the Union of the German Academies of Sciences and Humanities.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data available online:
<https://dnb.de>

© 2016, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Theaterstraße 13, D-37073 Göttingen

Typesetting: Dörlemann Satz, Lemförde

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlage | www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com

ISSN 2566-6673

ISBN (Print) 978-3-525-31027-4

ISBN (PDF) 978-3-666-31027-0

<https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666310270>

This publication is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial – No Derivatives 4.0 International license, at DOI 10.13109/9783666310270. For a copy of this license go to <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. Any use in cases other than those permitted by this license requires the prior written permission from the publisher.

Contents

Abbreviations	6
I. Introduction	
1. The Events	7
2. French Contexts	10
3. Schwarzbard between Left and Right	15
4. International Implications	22
5. Petliura's Assassination and Ukrainian Politics	25
6. Shaping a Ukrainian Narrative	35
7. The Assassination and Trial in Jewish Politics:	
Historical Background	53
8. Defending Schwarzbard	72
9. Outcomes	89
10. On the Documents in this Edition	95
11. Acknowledgments	98
12. List of Documents	99
II. Documents	
Transcription Conventions	104
1. The Background	105
2. First Responses	151
3. Preparations, Negotiations, Confrontations	201
4. The Trial	343
5. Aftermath	407
Biographical Notes	445
Bibliography	453
Index	466

Abbreviations

AAIU	Archives de l'Alliance israélite universelle, Paris
AJA	American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati
AJC	Archives of the American Jewish Committee, Blaustein Library, New York
AJHS	American Jewish Historical Society, New York
AMAE	Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, Paris
AN	Archives Nationales, Paris
APP	Archives de la Préfecture de Police, Paris
CAHJP	Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People, Jerusalem
DAKO	State Archive of the Kiev Province, Kiev
HURI	Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, Cambridge, Mass.
LNA	Archives of the League of Nations, Geneva
NYPL	New York Public Library, New York
PRO	Public Record Office, London (National Archives of the United Kingdom)
TT	Trial Transcript (YIVO, RG85/486–502)
YIVO	Archives of the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, New York

I. Introduction

1. The Events

On 25 May 1926, at approximately 2:15 in the afternoon, on the corner of rue Racine and boulevard Saint-Michel in the Latin Quarter of Paris, a naturalized immigrant Jewish watchmaker of Ukrainian origin named Scholem Schwarzbard (1886–1938) shot and killed a prominent emigré Ukrainian journalist, poet, and political leader, Symon Vasylyovych Petliura (1879–1926). The assassin was immediately taken into custody and confessed to his crime. Indeed, he could hardly have done otherwise, for dozens of on-lookers had witnessed the deed. He expressed no remorse for his action, nor did he plead diminished capacity. Yet although at first glance his culpability appeared beyond doubt, the examining magistrate to whom the case was assigned investigated for a full seventeen months before binding the assassin over for trial.¹ And when the trial, which lasted for eight days, from 18 through 26 October 1927, came to a close, the French jury pronounced the defendant not guilty.²

1 In the system of criminal procedure in force in France at the time, the facts of a criminal case were determined in advance of trial by an examining magistrate (*juge d'instruction*). The examining magistrate was charged with gathering the available evidence; taking depositions from the defendant, from witnesses, and from others possessing knowledge potentially bearing on the case; and preparing a dossier of his findings for the presiding trial judge. The magistrate had the power to dismiss charges upon investigation. He was required to bind a defendant over for trial only if he believed sufficient evidence for conviction existed. See Roberto Ferrari, The Procedure in the “Cour d’Assises” of Paris, in: *Columbia Law Review* 18 (1918), 43–62, here 43f., 56f.

2 There are two full-length studies of the trial, one by a legal scholar, the other by a historian: Me’ir Kotik, *Mishpat Shvarzbard. Rezaḥ nakam al reka ha-pogromim be-Ukrainah* [The Schwarzbard Trial. A Revenge Murder against the Background of the Pogroms in Ukraine], Hadera 1972; Saul S. Friedman, *Pogromchik. The Assassination of Simon Petlura*, New York 1976. Selections from some of the testimonies offered at the trial were published by Schwarzbard’s chief defense counsel: Henry Torrès, *Le procès des pogromes. Plaidoirie. Suivie des témoignages*, Paris 1928. Partisans of the opposing sides published several pamphlets in the wake of the trial, describing

The assassination, the investigation, the trial, and the acquittal all exercised the hearts and the minds of diverse segments of European society. Their reverberations even echoed well beyond the European continent. One of France's most celebrated criminal attorneys, Henri Torrès (1891–1966), took up the assassin's defense, while another, César Campinchi (1882–1941), became one of his chief accusers. When the case finally came to court, upwards of 400 spectators packed the auditorium at the massive Palais de Justice on Paris's Ile de la Cité³ – a crowd so large and impassioned that the presiding judge, Georges Flory, requested additional police protection for the duration of the hearings.⁴ According to one eyewitness account the audience included “quite a large number of press correspondents from virtually every one of the world's major newspapers.”⁵ French envoys in distant lands reported keen interest in the proceedings and sharp reactions to the verdict.⁶

The events touched Jews and Ukrainians in particular, largely because of the identity of the victim. At the time of his death Petliura was arguably the best-known Ukrainian public figure beyond the borders of his homeland. A founding father of the short-lived Ukrainian National Republic (*Ukrains'ka Narodnia Respublika* – UNR), one of the losing contenders for hegemony in

it from their perspective. The most widely-circulated account by a Ukrainian was A[n]driy Yakovliv, *Paryz'ka trahediia*. 25 travnia 1926 roku [The Tragedy in Paris. 25 May 1926], Prague 1930. Among accounts by exponents of Schwarzbard's case are Zalman Rosenthal, *Der Shvartsbard-protses* [The Schwarzbard Trial], Paris 1927; Anonymous, *Procesul Schwartzbart. O dramă in fața istoriei. Adevărul asupra pogromurilor lui Petliura* [The Schwarzbard Trial. A Drama in the Face of History. The Truth about the Pogroms of Petliura], Bucharest 1927; Sh. Weiss, *Der shos oyf Petlyuran (Shvartsbard-protses)* [The Shot at Petliura (Schwarzbard Trial)], Warsaw 1933. For a contemporary Soviet interpretation, see Anonymous, *Protses Shvartsbarda v parizhskom sude* [The Schwarzbard Trial in the Parisian Court], Leningrad 1928. See also Serhii Lytvyn, *Symon Petliura u 1917–1926 rokach. Istoriografiia ta dzherela* [Symon Petliura in the Years 1917–1926. Historiography and Sources], Kiev 2000, 368–397.

- 3 Anonymous, France. Petlura Trial, in: *Time*. The Weekly Newsmagazine, 7 November 1927, 13–14 (Document 74).
- 4 Flory to Director of Judicial Police, 13 October 1927, APP, C.3.173. Cf. the list of the police guards assigned to the trial: Leroy, Principal Inspector, Judicial Police, “Rapport,” 18 October 1927, *ibid*.
- 5 Anonymous, *Der Shvartsbard-protses in Pariz* [The Schwarzbard-Trial in Paris], in: Haynt, 20 October 1927.
- 6 See, for example, J. Tripier, French chargé d'affaires, Warsaw, to French Foreign Minister, 2 November 1927 (no. 343: “Impression provoquée par le procès Schwarzbard”), AN, Ministère de la Justice, 1583A 1926 (Document 73).

Ukraine during the Russian civil war of 1917 to 1922, he had begun both his political and literary careers in the tsarist empire during the decade preceding the 1905 revolution, working within the framework of the Revolutionary Party of Ukraine (*Revoliutsiina Partiiia Ukrainy*). Arrested briefly in 1903 for his work on the party's behalf, he had edited several influential political and cultural journals in the Ukrainian and Russian languages between 1905 and 1917 and had published hundreds of articles and poems under various pseudonyms. In May 1917, following the overthrow of the tsarist regime, he had become a leading member of the Ukrainian Central Council (*Rada*), which proclaimed an independent Ukrainian state on 25 January 1918. Although forces loyal to the Central Council had initially been unable to assume power, by December 1918 a provisional government known as the Directory (*Dyrektoriia*) of the Ukrainian National Republic had asserted control of much of the country, and Petliura had been named commander-in-chief (*holovnyi otaman*) of the Directory's army. In February 1919 he had assumed the additional position of chairman of the Directory (*holova Dyrektorii*) – in effect Ukraine's head of government and head of state. Following the Bolshevik triumph in 1920 he had been forced into exile, first in Poland, then in Hungary, Austria, and Switzerland. In 1924 he had settled in a small apartment near the Sorbonne in Paris, where he had continued to work as an advocate for Ukrainian independence and as a promoter of Ukrainian literature and culture.⁷

The assassin did not possess Petliura's public stature, but he had become a familiar figure in some parts of the Jewish world even before he fired the shots that would, for a short while at least, make him a household name. Born in 1886 in Izmail, in the far southwestern reaches of present-day Ukraine, and raised in the smaller town of Balta, his biography resembled that of his victim at several points. Like Petliura, he had begun to engage in radical politics on the eve of the 1905 revolution and had served several months in a tsarist prison, in late 1905 and early 1906. His politics had eventually made him an exile. He had spent brief periods in Habsburg Czernowitz, Lemberg, Budapest, and Vienna as well as in several smaller towns before settling in Paris in 1910. Taking up residence in a working-class neighborhood in the

7 For a brief outline of Petliura's life see Oleh S. Pidhainy/Olexandra I. Pidhainy, *Symon Petlura. A Bibliography*, Toronto/New York 1977, 13–16. Among recent full-length biographical studies are Serhii Lytvyn, *Sud istorii. Symon Petliura i petliuriana* [The Court of History. Symon Petliura and the Petliura Movement], Kiev 2001; Volodymyr I. Serhiychuk, *Symon Petliura*, Kiev 2004; Boris Doroshenko-Tovmatskyi, *Symon Petliura. Zhyttia i diial'nist'* [The Life and Deeds of Symon Petliura], Kiev 2005. For biographical details as recorded by the Paris police following the assassination, see the report by Police Inspector B. S. Goret, 2 June 1926, APP, C.2.173 (Document 18).

French capital's 20th *arrondissement*, he had earned a living as a watchmaker while becoming a fixture in immigrant left-wing circles. He had also published poetry in Yiddish under the pseudonym *Baal-khaloymes* (Dreamer) and had written for Yiddish-language anarchist newspapers in London and New York. Thus Schwarzbard's name was already known in Yiddish literary circles when it hit the headlines in May 1926.⁸ It would soon become famous (or infamous) the world over.

2. French Contexts

No doubt the location of the murder magnified its impact. Indeed, in France the political repercussions of the case, both domestic and diplomatic, were profound. The assassination came at a time of deepening economic travail to which the country's political leadership seemed hard-pressed to respond. The left-wing coalition (the so-called *Cartel des gauches*) that had been swept into power in the parliamentary elections of May 1924 had produced six cabinets in the succeeding two years. The *Cartel* had been formed largely in order to calm public apprehensions over the financial consequences of France's occupation of Germany's Ruhr district, launched a year earlier by the center-right government of the *Bloc national* at the initiative of Premier Raymond Poincaré, but it had failed to do so. Instead, each successive cabinet had fallen after revelations of fiscal irregularities by *Cartel* leaders or after dismissal of the minister of finance. Finally, in July 1926, a scant eight weeks following Schwarzbard's coup, Poincaré was returned to the premiership without benefit of election.⁹ Economic troubles grew during the interval between the

8 See, for example, Avraham Revutsky, *Ver hot dershosen Petlyura? Di perzenlikhkayt fun Shvartsbardn* [Who Shot Petliura? The Personality of Schwarzbard], in: *Morgen zhurnal*, 26 May 1926. Additional biographical information is presented below, *passim*, as required by the narrative. Details of Schwarzbard's biography deemed significant by the police can be found in the report by Goret (full reference above, n. 7; Document 18). Following the trial Schwarzbard published two autobiographical volumes: *Sholem Shvartsbard, In krig – mit zikh aleyn* [At War with Myself], Chicago Ill. 1933; *idem, In'm loyf fun yorn* [Over the Years], Chicago Ill. 1934. Selections from these and other of his writings can be found in Shalom Shvartsbard, *Mémoires d'un anarchiste juif*, ed. by Michel Hermon, Paris 2010. As of 2013 no full-length biography had been published, although a comprehensive unpublished biography had been accepted as a doctoral dissertation: Kelly Johnson, *Sholem Schwarzbard. Biography of a Jewish Assassin*, unpublished PhD dissertation, Harvard University 2012.

9 List of cabinets in Vincent Adoumié, *De la république à l'État français 1918–1944*, Paris 2005, 217f. For overviews of the politics surrounding the rise and fall of the

deed and the trial, when unemployment in France more than doubled, from 245,000 to 510,000. A broad wave of public agitation ensued against what was widely perceived as the Third Republic's overly liberal immigration policy, which, opponents maintained, had permitted foreigners to wrest precious jobs from Frenchmen.¹⁰

That agitation fed in turn an ongoing debate over the impact of immigration upon French society, culture, and identity – a debate that by the mid-1920s arguably claimed greater public attention than any other domestic issue.¹¹ Noting what he perceived as mounting affinity for foreign tastes in the arts, for example, journalist and cultural critic Jean-José Frappa observed in 1926 that France “suffers [...] at the moment from an acute crisis of personality.”¹² That crisis found expression in much public commentary in the wake of the assassination (in which, as some journalists were quick to note, one foreign-born person had killed another¹³) and particularly during the trial:

Cartel des gauches see, *inter alia*, Serge Bernstein/Jean Noël Jeanneney, *Les raisons de l'échec du Cartel des gauches*, in: *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire Moderne* 23 (1978), 2–15; Benjamin F. Martin, *France and the Après Guerre, 1918–1924. Illusions and Disillusionment*, Baton Rouge La. 1999, 226–252; Nathanael Greene, *From Versailles to Vichy. The Third French Republic, 1919–1940*, New York 1970, 39–44.

- 10 Ralph Schor, *L'opinion française et les étrangers en France 1919–1939*, Paris 1985, 450, 455–463. Responding to mounting public pressure, which extended from the extreme right to the noncommunist left, the Poincaré government took the extraordinary step of paying the repatriation expenses of foreign workers who agreed to return to their homelands between February and June 1927. *Ibid.*, 456.
- 11 Witness, *inter alia*, the 1927 remark of Senator Louis Pasquet that the question of immigration “ranks among the primary preoccupations of public opinion.” Quoted in Schor, *L'opinion française*, 464. A year later Edouard Herriot, leader of the *Cartel des gauches* and former prime minister, termed the issue “a formidable problem whose solution is for our country in large measure a matter of life and death.” Quoted in Gérard Noiriel, *Immigration, antisémitisme et racisme en France (XIXe–XXe siècle)*. *Discours publics, humiliations privées*, Paris 2007, 342. For a broad summary of the evolution of the debate since the 1880s, see Gérard Noiriel, *Le creuset français. Histoire de l'immigration, XIXe–XXe siècles*, Paris 1988, 249–293 and *passim*.
- 12 Jean-José Frappa, *A Paris, sous l'œil des métèques*, quoted in Schor, *L'opinion française*, 348. Such anxiety appears to have been at the root of the revision of the French naturalization law of 10 August 1927; see Noiriel, *Immigration*, 352–361.
- 13 For example, Anonymous, *L'assassinat de l'hetman Petlioura: L'instruction s'aiguille vers la recherche des complicités*, in: *L'Action française*, 30 June 1926; Anonymous, *L'assassin de Petlura devant les jurés de la Seine: Il s'est glorifié de son crime pendant toute l'audience*, in: *L'Écho de Paris*, 19 October 1927; Anonymous, *La situation. L'affaire Schwartzbard*, in: *L'Ouest-Éclair*, 27 October 1927.

Schwarzbard's seemingly improbable acquittal was alternately glorified as a shining example of how the French revolutionary heritage of human rights was uniquely capable of rendering justice to the beleaguered and defenseless¹⁴ and castigated as proof that "international avengers," who had imported their "foreign scores, troubles, and barbarities" into the French capital, could "count on the weakness" of the country's judicial and law enforcement agencies to permit them to murder with impunity.¹⁵

Indeed, for more than two decades before the deadly Schwarzbard-Petlura encounter the ability of France's courts and police to maintain justice and public safety had become a matter of some disquiet for much of the French public. Between 1914 and 1923 four high-profile political assassinations had been committed in Paris; in the ensuing trials all of the assassins had been acquitted despite confessing to the deed.¹⁶ Critics of the verdicts, whose identities often varied directly with the political affiliations of perpetrator and victim in each case, frequently laid the blame for what seemed to them ju-

14 Alfred Berl, *La condamnation des pogromes*, in: *Paix et droit*, October 1927. According to some press reports, announcement of the verdict was greeted with cries of "Vive la France" from the gallery. Anonymous, France. Petlura Trial (Document 74). See also Mariusz Wołos, *Proces Samuela Schwartzbarda w październiku 1927 r. (w świetle prasy francuskiej)*, [The Trial of Scholem Schwartzbard in October 1927 (as Reflected in the French Press)], in: *Dzieje najnowsze* 38 (2006), 71–80, here 78.

15 Anonymous, *L'acquittement de Schwartzbard*, in: *L'Écho de Paris*, 28 October 1927; Anonymous, *La situation. L'affaire Schwartzbard*.

16 The cases concerned the March 1914 shooting of Gaston Calmette, editor of the right-leaning daily *Le Figaro*, by Henriette Caillaux, wife of Finance Minister Joseph Caillaux, in retaliation for publishing a letter that damaged M. Caillaux's reputation; the July 1914 murder of French socialist leader Jean Jaurès by the young nationalist Raoul Villain in protest of the victim's vocal opposition to war mobilization against Germany; the June 1920 slaying of Albanian military strongman Essad Pasha by opposition leader Avni Rustemi; and the January 1923 killing of Marius Plateau, secretary of the monarchist *Ligue d'Action française*, by the anarchist Germaine Berton as ostensible payback for the League's alleged role in the agitation against Jaurès eight and a half years earlier. On the Caillaux trial see Edward Berenson, *The Trial of Madame Caillaux*, Berkeley Calif. 1992; Benjamin F. Martin, *The Hypocrisy of Justice in the Belle Epoque*, Baton Rouge La. 1984, 151–224. On the Berton case see Fanny Bugnon, *Germaine Berton. Une criminelle politique éclipsée*, in: *Nouvelles questions féministes* 24 (2005), 68–85. Some later political murderers – most notably the Italian anarchist Ernesto Bonomini, who killed the fascist journalist Nicola Bonservizi in Paris in February 1924 – were convicted but given relatively light sentences (in Bonomini's case, eight years of hard labor commuted to eight years imprisonment). See the table in Schor, *L'opinion française*, 484.

dicial travesties at the feet of the institution of the *cour d'assises* – a criminal court of combined initial and appellate jurisdiction, sitting permanently in each of France's 90 *départements*, in which the most serious offenses were tried by a panel of three judges and twelve jurors, from whose verdict (including a capital sentence) no appeal was permitted.¹⁷ The only French court to incorporate a jury, it was born of the revolutionary faith in the common sense of the populace as a safeguard against concentration of judicial authority in the hands of the state.¹⁸ This ethos encouraged a procedure in which the jury's attention tended to be focused less on the facts of the case at hand than on circumstances that might attenuate the defendant's culpability.¹⁹ The search for exculpatory circumstances no doubt contributed to significantly higher acquittal rates in the *cour d'assises* than in the so-called *tribunaux correctionnels*, where offenses punishable by less than five years imprisonment were tried and verdicts rendered by a single judge alone.²⁰ By the late nineteenth century acquittals became increasingly common, especially in the *cour*

17 Code d'instruction criminelle de 1808 (Texte intégral de la version en vigueur en 1929), art. 251, 252, 301, 309, 350, <http://ledroitcriminel.free.fr/la_legislation_criminelle/anciens_textes/code_instruction_criminelle_1929/code_1808_2.htm> (10 December 2015). For a contemporary description of the court and its procedures see Ferrari, *The Procedure*. For a description and evaluation of the operation of the provincial *cour d'assises* from a juror's perspective fifteen years before Schwarzbard's trial, see André Gide, *Souvenirs de la cour d'assises*, Paris 1913.

18 James M. Donovan, *Magistrates and Juries in France, 1791–1952*, in: *French Historical Studies* 22 (1999), 379–420, here 379 f.

19 Code d'instruction criminelle, art. 337: “La question résultant de l'acte d'accusation sera posée en ces termes: ‘L'accusé est-il coupable d'avoir commis tel meurtre, tel vol ou tel autre crime, avec toutes les circonstances comprises dans le résumé de l'acte d'accusation?’” Indeed, unlike in the Anglo-American system, French juries were charged less with establishing facts than in deciding whether the accused should be punished. Facts were established by the examining magistrate (see above, n. 1), but the presiding judge was not required to make the full contents of the examining magistrate's dossier known to the jury. For details, see Ferrari, *The Procedure*, 43 f., 56 f. The writer André Gide, who served as a juror in the *cour d'assises* of Normandy for twelve days in late 1912, noted that the control exercised by the presiding judge over the extent and nature of the evidence presented made it difficult for jurors to form a view of the case different from what the judge had already inferred from the dossier. He surmised, however, that the situation was different in the Paris court, where he imagined a more independently-minded jury. Gide, *Souvenirs*, 49 f.

20 Between 1825 and 1931 some 32 percent of defendants tried in the *cour d'assises* were acquitted, as opposed to only 10 percent in *tribunaux correctionnels*. Figures in Donovan, *Magistrates*, 384 f.

d'assises of Paris, in cases involving so-called crimes of passion (*crimes passionnels*), in which defendants demanded exoneration for murders committed ostensibly to avenge heinous affronts to personal honor, usually involving sexual transgressions by a mate.²¹ After the First World War a coterie of young, flamboyant criminal attorneys, led by two of the future antagonists in the Schwarzbard trial, Henry Torrès and César Campinchi, learned effectively to exploit the procedures of the *cour d'assises* in order to extend jurors' sympathy for such crimes to defendants charged with killing for political reasons. Indeed, shortly after Schwarzbard committed his deed, one of his supporters noted hopefully that "France is a very favorable country in which to commit a political murder."²²

Hardly all Frenchmen delighted in that situation, however. In late 1923 journalist and author Louis Martin-Chauffier had noted "the horror, the disgust, the dreadful feeling of decomposition" that accompanied the exoneration of murderers whose passion involved not honor but ideology: "It is all too extraordinary that our judicial system will henceforth shield so-called political crimes from [the reach of] the law, as it has long done for crimes of passion, and that murder has now ceased to be a crime and has become a dialectical argument."²³ Much anxiety focused upon violent acts associated with the revolutionary left. Less than a month before Schwarzbard shot Petliura, French newspapers reported that the spectre of impending revolution and civil war had been raised during the *cour d'assises* trial of two communist youth who had murdered four activists of a militant monarchist band and wounded seven others.²⁴ When one of the killers was set free and the other sentenced to four years imprisonment, a broad spectrum of public opinion appeared genuinely alarmed. Not only the venerable, widely-circulated conservative daily *Le Figaro*, which had turned toward the radical right with its 1922 acquisition by perfume magnate François Coty, decried the "fearful ver-

21 Ibid., 415; Roberto Ferrari, The "Crime Passionnel" in French Courts, in: *California Law Review* 6 (1918), 331–341, here 340 f.

22 M. Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress, 25 June 1926, AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 91 (Document 23).

23 Louis Martin-Chauffier, « Tu peux tuer cet homme avec tranquillité », in: *Le Figaro*, 28 December 1923.

24 Anonymous, Un verdict de défaillance, in: *Journal des Débats*, 7 May 1926; René de Planhol, Le procès des communistes assassins. La défense renonce à ses témoins et la partie civile commence ses plaidoiries, in: *L'Écho de Paris*, 30 April 1926; Georges Claretie, L'Affaire de la rue Damrémont. M. Vaillant-Couturier estime que nous sommes au début de la guerre civile, in: *Le Figaro*, 29 April 1926.

dict” that had “opened the door to all manner of violence by excusing it;”²⁵ the estimable centrist *Journal des Débats* admonished that “the opinion that political assassination may be considered an excusable act” would merely “encourage citizens to take justice into their own hands.”²⁶ The fall of the *Cartel des gauches* the following July thus brought with it expectations in circles backing the new right-leaning government that what seemed to many like excessive legal indulgence would be curbed.

3. Schwarzbard between Left and Right

Consequently it could not be taken for granted that Schwarzbard would benefit from the judicial system’s seemingly growing leniency. Judgment of dramatic acts like his was increasingly rendered in the court of public opinion long before the actual trial took place, and Schwarzbard’s standing in that court was hardly secure. True, he was a decorated veteran. He had enlisted in the French Foreign Legion at the outset of the First World War, fought in the bloody Champagne campaign, and in March 1916 suffered a severe combat wound.²⁷ But he was also a self-proclaimed anarchist who, as pretrial investigation revealed, had been arrested in 1908 in Austria for burglary and was suspected of having engaged in subversive political activity during his sojourn there, two years before taking up residence in France.²⁸ Like many

25 Georges Claretie, Clerc est condamné à trois ans de prison, Bernardon est acquitté, in: *Le Figaro*, 6 May 1926. The author observed, “Nous jugerions [...] cet extraordinaire verdict avec la même sévérité si des communistes eussent été frappés, ou des anarchistes tués dans le dos, simplement parce qu’ils étaient dans la rue.”

26 Anonymous, Un verdict de défaillance.

27 Rapport, 2 June 1926, APP, C.2.173 (Document 18). At his trial he declared that he had gone to war for France “in order to defend the memory of the [...] French Revolution against German militarism.” TT, 18 October 1927, 98 (YIVO, RG85/486/39553) (Document 62). Schwarzbard later described some of his combat experiences in a collection of war sketches: *Shvartsbard, In krig*. He related the circumstances of his wound in his autobiography: *Shvartsbard, In’m loyf fun yorn*, 58 f.

28 Schwarzbard proclaimed his anarchist loyalties publicly at his trial, where he also referred to himself as a “revolutionary”: TT, 18 October 1927, 96, 97 (YIVO, RG85/486/39551–39552) (Document 62). Some press reports identified him by one or another of those appellations as early as the day following the assassination: Anonymous, *Id shist Petlyurn in Pariz [Jew Shoots Petliura in Paris]*, in: *Morgen zhurnal*, 26 May 1926; Anonymous, *Zum Attentat auf Petljura*, in: *Schweizerbanner*, 15 June 1926. The initial report of Schwarzbard’s August 1908 arrest for burglary in Vienna, allegedly as the accomplice of a suspected anarchist assassin, was sent by the Austrian Legation

(though hardly all) in the international anarchist movement, he had been encouraged by the October 1917 ouster of the Kerensky government and the Bolshevik ascendancy in Russia;²⁹ in fact, earlier in the year, even before receiving a proffered military discharge and pension, he had requested repatriation to the country of his birth in order to help usher in the revolution.³⁰ In late 1917 he had joined a Red Guard unit in Ukraine, representing foreign anarchist elements in the Odessa headquarters and participating in the takeover of the city by revolutionary forces in January 1918.³¹ In France of the mid-1920s such a personal history was hardly a source of popularity. To be sure, in 1924 the new leftist government had reversed France's former policy of seeking to isolate the Soviet Union by extending it formal diplomatic recognition. Its action ushered in a brief era in which earlier fears of Bolshevik-inspired sedition beyond Russia's borders abated somewhat. But by the time Schwarzbard committed his deed those fears were on the

in Paris to the French Foreign Ministry, 17 June 1926 (no. 3893), AN, Ministère de la Justice, 1538 A 1926. For Schwarzbard's version of the arrest see TT, 18 October 1927, 93–97 (YIVO, RG85/486/39548–39552) (Document 62).

- 29 On anarchist reactions to the Bolshevik seizure of power see Jean Maitron, *Le mouvement anarchiste en France*, Paris 1975, vol. 2, 41–43. See also David Berry, *A History of the French Anarchist Movement, 1917–1945*, Westport Conn. 2002, 31 f.; Gaetano Manfredonia, *L'anarchisme en Europe*, Paris 2001, 87–89. Anarchists from abroad who traveled to Russia to assist the Bolsheviks included the Belgian writer and revolutionary Victor Serge and the Russian-born American agitator Bill Shatov; Paul Avrich, *Russian Anarchists and the Civil War*, in: *Russian Review* 27 (1968), 296–306, here 296 f. For Schwarzbard's retrospective affirmation of the October revolution see Schwarzbard, *In'm loyf fun yorn*, 71–76.
- 30 TT, 18 October 1927, 98 f. (YIVO, RG85/486/39553–39554) (Document 62). The transcript erroneously shows the year as 1919, but the testimony as a whole referred clearly to 1917. At his initial police interrogation Schwarzbard stated that he had been sent to Russia as part of a French military mission to Petrograd; entry no. 292, 25 May 1926, APP, CB 22/45. At the trial he confessed that this statement was not true; TT, 18 October 1927, 100 (YIVO, RG85/486/39555) (Document 62).
- 31 Schwarzbard, *In'm loyf fun yorn*, 77–86. The Red Guard (*Krasnaya gvardiya*) was a set of paramilitary units that first appeared on the scene in spring 1917. Although organized mainly at Bolshevik initiative, Red Guard units incorporated other leftist elements as well. By most accounts (including those of Bolshevik leaders themselves) they played a key role at several points in the Bolshevik rise to power: see, for example, Leo Trotzki, *Geschichte der russischen Revolution*, vol. 2: *Oktoberrevolution*, Frankfurt a. M. 1973, 846–852. On their origins and evolution see Rex A. Wade, *Red Guards and Workers' Militias in the Russian Revolution*, Stanford Calif. 1984, esp. 80–156.

rebound.³² Anticipating the scheduled parliamentary elections in 1928, politicians associated with the *Bloc national* determined to pry the more centrist Radicals away from the *Cartel des gauches* by portraying their Socialist partners as dupes of duplicitous Soviet diplomacy.³³ Indeed, virtually from the moment of its opening the Soviet legation in Paris, headed by the Trotskyite Christian Rakovsky, became notorious among the French public as a base for disseminating subversive propaganda. In August 1927, two months before Schwarzbard went to trial, Rakovsky signed a pro-Trotsky statement affirming the doctrine of world revolution and calling upon workers in all countries actively to pursue the overthrow of their governments – a move that precipitated a diplomatic crisis ending in the ambassador’s expulsion as *persona non grata*.³⁴ Later that same month violent protests in Paris over the execution of Italian American anarchists Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti were laid at the feet of communist agitators, prompting *Le Figaro* to warn of “a plan that serves the interests of Bolshevism and of general disorder everywhere and in particular promotes intrigues against France.”³⁵ In short, Schwarzbard’s politics were liable to obviate whatever favorable public impression his military record might have aroused only a short while before.³⁶

In fact, many of the voices that railed most loudly against the adverse consequences of immigration and mounting judicial leniency depicted Schwarzbard’s deed – which the assassin maintained had been entirely an individual act, undertaken with no assistance, intended to avenge certain alleged misdeeds of the victim during Schwarzbard’s time in Ukraine³⁷ – as an integral part of a larger Bolshevik scheme to undermine French society

32 Anne Hogenhuis-Seliverstoff, *Les relations franco-soviétiques 1917–1924*, Paris 1981, 262–269; Sophie Cœuré, *La grande lueur à l’est. Les Français et l’Union soviétique 1917–1939*, Paris 1999, 124–127.

33 Michael Jabara Carley, *Episodes from the Early Cold War. Franco-Soviet Relations, 1917–1927*, in: *Europe-Asia Studies* 52 (2000), 1275–1305, here 1290 f.

34 Alfred Erich Senn, *The Rakovsky Affair. A Crisis in Franco-Soviet Relations, 1927*, in: *Slavic and East-European Studies* 10 (1965), 102–117.

35 Anonymous, *Nous voulons la paix des rues*, in: *Le Figaro*, 24 August 1927. The editorial concluded, “Nous voulons une politique d’ordre et de fermeté qui rompe avec la Révolution et donne au pays qui peine, au moins la sécurité de la rue.”

36 Schwarzbard’s advocates recognized the difficulty even before the Rakovsky affair. Cf. M. Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress, 22 May 1927, AJHC, Stephen S. Wise, box 88 (Document 56): “It would be rather unfortunate to hold [the trial] at the present moment. [...] A campaign against communism is now under way here. [...] The result is a public state of mind which might be prejudicial to Schwartzbard.”

37 See below, at n. 202.

from within. Earliest and most vociferous among them was, not surprisingly, the nationalist, monarchist league *Action française*, a highly visible political pressure group whose similarly-named daily newspaper, edited by prominent intellectuals Charles Maurras and Léon Daudet (the latter also a member of the Chamber of Deputies), appealed to a largely young, professional, high-brow audience.³⁸ Only nine days after Schwarzbard's arrest, in a news item reporting his first interrogation by examining magistrate Marcel Peyre³⁹ (in which the prisoner had related matter-of-factly how he had come to do his deed) the paper declared that although "what is important to investigate is the probable involvement of accomplices" in the murder, doing so would entail "too great a risk of conflict with the Soviet embassy and with Rakovsky." It also put forth a theory of the crime upon which Schwarzbard's adversaries in the court eventually built their case against him:

"Recall that after having defeated the Bolsheviks, General Petliura was forced into exile when Ukraine was handed over to the Soviet Republic. Maintaining constant contact with many of his country's patriots, he labored for the liberation of his homeland. His activities bothered the Soviets. And Rakovsky, who had been governor of Ukraine, recognized his valor and feared it. A plot was hatched against the nationalist *hetman*.⁴⁰ His death was decided. Was Schwarzbard, a fanatical Jew, simply an instrument in the hands of the Soviets? That is what everyone is saying."⁴¹

38 On the league and its newspaper see, *inter alia*, Eugen Weber, *Action Française. Royalism and Reaction in Twentieth-Century France*, Stanford Calif. 1962. In 1923 the secretary of the league had been assassinated by the anarchist Germaine Berton, who had subsequently been acquitted by a jury in the Paris *cour d'assises*. See above, n. 16.

39 Peyre (b. 1883) had served as a provincial magistrate since 1906 but had been appointed *juge d'instruction* in Paris only a week before the Petliura assassination. A brief biography appeared in Anonymus, *Le nouveau procureur général près la Cour d'appel de Rennes* M. Marcel Peyre, in: *L'Ouest-Éclair*, 18 July 1937. On the role of the examining magistrate (*juge d'instruction*) in French criminal investigations, see above, nn. 1, 19.

40 A common foreign rendering of the Ukrainian *otaman* (chief).

41 Nicolas Sant'Andrea, *L'assassinat du général Petlioura: Une instruction pour la forme*, in: *L'Action française*, 3 June 1926. "Having defeated the Bolsheviks" was perhaps a reference to the interval in mid-1919 when Soviet forces, which had taken control of Kiev earlier that year, were redeployed against Russian Whites along the Ural front, thereby abandoning Ukraine to a civil war among competing Ukrainian and Russian factions in which units loyal to Petliura held a tenuous upper hand. Alternatively, it may have referred to the spring 1920 offensive against the Red Army

The suggestion of an attempted judicial coverup chimed with the French right's overall view of the left-wing government's susceptibility to Soviet manipulation. In the event, however, it appears to have had little basis in reality. Actually Peyre's first order to the police after receiving the case had been to search for traces of confederates.⁴² His investigation, whose results were presented at the trial, turned up no unimpeachable evidence of Soviet involvement. He interviewed a witness who claimed to have identified Schwarzbard in a group of people allegedly stalking Petliura.⁴³ Other informants told him of a mysterious figure named Mikhail Volodin, who, after insinuating himself into Ukrainian emigré circles in Paris, made suspicious efforts to learn Petliura's address and purportedly knew that the Ukrainian leader had been murdered before the news had appeared in the press.⁴⁴ A self-described former official of the Kerensky and Bolshevik governments, Ilya (Elie) Dobkowski, submitted a lengthy memorandum to the state prosecutor alleging the existence of a continent-wide espionage network directed from Moscow whose purpose was to assassinate vocal enemies of the communist regime.⁴⁵ And the police produced an express letter (*pneumatique*) sent by Schwarzbard to his wife on the day of the assassination from the post office of the Hôtel de Ville, bearing a time stamp of 2:45 pm, half an hour after the deed, when the assassin was already

by combined Polish and Ukrainian military divisions, in which the latter captured Kiev before a Soviet counterattack quickly forced them out of Ukraine altogether. Rakovsky had served as head of the Soviet Ukrainian government from 1919 to 1923.

- 42 Tribunal de la Seine, Commission rogatoire, signed order by M. Peyre, 29 May 1926, no. 1065, APP, C.2.173.
- 43 Confrontation Koval-Schwarzbard, 20 July 1926, YIVO RG80/451/38077–38078 (Document 30). Schwarzbard responded to the testimony that he had never been in the place mentioned by the witness and that on the date when the witness claimed to have seen him (14 or 15 April 1926) he would not yet have recognized Petliura. Cf. Anonymous, L'assassinat de l'hetman Petlioura.
- 44 Confrontation Chapoval-Schwarzbard, 20 July 1926, YIVO RG80/451/38069–38070 (Document 31); TT, 20 October 1927, 116–123 (YIVO RG85/488/39841–39848) (Document 64). Volodin himself denied emphatically that he had “any connection to the Schwarzbard-Petliura affair.” See his letter to the editor of *Parizer haynt*, Mikhail Volodin, A [*sic*] erklerung fun M. Volodin, edus in Shvartsbard-frage [Declaration by M. Volodin, Witness in the Schwarzbard Affair], in: *Parizer haynt*, 30 March 1927. For more on Volodin and the manner in which his name became associated with the assassination, see below, at nn. 133 ff.
- 45 TT, 20 October 1927 (YIVO RG80/488/39753–39774) (Document 64). For more on Dobkowski, who had actually worked for the tsarist regime, see below, at nn. 133 ff.

in custody. Only a co-conspirator, claimed those who painted Schwarzbard a Bolshevik agent, could have posted the letter at that time.⁴⁶ The examining magistrate considered all of these ostensible proofs of that portrayal carefully during his lengthy investigation and, in accordance with normal French criminal procedure, presented them to Schwarzbard himself in order to observe his reaction.⁴⁷ In the end, it appears, he found all of them wanting.

Indeed, none of the proofs linked Schwarzbard unambiguously and irrefutably to a Soviet operation, as chief defense attorney Torrès was quick to point out during the trial.⁴⁸ Actually Torrès himself appears to have presented Schwarzbard's denouncers with a more tangible, less equivocal Soviet connection. A former member of the French Communist Party (*Parti communiste français* – PCF), Torrès had been purged from the party in 1922 along with a fairly large coterie of young intellectuals deemed insufficiently obedient to Moscow and the Comintern – a move that contributed no doubt to a sharp decline in public support for PCF for the rest of the decade.⁴⁹ His subsequent notoriety as one of France's leading criminal attorneys was acquired in large measure through his successful 1923 defense of anarchist assassin Germaine Berton in the *cour d'assises*.⁵⁰ As his defense strategy for Schwarzbard involved an exposition of what the defendant had

46 TT, 18 October 1927, 38–41 (YIVO RG80/486/39499–39502). In the official police incident report the time of the shooting was given as 2:10 pm: « Homicide volontaire avec préméditation – aff. Petlioura, Schwarzbard au dépôt », 25 May 1925, APP, B9/2204. The arresting officer initially reported the time as 2:30 pm: Telegram, Marchaud, Seventh Police District, to Municipal Police Director, 25 May 1926, *ibid.* On 11 March 1927 Peyre ordered “an inquiry into the time of day at which Mr. Schwarzbard could have posted the express letter;” APP, C2.175–501. The postmaster at the Hotel de Ville surmised in response that most likely an employee had erred in setting the time stamp and that the letter was actually posted at 1:35 pm; “Rapport,” 17 March 1927, APP, C2.173 (Document 47).

47 In pretrial investigations it was customary for the suspect to be confronted, in the presence of the examining magistrate, directly by the people presenting evidence against him and even to interact directly with his accusers. The suspect's counsel was also normally present at such confrontations. See Martin, *Hypocrisy of Justice*, 26.

48 This is not to say that the trial established that Schwarzbard did *not* act at Moscow's behest. It is merely to indicate that the documentary record at the time was insufficient to prove Soviet involvement to the satisfaction of all. It remains so even today; see below.

49 Robert Wohl, *French Communism in the Making, 1914–1924*, Stanford Calif. 1966, 305f.

50 See above, n. 16.

experienced during his sojourn in Ukraine and his service in the Red Guard,⁵¹ Torrès sought witnesses in the Soviet Union and engaged the assistance of the Soviet embassy in Paris in locating them. His visits to the embassy, though infrequent, became public knowledge, suggesting to some a suspicious measure of collusion.⁵²

Suspicious and disputed testimony may have been all that those who saw Schwarzbard's act as a sign of an invidious Bolshevik plot could muster, but as the testimonies were presented to the examining magistrate and reported in the press,⁵³ the suspicions struck ever deeper root among the French right. In May 1927, evidently anticipating that the case would soon come to court,⁵⁴ *Le Figaro* owner François Coty took up the refrain with a vengeance, adding detail and background to what had been until then a rather nebulous tale resting almost entirely upon innuendo. On the front page of his newspaper he charged that a Paris-based subversive organization calling itself *Secours rouge international*, whose ostensible purpose was "to defend communist comrades abroad who are being persecuted by despicable capitalism" but whose "true goal" was "to plan terrorist crimes," stood behind Schwarzbard's defense. Even more, he claimed, prior to the assassination Schwarzbard had been a frequent visitor to *Secours rouge* headquarters, where he had received instructions from the organization's director – a "pseudo-Pole" representing the Third International whose real name was Efim Gheller but who lived in France under a stolen identity as Robert Schmidt – to kill the Ukrainian leader Petliura. In Coty's reconstruction the victim had come to pose a significant security threat to the Soviet Union:

"At the moment when Petliura was shot through with bullets in the Latin Quarter, he was about to leave for Warsaw, in order to plan with Marshal Piłsudski, in Poland, a Ukrainian offensive against the Soviets. It is certain

51 See esp. below, Document 62.

52 His visits to the embassy were recorded by the French Foreign Ministry. See the untitled list, 16 September 1926, AMAE, Europe-Russie-Ambassade et consulats russes en France, 1117/172; Surveillance de protection exercée aux abords de l'Ambassade de l'U.R.S.S., 6 October 1927, *ibid.*

53 The content of pretrial investigations was a matter of public record and could be reported freely. Cf. Code d'instruction criminelle, art. 153.

54 In March 1927 it had been announced that the trial would take place in June; M. Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress, 25 March 1927, AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 91 (Document 49). Cf. Anonymus, Vos iz mit'n Shvartsbard-protses? [What Is Happening in the Schwarzbard Trial?], in: Parizer haynt, 9 May 1927.

that the assassin Schwarzbard met the delegate of *Secours rouge*, Efim Gheller, at [the organization's offices at] 114 boulevard de la Villette. It can be deduced easily that the assassination of Petliura was decreed in Moscow and carried out in Paris in order to save the Soviets from imminent danger."⁵⁵

4. International Implications

Coty's association of the assassination with occurrences not only in Paris and Moscow but also in Warsaw suggested that the event possessed significant ramifications beyond France's own borders. On the surface, the suggestion was not improbable. Two weeks before Petliura's murder, his former ally and patron, Józef Piłsudski, had reassumed power in Poland following a military coup that had overthrown the country's parliamentary regime. Piłsudski (1867–1935), an early leader of the Polish Socialist Party and commander of the Polish Legions that fought on the side of the Central Powers during the First World War, had served as Poland's head of state (*naczelnik państwa*) from the country's declaration of independence in November 1918 until the implementation of its first constitution in December 1922. In April 1920, at the height of the war between Poland and the Soviet Union, he had signed an agreement (the Treaty of Warsaw) with Petliura's Ukrainian National Republic, which during the previous year had lost both military and political control of its territory – territory that ultimately fell under Bolshevik rule. The agreement recognized Ukrainian independence east of the Zbrucz River (the former Habsburg-Imperial Russian border) and established a Polish-Ukrainian anti-Bolshevik military alliance. Earlier, in December 1919, Piłsudski had given Petliura asylum in Warsaw; subsequently a Ukrainian government-in-exile, under Petliura's leadership, had operated in Tarnów. In March 1921 Piłsudski's political opponents in Poland's parliament had scuttled the agreement by concluding the Treaty of Riga, which recognized Soviet Ukrainian sovereignty in all of the areas claimed by the Ukrainian National Republic. That action, along with a newly-adopted constitution that provided for a strong parliament and a weak presidency, no doubt hastened his decision to retire from power – a decision he reversed with his May 1926 military coup, undertaken at a time when parliamen-

55 François Coty, « Un front unique » contre le communisme, in: *Le Figaro*, 19 May 1927, 1 (Document 54).

tary rule appeared to much of Poland's public to have crumbled beyond repair.⁵⁶

Piłsudski was thus a longstanding anti-Bolshevik. At the head of combined Polish and Ukrainian forces he had driven the Red Army out of Kiev in May 1920 and had held it for three weeks before retreating in the face of a Soviet counterattack. Consequently his assumption of the reins of government in Poland had aroused some initial anxiety in Moscow and elsewhere in Europe over the prospect of renewed hostilities along the Polish-Soviet border.⁵⁷ However, the anxiety actually appears to have been focused less on the Ukrainian than on the Baltic front, and in any event the Polish Foreign Ministry moved quickly to obviate it by promising no change in policy from the previous regime.⁵⁸ Moreover, the Soviets would have had little reason to fear

56 On the 1926 seizure of power see Joseph Rothschild, *Piłsudski's Coup d'Etat*, New York 1966. On the background and history of the Warsaw Treaty see Michael Palij, *The Ukrainian-Polish Defensive Alliance, 1919–1921. An Aspect of the Ukrainian Revolution*, Edmonton 1995. On Piłsudski's relations with Petliura during the interval between the Treaties of Warsaw and Riga, see Jan Pisuliński, *Nie tylko Petlura. Kwestia ukraińska w polskiej polityce zagranicznej w latach 1918–1923* [Not Only Petliura. The Ukrainian Question in Polish Foreign Policy in the Years 1918–1923], Wrocław 2004, 227–295.

57 Rothschild, *Piłsudski's Coup*, 302; Wojciech Materski, *Na widoczu. II Rzeczpospolita wobec Sowietów, 1918–1943* [On the Watchtower. The Second Republic and the Soviets, 1918–1943], Warsaw 2005, 294f.; Piotr S. Wandycz, *The Twilight of French Eastern Alliances, 1926–1936. French-Czechoslovak-Polish Relations from Locarno to the Remilitarization of the Rhineland*, Princeton N.J. 1988, 48–50. Cf. Anonymous, *The Situation in Poland. Soviet Interest*, in: *The Times*, 19 May 1926; Anonymous, *Moscow and Pilsudski Coup*, in: *ibid.*, 21 May 1926.

58 Telegramma chlena Kollegii Narodnovo komissariata inostrannykh del SSSR B. S. Stomonyakova polnomochnomu predstavitel'yu SSSR v Varshave P. L. Voikovu o besede s poslannikom Pol'shi v Moskve S. Kętrzyńskim v svyazi s perevorotom Yu. Pilsudskovo v Pol'she, 16 May 1926 [Telegram from B. S. Stomonyakov, Member of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, to P. L. Voikov, Plenipotentiary of the USSR in Warsaw, Concerning a Conversation with the Polish Legate in Moscow, S. Kętrzyński, in the Context of the coup d'état of J. Piłsudski in Poland, 16 May 1926], in: *Pol'skaya Akademiia Nauk et al. (eds.), Dokumenty i materialy po istorii sovetско-pol'skikh otnosheniy* [Documents and Materials on the History of Soviet-Polish Relations], 12 vols., Moscow 1963–86, here vol. 5, 9; *Iz zapisi besedy [...] Stomonyakova [...] s Kętrzyńskim: o soglasovanii pozitsiy Pol'shi i pribaltiyskikh gosudarstv v otnoshenii SSSR, 29 May 1926* [From the Record of a Conversation (...) of Stomonyakov (...) with Kętrzyński: On the Coordination of Positions between Poland and the Baltic States with Respect to the USSR], in: *ibid.*, 11–13.

Petliura: The French authorities had permitted him to take up residence in Paris in 1924 only on condition that he refrain from all political activity, and they had monitored his correspondence and visitors to guarantee his compliance.⁵⁹ Thus in the final analysis it seems more likely that Coty's reconstruction of events reflected primarily his own hopes for forging a broad European anti-Soviet bloc.⁶⁰ Indeed, when Schwarzbard issued an emphatic denial from prison of Coty's charges and repeated his consistent assertion that he had acted entirely alone and on his own volition, the publisher confessed that he could cite only "suggestive coincidences" in support of his version. Still, he insisted, he felt compelled to combat "the formidable powers who ordered Petliura's death," both in the name of "the thirty million Russians whom the new masters of Russia (who are not Russians themselves) exterminated through civil war and famine, with horrific suffering" and in order to defend "the eternal victim of all [Soviet] machinations, crimes, and conspiracies – France."⁶¹

Nevertheless, the general suspicion of a Soviet role in the assassination resonated even beyond France's borders, especially in the east European countries that had been strongly allied with France since the end of the First World War and who feared the growing power of the region's geopolitical giant. In Romania, for example, press reports of Petliura's death noted that the Ukrainian leader was a symbol of ongoing resistance to Bolshevik rule capable of inspiring others to work for regime change in Russia; hence, one commentator reasoned, his murder must have been a political act, part of "a methodical and premeditated program to suffocate Ukrainian national ex-

59 Minister of Interior and Director of General Security Service to Prefect of Police, Paris, 10 October 1924, APP, B9/2204; Rapport: Chef du Service des Recherches Administratives et des Jeux à Monsieur le Préfet de Police, « A. S. de Petlura, Simon, ancien chef du Gouvernement d'Ukraine », 25 January 1925, *ibid.*

60 During the two months before publishing his statement about Schwarzbard he had broached that hope with the foreign ministers of France and Britain, Aristide Briand and Austen Chamberlain; Carley, *Episodes from the Early Cold War*, 1293. Two months later, in the wake of Britain's move to sever diplomatic relations with the USSR, he traveled to London as a featured speaker at a "Hands Off Britain" rally, where he predicted that France would soon join Britain and Italy in "reduc[ing] those political criminals [in the Soviet Union's European missions] to impotence and send[ing] them back to their country, which they had turned into a place of evil influence." Anonymous, "Hands Off Britain" Campaign. A Victory Rally, in: *The Times*, 16 July 1927.

61 Coty, « Un front unique » contre le communisme (Document 54). The same edition of the newspaper urged Britain to sever diplomatic relations with the Soviets; Anonymous, *La Note des Soviets*, in: *ibid.*

istence.”⁶² In Czechoslovakia newspapers right and left debated the possible extent of Moscow's involvement in the murder.⁶³ And an official of the Polish Legation in Paris recalled receiving “clear instructions” from Warsaw immediately following the killing “not to talk about this event with anyone at all and to sit quietly” – so delicate might Poland's diplomatic situation be if the Soviets had indeed had a hand in Petliura's violent demise.⁶⁴

Yet no matter how great the significance that what soon came to be labeled the “Petliura-Schwarzbard affair” held for French politics and European international relations, its import was immeasurably greater for the two communities with which victim and perpetrator were most commonly associated in the public eye – Ukrainians and Jews.

5. Petliura's Assassination and Ukrainian Politics

Among Ukrainians Petliura was, at the time of his death, a controversial figure, admired, even adulated by some, criticized, even reviled by others.⁶⁵ Schwarzbard's act hardly put an end to the controversies over national policy that Petliura had aroused. Nevertheless, by elevating his victim to the level of a symbol, it altered the contours of the debate immeasurably.

62 Quoted in Anonymous, *Presa Rumunii pro vbyvstvo S. V. Petliury* [The Press of Romania on the Murder of S.V. Petliura], in: Tryzub, 18 July 1926.

63 Anonymous, *Cheska presa pro smert' S. V. Petliury* [The Czech Press on the Death of S. V. Petliura], in: Tryzub, 19 September 1926; cf. Anonymous, *Ataman S. Petljura*, in: *Právo lidu*, 27 May 1926.

64 Waclaw Zbyszewski, quoted in Wołos, *Proces Schwartzbarda*, 72.

65 See the characterizations in *Vasyl' Koroliv-Staryi, Nad svizhoiu mohyloiu* [Over the Fresh Grave], in: Tryzub, 27 June 1926. See also Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 27–28 May 1926, NYPL, *QGA 73–3926, no. 72 (Document 15). Controversy had long surrounded Petliura, to the point where he had been the target of death threats. Witness the following entry in the diary of Stephen Bonsal, Woodrow Wilson's personal translator at the 1919 Paris Peace Conference and liaison of the American Peace Commission to the delegations of the so-called small nations, 8 May 1919: “One of [Petliura's] henchmen came in this afternoon and whispered that Petliura, the great partisan who had perplexed us all by fighting under so many flags and on so many opposing fronts, had [...] reached Paris and naturally was most anxious to get in touch with the Colonel [Edward House, Wilson's chief foreign policy adviser]. ‘But there is a difficulty,’ he explained. ‘There are many assassins wandering along the boulevards of Paris and many of these misguided men would not hesitate to shoot our noble leader on sight.’” Stephen Bonsal, *Suitors and Suppliants. The Little Nations at Versailles*, New York 1946, 143.

Petliura had been one of several contenders for power in Ukraine during the chaotic interval between the fall of the tsar in March 1917 and the final conquest of the country by the Red Army in November 1920.⁶⁶ At one time or another he had clashed acrimoniously with rival Ukrainian leaders Pavlo Skoropadskyi,⁶⁷ Volodymyr Vynnychenko,⁶⁸ Yevhen Petrushevych,⁶⁹

66 For a broad overview of political events in Ukraine during the period of the Russian Revolution and Civil War see John S. Reshetar, *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1920. A Study in Nationalism*, Princeton N.J. 1952. More recent, abbreviated summaries can be found in Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine. A History*, Toronto 2000, 344–379; W. Bruce Lincoln, *Red Victory. A History of the Russian Civil War*, New York 1989, 302–327.

67 Skoropadskyi (1873–1945) led the so-called hetmanate regime that held power in Ukraine from April–December 1918. Known officially as the Ukrainian State (*Ukrains'ka Derzhava*), the hetmanate rested largely upon the support of large land-owners and was closely allied with the Central Powers against Russia in the waning months of the First World War. When German and Austro-Hungarian troops withdrew from the region in November 1918, forces loyal to the newly-formed Directory, led by Petliura, overthrew Skoropadskyi and drove him into exile. He fled first to Vienna, then to Berlin, where he gathered around him a small circle of conservative Ukrainian intellectuals and for a time enjoyed a modest stipend from the German government. See, *inter alia*, Reshetar, *Ukrainian Revolution*, 145–207.

68 Like Petliura, Vynnychenko (1880–1951) had been a member of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Party before the 1905 Russian revolution; unlike Petliura he did not subordinate his socialist convictions to Ukrainian nationalism. The first head of the Directory, he was ousted by Petliura in February 1919 and departed for Vienna, where in early 1920 he founded the Foreign Group of the Ukrainian Communist Party (*Zakordonna Hrupa UKP*) and began unsuccessful negotiations with Moscow aimed at maximizing Ukrainian autonomy within the Bolshevik state. The latest full-length biography is Stanislav V. Kulchytskyi, *Volodymyr Vynnychenko*, Kiev 2005. See also Alexander J. Motyl, *The Turn to the Right. The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian Nationalism, 1919–1929*, New York 1980, 54–56.

69 Petrushevych (1863–1940) was president of the West Ukrainian National Republic (*Zakhidno-Ukrains'ka Narodnia Respublika*), a short-lived political formation that claimed sovereignty over the former Habsburg territory of East Galicia following the collapse of Austrian rule in November 1918 before it was defeated by Polish forces in July 1919. Though he and Petliura had initially declared support for one another, each eventually (and reluctantly) formed an alliance with the other's primary antagonist – Petliura with Poland, Petrushevych with Russian White forces under Anton Denikin. At the end of 1919 he set up a West Ukrainian exile government in Vienna, which endeavored to spearhead an anti-Petliura coalition among Ukrainian emigrés and eventually found its principal patron in the Soviet Union. See Reshetar, *Ukrainian Revolution*, 288–291; Motyl, *Turn to the Right*, 33–43.

and Mykyta Shapoval,⁷⁰ as well as with local warlords and anarchist partisans like Matvii Hryhoriiv⁷¹ and Nestor Makhno,⁷² who had at intervals dominated much of the Ukrainian countryside. All of these would-be rulers of an independent Ukraine had eventually been forced abroad,⁷³ where competing circles of their acolytes in various European capitals (some of which styled themselves governments-in-exile) lashed out against each other nearly as acrimoniously as they did against the Bolsheviks who had ousted them.⁷⁴ The conflicts among them revolved about multiple axes. Ukrainians were a stateless community dependent upon foreign assistance for realization of its political aims, and leaders of their various factions routinely castigated one another for failure to achieve independence. They also debated the proper form of government for the Ukrainian nation and the diplomatic strategy most likely to advance the national cause.

70 Shapoval was leader of the centrist faction of the Ukrainian Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries (*Ukrains'ka Partiiia Sotsialistiv-Revoliutsioneriv*), a party that claimed to represent the interests of peasants and advocated uncompensated confiscation and redistribution of large landed estates. A minister in the Ukrainian Central Council under Vynnychenko before the proclamation of Ukrainian independence, he rejected Petliura's seizure of power, accusing him of scuttling significant socioeconomic reform. In February 1919 he left Ukraine, first for Budapest, where he served as secretary of the UNR diplomatic mission, then (in 1921) for Prague, where he set up a succession of emigré organizations, initially with the support of the Czechoslovak government, dedicated to undermining the Soviet Ukrainian regime. When Czechoslovak support waned in 1925, he sought alliances with the Russian and Belarussian Social Revolutionary parties, a move that incurred Petliura's sharp criticism. On the criticism, see below. See also Reshetar, *Ukrainian Revolution*, 51, 257, 291, 324 f.; Motyl, *Turn to the Right*, 52–54.

71 At first a supporter of Skoropadskyi, Hryhoriiv (1885–1919) raised his own private militia that initially assisted in the overthrow of the hetmanate, then turned against the victorious Directory following Petliura's ouster of Vynnychenko. In February 1919 he placed his forces at the disposal of the Red Army, only to disavow Bolshevik command the following May.

72 Makhno (1888–1934) led the Revolutionary Insurrectionary Army of Ukraine, a coalition of peasant bands that fought variously under a black anarchist flag with and against both Ukrainian national and Bolshevik forces. See Michael Palij, *The Anarchism of Nestor Makhno. An Aspect of the Ukrainian Revolution*, Seattle Wash. 1976.

73 Except Hryhoriiv, who was assassinated in July 1919 at Makhno's behest.

74 On divisions among Ukrainian exiles in the early 1920s see Reshetar, *Ukrainian Revolution*, 324–328; Motyl, *Turn to the Right*, 23–60; Vic Satzewich, *The Ukrainian Diaspora*, London/New York 2002, 49–64.

Petliura had earned the abiding enmity of many of his compatriots – in exile as well as in the Polish- and Soviet-ruled Ukrainian territories – both for his abandonment of socialism as the guiding ideology of the Ukrainian national movement⁷⁵ and for his Polish alliance.⁷⁶ The latter move actually reinforced the former in the minds of his opponents, both among the Ukrainian majority in the former Habsburg East Galicia (awarded to Poland in the Treaty of Riga of March 1921, which had ended armed Polish-Soviet hostilities) and within the Ukrainian diaspora. East Galician Ukrainians decried his relinquishment of Ukrainian claims to sovereignty over the region, while a significant number of prominent diaspora Ukrainians, having concluded by the early 1920s that the Bolsheviks had actually done more to foster economic and cultural development in Ukraine proper than any of the exile groups could ever hope to achieve, rued Petliura's seeming abandonment of all possibility of building a Ukrainian homeland within the framework of the Soviet Union.⁷⁷ In Paris opposition to Petliura within the Ukrainian exile community was concentrated in two left-leaning groups, each of which attacked both his social ideology and his foreign policy. One was composed of former adherents of the Ukrainian Social Revolutionary Party that coalesced around Mykyta Shapoval's brother Mykola, organized into the Ukrainian Association in France (*Ukrains'ka Hromada u Frantsii*). The other was the so-

75 Petliura's earliest political affiliation had been with the Ukrainian Revolutionary Party, in which strong Marxist tendencies were evident. In 1905, following secessions by both anti-Marxist nationalists and anti-nationalist Marxists, the party mainstream, including Petliura, transformed itself into the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers Party (*Ukrains'ka Sotsial-Demokratychna Robotnycha Partiiia*), which claimed to speak for the Ukrainian proletariat. This party formed the initial core of the Directory when it assumed power in Ukraine in December 1918. However, the party split in the face of the Bolsheviks' advance upon Kiev in January 1919, with the majority, including Petliura, ousting the more radically-inclined Ukrainian government led by Vynnychenko and pushing the Directory in a pronounced nationalist direction. See, *inter alia*, Kyrylo Mytrovych, *Politychni idealy i zapovity Symona Petliury* [The Political Ideals and Precepts of Symon Petliura], in: Vasyl Mykhalkchuk/Dmytro Stepovyk (eds.), *U 70-richchia paryz'koi trahedii 1926–1996. Zbirnyk pam'iaty Symona Petliury* [On the Seventieth Anniversary of the Tragedy in Paris 1926–1996. An Anthology in Memory of Symon Petliura], Kiev 1997, 48–53.

76 See above, at n. 56. For a brief survey of Ukrainian criticism of the alliance and Petliura's defense of it, by writers favorable to Petliura's action, see Dmytro Myroniuk/Nataliya Myroniuk, *Simon Petlioura. Fondateur du « Trident »*, Chernyvtsi 2006, 173–178.

77 On these anti-Petliurist Ukrainian diaspora circles see Motyl, *Turn to the Right*, 33–43, 57–60.

called Union of Ukrainian Citizens in France (*Soiuz Ukrains'kykh Hromadian u Frantsii*), which maintained close ties to the Soviet Ukrainian government in Kharkov.⁷⁸

During his sojourn in the French capital Petliura appears to have grown increasingly troubled by both the geographical and the ideological fragmentation of the Ukrainian national movement.⁷⁹ He expressed particular consternation over what he perceived to be the readiness of the Ukrainian Social Revolutionaries, under the leadership of the Shapoval brothers, to form an alliance with their Russian and Belarusian counterparts with the goal of establishing a multinational federal state in parts of the former Russian Empire should Bolshevik rule collapse. To Petliura's mind such readiness was tantamount to an admission that Ukrainian independence was an unrealizable goal.⁸⁰ It was evidently largely in order to counter what he thought to be such dangerous tendencies that in October 1925 he inaugurated a weekly journal, *Tryzub* (Trident), which promised "to elucidate the ways and means of nationbuilding" to the Ukrainian people.⁸¹ In the periodical's first issue Petliura admonished that "experience has compelled us to recognize the importance of unity and the destructive power of separatism;" he inveighed against those "fringe elements" in the Ukrainian world who "seek to split apart the national whole and to introduce disorder into [...] the Ukrainian community," declaring that "the state is superior to any party, the nation to any class."⁸² Yet although *Tryzub* developed an estimated readership of 25,000 among Ukrainian emigrés dispersed over an area extending from East Asia to the Western Hemisphere,⁸³ it does not appear to have mitigated intracommunal disputes. Indeed, in May 1926, on the eve of the assassination, the rival Union

78 Vasyl Mykhalchuk, *Vbyvstvo ta protses Petliury z perspektyvy 70-richchia* [The Assassination and the Trial of Petliura from the Perspective of Seventy Years], in: Mykhalchuk /Stepovyk, *U 70-richchia paryz'koi trahedii*, 11–40, here 28.

79 See, for example, S. Petliura to K. Matsievych, 19 April 1925, in: Volodymyr I. Serhiychuk et al. (eds.), *Symon Petliura. Nevidomi lysty z Paryzha yak politychnyi zapovit bortsiam za samostiiny Ukrainu* [Symon Petliura. Unknown Letters from Paris as the Political Legacy of a Fighter for Independent Ukraine], Kiev 2001, 30–34.

80 S. Petliura to K. Matsievych, 22 May 1925, in: *ibid.*, 40–44.

81 Symon Petliura, *Rozpochynaiuchy vydannia* [The First Edition], in: *Tryzub*, 15 October 1925. On the beginnings and subsequent history of the periodical, see Serhiychuk, *Symon Petliura*, 411f.; Myroniuk/Myroniuk, *Simon Petlioura*, 139–143. The name *Tryzub* invoked the trident symbol from the family crest of Grand Prince Volodymyr of Kiev, who had brought Christianity to Kievan Rus' in 988. In 1918 the trident had been adopted as the symbol of the Ukrainian National Republic.

82 Petliura, *Rozpochynaiuchy vydannia*.

83 Myroniuk/Myroniuk, *Simon Petlioura*, 141, 148.

of Ukrainian Citizens in France launched a competing newspaper, *Ukrains'ki visti* (Ukrainian News), which offered a platform to a broad spectrum of Petliura's Ukrainian opponents.⁸⁴

Not surprisingly, Petliura's associates in Paris combined their expressions of sorrow over his murder with public exhortations for all Ukrainians to close ranks behind his image and his cause. In the first of a series of black-bordered memorial declarations, *Tryzub* proclaimed his death "a grievous loss for the entire Ukrainian Nation" and figured the fallen leader as a martyr, whose "sacred blood [...] must unite all loyal sons of the native land in the struggle for Ukraine's liberation and independence."⁸⁵ At a special memorial meeting organized by his followers on the day of his funeral (30 May 1926), attended by delegates from 103 Ukrainian emigré organizations in France and abroad, speaker after speaker announced that "in his death S. V. Petliura has forged [...] a single unbreakable Ukrainian will;" the meeting endorsed a statement that "in this time of threat the entire Ukrainian nation will unite into a single national family in the name of its Leader-Martyr," while *Tryzub* editorialized that "a single watchword joins all who make up the Ukrainian people – *let us come together*."⁸⁶

The call for unity was no mere platitude, however. It posited the existence of a common enemy determined to crush all who continued to work for Ukrainian independence. For that enemy the questions that divided Ukrainian exile circles were presumed irrelevant. As the editors of *Tryzub* explained, "the hand that aimed the revolver at the one who was the embodiment of the Ukrainian nation's struggle for independent political existence knew what it was doing: with the shots on the rue Racine it strove to ward off the deadly danger to itself that the very name Symon Petliura posed. It meant to kill the very spirit of the Ukrainian liberation movement, to break apart, to atomize, to dissipate the emigré community."⁸⁷ Dmytro Andriievskyy, head of the Ukrainian National Council in Belgium, similarly assured the memorial gathering that "for the perpetrator and for those who stand behind him, it was not Petliura the person with whom they were concerned but the cause he served."⁸⁸

84 See the description by the Paris police: « Au sujet de l'Union des Citoyens Ukrainiens en France », 28 May 1926, APP, C.3.173.

85 Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Tryzub*, 30 May 1926.

86 Anonymous, *Zhalibna akademiia pam'iaty S. V. Petliury v Paryzhi* [Memorial Ceremony for S. V. Petliura in Paris], in: *ibid.*, 6 June 1926.

87 Anonymous, Untitled, in: *ibid.*

88 Dmytro Andriievskyy, *Petliura zahynuv – khay zhyve Petliurivshchyna!* [Petliura is Dead – Long Live the Petliura Movement!], in: *ibid.*, 27 June 1926.

The problem with this depiction of events was that the perpetrator himself told an altogether different story. Beginning with his initial interrogation, whose results were reported in the world press from the day following the deed, Schwarzbard steadfastly maintained that his act had been directed not against an abiding symbol of liberty for the Ukrainian nation but at a specific individual whom he held morally responsible for the deaths of many thousands of Jews during the internecine fighting that had beset Ukraine following the First World War, including during the interval when the Ukrainian National Republic, under Petliura's leadership, had held power in the country.⁸⁹ He further insisted that he had acted entirely alone, without accomplices; in his version, the idea to seek Petliura's death had occurred to him only shortly before he carried out the deed, when he learned by chance that, in the words of the French daily *L'Écho de Paris*, "the scoundrel was in Paris." The newspaper also quoted the assassin's version of how he had gone about pursuing his intended prey:

"I looked for how to find him, and I bought a revolver and some bullets. I did not know what he looked like. I cut his photograph out of a picture magazine. I knew that he frequented the Latin Quarter. Three weeks ago I thought I saw him in a café. But he was in the company of a woman and a young girl, so I did not dare to shoot. Upon investigation I learned that he ate his meals every day at the restaurant where I had just seen him. Now I was resolved. I killed him. I regret nothing."⁹⁰

Such an account of the assassination created difficulties not only for Petliura's supporters but even for those of his political rivals among the Ukrainian exiles who hoped one day to remove the Soviet regime from their homeland, for it diverted public attention away from their current political cause toward a past interethnic conflict whose memory few Ukrainians were interested in

89 For the record of the interrogation see ledger entry 292, APP, CB 22/45. Among initial press reports indicating Schwarzbard's stated motive, see Anonymous, Un crime politique, in: *L'Écho de Paris*, 26 May 1926; Anonymous, Ubit S. V. Petliura [S. V. Petliura Murdered], in: *Poslednie novosti*, 26 May 1926; Anonymous, Petljura in Paris erschossen, in: *Berliner Tageblatt*, 26 May 1926; Anonymous, General Petlura Is Fatally Shot in Paris By Russian Student Seeking Revenge, in: *New York Times*, 26 May 1926, 1. On the violence against Ukrainian Jews, see below. In a letter from prison to his wife, Schwarzbard asked that his father's tombstone be inscribed with the words, "Your son Scholem has avenged the sacred blood of your brother Israel the martyr and your entire people Israel." Schwarzbard to Anna Schwarzbard, n.d., YIVO, RG80/471/39078.

90 Anonymous, Un crime politique.

reviving. Virtually all segments of the Ukrainian national movement painted their people as the victim of powerful oppressors, laying claim in the process to the moral capital that has often been attached to victim status in the modern world. Indeed, Petliura himself had placed such a self-representation at the center of his political strategy. In his inaugural editorial in *Tryzub* he had declared that even though “the Ukrainian genius [has been] suppressed [...] throughout the centuries by a host of unfavorable geographical and international circumstances, it has retained its prodigious creative abilities, before which the foreign purveyors of violence remain powerless.”⁹¹ By contrast, Schwarzbard’s explanation for his deed effectively portrayed Petliura and the government he headed not as victims but as victimizers, as purveyors of violence in their own right, whose “Ukrainian genius” had expressed itself not in constructive state building but in mass murder. Ukrainian exile leaders appear to have understood the challenge well. A post-assassination editorial in *Tryzub* proclaimed that “to our ongoing task [...] of liberating the homeland and renewing our statehood there has now been added a new assignment: [securing] dignified respect [...] for the indefatigable fighter for Ukrainian statehood and defending his good name and honor, the good name of our entire nation, the honor of our state, from disgraceful and loathsome slanders.”⁹² Likewise, the resolutions of the Paris memorial meeting of 30 May protested “against the shameful attempts of our enemies to place a stain upon the pure memory of our Martyr, our Head of State, who always stood on guard for the interests of all of the communities of Ukraine and who with determination protected the Jewish population as well against those elements who did it harm.”⁹³

Small wonder, then, that from the very outset, before any investigation, most Ukrainian circles outside the Soviet Union dismissed Schwarzbard’s story out of hand. *Dilo*, the leading Ukrainian-language daily in Poland, whose editors adamantly opposed Petliura over what they called his “dreadful” pro-Polish foreign policy, nevertheless bridled palpably at the “disgusting legend” the assassin had begun to spread:

“Schwarzbard explains his act by referring to rumors about the persecution of Jews in Ukraine in 1917, as if Petliura was the cause of the persecution. Obviously Schwarzbard’s stated reasons are completely unfounded. In 1917 there was no persecution of Jews in Ukraine, and if there was, it was only because of soldiers who had gone over to the Bolsheviks returning from the

91 Petliura, *Rozpochynaiuchy vydannia*.

92 Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Tryzub*, 27 June 1926.

93 Anonymous, *Zhalibna akademiia pam’iaty S. V. Petliury v Paryzhi*.

southern and western fronts [...]. It is clear that it was not the 'pogroms' in greater Ukraine but something else that induced a Russian Jew not only to fire three revolver shots at S. Petliura while he was walking down the street but also to taunt the man while he was down and bleeding."⁹⁴

Few in these circles appear to have had much doubt about the nature of the "something else" that Schwarzbard allegedly refused to reveal. On 30 May *Dilo* reported that "the Ukrainian colony in Paris is of the opinion that Schwarzbard killed Petliura by order of the Executive of the Communist International."⁹⁵ The newspaper's Paris correspondent noted that although Ukrainian nationalists in Poland did not think Petliura a likely candidate for "political resurrection [...], all signs indicate that Bolshevik circles evaluated the future prospects of [...] the Petliura movement differently." In his opinion, the Soviet ambassador in Paris, Rakovsky, was especially nervous over Petliura's renewed prospects following Piłsudski's return to power in Warsaw. "It is just a bit strange," he commented, that "a scant two weeks later Schwarzbard carried out his sentence." Moreover, he claimed, Petliura was known far and wide for the favorable stance he had habitually taken on matters of Jewish interest. Hence the reporter's conclusion: in contrast to what he claimed, Schwarzbard had acted not alone but with accomplices, not as the avenger of his people but as a Bolshevik agent.⁹⁶ This version of events quickly gained currency throughout the Ukrainian diaspora. In the first instance it chimed well with the narrative of mounting Bolshevik danger that animated growing segments of the contemporary French public, thereby increasing the likelihood that the Ukrainian national cause would gain a sympathetic ear in the French press.⁹⁷ But even more, Petliura's followers in Paris appear to have been especially attracted to it because of what seemed to them its potential as a unifying force. *Tryzub* employed it explicitly for that purpose in an August 1926 editorial:

94 Anonymous, *Nosii velykoi idei* [The Bearer of a Great Idea], in: *Dilo*, 29 May 1926. See also Anonymous, *Ohydna lehenda* [An Abominable Legend], in: *ibid.*, 30 May 1926; Volodymyr Levytskyi, *Chyia zhertva?* [Whose Victim?], in: *ibid.*, 2 June 1926. In the event, Schwarzbard claimed to have sought vengeance for violence that occurred in 1919, not in 1917, and police reports noted that he had fired five shots, not three.

95 Anonymous, *Pisia vbyvstva otam[ana] Petliury* [After the Murder of Atam[an] Petliura], in: *ibid.*, 30 May 1926.

96 Levytskyi, *Chyia zhertva?*

97 See above, at n. 39 ff.

“The Bolsheviks have made a grievous error in counting upon a Jewish hand to eliminate S. Petliura, their most dangerous and most ferocious enemy [...], the very soul of the Ukrainian struggle for liberation, for by doing so they have brought down upon themselves the nation’s rage [...]. The death of the commander-in-chief, which has left us without a leader, has aroused in all of us an acute sense of the [...] duty and responsibility that falls upon us to stand more firmly shoulder to shoulder, to close ranks in order to carry on his work. Of course, it should be kept in mind that some other destructive elements may try to exploit the moment for their own interests by arousing mutiny among the emigrés who are organized under the banner of the Ukrainian National Republic. But we are certain that the healthy masses will not give in [...]: The sacred blood [of the fallen leader] will forge it stronger than cement.”⁹⁸

In the event, the unifying potential appears to have been realized to a large degree. To be sure, far-left elements, including Vynnychenko and the Union of Ukrainian Citizens in France, remained intractable, with the Union using its organ, *Ukrains’ki visti*, as a platform for attacks upon Petliura, his followers, and his memory.⁹⁹ Most other parts of the Ukrainian diaspora, however, along with the mainstream of the Ukrainian population in East Galicia, appear to have fallen readily into line behind the *Tryzub* circle. Committees for “defending the name and honoring the memory of S[ymon] Petliura” in various European countries began, in coordination with the Paris center, to gather documents and raise money for the purpose of countering the claims that Schwarzbard was expected to raise at his forthcoming trial.¹⁰⁰ Mykola

98 Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Tryzub*, 29 August 1926.

99 See, for example, Anonymous, «Repressii» petliursiv [The “Repressions” of the Petliurists], in: *Ukrains’ki visti*, 18 July 1926; Anonymous, Vynnychenko v «Dilo» [Vynnychenko in “Dilo”], in: *ibid.* Cf. Vynnychenko’s statement to the *cour d’assises* in connection with Schwarzbard’s trial, which broke with Petliura’s defenders and attached full responsibility for anti-Jewish violence in Ukraine in 1919 to him and the government he led: YIVO, RG80/432/37245–37266. And see also the circular of the Committee for the Defense of Ukrainian Honor (*Komitet oborony chesty Ukrainy*), Paris, 12 March 1927, NYPL, *QGA 73–3935, doc. 32, which charged that *Tryzub* was a creation of the Polish secret police and that key associates of Petliura in Paris were actually Polish agents.

100 Anonymous, Velyka vtrata [A Great Loss], in: *Dilo*, 5 June 1926; Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Tryzub*, 12 September 1926; Anonymous, Ob’iednannia ukrains’koi emihratsii v Chekhii [Associations of Ukrainian Emigrés in Czechoslovakia], in: *Tryzub*, 19 September 1926. Cf. the declarations of support and solidarity collected in *Comité commémoratif Simon Petlura* (ed.), *Documents sur les pogromes en Ukraine*

Shapoval and his Ukrainian Association in France supported and took part in activities initiated and led by Petliura's designated successors.¹⁰¹ And *Dilo* reminded its readers that although it had long suspected Petliura's tactics, the fallen leader was in the final analysis "the bearer of a great idea" to whose fulfillment all Ukrainians were obligated.¹⁰²

6. Shaping a Ukrainian Narrative

However, before the narrative of a nefarious Bolshevik plot could be made to stick, two obstacles had to be overcome. The first was the initial lack of tangible evidence to support it. Of course, Ukrainian circles worldwide were privy to the details of Schwarzbard's biography, including information regarding his service with the Red Guard, that were published in newspapers around the globe in the weeks following the assassination. But although Schwarzbard's past associations may have raised suspicions among people already inclined to identify Moscow's hand in the murder, they hardly constituted proof *prima facie* that he had in fact acted as a communist agent. The deficiency appears to have concerned at least some Ukrainian leaders. Key figures in the *Tryzub* circle, headed by the journal's editor, Vyacheslav Prokopovych, with the participation of Oleksandr Shulhyn, former chief of the Paris diplomatic mission of Petliura's exile Ukrainian National Republic, and Jan Tokarzewski-Karaszewicz, director of the UNR foreign office, quickly formed an investigating committee, which gathered numerous public documents and press clippings along with nearly 70 written affidavits from people who had been close to Petliura at various stages of his career.¹⁰³ However, doubtless to its consternation, the committee's labors do not appear to have

et l'assassinat de Simon Petlura à Paris (1917–1921–1926). Recueil de documents concernant la lutte du Gouvernement de la République Démocratique Ukrainienne contre les pogromes antijuifs en Ukraine et relatifs à l'assassinat de Simon Petlura à Paris, Paris 1927, 185–227. See also Lytvyn, *Sud istorii*, 496.

101 See Mykola Shapoval, *Pro smert' Petliury* [On the Death of Petliura], Paris 1927. On the other hand, Shapoval's brother in Prague complained in November 1926 that "our emigré community is [still] not one, but several." Mykyta Shapoval, *Bol'shevizm i Ukraina* [Bolshevism and Ukraine], Prague 1926, 2. Cf. Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 27–28 May 1926, NYPL, *QGA 73–3926, no. 72 (Document 15).

102 Anonymous, *Nosii velykoi idei*.

103 Serhii Lytvyn, *Vbystvvo S. Petliury i GPU. Do istoriohrafii problemy* [The Assassination of S. Petliura and the GPU. On the Historiography of the Problem], 1, <<http://www.sbu.gov.ua/sbu/doccatalog%5Cdocument?id=42156>> (9 April 2014).

uncovered any actual order from the Kremlin to Schwarzbard to kill his victim.¹⁰⁴ Other leaders concentrated upon identifying accomplices among alleged Ukrainian and Russian Bolsheviks in Paris, but their efforts similarly failed to yield unambiguous results.¹⁰⁵ Although in the end the absence of indisputable evidence may not have deterred those elements among the French public and the Ukrainian exile community who were favorably predisposed toward the narrative of a communist conspiracy from accepting it, it did permit Schwarzbard's attorney Torrès to make short shrift of the testimony its proponents offered at the trial.¹⁰⁶

The second problem presented by the rejection of Schwarzbard's own explanation of his deed in favor of one that evoked a Bolshevik plot was the possibility that it might exacerbate tensions between Ukrainians and important segments of the Jewish world – an eventuality that many Ukrainian leaders hoped studiously to avoid. All of the competing Ukrainian exile factions understood well that their political aims could not be realized without the support of influential allies who could advance their cause in the international arena and represent it sympathetically in the organs of public opinion in Europe and beyond.¹⁰⁷ For some, Jews seemed well suited to play such a role. In fact, Petliura himself appears to have regarded Jews as potentially valuable associates from the time he first sought power. In 1917, as a member of the Ukrainian Central Council, he was party to efforts to induce the cooperation of local Jewish political groups in the Council's program for augmenting Ukrainian territorial self-rule – efforts that included promises of farreaching Jewish linguistic and cultural autonomy, significant Jewish

104 On the eve of the trial the committee published a special volume containing upwards of 120 documents in support of its position, but the documents demonstrated only that in 1926 some Ukrainian circles in the Soviet Union, Poland, and the diaspora continued to portray Petliura as a dangerous enemy. *Comité commémoratif Simon Petlura* (ed.), *Documents sur les pogromes*, 272–284.

105 See, for example, *Confrontation Chapoval-Schwartzbard*, 20 July 1926, YIVO, RG80/451/38069–38070 (Document 31). Later, on the advice of Ilya Dobkowski, Shapoval would suggest to the magistrate that Mikhail Volodin had played a role in the murder. See Mykola Shapoval to I. Steinberg, 14 April 1927, NYPL, *QGA 73–3936, no. 6 (Document 51). For further details, see below, at n. 133 ff.

106 See TT, 26 October 1927, 21 (YIVO, RG80/496/40724). Cf. Torrès, *Procès des pogromes*, 31–34.

107 Motyl, *Turn to the Right*, 23–85; Jan Jacek Bruski, *Petlurowcy. Centrum Państwowe Ukrainińskiej Republiki Ludowej na wychodźstwie (1919–1924)* [The Petliurists. The Ukrainian National Republic and Its Central State Institutions in Exile], Kraków 2000, 363–371.

representation in the Council's inner circles, and (in 1918) the creation of a special cabinet-level Ministry for Jewish Affairs whose head was selected from among a slate of candidates nominated by Jewish parties.¹⁰⁸

Although these overtures did not produce the desired results in the long term, they did attract favorable attention in western Jewish circles, especially in Great Britain. Taking notice of what seemed to him Ukrainian attentiveness to Jewish national concerns and comparing them favorably to purported expressions of hostility toward Jews by Polish leaders, Lewis Namier, an adviser on east European affairs in the Foreign Office's Political Intelligence Division (eventually to become one of Britain's most prominent historians), argued vigorously in 1919 against extension of Polish sovereignty into East Galicia and represented an independent Ukraine as a bulwark against Bolshevik expansion.¹⁰⁹ Namier (born Ludwik Bernstein and raised near Lwów) was at the time also a rising star in British Zionist circles. But Zionists were not the only Jews who expressed sympathy for Ukrainian political aspirations. Lucien Wolf, the resolutely anti-Zionist head of the Joint Foreign Committee of the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Anglo-Jewish Association who had maintained a presence in Whitehall for a decade, addressed a "private and confidential" memorandum to the Foreign Office in February 1920 in which he insisted that the demands of the East Ukrainians under Petliura "must by all means be supported, not only by the British Government but also by the vast political and financial circles of English society, the more so that the new Ukrainian Government [...] is very near to the [Anglophil] feelings and attitudes which [...] are held by the [Ukrainian] Diplomatic Mission in Great Britain."¹¹⁰

Accordingly, Petliura and his associates continued to seek and cultivate Jewish backing after going into exile. As the head of Petliura's diplomatic mission in Prague, Maksym Slavynskyi, put it in a letter of greeting to the Twelfth Zionist Congress in 1921, since the First World War "the Jewish people [...]

108 On these developments see in particular Henry Abramson, *A Prayer for the Government. Ukrainians and Jews in Revolutionary Times, 1917–1920*, Cambridge Mass. 1999, 33–66. The Ministry continued to function during the interval in 1919 in which Petliura served as chairman of the Directory, although with little organized Jewish support. *Ibid.*, 141–161.

109 See, for example, L. Namier to J. Headlam-Morley, 21 February 1919, Churchill Archive Center, Churchill College, Cambridge, ACC 688, box 2; L. Namier to J. Headlam-Morley, 7 June 1919, *ibid.*, ACC 727, box 11, file: Mr. Namier: Correspondence and Memoranda. See also Paul Latawski, *The Dmowski-Namier Feud, 1915–1918*, in: *Polin* 2 (1987), 37–49.

110 Untitled memorandum, YIVO RG 348/8/83/8443–8444 (date established from file position).

has become an important factor in world Politics.”¹¹¹ Slavynskyi himself carried the ball in the most visible such effort – the agreement negotiated during the Zionist Congress with Zionist leader Vladimir Jabotinsky, which provided that, should they seek to reconquer Ukraine by force, UNR armies under Petliura’s command would permit armed Jewish self-defense units to protect Jews in the towns and villages that came under their control.¹¹² From the Ukrainian point of view the primary purpose of that agreement was, in Slavynskyi’s words, “to repair the tainted opinion of the Jewish public with regard to matters Ukrainian,” to counter publication of press reports potentially harmful to Petliura’s cause, and to gain access to presumed Jewish connections on the world diplomatic stage.¹¹³ In this case, too, the effort was unsuccessful, but the belief that Jews might be induced to open important doors to Ukrainian exile politicians continued to influence those politicians through the mid-1920s and even after Petliura’s death.¹¹⁴

A similar belief was noticeable among leaders claiming to speak for the Ukrainian population of Poland in particular. In March 1922, anticipating an impending decision by the League of Nations concerning the legitimacy of Poland’s incorporation of the largely Ukrainian-populated region of eastern Galicia, a diplomatic representative of Petrushevych’s West Ukrainian National Republic sought the assistance of Nahum Sokolow, a senior figure in the World Zionist Organization based in London, in ascertaining the position of the British government on the matter.¹¹⁵ Later that year Ukrainian and Jewish representatives in Poland joined spokesmen of other ethnic minor-

111 Stenographisches Protokoll der Verhandlungen des XII. Zionisten-Kongresses in Karlsbad vom 1. bis 14. September 1921, Berlin 1922, 37–38, here 37. (Document 10).

112 Jüdische Rundschau, 23 December 1921, 732 (Document 11). The agreement was forged against the background of Petliura’s plan to invade Soviet Ukraine in 1922. On the plan, see Bruski, Petlurowcy, 399–415. The invasion never took place, rendering the agreement moot. See also Joseph B. Schechtman, The Jabotinsky–Slavinsky Agreement. A Chapter in Ukrainian-Jewish Relations, in: Jewish Social Studies 17 (1955), 289–306; Shmu’el Katz, Zhabo. Biyografyah shel Ze’ev Zhabotinski [Jabo. A Biography of Ze’ev Jabotinsky], Tel Aviv 1993, 480–488.

113 See M. Slavynskyi’s report of his meeting: Maxim Slawinsky, Die Beziehungen zu den Zionisten, in: Jüdische Rundschau, 23 December 1921, 732 (Document 12).

114 See, *inter alia*, Moshe Landau, Mi’ut le’umi lohem. Ma’avak yehudei Polin ba-shanim 1918–1928 [A Fighting National Minority. The Struggle of Polish Jewry in the Years 1918–1928], Jerusalem 1986, 259. For further elaboration, see below.

115 S. Witwitsky (Vytvytskyi) to N. Sokolow, 1 March 1922, CZA, A18/50/1 (Document 13). International recognition of Polish sovereignty in eastern Galicia came about a year later, in March 1923. On the West Ukrainian National Republic, see above, n. 69.

ity groups in an electoral alliance – the Bloc of National Minorities – that garnered a significant presence in the Polish parliament despite widespread boycott of the elections by Ukrainians in East Galicia, who had yet to recognize Polish sovereignty over the province.¹¹⁶ In July 1924 Ukrainian parliamentary deputies enlisted Jewish assistance in an unsuccessful effort to defeat a bill promoting Polish-language instruction in schools with predominantly Ukrainian enrollments.¹¹⁷ When a year later the Jewish parliamentary caucus, in an apparent departure from its earlier practice of principled opposition in the name of minority solidarity, signed an agreement of cooperation with the government of Prime Minister Władysław Grabski, Ukrainian leaders in Poland reacted with consternation over the loss of an important ally and worked to dissuade them from their course.¹¹⁸ In fact, in early 1926 the recently-formed Ukrainian National Democratic Alliance (*Ukrains'ke Natsional'no-Demokratychnе Ob'iednannia* – UNDO) initiated discussions aimed at renewing the minorities bloc, in which Jewish participation was actively solicited.¹¹⁹ The discussions continued throughout the interval between Petliura's assassination and Schwarzbard's acquittal and beyond, reaching a successful conclusion on 22 January 1928.¹²⁰ In short, through the late 1920s significant parts of the non-Soviet Ukrainian political leadership wanted Jews on their side and reached out to them periodically to attract their support.

It was in this spirit, no doubt, that a mere five days after the assassination Mykola Shapoval publicly accused Moscow of seeking to pull the attention of Ukrainians away from the anti-communist struggle and to sharpen Ukrainian-Jewish tensions. “The murderer of the commander-in-chief could only have been an enemy of the Jewish people,” he declared, “for he sought to arouse all of the dark demons of antisemitism.”¹²¹ *Tryzub* made the same argument emphatically the following September:

116 The Bloc returned the third-largest number of deputies to the lower house (Sejm) out of 28 lists that competed in the elections. In the upper house (Senat) it returned 22 members out of 111. See Paweł Korzec, *Der Block der nationalen Minderheiten im Parlamentarismus Polens des Jahres 1922*, in: *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 24 (1975), 193–220.

117 Landau, *Mi'ut le'umi lohem*, 263.

118 *Ibid.*, 265–268. On the agreement of cooperation (*ugoda*) see Paweł Korzec, *Das Abkommen zwischen der Regierung Grabski und der jüdischen Parlamentsvertretung*, in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 20 (1972), 331–366.

119 Paweł Korzec, *Der Zweite Block der Nationalen Minderheiten im Parlamentarismus Polens 1927–1928*, in: *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 26 (1977), 76–116, here 81–84.

120 *Ibid.*, 115 f.

121 *Promova henerala Shapovala na zhalibniy akademii v pamiat' Holovnoho Otamana S. V. Petliury* [Speech of General Shapoval at the Memorial Ceremony for Chief Ata-

“Ukrainian democratic circles have considered the killing of Chief Ataman Petliura by a certain Schwarzbard as the doing not of the Jews but of the Bolsheviks, directed against Ukrainian democracy and the person of its leader, who had been leading an armed struggle for the independence of Ukraine. The fact that Schwarzbard is a Jew seems to us to be a horrible provocation by the Soviet authorities. Sensing that the ground under their feet is insecure, anticipating impending outbursts of popular anger, but nevertheless keenly aware of the complexity of Jewish-Ukrainian relations, the current Soviet regime, itself essentially antisemitic, has, through its calculated selection of the assassin, demonstrated a desire to divert the animosity of its downtrodden masses from the lines of political struggle and vengeance toward lines consistent with the convoluted past and recent practice of the Muscovite autocracy concerning relations among national groups.”¹²²

Privately, too, key figures in the Ukrainian exile community worked to mitigate any potential Ukrainian-Jewish rifts that might conceivably develop as a result of the assassination. They were aided in this task by a former associate with close connections in the Jewish world, Arnold Margolin (1877–1956). A prominent Jewish criminal attorney from Kiev who had come to international attention for his work in defending factory superintendent Mendel Beilis against the charge of ritual murder in his infamous 1911 trial, Margolin had become active in the Ukrainian national cause following the February 1917 revolution in the Russian Empire. Serving first as a supreme court justice, then as deputy foreign minister of the Ukrainian National Republic, he had attended the Paris Peace Conference as part of the Ukrainian mission and represented the Republic at the League of Nations and in London. He had migrated to the United States in 1922, where he had worked primarily as a journalist, contributing to Russian-, Ukrainian-, and English-language newspapers.¹²³ First in the Russian Empire, later in the capitals of western

man S. V. Petliura], 30 May 1926, NYPL, *QGA 73–3936, no. 1. The strategy of labeling Schwarzbard a “Judeophobe” had been suggested to him by his brother. See Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 27–28 May 1926, NYPL, *QGA 73–3926, no. 72 (Document 15).

122 Levko Chykalenko, *Sionisty i «Sionisty»* [Zionists and “Zionists”], in: Tryzub, 26 September 1926 (Document 36). Cf. I. Hodorozhnyy, *Sovits’kyi antysemityzm* [Soviet Anti-Semitism], in: *ibid.*, 12 September 1926.

123 For biographical information see Arnold Margolin, *From a Political Diary. Russia, the Ukraine, and America*, New York 1946; Victoria Khiterer, *Arnold Davidovich Margolin. Ukrainian-Jewish Jurist, Statesman and Diplomat*, in: *Revolutionary*

Europe and in New York and Washington, he had developed close ties with major Jewish organizations and political leaders.¹²⁴ At the time of Petliura's assassination he was serving as an informal adviser on east European Jewish affairs to the American Jewish Committee, the senior organization in the United States dedicated to combating anti-Jewish discrimination and persecution throughout the world.¹²⁵ In all stages of his career he had spoken publicly on behalf of Ukrainian-Jewish cooperation; indeed, he had concluded a 1922 book entitled *Ukraine and the Politics of the Entente* by declaring that his life's purpose was to bring about "a feeling of supreme mutual toleration" between Jews and Ukrainians and to unite all parts of the Jewish world around the task of forging a "close relationship with the peoples among whom the Jews reside."¹²⁶

Margolin was thus uniquely well suited to mediate between Ukrainians and Jews in the aftermath of Petliura's murder. Accordingly, during summer 1926 he received entreaties from Petliura's chief deputies in Paris and Warsaw, Oleksandr Shulhyn and Andrii Livytskyi, to come to Paris to "organize and direct our nations in connection with this trial." "Help us to prove," Livytskyi implored, "that our leader was killed not by a Jew but an internationalist, that the [sic] Jewry is not responsible for him just as it is not responsible for Trotsky."¹²⁷ Shulhyn also asked Margolin to convey to his Jewish comrades that it would be "a grave mistake on the part of the Jews" to affirm Schwarzbard's version of events; doing so, he warned, would be tantamount to Jews themselves saying, "We are those who killed the pogromtschik

Russia 18 (2005), 145–167. See also Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.A. (ed.), *In Memory of Arnold Margolin (1877–1956). Remarks and Reminiscences Presented at the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.A. on the Hundredth Anniversary of His Birth*, New York 1983.

124 In his memoir he mentioned three people with whom he came into contact upon arriving in New York: Louis Brandeis, Julian Mack, and Robert Szold – all both leading American jurists and central figures in the American Zionist movement. Margolin, *From a Political Diary*, 73.

125 See the Committee's mission statement; American Jewish Committee (ed.), *Ninth Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee*, in: *American Jewish Year Book 18 (1916–1917)*, 288–410, here 334.

126 Arnold D. Margolin, *Ukraina i politika Antanty (Zapiski yevreya i grazhdanina) [Ukraine and the Politics of the Entente (Notes by a Jew and a Citizen)]*, Berlin n.d. [1922], 362.

127 A. Livytskyi to A. Margolin, 1 July 1926, YIVO RG80/400/35109–35110 (Document 26).

Petl[i]ura,” and would invite “tragic events [...] about which it is terrible to think.”¹²⁸

Margolin, for his part, appears to have been moved by the pleas.¹²⁹ In July 1926 he wrote his long-time acquaintance Leo Motzkin, chairman of the Paris-based Comité des Délégations Juives, the most prominent international organization dedicated to the advancement of collective Jewish political interests across the European continent,¹³⁰ pleading with him to use his influence with other Jewish leaders to heal the rift between Ukrainians and Jews. In his description, that rift had grown rapidly wider following Schwarzbard’s act.¹³¹ Similarly, in October 1926 he submitted a lengthy memorandum to the American Jewish Committee imploring that body to “use its [...] authority in persuading the leading Yiddish papers to change their attitude” and to display “a more discreet and conciliatory attitude [...] towards questions which touch the sensibilities of the Ukrainians,” in the hope that he would then find it easier “to persuade the Ukrainians also to change their hostile attitude and the tone of their press towards all that which concerns this case and to create a more peaceful atmosphere in Ukrainian-Jewish relations.”¹³²

Ukrainian leaders appear to have been receptive to an overture to Jews in the spirit that Margolin suggested and to have looked for a way to incorporate it into the anti-Bolshevik narrative of Petliura’s assassination. It was this desire (and not, perhaps surprisingly, the ongoing search for proof of a communist plot) that provided the initial context in which two particu-

128 Shulhyn to Margolin, 12 August 1926, YIVO RG80/400/35107–35108 (Document 33).

129 In a note attached to the letter from Livytskyi Margolin indicated, “I also received a similar letter from Mr. I. Mazeppa, President of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party (Mensheviks), living now in Prague. Mr. Mazeppa belongs to the anti-Polish groups among the Ukrainian emigrés [in opposition to Petliura and his circle]. He also insists, in the name of *all* the [Ukrainian] groups and parties, upon my coming to Paris.” AJC, B22 F4 (Russia: Margolin, A. 1924–1928).

130 On the Comité des Délégations Juives, see below, at n. 209.

131 A. Margolin to L. Motzkin, 12 July 1926, YIVO RG80/476/39229–39231 (Document 27).

132 A. Margolin to Executive Committee, American Jewish Committee, [17 October 1926], AJC, B22 F4 (Russia: Margolin, A. 1924–1928) (Document 41). Shortly after composing this report Margolin asked Louis Marshall of the American Jewish Committee to make it possible for him “to go to Europe and spend a few months in Paris, Prague and some other cities in which the Ukrainians live at the present time,” because “my connections with all the Ukrainian parties and groups [...] could give me quite an exceptional possibility to create better mutual relations between the Jews and the Ukrainians.” A. Margolin to L. Marshall, 26 October 1926, *ibid*.

larly elusive and intriguing figures in the episode first caught the attention of the Ukrainian leadership in a way that helped shape significantly how many Ukrainians came to understand Petliura's death. The two figures were the ostensible former agent of the Kerensky and Bolshevik governments Ilya Dobkowski and the man he would eventually accuse of being Schwarzbard's Moscow-directed handler and partner in crime, Mikhail Volodin.¹³³

Dobkowski and Volodin had known each other for at least two years before the assassination. They had also both been acquainted with Schwarzbard before he committed his deed.¹³⁴ According to Dobkowski – himself a Jew who had received a traditional religious education before turning to revolutionary socialism¹³⁵ – he had encountered Volodin in the ranks of the Union of Socialist-Revolutionary Maximalists, a radical offshoot of the Imperial Russian Social Revolutionary Party distinguished from the party mainstream in part by its encouragement of assassination and robbery as political tactics.¹³⁶ After the October 1917 revolution Dobkowski, like a number of former Maximalists, appears to have joined the so-called Left Socialist Revolutionaries (Left SRs), who entered into a short-lived coalition with the Bolsheviks before leaving the government in protest over the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. That March 1918 agreement between Russia and the Central Powers had ended Russia's participation in the First World War, thereby creating the conditions that led, among other things, to the installation of the Skoropadskyi regime in Ukraine.¹³⁷ Volodin, too, evidently maintained close contact with Left SR exile circles in Berlin during the mid-1920s.¹³⁸ Indeed, it was through the agency of the most prominent Russian Left SR in Berlin at the time, Isaac

133 See above, at nn. 44, 45. Dobkowski had actually served as Vice-Commissar for Jewish Affairs in the People's Commissariat of Nationalities of the Bolshevik government, under the chairmanship of Josef Dzugashvili (Stalin). He was summarily dismissed from office when it was discovered that he had once been a paid agent of the tsarist secret police. Zvi Y. Gitelman, *Jewish Nationality and Soviet Politics. The Jewish Sections of the CPSU, 1917–1930*, Princeton N.J. 1972, 133.

134 Elie Dobkowski, *Affaire Petliura-Schwarzbard*, [Paris], n. d. [1928], 18–20.

135 Following the Bolshevik Revolution Dobkowski had approached Josef Stalin to publish a pro-Soviet newspaper in Yiddish. Mordekhai Altshuler, *Ha-yevsekziyah bi-vrit ha-mo'azot 1918–1930. Beyn le'umiyut le-komunizm* [The Yevseksia in the Soviet Union 1918–1930. Between Nationalism and Communism], Jerusalem 1980, 21 f.

136 Dobkowski, *Affaire Petliura-Schwarzbard*, 48–50. On the Maximalists, see Leonard Schapiro, *The Origin of the Communist Autocracy. Political Opposition in the Soviet State, First Phase, 1917–1922*, London 21977, 179 f.

137 On the Left SRs, see Schapiro, *Origin*, 111–129.

138 I. Steinberg to Mykola Shapoval, 22 April 1927, NYPL, *QGA 73–3936, no. 7 (Document 52).

Nachman Steinberg (who was also well known among Jews of Russian origin and active in Jewish exile politics),¹³⁹ that, by Dobkowski's account, the two met face to face for the first time in 1924.¹⁴⁰

Following their break with the Bolsheviks in mid-1918, the Russian Left SRs had worked together with some of their Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionary counterparts to organize an uprising against the Skoropadskyi government and the German military forces that backed it.¹⁴¹ The contacts established at that time had continued into the 1920s, when members of both the Russian and the Ukrainian parties found themselves moving in the same exile circles. Among other things they gave rise to an ongoing correspondence between Steinberg and the Shapoval brothers aimed at cultivating the Russian-Ukrainian-Belarusian left-wing alliance that had aroused Petliura's opposition.¹⁴² They also helped make Mykola Shapoval's Paris address a gathering place not only for Ukrainian emigré activists but for exiled Russian Left SRs and Maximalists as well. Hence when Dobkowski and Volodin turned up separately in Paris in 1925, each eventually found his way to Shapoval's home.¹⁴³

139 Isaac Nachman Steinberg (1888–1957), Yiddish-speaking, Sabbath-observing Jewish revolutionary attorney, trained in Moscow and Heidelberg, served as People's Commissar of Justice under Lenin during the Bolshevik-Left SR coalition. Under threat of assassination, he fled to Berlin in 1923, where he became a senior figure in the Russian exile community. Following the Nazi accession to power he moved to London, where he founded the Freeland League, an organization that sought a territory for mass resettlement of Jewish refugees.

140 Dobkowski, *Affaire Petliura-Schwarzbard*, 50.

141 Lutz Häfner, *The Assassination of Count Mirbach and the "July Uprising" of the Left Socialist Revolutionaries in Moscow, 1918*, in: *Russian Review* 50 (1991), 324–344, here 334 f.; Konrad Jarausch, *Cooperation or Intervention? Kurt Riezler and the Failure of German Ostpolitik, 1918*, in: *Slavic Review* 31 (1972), 381–398, here 396.

142 On Petliura's opposition see above, at n. 80.

143 Mykola Shapoval to I. Steinberg, 14 April 1927, NYPL, *QGA 73–3936, no. 6 (Document 51); Dobkowski, *Affaire Petliura-Schwarzbard*, 52–54. Dobkowski claimed that he asked Volodin to introduce him to Shapoval. Shapoval related at least two different stories about how he met Volodin. According to one (Mykola Shapoval to I. Steinberg, 14 April 1927, *ibid.*), Volodin came to his home with a letter of introduction from a mutual acquaintance asking Shapoval to help him settle in Paris. According to the other (TT, 20 October 1927, 114 f., YIVO, RG80/488/39839–39840) (Document 64), he met Volodin at a socialist congress in Paris on 8 August 1925, where Volodin "presented himself as a comrade" and asked him for help in legalizing his presence in France. In both versions Volodin lived in Shapoval's apartment for several months during the year prior to the Petliura assassination.

Dobkowski later testified that he had sought out Shapoval in the weeks following Petliura's death because "like many Jewish socialists I was outraged at the joy that Jewish nationalists were displaying over the assassination" and wanted to understand "how the Ukrainians, especially of the working class, regarded the affair."¹⁴⁴ He claimed that after discussing the matter with the Ukrainian leader he had determined to write a series of articles on the subject with a mind to persuading Jews that adopting Schwarzbard as a hero was contrary to their interests. "I shall raise my voice before the honest Jewish artisans, merchants, and craftsmen who are desperate to know the truth," he proposed, suggesting that by claiming that he had punished Petliura for the violence against Ukrainian Jewry, Schwarzbard actually "mock[ed] those honest Jews and Christians who condemned the pogroms."¹⁴⁵ Then, he reported, as he was discussing his idea with Shapoval, "Volodin entered the room [...] and offered to take various actions with [Mykyta] Shapoval and the group of Ukrainian socialists in Prague with the aim of editing the brochure."¹⁴⁶ It is not clear why Dobkowski might have required or desired Volodin's editorial assistance or intervention with Mykola Shapoval's brother (who, together with Vynnychenko, published a bi-weekly journal, *Nova Ukraina*, based in Prague), but he evidently accepted the offer. He composed a lengthy article in Russian, entitled "The Murder of Petliura: A Provocation on the Jewish Street – The Voice of a Jew;" Mykola Shapoval prepared a Ukrainian translation; and Volodin passed the document on to Mykyta Shapoval in the Czech capital.¹⁴⁷

Mykyta Shapoval's reaction to Dobkowski's text appears to have led to a clash between him and the author into which Volodin, Dobkowski's would-be editor, and Mykola Shapoval, Dobkowski's patron, were also drawn. From this clash a central element in the Ukrainian account of the assassination presented at Schwarzbard's trial would eventually be generated.

The conflict began when Mykyta Shapoval insisted upon changes in Dobkowski's draft. Generally he found the article written in a "nervous tone" that he felt "need[ed] to be made a bit more even-keeled." He noted

144 Dobkowski, *Affaire Petliura-Schwarzbard*, 52.

145 *Ibid.*, 21.

146 *Ibid.*, 52.

147 The original manuscript, bearing corrections in another hand (presumably that of Volodin), is housed at YIVO, RG80/476/39175–39199. A Russian typescript and a Ukrainian translation in Mykola Shapoval's hand are located at NYPL, *QGA 73–3978 no. 2. For evidence of Volodin's negotiations with Mykyta Shapoval over the content and publication of the article see Mykyta Shapoval to M. Volodin, 15 October 1926, YIVO, RG80/448/37829–37830 (Document 39).

imbalance in another aspect as well: Although to his mind the piece properly castigated “Jewish chauvinism,” it needed simultaneously to excoriate “Ukrainian antisemitism (which has raised its head as of old as a result of Schwarzbard’s crime).” Indeed, as far as he was concerned, his “main aim” in publishing Dobkowski’s piece was “to speak to the *Ukrainian* masses, among whom a hateful feeling toward the Jews is growing *as a result of* the anti-Jewish agitation of the Ukrainian chauvinists,” who “point to the astounding fact that almost no one among the Jews condemns Schwarzbard or tries to say a word to the Ukrainian masses on a human level.”¹⁴⁸ Finally, he objected to a passage in which Dobkowski stated that he “would be prepared to fight for [Schwarzbard’s] freedom if only [...] the Jews had not thoughtlessly turned the assassination into a national affair.”¹⁴⁹ Accordingly, Mykyta Shapoval asked Volodin to rewrite the article together with Dobkowski, eliminating the controversial passage and changing the piece’s overall tenor in a way that would effectively “remove the enmity between the 40 million members of the Ukrainian nation and 8 million Jews living in the Ukrainian lands” – all with a mind to publishing it in a forthcoming volume of *Nova Ukraina*.¹⁵⁰

Volodin introduced the changes into Dobkowski’s manuscript, but Dobkowski hesitated to consent to publication. Unlike Mykyta Shapoval, he seems to have been interested principally in addressing a Jewish audience, in order to deflect what he saw as the rising groundswell of support among

148 Mykyta Shapoval to I. Dobkowski, 15 October 1926, YIVO, RG80/448/37831–37834 (Document 38).

149 The text to which Shapoval objected is quoted here from Dobkowski’s manuscript: YIVO, RG80/476/39179 verso. Shapoval’s characterization of the article is from Shapoval to Volodin, 15 October 1926 (above, n. 147). Dobkowski stated further that he “would be prepared to testify before the entire world and before the court that [Schwarzbard] is a good man, ready to answer the call and to give help to all.” On the other hand, he declared that he objected to the assassination only because Petliura was “a peaceful, unarmed emigré,” unlike former Imperial Russian officials Vyacheslav von Plehve and Pyotr Stolypin, “all powerful” figures who allegedly bore direct responsibility for the wave of anti-Jewish pogroms that began in 1903. Schwarzbard, he noted, could not be compared to earlier “Jewish terrorists” like Hirsh Lekert (executed for the attempted assassination of the Governor of Vilna, Viktor von Wahl, in 1902) or Grigoriy Gershuni (who led an SR cell that carried out the assassination of the Governor of Ufa, N. M. Bogdanovich, in 1903); they put their lives on the line for Jewish equality, whereas Schwarzbard’s courage expressed itself in an attack aimed at achieving no immediate political goal upon one who was no longer politically active and could do him no harm. *Ibid.*, 39176 verso–39177 recto; cf. Dobkowski, *Affaire Petliura-Schwarzbard*, 6, 17f.

150 See Documents 38–39.

his coreligionists of all classes for Schwarzbard's battle for acquittal. For that reason he asked that his piece be published first in French and only later in Ukrainian, and he asked that Shapoval facilitate the French version as a condition for publication in his journal. Negotiations between author and editor dragged on for the next six months, with the latter showing periodic signs of exasperation with Dobkowski's dilatory responses;¹⁵¹ only in April 1927 did the two agree that Mykyta Shapoval would "make sure that a French edition was arranged simultaneously" with the article's appearance in *Nova Ukraina*.¹⁵²

Meanwhile, however, Dobkowski and Mykola Shapoval had fallen out with Volodin. The rift appears to have arisen primarily as a result of Volodin's growing involvement in an internal conflict within the Ukrainian and Russian Social Revolutionary leadership. Beginning in 1925, the Shapovals had felt increasing tension in their alliance with Vynnychenko (Mykyta's co-editor at *Nova Ukraina*), largely because of disagreements concerning the proper organizational framework for the international Social Revolutionary movement.¹⁵³ Similar disagreements had appeared simultaneously among the Ukrainian SRs' principal Russian interlocutors. The Shapovals' position was echoed by I. N. Steinberg, while Vynnychenko's main Russian advocate was Aleksander Schreider, a prolific journalist and former deputy minister of justice in the short-lived Bolshevik-Left SR coalition government who challenged Steinberg's senior position among Russian Left SR and Maximalist exiles.¹⁵⁴ Volodin had initially been aligned with Steinberg – an association that had likely won him Mykola Shapoval's patronage after he arrived in Paris.¹⁵⁵ However, in late July 1926, two months after the assassination, Mykyta

151 Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 29 October 1926, 20 December 1926, NYPL, *QGA 73–3926, no. 82.

152 Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 19 April 1927, *ibid.*, no. 96.

153 See Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 29 April 1925, NYPL, *QGA 73–3935, no. 8.

154 Mykola Shapoval to I. Steinberg, 16 February 1925, YIVO, RG 366, box 59, folder 1018; Schreider to Left SR Foreign Delegation and Maximalist Union, December 1925, *ibid.* Cf. Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 22 December 1926, NYPL, *QGA 73–3926, no. 85: "It isn't necessary to warn you that behind Schreider stands Vynnychenko." On Schreider see Lutz Häfner, *Die Partei der Linken Sozialrevolutionäre in der russischen Revolution von 1917/18*, Köln/Weimar/Wien 1994, 640 and *passim*.

155 Schreider to Left SR Foreign Delegation (see previous note); cf. Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 11 May 1926, NYPL, *QGA 73–3926, no. 71: "Concerning Volodin: perhaps you could put him to work in the office [...]. He has political experience and could be useful in organizing the Ukr[ainian] Workers' Federation."

Shapoval noted that he had begun to collaborate with Schreider.¹⁵⁶ The sense that the two were growing closer mounted over the following months, to the point where the Shapoval brothers began to regret their ties with Volodin, especially his involvement with Dobkowski's article.¹⁵⁷ Even as Mykyta Shapoval worked with him on editing Dobkowski's piece, he noted Volodin's complaint that Mykola Shapoval was "betraying his trust" by seeking to remove him from the editorial process.¹⁵⁸

The break with Volodin was complete by early 1927, but animosities among the former collaborators evidently continued to fester. On 23 March 1927, apparently in response to a request from attorneys representing the Petliura family occasioned by Mykola Shapoval's suggestion,¹⁵⁹ examining magistrate Peyre summoned Shapoval, Dobkowski, and Volodin, for questioning.¹⁶⁰ At the interrogation Dobkowski and Shapoval turned on their erstwhile colleague, suggesting for the first time that Volodin had either played an active role in Petliura's assassination or that at the least he had known about a plot to kill the Ukrainian leader well before the deed had been committed. Dobkowski testified that on the day before the murder Volodin and Schwarzbard had eaten lunch together at a restaurant in which Petliura's wife and daughter were also taking their meal; upon seeing Mrs. Petliura Volodin had allegedly averted his gaze, fearing that she would recognize him.¹⁶¹

156 Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 27 July 1926, NYPL, *QGA 73-3926, no. 75.

Seven days earlier Mykola Shapoval had first mentioned Volodin to the examining magistrate in connection with the assassination. "Confrontation Chapoval-Schwarzbard," 20 July 1926, YIVO RG80/451/38069-38070 (Document 31).

157 Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 4 September 1926, NYPL, *QGA 73-3926, no. 77; Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 22 December 1926, NYPL, *QGA 73-3926, no. 85: "Good that you have finished with Volodin."

158 Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 16 October 1926, NYPL, *QGA 73-3926, no. 81.

159 French criminal procedure permitted the families of murder victims to bring civil charges for damages against the defendant. The civil and the criminal cases were investigated and tried simultaneously. The Petliura family was represented in its civil claim by César Campinchi and Albert Wilm (1868-1944), both prominent attorneys and public figures associated with the moderate political left.

160 No official record of this interrogation has been located. The following account is based on a report published the next day in a Paris-based Yiddish newspaper, which suggested that the examining magistrate did not regard the proceedings as sufficiently significant for an official summary to be prepared. Anonymous, Shvartsbards letster farher [Schwarzbard's Most Recent Hearing], in: Parizer haynt, 24 March 1927, 1 (Document 48).

161 Cf. Schwarzbard, In'm loyf fun yorn, 192: "[For a long time] I was not [...] sufficiently certain that the person whom I had encountered a few times and whom I had

Shapoval not only confirmed that Volodin and Schwarzbard had been close acquaintances who saw one another often; he also claimed that “four months before Petliura’s murder he [Volodin] started unexpectedly showing up at my place [...], and two months before the murder he began coming to me nearly every day,” always wanting to talk about Petliura, inquiring about his address and asking about possibilities for visiting him in person. He recalled further that shortly after the assassination, but before he had heard the news, he and Volodin had walked by the murder site; when the two heard talk of a “Russian general” who had been shot at the corner of boulevard Saint Michel and rue Racine, Volodin said “somewhat nervously, ‘It must have been Petliura.’”¹⁶²

Volodin vigorously disputed his erstwhile comrades’ testimony,¹⁶³ but over the next seven months suspicious reports about him continued to circulate in Ukrainian exile circles. By the time of the trial these reports had evolved into a full-blown conspiracy theory. Shapoval now stated in open court that he was “convinced that Volodin is an agent of Moscow who was sent” expressly in order to recruit an assassin among “Ukrainian[s] from a party opposed to Petliura,” like Shapoval’s own Social Revolutionaries.¹⁶⁴ Dobkowski, whom neither the prosecution nor the Petliura family attorneys had seen fit to place on their list of witnesses, addressed a lengthy letter to the chief prosecutor in which he linked Schwarzbard and Volodin together to “acts of secret espionage carried out by various terrorist organizations that have been installed in France and whose network extends into the colonies, the countries of Europe, and America” – acts that the Bolshevik Cheka had (so he claimed) twice dispatched him from Moscow to organize.¹⁶⁵ “The as-

heard speaking Ukrainian was Petliura. And after I had confirmed for myself that it really was he, I encountered him a few times with a woman and a young girl, and that deterred me from the step, out of fear of [shooting] an innocent victim.” There is at least one other testimony to the effect that Schwarzbard first recognized Petliura in a restaurant – by the French anarchist journalist May Picqueray, who recalled in her memoirs that the event had taken place while she and Schwarzbard had been sharing a meal with two Russian-American anarchists, Mollie Steimer and Senya Flechine, whom she had helped to free from a Soviet prison in 1922 through personal appeal to Trotsky. Sylvain Boulouque, *Anarchisme et judaïsme dans le mouvement libertaire en France. Réflexions sur quelques itinéraires*, in: Amadeo Bertolo (ed.), *Juifs et anarchistes*, Paris 2008, 113–124, here 115.

162 Mykola Shapoval to I. Steinberg, 14 April 1927, NYPL, *QGA 73–3936, no. 6 (Document 51). Shapoval repeated his account at the trial; TT, 20 October 1927, 116–119 (YIVO, RG80/488/39841–39844) (Document 64).

163 See above, n. 44.

164 TT, 20 October 1927, 113 (YIVO, RG80/488/39838) (Document 64).

165 TT, 20 October 1927, 7 (YIVO, RG80/488/39756).

sassination of Petliura by the anarchist Schwarzbard, the Maximalist Volodin [...], and others,” he declared, “can serve as an incontestable example” of how “*agents provocateurs* [...] secretly assassinate the enemies of Bolshevism” throughout Europe.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, he argued, Volodin’s involvement in the murder, of which he had no doubt, put the lie not only to Schwarzbard’s claim that he had acted alone but also to his justification of his deed as revenge for the mass killing of Jews by Petliura’s troops. “[Volodin] was not a Jew, and the Jews who knew him accused him of antisemitism. Consequently he could not have abetted the murder of Petliura except insofar as [Petliura] was an enemy of the Bolsheviks.”¹⁶⁷

The chief prosecutor read Dobkowski’s letter to the court; Torrès, recalling Dobkowski’s own shady political past, dismissed it as the rant of a person of questionable mental stability.¹⁶⁸ He was no doubt unaware that at least one other person who knew Dobkowski well, I. N. Steinberg, shared doubts of his competence. In early April 1927, after Dobkowski, Shapoval, and Volodin had told their stories to the examining magistrate, Steinberg, the Shapoval brothers’ close Russian Jewish confidant, read a letter that Volodin had sent to the editor of the leading Paris Yiddish-language daily, *Parizer haynt*, which a week earlier had published an account of the interrogation.¹⁶⁹ Dismissing the suggestion that he possessed significant information that might be of value in the investigation of Petliura’s murder, Volodin had commented that “General Shapoval’s inventiveness (*erfindungs-kunst*) is well known to the local Ukrainian colony.”¹⁷⁰ In a letter to Mykola Shapoval written on 10 April, Steinberg pronounced himself “completely astounded” by what he had read and wondered, “What does this all mean?”¹⁷¹ He found it difficult to believe that Volodin, who until recently had been a regular associate of the Shapoval brothers, had been involved in any way in the Petliura assassination. Even more was he surprised that Dobkowski had been mentioned. Accordingly he requested from Shapoval a detailed explanation of the role Volodin and Dobkowski were supposed to have played in the affair.

Shapoval responded four days later with a long account of how he had come to suspect Volodin of being Schwarzbard’s accomplice.¹⁷² Steinberg,

166 *Ibid.*, 8 (39757).

167 *Ibid.*, 16 (39765).

168 *Ibid.*, 27 (39776).

169 See above, n. 160.

170 Volodin, A [*sic*] erklärung fun M. Volodin, edus in Shvartsbard-frage.

171 I. Steinberg to Mykola Shapoval, 10 April 1927, NYPL, *QGA 73–3936, no. 5.

172 Mykola Shapoval to I. Steinberg, 14 April 1927, NYPL, *QGA 73–3936, no. 6 (Document 51).

however, remained unconvinced, replying to Shapoval that on the basis of his acquaintance he did “not believe that Volodin’s character could have allowed him to take part in either the theoretical or the technical planning of this assassination” and that “Dobkowski is an even more unstable and unhealthy person” whose “manic tendencies” had “completely robbed him of his emotional equilibrium.”¹⁷³ As his testimony at the trial indicates, however, Shapoval did not take Steinberg’s reservations to heart. Indeed, when Volodin attempted publicly to discredit that testimony in a letter to the editor of the Paris-based Russian emigré daily *Dni*, published two days after Shapoval had taken the witness stand,¹⁷⁴ the Ukrainian leader responded with an even more radical version of his story. Now, in a letter to the newspaper’s editor, he claimed that he had suspected Volodin of being “the primary, actual organizer of the murder of S. Petliura” from the moment the deed was committed but had initially refrained from making his suspicion known to the examining magistrate only because he feared that it would become public knowledge.¹⁷⁵

173 I. Steinberg to Mykola Shapoval, 22 April 1927, NYPL, *QGA 73–3936, no. 7 (Document 52). Indeed, there is evidence of erratic behavior on Dobkowski’s part. Two years after the conclusion of the trial Dobkowski wrote a rather bizarre letter to Schwarzbard and his wife, in which he claimed that his letter to the court concerning Volodin had actually been intended, “in a strange way, to be sure [...], to free you, to help to explode and to impede the machinations of the pogromists and all of the adventurers among the emigrés who always look for the hand of the GPU [Soviet secret police].” He claimed that he had not initially thought to implicate Volodin as a Soviet agent but had been “forced, first to go to Shapoval to give testimony and to have a talk with him about Volodin. For none other than Volodin himself had recommended me to Shapoval as an honest man and an enemy of Petliura, who is happy about Petliura’s death. Therefore I could not possibly have known or expected that he would tell the investigating magistrate about my private conversation with him about Volodin’s having eaten with Scholem [Schwarzbard] in a restaurant.” In his words, he had presented himself to the court as one who had previously organized terrorist acts on behalf of Moscow in order to discredit his own testimony, which he had not wanted to present in the first place. E. Dobkowski to S. and A. Schwarzbard, n. d. [1929], YIVO, RG85/881/69859–69861. Yet in the year after Schwarzbard’s acquittal (and a year before writing this letter) Dobkowski had published a French version of his article in which he repeated the accusation against Volodin that he had made at the trial. Dobkowski, *Affaire Petliura-Schwarzbard*.

174 Mikhail Volodin, Pis’mo M. Volodina [A Letter from M. Volodin], in: *Dni*, 22 October 1927.

175 Shapoval to Editor, *Dni*, undated [November 1927], NYPL, *QGA 73–3936, no. 3 (Document 72).

Shapoval's determination to implicate Volodin in the assassination appears to have worried his brother, who sent him a gentle but unmistakable rebuke following his protest to the editor of *Dni*:

"I have read your reply to Volodin's letter: it's all right, but I have been thinking about whether it is a good idea publicly to allege that Volodin was the one who organized the murder of Petliura. This could succeed on condition that there is firm *proof*. I don't know, do we have any proof? In case Volodin takes you to court for slander, you will suffer defeat because of weak evidence."¹⁷⁶

Mykyta Shapoval was concerned not only for the legal jeopardy in which his brother's accusation might place him but for its political consequences as well:

"The Petliurists are dismissing you, saying that your performance at the trial was extremely unsuccessful, since you didn't have any evidence against Volodin, so when you spoke you looked ridiculous. [...] Some people [...] have even told me that you are not worthy of the role of our political leader! Among other things, everyone is repeating (the Petliurists!) that you were friends with Volodin, that you had pictures taken [with him], and then you betrayed him."¹⁷⁷

He might have expressed yet another reason for annoyance. Mykola Shapoval had evidently forgotten that both Volodin and Dobkowski were initially supposed to play a key role in cementing broader Ukrainian-Jewish cooperation and in forestalling a potential rift between the two groups. By the time he denounced Volodin publicly from the witness stand, he seems to have abandoned that aim altogether. Indeed, during the year between the submission of Dobkowski's original article and Schwarzbard's acquittal any hope of retaining a measure of Ukrainian-Jewish political cooperation appears to have vanished altogether, not only within Shapoval's own political group but within Ukrainian exile circles more broadly. On the eve of the trial an editorial in *Tryzub* decried what it saw as the attempt by "all of Jewry [...], from the first moment after the assassination," to "use all of their material and moral resources to bring before the court and public opinion throughout the world that S. Petliura is guilty of making pogroms against the Jews of Ukraine and that the murderer Schwarzbard cannot be found guilty of his inhuman crime of 'revenge.'" The Jews, the newspaper complained, "have lost all sense of re-

176 Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval, 11 November 1927, NYPL, *QGA 73-3936, no. 107. Emphasis in source.

177 Ibid.

ality and truth; they have raised a disgraceful act of murder for hire to the level of a heroic action by the national ‘avenger’ of the entire Jewish people and spread the guilt for the pogroms over [...] the entire Ukrainian nation.”¹⁷⁸ The course of the trial and the announcement of the verdict merely heightened Ukrainian anger. Less than a week following the trial’s conclusion Oleksandr Shulhyn complained bitterly to Arnold Margolin that “the sentiment of hatred is implanted even in the hearts of those Ukrainians who were absolutely foreign to anti-Semitism.” “The trial is a catastrophe [...] for Jewish-Ukrainian relations,” he lamented, adding that “no one knows how and when the possibility will arise to repair them.”¹⁷⁹ Indeed, an official statement on the verdict issued by the exile government of the Ukrainian National Republic portrayed Jews as mortal foes of the Ukrainian people and its political aspirations:

“Numerous Jewish emigré circles fell for the Bolshevik provocations. Standing in defense of the murderer, exalting him as an avenger and a national hero, they joined forces with the efforts of the Soviets to destroy the very idea of an independent Ukrainian state. In this task they willingly came to the assistance of Muscovite emigrés of all shades, thereby uniting all of the enemies of our statehood. [...] The disgraceful, deplorable, and harmful position that Jewish emigré organizations have taken in adopting the killer and assuming responsibility for his deed has outraged the entire Ukrainian nation.”¹⁸⁰

However much Ukrainian leaders might initially have aspired to minimize the potential adverse consequences of Schwarzbard’s deed and trial upon Ukrainian-Jewish interactions, the course of events eventually foiled their aim.

7. The Assassination and Trial in Jewish Politics: Historical Background

But why did events take the course that they did? From its point of view the Ukrainian exile leadership had offered its Jewish counterpart a thoroughly reasonable arrangement: if Jewish organizations would stand publicly within

178 Anonymous, Untitled, in: Tryzub, 16 October 1927, 1–2.

179 O. Shulhyn to A. Margolin, 31 October 1927, AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144 (Document 70).

180 Vid Uriadu Ukrains’koi Narodn’oi Respubliky [From the Cabinet of the Ukrainian National Republic], 30 October 1927, in: Tryzub, 13 November 1927, 1–2 (Document 69).

the broad western anti-Bolshevik mainstream and on the side of law and order against a killer who did not deny that he had committed the act with which he was charged, Ukrainian leaders would do their best to make certain that Jews were not collectively stigmatized in Ukrainian eyes because the murderer happened to be a Jew himself. Those leaders were no doubt aware that three decades earlier, when a French Jew, Alfred Dreyfus, had been charged with and convicted of the heinous crime of treason, the heads of the major French Jewish institutions had largely eschewed any notion that solidarity with a member of their religious community obligated them to come to his defense. On the contrary, the events surrounding the Dreyfus trial had provided them with an opportunity to demonstrate that Jews could rise above narrow sectarian loyalties; accordingly they had insisted that the accused's Jewishness was not relevant to their judgment of his alleged misdeeds.¹⁸¹ Clearly Ukrainian spokesmen expected similar behavior from the Jewish side in the current instance. When they experienced a radically different reaction – one in which Jewish solidarity appeared emphatically to trump any sense that a confessed murderer ought to be punished for his deed no matter what his communal identity – they were at once befuddled and dismayed.

Indeed, from virtually the moment his deed became known, Jews throughout the world proclaimed Schwarzbard a national hero.¹⁸² Jewish communities, newspapers, political leaders, and charitable organizations on six continents, from Buenos Aires to Melbourne, from Sfax in Tunisia to Harbin in Manchuria, joined together in a global effort, directed from Paris, to collect funds, gather data, and locate witnesses in the hope of securing the assassin's acquittal.¹⁸³ Unlike Dreyfus, who, following his return to France,

181 See, *inter alia*, Aron Rodrigue, Rearticulations of French Jewish Identities after the Dreyfus Affair, in: *Jewish Social Studies* 2,3 (1996), 1–24, here 3f.; Paula E. Hyman, *The Jews of Modern France*, Berkeley Calif. 1998, 108–111.

182 Cf. YIVO, RG85/906/72423. At times he was even dubbed a “sacred sacrifice” (*heylygn korbn*). See, for example, the placard summoning “all the Jews in Copenhagen to the magnificent people’s assembly called on account of the great Jewish Schwarzbard trial (*der groyser idisher Shvartsbard-protses*) in Paris,” 2 September 1926, YIVO, RG85/906/72419.

183 See, *inter alia*, F. Allouche, Sfax, to Comité des Délégations Juives, Paris, 28 May 1926, CAHJP, P243/1 (Document 16); M. Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress, 25 June 1926, AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 91 (Document 23); Kurtser barikht vegn der tetikayt funem fartaydigungs-komitet in Pariz, 7 October 1926, CAHJP, P10/4/1; H. Zand and M. Birman, Harbin, to E. Tcherikower, Paris, 22 October 1926, CAHJP, P243/1; Di tetigkayt un di lage funem Shvartsbard fartaydigungs-komitet, September 1927 (Document 58).

had lived a largely private existence and maintained only a nominal connection with the Jewish world,¹⁸⁴ Schwarzbard, once released, parlayed his newfound prominence into a career as a Jewish public figure. Even after his trial, Jewish groups and individuals continued to support him not only morally but materially.¹⁸⁵ The Schwarzbard Defense Committees in Great Britain and the United States that had underwritten much of the cost of his defense now raised funds to help him generate a regular income.¹⁸⁶ He became a highly sought-after speaker at Jewish gatherings from New York to Cape-town.¹⁸⁷ Jewish newspapers, publishers, and literary agents competed for the privilege of marketing and publishing his memoirs.¹⁸⁸ In 1930 the Jewish National Library in Jerusalem asked to place his photograph in a gallery of “great men of the generation” (*gedole ha-dor*).¹⁸⁹ Jewish authors composed literary works in his honor.¹⁹⁰ Even bookplates were printed bearing his

184 His principal involvement in Jewish affairs came through his membership in the honorary committee of *Accueil Fraternel Israélite*, an organization founded in 1926 whose primary purpose was to help Jewish immigrants from eastern Europe acquire the French language. Michael Burns, *Dreyfus. A Family Affair. From the French Revolution to the Holocaust*, New York 1992, 433f.

185 Immediately after the trial concluded he received an offer of employment from the New York office of the Judea Insurance Company, headquartered in Jerusalem, which sent him “heartiest felicitations on acquittal.” Cable, J. Strahl to H. Torrès, 28 October 1927, YIVO, RG85/903/72340.

186 L. Motzkin to Schwarzbard Defence Council, Glasgow Committee, 8 March 1928, CAHJP, P243/4; L. Motzkin to S. Schwarzbard, 3 April 1928, *ibid.*

187 See the placards announcing lectures by Schwarzbard in YIVO, RG85/906/72418, 72421–72427.

188 See, for example, M. Landau, editor, *Unzer Tsayt* (Kishinev) to S. Schwarzbard, 22 November 1927, YIVO, RG85/876/69621–69622; Y. Stoliar, editor, *El Diario Israelita* (Buenos Aires), 8 September 1928, *ibid.*, 69634–69635; correspondence with Desiré Schwarz Literary Agency, Paris, 19 November to 5 December 1927, YIVO, RG85/889/70335–70339.

189 J. Bluwstein, Tel Aviv, to S. Schwarzbard, 13 March 1930, YIVO, RG85/878/69748–69749. An announcement of a forthcoming appearance by Schwarzbard at Théâtre de la Mutualité, Paris, on 5 April 1932 billed him as “the world’s greatest sensation.” YIVO, RG85/906/72421.

190 The poet Itsik Manger included a poem entitled *Shvartsbard-balade* (Schwarzbard-Ballad) in his first published collection of poems. Itsik Manger, *Shtern oyfn dakh* [Stars on the Roof], Bucharest 1929, 167f. The volume contained two additional poems depicting the pogroms in Ukraine that Schwarzbard sought to avenge. One of them was entitled *Di balade fun Petlyura* (The Ballad of Petliura) (165f.); the other, *Vayse balade* (White Ballad), evoked the figure of Petliura in a child’s nightmare. In the mid-1930s the well-known writer and photographer Alter Kacyzne composed a

image.¹⁹¹ So great, in fact, was the adulation Schwarzbard received in Jewish circles worldwide that a North American Ukrainian English-language newspaper could report, credulously if in the end erroneously, that “the man who assassinated the former head of the Ukrainian forces during the days of the Ukrainian Republic, Simon Petlura [sic], on the streets of Paris in 1926, and who is now touring in America, has been brought to Hollywood where he may take a role in a film which will include a scene portraying the assassination.”¹⁹²

What prompted such unrestrained acclaim, so strikingly different from the broad reluctance among Jews to adopt Dreyfus as a particularly *Jewish* hero thirty years before and so contrary to Ukrainian expectations? It turned out that much had changed in the Jewish world during the intervening three decades. The most visible change was demographic. In the final decade of the nineteenth century fully three quarters of the world’s Jews had lived east of an imaginary line running from Danzig south through Łódź to Budapest; by the 1920s the number had fallen to half. The shift was almost entirely the consequence of mass migration. Between 1881 and 1925 nearly 3.5 million Jews left the great Jewish heartland in the Russian and Habsburg Empires for parts west and south, spawning a global, mostly Yiddish-speaking diaspora and turning several of the world’s major urban economic and communications hubs – among them New York, London, Paris, Vienna, Buenos Aires – into Jewish centers linked by a shared language and a widespread sense of common east European origins.¹⁹³

That diaspora was increasingly served by institutions that traversed state boundaries. Immigrant benevolent organizations (*landsmanshaftn*) united migrants in one place who had come from another. Through them Jews from

three-act play entitled *Shvartsbard*, productions of which were staged between 1937 and 1940 in Łódź, Riga, Kaunas, Johannesburg, São Paulo, and Los Angeles. Alter Kacyzne, *Shvartsbard*, Paris 1980 (partial Document 76). Many poems were composed by amateurs; examples can be found in YIVO, RG85/904/72388–72402.

191 A specimen is located in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, call no. BP 11:81:1. The plate bears a photograph of Schwarzbard placed atop a drawing of silhouetted figures on horseback setting buildings on fire.

192 Anonymous, Petlura’s Assassin in Hollywood, in: *Ukrainian Weekly*, 6 October 1933.

193 At the time of Petliura’s assassination these five cities were home to nearly 20 percent of the world’s Jews, and the majority of their Jewish residents were Yiddish-speaking immigrants from eastern Europe who had arrived since the beginning of the twentieth century. Arie Tartakower, *Nedudei ha-yehudim ba-olam* [Worldwide Jewish Migrations], Jerusalem 1941, *passim*.

Białystok, Berdichev, Buczacz, or Botoșani now living in Philadelphia, Manchester, São Paulo, or Tel Aviv found themselves joined together like spokes of a wheel attached to the hub of their mutual home town.¹⁹⁴ Philanthropic agencies collected and distributed funds not only for local benefit but also for remittance to Jews who remained behind in what had become increasingly known as the “old country.”¹⁹⁵ Newspapers in the Yiddish language, rare before the late 1890s but omnipresent thereafter wherever east European Jewish migrants congregated, kept Jews throughout the world apprised of happenings in the places from which they came.¹⁹⁶ Dissemination of news wherever Jews were found was facilitated by the establishment in 1919 of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, an international press service, based in London with offices in Paris, Berlin, Prague, Warsaw, Jerusalem, and New York, that distributed a daily bulletin and feature articles to Jewish and non-Jewish publications worldwide.¹⁹⁷ The Yiddish press also gave writers, poets, essayists, and other intellectuals from Vilna, Lemberg, or Odessa a platform from which to make their work known to former compatriots now residing in Montreal, Johannesburg, or Sydney. Many such literary figures even migrated themselves in mid-career, building on their old-world fame in their new places of residence while retaining a formidable presence and readership in their

194 One such migrant network stretching from America to Australia has been described and analyzed in detail in Rebecca Kobrin, *Jewish Białystok and Its Diaspora*, Bloomington Ind. 2010. On *landsmanshaftn* of east European Jews in the United States see Daniel Soyer, *Jewish Immigrant Associations and American Jewish Identity in New York, 1880–1939*, Cambridge Mass. 1997.

195 On the flow of monetary remittances across state boundaries by Jewish organizations in western countries to Jewish communities and philanthropic agencies in eastern Europe see Zosa Szajkowski, *Private and Organized American Jewish Overseas Relief (1914–1938)*, in: *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* 57 (1967), 52–106; Rachel Rojanski, *Hashpa’atah shel yahadut arzot ha-brit al hakamat ma’arakhot ha-revaḥah ha-yehudit be-Polin ba-shanim 1920–1929* [The Influence of American Jewry on the Establishment of Jewish Social Welfare Networks in Poland in the Years 1920–1929], in: *Gal-Ed* 11 (1989), 59–86; Rebecca Kobrin, *Contested Contributions. Emigré Philanthropy, Jewish Communal Life, and Polish-Jewish Relations in Interwar Białystok, 1919–1929*, in: *Gal-Ed* 20 (2006), 43–62.

196 For an indication of the range and spread of the Yiddish-language press at the time of Schwarzbard’s trial see Zalman Rejzen, *Leksikon fun der yidisher literatur, prese un filologye* [Lexicon of Yiddish Literature, Press, and Philology], Wilno 1929.

197 Verena Dohrn, *Diplomacy in the Diaspora. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency in Berlin (1922–1933)*, in: *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 54 (2009), 219–241.

erstwhile environment.¹⁹⁸ Hundreds of Yiddish-language theatres in major capitals and provincial towns provided a global Jewish audience with a common repertoire, helping, together with the press, to inculcate broadly-shared cultural attitudes, sensibilities, and values.¹⁹⁹ Such an intercontinental Jewish society had been in its infancy at the time of the Dreyfus affair; by the mid-1920s it had reached what would in retrospect appear to be the apogee of its development.

Among the attitudes that had permeated this society by the early twentieth century was an image of Jewish existence in the lands of imperial Russia as physically precarious, in which prospects for security of life, limb, and property were bound inexorably to deteriorate due to the fundamental ill will of local non-Jewish populations and of the autocratic state that governed them. No doubt it was this sense of inevitable decline, along with acute economic distress, that had prompted so many to depart the region. Yet although emigrants may have felt on the whole more confident in their new places of residence, most had left family and friends in their former homes, and they continued to worry for the wellbeing of those who had remained behind.

Concern had become especially acute during an interval of mob violence directed against Jews in a large part of the Russian Empire between 1903 and 1906.²⁰⁰ Violence had reached vastly more catastrophic proportions during

198 One such figure who played a prominent role in the public campaign on behalf of Schwarzbard was the novelist and playwright Scholem Asch (1880–1957), known particularly for his depictions of Jewish life in eastern Europe and among east European Jewish immigrants to the United States during the first decades of the twentieth century. After 1910 he moved intermittently among Warsaw, New York, and Paris, writing for leading Yiddish newspapers in each city.

199 See Nahma Sandrow, *Vagabond Stars. A World History of Yiddish Theater*, New York 1977, esp. 70–96, 251–336. On the cultural threads shared by east European Jewish migrants in the United States with Jews in their former homes, as well as those that distinguished them, see Eli Lederhendler, *Democracy and Assimilation. The Jews, America, and the Russian Crisis from Kishinev to the End of World War I*, in: Stefani Hoffman/Ezra Mendelsohn (eds.), *The Revolution of 1905 and Russia's Jews*, Philadelphia Penn. 2008, 245–254.

200 The academic literature on the violence of these years and on its impact upon Jews in and beyond the affected regions is vast. For an introduction, see the relevant articles in John D. Klier/Shlomo Lambroza (eds.), *Pogroms. Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian History*, Cambridge Mass. 1992, esp. the bibliographical essay by Avraham Greenbaum, 373–386. On responses of Jews abroad, see Eliyahu Feldman, *Yehudei Rusyah bi-yemeh ha-mahapekhah ha-rishonah vеха-pogromim* [The Jews of Russia in the Days of the First Revolution and the Pogroms], Jerusalem 1999, 117–188 and passim; Rebecca Kobrin, *The 1905 Revolution Abroad. Mass Migration, Russian Jew-*

the First World War, when some four million Jews from Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Romania had found themselves in an area of successive advances and retreats by warring forces. Their loyalties questioned by all parties to the conflict, Jews along the shifting front lines had faced periodic expulsions and mass deportations, property confiscations, compulsory levies, seizures for forced labor, and more than a few instances of plunder, rape, gratuitous humiliation, and indiscriminate killing of civilians, mostly by imperial Russian troops but also by members of the local population in all of the warring countries.²⁰¹

With the collapse of the great empires along the eastern front – Russia in 1917, Germany and Austria-Hungary the following year – and the chaos that ensued as new contenders for power, socialist and nationalist movements representing a multitude of largely irreconcilable ethnic and social claims, took up arms in support of their demands, the violence had escalated even further. Jews now found themselves often literally in the crossfire between Reds and Whites, Poles and Soviets, and the many forces that fought to rule in Ukraine. Between 1918 and 1922 the border areas between the Russian and Polish heartlands – present-day Ukraine and Belarus – had become the site of what was at the time the largest concentrated killing of Jews ever recorded: tens, perhaps even hundreds of thousands murdered, upwards of 30,000 more wounded, 200,000 orphaned, at least half a million turned into homeless refugees.²⁰²

ish Liberalism, and American Jewry, in: Hoffman/Mendelsohn (eds.), *The Revolution of 1905 and Russia's Jews*, 227–244; Lederhendler, *Democracy and Assimilation*.

201 For a contemporary description see S. Ansky, *The Enemy at His Pleasure. A Journey Through the Jewish Pale of Settlement During World War I*, ed. by Joachim Neugroschel, New York 2002. For recent scholarship see Alexander Victor Prusin, *Nationalizing a Borderland. War, Ethnicity, and Anti-Jewish Violence in East Galicia 1914–1920*, Tuscaloosa Ala. 2005, 13–62; idem, *The Lands Between. Conflict in the East European Borderlands 1870–1992*, Oxford/New York 2010; Eric Lohr, *The Russian Army and the Jews. Mass Deportation, Hostages, and Violence during World War I*, in: *Russian Review* 60 (2001), 404–419; idem, *1915 and the War Pogrom Paradigm in the Russian Empire*, in: Jonathan Dekel-Chen et al. (eds.), *Anti-Jewish Violence. Rethinking the Pogrom in East European History*, Bloomington Ind. 2011, 41–51; Peter Holquist, *The Role of Personality in the First (1914–1915) Russian Occupation of Galicia and Bukovina*, in: *ibid.*, 52–73.

202 For a general description of the pogroms see Abramson, *Prayer for the Government*, 109–140. The first figures on the number of Jewish dead were offered while the violence was still in progress. The Russian writer and former priest Sergey I. Gusev-Orenburgskiy, who left the country in the midst of the fighting, claimed that he could count approximately 35,000 victims by “combining the various incidental

Sensitive observers of the increasingly deadly upheavals of the first decades of the twentieth century had drawn ominous conclusions: In 1923, from a temporary perch in Berlin on the eve of his departure for Palestine, the poet

figures that we possess.” However, he pointed out, that calculation did not take into account casualties from Volhynia, Podolia, or the Kherson province, about which he had no information, nor did it consider the Jewish refugees who had died while fleeing or from injuries or illnesses sustained as a result of the pogroms. Hence, he concluded, “the total number of those who died as a result of the pogroms must under no circumstances be fixed at less than 200,000 persons.” Sergey I. Gusev-Orenburgskiy, *Bagrovaya kniga. Pogromy 1919–1920 gg. na Ukraine* [Crimson Book. The Pogroms of 1919–1920 in Ukraine], Harbin 1922, 15. An earlier tally, offered by the Kiev-based Jewish Civic Committee for Aid to Pogrom Victims, counted 90,500 dead by October 1919. Leon Chasanowitch, *Der idisher khurbn in Ukrayne. Materyaln un dokumenten* [The Jewish Catastrophe in Ukraine. Texts and Documents], Berlin 1920, 92. Subsequent attempts to calculate the number killed on the basis of verifiable data have produced estimates ranging from 50,000 to 200,000. The lower approximation (50,000–60,000) was first offered by Nahum Gergel, a Jewish aid worker for the Russian Red Cross who gathered mainly testimonial evidence during his mission to bring material assistance to survivors; Nahum Gergel, *Di pogromen in Ukrayne in di yorn 1918–1921* [The Pogroms in Ukraine in the Years 1918–1921], in: *Shriftn far ekonomik un statistik 1* (1928), 106–113, here 112. Gergel noted, however, that his data were incomplete and that the number might well be double or even triple what he had calculated. The higher figure (180,000–200,000) was offered by Z. S. Ostrovskiy of the Jewish Civic Committee for Aid to Pogrom Victims in a volume produced in connection with an exhibit on pogroms in Ukraine and Belarus mounted by the Committee in Moscow in 1923. Zalman Solomonovich Ostrovskiy, *Yevreyskie pogromy 1918–1921* [Jewish Pogroms 1918–1921], Moscow 1926, 74. Ostrovskiy, too, was careful to indicate that “precise, complete, exhaustive data [...] do not exist and cannot exist, because in the chaos of the pogrom epidemic it was difficult to gather statistics.” For a discussion of how recently-uncovered records housed in the State Archives of the Russian Federation throw light on the difficulty of arriving at an exact number, see Lidia Miliakova (ed.), *Le livre des pogroms. Antichambre d’un génocide. Ukraine, Russie, Biélorussie, 1917–1922*, Paris 2010, 15–17. The number of wounded, orphans, and refugees are estimated in *Article du vice-directeur de la section juive auprès du commissariat du Peuple aux Nationalités de la RSFSR*, Z. Midline [...], 14 April 1922, in: *ibid.*, 566. On refugees see also *Les Réfugiés Juifs en Bessarabie et en Roumanie (Situation au 1 septembre 1921)*, CZA, A139/29/3/1; L. Wolf to J. E. Stephenson, 22 April 1921, YIVO, RG348/8/84. At one time it was common to ascribe a similar magnitude of Jewish losses to the Cossack uprising of the mid-seventeenth century, but a recent analysis using the tools of historical demography places the number at fewer than 20,000. Shaul Stampfer, *What Actually happened to the Jews of Ukraine in 1648*, in: *Jewish History* 17 (2003), 207–227.

Uri Zvi Greenberg, himself a survivor of the infamous attack by Polish troops on Jews in Lwów in November 1918 who had fled the city shortly thereafter, depicted the plains of eastern Europe covered with “a thick black forest [...] of pain” on whose “wild-dark trees” hung “dead bodies still bleeding from their wounds,” while the living awaited the inevitable slaughterer’s knife like “young sheep with necks outstretched.”²⁰³ Two years later he made his inference explicit: “I do not believe in our continued existence in the land of the Slavs.”²⁰⁴ Surely no small proportion of the millions of Jews who had left that land over the course of the previous four decades felt relief that they had escaped a savage end.

That feeling of good fortune expressed itself, among other ways, in a search for effective vehicles for ameliorating what emigrants saw as the plight of fellow Jews who had remained behind. Since the mid-nineteenth century Jewish elites in France, Britain, Austria-Hungary, Germany, and the United States had created organizations – the Alliance israélite universelle (1860), the Anglo-Jewish Association (1871), the Israelitische Allianz zu Wien (1872), the Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden (1901), and the American Jewish Committee (1906) – dedicated to assisting their coreligionists in countries where Jews continued to be denied the status of citizens, in the conviction that “we must [...] relieve the downtrodden and not merely pity them, defend the slandered and not remain silent, render succor to all who are persecuted and not simply decry their persecution.”²⁰⁵ As Jews poured out of those countries in increasing numbers during the first decades of the twentieth century, these Jewish defense agencies increasingly directed their efforts toward the arena of international diplomacy, hoping that the great powers of the West might compel the governments of the states from which Jews were fleeing to provide guarantees of security sufficient to reduce the urge to take flight. By the 1920s east European migrants themselves had come to influence the diplomatic struggle by pressuring the established Jewish defense bodies from

203 Uri Zvi Greenberg, *In malkhus fun tseylem* [In the Kingdom of the Cross], in: idem, *Gezamlte verk* [Collected Works], Jerusalem 1979, vol. 2, 457.

204 Quoted in Jehuda Reinharz/Yaacov Shavit, *Glorious, Accursed Europe. An Essay on Jewish Ambivalence*, Hanover N.H. 2010, 105.

205 Aristide Astruc et al., *Appel a tous les israélites*, in: *Alliance israélite universelle* (ed.), *Alliance israélite universelle*, Paris 1860, 18–21, here 20. On the circumstances that gave rise to the underlying sentiment that the political, material, and cultural condition of Jews in one part of the world affected the security and wellbeing of Jews elsewhere, see Lisa Moses Leff, *Sacred Bonds of Solidarity. The Rise of Jewish Internationalism in Nineteenth-Century France*, Stanford Calif. 2006.

within and through the Yiddish-language press,²⁰⁶ as well as by founding parallel organizations with leaders more attuned to their sensibilities and style.

The most prominent defense agency of the latter type was the American Jewish Congress, created initially as an *ad hoc* body in November 1918 and reconstituted on a permanent basis in June 1922 “to further and promote Jewish rights, to safeguard and defend such rights wherever and whenever the same are either threatened or violated, [and] to generally deal with all matters relating to and affecting specific Jewish interests.”²⁰⁷ At the same time Jews in many parts of eastern Europe had also organized for the purpose of presenting their collective needs and concerns before the international community. In early 1919 Jews from thirteen east European countries or regions dispatched delegations to the Paris Peace Conference seeking recognition as the legitimate representatives of Jewish interests in their territories.²⁰⁸ On 25 March 1919 they joined together with similar delegations from Canada, Italy, Palestine, and the *ad hoc* American Jewish Congress to create an international Jewish defense agency, the Comité des Délégations Juives auprès de la Conférence de la Paix, whose task was “to demand equality of civil and political rights as well as the rights of a minority for the Jewish populations of the new or redrawn states” expected to be created on territories formerly belonging to the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires.²⁰⁹ In August 1920

206 For a description of this process in France see Paula E. Hyman, *From Dreyfus to Vichy. The Remaking of French Jewry, 1906–1939*, New York 1979, 115–152.

207 *Jewish National Organizations in the United States*, in: *American Jewish Year Book* 24 (1922–1923), 219–263, here 219. On the establishment of the American Jewish Congress, see Morris Frommer, *The American Jewish Congress. A History, 1914–1950*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1978, 169–203. The Congress’s leadership depicted the organization as “a representative Jewish body for the democratic management of the internal affairs of the Jewish community,” in opposition to the American Jewish Committee, purportedly dominated by “a number of wealthy and influential individuals [who] occupied themselves with problems of philanthropy and relief and constituted themselves the spokesmen and representatives of the Jewish community whenever occasion required.” Stephen S. Wise, *Challenging Years. The Autobiography of Stephen Wise*, London 1951, 128, 133.

208 L. Motzkin to Jewish National Council for German Austria, 10 January 1919, CZA, Z3/101. The delegations came from Bessarabia, Bukovina, Crimea, East Galicia, Georgia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russia, South Russia (Rostov and Taganrog), Czechoslovakia, Transylvania, and Ukraine. List of delegations in *Le Comité des Délégations Juives*, CZA A306/21. See also Oscar I. Janowsky, *The Jews and Minority Rights 1898–1919*, New York 1933, 272–282.

209 *Le Comité des Délégations Juives* (see previous note). At an early meeting of the Comité, Louis Marshall formulated the fundamental conviction that was supposed

the Comité formed itself into a permanent body, headquartered in Paris, with Nahum Sokolow (1859–1936) and Leo Motzkin (1867–1933), two east European stalwarts of the Zionist movement, serving respectively as president and secretary-general.²¹⁰

The spreading violence against Jews in eastern Europe occupied the attention of the American Jewish Congress and the Comité des Délégations Juives virtually from the moment of their creation, as it did the older established defense bodies.²¹¹ At first the organizations gave greater notice to the more sporadic attacks upon Jews in towns located in Poland's eastern borderlands (*kresy wschodnie*) during the first half of 1919, even though attacks farther east, in the Ukrainian and Belarusian heartlands, were considerably more frequent, more savage, and more deadly.²¹² Beginning in May, however, reports began to accumulate in the Western capitals about the wholesale murder of Jews by the various contenders for hegemony in Ukraine proper. At the end

to govern its activities: “[E]very Jew in the world, whether in Paris, Petrograd or Kamchatka, is interested in the welfare of the Jews throughout the world, and is therefore bound to express his views and to think of the remedy that is to bring the day of emancipation.” Abstract of Report of Meeting of Representatives of Jewish Organizations held in Paris, March 30th – April 6th, 1919, AJC, EXO–14.

210 Comité des Délégations Juives, *Dix-sept ans d'activité*, Paris-Geneva 1936, 3.

211 L. Wolf to Undersecretary of State (Tyrrell), 5 December 1918, PRO, FO 371/3281; Report of the Joint Foreign Committee, 28 January, 4 February 1919, YIVO RG348/8/82; Minute by J. Cambon, 3 April 1919, AMAE, Correspondance politique et commerciale 1918–1929, box 697, file 3; Report on the Occurrences in Wilna, n. d. [May 1919], AJC, EXO-7, box 1; Resolutionen der Pogromkommission unterbreitet, 29 June 1919, CZA, A126/668. Sitzung der Pogromkommission, 10 July 1919, CZA, A14/9. See also Carole Fink, *Defending the Rights of Others. The Great Powers, the Jews, and International Minority Protection, 1878–1938*, Cambridge Mass. 2004, 125–129, 193–202.

212 For an overview of the attacks in the eastern borderlands, including East Galicia, see Prusin, *Nationalizing a Borderland*, 100–106. Polish military personnel were the most visible perpetrators, although Ukrainian soldiers and peasants were also reported to have engaged in looting, assaults, and murder in several East Galician towns. The total number of Jews killed in such attacks probably did not exceed 1,000. That the attention of Jewish defense organizations in the West was initially directed toward them was perhaps the result of impediments to the flow of information from farther east. See, for example, the description of such impediments in the letter from the Central Zionist Bureau in Copenhagen to the Committee of the Zionist Organization in Białystok, 12 January 1919, CZA, Z3/101. See also Piotr Wróbel, *The Kadish Years. Anti-Jewish Violence in East Central Europe, 1918–1921*, in: *Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts/Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook 4* (2005), 211–236, here 219.

of that month Louis Marshall (1856–1929), a founder of the American Jewish Committee who had broken temporarily with many of his colleagues by accepting the vice-presidency of the American Jewish Congress and by working closely with the Comité des Délégations Juives, addressed a letter to President Woodrow Wilson informing him that in Ukraine, in the Baltic provinces, and in much of Russia “approximately five million Jews [...] tremble in daily peril of their lives.” “In all these regions,” he advised, “there have recently taken place numerous pogroms of the most atrocious kind, whose Jewish victims are said to run into the thousands and whose possessions of large aggregate value have been looted and destroyed.”²¹³ The following month five prominent Ukrainian Jews made their way to Paris and presented the Comité des Délégations Juives with eyewitness testimony about the “catastrophes and cataclysms” that had engulfed the Jews of their region.²¹⁴ The testimony prompted the Comité to establish a special pogrom committee for the purpose of collecting additional depositions and publishing them in the West in a “black book.”²¹⁵

The proposed volume never appeared, no doubt for lack of funds,²¹⁶ but affidavits and reports of awful deeds found other outlets. By August 1919 they had passed beyond the Jewish press into general-circulation newspapers.²¹⁷ Shortly thereafter books and pamphlets depicting the horrors began to appear serially in Yiddish, Russian, French, and English, put out by publishing houses on three continents.²¹⁸ Associations of Jewish migrants from villages

213 L. Marshall to W. Wilson, 23 May 1919, AJC, EXO–14.

214 Di tetikayt funem komitet fun di idische delegatsyes benoyge tsu Ukrayne [The Activity of the Comité des Délégations Juives Regarding Ukraine], n. d., CZA, A126/580.

215 Ibid., Resolutionen der Pogromkommission unterbreitet, 29 June 1919, CZA, A126/668.

216 A progress report on the volume, including an oblique reference to the need to find financing for publication, is included in Motzkin to “Werte Freunde,” 14 February 1921, CZA, A126/670.

217 See, for example, Anonymous, One Enormous Pogrom, in: *The Times* (London), 5 August 1919; Anonymous, Jews Slain in Ukraine. Their Former Minister in that Country Sends a Review of the Pogroms, in: *New York Times*, 14 September 1919.

218 Among them: Gusev-Orenburgskiy, *Bagrovaya kniga*; K. W. Wolken, *Les massacres des Juifs en Ukraine, Lwów 1919*; Julian Batchinsky, *The Jewish Pogroms in Ukraine. Authoritative Statements on the Question of Responsibility for Recent Outbreaks Against the Jews in Ukraine*, Washington D.C. 1919; Chasanowitch, *Der idisher khurbn in Ukrayne*; Israel Goldberg (ed.), *Massacres and Other Atrocities Committed Against the Jews in Southern Russia. A Record Including Official Reports, Sworn Statements and Other Documentary Proof*, New York 1920; Elias Heifetz, *The Slaughter of the Jews in the Ukraine in 1919*, New York 1921; Eliyahu Gumener, A

and towns that had suffered brutal attack published special memorial volumes for victims in their home communities, replete with graphic descriptions of the attackers' cruelty.²¹⁹ And as many such descriptions appeared in print and gained currency throughout the Jewish world, additional undertakings were launched to give the Ukrainian pogroms even greater exposure. In 1920 a Jewish teacher from Bessarabia named Eliezer David Rosenthal, himself an eyewitness to violent attacks in Ukraine who had been "a step from death before escaping," took upon himself the task of collecting documents and first-hand accounts from every Ukrainian town and village in which Jews had lost their lives, in order to compile "a book, arranged alphabetically [by location], presenting to his generation a true account of the entire chapter of agony and deathly torment endured by the Jews of Russia in the days of wrath and fury at the end of the World War and during the revolution."²²⁰ For the next

kapitl Ukrayne [About Ukraine], Wilno 1921; Eliyahu Tcherikower, Antisemitizm i pogromy na Ukraine, 1917–1918 gg. (K istorii ukrainsko-yevreyskikh otnoshe-niy) [Antisemitism and the Pogroms in Ukraine, 1917–1918 (Toward a History of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations)], Berlin 1923 (Yiddish: Antisemitizm un pogromen in Ukrayne. Tsu der geshikhte fun ukrainish-yidishe batsihungen, Berlin 1923); Nahum Shtif, Pogromen in Ukrayne. Di tsayt fun der frayviliger armye [Pogroms in Ukraine. The Period of the Volunteer Army], Berlin 1923; Ya'akov Latsky-Bertholdi, Gzeyres Denikin [The Denikin Catastrophe], Berlin 1922; Avraham Revutsky, In di shvere teg oyf Ukrayne [During Hard Times in Ukraine], Berlin 1924; Isaac Unterman, Fun di shkhite-shtedt 1919–1922 [From the Cities of Slaughter 1919–1922], Jersey City N.J. 1925; M[aks] Sadikov, In yene teg. Zikhroynes vegn der rusisher revolutsye un di ukrayner pogromen [In Those Days. Memoirs of the Russian Revolution and the Ukrainian Pogroms], New York 1926; Ostrovskiy, Yevreyskie pogromy. Many of these works were published in more than one language.

219 For example: Zhitomirer fareynigtes relief komiti [United Zhitomir Relief Committee] (ed.), Yizkor dem ondeynken fun di zhitomirer kedoyshim [Memorial for the Martyrs of Zhitomir], New York 1921. Anonymous, Skvirer khurbn [The Destruction of Skvira], Adar 5679 – Kislev 5681 (1919–1921), New York 1923; Alter Greyser/Zusia Wohl, Khurbn Proskurov. Tsum ondenken fun di heylige neshomes vos zaynen umgekumen in di shreklikher shkhite, vos iz ongefirt gevorn durkh di haydamakes [The Destruction of Proskurov. In Memory of the Sacred Souls Who Perished in the Terrible Slaughter of the Haidamaks], New York 1924. See also Jack Kugelmass/Jonathan Boyarin, From a Ruined Garden. The Memorial Books of Polish Jewry, Bloomington Ind. 21998, 18f.

220 From the editors' introduction to Eliezer David Rosenthal, Megilat ha-tevah. Homer le-divrei yemei ha-pera'ot veva-tevah ba-yehudim be-Ukrainah, be-Rusyah ha-gedolah uve-Rusyah ha-levanah [The Scroll of Slaughter. Materials on the History of the Riots and the Slaughter of the Jews in Ukraine, Great Russia, and White Russia], 3 vols., Jerusalem 1927–1931.

seven years the most famous Jewish poet of his day, Chaim Nachman Bialik, together with the Hebrew publishing house *Dvir* that he had founded in Berlin in 1919, supported Rosenthal's work financially and helped to transfer his extensive archive from the Soviet Union to Palestine, where at the time of Petliura's assassination it awaited a subvention for publication.²²¹

Even earlier, in May 1919, a group of east European Jewish writers, scholars, and intellectuals, meeting in Kiev under the sponsorship of the recently-established Yiddish-language publishing house *Folksfarlag*, initiated a project to produce a multivolume history of "the pogrom movement in Ukraine" on the basis of "protocols, statements by pogrom victims, official reports, community record books, lists of the murdered [...], [other] written records, photographs, and even films" that it sought to collect.²²² Unlike Rosenthal's

221 H. N. Bialik to Israel Matz Fund, New York, 18 August 1925, 27 January 1927, in: Fishel Lachower (ed.), *Igrot Hayim Nahman Byalik* [The Letters of Chaim Nachman Bialik], Tel Aviv 1938, vol. 3, 60 f., 179; Ch. N. Bialik to L. Motzkin, 11 February 1927, *ibid.*, 186–188 (Document 45). A small sample from Rosenthal's collection was published in 1923 in the Tel Aviv-based journal *Reshumot*, edited by Bialik. Three volumes, containing material from locations whose name began with the first nine letters of the Hebrew alphabet, were published in Jerusalem in 1927–1931 (see previous note). Additional brief selections concerning places beginning with the tenth letter of the alphabet appeared in *He-Avar* 17 (1970), 85–89. The entire manuscript collection, consisting of several thousand handwritten pages, is currently housed as an unregistered unit in the archives of the Genazim Institute in Tel Aviv. In addition to extensive testimonies it records the names of some 10,000 pogrom victims. Thanks to Prof. Gur Alroey of Haifa University for this information. On Rosenthal, see the biographical note in *He-Avar* 17 (1970), 83 f. On *Dvir*, see Hayim Nahman Bialik [Bialik], *Dvir u-moriyah. Sekirah kezarah al gidulam ve-hitpathutam* [Dvir and Moriah. A Brief Survey of Their Growth and Development], New York 1926.

222 Anonymous, *Di geshikhte fun der pogrom-bavegung in Ukrayne in di yorn 1917–1921* [History of the Pogrom Movement in Ukraine in the Years 1917–1923], Berlin 1923. According to this brochure, which offered a brief overview of the project, its purpose was "not to become an information bureau about pogroms, even though such a bureau would undoubtedly serve a great need, but to produce a *fundamental* objective work, in which the material will be systematically and *historically* explained, without political bias and even without an explicit tendency to arouse feelings of pity." *Ibid.*, 2. Description of sources from the appeal of the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv, CAHJP, P10/1/8 (Document 14). See also Zosa Szajkowski, *Di geshikhte fun dem itstikn bukh* [The History of This Book], in: Eliyahu Tcherikower, *Di ukrayner pogromen in yor 1919* [The Ukrainian Pogroms of 1919], New York 1965, 333–349; Laura Jockusch, *Collect and Record! Jewish Holocaust Documentation in Early Postwar Europe*, New York 2012, 27–30. On *Folksfarlag* see Kenneth B. Moss, *Jewish Renaissance in the Russian Revolution*, Cambridge Mass. 2009, 54 f.

enterprise, which was carried on mainly through the efforts of a single individual, this project had a distinctly public face: sanctioned by the Kiev-based Central Committee for the Relief of Pogrom Victims²²³ and the Secretariat of the Jewish National Assembly of Ukraine,²²⁴ it announced its existence in the Jewish press by mobilizing readers to give voice to their recent suffering:

“Jews! An awful chapter of pogrom affliction (*pogrom-tokhekhe*) has spilled onto Jewish cities and towns, and the world doesn’t know – we ourselves do not know or know very little. We must not be silent! Everything must be told and recorded. It is the obligation of each Jew who has come and is coming from the unhappy Jewish cities to relate everything that he saw so that the knowledge is not lost. Please report to the commission that is collecting and investigating all of the information about pogroms.”²²⁵

The call received a ready response. A network of volunteer collectors (*zamerler*) reaching across Europe and beyond sought out survivors, combed local newspapers, and conducted extensive searches in governmental, communal, and organizational archives.²²⁶ The principal Jewish charitable organizations of the former Russian Empire underwrote most of the expenses of collection.²²⁷ By late summer 1919 the project is said to have amassed a list of 1,350 instances of anti-Jewish violence in 750 locations throughout Ukraine and to have recorded the names of 17,000 murdered Jewish victims, supported by “many thousands of testimonies from those who had suffered, reports of delegates and community activists [...], and several hundred original documents.”²²⁸

223 A voluntary welfare organization created by the major Jewish political parties in Ukraine in January 1919. See Anonymous, *Di geshikhte fun der pogrom-bavegung*, 1.

224 A political body selected in November 1918 by delegates from the major Jewish political parties for the purpose of overseeing the establishment of official instruments of Jewish autonomy within the Ukrainian National Republic. See Abramson, *A Prayer for the Government*, 73 f., 91–99.

225 Facsimile in Szajkowski, *Di geshikhte fun dem itstikn bukh*, 334.

226 See the list of archives in Anonymous, *Di geshikhte fun der pogrom-bavegung*, 3.

227 Szajkowski, *Di geshikhte fun dem itstikn bukh*, 335. See also Joshua M. Karlip, *Between Martyrology and Historiography. Elias Tcherikower and the Making of a Pogrom Historian*, in: *East European Jewish Affairs* 38 (2008), 257–280, here 264 f.

228 Szajkowski, *Di geshikhte fun dem itstikn bukh*, 338; Anonymous, *Di geshikhte fun der pogrom-bavegung*, 3. The eyewitness testimonies in the remnants of the collection currently housed in the YIVO Archive in New York (RG80) amount to more than 17,000 pages. A second portion of the collection, including additional eyewitness

In spring 1921, when the project could no longer operate legally under Soviet rule, the collection was transferred surreptitiously to Berlin, where it continued its work under the name Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv (Historical Archive of East European Jewry).²²⁹ There it broadened its list of prominent supporters, which came to include political activists and opinion makers from diverse points on the Jewish ideological spectrum.²³⁰ It also established a branch in Warsaw and developed close connections with the Comité des Délégations Juives in Paris.²³¹ In 1923 the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv announced that it had commissioned seven volumes of studies based upon its holdings, each to include the original texts of documents preceded by an extensive scholarly introduction explaining “the general political background” to the violence.²³² At the time of Petliura’s assassination only the first volume of the series had appeared. Written by Eliyahu Tcherikower (1881–1943), a historian and former employee of *Folksfarlag* who had been the driving force behind the collection effort, and featuring an introduction by Simon Dubnow (1860–1941), the dean of contemporary Jewish historical writers, it treated only episodes of violence that took place prior to Petliura’s accession to power.²³³

Nevertheless, by 1926 the pogroms in Ukraine had become the subject of an extensive literature, and much of that literature associated them to a greater or lesser extent with Petliura’s name.²³⁴ In fact, although the vio-

ness testimonies, is located at CAHJP, Jerusalem (P10). Some 500 kg of material were sent from Berlin to Wilno in April 1933; these documents are presumed to have been destroyed during the Second World War. Szajkowski, *Di geshikhte fun dem itstikn bukh*, 347; Fruma Mohrer/Marek Web, *Guide to the YIVO Archives*, Armonk N.Y. 1998, 193 f.

229 Szajkowski, *Di geshikhte fun dem itstikn bukh*, 339; Anonymous, *Di geshikhte fun der pogrom-bavegung*, 4 f.; Karlip, *Between Martyrology and Historiography*, 265 f.

230 Cf. the signatories to the appeal of the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv, CAHJP, P10/1/8 (Document 14), who included Zionist Revisionists, General Zionists, Socialist Zionists, territorialists, bourgeois autonomists, social democrats, Social Revolutionaries, and communists. Only the Jewish Labor Bund appears not to have been represented.

231 Szajkowski, *Di geshikhte fun dem itstikn bukh*, 339 f.

232 Anonymous, *Di geshikhte fun der pogrom-bavegung*, 5.

233 Tcherikower, *Antisemitizm i pogromy*. Financial difficulties delayed publication of the remaining volumes; see Szajkowski, *Di geshikhte fun dem itstikn bukh*, 343.

234 The second volume of the planned series by the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv was to be entitled *Di [ukrayner] pogromen in yor 1919. (Di tekufe fun Petliuren un Grigorievs oyshtand)* [The pogroms in 1919 (the period of Petliura and Hry-

lence was the work of many different perpetrators – not only troops loyal to Petliura’s Ukrainian National Republic but also Red, White, and Polish army soldiers and members of the guerrilla bands of Hryhoriiv, Makhno, and others – Petliura came in the eyes of many to symbolize the pogroms as a whole.²³⁵ The association was not immediate: News items implicating forces loyal to Petliura in violent anti-Jewish actions began to circulate publicly in the West only in fall 1919, when Petliura no longer exercised any significant control in Ukraine.²³⁶ Jewish newspapers in the West took even longer to single him out as an especially heinous villain. Indeed, his name did not become especially prominent in news reports until mid-1920, in the context of his army’s participation in Poland’s counteroffensive in East Galicia during the Polish-Soviet war.²³⁷ In September 1920, for example, the Berlin-based Zionist semi-weekly *Jüdische Rundschau* noted that “since the Polish army command transferred authority in East Galicia [...] to the east Ukrainian guerrilla chieftain (*Bandenhauptling*) Petliura, a systematic hunting expedition against the Jewish population has been set in motion.”²³⁸ Over the next month the newspaper detailed atrocities ascribed explicitly not only to “Petliura’s bands” but to Petliura himself.²³⁹ The newspaper’s Paris-based counterpart, *Le Peuple Juif*, which a year earlier had attributed pogroms in

horiiv)]. Anonymous, *Di geshikhte fun der pogrom-bavegung*, 6. It was never published.

235 Estimates by contemporary investigators attributed about 40 percent of the incidents of anti-Jewish violence between 1917–1921 to UNR forces. See Abramson, *A Prayer for the Government*, 113–122. See also Document 1.

236 See, for example, Anonymous, 35,000 Jews Killed in Savage Pogroms, in: *New York Times*, 11 October 1919, which bore the subhead, “Helpless Population Murdered Wholesale by Petliura’s Troops and Bolsheviki Alike.”

237 The war was fought over a twenty-month interval from February 1919 to October 1920. Petliura had allied himself with Poland in April 1920, in time to participate in the Polish offensive against Kiev. The Soviets began to chase the combined Polish-Ukrainian forces from Ukraine in June; shortly thereafter they threatened Warsaw. To relieve pressure on the Polish capital, Polish forces counterattacked in East Galicia beginning in late July, with Petliura’s soldiers playing a significant role. See also above, nn. 56, 76.

238 Anonymous, *Das Wüten der Petljura-Banden in Ostgalizien*, in: *Jüdische Rundschau*, 20 September 1920, 505.

239 Anonymous, *Die Hölle in Ostgalizien*, in: *ibid.*, 6 October 1920, 525; Anonymous, *Die Pogrome der Petljura-Banden*, in: *ibid.*, 529; Anonymous, *Auch in Wolynien tobt Petljura*, in: *ibid.*, 15 October 1920, 551; Dmitro Lewitsky, *Die Schandtaten der Petljura-Banden*, in: *ibid.*, 20 October 1920, 556.

Ukraine to “bands of all sorts,”²⁴⁰ now declared Petliura’s soldiers, along with Bolshevik forces, the principal tormentors of the region’s Jews.²⁴¹ Even more significantly, both publications connected the current alleged misdeeds of the anti-Soviet forces to the violence of early 1919, when the Ukrainian National Republic had exercised its strongest control in Ukraine. “In effect,” *Le Peuple Juif* declared, “the Ukrainian soldiers [under Petliura’s command who are attacking Jews] [...] are the same *haidamaks* who perpetrated the terrible pogrom at Proskurov two years ago.”²⁴²

Perhaps it was the fact that forces associated with Petliura stood out in horrific accounts of the most recent anti-Jewish violence that embedded him in Jewish memory as a “master butcher,”²⁴³ a “pogromshchik” *par excellence*.²⁴⁴ In September 1920 the Jewish journalist and social worker Leon Chasanowitch noted in the introduction to a volume of pogrom testimonies that he was about to publish that “the latest documents and materials in our collection relate to the pogroms under Petliura.” “These documents and materials,” Chasanowitch continued, “leave not even a shred of a doubt about the most monstrous crimes of Petliura’s army and of the military forces that supported Petliura’s government, not a shred of doubt about the colossal guilt of a government that made common cause with all of the angels of destruction and purchased its power from their hands by turning over to them the lives, the honor, and the property of the three-million-strong Jewish population.”²⁴⁵ Later the same month all eleven Jewish deputies in the Polish

240 Anonymous, *La vie des Juifs à Odessa et en Ukraine*, in: *Le Peuple Juif*, 21 November 1919.

241 Anonymous, *La panique à Kamenetz-Podolsk*, in: *ibid.*, 8 October 1920.

242 Anonymous, *Polen. Abermals: Pogrome*, in: *Jüdische Rundschau*, 27 July 1920, 398, which made reference to “die Organe Petljuras, deren Wüten aus den vorjährigen schrecklichen Tagen der ukrainischen Pogrome bekannt ist.” The name *haidamak* was associated by Jews with bands of Cossacks and peasants who, rising in rebellion against the ruling Polish nobility in Ukraine in 1768, massacred Jews and Poles in Uman and several other nearby towns. The Proskurov pogrom, in which an estimated 800–1,500 Jews were killed on 15–18 February 1919 by troops of the 3rd Haidamak Regiment under the command of Otaman Semesenko, a general in the army of the Ukrainian National Republic, was the largest of the violent attacks upon Ukrainian Jews during the entire pogrom wave.

243 Menachem Ribalow, *Petlyura shhik-azamot* [Petliura, May His Bones Be Ground to Dust], in: *Ha-Doar*, 4 June 1926, 506 (Document 20).

244 Anonymous, *Petlyura hot aleyn gehetst tsu pogromen* [Petliura Personally Incited the Pogroms], in: *Morgen zhurnal*, 30 May 1926.

245 Chasanowitch, *Der idisher khurbn*, vii. The expression “angels of destruction” (*malakhey khabole*) refers to supernatural creatures who, according to a medieval

Sejm demanded that the Polish government investigate the activities of its allies, the “Petlurowcy,” who according to eyewitnesses had “permitted themselves bestial attacks upon the Jewish population; massacred Jews young and old; hacked them with their swords; cut off hands, feet, lips; tortured them horribly by scorching their knuckles with burning candles [...]; drowned mothers with their children [...]; shot women who resisted; or stabbed them with bayonets.”²⁴⁶ When word circulated a year later that Vladimir Jabotinsky had concluded an agreement with a representative of Petliura’s exile government,²⁴⁷ much of the world’s Jewish press reviled him for making a deal with the devil.²⁴⁸ In 1922 Poland’s most widely-circulated Jewish newspaper, *Haynt*, cursed Petliura’s name in connection with the public debate about the impending Jewish-Ukrainian cooperation within the framework of the minorities bloc.²⁴⁹ The 1924 memorial book for the Jews of Proskurov, the town that suffered the greatest losses during the pogrom wave, pointed out that the perpetrators had been members of a Cossack brigade named for Petliura and charged that they took pride in acknowledging Petliura as their leader.²⁵⁰

Thus by the time Schwarzbard committed his deed, his victim had long since been transformed for Jews the world over into a symbol of unprecedented brutality directed against them.²⁵¹

rabbinic commentary on the Biblical book of Numbers, torture the evildoers who are consigned to the lowest level of the netherworld. The quoted passage implies that Petliura’s government rose to power by selling to the devil not its own soul but the lives of Ukrainian Jews.

246 Text of resolution in YIVO, RG80/428/37071–37074.

247 See above, at n. 112.

248 Schechtman, Jabotinsky-Slavinsky Agreement, 294–296.

249 Sh. Rosenfeld, *Der blok un di demagogye* [The Bloc and Demagogy], in: *Haynt*, 6 October 1922.

250 Greyser/Wohl, *Khurbn Proskurov*, 20, 32.

251 Cf. the manner in which the New York Yiddish newspaper *Morgen zhurnal* (Anonymous, *Id shist Petlyurn in Pariz*) referred to the victim: “He has come to be regarded by the Jews of Ukraine and of the entire world as the premier pogromshchik, the bloodiest enemy the Jews have ever had.” Cf. also the description in the Hebrew-language weekly of the Zionist Organization, *Ha-Olam*; Anonymous, *Hazon ha-shavua* [What is Happening this Week], in: *Ha-Olam*, 28 May 1926: “[Petliura’s] name has become a symbol and a monster, and every Jewish heart trembles with anger upon hearing its mention.” Emphasis in source.

8. Defending Schwarzbard

In the same way, it seemed clear to Jews everywhere what must have transpired in Schwarzbard's mind when he learned that he and Petliura resided in the same city. Abraham Liessin, editor of the world's most prestigious Yiddish literary and intellectual journal, the New York-based monthly *Di tsukunft*, offered readers a reconstruction of the assassin's thoughts:

“He knew that somewhere near him in Paris Petliura, chief of the butchers in Ukraine, was walking around free as a bird, and this poisoned his days and his nights in the jolly capital. For him the air of Paris became heavy with the shadows of the ones who had been raped, tortured, torn to pieces – with the pale and silent shadows of the old and the young, men and boys, women and girls, mothers and suckling children. In their tens of thousands they fluttered before him, day and night, pale and silent, accusing, pointing the finger at their torturer and rapist and murderer who had gone unpunished. And just as when France had called upon him to fight for the Republic, just as when Russia had called upon him to fight for the revolution, so now did he answer the call and put his life on the line. [...] He offered his young life in a state of ecstasy. Dear, precious Schwarzbard – the redeemer of our blood!”²⁵²

With the expression “redeemer of our blood” (*unzer goel ha-dom*) Liessin placed Schwarzbard in a heroic tradition dating back to the Bible, one that had led great warriors like Gideon, Joab, and Absalom to avenge the murder of their kinsmen in response to the sacred injunction, “Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed” (Genesis 9:6). His sentiments were widely shared. Eliyahu Tcherikower of the *Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv* explained to a Warsaw audience that “there has never been such agreement among Jews as when Petliura was driven from Ukraine. Everyone,” he noted, “was seized by a feeling of revenge for the blood that had been spilled;” Schwarzbard, “who [...] lived through the pogroms ceaselessly,” had merely done what all Jews had long hoped to do.²⁵³ In Palestine the Zionist journalist and educator Y. H. Yeivin exhorted readers of the country's most widely-circulated Hebrew newspaper that “we must inscribe [Schwarzbard's] name in golden letters in our modern [Jewish] history because he has established an important new principle: We are not sheep, and those who attack us will be

252 Abraham Liessin, Sholem Shvartsbard, in: *Di tsukunft*, July 1926, 375–376 (Document 25).

253 Anonymus, *Petlyura un Petlyurovshchina* [Petliura and the Petliura Movement], in: *Haynt*, 28 June 1926.

punished [...] in the most basic sense of the word.”²⁵⁴ The Hebraist Menachem Ribalow, a recent migrant from Moscow to New York, proclaimed that Schwarzbard had “removed a stain from the name of Israel” – the stain of the defenseless victim whose injury remained unrequited.²⁵⁵ A Jew from Paris put it in the simplest terms in a letter addressed to Schwarzbard’s wife the day after the murder: “Your husband, who is familiar with the great criminals of his native land, may be excused; acting out of a feeling of greatheartedness he has avenged the unfortunate victims.”²⁵⁶

Such fervid pronouncements embodied much more than raw emotion, however. They also expressed no little criticism of the international Jewish defense organizations whose professed *raison d’être* was to ensure the physical security of Jews wherever that security was threatened. To be sure, those organizations had been quite active, both while the slaughter was raging and in its aftermath, but their efforts had yielded only the most meager results. Those efforts had centered primarily about a new international institution, the League of Nations, called into being by the Paris Peace Conference, which had charged it, among other things, with enforcing a set of treaties concerning the rights of “persons belonging to racial, linguistic or religious minorities” in the territories of the former Russian, Habsburg, and Ottoman Empires.²⁵⁷ “Of all peoples, the Jewish people is without doubt the one that has derived the greatest joy and satisfaction from the creation of the League of Nations,” declared Leo Motzkin, for alongside its mission “to redeem the world as a whole, to put an end to war, to beat tanks and cannons into tractors” it had also been charged, so he believed, with “putting an end to the political, social, and moral misery of the Jews in so many countries.”²⁵⁸ Even before the

254 Yehoshua Heshel Yeivin, Al yedi’ah aḥat [Concerning one News Item], in: Davar, 4 June 1926, 2 (Document 21).

255 Above, n. 243.

256 M. Blum to Mme. Schwarzbard, 26 May 1926, YIVO, RG80/435/37384.

257 Guarantee of the League of Nations in Respect of the Minorities Clauses of Certain Treaties: Memorandum by the Secretary-General, League of Nations Council Document 82 (41/7073/402). On the minorities treaties see, most recently, Fink, *Defending the Rights of Others*, 133–274.

258 L. Motzkin, *La Société des Nations et le Peuple Juif*, CZA, A126/52/17. On the occasion of the opening session of the League of Nations Assembly in January 1920 Motzkin wrote to the League Secretary-General, Sir Eric Drummond, that “the Jewish nation, scattered over the world, turns confidently towards the great Areopagus” in the belief “that the corner-stone laid to-day will be the corner-stone of the foundations of a magnificent temple in which humanity, weary of war and strife, may find at last a real bulwark of peace and justice.” Letter from the Secretary-General of the Committee of the Jewish Delegations to the Peace Conference, 16 January 1920,

League had come into existence Jewish leaders had expressed the view that only such a body, which would place “a perfectly revolutionary limitation on the rights of Sovereignty in both their external and domestic relations,”²⁵⁹ would be capable of “disciplining” the agents that fomented and perpetrated pogroms.²⁶⁰

In Ukraine, where no single sovereign power controlled the territory and where Jews were attacked by virtually all contenders for hegemony, the intervention of the League and the international community on behalf of the victims seemed indispensable. Louis Marshall expressed this conviction forcefully in a November 1919 speech at Carnegie Hall in New York, at a rally to protest the violence against Ukrainian Jewry attended, according to different accounts, by anywhere from 25,000 to 100,000 people:²⁶¹

“What shall be done to put a quietus upon this butchery of innocent men, women and children [...]? Diplomacy is voiceless, because there is no government to which it can express itself. Appeals for mercy from anguished and sympathetic hearts fall upon deaf ears. [...] The conscience of the world when it from time to time became vocal in the past compelled a hearing when similar excesses, though on a greatly smaller scale, took place in Russian territory; but then there existed established and organized governments to whose representatives the voice of that public conscience could be directed and which felt constrained, though often with reluctance, to harken to that voice. Relief must, therefore, now be sought, from the aroused conscience of the world, it is true, but from a forum which will make that conscience potent, even as against those who, in their wild fury, have forgotten that they must, in the end, be dependent upon the good-will of the civilized nations of the earth. That forum, it is needless to say, is the League of Nations. It alone is capable of offering protection. It alone can bring order and stability where men are now gnawing at each other’s throats as they did in prehistoric days. Without a League of Nations the minorities of Eastern Europe, whether they be

League of Nations Council Document G (41/2784/1249). On Jewish attitudes toward the League of Nations at its founding, see David Engel, *Manhigim yehudim, tikhnun strategi veħa-zirah ha-beyn-le’umit le-aħar milħemet ha-olam ha-rishonah* [Jewish Leaders, Strategic Planning, and the International Arena after the First World War], in: *Michael* 16 (2004), 165–178.

259 Speech by L[ucien] W[olf] at a meeting in connection with the Minorities Treaties of 1919, YIVO, RG348/8/82.

260 Cable, Zionist Bureau, London, 10 February 1919, CZA, A264/9.

261 For attendance estimates see Jewish delegations at State Dept., 10 December 1919, CZA A126/589 (Document 6).

racial, religious or linguistic, will forever be at the mercy of a tyrannical majority. Without it war will never cease and industry, commerce and the arts of civilization cannot flourish. A League of Nations can exert such pressure as will not be disregarded even by those who are responsible for conditions such as now prevail in the Ukraine. With the assurance that the forces that are seeking the restoration of law and order will have the sanction and the protection of the nations that constitute the League, brute force and anarchy will not be able long to withstand them, and reason, justice and common humanity will again predominate.”²⁶²

At the time Marshall spoke, however, the League was not yet fully operational; it became so only in December 1920, when its Assembly convened for the first time.²⁶³

Meanwhile, Jewish leaders in the West approached the foreign ministries of the major powers with requests for action aimed at protecting the physical wellbeing of east European Jewry. Initially their efforts centered on Poland's ethnically-mixed eastern border regions, including East Galicia. With regard to those territories they attained a measure of success, when the governments of the United States and Great Britain dispatched special investigating missions to Poland to determine the facts and to ascertain the causes of violent attacks upon Jews.²⁶⁴

No similar success was forthcoming, though, when they directed their attention farther east. In September 1919 Chaim Weizmann, head of the Zionist Organization's delegation to the Peace Conference, submitted a proposal to the British Foreign Office to facilitate an investigation of conditions

262 Speech of Mr. Louis Marshall at Carnegie Hall, New York, 24 November 1919, AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 131, folder 2 (Document 5).

263 The League Secretariat had begun operations in 1919, but the treaties concerning minorities explicitly vested authority for their execution in the hands of the League Council, which could not be elected until the Assembly convened. Accordingly, when in July 1920 Lucien Wolf inquired of the Secretariat whether, in the event that recent hostilities in East Galicia resulted in further pogroms, “the League was prepared [...] to take immediate action,” the head of the Secretariat's Minorities Section, Erik Colban, replied that the Secretariat was entitled only “to communicate petitions in Minority questions to the Government directly interested,” not to initiate any action on its own. Minute by E. Colban, 16 July 1920, LNA, R1613 (41/5124/402).

264 The United States mission was led by Henry Morgenthau, a former U.S. ambassador to Turkey, who had called attention to massacres of Armenians in 1915. The British mission was led by Liberal MP Sir Stuart Samuel. For a description of their activities, see Frank Golczewski, *Polnisch-jüdische Beziehungen 1881–1922. Eine Studie zur Geschichte des Antisemitismus in Osteuropa*, Wiesbaden 1981, 290–297.

in “Southern Russia” in order to determine “what value should be attached to [...] disquieting reports with regard to the Jewish question” in that region. The senior Foreign Office official to whom the proposal was referred rejected it out of hand, noting that he was “most reluctant to take up the question of Jews in Russia.”²⁶⁵ In December the American Jewish Congress sent a delegation to United States Secretary of State Robert Lansing imploring him to issue a declaration that “the United States will never recognize as a Government any power [...] that will tolerate such horrors as those that have recently occurred in all parts of the Ukraine.” Lansing replied that “until there is a change in the political situation in the Ukraine, we are almost hopeless.”²⁶⁶ In August 1920 the French minister in Warsaw advised the Quai d’Orsay to discount reports forwarded to it by the Alliance israélite universelle about “the purported dangers [...] threatening the Jews of East Galicia” as largely a product of Bolshevik propaganda.²⁶⁷ Thus by the time the League was ready to receive Jewish petitions about the ongoing killings in Ukraine, not only had the bloodiest episodes of killing passed but leading voices in the international community had warned of their disinclination to become involved.

Nevertheless, the defense organizations made certain that when the League Assembly finally met, the dire situation of the Jews in Ukraine would occupy its attention. The Comité des Délégations Juives, the Alliance israélite universelle, the Jewish Territorial Association, and the Joint Foreign Committee of the Anglo-Jewish Association and the Board of Deputies of British Jews, along with the French League of Jewish Women, all addressed memoranda to the new international body describing in impassioned detail the “war of extermination” against the Jews of Ukraine to which “history has nothing to compare.”²⁶⁸ Evidently realizing the unlikelihood that the League would apply direct pressure upon any of the contending claimants to power

265 Delegation Minute and Minute by Eyre Crowe, 30 September 1919, PRO, FO 608/196 (602/2/1/16783).

266 Jewish delegations at State Dept., 10 December 1919, CZA A126/589 (Document 6).

267 A. De Panafieu to French Foreign Minister, 29 August 1920, AMAE, Correspondance politique et commerciale 1918–1929, Série Z. Europe, Pologne, vol. 62, no. 221.

268 Quoted expressions from N. Sokolow, Comité des Délégations Juives; L. Wolf, Joint Foreign Committee; I. Zangwill, Jewish Territorial Association, to President of the Assembly of the League of Nations, in: *Supplementary Journal of the First Assembly of the League of Nations* (1920), 18 December 1920, 289 f. (Document 8); Comité des Délégations Juives, Memorandum on the Massacres of Jews in the Ukraine, in: *ibid.*, 26 January 1921, 320 f. (Document 9). Cf. S. Lévy and J. Bigart, Alliance israélite universelle, to President of the Council of the League of Nations, 8 December 1920, in: *ibid.*, 18 December 1920, 289 (Document 7); Ligue des femmes juives pour la défense

in the region to assume responsibility for protecting threatened Jews, the organizations requested more modest humanitarian steps – “exemplary punishment” of individuals implicated in a specific pogrom, funds for “internal reconstruction” of decimated communities, facilitation of emigration and aid to refugees,²⁶⁹ and appointment of a commission of inquiry to serve as “a testimony of sympathy which will reassure our sorely-trying brethren.”²⁷⁰ Even such limited actions, however, proved beyond the League’s own conception of its purview. The League officials who received the petitions acknowledged their receipt and published some of them in the League’s official journal, but the consensus regarding all of them was that the League was neither obligated nor well advised to involve itself in the Ukrainian Jewish situation.

Indeed, it appears that even before receiving the defense organizations’ formal appeals, the civil servants who were responsible for managing the League’s day-to-day affairs had already determined that the new world body would not respond to the Ukrainian violence. In November 1920 Helmer Rosting, a staff member of the League Secretariat’s Minorities Section, had advised that because “the political status of this country [Ukraine] is still unsettled [...], the clauses of the Minority Treaty are probably not applicable here,” meaning that “the protection of the Minorities in Eastern Galicia is the duty of the Allied Powers,” not of the League.²⁷¹ Even earlier, as part of a hypothetical internal discussion about how the League might deal with violent attacks upon protected minorities, a member of the Secretariat’s legal staff warned against all but the most circumspect action, not only for the benefit of the League but for the good of the minorities themselves:

“Any intervention by foreign organizations in the relations between the majority and the minority population of a state almost always produces unfortunate results that are radically opposed to the ones those organizations claim to pursue. Such is certainly the case when intervention may

de l’honneur de la femme et pour la protection de l’enfant juif to League of Nations Assembly, 15 December 1920, LNA, R1654 (41/10147/9677).

269 Cf. Comité des Délégations Juives, *Emigration des juifs de l’Ukraine*, 7 January 1921, League of Nations Council Document H5 (41/10147/9677).

270 The memorandum of the Ligue des femmes juives was exceptional in this regard; it demanded that the future governing power in Ukraine would be admitted to the League only on condition that it offered an explicit guarantee of security to Ukrainian Jews. See above, n. 268.

271 Minute by H. Rosting, 3 November 1920, LNA, R1613 (41/7683/402). His supervisor, Erik Colban, head of the Minorities Section, indicated his agreement; minute by E. Colban, 4 November 1920, *ibid.* Rosting would eventually become one of Denmark’s most prominent Nazi sympathizers.

take on a political nature. Any foreign intervention not [...] discretely carried out in relation to the interested government always bears the character of an action directed against that government. In the country that is the object [of intervention], such an action creates at the very least the appearance of an alliance between the minority and foreign elements directed against the government, something no nation can tolerate.”²⁷²

Whatever expectations Marshall, Motzkin, and their colleagues in the Jewish defense organizations may have held out for assistance from the international community were thus quickly dashed, and the faith of the Jews they sought to protect in their leadership waned concomitantly.²⁷³

When Schwarzbard shot Petliura, that lack of confidence found powerful expression in the worldwide Jewish press. *Fraye arbeter shtime*, a New York-based, nominally anarchist Yiddish newspaper with a high public profile (for which Schwarzbard himself had written as an occasional Paris correspondent), led the way with an explicit attack upon all of the many Jewish “diplomats, patriots, philanthropists, academics, financiers, journalists, and socialists” who had failed to find an appropriate response to “the gruesome, inhuman events” in Ukraine following the First World War and whose continued efforts to “professionalize” the business of defending the physical security of Jews threatened “to weaken and to uproot the sense of justice, responsi-

272 Minute by S. Neyman, 30 August 1920, LNA, R1613 (41/6153/402).

273 Those expectations did not necessarily misjudge the intentions of the framers of the international system of minorities protection. James Headlam-Morley, Britain’s representative on the committee of the Peace Conference that drafted the texts of the first minorities treaties, explained that “the object of [the treaties] is to enable the League, if necessary, to intervene supposing there was brought before it evidence that an alien population, as for instance the Ruthenians in Poland, or the Albanians in Serbia, or the Magyars in Rumania, were living in imminent danger of massacre or robbery.” Headlam-Morley to Henry Wickham Steed, 26 November 1919, Churchill Archives Centre, Cambridge University, ACC 688, box 1b. The framers, however, left the implementation of the system to civil servants, who ascribed to it a far more limited purpose devoid of any humanitarian dimension – in the words of one such civil servant, not “to shield the minorities from the danger of oppression by the majorities and from the pain and suffering [...] which such oppression necessarily causes” but solely “to avoid the many inter-state frictions and conflicts which had occurred in the past, as a result of the frequent ill-treatment or oppression of national minorities.” Pablo de Azcárate, *League of Nations and National Minorities. An Experiment*, Washington D.C. 1945, 14. During the 1920s Jews were not the object of “inter-state frictions;” hence they were of little interest to the officials of the League’s Minorities Section.

bility, and sacrifice” that Schwarzbard had demonstrated.²⁷⁴ Similarly, Abraham Liessin reminded his readers that in 1919 a group of American “Jewish notables” (*yahudim*) had endeavored to arouse the United States to action, only to be rebuffed “in the most insulting fashion.”²⁷⁵ Yeivin belittled what he represented as the quintessential organized Jewish response to the pogroms: gathering statistics of the casualties and publishing the results. He compared that response invidiously to that of “the Armenians,” who, he claimed, had undertaken to punish “the Turks” for the infamous massacres of the First World War not by “collect[ing] material about those acts” but by killing the “pasha-executioners” immediately. He also hinted that Schwarzbard had been able to act precisely because he had not been “sent by any party.”²⁷⁶ Ribalow even went so far as to charge that some members of the Jewish leadership had actually helped Petliura escape justice by insisting that he personally harbored no ill-will toward Jews.²⁷⁷ The French Jewish newspaper *L’Univers israélite*, though insisting in principle that individuals had no right to execute justice on their own, nevertheless extolled the “new mentality” of direct action that Schwarzbard’s deed appeared to embody.²⁷⁸ In New York, *Morgen zhurnal* summoned its readers to raise funds for Schwarzbard’s defense without waiting for any official Jewish body to organize the effort.²⁷⁹

To be sure, the defense organizations themselves were far from pleased with their manifest lack of success. During the years in which they had focused their efforts on the League of Nations they had learned, through the failure of several initiatives involving the interests of east European Jews, that the League, as a body constituted (its name notwithstanding) not by national groups but by sovereign states, could always be expected to side with states whenever stateless minorities sought to enlist the League’s aid against them.²⁸⁰ Thus by the eve of Petliura’s assassination many of the leaders of these groups

274 Anonymous, Di hinrikhtung fun dem pogroms-ataman [The Execution of the Pogrom Commander], in: Fraye arbeter shtime, 4 June 1926.

275 Above, n. 252.

276 Above, n. 254.

277 Above, n. 243.

278 Anonymous, Une victime des pogromes, in: *L’Univers israélite*, 28 May 1926.

279 Anonymous, Shvartsbard fartaydigungs-fond ruft aroys interes bay ale iden [Schwarzbard Defense Fund Elicits Interest Among All Jews], in: *Morgen zhurnal*, 30 May 1926.

280 For further detail see David Engel, Being Lawful in a Lawless World. The Trial of Scholem Schwarzbard and the Defense of East European Jews, in: *Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts/Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook* 5 (2006), 83–97, here 90–93.

had come to doubt their own reason for existence. Marvin Lowenthal, European editor of the American Jewish literary monthly *Menorah Journal* who doubled as representative of the American Jewish Congress in Geneva, expressed his frustration in a letter to Congress President Stephen S. Wise in December 1925. It had been his experience, he noted, that the League's "practice was to respond with legal arguments if you talked to them politics and with political arguments if you talked to them law."²⁸¹ Three months later Lowenthal's counterpart from the American Jewish Committee, Robert Neville, complained to President Louis Marshall (who had abandoned the Congress once it constituted itself a permanent body) that officials of the League's Minorities Section were unresponsive to his requests for information, prompting Marshall to observe that the League could not be expected to work against "the continuous misery and the shocking indignation that make life a burden to many of the Minorities of Eastern Europe" unless "a champion of all Minorities" from among the League's member states assumed a seat on the League Council. He saw no such champion on the horizon, however, unless Germany were admitted to the League – a possibility he regarded with mixed emotions.²⁸² In any event, in 1926 few in the Jewish world appear to have viewed the international system of minorities protection created at the Paris Peace Conference as anything but moribund.

Schwarzbard's assassination of Petliura appears to have suggested to at least some within the Jewish defense establishment a way to revive both the minorities protection system generally and the defense agencies' own standing in the Jewish world – press criticism of their past inadequacies notwithstanding. To be sure, the perception was not universal: The Alliance israélite universelle and the British Joint Foreign Committee did not take a stand on the matter, effectively ignoring the growing sentiment on the Jewish street to work actively for Schwarzbard's acquittal (or perhaps tacitly capitulating to it). In contrast, the American Jewish Committee and the Comité des Délégations Juives (with support from the American Jewish Congress) involved themselves actively in the affair, although they arrived at radically different operative conclusions.

The stance of the American Jewish Committee was heavily influenced by the views of Arnold Margolin. Following receipt of his October 1926 memorandum, which warned that "the trial of Shwarzbard [sic] may become an

281 M. Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress, 22 December 1925, CZA, A405/73.

282 R. Neville to L. Marshall, 9 February 1926, AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 6, folder 3; Marshall to R. Neville, 4 March 1926, *ibid.* Cf. R. Neville to L. Marshall, 22 April 1926, *ibid.* Germany became a member of the League in September 1926.

arena for an open and bitter fight between the Jews and Ukrainians,”²⁸³ the Committee’s executive board determined to “do whatever is in its power to influence the Jewish press to abandon its dangerous attitude” that represented Petliura’s murder as “the act of a national hero.”²⁸⁴ Shortly thereafter, at the Committee’s Annual Meeting, Louis Marshall issued a public statement that provoked a stir throughout the Jewish world:

“The assassination in Paris of the former Ukrainian leader, Simon Petlura, by Sholom Schwartzbard, a Jew, is [...] likely to create difficulties for Jews in the Southern republic. The manner in which the matter is being discussed in sections of the Jewish press is calculated to arouse violent anti-Jewish feeling on the part of the Ukrainian people, among whom Petlura was and is held in great honor. The Ukrainians are irritated by the attempts which are being made to prove that Petlura was not only officially but also personally responsible for pogroms, and by the attitude of some of the Yiddish newspapers in various countries, which depict Schwartzbard’s act as that of a national hero. This attitude is not only harmful but is believed to be unwise. It [...] will inevitably tend to open old wounds and give occasion for bitter controversy from which the innocent will be sure to suffer. While we can understand how a man who constantly broods over human wrongs and crimes and whose relatives may have been pogrom victims may find himself in such a state of mind as to be driven to so desperate, and futile an act, there is no justification for making him a national Jewish hero, or for the Jewish people to assume the responsibility for his deed. We trust that agitation along these false lines will cease before it is too late. Defense for his act should rather be sought in the field of mental irresponsibility in the juridical sense.”²⁸⁵

Marshall was not entirely alone in his position. Months earlier, during the fortnight following the assassination, a prominent Zionist journalist, Moshe Beilinson, had declared that he took “neither joy nor comfort” from the death of “a very little man [...], an ‘emigré’ whose political path came to an end five years ago,” because in his view “no one is entitled, under any conditions,” to impose “a death sentence upon a person because of his past.” He also feared a deterioration of Ukrainian-Jewish relations if Jews adopted Schwarzbard

283 Above, n. 132 (Document 41).

284 Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee, 17 October 1926, AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144, file: American Jewish Committee, 1926 (Document 40).

285 American Jewish Committee (ed.), *Twentieth Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee*, in: *American Jewish Year Book 29 (1927–1928)*, 391–445, here 427f.

as a hero, even though he had no doubt that the assassin's motive was entirely pure.²⁸⁶ But his scruples found virtually no echo until Marshall and the American Jewish Committee – an organization with little sympathy for Zionism – entered the fray nearly six months later. Moreover, whereas Beilinson's strictures passed with little comment,²⁸⁷ Marshall's forced into the open a fundamental strategic difference between the American Jewish Committee and the Comité des Délégations Juives that the latter would no doubt have preferred to keep private.

That difference revolved primarily about the basis on which Schwarzbard should be defended. Virtually no one within the Jewish world wished to see the assassin convicted; all professed to understand how a person “who saw all of the horrible and frightening acts of 1918–1919 with his own eyes,”²⁸⁸ “who had been shaken to the depths of his human and his Jewish conscience when he learned of the appalling tortures that his brothers and sisters had endured,”²⁸⁹ could have been driven to act in a fashion that belied his fundamentally peaceful, noble character.²⁹⁰ Such a person, Jewish spokesmen and editorialists universally agreed, did not deserve the penalty of death that the *cour d'assises* was empowered to impose. Rather, disagreement centered about the basis upon which Schwarzbard's acquittal should be sought. Marshall favored presenting Schwarzbard's act as a *crime passionnel*, in which an aggrieved individual whose “mind had been unbalanced by the agony suffered by him because of the shocking pogroms which had taken place in the Ukraine” committed a deed that, though surely unacceptable, nevertheless merited forgiveness.²⁹¹ In contrast, the Comité des Délégations Juives, along with the majority of voices in the Jewish world, insisted that his act be declared not merely excusable but morally necessary – or, as Marvin Lowenthal put it, that “not only S[chwarzbard] be acquitted but that the Ukrainian po-

286 Moshe Beilinson, *Lo simḥah ve-lo neḥamah* [Neither Joy nor Comfort], in: *Davar*, 8 June 1926, 2 (Document 22). The article was written in response to the praise heaped upon Schwarzbard four days earlier in the same newspaper by Y. H. Yeivin (above, n. 254).

287 He appears to have received only a single rebuke in print: Zelig Lubianiker, *Mikhtevei ḥaverim* [Letters from Members], in: *Davar*, 13 June 1926.

288 Anonymous, *Ḥazon ha-shavua*.

289 Anonymous, *Une victime des pogromes*.

290 For statements alleging Schwarzbard's nonviolent character, see, *inter alia*, Revutsky, *Ver hot dershosen Petlyura?*; Anonymous, *Nokh der ermordung fun Petlyura* [After the Murder of Petliura], in: *Haynt*, 1 June 1926.

291 L. Marshall to P. Wiernik, 29 October 1927, AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144 (Document 67).

gromists be condemned.”²⁹² In the preface to a compilation of documents about the pogroms published in conjunction with the trial, Comité chairman Motzkin explained why his organization had adopted this attitude:

“The memorandum of the Committee of Jewish Delegations [to the League of Nations, 16 December 1920²⁹³] not only gave a picture of the horrors perpetrated on Ukrainian Jewry, but also mentioned the names of a whole list of persons who, notwithstanding the fiendish cruelties committed by them, had escaped all punishment, and might even be holding prominent positions. It must be stated that some of these criminals are still enjoying complete liberty [...]. That amazing fact, which at the time when the memorandum was lodged was even more painfully evident than now, inspired the gloomiest apprehensions. [...] The representation of Jewries set up in Paris [...] cherished the firm belief that it would suffice to draw attention to the facts in order to induce that body which after the war assumed the task of speaking on behalf of humanity to take action which would put an end to the fatalistic [sic] progress of destruction and extermination. The hopes then entertained were doomed to disappointment, and for a long time the fears for the future became intensified. For the League of Nations paid but scant attention to the memorandum.”²⁹⁴

Bringing the perpetrators of pogroms to justice, Motzkin argued further, was a matter of the utmost international interest. “All political parties and political leaders,” he declared, “must be brought to understand [...] that pogroms as a political weapon are not only despicable in themselves but must bring ruin on those who resort to them; otherwise there is still the danger that some political convulsion might bring into existence a Government which might attempt to [...] arouse the slumbering passions once more and seek by

292 M. Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress, 26 October 1926, CZA, A405/73 (Document 42).

293 Document 9.

294 Committee of the Jewish Delegations (ed.), *The Pogroms in the Ukraine under the Ukrainian Governments (1917–1920). Historical Survey with Documents and Photographs*, London 1927, xi f. On Motzkin’s authorship, see Alex Bein (ed.), *Sefer Moțkin. Ketavim u-ne’umim nivħarim, biyografyah ve-divrei ha’arakhah* [The Moțkin Volume. Selected Writings and Speeches, Biography and Words of Appreciation], Jerusalem 1939, 219–224. On the documentary compilation, see the circular letter from the Comité des Délégations Juives, 2 October 1927, AAIU, III.D.11 (Comité des Délégations Juives) (Document 61).

pogroms to strengthen temporarily its own position.”²⁹⁵ Unrequited wrongs against Jews, he suggested, posed a threat to the rule of law everywhere; indeed, Schwarzbard had been forced to take the law into his own hands in the first instance because the international community had failed in its fundamental task of defending the defenseless. Accordingly the Comité determined within days of the assassination to do all within its power “to hand over [...] those guilty of the ignominious deeds, so as to put an end, to the extent possible, to similar acts of torment and brutality.” “Exposing the reality,” it added, “stigmatizing the [...] murderers, inciters to murder, and authors of rape and acts of hardly imaginable bestiality [...], ought to serve not only as a way to compensate the hundreds of thousands of victims but also as a prophylaxis in the future.”²⁹⁶

Schwarzbard’s action thus offered the Comité “an unexpected opportunity [...] to disclose the horrible aspect of what the Jews had gone through [in Ukraine] and to arouse the indignation of the entire world” in a way that had not been possible six years earlier.²⁹⁷ That opportunity could not have been realized, however, had Schwarzbard claimed to have acted upon an uncontrollable irrational impulse. As far as the Comité was concerned, the French court needed to determine that the defendant, far from committing a crime, had actually executed a criminal who, by any reasonable standard of justice, deserved to die. That aim, in turn, necessitated, as Schwarzbard’s attorney Torrès put it in a response to Marshall’s statement coordinated with the Comité, that “the Schwartzbard trial must [...] inevitably be transformed into a trial of the pogroms and pogromists”²⁹⁸ – in particular of “Petlura and Petlura’s henchmen, who perpetrated hundreds of pogroms resulting in the deaths of scores of thousands of innocent peaceful citizens.”²⁹⁹ Such was precisely the course that Marshall, prodded by Margolin, had hoped to avoid.

Not that the Comité was unmindful of the probable adverse effects of such a strategy on Ukrainian-Jewish relations. On the contrary, it contemplated those effects with considerable disquiet. In what was likely its earliest

295 Committee of the Jewish Delegations (ed.), *Pogroms in the Ukraine*, xii.

296 Ueberblick ueber die Taetigkeit des Verteidigungskomitees in der Sache Schwarzbart, [October 1927], CZA, A18/50/6 (Document 60).

297 Comité des Délégations Juives (handwritten date: 1927), CZA, A126/52/22 (Document 71).

298 Reply of H. Torrès to L. Marshall, 14 February 1927, AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144 (Document 46).

299 B. Grad, *Significance of the Schwarzbard Trial. An Exclusive Interview with Henri Torrès, Chief of Defense Counsel in Slaying of Pogromist Petlura*, in: *American Hebrew*, 25 March 1927.

formulation of its attitude toward Schwarzbard's act and his impending trial, the Comité stated emphatically that it "must do everything to avoid damaging the relations between the Jewish masses and the Ukrainians in any way."³⁰⁰ Shortly after the assassination, Motzkin reassured Polish Sejm deputy Izaak Gruenbaum, the prime Jewish mover of the Bloc of National Minorities³⁰¹ and an ardent advocate of Jewish-Ukrainian political cooperation, that "we are making an effort so that the entire affair does not take on the character of a struggle of one people against another," expressing the hope "that the Minorities Bloc does not suffer because of it."³⁰² Similarly he told Arnold Margolin, "We have the strongest desire to do everything so that this trial does not damage the mutual relations between Ukrainians and Jews."³⁰³ That desire lasted throughout the seventeen-month interval between the murder and the trial. A month before the trial's opening he continued to express the conviction that "the trial need not be a source of enmity."³⁰⁴

Indeed, just as Ukrainian exile leaders had worked toward a Jewish alliance during the first half of the 1920s, so too had Jewish leaders found value in cultivating Ukrainian contacts, especially in light of their growing disillusionment with the international minorities protection system during the same interval. In theory that system gave all minority groups a common interest in activating and strengthening the new international mechanism for minorities protection. It gave Ukrainians and Jews a particular affinity, for they were Europe's two largest stateless minorities. Moreover, they had no other likely allies; unlike Germans in the Czechoslovak Sudetenland or in Poland or Székely Hungarians in post-Trianon Romanian Transylvania, they could count presumptively on no European state to promote their political welfare. Hence, leaders of both groups reasoned, the new international configuration placed Ukrainians and Jews in a position to influence each other's political futures in ways that had not been available to either group before. Such, in part at least, was the thinking that underlay Jewish-Ukrainian cooperation within the Polish Bloc of National Minorities.³⁰⁵ It also stood at the root of one of Motzkin's pet undertakings – the Congress of Organized

300 Untitled document beginning, "Das Verteidigungs-Komitee wegen Pogrom-Angelegenheiten," CAHJP, P10/4/1 (Document 17).

301 See above, at n. 116.

302 L. Motzkin to I. Gruenbaum, 5 June 1926, CAHJP, P243/3.

303 L. Motzkin to A. Margolin, 17 July 1926, CAHJP, P243/4 (Document 28).

304 Zametka o dele Shvartsbarda, n. d. [September 1927], YIVO, RG80/400/35120 (Document 59).

305 For a fuller explication of the ideas that initially animated Jewish proponents of the Bloc, see Yitshak Gruenbaum, *Madua yazarnu et gush ha-mi'utim* [Why We Created

National Groups in the States of Europe, which convened for the first time in October 1925.³⁰⁶

In both cases Jewish leaders hoped to take advantage of the new political status that the international minorities protection system had (or was supposed to have) afforded minority populations, or, as Motzkin put it, “to expurgate the idea [...] that minorities constitute an obstacle to the proper functioning of states.”³⁰⁷ Those leaders held that the minorities protection treaties embodied the principle that states were to be constituted on the basis not of national homogeneity but of national diversity, and they believed that the key to actuating that principle lay in the cooperation of all minorities against the governments of majority nation-states, with the assistance of the international community. However, international assistance was likely to be forthcoming, in their estimation, only to the extent that all minorities, whether in a single state or over the entire continent, agreed on an overarching common purpose. Gruenbaum and Motzkin in particular greatly valued Ukrainian participation in their respective ventures and worked to cajole Ukrainian leaders into a lasting horizontal political alliance within the framework of these two formations. They and their colleagues were thus genuinely worried lest the passions aroused by the Petliura-Schwarzbard affair bring their efforts to naught.³⁰⁸

It was largely in the hope of controlling those passions and channeling them in what it considered a constructive direction that in early June 1926 the Comité des Délégations Juives initiated the formation of a special committee to support Schwarzbard’s defense. From the outset Motzkin was troubled by what he termed “irresponsible reports and comments” about a situation that was, to his mind, “more complicated than would appear to an outsider.”³⁰⁹ The complexities involved not only relations with Ukrainians (including a

the Minorities Bloc], in: Yitshak Gruenbaum, *Milhamot yehudei Polanyah* [5]673–[5]700 [The Wars of the Jews of Poland 1918–1940], Jerusalem 1941, 156–161.

306 On the Minorities Congress see Moshe Landau, *Ha-brit she-hikhzivah. Yehudim ve-germanim be-kongres ha-mi’utim ha-eropi 1925–1933* [The Alliance that Failed. Jews and Germans in the European Minorities Congress 1925–1933], Tel Aviv 1992; Sabine Bamberger-Stemann, *Der Europäische Nationalitätenkongreß 1925 bis 1938. Nationale Minderheiten zwischen Lobbyistentum und Großmachtinteressen*, Marburg 2000; John Hiden, *Defender of Minorities. Paul Schiemann, 1876–1944*, London 2004.

307 Bein (ed.), *Sefer Mozkin*, 217.

308 Above, nn. 302–305. See also Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress, 7 August 1926, AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 91.

309 L. Motzkin to S. Dubnow, 4 June 1926, CAHJP, P243/3 (Document 19).

fear that “Ukrainian nationalist and antisemitic circles” would seek murderous revenge upon Schwarzbard’s defenders³¹⁰) but also the domestic political situation in France, of which the leaders of the Comité, based in Paris, appear to have been acutely aware.³¹¹ Public appeals and demonstrations by Jews in Schwarzbard’s support, warned Marvin Lowenthal, were liable to turn what might otherwise be the favorable inclination of French public opinion in the opposite direction, perhaps playing into the hands of *Action française* and others on the extreme right.³¹² They also impeded the possibility of an agreement with Ukrainian leaders that might result in an outcome satisfactory to both sides.³¹³ Accordingly, the Comité-sponsored Schwarzbard Defense Committee declared as one of its purposes from the outset to restrain public discussion of the affair among Jews as much as possible until the trial itself. Its representatives met regularly with editors of major Jewish newspapers in an effort to persuade them “to treat this matter in confidence and to follow our suggestions.”³¹⁴

The Defense Committee’s aims were not entirely negative, however. Actually the Committee – whose membership included such ideologically and culturally diverse figures as Léon Blum, André Spire, Marc Jarblum, Edmond Fleg, Scholem Asch, Joseph Schechtman, and Genrikh Sliosberg, along with Motzkin, Lowenthal, and Eliyahu Tcherikower³¹⁵ – devoted the bulk of its attention to three principal affirmative tasks: gathering documentary materials and locating witnesses to support the defense strategy of transforming Petliura from victim into chief culprit; preparing a selection of those materials

310 Schwarzbard Defense Committee to the Editorial Board of *Forverts*, New York, 27 June 1926, CAHJP, P243/3 (Document 24).

311 Cf. *ibid.*: “For several reasons we believe it is not desirable to raise too much noise here in France before it is time [to do so]. Those reasons will be clear to anyone who knows the local political circumstances.”

312 M. Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress, 25 June 1926, AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 91 (Document 23): “The Committee decided that the time had come to open a pro-Jewish campaign in the Left press and to win over, as far as possible, the great neutral “journaux d’information” such as the *Matin*, *Petit Parisien*, *Journal [des Débats]* etc. It had been hoped, hitherto, to hold off this activity until the last moment in order to give the Ukrainians the least opportunity to react and reply.”

313 M. Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress, 22 May 1927, AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 88 (Document 56).

314 B. Richards, New York, to M. Lowenthal, 6 July 1927, AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 91; cf. B. Richards to M. Lowenthal, 8 November 1926, *ibid.* See also above, nn. 309–312; Defense Committee to Editorial board of *Moment* (Warsaw), 15 September 1926, CAHJP, P243/3.

315 For membership lists see Documents 23, 24.

for publication on the eve of the trial in order to provide readers in French and English with “a complete picture of the episodes of pogroms in Ukraine during the time of Petliura’s government on the basis of new, unpublished, official and other documents;”³¹⁶ and raising funds to enable it to carry out the first two undertakings.

In the event it enjoyed remarkable success in all of these endeavors. From the outset it worked closely with the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv, to the point where the key figures responsible for the Berlin repository – most notably the eminent historian Simon Dubnow – became corresponding members of the Committee and played a significant role in shaping its actions.³¹⁷ Working with correspondents in Argentina, Britain, Germany, Palestine, Poland, and the United States it checked and verified the testimony of many dozens of potential witnesses, finally bringing over 80 of them to Paris to testify at the trial.³¹⁸ Shortly before the trial began, it published the planned volume of documents in English and French.³¹⁹ It managed to raise an amount sufficient to pay not only the costs of publication and the expenses of the witnesses but also to satisfy Torrès’s monetary demands, which grew to proportions that the Committee had not anticipated.³²⁰ And in the

316 Di tetigkayt un di lage funem Shvartsbard fartaydigungs-komitet [The Activities and the Situation of the Schwarzbard Defense Committee], September 1927, CAHJP, P10/4/1 (Document 58).

317 Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv to Schwarzbard Defense Committee, 10 August 1926, CAHJP, P243/1 (Document 32); Séance du Bureau du « Comité de Défense », 13 September 1926, CZA, A126/52/20 (Document 35).

318 See Documents 23, 24. On the number of witnesses, see Kotik, *Mishpat Shvartzbard*, 163. The process of identification of witnesses and verification of testimony is reflected in, *inter alia*. L. Motzkin to D. Simonsen, 12 August 1926, CAHJP, P243/3; E. Tcherikower to Y. Giterman, 26 August 1926, *ibid.* (Document 34); Defense Committee to A. Druyanov, 17 February 1927, CAHJP, P243/4.

319 Above, n. 294; French version; Comité des Délégations Juives (ed.), *Les pogromes en Ukraine sous les gouvernements ukrainiens (1917–1920). Aperçu historique et documents*, Paris 1927.

320 At the conclusion of the trial the Defense Committee faced a deficit of a bit over \$1,500 for estimated total expenses of approximately \$25,000. Defense Committee to Joseph Barondess, 18 January 1927, CAHJP, P243/4; Defense Committee to Schwarzbard Defence Council, Glasgow, 8 March 1928, *ibid.* Torrès had initially volunteered his services *pro bono publico*, but on the eve of the trial he demanded and received payment of 10,000 fr. from the Defense Committee; Defense Committee to Torrès, 17 October 1927, CAHJP, P243/4. Cf. Di tetigkayt un di lage funem Shvartsbard fartaydigungs-komitet, September 1927, CAHJP, P10/4/1 (Document 58). Evidently Torrès continued to demand additional payments even after the trial

end the trial produced the verdict it had sought: “Schwarzbard’s acquittal,” declared Motzkin in a summary report to the Comité des Délégations Juives, “was consistent with the general sense of all friends of humanity and brought honor to French justice.”³²¹

9. Outcomes

Yet in another sense the outcome of the Comité’s work on Schwarzbard’s behalf left all of the Jewish defense agencies with cause for anxiety. To begin with, the affair clearly exposed the inability of those organizations – all of them elite bodies that promoted a pragmatic, interest-based approach to politics rooted in a rational calculation of resources and a search for alliances within an international order based upon the rule of law³²² – to tame popular urges or even to mobilize them effectively in pursuit of ends they considered desirable. The October 1926 attempt by Louis Marshall and the American Jewish Committee to do so appears to have placed them at odds with most of the Jewish world,³²³ including the Schwarzbard Defense Committee, which

had concluded; Defense Committee to Schechtman, 8 February 1928, *ibid.* It is not certain whether those payments covered attorneys’ fees or other expenses that Torrès incurred in the course of preparing for the trial. For examples of fundraising appeals, see Defense Committee to Copernik, Jewish Club, Shanghai, 18 January 1927, *ibid.*; Defense Committee to J. Krinsky, 21 April 1927, YIVO, RG80/445/37744–37745 (Document 53).

321 Comité des Délégations Juives, November 1927, CZA, A126/52/22 (Document 71).

322 The Comité des Délégations Juives and the American Jewish Congress both represented themselves at the time of their establishment as organizations representing the authentic voice of the Jewish people, in contrast to the Alliance israélite universelle, the Joint Foreign Committee, and the American Jewish Committee, which were portrayed as organizations of so-called notables without true popular support. By the mid-1920s, however, both bodies had come to favor the quiet, behind-the-scenes negotiating style for which they had earlier criticized the notables. Witness the December 1925 warning of Marvin Lowenthal, the American Jewish Congress’s delegate to the Comité des Délégations Juives: “Negotiation without publicity [...] would always seem preferable when a private organization is trying to deal with a Government. The government can then formulate a policy without offending nationalist passions. Is this that terrible thing, ‘secret diplomacy?’” Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress, 22 December 1925, CZA, A405/73. On the defense organizations’ general approach to politics, see Engel, *Manhigim yehudim*, *passim*.

323 See, for example, the reportage Anonymous, Untitled, in: Haynt, 6 December 1926; Anonymous, Untitled, in: Haynt, 30 January 1927; Anonymous, Untitled, in:

felt compelled to depart from its preference for behind-the-scenes work and to dissent publicly in order to avoid a similar judgment.³²⁴ Compelled by Marshall's statement to expose its own strategy to public debate, the Defense Committee found itself increasingly put upon to explain and to justify that strategy to recalcitrant representatives of the Jewish press.³²⁵

Parizer haynt, 27 January 1927. Marshall's statement was quoted at the trial by the attorney representing Petliura's brother, César Campinchi, who employed it as proof that Schwarzbard has actually done a disservice to his coreligionists; TT, 26 October 1927, 16–18 (YIVO, RG80/494/40652–40654). Evidently anticipating such use, several Jewish newspapers, along with the Schwarzbard Defense Committee in Paris, requested that he revise his statement so as to forestall this possibility. In response, Marshall wrote to Peter Wiernik, editor of the New York Yiddish newspaper *Morgen zhurnal* (and a close associate of Marshall in the social welfare work of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee). Wiernik did not publish Marshall's letter, warning him that it "would arouse considerable resentment." P. Wiernik to L. Marshall, 27 October 1927, AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144 (Document 66). His associate did, however, tell Joseph Barondess, head of the Schwarzbard Defense Committee in New York (who had conveyed to Marshall the Paris Committee's request), that "if his statement would have been published, Mr. Marshall would have exposed himself to the severest possible criticism and enmity of the Jewish people the world over." J. Barondess to S. S. Wise, 9 November 1927, AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 88 (Document 75). Marshall replied to Wiernik with a resounding reaffirmation of his position; L. Marshall to P. Wiernik, 29 October 1927, AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144 (Document 67). Cf. L. Marshall to Ivri Anochi, Esq., 29 October 1927, *ibid.* – a response to a letter by an unnamed "Scribe of Jewish Student Body" who charged that Marshall's "name is to be associated for all time with the defense of Petlura."

324 Prior to the issue of a formal statement to the press via Torrès (above, n. 298), several key figures in the Defense Committee, including Motzkin and Genrikh Sliosberg, wrote privately to Marshall imploring him to repudiate his declaration. L. Motzkin to L. Marshall, 30 January 1927, CAHJP, P243/4 (Document 44); G. [H.] Sliosberg to L. Marshall, 5 February 1927, *ibid.* Sliosberg's letter is of particular interest, because earlier he had written to Margolin expressing dissent from the work of the Defense Committee and noting that "in any case this crime would be recognized as committed under extenuating circumstances." G. Sliosberg to A. Margolin, 15 September 1926, AJC, B22 F4 (Russia: Margolin, A. 1924–1928). Margolin passed the letter on to Marshall in support of his plea for action to keep the Jewish press in check; see Document 41. Evidently Sliosberg felt pressure to dissociate himself from Marshall. See also *L'opinion d'un homme politique juif galicien sur Petlioura et sur l'affaire Schwarzbard*, YIVO, RG80/453/38196–38197.

325 See, for example, Defense Committee to Editorial Board of *Nasz Przegląd*, Warsaw, 1 February 1927, CAHJP, P243/4.

Growing publicity also forced it to present its case in the general European press, encumbering its ability to avoid public confrontations with Ukrainian spokesmen.³²⁶ Indeed, pressure from below appears over time to have led the Committee to a position that effectively precluded avoidance of a severe rupture in Jewish-Ukrainian relations.³²⁷ Initially the Committee had hoped to portray Petliura's responsibility for the pogroms as at most indirect, noting that he had indeed issued orders to his troops to refrain from anti-Jewish violence. Its contention was not that Petliura had ordered pogroms, as Motzkin testified before the examining magistrate in July 1926, or even that he consented to them, but merely that "he tolerated them for [...] five or six months" before speaking out against them.³²⁸ Evidently it hoped to avoid casting any greater aspersions upon Petliura's character and legacy than were necessary to present the story of Ukrainian Jewish suffering and to secure Schwarzbard's acquittal.

Following Marshall's pronouncement, however, its line began to change. Committee member Vladimir Tiomkin told a meeting of the London Council to Aid Schwarzbard's Defence that had been called to protest Marshall's statement, "I safely and conclusively affirm that Petlura was the man responsible for those terrible massacres in the Ukraine."³²⁹ The Committee itself now began actively to search for witnesses who would testify that Petliura had issued *explicit* instructions to murder Jews.³³⁰ Within a short time it lo-

326 Above, n. 312.

327 Not only the Committee was moved by such pressure. Shortly after the assassination Vladimir Jabotinsky had written emphatically that "Petliura [...] was not what we call a 'pogromshchik'" – a statement frequently quoted in subsequent months by Ukrainian spokesmen. Vladimir Jabotinsky, Di "Krim"-kolonizatsye [The Colonization of Crimea], in: Morgen zhurnal, 4 June 1926. On the eve of the trial, in contrast, he declared no less emphatically that "the responsibility for the pogroms falls upon him." Vladimir Jabotinsky, Petliura i pogromy [Petliura and the Pogroms], in: Poslednie novosti, 11 October 1927. The latter article appeared also in *Haynt*, Vladimir Jabotinsky, Petlyura un di pogromen [Petliura and the Pogroms], in: Haynt, 16 October 1927.

328 "Déposition du Monsieur Motzkin," 17 July 1926, YIVO, RG80/427/37037 (Document 29). Cf. L. Motzkin to A. Margolin, 17 July 1926, CAHJP, P243/4 (Document 28).

329 Mr. Vladimir Tiomkin's Speech, November 1926, YIVO, RG80/453/38188–38190. The meeting chair concluded that on the basis of "the facts as told here by Mr. Vladimir Tyomkin [...] we are firmly convinced that Petliura was *wholly* responsible" (emphasis added).

330 Defense Committee to Schwarz, Jerusalem, 9 November 1926, CAHJP, P243/3; M. Lowenthal to S. S. Wise, 30 November 1926, AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 91 (Document 43).

cated three: Hirsch Zekcer, a Jewish member of a committee formed under Bolshevik rule that had investigated the February 1919 events in Proskurov, who claimed to have seen a secret telegram from Petliura directing local commanders “to suppress powerfully and unconditionally by force of arms all efforts of the Jewish population [in support of] a Bolshevik uprising so that no traitorous Jewish hand in Podolia will dare to revolt against independent Ukraine;” Henryk Przanowski, an ethnic Pole employed by the delegation of the Danish Red Cross in Kiev, who told of a personal audience he had had with the Ukrainian leader in Proskurov during which the town’s military governor, the notorious Otaman Semesenko, entered and reported that he had carried out a pogrom “according to the order of the commander-in-chief;” and Leon Bienko, a Ukrainian of Polish origin, who while serving as secretary to a Ukrainian military tribunal had been privy to conversations among the soldiers that convinced him that they understood attacks upon Jews to have been commanded by Petliura himself.³³¹ Although Committee investigators identified discrepancies, inaccuracies, or other difficulties in their accounts, the Committee nevertheless brought the witnesses into contact with the examining magistrate and arranged visas for them to come to Paris to testify at the trial.³³² In the end these witnesses did not take the stand; Torrès, whose aim was to obtain a favorable verdict, not necessarily to expose all details of what had transpired in Ukraine in 1919, did not regard their testimony as crucial for his purpose. But it appears clear that from the end of 1926 the Committee had decided to charge Petliura not with the minimum but with the maximum responsibility for the pogroms, in conformity with the image that prevailed among the Jewish public at large.³³³

331 Details in Tcherikower, *Di ukrayner pogromen*, 145–149. For Zekcer’s principal testimony see *Moe pokazanie k protsesu Shvartsbarda* [My Testimony at the Schwarzbard Trial], YIVO, RG80/439/37548–37556. For Przanowski see *Zayavlenie Genrikha Pshanovskavo* [The Statement of Henryk Przanowski], YIVO, RG80/431/34268–34269. Bienko sent written testimony to Torrès; L. Bienko to H. Torrès, n. d., YIVO, RG80/441/37616–37621. See also the “corrections” to his testimony, 2 December 1926; YIVO, RG80/466/38833–38835.

332 See the visa list attached to French Foreign Minister to Keeper of the Seal, French Ministry of Justice, 26 September 1927, AN, Ministère de la Justice, 1538 A 1926. Regarding the Committee’s hesitations about features of their testimony, see, *inter alia*, Defense Committee to I. Gruenbaum and A. Hartglas, Warsaw, 16 November 1926, CAHJP, P243/3 (containing a request to Bienko to “correct” his testimony at eight points); Defense Committee to H. Zekcer, 18 April 1927, CAHJP, P243/4.

333 The point was made at the trial in the testimonies of Sliosberg, Tiomkin, and Tcherikower. TT, 24 October 1927, 115–124, 181 (YIVO, RG80/491/40373–40382, 40435); 25 October 1927, 22–30 (YIVO, RG80/492/40461–40469).

That decision effectively eliminated any possibility that the trial would proceed with minimum disruption to the relations between Ukrainians and Jews. The notion that Petliura was a particularly bloodthirsty Jew-hater who had been personally responsible for the deaths of hundreds and thousands of Jews, and that for that reason his killer should not be held accountable for his action, was a version of history that even the most adamant Ukrainian advocate of an alliance with Jews could not swallow. Indeed, Schwarzbard's explanation for his deed effectively portrayed Petliura and the government he headed not as victims but as victimizers whose moral capital had yielded not constructive state building but mass murder; when Jewish leaders endorsed it, they robbed the Ukrainian national movement of its sole remaining asset in its struggle for independence.

To be sure, Jewish spokesmen offered their Ukrainian counterparts a compromise, much as Ukrainian leaders had offered Jews a way to avoid the adverse consequences of their situation by branding Schwarzbard a Bolshevik agent and disclaiming any Jewish connection with him. Motzkin put the offer this way:

“We are not interested in Schwarzbard's fate; we are interested in one question only: will humankind suffer along with us when it learns that tens of thousands of innocent human beings were cut to pieces, brutally raped, maimed, that an entire people became aware that it was to be exterminated and not even a single human voice would be raised against that possibility, or perhaps even against the fact. Before everything else we want the Ukrainians to suffer along with us. We want them, more than us, to support our demand that those guilty of such horrors, directly or indirectly, must themselves be condemned and shunned. [...] How can the Ukrainians be silent in the face of those hecatombs of Jewish victims that covered the entire Ukraine? I still hold out the hope that in the near future Ukrainian representatives will shout in unison with the Jews against the guilty ones and will not try to wipe away the impression that will naturally be aroused by all of the sworn testimonies at the trial.”³³⁴

The message was clear: disavow Petliura, acknowledge that he was responsible for the pogroms and that he deserved to be called to account for them, and Jews would work to make certain that the stain that would attach to him thereby would not extend any further over the Ukrainian people.³³⁵ But

334 Above, n. 304.

335 Polish Sejm Deputy Ozjasz Thon from Kraków, leader of the Zionist Federation of West Galicia, summed up this approach facetiously at a joint meeting of the Comité des Délégations Juives and the American Jewish Congress in August 1926: “Our

Ukrainian leaders were no more prepared to cut loose their national martyr than Jews were to cut loose theirs – and the Jewish press emphatically figured Schwarzbard as a martyr who had sacrificed himself on the altar of his people's collective honor.

Thus the pragmatic politics of alliance that had characterized the behavior of both Jews and Ukrainians in the international arena and in their relations with each other in recent years now gave way to a romantic politics of memory and national pride, in which popular passions figured less as an encumbrance to realistic decision-making by elites than as a resource for elites to exploit in confrontations with adversaries. For Jews, Schwarzbard's status as the supreme symbol of resistance to oppression continued to fuel spirits during the Hitler era, when, until Schwarzbard's death in 1938, his public speeches energized Jewish audiences throughout the world.³³⁶ In contemporary Israel he continues to be honored as the bearer of a heroic legacy. Streets called *Ha-Nokem* (The Avenger) in several Israeli towns are named in his memory. In 1967 his remains were brought from Capetown, where he had passed away while on a lecture tour, to Moshav Avihail, a settlement near the Mediterranean founded by veterans of the Jewish Legion in the First World War. There he was reinterred near the burial place of those veterans in a public ceremony featuring a speech by then Minister-Without-Portfolio (later Prime Minister) Menachem Begin. His gravestone reads: "Scholem, the son of Haya and Yitshak Schwarzbard, avenger of the Jewish blood spilled in the pogroms of Ukraine."³³⁷

For Ukrainians the move from pragmatism to romanticism found a rather different expression. The Ukrainian insistence upon a nefarious Soviet hidden hand controlling the assassin had found resonance more or less

program is simple: damn Petlura, save Schwarzbard, and whitewash the Ukrainian people." M. Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress, 7 August 1926, AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 91.

336 As did his imaginary ones. See the speech placed in his mouth by the playwright Alter Kacyzne; Kacyzne, Shvartsbard, 152–155 (Document 76). The relevance of Schwarzbard's deed and the debate surrounding it for understanding Nazi attitudes and actions toward Jews had actually been foreshadowed in the months leading up to the trial. See B. Sendrowicz, Der „Figaro“ für Petljura: Eine Kampagne des Parfumeurs Coty gegen Schwarzbart und das Judentum, in: Wiener Morgenzeitung, 24 May 1927, 2 (Document 55).

337 Cf. the inscription on a street sign the Israeli city of Beersheva: "The Avenger (Scholem Schwarzbard) Street: 1886–1938. Writer and avenger of the blood of Ukrainian Jewry. In 1926 in Paris he killed Petliura, the leader of the Ukrainian pogromists. In his trial, which turned into an indictment of the pogroms, he was acquitted."

exclusively among European right-wing nationalists, a fact that must have suggested to many Ukrainians that their national interests were best served by alliance with those circles instead of with the left-wing forces to which the likes of Shapoval, Vynnychenko, and even Petliura himself had earlier been attracted. Schwarzbard's deed and his acquittal thus demanded a fundamental political realignment. Indeed, the meetings that led proximately to the 1929 formation of the right-wing Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, which consciously employed violence and assassination as a strategic political tool, can be traced in significant measure to anger within Ukrainian circles in Poland over the more centrist Ukrainian National Democrats' ongoing encouragement of Jewish participation in a second minorities bloc in the wake of Schwarzbard's trial.³³⁸ Some segments of this group would eventually collaborate with Nazi Germany at different stages of the Second World War. From 25 to 27 July 1941, Ukrainian police in the service of the recently-completed German occupation of Lwów were joined by mobs of Ukrainian peasants from nearby villages in brutal attacks upon Jews in the city streets and in their homes, in a fashion reminiscent of the pogroms of two decades previous. Upwards of 2,000 Jews were killed over the course of three days. The events were presented at the time as an act of revenge for the death of a Ukrainian national hero on the fifteenth anniversary of his murder. They have been known ever since as "the days of Petliura."³³⁹

10. On the Documents in this Edition

The 76 documents that follow have been culled from more than a dozen archival repositories in Europe, Israel, and the United States. They constitute only a small fraction of the extensive documentary record that Petliura's assassination and Schwarzbard's trial produced. That record would undoubtedly be even more extensive had many documents of Ukrainian provenance not been destroyed during and after the Second World War.³⁴⁰ Fortunately, a recently-discovered body of correspondence and other papers of the Shapoval

338 Motyl, *Turn to the Right*, 49–52, 72 f., 139–152, 174 f.

339 Tadeusz Zaderecki, *Bi-meshol zlav ha-keres bi-Lvov. Ĥurban ha-kehillah ha-yehudit be-einei mehaber polani* [When the Swastika Ruled in Lwów. The Destruction of the Jewish Community as seen by a Polish Author], ed. by Aharon Weiss, Jerusalem 1982, 62–67.

340 Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, *The Odyssey of the Petliura Library and the Records of the Ukrainian National Republic during World War II*, <<http://www.archives.gov.ua/Eng/Odyssey.php>> (8 April 2014).

brothers, Mykyta and Mykola, sheds considerable new light on Ukrainian perspectives concerning the affair.³⁴¹

The documents have been selected with a mind to illuminating the positions that Ukrainian and Jewish spokesmen adopted during the interval between the assassination and the trial and the multiple contexts that influenced their thinking. For this reason few of them speak to issues that have traditionally driven both scholarly and public discussions of the affair. Readers hoping to learn, for example, whether Schwarzbard was in fact a Bolshevik agent who killed Petliura on orders from Moscow will surely be disappointed, as will those seeking an assessment of Petliura's responsibility for the pogroms. These issues have not been treated because the available documentation does not permit any definitive determination concerning them. In the absence of any unambiguous, tangible proof that Petliura ordered pogroms (and none has been located, despite the best efforts of Schwarzbard's champions at the time and since to do so), any assessment of responsibility must depend in the first instance upon a philosophical determination of how the limits of responsibility are to be drawn. That is a problem that documents cannot resolve. Similarly, until former Soviet archives yield an actual written directive from Moscow to Schwarzbard to eliminate the Ukrainian leader (and extensive searches by scholars and other interested parties since the fall of the Soviet Union have failed to uncover one), the assassin's motives can be inferred only indirectly in a manner that yields far more speculation than certainty.

The contention that the Soviet regime planned and instigated Petliura's murder (with its hidden assumption that Schwarzbard would not have acted except for Moscow's prodding) has been founded upon three main facts: The files of the French Interior Ministry reveal that from 1921 to 1922 Schwarzbard was under police surveillance for his "anarcho-communist" and "Bolshevist" connections;³⁴² Soviet foreign ministry documents show a keen interest in the outcome of Schwarzbard's trial and a desire to influence its course;³⁴³ and witnesses at the trial testified to Schwarzbard's

341 See Documents 15, 51, 52, 72.

342 Marko Antonovych/Roman Serbyn, *Dokumenty pro uchast' Shvartsbarda v komunistychnii yacheitsi v Paryzhi* [Documents about the Participation of Schwarzbard in Communist Cells in Paris], in: *Naukovyi zbirnyk* 4 (1999), 334–346.

343 Yu[ri] I. Shapoval, *Vbyvstvo Symona Petliury. Nova informatsiia dla rozhdumiv* [The Assassination of Symon Petliura. New Information for Consideration] in: Yu[ri] I. Shapoval, *Liudyna i systema. Strykhy do portretu totalitarnoi doby v Ukraini* [Man and the System. Sketches for a Portrait of the Totalitarian Period in Ukraine], Kiev 1994, 96–107.

contacts with Soviet agents, foremost among them Volodin.³⁴⁴ The first two facts, though well established, do not logically require a conclusion of Soviet agency, while documents presented here indicate that the trial testimony in question was not only unsubstantiated but to a significant extent fabricated during the pretrial investigation.³⁴⁵ Yet other considerations that might have spurred Schwarzbard are similarly unprovable. It is known, for example, that Schwarzbard reported on the murder trial of Germaine Berton for the *Fraye arbeter shtime* and had noted Torrès's successful defense of his fellow anarchist.³⁴⁶ Did he perhaps recall that occasion when he learned of Petliura's presence in Paris? Was it the key factor in persuading him to commit his deed? Documentary evidence is unlikely to provide answers to these or similar questions.

As a result, neither Schwarzbard nor Petliura play a significant role in this volume. Indeed, it turns out that the thoughts and activities of others that *can* be documented were far more consequential in determining how the affair unfolded and why it generated the longterm effects that it did. Readers are invited to explore those thoughts and actions in detail in what follows, along with the multiple, overlapping, intertwined, and convoluted contexts in which they developed.

The documents are presented in chronological order, with minor deviations for the purpose of presenting exchanges between individuals *seriatim*. Documents written originally in English, French, or German have been transcribed in the original language only. Documents written in Hebrew, Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, and Yiddish are presented in the original and in English translation. All translations are my own. The translations are meant to convey both the sense and the register that a reader of the texts at the time they were written would have gotten from them; hence expressions and structures that today seem archaic or designations that are no longer current have been rendered freely instead of literally. In cases where versions of a document exist in more than one language, preference has been given to a version written in the Latin alphabet. The transcriptions retain the original orthography. The

344 Palij, Ukrainian-Polish Defensive Alliance, 189f; Mykhalchuk, Vbyvstvo ta protses Petliury; Yuri Kulchytskyi, Symon Petliura i pogromy [Symon Petliura and the Pogroms], in: Volodymyr Kosyk (ed.), Symon Petliura. Zbirnyk studiyno–naukovi konferentsii v Paryzhi [Symon Petliura. A Collection of Studies from an Academic Conference in Paris], Munich 1980, 137–159.

345 Documents 51–52. See also above, at nn. 171–177.

346 Sholem [Shvartsbard], Fashizm far'n gerikht [Fascism on Trial], in: *Fraye arbeter shtime*, 28 December 1923.

texts are offered precisely as written. Typographical or grammatical errors have not been corrected. (In most cases such errors have been marked by “[sic],” but in instances where readers might have difficulty making sense of the text when the error is left uncorrected, a correction has been suggested in square brackets.) As a result of the preservation of the original orthography, spellings abound that are both nonstandard and internally inconsistent. No attempt has been made to standardize them (Unusual spellings are marked by “[sic]” the first time they occur in each document). Occasional omissions of passages have been marked in the footnotes, and occasional emendations have been marked in square brackets. Omissions are signalled by [...]. All other indications of ellipses appear in the original documents.

In addition to providing the most precise and faithful rendition of the texts possible, an effort has been made to convey as much information as possible about the physical appearance of each of the documents. Conventions governing the presentation of this information in the transcriptions are indicated on the first page of the Documents section below.

Place names have been rendered in the language of the state that held sovereignty over the place in 1926, except in contexts where such usage would have been anachronistic.

11. Acknowledgments

Emmanuel Darmon played a major role in locating materials in Paris, as did Sara Fredman Aeder in New York. Clémence Boulouque, Gennady Estraiikh, Christina Frei, Ania Hyman, Vladyslava Moskalets, and Gennady Pasenchik all helped in deciphering or proofreading the documents and their transcriptions. Viktoria Khiterer, Claude Klein, Vladimir Levin, and Benjamin Nathans responded graciously to queries. Michael Marrus called my attention to one of the documents presented below.

I received invaluable assistance and outstanding service from the following librarians and archivists: Stephen Corrsin and Jessica Pigza of the New York Public Library; Diana Greene of the Elmer H. Bobst Library at New York University; Fruma Mohrer, Gunnar Berg, and Leo Greenbaum at the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research in New York; and Benjamin Lukin of the Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People in Jerusalem.

A special debt of gratitude is due to the project “European Traditions – Encyclopaedia of Jewish Cultures” of the Saxonian Academy of Sciences and Humanities in Leipzig, which invited me to prepare this volume and according to whose editorial standards, house style, and transliteration conventions the text and documents are presented. In particular, Frauke von Rohden, Stefan

Hofmann, Markus Kirchhoff, and Ulrike Kramme performed the laborious tasks of proofreading each and every letter of the completed volume and of reviewing the transcriptions, translations, and notes in order to insure maximum completeness, accuracy, and consistency. The preparation of a volume containing texts in eight languages, three alphabets, and two reading directions is an exceptionally complex undertaking, and their dedicated labors have been exemplary.

To all of these individuals and institutions I extend my heartfelt thanks.

April 2014

12. List of Documents

- 1 Report by Iser Nastaskin and Haim Lemberg; Kiev, 19 September 1919
- 2 Letter from Leo Motzkin to Louis Marshall; Paris, 29 August 1919
- 3 Letter from Mykhailo Tyszkiewicz to Jacques Bigart; Paris, 11 October 1919
- 4 Letter from Leo Motzkin to Alliance Israélite Universelle; Paris, 7 November 1919
- 5 Speech by Louis Marshall; New York, 24 November 1919
- 6 Minutes of a meeting of a Jewish delegation with U. S. Secretary of State Robert Lansing; New York, 10 December 1919
- 7 Letter from Sylvain Lévy and Jacques Bigart to the President of the Council of the League of Nations; 8 December 1920
- 8 Letter from Nahum Sokolow, Lucien Wolf, and Israel Zangwill to the President of the Assembly of the League of Nations; 8 December 1920
- 9 Memorandum by Comité des Délégations Juives to League of Nations; 16 December 1920
- 10 Letter from Maksym Slavynskyi and Hypolyt Boczkowski to Twelfth Zionist Congress; Prague, 29 August 1921
- 11 Agreement between Maksym Slavynskyi and Vladimir Jabotinsky; Karlsbad, 4 September 1921
- 12 Report by Maksym Slavynskyi; Prague, 23 December 1921
- 13 Letter from Stepan Vytvytskyi to Nahum Sokolow; Paris, 1 March 1922
- 14 Letter from the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv; Berlin, undated [1924]
- 15 Letter from Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval; Prague, 27–28 May 1926
- 16 Letter from Félix Allouche to Comité des Délégations Juives; Sfax, 28 May 1926
- 17 Draft by Schwarzbard Defense Committee; undated [June 1926]

- 18 Report by Police Inspector B. S. Goret to Examining Magistrate Marcel Peyre; Paris, 2 June 1926
- 19 Letter from Leo Motzkin to Simon Dubnow; Paris, 4 June 1926
- 20 Newspaper editorial by Menachem Ribalow; *Ha-Doar*, New York, 4 June 1926
- 21 Newspaper editorial by Yehoshua Heshel Yeivin; *Davar*, Tel Aviv, 4 June 1926
- 22 Newspaper editorial by Moshe Beilinson; *Davar*, Tel Aviv, 8 June 1926
- 23 Letter from Marvin Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress; Paris, 25 June 1926
- 24 Letter from Schwarzbard Defense Committee to Editorial Board, Jewish Daily Forward; Paris, 27 June 1926
- 25 Journal editorial by Abraham Liessin; *Di tsukunft*, New York, July 1926
- 26 Letter from Andrii Livytskyi to Arnold Margolin; Warsaw, 1 July 1926
- 27 Letter from Arnold Margolin to Leo Motzkin; New York, 12 July 1926
- 28 Letter from Leo Motzkin to Arnold Margolin; Paris, 17 July 1926
- 29 Report by Marcel Peyre on deposition of Leo Motzkin; Paris, 17 July 1926
- 30 Report by Marcel Peyre on confrontation between Koval and Schwarzbard; Paris, 20 July 1926
- 31 Report by Marcel Peyre on confrontation between Shapoval and Schwarzbard; Paris, 20 July 1926
- 32 Letter by Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv to Schwarzbard Defense Committee; Berlin, 10 August 1926
- 33 Letter from Oleksandr Shulhyn to Arnold Margolin; Paris, 12 August 1926
- 34 Letter by Eliyahu Tcherikower to Yitshak Giterman; Paris, 26 August 1926
- 35 Minutes of a meeting of the Schwarzbard Defense Committee; Paris, 13 September 1926
- 36 Journal article by Levko Chykalenko; *Tryzub*, Paris, 26 September 1926
- 37 Report of the Schwarzbard Defense Committee; Paris, 7 October 1926
- 38 Letter from Mykyta Shapoval to Ilya Dobkowski; Prague, 15 October 1926
- 39 Letter from Mykyta Shapoval to Mikhail Volodin; Prague, 15 October 1926
- 40 Minutes of a meeting of the Executive Committee, American Jewish Congress; New York, 17 October 1926
- 41 Letter and report from Arnold Margolin to Executive Committee, American Jewish Committee; New York, 17 October 1926
- 42 Letter from Marvin Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress; Paris, 26 October 1926

- 43 Letter from Marvin Lowenthal to Stephen S. Wise; Paris, 30 November 1926
- 44 Letter from Leo Motzkin to Louis Marshall; Paris, 30 January 1927
- 45 Letter from Chaim Nachman Bialik to Leo Motzkin; Tel Aviv, 11 February 1927
- 46 Open letter from Henry Torrès to Louis Marshall; Paris, 14 February 1927
- 47 Report by Police Inspector B. S. Goret to Examining Magistrate Marcel Peyre; Paris, 17 March 1927
- 48 Anonymous newspaper article; *Parizer haynt*, Paris, 24 March 1927
- 49 Letter from Marvin Lowenthal to Stephen S. Wise; Paris, 25 March 1927
- 50 Letter from Arnold Margolin to Louis Marshall; New York, 31 March 1927
- 51 Letter from Mykola Shapoval to Isaac Nachman Steinberg; Meudon, 14 April 1927
- 52 Letter from Isaac Nachman Steinberg to Mykola Shapoval; Berlin, 22 April 1927
- 53 Letter of the Schwarzbard Defense Committee to Joseph Krinsky; Paris, 21 April 1927
- 54 Newspaper articles by Scholem Schwarzbard and François Coty; *Le Figaro*, Paris, 19 May 1927
- 55 Newspaper article by B. Sendrowicz; *Wiener Morgenzeitung*, Vienna, 24 May 1927
- 56 Letter from Marvin Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress; Paris, 22 May 1927
- 57 Draft of a statement by Jan Tokary Tokarzewski-Karaszewicz; Paris, 7 August 1927
- 58 Report of the Schwarzbard Defense Committee; Paris, September 1927
- 59 Memorandum by Leo Motzkin; Paris, September 1927
- 60 Report of the Schwarzbard Defense Committee; Paris, October 1927
- 61 Letter from Comité des Délégations Juives; Paris, 2 October 1927
- 62 Trial testimony of Scholem Schwarzbard; Paris, 18 October 1927
- 63 Trial testimony of Jan Tokary Tokarzewski-Karaszewicz; Paris, 19 October 1927
- 64 Trial testimony of Mykola Shapoval; Paris, 20 October 1927
- 65 Trial testimony of Haya Greenberg; Paris, 24 October 1927
- 66 Letter from Peter Wiernik to Louis Marshall; New York, 27 October 1927
- 67 Letter from Louis Marshall to Peter Wiernik; New York, 29 October 1927
- 68 Newspaper article by Leo Motzkin; *Di idishe shtime*, Kaunas, 28 October 1927
- 69 Declaration by the Cabinet of the Ukrainian National Republic; Paris, 30 October 1927

- 70 Letter from Oleksandr Shulhyn to Arnold Margolin; Paris, 31 October 1927
- 71 Extract from a report of the Comité des Délégations Juives; Paris, November 1927
- 72 Letter from Mykola Shapoval to editor of *Dni*; Berlin, undated [November 1927]
- 73 Report by Jean Tripier to French Foreign Minister; Warsaw, 2 November 1927
- 74 Anonymous magazine article; *Time: The Weekly Newsmagazine*, New York, 7 November 1927
- 75 Letter from Joseph Barondess to Stephen S. Wise; New York, 9 November 1927
- 76 Excerpt from a play by Alter Kacyzne, *Shvartsbard* (1937), Paris 1980

II. Documents

Transcription Conventions

Legibility:

#	Single illegible letter
###	Illegible word
ẋ	Doubtful reading
◇◇◇	Decorative element

Pagination:

x	Page break with page number appearing in original document
! x !	Page break with page number added to original document by hand
[[x]]	Page break with page number added by editor to unpaginated original

Corrections and insertions:

<u>Underline</u>	Typewritten text underlined with typewritten solid line
<u>Underline</u>	Typewritten text underlined with typewritten broken line
<u>Underline</u>	Typewritten or handwritten text underlined by hand
Erasure	Handwritten strikethrough
Erasure	Legible typewritten strikethrough
###	Illegible typewritten strikethrough
!Insertion!	Text inserted by hand (including handwritten signature) or typewritten

Corrections of obvious typographical errors made by document authors (by hand or typewritten) are not indicated.

Part One: The Background

Document 1

*Iser Nastaskin and Haim Lemberg*¹

Kiev, 19 September 1919

Typewritten report, 3 pages; handwritten additions and corrections; handwritten archival notation in upper right corner (“79N23”)

Language: Russian

DAKO, FR-3050, 46/79–80

Из матеріаловъ Редакціи.

Поступило въ сентябрь
1919

!Бѣлая-Церковь Киев. губ.!

Бѣлая-Церковь

Передано Исеромъ Настаскинымъ и Хаимомъ Лембергомъ
бывшими членами Бѣлоцерковской Городской Управы
6-го сентября /ст. ст.²/ 1919 года.

Кошмарныя событія тянутся въ Бѣлой-Церкви съ 10 августа /ст. ст./
Въ субботу 10-го августа регулярныя Петлюровскія части /Полтавскій
Полкъ и др./ заняли городъ. Было спокойно. Въ понедѣльникъ, 12-го

1 This document is typical of thousands of reports that circulated in Ukraine and beyond during and after the pogrom period. It concerns events in the town of Belaya Tserkov (today Bila Tserkva, Ukraine), a commercial and agricultural center about 80 km south of Kiev. In the early twentieth century Belaya Tserkov was home to some 20,000 Jews, who comprised a bit over half the total population. An earlier pogrom had struck the town in February 1919. The testimony is noteworthy particularly for its enumeration of the various perpetrators, among whom “Petliurists” were only one group. Indeed, witnesses were generally quite careful about distinguishing among different attackers. It is not known to whom the testimony was originally given. It eventually became part of the holdings of the Kiev regional office of the Jewish Public Committee for Provision of Aid to Pogrom Victims, an organization formed in June 1920 under prodding from the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee to coordinate the efforts of the major Russian Jewish political and social welfare organizations regarding the violence in Ukraine.

2 Старого стиля.

августа, прошли мимо Бѣлой-Церкви Зеленовцы. Благодаря принятымъ команднымъ составомъ мерамъ, по инициативѣ представителей Городской Управы, Зеленовцы въ городѣ не задержались, тѣмъ не менѣе они успѣли захватить съ собою двухъ всртѣтившихся имъ на окраинѣ города евреевъ — Комаровскихъ, отца и сына. По этому поводу Дума отправила делегацію къ Зеленому, который приказалъ: «Вернуть и отлупить тѣхъ, что забрали ихъ». Несмотря на это оба Комаровскіе были через пару дней найдены убитыми.

Во вторникъ, 13-го августа, утромъ Петлюровцы вынуждены были благодаря натиску большевиковъ, оставить на часъ городъ, но наступленіе удалось немедленно ликвидировать, и они опять вернулись. Петлюровцы рѣшили за это отомстить и распустили слухи, что изъ оконъ еврейскихъ домовъ стрѣляли изъ пулеметовъ и что евреи вынули замки изъ двухъ орудій, стоявшихъ на площади около церкви. Началася рѣзня евреевъ, длившаяся съ 9 часовъ утра до 4 часовъ дня — ее устроили объединенныя банды Сокола, Соколовскаго и др. Убивали, но никого не грабили. За эти 7 часовъ было убито 140 евреевъ. Благодаря усилямъ членковъ Городской управы и украинскаго с.-р. Н. А. Тимченко, былъ въ тотъ же день украинскимъ комендантомъ изданъ строгій приказъ о прекращеніи эксцессовъ. Еврей ходили по улицамъ, магазины были открыты.

Въ субботу, 17-го августа, Бѣлая-Церковъ была занята добровольцами — терскими казаками. ~~Населеніе встрѣтило ихъ радостно.~~ |2| Но Вскорѣ казаки приступили къ грабежамъ. Въ ночь на воскресенье ограблены г. Римерь по Бердичевской улицѣ, г. Бяликъ по Кіевской, галантерейный магазинъ Ананицкаго и др.

Въ воскресенье, 18-го августа, около 6 часовъ утра солдатами были обстрѣляны желѣзныя двери и шторы магазиновъ на базарѣ. Начались грабежи на всѣхъ улицахъ. Человѣческихъ жертвъ въ этотъ день не было.

Въ ночь на понедѣльникъ, были отдѣльные эксцессы.

Въ понедѣльникъ, 19-го августа, грабежи продолжались и на этотъ разъ уже съ человѣческими жертвами. Была убита семья Конторщика изъ 4 человѣкъ и др. Солдатами въ этотъ день было устроено нѣчто въ родѣ аукціона, гдѣ открыто продавалось награбленное еврейское добро. Часть крестьянъ Заречія /пригород Бѣлой-Церквы/ рѣшила использовать погромъ и принялась уже грабить, но мѣстная русская интеллигенція воспрепятствовала этому, отбирая награбленное. Въ другихъ частяхъ города со стороны мѣстныхъ крестьянъ не было попытокъ къ погрому.

Во вторникъ, 20-го августа, грабежи продолжались. Въ этотъ день

быль назначенъ начальникомъ гарнизона полковникъ Сахаровъ, издавшій строгій приказъ /№ 7/ о прекращеніи эксцессовъ.

На нѣсколько дней — до субботы — стало спокойнѣй, хотя единичные эксцессы еще имѣли мѣсто; евреи все еще прятались, магазины не открывались.

Въ субботу, 24-го августа возобновились массовые грабежи, сопровождавшіеся двумя человѣческими жертвами. Эксцессы продолжаютъ непрерывно до настоящаго дня.

Массовые грабежи происходили систематически, какъ бы по заранѣ намѣченному плану. Военная часть окружала улицу; ходила изъ одного еврейскаго дома въ другой и опустошала ихъ. Одна группа покидала домъ, а затѣмъ входила другая. Чтобы выколотить побольше денегъ, жертвъ подвергали страшнымъ пыткамъ: подвѣшивали /какъ это имѣло мѣсто съ предсѣдателемъ общины Мееромъ Зайденбергомъ/, рвали языкъ клещами /торговецъ-галантерейщикъ Черняховскій, котораго между прочимъ подвергали пыткамъ въ присутствіи полицейскаго чиновника Савицкаго, прибывшаго туда съ двумя офицерами для производства обыска/, жгли волосы на головѣ /нѣсколькимъ женщинамъ/ и т. п. У нѣкоторыхъ тифозныхъ больныхъ сдimalы |3| простыни съ кроватей и заворачивали въ нихъ награбленное, тѣмъ содѣйствуя распространенію эпидеміи — было зарегистрировано много новыхъ случаевъ заболѣванія тифомъ.

Почти все еврейское населеніе ограблено. Городъ страшно обѣднѣлъ. Свирѣпствуетъ голодъ. Тифозная эпидемія непрерывно усиливается. До 4-го сентября, когда дающіе настоящее показаніе покинули городъ, |евреи| еще боялись показываться на улицахъ. Отъ 7 до 11 часовъ утра на улицахъ еще замѣтно нѣкоторое движеніе. Съ 11 часовъ уже никто не рѣшается выходить изъ дому, рискуя въ противномъ случаѣ остаться безъ сапогъ, одежды и т. п. До 7 часовъ вечера грабежи случайны, но съ 7 часовъ до 11 они уже носятъ систематическій характеръ. Ночь протекаетъ болѣе или менѣе спокойно.

Мѣстное христіанское населеніе, Городская Управа, депутаціи отъ разныхъ общественныхъ организацій /отъ учительскаго союза и др. / посылаютъ часто делегаціи къ начальнику гарнизона о прекращеніи эксцессовъ. Онъ даетъ обѣщанія, но надлежащія мѣры не были приняты.

Крестьяне и мѣстная интеллигенція относятся отрицательно къ погромамъ, но не проявляютъ достаточно энергіи для борьбы съ эксцессами. Между прочимъ, казаки были весьма недовольны Зареческій интеллигенціей, воспрепятствовавшей грабежамъ, и это имѣло своимъ послѣдствіемъ то, что интеллигенты больше не вмѣшиваются въ

подобныя дѣла. Съ субботы, 17-го августа, было убито 60 человекъ, немного меньше того — раненныхъ и около 40 изнасилованных женщинъ.

+++++ ооо +++++

Translation

From the materials of the Editorial Board³

Received in September
1919

{Belaya Tserkov Kiev Province}

Belaya-Tserkov

Submitted by Iser Nastaskin and Haim Lemberg,
former members of the Municipal Council of Belaya-Tserkov
6 September (OS) 1919⁴

The nightmarish events dragged on in Belaya-Tserkov from 10 August (OS). On Saturday, 10 August, regular Petliurite units (the Poltava Regiment and others) occupied the city. Things were calm. On Monday, 12 August, the forces of Zeleny⁵ passed through Belaya-Tserkov. Thanks to measures taken by the military rulers on the initiative of representatives of the Municipal Council, the Zelenites did not linger in the city, but they still managed to take

-
- 3 Reference to the Editorial Board for the Collection and Publication of the Materials concerning the Pogroms in Ukraine, established in May 1919 in order to direct the publication project sponsored by the Kiev-based Jewish publishing house, *Folksfarlag*. See introduction, n. 222. Members of the Board included W. Latzky-Bertholdi, N. Shtif, E. Tcherikower, and M. Goldstein – all figures who later played a role in the Schwarzbard defense effort. Anonymous, *Di geshikhte fun der pogrom-bavegung*, 2.
 - 4 All dates in this document are given in the so-called Old Style (OS), according to the Julian calendar used in prerevolutionary Russia. The equivalent Gregorian dates are determined by adding 13 to the number given. Accordingly the date of this document is 19 September 1919.
 - 5 *Nom-de-guerre* of Danylo Terpylo, a Ukrainian warlord who sometimes fought in alliance with Petliura's forces. His troops were implicated in several pogroms in the Kiev region from March through September 1919. See Tcherikower, *Di ukraiyner pogromen*, 250–267.

captive two Jews whom they encountered on the outskirts of town – a father and son named Komarowski. Because of this the Council sent a delegation to Zeleny who ordered, “Return them and banish the ones who took them.” Nevertheless, both Komarowskis were found dead a couple of days later.

On the morning of Tuesday, 13 August, the Petliurites were forced to leave the city for an hour because of Bolshevik pressure, but right away they managed to put an end to the offensive, and they returned yet again. The Petliurites decided to take revenge for this, and they spread rumors that machine gunfire was coming from the windows of Jewish houses and that Jews had taken the locks off of two pieces of artillery that were standing in the square across from the church. A massacre of Jews commenced, lasting from 9 am to 4 pm. It was carried out by a union of the bands of Sokol,⁶ Sokolovsky,⁷ and others. They killed but robbed no one. During these seven hours 140 Jews were killed. Thanks to the efforts of members of the Municipal Council and the Ukrainian SR,⁸ N. A. Tymchenko, the Ukrainian commander, issued that very day a strict order to stop the excesses. Jews walked in the street; shops were open.

On Saturday, 17 August, Belaya-Tserkov was occupied by Terek Cossacks⁹ of the Volunteer Army.¹⁰ ~~The population greeted them with joy.~~ [2] Soon thereafter the Cossacks proceeded to plunder. Over the night into Sunday Mr. Rimer was robbed on Berdichevskaya Street, Mr. Bialik on Kievskaya Street, the haberdashery of Ananich, etc.

On Sunday, 18 August, around 6 am, soldiers shot out the iron doors and blinds on the shops in the bazaar. Looting began on all streets. There was no loss of human life that day.

6 Warlord, sometimes identified as Sokolov (distinct from Sokolovsky; see following note). In a list of pogroms prepared for the trial, Eliyahu Tcherikower noted that “the accounts of Sokolov and his connection with Petliura have not been established precisely, but he often acted in concert with such insurgent atamans as Zeleny, Tiutiunyk, etc., who were indubitably tied to Petliura.” Eliyahu Tcherikower, *Tableaux des pogromes organisés par l’armée ukrainienne et par les atamans insurgés qui furent en liaison avec l’armée ukrainienne*, YIVO, RG80/408/35372.

7 Dmytro Sokolovsky, leader of a major anti-Bolshevik partisan force in right-bank Ukraine. See Tcherikower, *Di ukraïner pogromen*, 220–225.

8 Social Revolutionary Party.

9 A unit based on the Terek River in the northern Caucasus.

10 A Russian anti-Bolshevik armed force that operated in the southern regions of the former Russian Empire between December 1917 and March 1920. During most of its existence it was commanded by General Anton Denikin (1872–1947). Its troops were heavily implicated in anti-Jewish violence. See Joseph B. Schechtman, *Pogromy Dobrovol’cheskoi armii na Ukraine* [The Pogroms of the Voluntary Army in Ukraine], Berlin 1932.

Over the night into Monday there were separate excesses.

On Monday, 19 August, the looting continued; this time there were casualties. The Kontorshchik family of four was killed, along with others. That day the soldiers arranged a sort of auction, in which plundered Jewish goods were sold openly. Some of the peasants of Zarechiye (a suburb of Belaya-Tserkov)¹¹ decided to take advantage of the pogrom and started looting, but the local Russian intelligentsia stood in the way of this, taking away the loot. In other parts of the city the local peasants did not attempt a pogrom.

On Tuesday, 20 August, looting continued. On that day Colonel Sakharov was appointed head of the garrison, and he issued a strict order ~~№. 7~~ to stop the excesses.

For a few days, until Saturday, things calmed down, although individual excesses still took place, the Jews still hid, and stores did not open.

On Saturday, 24 August, massive looting resumed, accompanied by two human victims. The excesses are continuing with a break to this day.

Massive looting has proceeded systematically, as if according to a pre-arranged plan. A military unit would surround a street; it would go from one Jewish home to another and destroy it. One group would abandon the house and another would come after it. In order to wring more money out of the victims, horrible tortures were employed: hanging (as happened to the chairman of the Jewish community, Meir Seidenberg), tearing out the tongue with tongs (the haberdashery merchant Tcherniakhovsky, who, by the way, was subjected to torture in the presence of police officer Savitsky, who had come there with two other officers to conduct a search), burning the hair on the head (quite a few women), etc. Sheets were removed |3| from the beds of some typhus patients and plundered goods rolled up in them, thereby contributing to the spread of the epidemic. Many new cases of typhoid were recorded.

Almost the entire Jewish population has been robbed. The city has been horribly impoverished. Hunger has become rampant. The typhoid epidemic has grown constantly in strength. Up to 4 September, when the witnesses who are giving this testimony left the city, |Jews| were still afraid to appear in the streets. From 7 to 11 am some movement in the streets is still visible. After 11 no one dares to leave his home; if he does, he risks being left without shoes, clothing, etc. Until 7 pm robberies are random, but from 7–11 pm they take on a systematic character. The night gives greater or lesser protection.

The local Christian population, the Municipal Council, deputations from various communal organizations (the teachers' association, etc.) often send

11 The name conveys the sense of "beyond the river."

delegations to the head of the garrison to stop the excesses. He makes promises, but appropriate measures have not been taken.

The peasants and the urban intelligentsia have a negative attitude toward the pogroms, but they do not display enough energy to fight the excesses. By the way, the Cossacks were quite unhappy with the intelligentsia from Zarechiye who impeded their plunder, and this has had the effect of making the intellectuals no longer willing to intervene in similar cases. From Saturday, 17 August, 60 people have been killed, slightly fewer wounded, and 40 women raped.

+++++ ooo +++++

Document 2

Leo Motzkin to Louis Marshall

Paris, 29 August 1919

Typewritten letter, 2 pages

Language: English

AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 154

COMITÉ
DES DÉLÉGATIONS JUIVES
AUPRÈS DE LA CONFÉRENCE DE LA PAIX 94, RUE SAINT-LAZARE
PARIS, le August 29th, 1919.
◇◇◇
TÉLÉPHONE CENTRAL 27-79

Mr. Louis Marshall,
120 Broadway,
New York

Dear Mr. Marshall,

We received your letter of August 6th and your telegram nearly at the same time.¹²

12 On 6 August 1919 Marshall wrote to Motzkin, "I am in receipt of your cablegram with regard to conditions in the Ukraine. I have given it wide publicity and have commented upon it. I have also had a conference with Archbishop Platon in com-

We thank you very much for the steps you undertook concerning Ukraina [sic]. We are sorry to say that the situation there has not improved. The last news we have received prove that a frightful panic reigns in Ukraina. Yesterday only we received an alarming telegram from a man who is a member of the Ukrainian [sic]-Jewish National Council and of the Ukrainian-Zionist Central Committee and who has just come from Ukraina.

From that telegram, of which you find a copy herewith,¹³ you will see that the Ukrainian [sic] Judaism lives in the hope that the Entente governments [2] will exert a direct pressure on the Ukrainian government. It seems to us that this could be realised as far as the American government is concerned. The slightest sign given by this government would bring the Ukrainian authorities to put an end to the massacres. For it is to the interest of the Ukrainian [sic] to keep on good terms with America. As you may have noticed, an Ukrainian Commission which has as mission to create economical relations with America has been since a little time in the country !(in U.S.A.)!. It is therefore clear that the Ukrainians lay great stress upon the American Government not being badly disposed against the Ukrainian representatives.

I have read your letter in the last full sitting of the Committee. The assembly in which there are already several new members of Tchechoslovakia [sic] and Bukovina, was pleased about the warmth with which you write on our collaboration in the past as well as about your active participation in the actual work.

With hearty greetings, we are,
Yours very truly,

THE SECRETARY GENERAL:
!L. Motzkin!

pany with Mr. Jacob H. Schiff, Hon. Oscar S. Straus, Rev. Dr. Stephen S. Wise and Mr. A. J. Sack, with regard to conditions in the Ukraine. The delegates of the American Jewish Congress will have a meeting on this subject as soon as Judge Mack returns from his vacation." AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 1589. Neither of the telegrams has been located.

13 Not in file.

Document 3

Mykhailo Tyszkiewicz¹⁴ to Jacques Bigart

Paris, 11 October 1919

Typewritten letter (copy), 2 pages; front page on printed letterhead; day and month typewritten; handwritten notation (“copie”), stamped and handwritten serial number (“N^o 7149”), and receipt stamp (“14 OCT. 1919”) along top; handwritten notation in upper left corner (“Paris Délégation ukrainienne”)

Language: French

AAIU, II.D.10.08 (Question juive)

DÉLÉGATION

DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE UKRAINIENNE

PARIS, LE 11 Octobre 1919

37, RUE LA PÉROUSE

TÉL.: PASSY 33–87

Monsieur,

J’ai l’honneur de vous prier, au nom de mon Gouvernement, de vouloir bien prendre part à une Commission d’enquête qui aura pour but de se renseigner exactement sur les pogroms Juifs en Ukraine.

Cette commission fonctionnera en coopération avec les organisations ci-dessous, auxquell[e]s nous adressons la même invitation:

- 1^o.- Joint Foreign Committee London
- 2^o.- American Jewish Committee
- 3^o.- Organisation Sioniste Universelle
- 4^o.- Jewish Territorialists Organization.
- 5^o.- Comité de Délégation[s] Juive[s]

Le Gouvernement Ukrainien a combattu et combat encore contre l’Anti-sémitisme et contre les pogroms. Il considère les Juifs comme des amis; il est

14 Mykhailo Tyszkiewicz (1857–1930), president of the Délégation de la République Ukrainienne à Paris in August 1919. Descended from a Polish-Lithuanian noble family, he became involved with the Ukrainian cultural organization *Prosvita* in East Galicia during the 1880s. Later he played a leading role among Ukrainian Catholics. That position led to his appointment as the Ukrainian National Republic’s first diplomatic representative to the Vatican. From Rome he was dispatched to Paris to head the Ukrainian Peace Conference delegation.

le premier Etat de l'Europe Orientale qui ait donné la plus large autonomie aux Israélites, de même qu'aux autres minorités nationales.

Parmi les milliers d'Ukrainiens qui sont tombés dans la lutte opiniâtre et sanglante que soutient notre pays pour son indépendance, les Juifs figurent à côté des patriotes qui appartiennent aux autres confessions.

Le Gouvernement a l'honneur de vous inviter à faire parti [sic] de la commission susdite, afin que les Juifs puissent se convaincre que ce dernier fait tout ce qui dépend de lui pour lutter contre ce triste état de chose qui, d'ailleurs, n'existe que dans les villes en grande partie dénationalisées alors que les campagnes habitées par 97% d'Ukrainiens restent absolument étrangères aux pogroms. Les Juifs y jouissent d'une sécurité absolue et de la sympathie de la population.

[2] Le Gouvernement étudiera avec la plus grande attention les propositions et les Conseils qui lui seront présentés par la Commission, en vue de faire cesser enfin des actes préjudiciables au pays tout entier.

Le Gouvernement supportera toutes les dépenses et facilitera le voyage en Ukraine des membres de la Commission.¹⁵

Dans l'espoir que pour le bien des Ukrainiens comme pour celui des Juifs en Ukraine, vous voudrez bien accepter la présente invitation, je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur, l'expression de mes sentiments les plus distingués.

{Pr. Tyszkiewicz}
Président de la Délégation
de la République Ukrainienne à Paris

Monsieur Bigare [sic]
Secrétaire de l'Alliance Israélite
45, Rue Labruyère
Paris

15 The proposed commission did not materialize.

Document 4

Leo Motzkin to Alliance Israélite Universelle

Paris, 7 November 1919

Typewritten letter, 1 page; printed letterhead; day and month typewritten; stamped and handwritten serial number (“N^o. 7202”), receipt stamp (“9 NOV. 1919”), and handwritten notation (“Paris Comité des Délégat[ion]s Jui[f]s”) in upper left corner

Language: French

AAIU, III.D.11 (Comité des Délégations Juives)

COMITÉ
DES DÉLÉGATIONS JUIVES
AUPRÈS DE LA CONFÉRENCE DE LA PAIX

TÉLÉPHONE: GUTENBERG 74–51

PARIS, le 7 novembre 1919

10, RUE EDOUARD – VII
PARIS

Alliance Israélite Universelle,
PARIS

Messieurs,

Nous avons l'honneur de vous faire savoir que nous avons adressé à la Délégation Ukrainienne à Paris, ce jour, la lettre suivante:

« Nous avons décidé depuis quelque temps qu'une commission composée de représentants juifs de tous le pays devait être envoyée dans tous les endroits où les pogromes ont eu lieu. Nous avons déjà fait des démarches dans ce sens. Cette commission aurait pour tâche de venir en aide aux victimes des pogromes et de faire une enquête sur ces évènements. C'est pourquoi nous avons accueilli avec grand plaisir votre proposition, par laquelle une partie de notre projet se trouvera réalisée. Dans sa dernière séance le Comité des Délégations juives a examiné la question à propos de votre proposition. Le Comité décida qu'en cas d'envoi d'une telle commission il y serait représenté.

« Quant à votre aimable offre de supporter les frais de l'envoi de cette commission, nous avons l'honneur de vous déclarer que nous pourrions nous-mêmes aux frais de notre Délégation.

« Nous vous prions de prendre en considération notre présente lettre; nous sommes prêts à discuter avec votre Délégation la question relative à la réalisation de ce projet. »

Nous vous prions d'agr eer, Messieurs, l'expression de notre consid eration distingu ee,

LE SECRETAIRE GENERAL:

!L. Motzkin!

Document 5

Speech by Louis Marshall

New York, 24 November 1919

Typewritten manuscript, 9 pages; typewritten corrections

Language: English

AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 131, folder 2

Speech protesting anti-Jewish violence in Ukraine and calling for the United States to join the League of Nations as a step toward stopping these attacks.

Speech of Mr. Louis Marshall at Carnegie Hall, New York, November 24, 1919.¹⁶

In 1648 the Thirty Years' War was ended by the Treaty of Westphalia. Europe became a wilderness. Its population was diminished by one-third. The consequences were felt for two hundred years. It was in that same year that the ravages of Bogdan Chmielnicki¹⁷ laid waste the fertile lands of Poland and

16 The speech was given at the culmination of a protest march from New York's Lower East Side Jewish neighborhood to the city's premier concert hall. Reports note as many as 50,000 people participated in the march, and 1,500 policemen were dispatched to maintain order. Other speakers included U. S. Secretary of the Navy Joseph Daniels (1862–1948), New York Mayor John Francis Hylan (1868–1936), and Rabbi Stephen S. Wise (1874–1949). Anonymous, *Our Weekly Letter from New York*, in: *The Sentinel*, 5 December 1919. An abbreviated version of the speech was published as a letter to the editor in *New York Times*, 25 November 1919.

17 Ukr.: Bohdan Khmel'nyts'ky (c. 1595–1657), leader of an uprising against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, 1648–1654, that led to the establishment of a Cossack state. Ukrainians have regarded him as a national hero. However, in the course of the uprising troops under his command attacked Jews, killing perhaps 20,000 (although the Jewish historical imagination has traditionally placed the number much higher). As a result, Jews have figured him as a would-be destroyer of their people, and his name has symbolized the epitome of villainy.

of the Ukraine and wrought such havoc that even to this day Jewish and Polish mothers tremble at the tales of the cruelty, the torture and the brutality to which their ancestors were subjected by the wild hordes who, with fire and sword,¹⁸ carried on their hellish work of destruction. Three hundred thousand Jews were the victims of insensate hate, many more were driven from their homes and were deprived of their slender possessions. It was the most atrocious butchery recorded in history except in so far as it has now been paralleled.

One would believe that so terrible a lesson as that written in letters of blood two hundred and seventy years ago would never be repeated, and yet in their passions, their ambitions, their prejudices, their greed, the men of to-day have forgotten all of the horrors of the past and once more have become so brutalized as to reenact orgies of violence ~~that~~ |which| those who fondly believed in the progressive amelioration of mankind ~~###~~ |looked upon| as a hideous nightmares that ~~would~~ never |again would shock| ~~humanity~~ human-kind. ~~again~~. Scarcely had the cessation of hostilities been proclaimed by the armistice of a year ago, than, in the very region where Chmielnicki raged, there were reproduced the same atrocities, the same carnage, with the accompaniment of the same |2| bestiality and the same defiance of the laws of God and man so graphically portrayed by Sinkiewicz [sic] in that remarkable trilogy in which he presents a vivid panorama of the terrors of those evil days deemed to have passed, never to return.

The Ukraine is beautiful and rich in natural resources. From its soil springs the golden grain, capable of feeding untold millions, where none the less famine now prevails. Within that region flow noble rivers, on whose banks populous cities have sprung where the hum of industry has ceased. At this very moment chaos and anarchy reign there unchecked and its teeming population is helpless beyond compare. In that region live forty million, among whom are nearly three millions of Jews. There is no established government. Life, liberty and property have become devoid of meaning. Law has been dethroned, and order is a byword. Like a blind colossus these unhappy |creatures of God| grope about in utter darkness. Every man's hand seems to be against his brother. Continuous conflict ~~###~~ |flames|. One horde of murderers follows in the wake of another. No man knows what the morrow will bring forth. Death and destruction are the only certainty. Unity and harmony have long given way to hatred and dissension. There is, alas, but one policy as to which there seems to be agreement among those discordant factions

18 As the text subsequently makes clear, this is a reference to the classic Polish historical novel by Henryk Sienkiewicz, *Ogniem i mieczem* (1884; English: *With Fire and Sword*, 1890). Set in the time of the Cossack uprising of the mid-seventeenth century, the novel featured Bogdan Chmielnicki as a central character.

– the annihilation of the long-suffering and helpless Jewish minority of the Ukraine. All of these foes alike, Bolsheviks and Czarists, the followers of Petlura and those of Denikin, the robber bands of Gregorieff¹⁹ and of [3] numerous other unnamed and unspeakable bandits, have for the past two years vied with one another in this unholy persecution. The number of the defenseless victims who have been ground into the dust, who have been brutally massacred, runs into the thousands and tens of thousands. The reports that have filtered out of that charnal house are of such a nature that the mind cannot grasp them and one hesitates to give credence to them in their entirety. The means of obtaining circumstantial information and precise statistical details are as yet unavailable. With every desire on the part of our Government and the Governments of Western Europe to obtain a complete history of these tragic occurrences it has been impossible to do so. From the very nature of things, diplomatic relations cannot exist, and dispassionate investigation is inconceivable. Yet there is such a consensus in the reports which have been received from apparently reliable sources as to lead to the sad conclusion that of all the pogroms and massacres of our time, there have been none to compare with those that are now taking place in that war-torn, bleeding, lawless land. The most conservative statements show that, up to six months ago, not less than thirty-five thousand Jews had been murdered.²⁰ There are other estimates that make the numbers mount to upwards of one hundred and twenty-five thousand.²¹ The full extent of the calamity remains unknown. But the extent of the tragedy may be surmised by the fact that the represen-|4| tatives of the several warring parties openly confess these dreadful crimes.

But whatever the actual number may be, it is so abhorrent and unprecedented at this stage of our boasted civilization as to wring from every breast the sob of pity and from every ardent soul a cry of indignation because these shameful deeds have been permitted to disgrace mankind and nothing has been done to end this monstrous disclosure of human degeneracy.

And now the question arises, What shall be done to put a quietus upon this butchery of innocent men, women and children, upon these acts that are converting an earthly paradise into a barren desert, upon this war against law, human and divine, and upon this madly persistent effort to reverse the wheels of progress and to stay the onward flight of civilization? Diplomacy is voiceless, because there is no government to which it can address itself. Appeals for mercy from anguished and sympathetic hearts fall upon deaf ears. One might as well seek to mollify a tiger whilst stalking for his prey as to at-

19 Matvii Hryhoriiv. See above, Introduction, n. 71.

20 Cf. Anonymous, 35,000 Jews Killed in Savage Pogroms.

21 It is not clear to which estimates Marshall referred.

tempt to argue with anarchy. The conscience of the world when it from time to time became vocal in the past compelled a hearing when similar excesses, though on a greatly smaller scale, took place in Russian territory; but then there existed established and organized governments to whose representatives the voice of that public conscience could be directed and which felt constrained, ### |though| often with reluctance, to hearken to that voice.²²

[5] Relief must, therefore, now be sought, from the aroused conscience of the world, it is true, but from a forum which will make that conscience potent, even as against those who, in their wild fury, have forgotten that they must, in the end, be dependent upon the good-will of the civilized nations of the earth. That forum, it is needless to say, is the League of Nations. It alone is capable of affording protection. It alone can bring order and stability where men are now gnawing at each other's throats as they did in prehistoric days. Without a league of nations the minorities of Eastern Europe, whether they be racial, religious or linguistic, will forever be at the mercy of a tyrannical majority. Without it war will never cease and industry, commerce and the arts of civilization cannot flourish. As society is now constituted, an internecine conflict waged in the Ukraine, or in the Baltic Provinces, or in the Balkan States, is certain to disturb the delicate adjustment of international relations that is essential to the happiness and prosperity of every part of the world. A league of nations can exert such pressure as will not be disregarded even by those who are responsible for conditions such as now prevail in the Ukraine. With the assurance that the forces that are seeking the restoration of law and order will have the sanction and the protection of the nations that constitute the league, brute force and anarchy will not be able long to withstand them, and reason, justice [6] and common humanity will again predominate. If, however, the hopes for such a league are shattered, if the good people of the Ukraine, and they are in the vast majority, shall be told that they cannot look for help, sympathy or encouragement from that quarter where lie their hopes, then, indeed, will the heavens be hung in black and not a ray of light will penetrate the Cimmerian darkness in which these hapless millions are now staggering.²³

22 The reference is to widespread public protests in Western Europe and North America following the infamous Kishinev pogrom of 1903. See, for example, Cyrus Adler (ed.), *The Voice of America on Kishineff*, Philadelphia Penn. 1904.

23 Marshall was speaking during a period in which American participation in the League of Nations was a matter of intense public debate in the United States. Less than a week earlier, on 19 November 1919, the United States had voted against ratification of the Versailles Treaty as written. Ratification would have made the United States a member of the League. The Senate had yet to consider a series of amend-

Nearly ten years ago that exalted American patriot, Theodore Roosevelt, whose untimely death every good citizen mourns,²⁴ in an address delivered before the Nobel Prize Committee²⁵ at Christiania,²⁶ Norway, with prophetic vision said:

“It would be a master stroke if the great powers of the world honestly bent on peace would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves, but to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by others ... Each nation must keep well prepared to defend itself until the establishment of some form of international police power, competent and willing to prevent violence as between nations. As things are now, such power to command peace throughout the world could best be assured by some combination between those great nations which sincerely desire peace and have no thought themselves of committing aggressions. The combination might at first be only to secure peace within certain definite limits and certain definite conditions; but the ruler or statesman who should bring about such a combination would have earned his place in history for all time and his title to the gratitude of all mankind.”

Like many others, I was skeptical when the plan of a league of nations was first broached.²⁷ The avoidance of entangling alliances, so powerfully championed by Washington²⁸ and so greatly justified in our early history, seemed the height of present wisdom. It was not until I stood upon the [7] battlefield

ments and reservations to the Treaty that might have preserved League participation. Initially an opponent of the League idea, Marshall switched his position during his attendance at the Paris Peace Conference. His remarks here can thus be seen, *inter alia*, as part of the broader campaign for American ratification of the Treaty and entry into the League.

24 Roosevelt died suddenly on 6 January 1919 at age 59.

25 Roosevelt was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1906 for his role in the negotiations that ended the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–1905.

26 Today Oslo.

27 See Marshall to George Barrow, 4 January 1919, AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 1589.

28 The reference is to an open letter to the people of the United States written by George Washington toward the end of his second term as the country’s first president, originally published in *American Daily Advertiser*, 19 September 1796. The letter included the sentences, “‘Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances, with any portion of the foreign world ... Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.” Although Washington himself never used

of Verdun, where more than three-quarters of a million men in the bloom of youth had laid down their lives,²⁹ not until I passed through the devastated regions of France, that I became convinced that the old bad, selfish, militaristic system was but weakness and had ended in miserable failure. I became satisfied that anything in the form of a league of peace that could be devised by the mind of man should be encouraged, in the hope that eventually there might evolve from the experiment a new system which would restore the glories of civilization and speed the day when the inspiring vision of our ancient prophets would be realized. We are now living in a time when every man and woman of humane instincts cannot but feel that if the League of Nations had not already been conceived it would have to be invented.³⁰

A critical period is now at hand in Western Europe. It is true that the clash of arms was silenced there more than a year ago and that the great armies have been demobilized. But in the vast regions of Eastern Europe actual conflict still continues. Nowhere does peace as yet smile. On every side there is unrest. Commerce and industry have not as yet regained their orderly courses. Dissatisfaction and controversy are well-nigh universal. Economic reconstruction is awaiting the ratification of the treaties that are to end the war, and it is an absolute certainty that, unless peace comes speedily, industrial collapse will come. There exist honest [8] differences of opinion here as to the terms in which the resolution of ratification of the treaty by the United States Senate shall be couched; or how the reservations regarded as prudent, shall be phrased.³¹ Seventy-nine members of that great body have, by their recent votes, indicated that they are in favor of the ratification of the treaty, and that they approve in principle of the Government of the League of Nations.³² Their only differences relate principally to what, after all, are largely matters of form. They are all patriotic Americans. They all have a deep concern in the welfare of humanity. It is impossible that they should be indifferent to

the phrase, he is commonly believed to have warned the United States against “entangling alliances” altogether.

- 29 The battle of Verdun lasted ten months, from 21 February through 18 December 1916. The official battlefield death total was 698,000.
- 30 For an alternate account of how Marshall changed from an opponent to a proponent of the League of Nations, see Engel, *Manhigim yehudim*, 170 f.
- 31 Fifteen reservations to the Treaty were considered in the Senate on 19 March 1920. A motion to ratify the Treaty with the reservations fell seven votes short of the required number.
- 32 The United States Senate consisted of 96 members. According to the constitution of the United States (article 2, section 2), two thirds of the members must consent to any treaties made by the president.

conditions such as those which have brought us together on this occasion. The time has now come when those in whom is lodged the treaty-making power must make a final effort to reconcile their differences, to make mutual concessions, to agree upon reasonable terms of compromise, to abate the extreme demands upon which some of them have hitherto insisted, to the end that the unhappiness that has made |the| life |of mankind| burdensome during the past five years may be buried with ancient hatreds and grudges, and that a united humanity may in that laboratory, which is the League of Nations, find a proper solution for those problems that have retarded the human race in its struggle toward perfection. To delay action would not only mean a continuance of the Ukrainian horrors, but would be likely to give rise to similar phenomena in lands where, under normal conditions, one would least |9| expect them to occur. The world cannot afford to wait until issues which are by no means vital shall have been submitted for determination at a national election to take place a year hence.³³ The world cannot wait. This is the accepted time and hour when judgment must be pronounced. I am confident that the two coordinated branches of our Government upon whom at this moment rests the solemn responsibility of making an effective peace, already too long withheld, are possessed of that American spirit that has never yet failed to meet the supreme test when the hour for action has arrived. Agreement must and will come. The people of the world demand it. When it comes I foresee the pacification of all of the lands where hideous war yet lingers. Then only will the final victory have been gained over those forces of brutality that have so often converted the cities and villages of Eastern Europe into shambles, and where, oh, for so many weary centuries, the manifestation of insane hatreds engendered in the Dark Ages, has shamed the human race. These are no longer matters that may be looked upon with indifference. They are assuredly of highest international concern.

33 A presidential election in the United States was scheduled for November 1920.

Document 6

Minutes of a meeting of a Jewish delegation with U. S. Secretary of State Robert Lansing

New York, 10 December 1919

Typewritten report (copy), 6 pages; handwritten archival annotations on page 1 (“1919 אוקרײַנה - יהודי רוסייה - מצב יהודי רוסייה”)³⁴ and page 2 (“ועד הארצות”).³⁵

Language: English

CZA, A126/589

A delegation of the American Jewish Congress visited the U. S. State Department to ask the U. S. government to take steps to end the persecution of Jews in Ukraine and Southwest Russia, including withholding recognition from any government that does not guarantee the protection of minorities.

COPIE [sic].

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR AN AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS.

Offices: 1 Madison Avenue, NEW YORK.

Bernard C. Richards,
Executive Secretary.

JEWISH DELEGATIONS AT STATE DEPT.

Hearing of delegations appointed by the American Jewish Congress and at various Mass Meetings held in protest of the Massacres of Jews in Ukraine, before Honorable Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, in the Conference Room of the Secretary of State in the State, War, and Navy Building, Washington, D.C., on December 10th, 1919; at 11.15 a.m.

Present:

The Honorable Secretary of State:

Delegation from the American Jewish Congress and representatives appointed at various mass meetings held throughout the United States.

34 “Condition of the Jews in Russia – Ukraine 1919.”

35 Literally “Committee of the Countries”: the Hebrew name used by the Comité des Délégations Juives.

Mr. Marshall, as the Chairman of the Delegation, said:

Mr. Secretary: Permit me to present to you my associates who are here assembled and who constitute committees appointed at public meetings recently held, in which Jews and non-Jews participated in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston, and other cities, to protest against the massacres of Jews that have occurred during the past year in the Ukraine and other parts of Southern Russia. They have come here to convey to you the resolutions adopted at these meetings and to protest against the atrocities to which the unfortunate Jews have been subjected, in the Ukraine, by all of the parties that are engaged in conflict in that unhappy territory. We are fully aware of the fact that there is no established government there, that the entire region is in a state of anarchy, and that there is a deplorable absence of law and order. We therefore appreciate how difficult it is for our Government at this time to take direct action for the purpose of putting an end to these massacres. We are nevertheless persuaded that these protests, presented through you to the world, will be heard and that the voices of American citizens who are seeking to put an end to these mass murders of innocent men, women and children, will resound throughout the world and that the conscience that all right-minded men look with abhorrence on such inhuman acts as have occurred will of itself mitigate the evil.

The State Department has been exceedingly kind to the Jews of America in enabling them to bring relief to their [2] suffering brethren in Eastern Europe. It has added to our obligation by its readiness to enable us to send representatives of the Joint Distribution Committee³⁶ and of the American Jewish Congress to the Ukraine and to Southern Russia for the purpose of relieving the necessities of the suffering Jews of those lands. Whilst we fully understand the limitations of our Government in dealing with conditions in the Ukraine, due to the fact that as yet no stable government exists there and that none of the contending factions have been recognized by the United States, we are confident that if it should go forth that the United States will never recognize as a Government any power, whatever it may be, that will tolerate such horrors as those that have recently occurred in all parts of the Ukraine and to which all of the armies have contributed, and that it will not recognize as a government any power that will not guarantee to the racial, religious and linguistic minorities dwelling within its jurisdiction the same rights as have

36 American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (also known as JDC or “the Joint”), established in 1919 as the principal organization through which American Jewry provided philanthropic assistance to Jews in eastern Europe. In 1919 it sent a professional delegation to areas of pogrom activity to aid survivors and refugees. Louis Marshall was one of the JDC’s prominent organizers.

been embodied in the Conventions between the Allied and Associated Powers and Poland, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia and other East-European countries,³⁷ much will have been accomplished in the direction of bringing about a cessation of the atrocities against which to protest.

Permit me further to make another suggestion, which naturally is but tentative, namely that, in view of the fact that the United States, England, France and Italy have so largely cooperated since April 1917, in respect to all matters relating to Eastern Europe, a way may be discovered, through the instrumentality of a joint commission created by these great powers, whereby those who are now engaged in the conflict for supremacy in the Ukraine and in Southern Russia may take immediate and effective action to put an end to the persecution of the Jews and to the jeopardy of life and limb in which they now exist.

We are sure that we have your entire sympathy and that whatever can be done to avert the continuance of this unspeakable misfortune will be done.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Judge Hugo Pam and Mr. Morris Rothenberg will now briefly address you.

[S. S. Wise:] "It is a deep sorrow that a year or more after the armistice it should be necessary for us to lay before you, Sir, the facts of the grievous oppression and suffering of our brothers in East-European lands, most especially in the Ukraine.

Our authorization comes not only from the Executive of the American Jewish Congress, but from great numbers of American Jews whose kinsmen and kinswomen have been wounded, slain, mutilated,— and above all from the heart of Israel which is justly aggrieved by the state of war that prevails against unoffending men and defenceless women and children.

[3] We remember, Mr. Secretary, as the world will long note, the earnestness of the effort put forth by you and your associates of the American Delegation to the Peace Conference to avert such a disaster as has befallen our people. We understand too the difficulties involved in governmental action in relation to a country with which, owing to its unstable and unorganized status, it has thus far remained impossible for our country to enter into official and diplomatic relations.

None the less, in behalf of the tortured and the slain of Israel and in the name of our common humanity, we record our solemn protest against such treatment of law-abiding men, of innocent women and children, by different militarist groups and governmental factions in the Ukraine as has made the

37 See Introduction, at n. 257.

life of Jews a grievous calamity to themselves and a reproach to the civilized world.

Counting upon the will of our Government to move whensoever possible against tyranny and oppression, and upon the oft expressed sympathy of our fellow-Americans, we solemnly beseech you, Sir, to take such action as our Government may take within the scope of its power in order to convey to the oppressors (of whatsoever political group) of the Ukrainian Jews our governments' [sic] sense of sorrow at the outrages which have been inflicted. And we urge that, as the Secretary of State for the United States and its representative in dealing with foreign nations, you make clear that our government cannot and will not acknowledge the existence of a Government in a land stained by crimes of violence, spoliation and slaughter.

We would not be worthy of the high status of American citizenship if we were silent at such a time as this. We could not respect ourselves, nor would we be deserving of your respect, if we did not firmly and with utmost earnestness protest to our government against the deep damnation of the crimes committed from day to day against our fellow-Jews in the Ukraine. These plead through us not so much for redress of the misdeeds of the past as for justice in a future which our government and people have resolved to make secure and just for all peoples.

JUDGE PAM: I believe the procession of 25,000 Jewish people who marched on November 24³⁸ – and they marched to the rhythm [sic] of mournful hearts – and who met in solemn assemblage afterwards and protested solemnly against the cruelty and murder directed against their brothers and sisters in Europe – will bespeak your assistance on behalf of the Jewish people in the Ukraine.

It is not only the number of people that were killed, but also the fact that all those dreadful pogroms have crushed out the life of their ideals; and it is in behalf of the future of these people, that we implore you to act on behalf of the United States Government by a Joint Commission, as has been suggested to you. It is hoped that the United [4] States will take the initiative in this, to the end that the people in the Ukraine and elsewhere may know that the United States Government and other enlightened nations of the world will stand for no government save those who will give justice to all people.

Mr. ROTHENBERG: Mr. Secretary of State, I want to address you as the Chairman of the Committee on protest against the massacres of the Jews in the Ukraine. Our Committee held a demonstration on Nov. 24th in New York,

38 See above, Document. 5, n. 16.

where approximately 100,000 people marched in mournful procession to give evidence of the burden of their grief of what happened in the Ukraine.³⁹

We should like to call your attention to this wave of pogrom[s] that is engulfing the Jewish people in the Ukraine. At this time there are three million Jews in the Ukraine and representing these a committee has been formed, calling itself the central pogrom committee of the Ukraine, with offices at Kief [sic], which sends out investigators to the 175 cities in the Ukraine and have reported these pogroms. We have every reason to believe that their report is true which says that 40,000 Jews have been made the victims of cruelty this year. Men, women and children have been cruelly murdered. And these pogroms were carried out in a systematic way, the assailants taking recess for lunch and then continuing their work of murder and destruction.

We had hoped that this wave of pogroms would recede, but to our great sorrow, they are continuing; and even, Mr. Secretary, at the very time when I have the honor to address you, the report comes to us that in Elizabethgrad,⁴⁰ a pogrom has taken place in which thousands of Jews have lost their lives.⁴¹ Up to the summer of this year the report had been that 40,000 have been killed. There can be no doubt that since that time thousands more have lost their lives.

Knowing the broad spirit of humanity for which you are noted, we appeal to you to do something in behalf of our Government to bring this thing to a stop. If it is not brought to a stop there is a possibility that the entire Jewish population in the Ukraine may be exterminated. For this is not a thing that is occurring in one isolated instance, but it is an organized massacre to exterminate the Jews in the Ukraine.

There can be little doubt about the authenticity of these reports. A representative of the Ukrainian Government said in a letter to the Press, that there can be no doubt that these pogroms have taken place, and that he joins with us Jews of this country in a protest against these outrages, and hopes something will be done to bring these things to a stop. Several other representatives of the Ukrainian governments have equally said that the facts cannot be disputed, and that something must be done to bring this to a stop.

39 Ibid. Note the discrepancies in the estimated attendance.

40 Yelisavetgrad (also Elisavetgrad or Elizabethgrad). Renamed Zinovievsk in 1924, Kirovograd in 1934. Today Kirovohrad, Ukraine.

41 No such report has been located. The research undertaken by Eliyahu Tcherikower in preparation for the Schwarzbard trial noted a single pogrom in Yelisavetgrad, on 4–5 February 1919, in which four Jews were killed. Tcherikower, *Tableaux des pogromes* (above, Document 1, n. 6), 35376.

And I join my plea with those of my fellow-Jews here in behalf of this Committee, which represents the entire [5] Jewry of the United States. I join in the appeal that has been made to you, Mr. Secretary; that something be done for our unfortunate brethren on the other side.

I may add I have here resolutions adopted by our people throughout the country, protesting against these outrages, which we would like to place before your Department.

THE SECRETARY: Gentlemen, your commission here to-day which lays before this Government the terrible situation in the Ukraine, and enters its protest against what is being done in that region, voices a protest, I am sure, that is in the heart of all humanity.

These outrages have been known to us – though indirectly – and we have sought constantly ways in which to suppress them, if it were possible.

The difficulty lies in the fact that Western Russia, particularly South-Western Russia, is in such a state of turmoil and anarchy, that we have been unable to even send representatives there, – because there has been no stable government with which to deal. There has been no certainty that a Government would continue for any length of time, and I believe our commissioners' lives would be in danger if we sent them there for any purpose.

Until there is a change in the political situation in the Ukraine, we are almost hopeless. We have no one to whom we can send a protest; there is no one with whom we can reason. The heads of their armies seem to be more of the medieval type; they are not modern in the way in which they conduct their hostilities. It is difficult to tell whether they belong to the Bolcheviki [sic] or to the Reactionaries. It is difficult to find out where their leaders stand politically. We know they are being pressed on every side, and fighting with everybody, and of course, in such a state of anarchy as exists there, we are without power to help the unfortunate inhabitants of that stricken region.

We have established a Consulate General at Odessa, and from there we will gather information as rapidly as we can.

As to what steps further can be taken, I cannot tell. The United States has generally avoided Joint Commissions with other nations. Our policy has been to send our own commission independently. And that seems to be at present the only solution.

But whether it is the time to send a Commission, I very much doubt. I do not believe they could enter the Ukraine,

On the other hand, as far as the recognition of a Government in the Ukraine is concerned, you can be sure that, [6] whatever government is recognized, and recognized in all Russia, because I do not wish to see Russia dismembered, there will certainly be a very decided movement for the proper

protection of the minorities and the rectification of wrongs that have been done, insofar as that is possible. Of course, life we cannot restore, but we can restore the rights of the living and that will be the purpose with which this government will approach the recognition of a Government in Russia.

I thank you.

Mr. Marshall and Mr. Rothenberg then presented to the Secretary of State a number of documents and memoranda relating to the pogroms in Ukrainia [sic] together with resolutions relating to the pogroms in Ukrainia [sic], together with resolutions adopted at various mass meetings throughout the country.⁴²

Document 7

Appeal by the president and secretary of the Alliance israélite universelle⁴³ to the President of the Council of the League of Nations⁴⁴

8 December 1920

Published letter, 1 page

Language: English

Supplementary Journal of the First Assembly of the League of Nations (1920), 18 December 1920, p. 289

Appeal from the Jewish Central Committee in Paris.⁴⁵

Paris, 45, rue Labruyère.⁴⁶

December 8th, 1920.

42 None of these materials is in the archival file.

43 Erroneously identified (presumably by the editor of the publication in which the document appeared) as “Comité central israélite de Paris” in French and “Jewish Central Committee in Paris” in English. An organization by this name did not exist.

44 Léon Victor Bourgeois (1851–1925), former French prime minister, president of the League of Nations Council 1920–1923.

45 Parallel French version: “Lettre du Comité central israélite de Paris.”

46 Parallel French version: “rue La Bruyère.”

To the President of the Council of the League of Nations, Geneva.⁴⁷

Sir,

The tragedy of Eastern Europe, which has already claimed so many victims [sic], and which is a terrible and perpetual menace to so many millions of human beings, especially affects the Jewish population. Crowded together upon a limited territory in accordance with an evil policy it has seen its cities, towns and villages successively pillaged and laid waste by German and Russian armies. From Odessa to Vilna a multitude of people, maddened by their sufferings, are appealing for help, and, in despair, are preparing to abandon their homes. The countries on the other side of the Atlantic are watching with alarm the arrival of the first batches of emigrants. The problem is essentially an international one. The country in which it originates is under the rule of several States. A part of it (known as “The Territories” when it formed part of the immense Russian Empire)⁴⁸ still has no recognised ruler. Bands of armed robbers are now disputing it.

Owing also to its effects elsewhere the problem is an international one. An influx of foreigners, exhausted by hunger and rendered desperate by privations, threatens eventually to endanger public order and public health. Thousands of orphan children are wandering along the roads and amongst the ruins. Their only hope of salvation from death and hatred lies in the possibility of friendly intervention from without.

Only the League of Nations can undertake this formidable task and all the problems involved. Only the League, which rises above religious and racial interests, and is inspired by generous humanitarian motives, can undertake the task of studying and preparing common remedies applicable to the various cases. If the League does not intervene sufficiently soon to bring hope

47 Parallel French version: “A Monsieur le Président de la Société des Nations, Genève.”

It is not clear why the addressee was not designated as the President of the Council of the League of Nations. The League of Nations as a whole did not have a president, although in popular discourse the title was sometimes given to the president of the League Assembly. The League Assembly (a body consisting of representatives of all member states, which met yearly) held its first meeting in Geneva between 15 November and 18 December 1920, electing Belgian Foreign Minister Paul Hymans (1865–1941) president. However, the League secretary-general, Sir Eric Drummond, directed the document to members of the Council (an executive body of eight member states, which met monthly); LNA, 41/9371/1249.

48 The reference may be to the ethnically-mixed border regions between the Polish and Russian heartlands, known in Polish as *kresy*, which encompass portions of present-day Ukraine, Belarus, and Lithuania.

to these unfortunate people, massacres, violence and persecution will ensue which will be a disgrace to civilisation.

On behalf of our cruelly-trying brethren, we implore the League of Nations to form a Commission to study the Jewish Question in Eastern Europe without delay, and to endeavour to find [sic] possible remedies such as internal reconstruction and emigration.

We have the honour, etc.⁴⁹

BIGART,
Secretary for the Central Committee

SYLVAIN LEVY,⁵⁰
President

Document 8

*Appeal by Jewish representatives in Geneva to the President of the Assembly of the League of Nations*⁵¹

8 December 1920

Published letter, 2 pages

Language: English

Supplementary Journal of the First Assembly of the League of Nations (1920), 18 December 1920, pp. 289–290

Appeal from the President of the Jewish Delegations in Geneva.⁵²

Hôtel Beau-Séjour, Geneva,
December 8th, 1920.

49 Parallel French version: « Veuillez agréer, Monsieur le Président, l'expression de notre considération la plus distinguée. Pour le Comité Central [de l'Alliance israélite universelle]: ».

50 Sylvain Lévy (1863–1935), French orientalist and president of the Central Committee of the Alliance israélite universelle, 1920–1935.

51 See above, Document 7, n. 47.

52 This formulation reflects the mistaken understanding of the editor of the publication in which the document appeared regarding the identity of the writers and the organizations they represented. Only one of the three signatories (Sokolow) was associated with the Comité des Délégations Juives.

To His Excellency
the President of the First Assembly
of the League of Nations.

Your Excellency,

The Undersigned, on behalf of the representative Jewish organisations whose names are appended, have the honour to invite Your Excellency's attention and the attention of the High Assembly over which Your Excellency presides, to the present terrible situation of the great Jewish masses inhabiting the countries of Eastern Europe.

[290] A cry of panic and distress reaches us from large tracts of that immense region. After the appalling trials experienced by the Jewish population, in common with their non-Jewish fellow-countrymen during the world war, in which they bore their part of sacrifices, of sorrows and of hopes for a happier future, a fresh and even more frightful storm burst upon them in the shape of a new war – a war of extermination directed exclusively against them – the War of Pogroms. During the past two years the most thickly populated centres of Jewish life have been swept by an endless succession of Pogroms. The hecatombs of Proskurov, the massacres of Uman,⁵³ the carnage of Fastov,⁵⁴ the funeral pyres and devastation in hundreds of towns, the seats of ancient Jewish communities, the atrocities and cruelties inflicted, the disasters and agonies suffered, constitute a catastrophe which has no parallel in the troubled history of the Eastern Jews during recent centuries. Brutalised hordes, with no thought but to kill, to dishonour, to burn and to destroy, have descended in masses on the Jewish communities devastating their homes and maltreating and murdering their peaceful and innocent inmates with a bestiality and fury which defy description. Everywhere men and women, old and young, the aged, the infirm, and the helpless, mutilated, tortured, outraged, burnt, buried alive; scores of communities, overwhelmed or decimated, their hearths, their cemeteries, their sanctuaries destroyed or desecrated; every house either a ruin or a wailing place; thousands of emaciated fugitives wandering in the forests and hiding in caverns, and – most pitiable of all – many thousands of orphaned children, hungry, naked and homeless, their young lives poisoned by terror and vagabondage.

Such is the spectacle presented by a large part of the Jewry of Eastern Europe. Never since the Middle Ages has the Pogrom Monster appeared in such terrible guise. What torrents of blood have been made to flow! How many

53 May, July, August 1919. See Tcherikower, *Tableaux des pogromes* (above, Document 1, n. 6).

54 August–September 1919. See Miliakova (ed.), *Le livre des pogroms*, 252–266.

victims has he deprived of life! What an immense abyss of misery has he dug! On how vast a scale have human law and divine truth been outraged and set at nought! And what, perhaps, is still more terrible is the continuation of the anguish, the haunting fears of every hour, the dread of a final catastrophe, which keeps all minds on a poignant alert. Millions of human beings are troubled and paralysed, abandoned to fatalism and despair. This tragedy has not failed to find a response in the hearts of the Jews of all countries, and we believe in those of all good men throughout Europe and America. But help on an adequate scale is difficult to find.

It is to the League of Nations that the suffering populations now turn their eyes in a last effort of hope – to the League which personifies Right, Liberty and moral authority as against Might, Tyranny and Violence. We ask of the League a testimony of sympathy which will reassure our sorely-trying brethren, the stretching out of a hand which will show them that they are not abandoned, and that there may yet be a chance of lifting their heads and returning to a life of peace, of fertile work and, perhaps, of happiness.

We beg of your Excellency to communicate this appeal to the Assembly of the League of Nations. We venture further to ask of the Assembly that it will refer it to the Council and suggest to that body the appointment of a Commission of Enquiry. To that Commission the organisations we have the honour to represent will be prepared to submit all the evidence they have in their possession together with suggestions for remedial action.

We have the honour to be, of Your Excellency, the most obedient humble servants,

NAHUM SOKOLOW,
President of the Committee
of Jewish Delegations.⁵⁵
LUCIEN WOLF,⁵⁶
Secretary and Special Delegate
of the Jewish Board of Deputies
and the Anglo-Jewish Association

55 The English designation used by the Comité des Délégations Juives.

56 Lucien Wolf (1857–1930), British Jewish journalist, from 1917 secretary of the Joint Foreign Committee of the Anglo-Jewish Association and the Board of Deputies of British Jews. In this function he attended the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. At the sessions of the League of Nations in Geneva he became known as an authority on Minority Rights. The Anglo-Jewish Association, founded in 1871, was a defense organization similar to the French Alliance israélite universelle. The Board of Deputies of British Jews, established in 1760, was the public representative body of British Jewry.

I. ZANGWILL,⁵⁷
 President of the Jewish Territorial
 Organisation

Document 9

Memorandum from Comité des Délégations Juives to League of Nations
 16 December 1920
 Published article,⁵⁸ 2 pages
 Language: English
Supplementary Journal of the First Assembly of the League of Nations (1920), 26
 January 1921, pp. 320–321

MEMORANDUM ON THE MASSACRES OF JEWS IN THE UKRAINE

Committee of Jewish Delegations,
 Paris,
 10. Place Edouard VII.

Geneva, December 16th, 1920.

The Committee of Jewish Delegations, representing either by direct election or by written authority the Jewish populations of 22 countries, appeals to the League of Nations to obtain justice for the most terrible crimes that history has ever witnessed.

In Eastern Europe, in the Ukraine, a people numbering millions of souls has been massacred; intervention to put an end to these massacres demands the urgent attention of the human race and of the League of Nations, its spokesman.

The Committee deems that action in this direction is possible; it is a duty incumbent on civilized peoples.

If the League of Nations makes its voice heard, the first step will have been taken towards putting an end to these massacres. Categorical declarations

57 Israel Zangwill (1864–1926), British Jewish writer and political activist, founder and president of the Jewish Territorial Organisation, established in 1905 to promote international support for a Jewish homeland in a territory other than Palestine.

58 Cf. typescript in LNA, R1654 (41/9677/9677).

made by the Governments who will co-operate in this matter will exercise a restraining influence on these acts of destruction.

Since December, 1918, there has been an uninterrupted series of pogroms in the Ukraine. Since the beginning of September, 1919, a report of the Red Cross Society at Kieff [sic] records that more than 30,000 Jews have been murdered. (Report of the Relief Committee of the Russian Red Cross at Kieff; annexe No. 1).⁵⁹ Since that date the number of murders has increased alarmingly. Jewish representatives, recently arrived from the Ukraine, unanimously declare that the number of Jews massacred far exceeds a hundred thousand. The Committee of Jewish Delegations has in its possession reports on these massacres committed in more than 400 places. (Annexe No. 1, Some statistics on wholesale massacres.)

Many of the pogroms were specially serious on account of their long duration. The pogroms at Ovrutch⁶⁰ lasted from the 31st December, 1918, to the 16th January, 1919. Those at Vassilkof⁶¹ lasted from the 7th to the 15th of April; those at Zlatopol⁶² from the 2nd to the 8th of May; those at Tcherkassy⁶³ from the 16th to the 21st of May; those at Derajna⁶⁴ from the 7th to the 17th of June; those at Rovno⁶⁵ from the 14th to the 29th of May; those at Lytine⁶⁶ from the 14th to the 28th of May, and those at Balta⁶⁷ lasted 9 days. In other places massacres have been several times repeated; Radomysl,⁶⁸ Tcherniakof,⁶⁹ Kornip,⁷⁰ Volodarka,⁷¹ Elisabetgrad⁷² and several other towns were the scenes of massacres of 4, 5 and even 10 days' duration (Report of the Red Cross).

59 This and subsequent annexes not reproduced in published text.

60 Today Ovruch, Ukraine. See Miliakova (ed.), *Le livre des pogroms*, 91–105.

61 Russ.: Vassilkov; today Vasylykiv, Ukraine. See *ibid.*, 302–304.

62 Russ.: Zlatopol; today Zlatopil, Ukraine. See *ibid.*, 158 f.

63 Russ.: Cherkassy; today Cherkasy, Ukraine. See *ibid.*, 186–190.

64 Pol.: Dzierażnia, today Derazhnia, Ukraine. No record of the event in question has been located.

65 Russ.: Rovno; Pol.: Równe; today Rivne, Ukraine. See Miliakova (ed.), *Le livre des pogroms*, 193–195.

66 Russ.: Litin; today Lityn, Ukraine. See Tcherikower, *Di ukrayner pogromen*, 120.

67 See Tcherikower, *Tableaux des pogromes* (above, Document 1, n. 6).

68 Pol.: Radomyśl; today Radomyshl', Ukraine. See Tcherikower, *Di ukrayner pogromen*, 220–226.

69 Russ.: Chernyakhov; today Chernyakhiv, Ukraine. See Tcherikower, *Tableaux des pogromes* (above, Document 1, n. 6).

70 Probably Russ.: Kornin; today Kornyn, Ukraine. See Miliakova (ed.), *Le livre des pogroms*, 216 f.

71 Pol.: Wołodarka. See *ibid.*, 223–225.

72 See above, Document 7, n. 41.

Hundreds and thousands of Jews have been wounded, ill treated, savagely beaten. Up to the present more than a million Jews have been robbed and many of them have had literally their last shirt taken from them. The most refined tortures have been devised. Old men and children have been cut to pieces. Thousands of women and young girls have been outraged, and among these even little girls and old women. (Some statistics on the violation of Jewish women in the Ukraine Annexe [sic] No. III). The victims have been terribly mutilated; the right arm and left leg have been cut off, or vice versa, the left arm and right leg; one eye has been torn out and the nose cut off. The houses in which the Jews took refuge were burnt, and all perished in the flames. The number of cases in which these unhappy victims were doomed to die a slow death of indescribable torture cannot be counted. Burning was the usual practice.

Besides physical torture, they were subjected to mental torture of a kind for which there is no parallel in history. Jews were compelled to dance and to sing in the presence of their torturers, to mock their own nation and to praise their executioners; they had to dig their own graves and to commit shameful acts for the amusement of their murderers. These wretched people were forced to look on at the dishonouring of their daughters and of their wives, and children were compelled to hang their fathers. (Some typical pogroms, annexe [No. IV].)

[321] The moral condition of the Jewish population of the Ukraine is near insanity; the terrible sufferings which all the population of this country is enduring through famine and epidemics, cannot be compared to the hell in which the Ukrainian Jews have been plunged for a year and a half. History has nothing to compare with it. The imagination of the greatest poet could not describe these scenes of horror. Dante's Inferno pales besides the realities of every day life in the Ukraine.

Apart from Jewish circles, the protests which have been made up to the present in many countries against this state of things have been merely the individual protests raised by eminent persons (Appeal to Humanity. Annexe No. VI); and, however highly placed those persons were, they found that they were helpless [sic] in the face of these crimes. It is a matter of urgent importance that the civilised peoples should make themselves heard. To keep silence is to become the accomplice of these murderers. The vicissitudes of civil war in Russia have not in any way modified the duty of the League of Nations. Should the Ukraine fall temporarily under the sway of the Soviets, it must be realised that in the case of new upheavals these pogroms will break out with fresh violence. The blood of these victims is not yet dry, and we see at hand the moment when the crimes of the last two years will be surpassed by new acts of violence.

Firm intervention is urgently called for, if three millions of human beings are to avoid complete annihilation. Is an intervention of this kind possible? Will it succeed?

It is our opinion that, if at any moment during the course of this criminal butchery at which the world has passively looked on the public opinion of the civilised world and the Governments had expressed strongly its firm determination to put a stop to this state of things, the massacres would, in spite of all, have ceased. During the most disordered days, when it seems that no regular authority any longer exists, nevertheless there are some amongst the leaders of these savage bands who would listen to the cries of horror and indignation coming from the West, and would give way before a determined and authoritative protest.

The Committee thinks that the same will be true in the future. The extermination of the Jewish people will become impossible from the moment when order is restored and the League of Nations makes its voice heard. The principal murderers and the guilty ones are at the present moment in full liberty and go entirely unpunished, since most, if not all of them, have gone to countries within the sphere of influence of the League of Nations. We demand that an exemplary punishment should be visited upon them, convinced as we are that this will give a determined and undeniable proof of the formal will of the peoples of the West to put an end to these massacres.

At the bar of the civilised world, at the bar of the League of Nations, which is the largest representative international body which has ever been brought into existence, we denounce as murderers the following persons: the Hetman Strouk,⁷³ who at the head of his men, massacred a thousand Jews, in 41 places in the neighbourhood of Tchernobyl;⁷⁴ the Colonel Hetman Tiutiounik,⁷⁵ the Hetman Sokolowsky⁷⁶ whose troops massacred 3000 Jews in 70 places in the neighbourhood of Radomysl-Jitomir;⁷⁷ the Hetman Simossenکو who

73 Ilya Timofeyevich Strouk (1896–1969), warlord operating mainly in the area of Horonstaipol, on the Dniepr River north of Kiev. Tcherikower's materials implicated him in 20 pogroms; Tcherikower, *Tableaux des pogromes* (above, Document 1, n. 6). For descriptions see Tcherikower, *Di ukrayner pogromen*, 77–80, 225–236.

74 Chernobyl.

75 Yurii (Yurko) Yosypovych Tiutiunyk (1891–1930), one of Hryhoriiv's deputies. Tcherikower's materials implicated him in 20 pogroms; Tcherikower, *Tableaux des pogromes*, (above, Document 1, n. 6).

76 See above, Document 1, n. 6.

77 Refers to the area around Radomyshl' in the province of Zhitomir.

was responsible for the butchery at Proskourof;⁷⁸ and others besides a list of whose names we append (See Annex No VI “List of the principal organizers of the massacres.”)

We like to hope that the conscience of humanity will refuse to allow these murderers to remain in complete liberty, to command their regiments and indirectly to ask for the protection of the civilised world. We ask the League of Nations, which represents the continuity of the brotherhood of man, to make a stern example of the culprits. It is a defiance, direct or indirect, to the principle of the League of Nations and to the most elementary principles of human justice to maintain amicable relations with men still red with the blood of their innocent victims, with men who have surpassed an hundred-fold the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition.

We ask plainly for the punishment of these murderers. We hope that the whole of humanity will support our claim with all its might.

The Secretary General:
L. MOTZKY.⁷⁹

The President:
N. SOKOLOW.

Document 10

Diplomatic Mission of the Ukrainian People's Republic to Twelfth Zionist Congress

Prague, 29 August 1921

Published letter,⁸⁰ 2 pages

Language: German

Stenographisches Protokoll der Verhandlungen des XII. Zionisten-Kongresses in Karlsbad vom 1. bis 14. September 1921, Berlin 1922, pp. 37–38

Ukrainische Demokratische Republik.
Außerordentliche Diplomatische Mission
in der Tschechoslovakei.

Prag, 29. August 1921.

⁷⁸ Russ.: Proskurov; Ukr.: Proskuriv. Renamed Khmel'nitsky in 1954. Today Khmel'nyts'kyi, Ukraine.

⁷⁹ Motzkin.

⁸⁰ According to the printed source, Jabotinsky read the letter aloud to the Congress in French. An original version has not been located.

An den 12. Zionistenkongreß,

Karlsbad.

Sehr geehrte Herren!

Die Regierung der Demokratischen Republik der Ukraina hat mich beauftragt, dem 12. Zionistenkongreß die Grüße des Ukrainischen Volkes zu übermitteln. Ich tue dies um so lieber, als Ihr Kongreß als die Vertreterversammlung des jüdischen Volkes der ganzen Welt betrachtet werden kann. Seit Ihrem letzten Zusammentritt in Wien 1913⁸¹ haben sich Ereignisse von Bedeutung für die ganze Welt zugetragen. Eines der bemerkenswertesten darunter ist die Tatsache, daß das jüdische Volk, welchem die Zivilisation und alle Nationen der Erde soviel verdanken, zu einem wichtigen Faktor in der Weltpolitik geworden ist. Mehr als irgendein anderes Volk weiß die ukrainische Nation, die sich in den letzten Jahren von einer hundertjährigen Knechtschaft befreit gesehen hat, die aber, wie das jüdische Volk, noch kämpfen muß, um zu ihrer vollständigen Freiheit zu gelangen, den gewaltigen Erfolg Ihrer Arbeiten und die außerordentliche Bedeutung Ihrer Wiedergeburt zu schätzen.

Aus vollem Herzen wünsche ich Ihrer Versammlung den besten Erfolg, umsomehr, als auf dem Völkergelände der Ukraina Millionen von Juden wohnen, die seit Jahrhunderten ihr Geschick mit demjenigen unseres Volkes verknüpft haben und die mit der größten Erwartung die Beratung Ihres Kongresses verfolgen.

Ich möchte die Gelegenheit nicht vorübergehen lassen, ohne die wichtige Rolle hervorzuheben, welche dieser Teil des jüdischen Volkes, der auf dem Boden der Ukraina wohnt, in der Geschichte dieses Landes spielt. Um so mehr macht es mir Kummer, festzustellen, daß während der letzten Jahre die ukrainischen Juden von verschiedenen Seiten schreckliche Verfolgungen zu erdulden hatten. Die Ausschreitungen, deren Opfer sie waren, treffen das ukrainische Volk ebenso schwer wie die jüdische Rasse. Der seiner Aufgabe bewußte Teil der ukrainischen Nation kann hierfür nicht nur nicht verantwortlich gemacht werden, sondern er mißbilligt und verurteilt die verbrecherischen Angriffe, deren sich unverantwortliche Elemente schuldig gemacht haben. Wir wollen vielmehr in Brüderschaft mit dem jüdischen Volke leben und mit ihm eine zivilisatorische Arbeit im Gebiete der Ukraina verrichten. Was wir am brennendsten wünschen, ist die Wiederkehr des Friedens in das Land, welcher uns die Heilung der Wunden gestatten wird, die un-

81 Zion Congresses had been suspended during the First World War.

seren jüdischen Mitbürgern während der letzten Jahre geschlagen worden sind.

Nehmen Sie, sehr geehrte Herren, den Ausdruck unserer größten Hochachtung entgegen.

Chef der Mission: Sekretär
(gez.) Maxime Slavinsky, (gez.) H. Boczkowski.⁸²

Document 11

Agreement to create a Jewish gendarmerie in Ukraine

Karlsbad, 4 September 1921

Published article, 1 page

Language: German

Jüdische Rundschau, 23 December 1921, p. 732

Abkommen. B[eilage] zu 825/III⁸³
Uebersetzung:⁸⁴

Am 4. September (n. St.)⁸⁵ 1921 in der Stadt Karlsbad im Hotel Olympic-Palast-Hotel wurde zwischen den untengefertigten Maxim Antonowitsch Slawinskyj und Wladimir Eugenowitsch Jabotinsky eine prinzipielle Uebereinstimmung bezüglich nachstehender Bedingungen erzielt:

82 Ol'herd-Ipolyt Bochkovs'kyi (1885–1939), also Olherd Hypolyt Boczkowski, sociologist and activist in the Ukrainian Social Democratic Labor Party, secretary of the Ukrainian diplomatic mission in Prague 1918–1923. He also taught at the Ukrainian Economic Academy in Poděbrady, Czechoslovakia, founded by Mykyta Shapoval as a higher education institution for the Ukrainian diaspora.

83 The Ukrainian text of the agreement was attached to a report of 16 September 1921 by Maksym Slavynskyi (see following document). The report bore the serial number 825. The Roman numeral III likely indicates that the text of the agreement constituted the third page of Slavynskyi's transmission. YIVO, RG80/134/10333–10333a.

84 This German version was evidently made from a Ukrainian translation of the original agreement, which was presumably recorded in Russian or in French. A copy of the Ukrainian typescript is in YIVO, RG80/134/10332–10332a. The text on which that translation was based has not been located.

85 Neuen Stils (i.e., according to the Gregorian calendar). See above, Document 1, n. 4.

1. Beim Heere der ukrainischen Volksrepublik wird provisorisch im Verbandsverbande der ukrainischen Staats-Gendarmerie eine jüdische Gendarmerie begründet mit der Spezialaufgabe, die jüdische Bevölkerung in den von den Truppen der ukrainischen Volksrepublik eroberten Städten zu beschützen.
2. Die jüdische Gendarmerie nimmt an den militärischen Aktionen keinen Anteil.
3. Die jüdische Gendarmerie wird von einer besonderen jüdischen Organisation zusammengestellt unter der Verantwortung dieser Organisationen, wobei zu bemerken ist, daß Kommunisten nicht in die jüdische Gendarmerie eingestellt werden dürfen.
4. An die Spitze der jüdischen Gendarmerie wird ein Jude gestellt im Einvernehmen mit der oben erwähnten Organisation und dem Oberkommando der Armee der ukrainischen Volksrepublik.
5. Der Kommandant der jüdischen Gendarmerie untersteht in Angelegenheiten der allgemeinen Ordnung dem Kommandanten der ukrainischen Gendarmerie, in Angelegenheit der oben angeführten speziellen Aufgabe der jüdischen Gendarmerie hat er das Recht des unmittelbaren Vortrages beim Chef des Generalstabes, dem zur Zeit militärisch-kriegerischer Ereignisse die gesamte Gendarmerie untersteht, oder bei einer anderen Person, der die Gendarmerie unterstehen sollte.
6. Die Funktionäre der jüdischen Gendarmerie haben alle Rechte der ukrainischen Gendarmerie und sie verantworten für ihre Handlungen nach dem Gesetze gleich der ukrainischen Gendarmerie.
7. Die jüdische Gendarmerie rückt gemeinsam mit der ukrainischen Gendarmerie unmittelbar hinter der Armee der ukrainischen Volksrepublik in der Etappe vor, indem sie ihre spezielle Aufgabe unverzüglich nach der Einnahme von Ortschaften mit jüdischer Bevölkerung durch die Truppen der ukrainischen Volksrepublik durchführt. Die territorialen und anderweitig bestimmbar Funktionen werden nach einem rechtzeitig ausgearbeiteten Plane in die Tat umgesetzt, der Plan wird vom Kommandanten der jüdischen Gendarmerie ausgearbeitet und vom Generalstab bestätigt. In den Grenzen des erwähnten Planes ist die Tätigkeit der jüdischen Gendarmerie autonom.

Ergänzung:

Das Oberkommando der Armee der ukrainischen Volksrepublik wiederholt seinen Befehl von der unbedingten Unzulässigkeit irgendwelcher Repressalien gegenüber der christlichen und jüdischen Bevölkerung, mögen diese Repressalien noch bis zum Eintreffen der Truppen der ukrainischen Volksrepublik vorgekommen sein. Alle diese Ausschreitungen werden von

dem militärischen Kriegsgericht abgeurteilt werden, in welchem nach Möglichkeit Vertreter der christlichen und jüdischen Bevölkerung sich befinden mögen.

Die Gefertigten verpflichten sich, alle Mittel unverzüglich in Anwendung zu bringen – jeder in seiner Einflußsphäre – um diesen Plan praktisch zu verwirklichen, die technischen Details werden Gegenstand weiterer Vereinbarungen bilden.

Maxim Slawinskyj.

Wolodymyr Jabotinsky.

Uebereinstimmend: M. Slawinskyj.

Bestätigt für den Chef der Direktorialkanzlei
(unleserlich) [sic].⁸⁶

Document 12

Report by Maksym Slavynskyi on negotiations with Vladimir Jabotinsky

Prague, 16 September 1921

Published article, 1 page⁸⁷

Language: German

Jüdische Rundschau, 23 December 1921, p. 732

Ukrainische Volksrepublik.

Außerordentliche diplomatische Mission in der Tschechoslowakei.

Prag, 16. September 1921

Die Beziehungen zu den Zionisten.

Wie ich bereits berichtet habe, haben in Prag Ende Juli die Vorbereitungen des Zentral-Exekutivkomitees (Sitzung des großen Actions-Comités⁸⁸) für den Kongreß stattgefunden. Unter den Zionistenführern war der bei uns bekannte W. J. Jabotinsky, gegenwärtig Mitglied des Zentral-Exekutivko-

⁸⁶ The Ukrainian document bears an illegible signature.

⁸⁷ Cf. typewritten Ukrainian version in YIVO, RG80/134/10333–333a.

⁸⁸ The board of governors of the Zionist Organization, chosen by the plenum of the Zionist Congress to conduct the affairs of the Organization between Congresses. The document refers to preparations for the Twelfth Congress, the first to take place since 1913.

mites und Chef seines Informationsdienstes – unter seiner Aegide stehen 450 Tageszeitungen⁸⁹ –, mit welchem ich zwei Zusammenkünfte hatte. Als alte gute Freunde⁹⁰ haben wir prinzipiell die Frage behandelt, wie man die verdorbene jüdische öffentliche Meinung betreffend des Ukrainertums verbessern könnte. Ich gab ihm das ganze Material, das wir besitzen; außerdem verfielen wir auf den Gedanken, eine jüdische Gendarmerie zu gründen. Am 1. September begann der zionistische Kongreß in Karlsbad. Ich war zweimal in Karlsbad, am 29., 30. und 31. August, ferner am 3. und 4. September. Die erste Konferenz mit Jabotinsky hatte ich am 30. August in Anwesenheit unseres Berliner Gesandten R. Stockyj;⁹¹ weitere Konferenzen fanden am 3. und 4. September statt, ohne ihn. Wir behandelten die Frage der Taktik unter den Mitgliedern des Kongresses; ich übergab ihm meine Begrüßung, welche auch am ersten Tage des Kongresses vorgelesen wurde und einen sehr guten Eindruck auf den ganzen Kongreß machte.⁹²

Meine Begrüßung und unsere Konferenzen haben schon den einen guten Erfolg gezeitigt, daß sie eine Aktion verhindert haben, die sehr unangenehm für die ukrainische Volksrepublik werden konnte, und zwar: Eine große Gruppe von osteuropäischen, englischen und amerikanischen Zionisten wollte bei der Frage über die Pogrome in der Ukraine die Regierung und die Armee der ukrainischen Volksrepublik als die Hauptschuldigen bezeichnen. Sie beriefen sich hierbei hauptsächlich auf die Informationen der „Ukranska Propor“ und anderer galizischer Zeitungen, indem sie darauf hinwiesen, daß dies doch das eigene Urteil von Ukrainern sei.⁹³ Die Aktion dieser Gruppe wurde durch meine und Jabotinskys Erklärungen und Informationen niedergeschlagen.

Vom 31. August bis 3. September dauerten die Bemühungen, einen Ausgleich zu finden zwischen meiner und Jabotinskys Meinung über die jüdische

89 The figure, which Slavynskyi likely obtained from Jabotinsky, evidently refers to the number of daily newspapers to which the Zionist Press Bureau sent regular releases, not the number of publications under direct Zionist control. The Ukrainian word translated here as “Aegide” is *vplyv* (influence).

90 The two had known one another since before the First World War, when both had worked as journalists for the Moscow-based liberal daily *Russkie vedomosti*.

91 Roman Smal-Stotsky (1893–1969) was one of the key diplomats in Petliura’s exile regime during its period in Poland. See Bruski, *Petlurowcy*, 375.

92 See Document 10.

93 Actually *Ukrains’kyi Prapor* (The Ukrainian Flag), a publication associated with Petrushevych’s West Ukrainian National Republic and a vigorous critic of Petliura over the Polish alliance.

Gendarmerie und zwischen den zionistischen Gruppen. Wir kamen zu dem Beschluß:

Die Angelegenheit der jüdischen Gendarmerie und die Verhandlungen mit der ukrainischen Volksrepublik übernimmt eine besondere Organisation, die außerhalb der Zionistischen Organisation steht, da die Zionistische Organisation eine allweltliche ist, in welcher sich auch Gruppen befinden, die dem Kommunismus nahestehen. Die Organisation trägt die Vorbereitungs-kosten; mit dem Moment aber, wo die jüdische Gendarmerie das Territorium der Ukraine betritt, wird die ukrainische Volksrepublik die Kosten decken.

Unsere Abmachung kristallisierte sich in einem prinzipiellen Projekt, das von mir und Jabotinsky unterschrieben wurde.⁹⁴ An der letzten Konferenz, wo das Projekt perfekt wurde, hat unter anderen auch der englische Colonel Patterson⁹⁵ teilgenommen, der sich warm für die Sache einsetzte und seine ganze Hilfe zusagte – er ist eine einflußreiche Person im englischen Kriegs- und Außenamt.⁹⁶

Was im Projekt nicht angeführt ist, ist noch außerdem die Meinung, welche von den zionistischen Führern ausgedrückt wurde: Wir müssen die ukrainischen Juden und die Ukrainer fest verbinden, es sei zum Glück oder Unglück.⁹⁷

Wenn also auch aus dem Projekt keine große Sache entstehen sollte, so kann man nicht achtlos an den moralischen Folgen für das Zusammenleben beider Völker vorbeigehen.

Die weiteren Sitzungen in dieser Frage werden geführt werden von den Führern der erwähnten Organisation (wahrscheinlich wird es Temkin sein⁹⁸) und den verantwortlichen Vertretern der ukrainischen Volksrepublik.

M. Slawinskyj.

94 See Document 11.

95 John Henry Patterson (1867–1947), British commander of the first battalion of the Jewish Legion (officially the 38th Battalion of the Royal Fusiliers), a volunteer military formation of Jews from Britain, Russia, and other allied countries, of which Jabotinsky had been one of the principal organizers.

96 Slavynskyi's assessment of Patterson's influence appears highly exaggerated. Patterson had retired from active military service (and from public life in general) in 1920. Whatever prestige he enjoyed in Britain stemmed mainly from his exploits as a big-game hunter and warden in Kenya, where he had killed two man-eating lions in 1898.

97 It is not clear which Zionist leaders Slavynskyi had in mind.

98 Probably Vladimir Tiomkin.

Document 13

Stepan Vytvytskyi to Nahum Sokolow

Paris, 1 March 1922

Typewritten letter, 1 page; printed letterhead; place and year (“1921”) preprinted; actual date (including the year “1922”) typewritten; large round stamp (“Délégation de la République de l’Ukraine Occidentale [Galicie],” with trident symbol) in lower left

Language: French

CZA, A18/50/1

DÉLÉGATION
DE L’UKRAINE OCCIDENTALE
(GALICIE)

PARIS, LE 1er MARS 1922

15, RUE HENRI-MARTIN – 16^E
TÉLÉPH. AUTEUIL 17–06

Monsieur Nahum Sokolow
LONDRES

Exp. n^o 702/22.

Monsieur,

Je ne doute pas que vous soyez surchargé d’occupations depuis votre retour des Etats-Unis; cependant, en présence de la situation politique actuelle et de la possibilité d’un proche règlement de la question galicienne,⁹⁹ je me permets de venir vous incommoder avec la demande de bien vouloir me fournir des informations sur le point de vue des organes compétents anglais au sujet de la Galicie Orientale.

99 On 25 June 1919 the Council of Ambassadors of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, meeting in conjunction with the Paris Peace Conference, recognized Poland as the *de facto* occupying power in East Galicia but suspended a decision on whether the territory would be incorporated *de jure* into the new Polish state. The exile West Ukrainian Republic carried on extensive lobbying efforts with the League of Nations and with various European governments in order to forestall such incorporation. The efforts ultimately proved unsuccessful: on 14 March 1923 the Council of Ambassadors awarded the territory to Poland.

Le Gouvernement britannique envisage-t-il le règlement de cette question avant la Conférence de Gênes,¹⁰⁰ ou bien projette-t-il plutôt de mettre cette question à l'ordre du jour de cette Conférence et dans ce cas, quelle solution propose-t-il?

Veillez agréer, Monsieur, avec mes remerciements anticipés, l'expression de ma haute considération.

|Dr. Stephen Witwitsky|
Président de la Délégation.

Document 14

Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv

Berlin, undated [1924]¹⁰¹

Typewritten letter, 2 pages; handwritten corrections; some letters cut off at right margin; printed letterhead on page 1

Language: German

CAHJP, P10/1/8

Verein

Ostjüdisches Historisches

Archiv e. V.

Wilmersdorf

Pfalzburgerstr. 33a.

פֿאַראײן

מזרח-אידישער היסטאָרישער

אַרכיוו

בערלין.

Vor 5 Jahren gründeten die jüdischen gesellschaftlichen Kreise in Kiew ein Kollegium, welches die Aufgabe hatte, Materialien über die Pogrome, die zu jener Zeit in Ukraina mit aller Gewalt wüteten und bereit[s] einen

100 Conference held in Genoa, Italy, 10 April – 19 May 1922, in which representatives of 34 states discussed reinstatement of the international gold standard following its virtually universal suspension during the First World War. Issues of economic aid to eastern Europe and of economic relations between the capitalist West and the Soviet Union were also discussed, making the conference a matter of concern for Ukrainian exile leaders. See Carole Fink, *The Genoa Conference. European Diplomacy 1921–1922*, Chapel Hill N.C. 1984.

101 Date determined from first sentence of document. See following note.

Massencharakter angenommen hatten, zu sammeln.¹⁰² Dieses in der Zeit des Elends ins Leben gerufene Archiv, nahm allmählich an Umfang und historischer Bedeutung zu – und ist nun ein riesiger [sic] Quellenschatz geworden, welcher Tausende von Protokollen, von Angaben der Pogromopfer, von offiziellen Berichten, Gemeindeaufzeichnungen („Pinkosim“), Verzeichnissen der Ermordeten, Hunderte von Urkunden, Photographien, ja sogar Kinoaufnahmen und dergl.¹⁰³ enthält. Das Archiv stellte sich die Aufgabe, das aufgesammelte Material in einer Reihe von Büchern zu veröffentlichen – ein Fundamentalwerk auf diesem Gebiet zuschaffen. Zu diesem Zwecke wurde die Sammlung nach dem Auslande, nach Berlin, gebracht, wo sich um das herauszugebende Werk verschiedene Geschichtsforscher, Schriftsteller, sowie gesellschaftlich tätige Personen gruppierten.

Nach einigen Jahren mühseliger Arbeit stellte es sich jedoch heraus, dass es bei der Knappheit an Geldmitteln sehr schwer sei, das Werk zu Ende zu führen. Die verschiedenen Hilfsorganisationen, die eigentlich eine solche Arbeit zu fördern hätten, waren so sehr durch ihre direkte Hilfstätigkeit in Anspruch genommen, dass sie einem Werke von solch grosser historischer Bedeutung gar kein Interesse entgegenbrachten und nur [[2]] sehr wenig dieses Unternehmen unterstützten. Es ist daher bisher nur gelungen den ersten Band dieser aus mehreren Bänden zu bestehenden Ausgab[e] in zwei Sprachen herauszugeben.¹⁰⁴

Zurzeit befindet sich das Archiv in einer sehr kritischen Lage, und es besteht daher keine Möglichkeit, die weiteren, im Manuskript bereits fertiggestellten, Bände zu veröffentlichen. Das Material über die Pogrome von Petliura, Denikin usw. auch ein namentliches Verzeichnis der Ermordeten, das Material über den jüdischen Selbstschutz – das alles wird unausgenutzt bleiben müssen. Einer grossen Gefahr wird das Archiv selbst – diese seltene Sammlung von Dokumenten über die Leiden und das Elend der Juden – ausgesetzt.

102 This event occurred in May 1919.

103 dergleichen.

104 The board of the archive planned a seven-volume-series, *Di geshikhte fun der pogrom-bavegung in Ukrayne in di yorn 1917–1921* [The History of the Pogrom Movement in Ukraine in the Years 1917–1921]. Volume one, mentioned here, was Tcherikower, *Antisemitizm i pogrom. On the history of the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv* see Efim Melamed, ‘Immortalizing the Crime in History...’. The Activities of the ‘Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv’ (Kiev-Berlin-Paris, 1920–1940), in: Jörg Schulte/Olga Tabachnikova/Peter Wagstaff (eds.), *The Russian Jewish Diaspora and European Culture, 1917–1937*, Leiden/Boston Mass. 2012, 373–386.

Wir wenden uns deshalb an die jüdischen Gemeinden, Genossenschaften und Organisationen aller Länder, denen die Vollendung eines solchen historischen Werkes naheliegt. Ein so wichtiges kulturelles Unternehmen darf nicht untergehen. Es muss die Möglichkeit geschaffen werden, das begonnene Werk zu vollführen. Die dazu nötigen Mittel sind nicht gross. Die Ausgabe erscheint in jüdischer und russischer Sprache. Ein solches historisches Werk könnte auch in hebräischer, sowie einer der europäischen Sprachen herausgegeben werden, wären bloss die erforderlichen Geldmittel da. Ganz besonders wenden wir uns an die ukrainischen Emigranten, an diejenigen, denen es gelungen ist, sich vor der Pogromgefahr zu retten, und die jetzt in ruhigen Verhältnissen leben. Sorget, dass das Archiv bestehen bleibt, dass das begonnene Werk vollendet und unseren gefallenen Brüdern in der Ukraina ein historisches Denkmal errichtet wird.

H. N. Bialik,	H. Schitlovsky,	J. Teitel,
D. Bergelson,	M. Silberfarb,	E. Tscherikover,
Ben-Adir,	M. Kreinin,	N. Stif,
J. Grinbaum, ¹⁰⁵	W. Latzky,	J. Schechtman,
N. Gergel,	J. Lestschinsky,	J. Schiper.
S. Dubnov,	M. Soloveitschik,	

105 Izaak Gruenbaum.

Part Two: First Responses

Document 15

Mykyta Shapoval to Mykola Shapoval

Prague, 27–28 May 1926

Handwritten letter, 4 pages; handwritten archival stamp (“АРХІВНИЙ ФОНД імені МИКИТИ ШАПОВАЛА” [Mykyta Shapoval Archival Repository]) and number (“72”) along top

Language: Ukrainian

*NYPL, *QGA 73–3926, no. 72*

27.V.1926

Дорогий Миколо!

Ми схвильовані вбийством Петлюри, бо це очевидно починається здійснення постанов «Комінтерна» про індивід. терор і намір «зняти» провідників еміграції.

Тут склався комітет для винесення протесту і т.п. Ми також приняли участь в цьому Комітеті.

~~Боролись і будемо боротися проти~~

28.V.

Вчора не міг докінчити цього листа, а сьогодні одержав твого. Ті дрібні прикмети, про які ти пишеш, що-до стежіння большевиків за Петлюрою тільки підтверджують ту думку, що цей бандицький злочин є ділом большевицької мафії. Це видно по тій мотивації, яку вже пущено: вбив жид з помсти за жидівські погроми. О, це гнусно-хитрий хід! Світовий жидівський капітал, преса і сили все буде гіпнотизовано цією вказівкою. Ніхто не спочуває погромам. А тому це обраховано, що й убивцю оправдають, як, мовляв, екзальтованого месника за жертви погромів. Чомусь тільки вони не вбивають Денікиних, Врангелів і ін., що справді робили оргії погромні. Все діло тут в тім, що большевики постановили перейти до індивідуального терору і почали з Петлюри, як українця.

Наше відношення до Петлюри в цей момент: Ми боролись і боремся проти його неправильної політики, проти орієнтації на Польщу і не визнаємо його «уряду», як створеного в супереч і з скасуванням конституційних засад Трудового Конгресу але проти особи Петлюри не боремося. Ми стоїмо на засаді [|2|] що українські течії своїх непорозумінь розв'язувати просто не можуть. Тому ми протестуємо проти гнусної розправи з Петлюрою ворогів укр. нації і державности – раз, і з мертвим Петлюрою не боремось – два.

Висловлюємо співчуття його родині, котра постраждала за те, що Петлюра був активним борцем за Україну.

Ми Петлюру знали, як соц-демократа і співпрацювали з ним аж-до його порозуміння з Польшею і скасування конституції Трудов. Конгресу. Ці два акта вважаємо шкідливими для розвитку укр. визвольної боротьби. Але Петлюру, що працював з нами колись, не можемо не захищати од клевети, якою хочуть вороги (через Петлюру) принизити і здискредитувати чистоту українського визвольного всенароднього руху, в якому і ми приймали і приймаємо участь.

Треба і вам там реагувати на гнусний акт большевиків тим, щоб вказати його злочинний напрям. Українського руху цим не зупинять вороги, а жидам нашкодять вони більш, ніж хто. Юдофобом справді є отой Шварцбарт.

Большевики хотіли мабуть свідомо найтовити україн. почуття проти жидівства, щоб одвернуть увагу од Москви. Большевизм морально впав і бачучи свою загибель направляє енергію противників у бік юдофобства (як і царські уряди робили!) – це пекельна змова для продовження їх панування. На Україні скажуть «жиди вбили Петлюру» і це буде для жидів (і большевиків) небезпечним.

Петлюра виростає на мученика, а це сильно підніме його ім'я між українцями. [[3]] Одначе з смертю Петлюри значно змінюється внутрішня ситуація українства: «петлюрівщина» далі може існувати хіба як настрій, а не політика. «Директорії» нема, а тому нема ґрунту для петлюрівського легітимізму. «Уряд» Петлюри згубив ґрунт, як «петлюрівщина», котра не має вже своєї персоніфікації. Петлюрівці з смертю П. гублять єдину видатну, популярну особу, що мала політичне значення. Отже тому «польська орієнтація» мусить ослабнути. Натомість виростає бажання йти по лінії соборницької політики, а це в свою чергу поведе до зміцнення нашого політичн. курсу: соборництва, і похилить до нас більше людей.

Не треба почувати «ніяковости»: «петлюрівці», вражені нещастям, тепер краще зрозуміють необхідність більш рахування з іншими політ. течіями. Ми не покинемо критикувати варшавської орієнтації, але це не перешкоджає нам кожному віддати своє: політичного противника, котрий умер та ще трагічно – особисто не судять і особисто з ним рахунків не зводять, але з його помилками і їх наслідками боряться.

Ми думаємо, що треба нам боротись проти клевети про погроми. Далі, з «сменовеховцями» вести боротьбу ще гостріше: вони є моральними учасниками убийства Петлюри і учасниками будучих убийств, що будуть виконуватись агентами Комінтерну. З «Норичами» і под. навіть просте знайомство не допустиме. Я з твого листа не зрозумів чим закін-

чився «з'їзд петлюрівців»: Чи громади з Омекуву, Кнютанжу, Оден-ле-Тішу брали в тому участь?

Тепер на чергу стане завдання створити укр. політичний осередок еміграції. Претендувати на «центр» петлюрівці тепер ледве чи зможуть.

У нас вчора т. т. говорили, що нам треба вийти на форум ширшої політики, щоб навіть заінтересовати [4] створення політичного осередку. Я хоч в основі не заперечую потреби ширшої політики, однак ставлюся скептично що-до «центру»: в коаліцію з правими нам йти не можна, а на створення лівого центру більшість еміграції (поміркована) ледви чи згодиться. В усякому разі це питання ще не ясне.

Цікаво, як реагує на смерть Петлюри Винниченко?

Він би міг, йдучи на зустріч «легітимітичним» настроям відновити Директорію і спричинитися до утворення нового осередку. Але він політично тепер дезорієнтован і ледве чи ворухнуться. Впав у втому і лінь.

[...]

Сердечний привіт від нас
Твій Микита

Translation

27 May 1926

Dear Mykola,

We are upset by the murder of Petliura, because evidently the Comintern has begun to carry out a decision concerning individual terror and a plan to “remove” emigré leaders.

Here a committee has been formed to mount a protest etc. We too took part in this committee.

~~We have fought and we shall fight against~~

28 May

Yesterday I couldn't finish this letter, and today I received yours.¹ Those tiny signs of which you write that the Bolsheviks were tailing Petliura only confirm the notion that this bandit-like crime is the work of the Bolshevik mafia. This is evident from the motivation that has already been adduced: a Jew did the killing to avenge the Jewish pogroms. O, this villainous, devious deed! International Jewish capital, the Jewish press, and Jewish energies will

1 Not located.

all be hypnotized by this line. No one sympathizes with pogroms. So the murderer is regarded as justified, as, so to speak, a magnificent avenger of the pogrom victims. For some reason they don't kill only the followers of Denikin, Wrangel, and others, who really carried out an orgy of pogroms. The whole thing here is that the Bolsheviks decided to move to individual terror and began with Petliura as a Ukrainian.

Our attitude toward Petliura at this moment is that we have fought and will fight against his mistaken policy, against his orientation toward Poland,² and we shall not recognize his "government," because it was established in contradiction to and through the abolition of the constitutional principles of the Labor Congress,³ but against the person of Petliura we shall not fight. We stand on the principle [[2]] that the Ukrainian movements cannot simply resolve their differences. Thus we protest first against the evil violence against Petliura by the enemies of the Ukrainian nation and its state, and second, with a dead Petliura we do not do battle.

We shall express sympathy for his family, which has suffered because Petliura was an active fighter for Ukraine.

We knew Petliura as a Social Democrat and worked together with him until his accord with Poland and the abrogation of the constitution of the Labor Congress. We regard these two acts as detrimental to the progress of the Ukrainian struggle for liberation. But we cannot refrain from defending Petliura, who worked with us earlier, against the slanderous way in which enemies are trying to use Petliura to disparage and discredit the purity of the entire Ukrainian national liberation movement, in which we have played and continue to play a role.

You therefore need also to respond to the villainous act of the Bolsheviks by pointing out its criminal tendency. The enemy will not stop the Ukrainian movement by doing this, and it will hurt the Jews more than anyone. That Schwarzbard is actually a Judeophobe.

2 See Introduction, at n. 56.

3 The legislative assembly of the Ukrainian National Republic, which convened in Kiev from 23 to 28 January 1919, following elections held ten days earlier. On 28 January it drafted a provisional constitution for the Republic, but ratification and implementation were suspended when the Republican government fled Kiev in the face of a Bolshevik advance. Upon dispersal the Labor Congress transferred all powers to the executive branch of the government (the Directory), headed at the time by Vynnychenko, who would be replaced by Petliura on 11 February. On 15 November 1919 Petliura assumed all legislative as well as executive powers, effectively abolishing the draft constitution.

The Bolsheviks probably wanted consciously to seize upon Ukrainian sentiments against the Jews in order to divert attention from Moscow. Bolshevism has collapsed morally, and observing its ruin, its opponents direct their energy toward Judeophobia (just as the tsarist authorities did!) – this is a devilish plot to extend their rule. In Ukraine they are saying “the Jews killed Petliura”; this will be dangerous for the Jews (and for the Bolsheviks).

Petliura will grow into a martyr, and this will be a powerful boost to his name among the Ukrainians. [[3]] However, with Petliura’s death the internal situation of the Ukrainian community has changed notably: “Petliurism” will probably be able to continue to exist as an attitude but not as a policy. There is no “Directory,” and for this reason Petliura has no basis for legitimacy. Petliura’s “government” has lost its foundation, as has “Petliurism,” which is now without its personification. With the death of Petliura the Petliurists have lost their only outstanding popular personality who possessed any political significance. That is why the “Polish orientation” must lose strength. On the other hand the desire is growing to pursue a conciliatory policy, which in turn will lead to the strengthening of our political course: conciliation will also incline more people toward us.

There is no need to feel “awkwardness”: the “Petliurists,” under the impact of their misfortune, now understand better the necessity for taking other political currents into closer account. We shall not give up criticizing the Warsaw orientation, but this will not prevent us from giving everyone his due: we shall not judge the political opponent who died so tragically on a personal basis, and we shall not carry on personal accounts with him, but we shall fight against his mistakes and their consequences.

We think that we must fight against the defamation concerning the pogroms. Furthermore, we need to carry on the fight against the smenovekhovtsy⁴ even more intensely: morally they are participants in the murder of Petliura and participants in the future murders that will be carried out by agents of the Comintern. With the “Norichites”⁵ and the like we shall not

4 Reference to a Russian emigré political movement founded in Prague in 1921 by the former Kadet intellectual Nikolai Vasilyevich Ustryalov (1890–1937). The name was derived from the Prague-based Russian exile journal *Smena vekh* (Changing Points of Reference). It urged former opponents of the Bolsheviks now living in exile not to boycott the Soviet regime but to engage it constructively in the hope of moving it in a more Russian-national direction. The program of the *smenovekhovtsy* is often termed a form of “National Bolshevism.”

5 Reference to followers of Virhel Norich-Dzhikovskii, secretary-general of the Union of Ukrainian Citizens in France. See Au sujet de l’Union des Citoyens Ukrainiens en France, 28 May 1926, APP, C.3.173. In his first deposition before examining magis-

allow even simple friendly relations. I didn't understand from your letter how the "Congress of Petliurists" ended. Did the communes from Omécourt, Knutange, and Audignies participate in it?⁶

Now the matter on the agenda is to create a Ukrainian political nucleus for the emigré community. The Petliurists will now hardly be able to pretend to represent the "center".

Yesterday comrades in our place said that we need to step out into a broader political forum, even to think about [4] establishing a political nucleus. In principle, although I don't object to the demand for a broader politics, I remain skeptical with respect to the "center": we can't enter a coalition with the Right, whereas the majority of the (moderate) emigré community will hardly agree to the establishment of a Leftist center. In any case this matter is not yet clear.

I wonder how Vynnychenko is reacting to Petliura's death.

If he went to talks with a "legitimizing" attitude he could restore the Directory and bring about the establishment of a new nucleus. But he is politically disoriented at the moment and is hardly doing anything. He has fallen into exhaustion and laziness.

[...]⁷

Heartiest greetings from us

Your Mykyta

Document 16

Félix Allouche to Comité des Délégations Juives

Sfax, Tunisia, 28 May 1926

Typewritten letter, 1 page; printed letterhead; day, month and final digit of year typewritten

Language: French

CAHJP, P243/1

trate Peyre on 20 July 1926, Mykola Shapoval implicated "Norich and his comrades" as possibly "morally responsible for the crime [Petliura's assassination]." See Document 31.

6 These appear to be the closest actual French communes that match the transliterations in the original. All are in northeastern France, near the Belgian border.

7 Obscure references to internal SR matters omitted.

LE RÉVEIL JUIF
היקיצה היהודית
JOURNAL HEBDOMADAIRE DE DÉFENSE
ET D'INFORMATIONS JUIVES

TÉLÉGRAMMES RÉVEIL – SFAX
CASE POSTALE: 172
Sfax, le 28 Mai 1926

ADMINISTRATION & RÉDACTION
6, RUE ANNIBAL
SFAX (TUNISIE)
◇◇◇

Comité des Délégations Juives
83, Avenue de la Grande-Armée
PARIS

Messieurs,

Le meurtre du pogromiste Petlioura par Samuel Swarzbard a créé ici, dans certains milieux, un état d'esprit défavorable aux Juifs. Quelques journaux nous attaquent à ce propos. Nous ~~ne~~ nous ne nous laissons pas faire naturellement et répondons de tac-autac.

Cependant, nous répondrions encore mieux à nos adversaires si nous pouvions leur opposer⁸ des documents à l'appui, les tristes exploits de Petlioura et de ses bandes.

Notre |journal| n'existant que depuis deux ans et demi, nous ne possédant pas ces documents. Comme nous savons que vous êtes bien renseignés sur les pogromes, nous venons vous demander s'il vous [sic]⁸ |est| possible de nous communiquer les pièces nécessaires?

En vous en remerciant à l'avance, nous vous prions d'agrèer, Messieurs, nos salutations les meilleures.

Le Directeur⁹
|Allouche|¹⁰

8 Presumably an oversight. Evidently the word was to have been replaced by “est” but was not stricken.

9 Stamp.

10 Félix Allouche (1901–1978) founded *Le Réveil Juif* in 1924 as a platform for promoting the Zionist approach of Vladimir Jabotinsky among the Jews of North Africa and for combating the influence of the Alliance israélite universelle in the region.

Document 17

Schwarzbard Defense Committee

Undated [June 1926]¹¹

Typewritten draft,¹² 1 page; handwritten additions and corrections

Language: German

CAHJP, P10/4/1

Das spezielle |Verteidigungs-|Komitee wegen Pogrom-Angelegenheiten geht von zwei Gesichtspunkten aus:

Erstens vom Gesichtspunkt, dass die gesamte Aktion wegen der Zusammenfassung des Anklage-Materials gegen die Pogromschuldigen einzig und allein gegen diese gerichtet ist und alles vermeiden muss, was die Beziehungen zwischen den juedischen Massen und den Ukrainern irgendwie gefaehrdet koennte. In diesem Sinne wird die ganze Arbeit vom Komitee geleistet.

2. Das Komitee hat mit besonderer Genugtuung die Tatsache begruesst, dass in Europa und insbesondere in Amerika spontane Aeusserungen des Interesses fuer diese aeusserst ernste und verantwortungsvolle Arbeit zutage treten. Es erblickt darin den Ausdruck des nationalen Unwillens und nationalen Schmerzes ueber die furchtbare Katastrophe welche das ukrainische Judentum vor einigen Jahren erlebt hat und zugleich den Ausdruck der juedischen Solidaritaet.

3. Das Komitee ist sich voellig dessen bewusst, dass der bevorstehende Prozess, der sozusagen ein Prozess der Sympathie fuer die Pogrom-Oefer |gegen die Pogrom-Stifter| [sic] werden muss, in einem Lande gefuehrt werden wird, welches von jeher ein Staat der Gerechtigkeit gewesen ist und die Sicherheit bietet, dass die gesamte Schuld der Pogromstifter ins Licht kommt.

Document 18

B. S. Goret (Police Inspector) to Marcel Peyre (Examining Magistrate)

Paris, 2 June 1926

Handwritten police report, 15 pages; darkened with blotches, writing partly effaced; handwritten ("C. 2173" and "Duplex le 20/7?/27 à Président ### ##")

¹¹ Date estimated.

¹² Apparently an early formulation of the Defense Committee's basic principles, possibly a fragment.

and typewritten (“R. F. 3/6/26 A/A -1-”) archival notations on left margin of front page, written vertically from bottom to top; stamps (“B. S.” and “3 juin 1926”) in upper left corner, along with annotation (“Urgent R”) in handwriting different from that of document author; interlineal additions and pagination in handwriting different from that of document author

Language: French

APP, C.2.173

B. S.	Paris le 2 juin 1926
Goret	Soit ###
	M. Peyre
No 1.068	insp. Goret
	aff. # Schwartzbard

Rapport.

Le N^é¹³ Schwartzbard, Salomon-Samuel, né le 30 Septembre 1886 (non en 1888 qui est l’année de naissance de son frère Samuel, expulsé de France) à Smolensk (Russie), de Borouch et de Feinberg Haya, est de nationalité française par voie de naturalisation.

Il s’est marié le 24¹⁴ |2| Août 1914 à Paris (3e), avec Render Hinda, née en 1886, à Odessa (Russie), de Chaïm et de Steinberg Moha.

De son union il n’a pas d’enfant.

Les époux Schwartzbard ont été naturalisés français par Décret en date du 16 janvier 1925, No 12.495 X23, paru au Journal officiel le 27 janvier suivant.

L’inculpé réside en France depuis 1911.

Comme sujet russe, il a fait une déclaration de résidence à la Préfecture |3| de Police le 18 février 1914, enregistrée sous le No 3.579, folio 50, et par la suite il a été nanti au même titre de la carte d’identité et de circulation N^o 1.217.680, qui lui a été délivrée le 6 juillet 1921. (La dite carte lui a été retirée lorsque la nationalité française lui a été accordée).

Engagé volontaire fin août 1914, ð au 2e |Regt|¹⁵ Etrangers, il a été blessé le 1er mars 1916, sur le front français et réformé |4| N^o 1, le 25 mai 1920, par la 3^e Commission de Réforme de la Seine. Depuis le 1^{er} avril 1926, |le N^é Schwartzbard| il habite 82 boulevard |de| Menilmontant à Paris (20e), où il occupe avec sa femme, une chambre du loyer annuel d’environ 650 francs.

13 Nommé.

14 The catchword of each page is not rendered.

15 Regiment. Word added on left margin before “Etrangers.”

Antérieurement et depuis 1920, il a résidé avec son épouse, 20, passage de la Folie-Regnault à Paris (11^e), à cette adresse [où] il occupait un logement du loyer annuel de 500 francs, qui a ||5|| toujours |été| régulièrement payé.

|###| Il exerce la profession d'horloger.

Comme tel, il exploite depuis environ 6 ans, 82 boulevard |de| Menilmontant, une boutique installée dans des locaux du loyer annuel d'environ 1350 frs où Il travaillait |faisait| pour son compte et pour le compte de tiers, à des travaux d'horlogerie.

Les renseignements recueillis sur son compte tant à son domicile ||6|| que 20, passage de la Folie-Regnault, sont favorables à tous les égards. Il paraissait être de bonne conduite et |de| bonne moralité. D'autre part, |le Né Schwartzbard| il donnait l'impression de travailler assidûment et avait des habitudes régulières.

A ces deux adresses, il ne recevait que très peu de visites, des ex-compatriotes, croit-on. Ses relations, fréquentations et agissements au dehors étaient ignorés. ||7||

(L'acte qu'il a commis a stupéfait son entourage et tous les gens qui le connaissent.)

|###| ###|

Il n'est pas noté aux sommiers judiciaires. Il en est de même de son épouse.

L'Arrêté d'expulsion auquel |il a été| fait allusion |dans| la commission rogatoire ne concerne pas le N^e Schwartzbard Salomon-Samuel. Il concerne son frère Samuel, né le 30 avril 1888, à Smolensk (Russie), expulsé de France ||8|| pour propagande politique par Arrêté Ministériel en date du 25 mars 1919, notifié le 3 avril suivant, avec lequel l'inculpé a été très souvent confondu administrativement, du fait que tous deux répondent au même prénom (Samuel) et de cet autre fait que l'inculpé, soit par erreur, soit sciemment, fait usage de l'année de naissance de son frère (1888 au lieu de 1886.).¹⁶

L'inculpé est connu des services politiques |spéciaux| de la Préfecture de Police

||9|| pour les raisons ci-dessus énumérées. Personnellement il n'a jamais été retenu pour un militant.

* * *

16 Indeed, Schwarzbard did have a brother, Shmuel (Samuel), two years younger than he. On the frequent confusion between the two brothers see Johnson, Sholem Schwarzbard, 46, n. 119.

Le N^e Petlura, dit Petlioura, Simon, né le 10 mai 1879 à Kiev (Russie) de Basil et Martchenko Olga, victime du N^e Schwartzbard Salomon, était de nationalité russe.

Il s'était marié le 27 juin 1910, à Moscou (Russie) avec sa compatriote Bielsky ou Bilsky, Olga, née le 30 décembre ||10|| 1885 à Prylouki (Russie), de Stéphan et de Bykovska, Sophie.

De son union est issue une fille prénommée Larissa, née le 11 novembre 1911 à Moscou (Russie).

||Le N^e Petlura|| # résidait en France depuis le 16 octobre 1924. Il venait alors, a-t-il dit, de son pays d'origine.

Comme sujet russe, il a fait, dès son arrivée à Paris, une déclaration de résidence à la Préfecture de Police et a été nanti, à ce titre, d'une ~~déclaration~~ carte d'identité et de circulation portant ||11|| le N^o 2.084.071. qui lui avait été délivrée le 7 décembre 1924.

Lors de son assassinat le 25 mai dernier, il logeait depuis le 28 mars 1925 à l'hôtel sis 7 rue Thénard où il occupait une chambre meublée du loyer mensuel de 300 francs, régulièrement payé. Sa femme et sa fille qui étaient venues le rejoindre audit hôtel, le 20 Août 1925, occupent une chambre attenante, du loyer mensuel de 350 francs.

||12|| Précédemment, # ||le N^e Petlura|| avait logé du 23 décembre 1924, au 23 mars 1925, à l'hôtel sis 192 avenue Daumesnil, et antérieurement depuis son arrivée à Paris, 27 rue Belgrand (20^e).

A ces deux adresses, il n'a laissé aucun souvenir. Le tenancier de l'hôtel précité et la concierge de l'immeuble 27 rue Belgrand, ne l'ont pas connu.

Les renseignements recueillis sur son compte à son dernier domicile sont favorables à tous ||13|| les égards. Il paraissait être de bonne conduite et de bonne moralité. Jusqu'à son décès, il n'avait fait l'objet d'aucune remarque ayant retenu l'attention de son entourage.

On ignore d'où il tirait ses moyens d'existence. ~~Il paraissait~~ ||Le N^e Petlura semblait|| vivre de revenus personnels.

A son domicile, il ne recevait que très peu de visites. Ses relations, fréquentations et agissements au dehors ||14|| étaient ignorés.

Il n'était pas noté aux sommiers judiciaires.



Le complément d'enquête auquel il a été procédé au sujet des faits reprochés au N^e Schwartzbard, Salomon, n'a donné aucun résultat. Il n'a pu être établi si l'inculpé a eu ou non des complices.

De l'ensemble des renseignements recueillis et de l'enquête |faite| notamment par Monsieur le Commissaire ||15|| de Police, du quartier de l'Odéon,

à l'issue du crime, tout laisse croire que le susnommé dit la vérité lorsqu'il affirme avoir agi seul et de sa propre initiative.

Ci-joint la commission rogatoire {communiquée.}

Goret

Document 19

Leo Motzkin to Simon Dubnow

Paris, 4 June 1926

Typewritten letter, 2 pages; front page on printed letterhead in French, English, Hebrew, and Yiddish

Language: Russian

YIVO, RG80/437/37452–37443

COMITÉ DES DÉLÉGATIONS JUIVES
COMMITTEE OF JEWISH DELEGATIONS

ועד הדלגציות היהודיות

קאמיטעט פון די אידישע דעלעגאציעס

83, AVENUE DE LA GRANDE ARMÉE, PARIS (16^o)

ADRESSE TÉLÉGRAPHIQUE: DELISRAEL PARIS.

TELEPHONE: PASSY 65–78

Господину С. Д У Б Н О В У

Paris, le 4 июня¹⁷ 1926¹⁸

Б е р л и н ъ

Глубокоуважаемый
Семень Яковлевичъ,

Въ виду моего отсутвія изъ Парижа, я только сегодня получилъ Ваше письмо отъ 31-го мая. Спѣшу отвѣтить на это письмо слѣдующее.

По какому то недоразуменію, письмо, которое было уже мною написано {несколько дней тому назад}, не было Вамъ отправлено. Само собой понятно, что мы сразу же рѣшили сообщить Вамъ о томъ, что

17 Month and date typewritten in Russian.

18 Final digit typewritten.

Комитетъ Еврейскихъ Делегацій, съ момента происшедшаго событія, занявъ выдвинутыми проблемами, что онъ образоваль уже для этой цѣли расширенный Комитетъ, не только изъ своей среды, но включилъ в него и нѣкоторыхъ другихъ представителей общественнаго мнѣнія, и что онъ стоитъ на той точкѣ зрѣнія, что выступления должны быть солидарны и главнымъ образомъ – обдуманы. Къ сожалѣнію, я принужденъ былъ уѣхать отсюда въ прошлое воскресенье в Лондонъ, отчасти также и по этому дѣлу, почему и не возникла связь между нами.

Мы очень хотѣли бы, чтобы представитель Вашего архива приѣхалъ сюда для того, чтобы можно было координировать всѣ дѣйствія. По существу – не такъ важно работать спѣшно, какъ работать правильно. Такъ, мы полагаемъ, что лучше было бы, если бы въ настоящій моментъ печать не публиковала бы такъ много, часто безответственныхъ сообщений и комментариевъ. Въ особенности насъ смущаютъ разные комментарии по такому дѣлу, которое является столь деликатнымъ и болѣе сложнымъ, чѣмъ это можетъ показаться постороннему. Какъ Вы уже вѣроятно замѣтили, мы до сихъ поръ еще не обнародовали никакихъ коммуникатовъ, н давали никакихъ интервью и вообще еще не высказывались отъ имени Комитета Еврейскихъ Делегацій. Нужно ли сейчасъ печатать информациі и что нужно печатать – это по нашему мнѣнію болѣе важный вопросъ, чѣмъ быстрыя выступления в целяхъ сенсаціонныхъ или вѣдомственныхъ.

[2] Мы очень довольны, что Вы |и Ваши коллеги|, повидимому, стоите на той же точкѣ зрѣнія, но хотѣли бы совмѣстно обсудить наиболѣе важные вопросы. Что касается необходимой для этого встрѣчи, то она возможна или въ томъ случаѣ, чтобы кто-либо приѣхалъ сюда изъ Берлина / намъ казалось, что ЧерикOVERь, какъ наиболѣе освѣдомленный, наиболѣе подходит, хотя это Ваше дѣло /, или же в томъ, чтобы я поѣхалъ въ Берлинъ. Оказывается, что я могу уѣхать отсюда лишь дней черезъ двѣнадцать. Вотъ почему мы отправляемъ Вамъ также телеграмму, въ которой просимъ, чтобы ЧерикOVERь, или кто-либо другой изъ представителей, приѣхалъ сюда. Если это невыполнимо въ ближайшіе дни, то тогда, конегно, лучше отложить это совмѣстное совѣщаніе до моего приѣзда въ Берлинъ.

Пока пишу только эти строки. Въ слѣдующемъ письмѣ я сообщу Вамъ подробности о предпринятыхъ здѣсь шагахъ.

Въ ожиданіи Вашего отвѣта,
Съ глубокимъ уважаніемъ,

{Л. Моцкинъ}

*Translation*COMITÉ DES DÉLÉGATIONS JUIVES
COMMITTEE OF JEWISH DELEGATIONS83, Avenue de la Grande Armée, Paris (16°)
Adresse télégraphique: DELISRAEL PARIS
Téléphone: PASSY 85–78

To Mr. S. DUBNOW

Paris, 4 June 1926

BERLINMost esteemed
Semen Yakovlevich,

In view of my absence from Paris I received your letter of 31 May¹⁹ only today. I hasten to respond to that letter as follows:

Because of some misunderstanding or another a letter that I had already written [a few days ago] was not sent to you. It should be self-evident that we immediately made the decision to inform you that from the moment the event²⁰ occurred the Committee of Jewish Delegations has been taking up the pressing issues, that it has already formed an expanded Committee for that purpose not only from within its own ranks but including several other representatives of public opinion,²¹ and that it proceeds from the conviction that public statements should be uniform and, most important, well thought out. Unfortunately I had to leave for London last Sunday, which is also to some extent a reason why we didn't make contact with one another.

We would like very much for a representative of your archive to come here so that we can coordinate all activities. The truth is that it is not as important to work quickly as it is to work accurately. Hence we are of the opinion that it would be better if at the present moment the press did not publish so many frequently irresponsible reports and comments. In particular we are bothered by various comments on this matter, which is so delicate and more complicated than would appear to an outsider. As you have already surely noticed, to date we have not promulgated any comment, given any interview,

19 Letter not located.

20 The killing of Petliura.

21 See the list of Schwarzbard Defense Committee members, Document 14.

and have not yet spoken in the name of the Committee of Jewish Delegations. Whether it is necessary now to publish information and what information should be published – this is, in our opinion, a more important question than a quick statement for sensational or informational purposes.

[2] We are very glad that you [and your colleagues] evidently share our view, but we would like to discuss the most important issues together. Regarding the meeting that will be necessary for this to take place, it is possible either if someone comes here from Berlin (it seems to us that Tcherikower, who is best informed, is the most appropriate, but this is your business) or if I go to Berlin. It turns out that there is only one day that I can leave here during the next twelve. That is why we are also sending you a telegram in which we ask Tcherikower or some other representative to come here. If this cannot be done in the next few days, then naturally it will be better to leave this joint conference until I come to Berlin.

For now I'm writing you only these lines. In my next letter I will give you details about the steps being taken here.²²

Awaiting your reply,
With deep respect,

[L. Motzkin]

Document 20

Menachem Ribalow
New York, 4 June 1926
Published newspaper editorial
Language: Hebrew
*Ha-Doar,*²³ *1926, no. 26, p. 506*

22 Motzkin's next letter to Dubnow was dated 8 June 1926. In it he indicated that a Mr. Katzenbogen, whom the Defense Committee did not know, had introduced himself as the Archive's representative. Motzkin asked Dubnow for written information about Katzenbogen. He also stated that the Defense Committee impatiently awaited Dubnow's response to the letter of 4 June. He did not provide any information along the lines promised. Motzkin to Dubnow, 8 June 1926, YIVO, RG80/437/37450.

23 Hebrew-language literary weekly sponsored by the Hebrew Federation (*Histadruth Ivrit*) of America. Founded in 1922, it was edited by Menachem Ribalow from 1925 through to 1953.

פְּטִלְיֹרָא שְׁחִיקַעְצָמוֹת

מאת מנחם ריבולוב

לב ישראל בכל העולם פחדורחב, מרגש-מיוחד-במינו, לשמע היריה אשר ירה שלום שווארצבארד, ברחובות פאריז ההומיה, ברב-טבחים – פטליורא. רבים מאתנו, נודה על האמת ונבוש, שכחו לגמרי על מציאותו של זה בעולמנו – ורק עם רציחתו קם שמו לתחיה. פן דרכנו מאז לשכוח עלבונות ומכאובים. היום אנו שוכחים את פאכה-האמול ולמחר אנו מזדוים להשכיח את יגון-היום. אנו חיים בכחה-שכחה, המקרימה עור על כל הפצעים. אלה, שנמלטו מאוקראינה, שכחו, או התאמצו לשכוח, את כל אשר עבר עליהם ועל אחיהם, ואל חיי-שלום שבו. וגם מנוול זה, פטליורא, כמעט עבר מזכרונו.

אבל יש בתוכנו אנשים, אשר לא יוכלו שכוח. קול דמינו צועק אלינו מאדמת-אוקראינה. ואין דמי לו. עוד לא נח העולם ועוד לא נח הדם שהיה רותח ועולה פדמו של זכריה. והפצע שנפצע בעל הנפש העדינה והלב הרגש לא במהרה ירפא.

שלום שווארצבארד לא שליחנו היה; לא בקשנו מאתו לעשות נקמה בגוי אכזרי זה – אבל הכל יודעים ומודים, כי קרבנו הוא. אָחינו הוא ומכאבנו נצרב. ומדמנו הורעלה מנוחתו. הוא נשא בקרבו כל השנים האלה את פאכה-האדם שביהודי. הוא רָאָה בעצם עיניו את כל אשר עוללו ההיידמאקים לנו – גם על משפחתו ירד זעם הפראים הללו – וקול הדם שנשפך קרא לו לנקמה. הוא נקם את נקמת דמנו השפוך. ולא לחנם נעשה שמו קרוב ויקר לנו – בין יום. יש טראגיות נעלה והוד-מסירות במעשהו. הוא הקל משא מעל עצמו, משא-הנקמה. וגלל חרפה מעל שם ישראל – עד כמה שלא יהיה עצם הרצח נגד הרגשתו ואמונתו. ואם יש צידוקידין, של בדיעבד, למעשה-הרצח – מן הדין הוא שינתן פולו למעשה-שווארצבארד; פי נקמת דמנו השפוך נקם. והוא עצמו נקי.

עתה יעמוד שווארצבארד לדין. אבל עלינו החובה הפולה: ללמד זכות על הנאשם וללמד חובה על הרוצח שנרצח וכן על אלה שלא נרצחו. אנו חייבים להגן על שווארצבארד ויחד עם זה לגלות לעיני העולם, ולהעמיד לדין, את כל התקופה האיומה של שפיקת-הדמים באוקראינה ואת "גבוריה המהוללים". ואם אין ביכלתנו להביא את האנשים (או החיות בדמות אנשים) לפני כסיהמשפט – יבואו מעשיהם ויעידו. ואם אין ביכלתנו לענוש את הזדים, המתהלכים עדיין בעולם, בכל הבירות הגדולות והקטנות, ישמע לפחות קול המחאה העזה שלנו – על דמנו השפוך.

תקופת המהפכה ומלחמת-האזרחים ברוסיה העמידה כמה וכמה "גבורי קלון" – אבל המסוכן שבהם והמנוול שבהם היה פטליורא שחיקעצמות. כל הזוהמה והחלאה שבאוקראינה הכפרית והאפלה מצאָה את בטויה בו – ראש הריפובליקה ה"דימוקראטית" ומי שהיה סוציאליסטון וריבולוציונר. הוא היה דימאגוג ורודף-שלטון. לבלר פפרי שנעשה מנהיג ב מפלגה, עסקן מדיני פעוט שהעמד בראש מדינה, השואפת לשחרור – נטרפה עליו דעתו ולא ידע את דרכו. היידמאקים שפורים סבוהו ומשלו בו. לא הוא בהם – פי הם בו. הם שכרו מדם ישראל והוא שכר גם מדמנו וגם מ"נצחונותיו" הגדולים. אנו זוכרים עוד את ימי הטירוף הגדול באוקראינה, עת הארץ הגדולה והרחבה והפראית שתתה ורוותה דם ישראל. זכר אותם הימים מחרידנו עד היום, – ויחרידנו לאורך-ימים. וכל שמות ה"גבורים" שופכידמנו ארוורים יהיו לעולם. ובראשם – פטליורא. שמו הטיל אימה על עיירות-ישראל באוקראינה. ידעו כולם, פי אין רחמים בדין. ועדות שלמות, שלא הספיקו לברוח, נשמדו על בתיהם

ועירוותיהם. הם תעו, גייסות פטליורא, ברחבי הארץ האפלה והשמידו באף ובחימה את ישובייהיהודים. בכל מקום אשר שם נראו ה"כובעים הצהובים" – מלאך המות בא אתם. מובן הדבר, פי פטליורא בכבודו ובעצמו לא יצא אל השוק – לשדוד ולהרוג – אבל כלום גיניראלים אחרים עשו כן? כלום דניקין הלך בעצמו ל"קרב"? הנחשים הערומים האלה ידעו, פי לא לפי כבודם ולא לפי חשבונם הוא זה. הם הלכו ב"עורף" המחנה – והחיילות הטורפים בראש. ואין איפוא מקום למלמד־זכות משלנו לטהר את השרץ במעט זה. ידוע, פי בפרוסקורוב נערכה השחיטה הגדולה בחשבון מחריד לב ובשיטה מסמרת־שער. בכלי זיין קרים, חרבות וספינים, נערכה השחיטה ההיא, אשר גולה מאתנו 1,260 נפש והשאירה 700 אלמנות ו־3,600 יתומים. הנקל לשער את תוס־נפשו וטוב־לבו של מנהיג, אשר חיילותיו שוחטים, ברשותו וידיעתו, בחשאי ובסדר, משך יום ולילה בעיר ואם בישראל – ואין פוצה פה ומצפץ!

ובלילות־האימים, עת פתים בערו באש שהציתו ההיידמאקים, ועת ילדים נשחטו באַכד ריות פראית ונשים עונו עד שגעון – היכן היה פטליורא אז? האם תפלות היה עורך לאלהים, שישקיט את חמת ההמון הפרוע?

אהה, הוא היה ערום ונוכל. הוא עשה הכל בחשבון וידיעה. אם הבין, פי אין לשחוט – נתן צו – ולא שחטו. ואם רָאָה צורך, פי יש לקבל פני מלאכות יהודית ולדבר אליה רפות ולהבטיח "ישועות ונחמות" – היה מסתיר הקפוד את מחטיו, מכבה את אש־הרצח בעינים – המחייך חיוך טמא ומנוול. והלב השוטה היה נפתה להאמין, פי מעתה הכל ישתנה – ולטובה. הוא ידע לאחז את העינים ואת הלב. בכח עברו ה"דימוקראטי" ובזכות דרשותיו הליבראליות ובדרכי־ערמה שונים הוא הוליך אותנו שולל ורבים חפצו להאמין, פי אמנם תִּפְּשֶׁע הוא. ואחדים השתדלו אפילו לפתותנו פי כן הוא.

והוא הוסיף ערמה על ערמה. ביד אַחַת נצח על הפרעות ובשניה פרש רשת לצודנו. עד יומו האַחרון לא פסק "מיניסטר" יהודי משלטונו. הם, המיניסטרים האלה, שמשו לו טלית־שלי־תכלת לכסות על פשעיו. הוא הערים למסור את כל הענין בידי ה"מש'קה" שלו ולהשליך מעל עצמו את האַחריות. וכך היה העולם חושב, העולם הרואה ויודע – ומחשה: אם יש מקום למיניסטר יהודי ב"קאפינט" של פטליורא, הרי מובן, פי אין מקום בלבו של המושל לשנאת־ישראל. ואם בכל זה נשפכים נהרי־נחלי דם שלנו – הם... הם... הרי זו חמת העם שנשפכה. זה היה תכסיס נורא, תכסיס עוד לא ברא השטן. פי יהודים ומנהיגים־בישראל נקראו ללוות את פטליורא במנגינת־הדס־זה־הרס. והם לוּוּהוּ. והם נושאים וישאו באַחריות עד־עולם, אם גם ימלטו לאַמריקה ויכסו את עצמם בעלי עתונים יהודיים טובים...

בעטים של יהודים כאלה יש וישמע אי־פה אי־שם קול מלמד־זכות על פטליורא. אבל זו חרפה לאומית. אם נהנו ממנו יחידים – לא לזכותם, ולא לזכותנו, עשו זאת, פי אם לזכותו ולטובתו – ולרעתנו אָנוּ. העם לא שכח ולא ישכח את תקופת־הדם – ועתה השעה לפתוח שוב את ספר־הזכרונות ולגלות לעיני העולם את כל אשר מצאנו בשנות־האימה באוקראינה. שווארצבארד קדש את שם ישראל ברבים. הוא לא רק הרג את המשוקק והמתועב ברוצחי ישראל – אלא גם היום את הוילון מעל גיא־ההריגה שלנו, אשר למראהו יקפא דם החיים ודם ה"קדושים" ירתח ויעלה שוב.

ירתח ולא ינוח.

שלום שווארצבארד העמיד לפני כס־המשפט לא את עצמו, פי אם את כל פורעי־ישראל

באשר הם –

וְאָנוּ, אָנוּ הַמַּאֲשִׁימִים!

*Translation***Petliura, May His Bones Be Ground to Dust**

The heart of Israel throughout the world took fright and then relaxed, with unique emotion, upon hearing the shot that Scholem Schwarzbard fired on a noisy Paris street at the master butcher – Petliura. Many of us – let us admit it, to our shame – had forgotten the existence of that person in our world; only with his murder was his name resurrected. It has long been our habit to forget insults and injuries. Today we forget yesterday’s pain, and tomorrow we shall be quick to forget today’s sorrow. We live thanks to the amnesia that regrows skin over all our wounds. Those who escaped from Ukraine have forgotten, or have made an effort to forget, all that happened to them and to their brothers; they have returned to peaceful life. And even this rotten character, Petliura, had almost vanished from our memory.

But there are people among us who could not forget. The voice of our blood cries out to them from the land of Ukraine.²⁴ And they cannot remain silent. The world has not yet come to rest, nor has the blood that boiled over like the blood of Zechariah.²⁵ And the wound that strikes those of gentle soul and sensitive heart is not easily healed.

Scholem Schwarzbard was not our *delegate*; we did not ask him to take revenge upon this cruel *goy*.²⁶ But we all acknowledge him as our *sacrifice*.

24 Cf. Genesis 4:10.

25 Reference to a Talmudic legend based on II Chronicles 24:20–22. In the Bible, King Joash of Judah ordered a Jerusalem mob to stone to death the priest Zechariah ben Jehoiada, a political opponent. The Talmud (Bavli, Gittin 57b and elsewhere) reported that in the days of the Babylonian invasion of Judah (early sixth century BCE), the Babylonian military commander Nebuzaradan, who set fire to Jerusalem and slaughtered its inhabitants *en masse*, encountered the blood of Zechariah “bubbling up hot.” When Nebuzaradan learned the identity of the blood that had not yet come to rest because of the violent manner of its bearer’s death, he determined to avenge it. The mass slaughters in Jerusalem were ostensibly carried out for that purpose, but they did not appease Zechariah, whose blood came to rest only when Nebuzaradan asked him, “I have killed the best of them, do you want me to kill them all?” Nebuzaradan immediately repented of his violent deeds, declaring, “If this is what happens for killing one soul, how much more so will I have to pay for killing so many!” According to the story, his remorse led him to forsake his worldly possessions and convert to the religion of Israel.

26 Yiddish: non-Jew, from a Hebrew word used in the Bible as a general designation for a “people” or a “nation,” of which the Israelite nation was one. In Yiddish the word

He is our brother, and he has been scorched by our pain. His tranquility was poisoned by our blood. All those years he carried within him the pain the Jew feels as a human being. He saw with his own eyes everything that the haidamaks²⁷ did to us. The fury of those wild animals fell upon his family as well, and the voice of the blood that was shed cried out to him for revenge. He avenged our spilled blood. It is not for nothing that his name has become near and dear to us overnight. There is noble tragedy and glorious devotion in his deed. He unburdened himself of the burden of vengeance and removed a stain from the name of Israel, no matter how greatly the murder ran counter to our sensibility and to our faith. And if murder can be justified after the fact, it should be justified completely for Schwarzbard, because he avenged our blood. He himself is pure.

Now Schwarzbard will stand trial. But we have a dual task: to argue for the acquittal of the accused and to prosecute the murderer who has been murdered and the others who have not. We must simultaneously defend Schwarzbard and reveal to the world everything that happened during that frightful period of bloodshed in Ukraine, placing its “glorious heroes” on trial. And if we are unable to bring those people (or those animals masquerading as people) before the bar of justice, then let their deeds testify for them. If we do not have the power to punish the evildoers who still roam free on earth in all the greater and lesser capitals, at least let our powerful voice of protest for our spilled blood be heard.

The period of the revolution and the civil war in Russia threw up no small number of “heroes of shame,” but the most dangerous, the most rotten of them all was Petliura, may his bones be ground to dust. All the filth and scum of darkest rural Ukraine found its expression in him, the head of the “democratic” republic, who had been a socialist and a revolutionary. He was a power-hungry demagogue, a country clerk who became a party leader, a minor political functionary who was placed at the head of a state seeking liberation; he went crazy and didn’t know what to do. Drunken haidamaks surrounded him and dominated him. He did not control them; they controlled him. They became drunk on the blood of Israel, while he became drunk both on our blood and on his great “victories.” We still remember the days of the great madness in Ukraine, when that enormous, wide-open, wild country drank its fill of Jewish blood.²⁸ The memory of those days frightens us even today, and it will frighten us for a long time. The names of all those

came to designate non-Jews only, and often it carried a negative connotation. In the nineteenth century it was reabsorbed into Hebrew in this derogatory sense.

27 See above, Introduction, n. 242.

28 A reference to the pogroms that followed the First World War.

“heroes” who shed our blood will be cursed forever, Petliura foremost among them. His name struck fear into Jewish towns in Ukraine. All knew that their fate would be merciless. Entire communities that did not run away in time were destroyed, along with their homes and with their towns. Petliura’s units roamed all over the bleak countryside, destroyed in wrath and fury the Jewish towns of Ukraine. Everywhere the “yellow hats”²⁹ appeared, the angel of death appeared with them. Of course Petliura himself didn’t enter the marketplace to rob and kill, but did other generals do this? Did Denikin himself go forth to do “battle”? Those clever snakes knew that doing so was not for people of their rank and stature. They passed to the rear of the camp, with their predatory troops in front. So let none of our defense advocates seek this reptile’s exoneration on those paltry grounds. We know that in Proskurov the great slaughter was carried out with frightful precision that made hair stand on end. The slaughter was conducted with cold weapons, swords and knives, that claimed 1,260 lives, left 700 widows and 3,600 orphans.³⁰ How can we assume the innocence and good will of a leader whose troops slaughter with his knowledge and permission, secretly and openly, for a full day and night in a large Jewish center, and he does not open his mouth to utter a sound?!

And during those horrible nights when the houses that the haidamaks set on fire burned, children were slaughtered in frenzied cruelty, and women were tortured to madness – where was Petliura then? Was he praying to God to quiet the wrath of the disorderly mob?

Oh, he was a crafty scoundrel. If he understood that slaughter was not permissible, he gave an order, and the slaughter ceased. If he saw that he needed to receive Jewish envoys, to speak softly to them and to promise comfort and salvation, the porcupine would hide his quills; he would extinguish the murderous fire in his eyes, smiling a corrupt, rotten smile. And the foolish heart would be tricked into believing that henceforth everything would change for the better. He knew how to pull the wool over eyes and hearts. On the strength of his “democratic” past and his liberal speeches, in various cunning ways, he led us astray, and many have wanted to believe that he committed no crime. Some have even tried to make us believe that he is honest.

29 Perhaps a reference to the blue and yellow hats worn by certain Ukrainian Cossack formations, whose colors are commemorated in the flag of contemporary Ukraine.

30 Source of figures unclear. A memorial book for pogrom victims in Proskurov, published in New Jersey in 1924, listed the names of 884 Jews killed. Greyser/Wohl, *Khurbn Proskurov*, 77–104. Tcherikower’s list of pogroms listed 1500 killed, 600 wounded, and “many” raped; it made no mention of widows or orphans. Tcherikower, *Tableaux des pogromes* (above, Document 1, n. 6).

Meanwhile, he added deceit to deceit. With one hand he orchestrated the pogroms and with the other he set out a trap for us. To its final day there was a Jewish “minister” in his government.³¹ Those ministers provided him with a kosher prayer shawl with which to cover up his crimes. Slyly he arranged to turn the entire affair over to his “Moshke”³² and to absolve himself of all responsibility. Thus the world would observe and think, if there is room for a Jewish minister in Petliura’s “cabinet,” then clearly the head of the government has no room in his heart for hating Jews. So if even so rivers of our blood are being shed, this must be the wrath of the people that has been poured out. This was an awful tactic, one that the devil had not yet created. Jewish leaders and rank-and-file were called upon to accompany Petliura in his song of blood and destruction, and they accompanied him. And they will bear responsibility forever, even if they escape to America and cover themselves with the pages of respectable Jewish newspapers ...³³

Somewhere the pens of such Jews are writing articles in defense of Petliura. This is a national disgrace. If some individual Jews benefited from [Petliura], they did not do so for the benefit of [Ukrainian Jews] nor for our benefit, but for their own benefit and advantage, *and to our detriment*. The people have not forgotten and will not forget that bloody era. Now is the time to reopen the memorial book and to reveal to the world all that befell us during the years of terror in Ukraine.

Schwarzbard sanctified the name of Israel publicly. Not only did he kill the most abominable, the most loathsome of the Jews’ murderers, he also raised the veil that hung over our killing fields, whose sight will make the

31 See Introduction, at n. 108.

32 Diminutive for Moshe (Moses); a dismissive appellation for a Jew.

33 The reference may be in particular to Avraham Revutsky (1889–1946), who served as one of three deputy ministers for Jewish affairs in the government of the Ukrainian Central Council (*Rada*) from January 1918 until the establishment of Skoropadskyi’s hetmanate three months later. When the Directory took power in December 1918 he became minister of Jewish affairs but resigned in February 1919, perhaps in protest over pogroms, perhaps out of disagreement with other aspects of Directory policy. His public statements and writings regarding responsibility for the pogroms were not unequivocal. See in particular his memoir, *Revutsky, In di shvere teg*; also Abramson, *A Prayer for the Government*, 140 f., 148 f. Revutsky left Ukraine for Palestine in 1920, moved to Berlin in 1922, and settled in New York in 1924, where he worked at the foreign desk of the Yiddish newspaper, *Morgen zhurnal*. The day after the assassination he published a profile of Schwarzbard in that newspaper, in which he stated that he did not regard Petliura personally as an antisemite (although he did declare that Petliura “bears the greatest responsibility for the shedding [of Jewish blood]”). Revutsky, *Ver hot dershosen Petliura?*

blood of the living freeze and the blood of the martyrs boil over and bubble again.

It will boil over and not rest.

Scholem Schwarzbard has placed not himself on trial but everyone who has made pogroms against Israel.

And we, we are the accusers!

Document 21

Yehoshua Heshel Yeivin

Tel Aviv, 4 June 1926

Published newspaper editorial

Language: Hebrew

*Davar,*³⁴ *vol. 2, no. 310, p. 2*

על ידיעה אחת

יד[ני]עה קצרה הביא לנו הטלגרף:
"פטלורה הומת".

וביום השני – המשך:

"ההורג – בחור יהודי".

לשמע ידיעה זו דבר מה זע בנפש. דומה, כאילו אבן כבדה נגולה מהלב. דומה, כאילו איזו חרפה קשה, שזה שבע שנים צרבה את לחיינו, הוסרה כעת. פטלורה התלין, ראש הפורעים, הומת; ובידי בחור יהודי. נראה, שהבחור לא נשלח משום מפלגה, בחור שרצה לעלות לא"³⁵... על דעת עצמו עשה זאת. מי הוא זה הבחור, שהקריב את עצמו, בשביל להוכיח, שאנו לא צאן, שכל אוכליהם לא יאשמו, שאנו – לא הפקר? מי הוא זה, שאת שמו עלינו לחרות באותיות זהב בהיסטוריה החדשה שלנו, מפני שהוא חדש הלכה גדולה: אנו כבר לא צאן. אוכלינו יאשמו. כן, יאשמו. במובן הכי פשוט של המילה.

34 Organ of the General Federation of Jewish Workers in Palestine (Histadrut). Founded in 1925 by Berl Katznelson (1887–1944), one of Jewish Palestine's most prominent intellectual and political leaders, it quickly became the country's largest-circulating and most influential daily.

35 לארץ ישראל.

כשהתורכים השמידו בפרעות אכזריות את רוב עם הארמנים, לא הלכו אלה לאסוף חומר על פרעות. הם לא הדפיסו ספרים על זה. הם עשו אחרת: טלעת-ביי ושאר הפחות התלינים הומתו בידי ארמנים במשך איזו שנה, בכל מקום שהיו. אנו לא כף עשינו. אנו אספנו חומר לפרעות והדפסנוהו בכמה וכמה כרכים. הושבנו סטטיסטיקים מומחים למנות את מספר הנטבחים. התרענו והתרענו על הרעה הנעשה לנו. אפילו לשתוק מתוך חרוק שנים לא ידענו. חומר לפרעות בכך וכך כרכים – זאת היתה התשובה שלנו על הפרעות באוקריינה. תשובה ראויה לעם הספר לצאן ההרגה.

ב.

ועוד אילוסטרציה אחת ל"ספריות" שלנו: לפני שנים אחדות הופיע בירחון הביבליוגרפי "ביכער וועלט" רצנזיה על המאספים של חומר הפרעות. הרצנזיה היתה כתובה בידי מי שהיה מיניסטר יהודי באחת הממשלות באוקריינה, מר זילברפרב. ברצנזיה זו מסיר זילברפרב מעצמו, דרך אגב ובאופן ארעי, את האשמה, על שבהיותו מיניסטר באוקריינה בשנים לפני הפרעות לא עשה כלום בשביל לסדר הגנה, אותה הגנה שעליה חלם טרומפלדור ושכל כך קל היה לסדר אז, בשנת 1918, מפני שנשק היה בכל רוסיה, ומפני שכל כפר וכנופיה לאומית הזדיינה אז – בראשית אותה האנדרולמוסיה הגדולה, כשרק מי שהיה מזוין היתה לו הזכות לחיות.

האשמה קשה, אם מיניסטרים שעמדו בראש הפקירו את מבצר היהדות בשעה שכולם ידעו, שהסכין כבר מונח על הצואר – הרי דינם כדין בָּן, סטסל ושאר מוסרי מבצרים – זאת אומרת עליהם להשפט לפני עמם. כך נהוג אצל אומות העולם. מר זילברפרב לא נשפט. גם איש לא דרש ממנו זאת. את ההאשמה הכבדה הוא הסיר מעצמו דרך אגב – ברצנזיה ארעית בעתון ביבליוגרפי. לא סדרו הגנה – "שלא להתבדל מהמפלגות השמאליות שלהם", כמובן.

ירחון ביבליוגרפי – מקום נאה מאד לתשובה של בן עם הספר לפני עם הספר... שבע שנים אכל בעצמותינו הקלון, קלון "החומר ההיסטורי" והרצנזיות על שחיטת צאן־הפקר...

והנה ידיעה זאת.

נמצא בחור אחד מישראל, שלא אסף חומר, בחור אחד, שלא היה אולי מוסרי על טהרת "צאן הקדשים" במאה אחוז – אבל שהקריב את עצמו ועשה מה שעשה. אם כן, לא כולנו צאן, יש עוד כאלה, שמתנהגים כבני כל העמים – באופן פשוט ופרימיטיבי. בין שנת ת'ח ושנת תרע"ט יש כבר הבדל. "עם ישראל חי" בכל זאת. וגם זאת היא נחמה בשבילנו.

ה. ייבין

Translation

Concerning One News Item

A short news item came to us over the wire:

“Petliura has been killed.”

The next day – a continuation:

“The killer – a young Jewish man.”

Something stirred in my soul when I heard this news. It seems as though a heavy burden had been lifted. It seems as though a major disgrace that has been burning away at us for seven years has now been removed.

Petliura the executioner, the chief pogromist, has been killed, and a young Jewish man did it.

It appears that the young man was not sent by any party; he wanted to immigrate to Palestine ...³⁶ He acted on his own. Who is this young man who sacrificed himself in order to prove that we are not sheep who may be consumed with impunity, that we have not been abandoned to our fate? Who is this person whose name we must inscribe in golden letters in our modern history because he has established an important new principle: we are not sheep, and those who attack us will be punished. Yes, punished, in the most basic sense of the word.

—

When the Turks exterminated most of the Armenian nation in cruel acts of violence, the Armenians did not set out to collect material about those acts. They didn't print books about them. They did something else: Talaat Bey and the other pasha-executioners were killed by Armenians within the space of a year, wherever they were.³⁷

36 There is no evidence that Schwarzbard had ever planned to migrate to Palestine before he committed his deed. This assertion, along with the emphasis on Schwarzbard's youth (he was 40 years old and married at the time, hardly a situation befitting the Hebrew word *baḥur* [young unmarried man]), points to a tendency to transform him into a figure of mythical proportions virtually from the outset.

37 Reference to the assassination in Berlin on 15 March 1921 of the Young Turk leader Mehmed Talât (1872–1921), more commonly known as Talaat Bey, who had served as interior minister (1911–1915) and grand vizier (1915–1918) in the Ottoman Turkish government, by the exile Armenian Soghomon Tehlirian in revenge for Talât's role in the massacre of Ottoman Armenians in 1915–1916. Tehlirian was tried in June 1921 and acquitted on the grounds of diminished capacity. Schwarzbard's defenders found a precedent in the Tehlirian case; see Protsets fun armenishn student

We didn't do this. We gathered material about the pogroms and printed it in more than a few volumes. We set expert statisticians to work counting how many were slaughtered. We made all sorts of loud noises about the evil that was done to us. We didn't even know how to clench our teeth and remain silent.

Material about the pogroms in so many volumes – that was how we responded to the violence in Ukraine. It is a response worthy of the people of the book, of sheep for slaughter.

2

Here is another illustration of our “literariness”: A few years ago a review of the collections of material about the pogroms appeared in the [Yiddish] bibliographic monthly *Bikher velt*.³⁸ The review was written by a person who had been the minister for Jewish affairs in one of the Ukrainian governments, Mr. Silberfarb.³⁹ In it Silberfarb denied, incidentally and in passing, responsibility for doing nothing to organize a self-defense effort during the time he was a minister in Ukraine, before the pogroms. Trumpeldor⁴⁰ had dreamed about such a self-defense effort, and it was so easy to set it up then, in 1918, because there were arms to be had throughout Russia and because every village and gang of nationalists armed itself at the outset of the great chaos, when only those who were armed had the right to live.

That is a grave charge, if responsible ministers *abandoned* the Jewish fort at a time when everyone knew that *the knife was already poised to slit the*

Tehlirian far mord, Berlin 1921 [The Murder Trial of the Armenian Student Tehlirian], YIVO, RG80/476/39211–39220.

- 38 *Bikher velt* (Book World), bi-monthly bibliographic publication of the Warsaw based *Kultur-lige* (Culture League), an organization associated with the Jewish Socialist Bund whose purpose was to promote and to disseminate secular cultural production in the Yiddish language. Its first issue appeared in 1922.
- 39 Silberfarb also wrote a memoir of his service, entitled *Dos idishe ministryum un di idishe avtonomye in Ukrayne. A bletl geshikhte* [The Jewish Ministry and Jewish Autonomy in Ukraine. A Page of History], published in Kiev in 1918.
- 40 Josef Trumpeldor (1880–1920), Zionist activist and Russian army veteran who organized a force of Jews from Palestine (the Zion Mule Corps) to fight with the British army during the First World War. During the 1917 revolutions in Russia he played an instrumental role in forming the General Federation of Jewish Soldiers in Russia, which undertook to protect Jews against the violence of the revolutionary era. Leaving Russia for Palestine in 1919, he led a group of volunteers to defend Jewish settlements in the northern part of the country. His death in March 1920 during an exchange of gunfire between Jews and Arabs at Tel Hai in the Upper Galilee solidified his legacy as a hero in Jewish Palestine.

throat. They should be tried like Bazan, Stoessel, and others who betrayed their garrisons;⁴¹ they should be judged by their people. That is what civilized nations do.

Mr. Silberfarb was not put on trial. No one asked him to stand trial. He dismissed the serious charge himself, incidentally, in a passing review in a bibliographic journal. They didn't organize self-defense "so as not to set themselves apart from their left-wing parties," naturally.

A bibliographic monthly – a very fine place for a response by a member of the people of the book to the people of the book ...

Seven years the disgrace has been eating at our bones, the disgrace of "historical material" and reviews about the slaughter of the abandoned sheep ...

And now comes this news item.

We find one young man among the Jews who didn't gather material, one young man who perhaps wasn't so one-hundred-percent morally pure as a "sacrificial lamb" but who sacrificed himself and did what he did.

If so, then not all of us are sheep. There are still some who act like members of all other nations, simply and primitively. There is a difference between 1648⁴² and 1919.

"The people of Israel is alive" after all.

That too is a comfort for us.

H. Yeivin

Document 22

Moshe Beilinson

Tel Aviv, 8 June 1926

Published newspaper editorial

Language: Hebrew

Davar, vol. 2, no. 313, p. 2

41 Anatoly Mikhailovich Stoessel (1848–1915), military commander of the Russian garrison at Port Arthur, who surrendered to Japanese forces on 1 January 1905, at the conclusion of the Russo-Japanese war. Stoessel was convicted of treason and sentenced to death but was pardoned by the tsar in 1909.

42 The year of the Cossack uprising, to which the Ukrainian pogroms of 1919 were often compared. See above, Introduction, n. 202, Document 5, n. 17.

לא שמחה ולא נחמה

ברשימתו "על ידיעה אחת" (דבר, גל⁴³ ש"י) בענין פטליוורה נתן ה. ייבין ביטוי בולט מאד להרגשה אשר עברה אותו אחרי הידיעה על המקרה. בהתמרמרות אמתית הזכיר ייבין לנו איך נענו יהודים על הפרעות באוקריינה – ע"י⁴⁴ אסוף חומר ספרותי וסטטיסטי – "חומר לפרעות בכך וכך כרכים – זאת היתה תשובה שלנו, תשובה ראויה לעם הספר, לצאן ההרגה". עכשיו, אחרי הידיעה על הרצח, "דבר מה זע בנפש. דומה, כאילו אבן כבדה נגולה מהלב. דומה, כאילו איזו חרפה קשה שזה שבע שנים צרבה את לחיינו, הוסרה כעת... אם כן לא כולנו צאן, יש עוד כאלה שמתנהגים כבני כל העמים – באופן פשוט ופרימיטיבי. עם ישראל חי. וגם זאת נחמה בשבילנו". יש לשער שהרגשת ייבין היא הרגשת רבים. ובכל זאת נדמה לי, כי הרצח הפריסאי אינו כל כף פשוט וברור שאפשר יהיה להסתפק בהבעת סיפוק. הרצח הזה העמיד לפנינו מחדש את השאלה הנצחית על רשותו של בן אדם אחד לדון את רעהו למות. ההגנה על עצמו מפני מתנפל מוצדקת. אולי מוצדקת גם המלחמה בממשלה דספוטית בעזרת הפעולה הטרוריסטית נגד באי-כוחה – אני אמון גם בזה. אולם ברצח של פטליוורה לא היה משום הגנה עצמית ולא משום מלחמה נגד רבים. זהו משפט מות לבן אדם בשל עברו – ואין לפי דעתי רשות למישהו, בתנאים איזה שהם, לשפוט ככה. ויודע אני מה יענו לי: אין לגשת בקנה המדה של המשפט המופשט אל הענין הנורא אשר פטליוורה נעשה לו סמל. אך הפרובלימה במקומה נשארת.

ה. ייבין מוצא נחמה בזה "כי יש עוד כאלה שמתנהגים כבני כל העמים, באופן פשוט ופרימיטיבי". אבל שכל ולב ניתנו לנו, לבני אדם, כדי לכלכל את מעשינו לא בפשטות ובפרימיטיביות אלא בבינה ובצדק. ואם דבר זה או אחר נהוג אצל "בני כל העמים", אין זאת אומרת, כי גם אנו צריכים לעשות כן. ואפילו לפני המעשה הטרגי שקרה בפאריס, עלינו לנסות לתת לעמצנו דו"ח⁴⁵

נהרג לא בן אדם אשר בידו השלטון, אשר היה הכרח להפסיק את פעולתו המזיקה. נהרג "אמיגרנט" – שדרכו הפוליטית נגמרה לפני חמש שנים, ונגמרה בהחלט, יען כי כמעט שלא היתה שום תקווה לפטליוורה לשוב לאוקריינה. אם כן – במובן הפוליטי אין צורך לעם היהודי ברצח הזה. אבל הוא מזיק בכל אופן. הרבה מן האוקריינים, אשר תנועתם אינה נקיה מסין[מ]נים של פנטיזם לאומי, יראו בזה התנפלות של יהודים על העם האוקרייני. הקולו היהודי בסיים הפולני היה כבר מוכרח לאחוז באמצעים להחליש את הרושם הזה – והוא אולי עוד יתחזק במשך המשפט. וכאשר תקום מחדש תנועה אוקריינית – אם בפולין ואם ברוסיה – איני יודע, אם לא יהיה משקל רב לגוית פטליוורה, גם אם לתנועה החדשה לא יהיה שום דבר משותף עם "פטליוריזם". ובקרב האוקריינים יושבים מיליוני יהודים. שוב יודע אנכי את התשובה – ה"חשבונות הפוליטית" הזאת אינה ראויה לעם הלוחם בעד שחרורו וכבודו. אבל הנזק לעם היא עובדה הקיימת גם אחרי הנימוק הזה.

בשמו של פטליוורה קשור אסון לעם ישראל. ואולם ישנה עדות – למשל של מיניסטר לעניני חוץ של פטליוורה, מרגולין, או של מיניסטר לעניני יהודים באותו מיניסטרוון, רבוצקי – האומרת, כי היה פה משגה פטלי, וכי פטליוורה נלחם נגד הפרעות. הישנה עדות

43 גליון.

44 על ידי.

45 דין וחשבון.

מתנגדת לזו? כן. ואיני יודע אם נגמר כבר המשפט, אם אפשר כבר לחרוץ את פסק-הדין. בכל אופן ברור, כי לא היה פטליורה על-פי עדות רבים אלא איש קטן מאד וכאין היה בים המאורעות ברוסיה בתקופה הסוערת ההיא ובארץ ההיא, אשר בה שלטה האכזריות הפראית והעבדות – בת אלפים בשנים – של האכזרים האוקריינים עם שנאתם העזת בת מאות השנים ליהודים.

ואם זה ככה, מה נשאר מרצח פטליורה? ספוק מוסרי? הוא היה מובן אילו התלאה, ללא שם וללא מספר, אשר הצטברה מסביב לאסון האוקרייני. חדלה – לו גם בחלק קטן – להיות תלאה מפני שפטליורה איננו, משום שיד יהודית גדתו. זאת אינני רואה. ואם מי שהוא יבוא עכשיו ליתומי אוקריינה ויגיד להם: "התנחמו, כי דם הוריתם נוקם", אדם זה יעשה מעשה רע ויכוון את לבבות הילדים בדרך בלתי נכונה.

נשאת עוד "הוכחה", כי עם ישראל לא צאן הוא. את ההוכחה הזאת – לא, כמוכח, בשביל אחרים, אלא בשביל עצמנו – מחויב העם היהודי לחפש בלי הרף. בזה צדק ייבין כשם שצדק בדבריו, כי לא באוסף חומר היסטורי יש לחפש הוכחה זו. אבל גם, לא בנקמה מצללי העבר. את ההוכחה הזאת מחויב עם ישראל לחפש במלחמה בלתי פוסקת – בכל מקום, בקרב כל עם ועם, תמיד – נגד כל מיני גלויי אלמות, נגד כל מיני נצול, כל מיני רע, נגד כל זה שאפשר את השחיטה האוקריינית; את ההוכחה מחויב עם ישראל לחפש בבנין מולדתו. וכאשר יתן את ההוכחה הזאת, אז יגיד: עם ישראל חי.

האם פרוזאית היא, תשובה זו, פעוטה, חסרת גבורה? אני חושב, כי בה שאר רוח, בה גודל, בה גבורה וגם אמת.

לא כדי להטיל צל איזו שהיא על שווארצבארד כתובות השורות האלו – קרבנו טהור הוא. אבל זו לא הפעם הראשונה, אשר יש הכרח להבדיל בין כוונה למעשה. ומעשה זה אינו צריך לעורר לא שמחה ולא נחמה. חוליה אחת בשרשרת הפרעות של יהודי אוקריינה. ויהי רצון כי תהא האחרונה.

מ. בילינסון

Translation

Neither Joy nor Comfort

In his piece, "Concerning One News Item" (*Davar*, no. 310),⁴⁶ regarding Petliura, H. Yeivin gave quite clear expression to the feeling that passed over him upon receiving news of the event. With genuine bitterness Yeivin reminded us of how Jews responded to the pogroms in Ukraine – by gathering literary and statistical material – "material about the pogroms in so many volumes – that was how we responded to the violence in Ukraine. It is a response worthy of the people of the book, of sheep for slaughter." Now,

46 Document 21.

following the news of the murder, “something stirred in my soul. It seems as though a heavy burden had been lifted. It seems as though a major disgrace that has been burning away at us for seven years has now been removed ... If so, then *not all of us* are sheep. There are still some who act like members of all other nations, simply and primitively. The people of Israel is alive. That too is a comfort for us.” Presumably Yeivin’s feeling is the feeling of many. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the murder in Paris is not quite so clear and simple as to elicit nothing but expressions of satisfaction.

This murder laid before us once again the eternal problem of whether it is permissible for one human being to condemn his fellow human being to death. Self-defense against an attacker is justified. Perhaps terrorist action against representatives of a despotic regime is also justified – I believe so. But in the murder of Petliura there was no self-defense and no war against the many. It is a death sentence upon a human being because of his past, and in my opinion no one has permission to impose such a sentence under any conditions. I know the answer: one must not approach the horrible affair of which Petliura has become a symbol according to the standards of abstract justice. But the problem persists.

H. Yeivin finds comfort in the notion that “there are still some who act like members of all other nations, simply and primitively.” But we human beings have been given an intellect and a heart so that they may nourish our actions not simply and primitively but with understanding and with justice. If something is common among “members of all other nations,” this does not mean that we must do the same. Even before the tragic event in Paris, we need to render an accounting to ourselves.

It wasn’t a person in power who was killed, one whose dangerous actions had to be stopped. The one who was killed was an “emigré” whose political career had come to an end five years earlier – come to a complete end, because Petliura had virtually no chance of returning to Ukraine. If so, then the Jewish people did not need this murder for political reasons. Still, it is harmful. Many Ukrainians, whose national movement is not free of signs of national fanaticism, will see in it an attack by Jews upon the Ukrainian people. The Jewish caucus in the Polish Sejm has already been forced to adopt measures to mitigate this impression, which may become even stronger during the trial. And when a Ukrainian national movement rises again, whether in Poland or in Russia, I do not know if Petliura’s corpse will not carry great weight even if the new movement has nothing in common with “Petliurism.” And there are millions of Jews living amidst the Ukrainians. Again, I know the reply: this sort of “political bookkeeping” is not worthy of a nation fighting for its liberation and its honor. But even after this justification is taken into account, the damage to the people remains.

A catastrophe for the Jewish people is connected with Petliura's name. But there are also testimonies – from Petliura's foreign minister, Margolin, for example,⁴⁷ or from the minister for Jewish affairs in the same government, Revutsky⁴⁸ – according to which there was a fatal mistake, that Petliura fought against the pogroms. Are there any testimonies to the contrary? Yes. And I don't know whether the jury is still out, whether it is possible already to issue a judgment. In any case it is clear that according to the testimony of many people Petliura was nothing but a very small man, insignificant in the sea of troubles in Russia in that stormy time and place where savage cruelty reigned along with the Ukrainian peasants' two-thousand-year-old bondage and their centuries-old blind hatred of the Jews.

And if that is the case, then what remains from Petliura's murder? Moral satisfaction? That would be obvious except for the nameless, incalculable, accumulated suffering over the Ukrainian catastrophe. Has the suffering stopped, even in small measure, because Petliura is no longer alive, because a Jewish hand cut him down? I don't see this. If someone were to come now to the [Jewish] orphans of Ukraine and say to them, "Take comfort; your parents' blood has been avenged," that person would be doing an evil deed and would be directing the hearts of the children in an improper direction.

One "proof" remains that the Jewish people is not a bunch of sheep. The Jewish people must search for this proof constantly – not for the sake of others, of course, but for its own sake. Yeivin was right about this, as he was right when he said that this proof is not to be sought in a collection of historical documents. But it is also not [to be sought] in revenge for the shadows of the past. The Jewish people must seek this proof in a ceaseless struggle – everywhere, always, among every nation – against any sort of violence, against any sort of exploitation, against any sort of evil, against everything that made the Ukrainian slaughter possible. The Jewish people must search for this proof by

47 Margolin actually held the position of deputy foreign minister. Margolin's most familiar statement in this regard was made in a 1919 interview with the London *Jewish Chronicle*, subsequently reprinted in Batchinsky, *The Jewish Pogroms in Ukraine*, 19: "The Ukraine Government has steadfastly set its face against the pogroms, and it had no part in, or responsibility for them. At the time of Petlura's coup d'etat in November 1918, I myself read, in numerous towns and villages in the Ukraine, proclamations issued by the Government strongly condemning pogroms, explaining to the people that Jews were fellow-citizens and brothers who were helping in the evolution of the Ukrainian State, and to whom the fullest rights were due. The proclamations declared that pogroms must tend to discredit the Ukraine in the eyes of the civilized world, and those who took part in them were no friends of their country."

48 See above, Document 20, n. 33.

building up its homeland. And when it offers this proof, then let it say, "The Jewish people lives."

Is this a prosaic answer, petty, devoid of heroism? I think that there is inspiration in it, greatness, heroism, and truth.

These lines have not been written in order to cast even the slightest aspersion upon Schwarzbard; his sacrifice is pure. But this is not the first time that it has become necessary to distinguish between intent and action. And this action should arouse neither joy nor comfort. It is one link in Ukrainian Jewry's chain of violence. May it be the last.

M. Beilinson

Document 23

Marvin Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress

Paris, 25 June 1926

Typewritten letter, 2 pages; typewritten corrections; handwritten note ("Copy Dr. Wise") in upper left corner

Language: English

AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 91

CONFIDENTIAL

June 25, 1926.

The American Jewish Congress,
New York.

Gentlemen:

The following information is in no way meant for publication.

Following the murder of Petlura [sic], an epidemic of offers of money, legal assistance, information, mass-meetings (exactly what for – the mass meetings, I mean – would be difficult to say) poured into Paris from most [of] the Jewries of the world. These offers were for the most part as injudicious as they were well-meaning. Money, undoubtedly, will be required in order to give Schwartzbard [sic] all possible advantages in his trial. Information must likewise be placed at the disposal of S's lawyer, Torres, who is, as you know, one of the leading criminal lawyers of France. But offers of money

and advice and moral support were in general coupled with the idea of securing these necessities by public appeal and public demonstration. Nothing could be more inadvisable. France is not Poland. The French court cannot, in advance, be suspected of being unfair to S. because he is a Jew. As a matter of fact, France is a very favorable country in which to commit a political murder. And, moreover, up to date French public opinion, as expressed in all the newspapers except the extreme right (Le Action Francaise [sic]), is sympathetic toward S. Any undue demonstrations on the part of the Jews or public collection of funds might well change this sympathy. In other words, anything but silence – until the trial – is not only unwise, it is unnecessary. The money that will be needed can surely be collected without propaganda and publicity.

In order to channel the goodwill and offers of assistance that have come in from all quarters – it seemed for a moment as though every Jewish lawyer in the world wanted to defend the case and every Jewish layman wanted to pay for it – a committee was formed of Jews living in France. So far the committee consists of the following: Motzkin, Dr. Victor Jacobson, Vishniac (a Russian jurist occupied with minority questions), Naiditch, Grand Rabbi Eisenstadt (formerly of Petrograd), Robert Salomon of the Quotidien, M. Le-cache of Paris Soir, M. Grumbach likewise of Quotidien, M. Sliosberg, MM. Zinovi and Vladimir Tiomkin, M. Koulicher (formerly a professor in the University of Petrograd), M. Goldstein (formerly president of the Russian Committee[e] for Relief of Pogrom Victims in 1919–20), M. Herman (journalist), M. Jarblum, André Spire, Henri Hertz (novelist), Fernand Corcos (lawyer), I. Trivus (lawyer who wrote book on pogroms), Léon Blum, M. Chapiro (member of Comité Défense Social and close to Schwartzbard), Sholem Asch, Edmond Fleg, Jefroykin⁴⁹ and Grunberg of the Comité de Secours, Vinaver the Russian lawyer and member of first Duma, Tcherikover, Chtchoupak (social democrat connected with Ort⁵⁰), Pierre [2] Bernard (likewise of the Comité Défense Social, a French syndicalist organization, and close to Schwartzbard), Tsatskis (of the Comité Delegations Juives), and myself.

The purpose of this organization, as I said, is to furnish a unified direction to the many unofficial efforts made to aid S. It tries to furnish correct information to the press. It is directing the collection of all sorts of material for the defense – data on the pogroms chiefly. It is getting up a brochure in

49 Israel Efroykin.

50 Russian Acronym for *Obshchestvo Remeslennogo Truda* (Society for Craft Labor), an organization founded in 1880 for equipping indigent Jews with skills needed for employment in industry and agriculture. Following the First World War it opened branches throughout Europe and North America.

French and English, which however will not be published until the time is ripe. This organization is – how shall I say? – neither secret nor open. It is simply a matter one should not talk about or write about.

The Executive Committee of the organization consists of Motzkin, Spire, Tiomkin, Efroykin, Lecache – with Tcherikover the secretary. Attached to it is a committee of jurists, Sliosberg, Vinaver, and Goldstein.

Motzkin left for Berlin two days ago (from London) and Tcherikover today – in order to examine the large collections of pogrom material gathered there. Tcherikover will remain a month and will be aided by Dubnow, Krainin, and Lechtchinski of Berlin, who are, as it were, extra-territorial [m]embers of the Committee.

At first blush it might appear that a group of Jews living in France are trying to monopolize the control of the situation. Perhaps they are; but the circumstances are such – as you can see at once – that this is both advisable and necessary.

In conclusion let me touch upon the fact that Americans are beginning to be unpopular in France – and they will continue to be for exactly 62 years.⁵¹ The trial will not take place at least for five or six months. As things develop I shall write you.

Sincerely yours,
!Marvin Lowenthal!

Document 24

*Schwarzbard Defense Committee to Editorial Board, Jewish Daily Forward*⁵²

Paris, 27 June 1926

Typewritten letter, 3 pages

Language: Yiddish

CAHJP, P243/3

51 Most likely a facetious remark; the figure 62 does not appear to have any significance.

52 Common name for the Yiddish-language daily *Forverts*, published in New York beginning in 1897. At the time of Petliura's assassination it was the largest Yiddish-language newspaper in the world, with circulation estimated at some 275,000 at the end of the 1920s.

יוני 27, 1926
 צו דער רעדאקציע "פאר ווערטס"
 ניריארק

שטרענג קאנפידענציעל

זער געשעצטע פריינט,

אין צוזאמענהאנג מיט דעם פראצעס פון שווארצבארד האָט זיך דאָ אַרגאניזירט א פארטיידיגונגסקאָמיטעט, וואָס זיין ציל איז צוצוגרייטן אלע מאטעריאלן וועגן די אידישע פאָגראָמען אין אוקריינע און וועגן דער ראָלע וואָס פעטליוורא האָט אין די דאָזיקע פאָגראָמען געשפילט, ווי אויך צו אַרגאניזירן די פארטיידיגונג בכלל. דער קאָמיטעט געפינט זיך אין קאָנטאקט מיט שווארצבארד'ס פארטיידיקער אנרי טאָרעס, וועמען ער וועט די אלע מאטעריאלן איבערגעבן. דער קאָמיטעט וועט אין הסכּם מיט אים ארויסרופן די עדות וואָס קאָנען נוצליך זיין פאר דער פארטיידיגונג, הן אזוינע וואָס האָבן אליין איבערגעלעבט די פאָגראָמען, הן אזוינע וואָס קאָנען געבן א ריכטיקע אָפּשאצונג פון די פאָליטישגעזעלשאפטליכע [אומשטענדן] פון דעם פאָגראָם־פּעריאָד און די ראָלע] פון די איינצעלנע פאָגראָם־העלדן. -- די מאטעריאלן פאר די פאָגראָמען זיינען צעזייהט און צעשפרייט אין פארשידענע לענדער און שטעט, די עדות געפינען זיך אויך אין פארשידענע וועלט־טיילן. דאָס אלץ צונויפצונעמען איז פארבונדן מיט א סך ארבעט און מיט גאנץ באדייטענדע הוצאות. עס איז איצט נאָך שווער פאָרצושטעלן א גענויעם ביודזשעט. בכלאופן איז שוין קלאָר, אז ער וועט דארפן דערגרייכן א באדייטענדע סומע. די דאָזיקע סומע וואָלט געווען נאָך העכער, ווען אנרי טאָרעס וואָלט זיך ניט אָפּגעזאָגט פון יעדער באליוונג פאר זיין ארבעט און ווען די פרוי שווארצבארד וואָלט זיך ניט אָפּגעזאָגט פון |2| יעדער געזעלשאפטליכער שטיץ, דערקלערענדיק אז זי האָט ביז איצט מיט ארבעט געמאכט איר לעבן, וועט זי אויך וייטער אזוי טאָן.

אָפיציעל האָט דער קאָמיטעט ניט דערקלערט וועגן זיין עקזיסטענץ. צוליב כמה טעמים האלטן מיר ניט פאר געוואונשן אויפצוהויבן דאָ אין פראנקרייך א צו גרויסן טומעל פאר דער צייט. ווער ס'קען די היגע פאָליטישע אומשטענדן, פאר דעם וועלן די דאָזיקע טעמים זיין קלאָר. מיר טיילן דאָ אייך מיט אוי[ס]שליסליך פאר אייער אינפארמאציע נעמען פון אייניגע מיטגלידער פון קאָמיטעט, וועלכע דארפן בשום אופן ניט פארעפענטליכט ווערן, אָפּגערעדט פון אלגעמיינע פאָליטישע מאַטיוון, שוין צוליב דעם פשוט'ן טעם, וואָס מע קאָן קיינמאָל ניט זיין גאראנטירט קעגן די נקמה־שטימונגען, וואָס דער אטענטאט פון פעטליוורא'ן האָט ארויסגערופן אין די אוקריינישע נאציאָנאליסטישע און אנטיסעמיטישע קרייזן. צווישן אנדערע באקאנטע פּערזאָנען זיינען צום קאָמיטעט צוגעשטאנען: פון די רר סישידישע טוער, חוץ די צוויי אונטערגעזעצטע, ה'ה⁵³ סליאָזבערג, גידיטש, וולאדי מיר טיאָמקין (געוועזענער פאָרזיצער פון דער אידישער נאציאָנאלער פארזאמלונג אין אוקריינע) |שאפירא (פארשטייער פון די ראדיקאלע ריכטונגען)| א. טשעריקאָווער, פאָרשער פון די פאָגראָמען; פון די פראנצויזישע אידען: לעאָן בלום, אנדריי ספיר (באוואוסטער שריפטשטעלער), אנרי הערץ (באוואוסטער היסטאָריקער און שריפטשטעלער), גרומבאך

גענעראל-סעקרעטאר פון דער פראנצויזישער סאָציאליסטישער פארטיי), עדמאָנד פלעג (דראמאטורג), בערנארד לעקאש און ראָבערט סאלאָמאָן (זשורנאליסטן פון גרויסע פראנצויזישע צייטונגען), דער בארימטער אדוואָקאט פערנאנד קאַרקאָס און אנדערע. אלס פאָרזיצער פון קאָמיטעט איז אויסגעקליבן ה'54 לעאָ מאָצקין.

ווי איר זעהט, באשטייט דער קאָמיטעט פון פערזענליכקייטן 131 וואָס פארטרעטן די פארשיידענסטע פאָליטישע ריכטונגען, וואָס קאָנען דינען אלס א פולע גאראנטיע פאר זיין אומפארטייאישקייט.

חוץ די אידישע מיטגלידער פון קאָמיטעט, ווערן צו דער פארטיידיגונג צוגעצויגען א רייע באקאנטע פראנצויזישע פאָליטיקער, וועלכע האָבן פארשפראַכן זייער פולע מיטוויר-קונג.

מיר ווענדן זיך איצט צון אייך מיט דער בקשה, איר זאָלט קומען צו הילף דעם דאָזיקן פארטיידיגונגס-קאָמיטעט מיט אלץ וואָס נאָר מעגליך הן מאָראליש הן מאטיריעל. -- אויב אין אייער רשות געפינען זיך וועלכע ניט איז מאטעריאלן און אינפארמאציעס וואָס קאָנען נוצליך זיין פאר דער פארטיידיגונג, בעטן מיר אייך דאָס צושיקן. אויב איר האָט שוין וועל-כע ניט איז פאָנדן פאר דעם צוועק אָבער אויב איר קאָנט פאר דעם וועלכע ניט איז סומע באשטימען, בעטן מיר אייך ווי מעגליך גיכער זיי איבערצושיקן דעם קאָמיטעט פאר די הוצאות וואָס זיינען אויבן אָנגעוויזן.

געלט קאָנט איר שיקן אפן נאָמען פון לעאָן בלום :

Monsieur le deputé LEON BLUM
126, B-D MONTPARNASSE, PARIS

אין בריוו וועט איר אזוי גוט זיין אָנווייזן, אז דאָס געלט איז באשטימט פארן פאר-טיידיגונגס-קאָמיטעט.

Translation

June 27, 1926
To the Editorial Board of *Forverts*
New York

Strictly confidential

Most Esteemed Friends,

In connection with the trial of *Schwarzbard* a Defense Committee has been organized here for the purpose of preparing all materials about the Jewish pogroms in Ukraine and about the role that Petliura played in those

pogroms, as well as to organize the defense in general. The Committee is in contact with Schwarzbard's defense attorney, Henri Torrès, to whom it will give all its materials. With his agreement the Committee will summon the witnesses who may be useful for the defense, both those who survived the pogroms and those who can give a proper evaluation of the sociopolitical [circumstances] of the pogrom era and of the role of the individual protagonists. Materials concerning the pogroms are scattered throughout various countries and cities; the witnesses also live in different parts of the world. Pulling all of this together involves considerable work and significant expenses. At this time it is still difficult to envision a precise budget. Nonetheless it is clear that it will necessarily rise to a significant sum. That sum would be even higher if Henri Torrès had not refused any compensation for his work and if Mrs. Schwarzbard had not refused [2] any social support, declaring that until this point she has made her living from labor and will continue to do so henceforth as well.

The Committee has not officially proclaimed its existence. For several reasons we believe it is not desirable to raise too much noise here in France before it is time. Those reasons will be clear to anyone who knows the local political circumstances. Here we are informing you exclusively *for your information* the names of several members of the Committee, which should under no circumstances be published for the simple reason that, general political reasons aside, one can never give a guarantee against the voices of revenge that the assassination of Petliura has aroused in Ukrainian nationalist and antisemitic circles. Among other well-known personages the following have joined the Committee: Of Russian Jewish public figures, besides the two undersigned,⁵⁵ Messieurs Sliosberg, Naiditch, Vladimir Tiomkin (former chair of the Jewish National Assembly in Ukraine), 'Shapira (leader of the radically-inclined) E. Tcherikower, a scholar of the pogroms; of French Jews, Léon Blum, André Spire (well-known author), Henri Hertz (well-known historian and author), [Salomon] Grumbach (secretary-general of the French Socialist Party), Edmond Fleg (dramatist), Bernard Lecache and Robert Solomon (journalists for major French newspapers), the famous lawyer Fernand Corcos, and others. Leo Motzkin was chosen Committee chair.

As you see, the Committee consists of personalities [3] who represent the most varied political tendencies, a fact that can guarantee fully its nonpartisan character.

55 The signatures are absent on the archival copy of the letter. The two most prominent figures in the Defense Committee who are not listed (and are therefore likely to have signed the letter) were Leo Motzkin and Josef Schechtman.

Besides the Jewish members of the Committee a number of well-known French political figures have been enlisted in the defense; they have promised their full cooperation.

We are approaching you now with a request to assist the Defense Committee in any way possible, both morally and materially. If you have in your possession any materials or information that may be useful for the defense, we ask you to send them to us. If you already have any funds for this purpose or if you could designate any sum for it, we ask you to send them to the Committee as quickly as possible to cover the expenses noted above.

You may send money in the name of Léon Blum:

Monsieur le député LEON BLUM
126, B-D MONTPARNASSE, PARIS

Please indicate in your letter that the money is designated for the Defense Committee.

Document 25

Abraham Liessin
New York, July 1926
Published journal editorial
Language: Yiddish
*Di tsukunft,*⁵⁶ *July 1926, pp. 375–376*

א. ליעסין

שלום שווארצבארד

כאַשר שכלה נשים חרבך
כן תשכל מנשים אמך.
(שמואל)

56 Monthly founded in New York in 1892 as a platform primarily for Jewish socialist thought. Under the editorship of Abraham Liessin from 1913 to 1938 it became one of the Jewish world's leading intellectual and literary journals.

זאָלען די באַרוהיגטע, וואָס זיינען פילייכט קיין מאָל אומרוהיג ניט געווען, זיך פשט'לען און חקירה'ן און אויפווייזען, אַז מען האָט עס ניט געדאַרפט טהאָן. שלום שוואַרצבארד איז קיין באַרוהיגטער ניט געווען.

ער האָט געוואוסט, אז נאָהענט פון איהם אין פאַריז דרייט זיך ערגעץ אַרום פראַנק און פריי פעטלורא, דער הויפט פון די קוילער אין אוקראַינע. און דאָס האָט איהם פאַר'סמ'ט די טעג און די נעכט אין דער פרעהליכער הויפט־שטאָט. די פאריזער לופט איז פאַר איהם געווען אַנגעלאָדען מיט די שאַטענס פון די געשענדעטע, פאַרפייניגטע, צופאַלמעסטע, מיט די בלייכע און שטומע שאַטענס פון זקנים און בחורים'לאך, פון זקנות און יונגינקע מיידלאַך, פון מוטערס און זויגקינדער. אין די צעהנדליגער טויזענטער האַבען זיי אומגעוועהט פאַר איהם, טאָג און נאכט מיט'ן בלייכען און שטומען פאַרוואורף, טיילענדיג אויפ'ן אונבאַ־שטראַפטען פייניגער און שענדער און מערדער זייערען.

און אַזוי ווי פריהער אויפ'ן רוף פון פראַנקרייך צו קעמפפּען פאַר דער רעפּובליק, און אַזוי ווי שפעטער אויפ'ן רוף פון רוסלאַנד צו קעמפפּען פאַר דער רעוואָלוציע, אַזוי האָט ער זיך אויך איצט אָפּגערוּפּען און זיין לעבען צוגעטראָגען.

אזוי ווי הירש לעקערט, אזוי ווי די קדושים פון די פארישעדיענע זעלבסט־שוין אַרגאני־זאציעס, האָט ער אין עקסטאז זיין יונגען לעבען צוגעטראָגען.
ליבער און טייערער שוואַרצבארד – אונזער גואל הדם!

* *

*

שוואַרצבארד'ס קויל האָט דורכגעשאַסען ניט נאָר דעם נידערטערעכטיגען אַוואַנטור ריסט, וואָס האָט דורך זיינע אטאמאנען די אידען געשאַכטען און דורך זיינע אידליקעס די אידען געלאַשצט; שוואַרצבארד'ס קויל האָט דורכגעשאַסען אויך די נידערטערעכטיגע פארשווערונג די שעכטערייען צו פארשווייגען און די לאַשצערייען פאנאנדערצופויקען.
און דאָס ווענדט זיך שוין אָן אונז אַלעמען, אָן די אַנשטריינגונגען פון כלל ישראל, אַז אָט די דורכגעשאַסענע פאַרשווערונג זאָל אויך אַוועק אויפ'ן עולם האמת, אַזוי ווי עס איז אַוועק דער דורכגעשאַסענער פעטלורא.

מיר געדיינקען די טעג, ווען די פעטלורעס און די דעניקינס און די באַלאַכאָוויטשעס און די האַלערס זיינען געהאנגען פינסטער אויפ'ן אידישען הימעל און באַגאַסען די אידען מיט טויט, אַזוי ווי וואַלקענס מיט רעגען. און מיר געדיינקען, ווי אַזוי די זעלבע אידען, געגען וועלכע מען האָט געהעצט אין דער היים ווי געגען בלוט־זויגערס און קאַפּיטאַליס־טען, האָט מען אַרויסגעשטעלט אין דער פרעמד, אין די לענדער פון די אַנטאַנט־מלוכות, ווי געפעהרליכע קאַמוניסטען. און דאָס איז געווען גענוג צו מאַכען די אידען פאַרהאַסט אין דער אַנצער וועלט ביי אַלע בלוט־זויגערס און קאַפּיטאַליסטען. מיר געדיינקען, ווי אַזוי דער פאַרשטאַרבנער פרעזידענט ווילסאָן איז געווען שטייגלייכגילטיג און שטיי־קאַלט צו אַלע יאָמער־געבעטען אונזערע, ווי אַזוי ער פלעגט אַרומפאַהרען און פייערען מיט רע־דעס געגען די טערקען פאַר דער "קריסטליכער אַרמענישער נאַציע" און מיט פאַריסענער עקשנות אַ פּיפּס ניט טהאָן וועגען די געשאַכטענע אידען, ווי אַזוי זיין אויסערען מיניס־טער, דער טעמפּער לאַקעי לאַנסיונג, האָט אויף דעם באַליידיגענדסטען אופן אויפגענומען אַ שתדלנות־דעלעגאַציע פון די פראַמינענטסטע יהודים. און מיר געדענקען, ווי אַזוי די גאַנצע אַמעריקאַנער פרעסע איז טויב־שטום געוואָרען צו יעדען אפּיעל אונזערען, אזוי ווי א געהיימע האנד וואָלט זי צוגעהאַקט פאַר אונז. טאַג־טעגליך פלעגען מיר באַקומען פאַ־

גראַסנאַכריכטען איינע פון די אַנדערע שרעקליכער, וואָס פלעגען שמייסען די נשמות, ווי פייערדיגע בייטשען. ווייטער אָבער פון די קאַלומס פון די אידישע צייטונגען פלעגען זיי בשום אופן ניט דורכדרינגען.

און דאָס אַליין איז שוין געווען אַ טייוועלשער וואונק צו יעדען, וואָס שעכט, אַז ער וועט בלייבען גערעכט. עס איז שטענדיג געווען דאָס געפיהל פון אונבאַשטראָפּטקייט, וואָס פלעגט שאַפען דעם פּאָגראַמשטיק. עס איז דער באַוואוסטזיין, אז פאר אידען וועט מען זיך ניט אָננעהמען, אז זיין גוט און בלוט איז הפקר, וואָס פלעגט דערמוטיגען דעם כר ליגאַן זיך אַריינצורייסען אין די אידישע הייזער און רויבען און שענדען און מאַרדען. און אַט דעם באַוואוסטזיין און די געפיהלען, וואָס די רוסישע צאַרען פלעגען וועקען און האַדעווען ביי די איינצעלנע כוליגאַנעס, האַבען די ווילסאַנס אויפגעוועקט און אויפגעהאַדעוועט ביי גאַנצע כוליגאַנישע שטאַטען. וואָלטען, למשל, די גרויסע הערען אין פאַריז תיכף נאָך דער לעמבערגער שחיטה אַרויסגעקומען געגען די שוחטים מיט אַ צושמעטערענדער וואַרנונג, דאָן וואָלטען קיין פּאָגראַמען מעהר ניט פּאָרגעקומען. איז דאָך די פּוילישע מלוכה וואָס האָט געמאַכט די פּאָגראַמען, פון ווילסאַנען אַליין דעמאַלט טאַקע געמאַכט געוואָרען. איין וואָרט, איין וואונק זיינער וואָלט געווען גענוג די פּאָגראַמען אַפּצושטעלען. ווילסאַן האָט אָבער דעם וואָרט ניט געזאָגט, דעם וואונק ניט געגעבען. און די כוליגאַנישע פּוילישע מלוכה האָט דערפיהלט – פּונקט ווי דער קישענעווער כוליגאַן פלעגט פיהלען אונטער'ן צאַרען־רעזשים – אַז געגען אידען איז אַלץ דערלויבט.

מיט דער לעמבערגער שחיטה האָט זיך דער פּרידענס־קאַנפּערענץ אין פאַריז געעפּענט און מיט דער פּינסקער שחיטה האָט ער זיך געשלאָסען. און די פּאָגראַמען זיינען ווייטער אָנגעגאַנגען. די פּוילישע מלוכה האָט זיך ניט אַפּגעשטעלט אַ טראַכט צו טהאָן וועגען אַן אויפגערעגטער עפענטליכער מיינונג אין מערב אייראָפּאָ און אַמעריקע, ווי עס פלעגט אַמאַל פּאַסירען אין צאַרען־רוסלאַנד. אין מערב אייראָפּאָ און אַמעריקע איז די עפענטליכע מיינונג ניט אויפגערעגט געווען, זי איז אין גאַנצען ניט אינפּאַרמירט געווען וועגען די פּאָגראַמען. אין געגענטייל, מען האָט אומעטום געהאַט גרויסע סימפּאַטיען צום באַפּרייטען פּוילען, וואָס איז נאָך 130 יאָהר צוטיילונג און קנעכטשאַפט צוריק גאַנץ און אונאַפהענגיג געוואָרען. און די אינפּאַרמירטע קרייזען האָט דער פּאָליאַק פּאַרשאַנען ווי אַזוי צו בעאַר־רבייטען. דער פּוילישער יעזואיט האָט זיך אַרויסגעוויזען פיעל געשיקטער, איידער דער אומגעלומפערטער צאַרישער בער. און אַזוי ווי נאָך די ערשטע רוסישע מפלות אין וועלט קריג האָט דער פּאָליאַק אַרויסגעלאָזען דעם בלבול פון "זשידאָוסקען פאַראַרט", און די רוסישע גענעראַלען, וואָס האַבען געדאַרפט האַבען אַ שעריר לעזאזל, האַבן דעם בלבול אָנגענומען, און זיי האַבען דעם אידען פאַרטריבען און אין די אידישע קראַמען אַריינגעלאָזען דעם פּאָליאַק, אַזוי האָט דער פּאָליאַק אויך שפּעטער, ווען פאַר די פאַרמעגליכע קלאַסען איז אויפגעשטאַנען דאָס רויע געשפּענסט פון דער סאַציאַלער רעוואָלוציע, אַרויסגעלאָזען דעם געשריי פון "זשידאָוסקען באַלשעוויזם", און די גאַנצע פּריציפּל־בורזשוואַזע וועלט איז זעהר צופרידען געווען צו האַבען אַ שעריר לעזאזל, אויף וועמען אַפּצוציהען די עלעקטרי־זירטע אומרוהיגקייט פון די מאַסען, און ממילא איז מען שוין אויך צופרידען געווען אין די הויכע פענסטער אין מערב אייראָפּאָ און אַמעריקע. אויף די אידישע בערג מיט הרוגים האָט מען גענומען קוקען, ווי אויף אונטערשפּאַרונגען, וואָס העלפען אויפצוהאַלטען דעם דורכגעפּוילטען סדר פון דער וועלט.

און די אונבאַשטראָפּטע פּוילישע פּאָגראַמשטיקעס האַבען באַלד געקראַגען די ריכ־

טיגע נאָכמאַכער – די אוראייניקלאַך פון טאַמערלאַן און כמעלניצקי און די היידאַמאַקען. ווי אַ העליש פייער, האָבען זיך די אונגעשטערטע פּאַגראַמען איבער-1376 געטראָגען אין דער טעריטאָריע פון פעטלורא און דעניקין, און אונזער דור איז געוואָרען דער אויפגע- שוידערטער עדות פון אַ נייער גזרת ת"ח. די ערד פון גאַנטא און זשלעזניאק, וואָס האָבען געפייערט דעם "בלוטיגען יום טוב", און פון טאַראָס שעוטשענקא, וואָס האָט דעם יום טוב אַזוי קאַניבאַליש באַזונגען, איז ווידער בוכשטעבליך פאַרפלייצט געוואָרען מיט טייכען אידישע בלוטען. און דאַשינסקי פון דער פ.פ.ס. האָט דערקלערט, אז פוילען שטעהט אין אַ לעבען אַנטאַנט מיט פעטלורא'ן, און ווילסאָן האָט דערקלערט, אז ער שטעהט אין אַ לעבען אַנטאַנט מיט פוילען, ממילא שוין אויך מיט פעטלורא'ן. און דזשאדווין, ווילסאָן'ס אַפיציעלער שליח אין אוקראינע, האָט געלויבט און געהויבען דעניקינ'ען. און די קוילער האָבען אַלץ געקוילעט און געקוילעט, און די צייטונגען האָבען אַלץ געשוויגען און גע- שוויגען.

דער פוילישער שליאַכטשיטש, דער באַגייסטערער פון די אידען-שחיתות אין אוק- ראַינע און ווייסרוסלאַנד, איז געוואָרען, אויסער די רוסישע גלות-אַפריכטער, די גרעסטע פיינדליכע מאַכט, וואָס אידען האָבען געגען זיך – ניט נאָר אין פוילען, נאָר אין דער גאַנצער וועלט. אַזאַ פיינדליכע מאַכט איז פריהער געווען פאַר אונז דער צאַריזם. כדי צו רעכט- פערטיגען די פּאַגראַם-פּאַליטיק, האָט דער צאַריזם אָנגעפיהרט אומעטום אַן אַנטיסעמי- טישע פּאַליטיק און געזוכט צו דיסקרעדיטירען די אידען אין אַלע אַנדערע לענדער. און דער שליאַכטשיטש איז נאָך געפעהרליכער. דער צאַריזם איז געווען אַ פאַרהאַסטע מאַכט, בעת דאָס פוילישע פּאַלק, וואָס איז אַזוי לאַנג אונטערדריקט געווען, אַפעלירט אויך צו די אַלע קרייזען, צו וועלכע אידען קענען נאָר אַפעלירען. און די אנדערהאלבען הונדערט יאָהר שתדלנות, הינטערטהיר קריכעניש, לאַבי-אַרבייט, וואָס דער שליאַכטשיטש האָט געמוזט טהאָן, האָט איהם געמאַכט פאַר אַ בעסערען שתדלן, פאַר אַ דורכגעטריבענערען לאַביאיסט, איידער אַפילו דער איד. און אַזוי האָט זיך דער פאַרהאַנג אַראָפּגעלאָזען אויף די גרויסע בלוטיגע פּאַגראַם-געהיימיניסען. און אַ וועלט, וואָס איז פון דער מלחמה אַזוי ברוטאַליזירט געוואָרען, האָט נאָר געהערט פון אונזער ענדלאָזער אומרוה, אָבער ניט פון אונזער ענדלאָזען אומגליק, און זי איז אין איהר שנהא צו אונז אַלץ מעהר און מעהר פאַר- האַרטעוועט געוואָרען.

און דער שוואַרצבאַרד-פּראָצעס אין פאַריז, אויב מיר זאָלען זיין ריכטיג צוגעגרייט, גיט אונז אַ געלעגענהייט אויפצוהויבען דעם פאַרהאַנג און אויפצודעקען דעם גרויסען שעכטהויז, וואו עס האָט געאַרבייט פעטלורא, דער פריינד פון פילסודסקי, דער פריינד פון פראַנקרייך, און דער געוויסען פון דער וועלט, פון די גרויסע מאַסען פון דער וועלט וועט אויפגעשוידערט ווערען.

די אוקראַינער זיינען אַמאַל געווען אונטערטעניג צו פוילען, און געמאַכט אויפשטאַנ- דען, און יעדער אויפשטאַנד האָט געקאָסט פריהער פון אַלץ טייכען אידיש בלוט, ביז זיי האָבען זיך באַפרייט פון פוילען און זיינען איבערגעגאַנגען צו רוסלאַנד. די צאַרען האָבען זיי דערפאַר באַצאָהלט מיט לייב-אייגענטום, מיט פאַנשיצונע, און מיט "צעהן טויזענד פּאַליציימיסטערס", וואָס האָבען זיי גענומען אונטער זייער אויפזיכט. וועגען דער אוק- ראַינישער שפראַך האָבען די צאַרען גוזר געווען: "ניע בילאָ, ניעט אי ביט ניע מאַזשעט" (עס איז ניט געווען, עס איז ניטאָ און עס קען ניט זיין). און דאָך, ווי נאָר דער צאַריזם פלעגט זיך נעהמען שאַקלען, פלעגען די אוקראַינער זיך אַ נעהם טהאָן פריהער פון אַלץ

פֶּאָר די אידישע העלזער און די אידישע טעכטער. אַזוי איז געווען אין דער צייט פון דער "נאַראָדנאַיאַ וואָליאַ" און אַזוי איז אויף געווען אין דער צייט פון דער ערשטער רוסישער רעוואָלוציע. איין אויסנאהם איז געווען נאָר די צייט פון דער דעמאָביליזאַציע און פון דער קערענסקי רעוואָלוציע. דעמאָלט זיינען שוין דער שער לעזאזל געווען די פריצים און די ראָמאַנאָוס. עס האָט אָבער לאַנג ניט געדויערט, און די אוקראינער האָבען זיך ווידער אַ נעהם געטהאָן פריהער פון אַלץ צו די אידען, און ווידער מיט אַזאַ בעסטאַלישער בלוט־דורשטיגקייט, וואָס האָט קיין ביישפּיל ניט אין דער געשיכטע פון מענשליכער אכזריות. און עס ווילט זיך ניט דענקען, עס איז צו שעדליך צו דענקען, וואָס דאָרט קען נאָך מיט די אידען פּאַסירען, אויב דער סאָוועטישער רעזשים זאָל זיך אַ שאַקעל טהאַן, און די יורשים פון פעטלוראַז', מושטירט פון פּילסודסקי'ן וועלען זיך אַהין ווידער אַ לאַז טהאַן.

* *
*

עס ווילט זיך האַפען, אַז פּאַריז איז נאָך אַלץ דאָס האַרץ פון דער מענשהייט, ווי וויקי טאָר הוגאָ האָט זיך אַמאָל אויסגעדריקט. און אויב אידען וועלען טהאַן אַלץ וואָס מען דאַרף, כדי אויפצוהויבען דעם פּאַרהאַנג פון אוקראינער גיהנום, וועט שוואַרצבאַרד, אַזוי ווי אַמאָל דרייפּוס, אפשר נאָך געפינען זיין עמיל זאָלאַ און אַ גאַנצע פּאַרטיי פון ענטער זיאַסטישע העלפער און באַגייסטערטע באַשיצער.

און אַזוי ווי די פריישפרעכונג פון דרייפּוס'ען, אַזוי וועט אויך די פריישפרעכונג פון שוואַרצבאַרד'ן זיין דער גרעסטער קלאפ פאַר די פיינד פון אידישען פּאַלק און פאַר די פריינד פון אידישע שחיטות — פאַר אַלע נעכטיגע, היינטיגע און מאַרגענדיגע פּאַגראַמסט־שיקעס און זייערע מיטפיהלער און אַרויסהעלפער.

דאָס האַרץ פון פּראַנקרייך און פון דער ציוויליזירטער מענשהייט וועט אויפגעקלעמט ווערען צו זעהן, וואָס פאַר אַ בעסטיעס אין מענשען־געשטאַלט מען האָט עס אונדירעקט דורך פּוילען און אויך דירעקט אויף אַ פּאַרמאַסקירטען און אויף אַן אָפּנעם אופן אַזוי פיעל אין זייער בעסטאַליטעט אַרויסגעהאַלפּען.

Translation

A. Liessin

Scholem Schwarzbard

As your sword has made women childless
So shall your mother be childless among women
(Samuel)⁵⁷

57 1 Samuel 15:33. The reference is clarified by the context of the Biblical story of which it is part, beginning in v. 32: "Samuel said: Bring Agag, King of the Amalekites, before me. And Agag went to him delicately. And Agag said: Indeed, the bitterness of death

Let the tranquil ones who have perhaps never had their peace disturbed scour the text for its plain meaning and prove that he shouldn't have done it. Scholem Schwarzbard was not a tranquil one.

He knew that somewhere near him in Paris Petliura, chief of the murderers in Ukraine, was walking around free as a bird, and this poisoned his days and nights in the jolly capital. For him the air of Paris became heavy with the shadows of the ones who had been raped, tortured, torn to pieces – with the pale and silent shadows of the old and the young, men and boys, women and girls, mothers and suckling children. In their tens of thousands they fluttered before him, day and night, pale and silent, pointing the finger at their torturer and rapist and murderer who had gone unpunished.

And just as when France had called upon him to fight for the Republic, just as when Russia had called upon him to fight for the revolution, so now did he answer the call and put his life on the line.

Like Hirsh Lekert,⁵⁸ like the martyrs of the various self-defense organizations, he offered his young life in a state of ecstasy.

Dear, precious Schwarzbard – the redeemer of our blood!

* *
*

Schwarzbard's bullet penetrated not only the vile adventurer who used his generals to slaughter the Jews while using his little Jewish toadies to stroke them.⁵⁹ Schwarzbard's bullet also pierced the vile conspiracy to keep quiet about the slaughter while loudly trumpeting the strokes.

And it serves all of us, the interests of the entire Jewish people, that the conspiracy that has now been pierced should pass on to the next world just like Petliura.

has passed. And Samuel said: As your sword has made women childless, so shall your mother be childless among women; and Samuel hacked Agag to pieces before the Lord, in Gilgal." Readers familiar with the Biblical story would have been aware that King Saul had taken Agag alive in battle, along with the Amalekites' best livestock, as spoils of war. The prophet Samuel, who had anointed Saul king of Israel, reproached him for violating the divine commandment "to erase the memory of Amalek from under the heavens" (Deuteronomy 25:19) and declared, "Because you have rejected the word of the Lord, He has rejected you from being king" (1 Samuel 15:23).

58 See above, Introduction, n. 149.

59 The reference is no doubt to the Jews who served under Petliura in the government of the Ukrainian National Republic, including Margolin, Revutsky, and Silberfarb. All three had been roundly criticized in Jewish circles for failing adequately to protest the pogroms.

We remember the days when the Petliuras and the Denikins and the Bałachowicz⁶⁰ and the Hallers⁶¹ hung darkly in the Jewish sky like rain clouds and rained death upon the Jews. And we remember how the same Jews, cursed at home as bloodsucking capitalists, were depicted abroad, in the Entente countries, as dangerous communists. This sufficed to render the Jews hated throughout the world by all the bloodsuckers and the capitalists. We remember how the late President Wilson remained stone cold and indifferent to all of our pleas of misery, how he would travel around inveighing against the Turks on behalf of the “Christian Armenian nation” while refusing with bitter stubbornness to make even the slightest sound about the slaughtered Jews, how his foreign minister, the dull-headed lackey Lansing, received a delegation of intercessors from the most prominent Jewish notables in the most insulting fashion.⁶² And we remember how the entire American press turned deaf and dumb to every appeal of ours, as if a hidden hand had pulled it away from us. Every day we would receive news about the pogroms, one report more horrible than another, tearing at our souls like flaming whips. But they didn’t make their way any further, into the newspaper columns.

This in itself was a diabolical wink to any butcher that he would continue to be on the right side of the law. It was always the sense of impunity that created the pogromshchik. It was the consciousness that no one will trouble himself about Jews, that there is no protection for Jews’ property and lives, that emboldened the hooligan to tear his way into Jewish houses and rob and rape and murder. It was precisely that consciousness and the feelings that the Russian tsars used to arouse and cultivate in individual hooligans that the Wilsons aroused and cultivated in entire hooligan-states. Had, for example, the great lords in Paris, immediately after the slaughter in Lemberg,⁶³ issued

60 Stanisław Bułak-Bałachowicz (1883–1940), general and warlord who fought alternately with and against the Bolsheviks in the Russian civil war, alongside Piłsudski in the Polish-Soviet war, and at the head of a Belarusian National Army in 1920. He was not active in Ukraine but was reputed to have led pogroms in Pińsk and other Belarusian towns.

61 Józef Haller (1873–1960), Polish general who in July 1918 raised a Polish force that fought alongside the Allies against Germany on the eastern front and, following Germany’s departure, against the Ukrainians in East Galicia. Jews charged his troops with much anti-Jewish violence during these campaigns.

62 See Document 6.

63 73 Jews were killed in Lemberg (Lwów, Lviv) by Polish troops on 22–23 November 1918 after they had wrested the city from Ukrainian forces. Initial casualty reports reaching the West were immensely exaggerated and prompted vocal Jewish protests in many cities throughout the Jewish world. On the events and the diplomatic maneuvering surrounding them see, *inter alia*, Fink, *Defending the Rights*, 101–130.

an ear-shattering warning to the slaughterers, no more pogroms would have ensued. Had Wilson himself warned the Polish state that made the pogroms, had he said a single word, given a single wink at the time, that would have been enough to make the pogroms stop. But Wilson did not say the word nor give the wink. And the hooligan Polish state sensed the same thing that the hooligan in Kishinev felt under the tsarist regime – that everything done against Jews is permissible.

The Paris Peace Conference opened with the slaughter in Lemberg and ended with the one in Pińsk.⁶⁴ And the pogroms continued. The Polish government did not have to take an enraged public opinion in western Europe and America into account, as had happened with tsarist Russia. In western Europe and America public opinion was not enraged; it was completely uninformed about the pogroms. On the contrary, people everywhere had great affection for liberated Poland, which had become whole and independent after 130 years of partition and slavery. And the Poles understood how to cultivate informed circles. The Polish Jesuit seemed far more intelligent than the clumsy Russian bear. So when, after the first Russian defeats in the World War, Poles spread the calumny of “Jewish treachery,” and the Russian generals, who needed a scapegoat, accepted it, expelled the Jews, and let the Poles into the Jewish stores, so later did the Poles raise the cry of “Jewish Bolshevism” when the possessing classes faced the Red spectre of social revolution, and the entire aristocratic-bourgeois world, along with the bigwigs in western Europe and America, was quite glad to have a scapegoat toward which to direct the electrified discontent of the masses. People looked at the mounds of Jewish dead like props helping to hold up the rotten world order.

And the Polish pogromshchiks who went unpunished soon found worthy successors – the great-grandchildren of Tamerlane and Chmielnicki and the haidamaks. Like hellfire the pogroms [376] took over the territory of Petliura and Denikin, and our generation became the shocked witness to new gzeires-takh.⁶⁵ The land of Gonta and Zheleznyak, who celebrated the “bloody holiday,”⁶⁶ and of Taras Shevchenko, who sang the praises of that holiday in so

64 By order of the local Polish military commander, 35 Jews were executed in Pińsk on 5 April 1919 on charges of giving aid to Poland’s enemies. Reports of the executions reached the West just as the political disposition of the territories of the former Russian and Habsburg Empires, including the historically Polish and Ukrainian lands, were being discussed at the Peace Conference. See *ibid.*, 171–208.

65 Literally, “decrees of [5]408.” The traditional Yiddish-Hebrew name for the killings of Jews during the 1648 Chmielnicki uprising.

66 Ivan Gonta (c. 1740–1768) and Maksym Zheleznyak (c. 1740–after 1768), two central figures in the haidamak uprising of 1768.

cannibalistic a fashion,⁶⁷ became literally inundated with rivers of Jewish blood. And Daszyński of the P.P.S.⁶⁸ declared that Poland is a cordial ally of Petliura, and Wilson declared that he is a cordial ally of Poland, meaning in essence with Petliura as well. And Jadwin, Wilson's official representative in Ukraine, praised and exalted Denikin.⁶⁹ And the murderers kept on murdering, and the newspapers kept up their silence.

The Polish nobleman,⁷⁰ who inspired the massacres of Jews in Ukraine in Belarus, has become, except for the Russian exiles with their innuendo, the greatest hostile power that Jews have against them, not only in Poland but throughout the world. Earlier it was tsarism that was such a hostile power. In order to justify the pogrom policy tsarism conducted everywhere an antisemitic policy that sought to discredit the Jews in all other countries. The Polish nobleman is even more dangerous. Tsarism was a hated power, whereas the Polish people, so long oppressed, appeals to all the same circles to which Jews can appeal. And a century and a half of begging, lobbying, behind-the-scenes cringing that the nobleman was forced to do made him a better, more skillful lobbyist than even the Jew. So the curtain fell over the great bloody pogrom-secrets. And a world that had been so brutalized before the war heard only of our ceaseless unrest but not of our ceaseless misfortune, and its hatred for us became ever stronger.

And the Schwarzbard trial in Paris, if we prepare for it properly, gives us an opportunity to raise the curtain and to expose the great slaughterhouse that Petliura built – Petliura, the friend of Piłsudski, the friend of France – and the conscience of the world, of the great masses of the world, will be shaken.

67 Reference to the 1841 epic poem *Haidamaky* by Ukrainian national poet Taras Shevchenko (1814–1861).

68 Ignacy Daszyński (1886–1936), leader of the Polish Socialist Party (*Polska Partia Socjalistyczna* – PPS) and briefly head of government of the Second Polish Republic (November 1918).

69 Edgar Jadwin (1865–1931), American military officer appointed by President Wilson to a special commission to investigate pogroms in Poland, headed by former US ambassador to Turkey Henry Morgenthau. In September 1919 he was dispatched as special US observer in Ukraine, where he advised Petliura and Denikin to join together against the Bolsheviks. He also informed the US State Department that Denikin had taken measures to protect Jews. See United States Department of State (ed.), *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919, Russia*, Washington D.C. 1919, 782.

70 The expression appears to be used here as a metonym for the Second Polish Republic, seen as a reincarnation of the former “noble republic” that was liquidated in the Polish partitions of the late eighteenth century.

The Ukrainians were once subject to Poland; they rose up, and every uprising cost rivers of Jewish blood, until they freed themselves from Poland and went over to Russia. The tsars repaid them with serfdom, with feudalism, and with “ten thousand police masters” to oversee them. Regarding the Ukrainian language the tsars decreed: “Ne bylo, net i byt’ ne mozhet” (there never was, there isn’t, and there cannot be). And yet whenever tsarism wobbled the Ukrainians would go first of all for the throats and the daughters of the Jews. That is how it was in the time of the *Narodnaya volya*,⁷¹ that is how it was during the first Russian revolution.⁷² The only exception was in the time of the demobilization and the Kerensky revolution.⁷³ Then the landowners and the Romanovs⁷⁴ were the scapegoats. But this did not last long, and the Ukrainians once again attacked the Jews first of all, again with a bestial thirst for blood without parallel in the history of human cruelty.

And we do not wish to think, it is too pernicious to think, what can yet happen to the Jews there should the Soviet regime wobble and the heirs of Petliura, mobilized by Piłsudski, will get a chance there again.

* *
*

One hopes that Paris is still the heart of humanity, as Victor Hugo once put it.⁷⁵ And if Jews do everything necessary to raise the curtain on the Ukrainian hell, then Schwarzbard, like Dreyfus before him, may yet find his Emile Zola and an entire party of enthusiastic helpers and inspired defenders.

And like Dreyfus’s [eventual] acquittal, so too will Schwarzbard’s acquittal be the greatest blow to the enemies of the Jewish people and the friends of Jewish slaughter, to all past, present, and future pogromshchiks and their accomplices and collaborators.

71 Iconic Russian revolutionary organization, founded in 1878, known primarily for its assassination of Tsar Aleksander II in 1881, an event that triggered a wave of pogroms, mainly in Ukraine, over the subsequent two years.

72 The revolution of 1905.

73 A reference to events surrounding the accession to power of Aleksander Kerensky in July 1917 following collapse of the first Russian provisional government, in part over the issue of Ukrainian autonomy.

74 The tsarist dynasty.

75 Actually, the statement appears first to have been made in Anonymous, British and Foreign Arms No. VI, in: *United Service Magazine*, 1843, Part 1, 507–517, here 514. On Hugo’s use of the phrase following the French defeat in the Franco-Prussian War of 1871 see Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat. On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery*, New York 2003, 123.

The heart of France and of civilized humanity will shudder when it sees what sort of beasts in human figure it has aided, indirectly via Poland and also directly, disguised and in the open, to perform so many bestial deeds.

Part Three: Preparations, Negotiations, Confrontations

Document 26

Andrii Livytskyi to Arnold Margolin

Warsaw, 1 July 1926

Typewritten letter;¹ 2 pages

Language: English

YIVO, RG80/400/35109–35110

(Translation of letter from A. Livicki to A. D. Margolin.)

Warsaw, July 1st, 1926.

Dear Arnold Davidovich:

I intended to write you immediately after the dreadful tragedy which occurred in Paris. But my sudden trip to Paris, to attend the funeral, and my trip to Prague to attend the meeting of all the Ukrainian parties, compelled me to postpone doing so until my return to Warsaw.

You can imagine how this death strongly impressed me, especially the very fact that the murder, as it is evident for us, was organized by the Communists who used Shwartzbardt as their tool. The worst thing, however, is that the Jewish press and also some Ukrainian papers can create, by their behaviour, an abyss between the Ukrainian and Jewish nationalities – the abyss which was artific[i]ally created in the former Russian Empire by the Black-Hundreds,² but which disappeared under the influence of the Ukrainian and Jewish democracy.

What a mistake it is on the part of the Jewish press to take such an attitude towards this murder! Instead of separating themselves from this act, instead of declaring that the nationality of Shwartzbardt is but an accidental trait in this case, the Jewish press took Shwartzbardt [sic] under the defense, under the defense of the whole Jewish public opinion. No wonder that, after this, some Ukrainian papers started to accuse the Jewry of this murder. Think what can happen as a result of it! Think whether we have the right to allow

1 English translation of a letter presumably written originally in Ukrainian. Original not in file.

2 The “Black Hundreds” (*chornaya sotnya*) was the name given to a set of early twentieth-century Russian nationalist organizations that supported the tsarist autocracy and the Russian Orthodox Church as the essential foundations of the Russian state. The Black Hundreds opposed all notions of autonomy for non-Russian peoples within the Russian Empire, including Ukrainians. They were also known for public incitement against Jews.

that around the noble name of S. V. Petliura two nationalities should demonstrate their mutual hatred – – the two nationalities whose fate is to live in the country, to have a common fatherland!!!

There was a time, dear Arnold Davidowich, when you defended the interests of Ukraine in the international field. In this task you always had in mind the interests of both Ukrainian and Jewish nationalities. At the present time, in the name of truth, you must defend the national honor of the Ukrainian nationality, as [2] such a defense corresponds to the interests of both nationalities. Help us to prove that our leader was killed not by a Jew but an internationalist, that the Jewry is not responsible for him just as it is not responsible for Trotsky.

I understand how hard it is for you to leave America and to participate in the coming trial. But this is the request of the whole Ukrainian emigration irrespective of parties. You are indispensable not only as a lawyer and witness but as a man who will organize and direct our actions in connection with this trial. The sooner you come to Paris the more we will appreciate it. Write me that you agree to come and then we will solve all the technical details of your journey.

Very sincerely yours,
(signed) A. Livicki

Document 27

Arnold Margolin to Leo Motzkin

New York, 12 July 1926

Handwritten letter, 6 pages (three sheets recto and verso); name and address printed on recto of each sheet

Language: Russian

YIVO, RG80/476/39229–39231

A. D. MARGOLIN
222, Fourth Avenue
NEW YORK

Дорогой Лев Ефимович,

Пишу Вам на сей раз – как сионист (и бывший, давнишн. территориалист) – одному из основоположников сионизма – и прошу Вас считать

это письмо личным, предназначенным только для Вас, но не для остальных членов комиссии по организации защиты Шварцварда.

Меня все время преследует страх, что большинство членов комиссии – а в особенности Голдштейн (М. А.) и Винавер – одержимы не только естествен. и справедливым чувством боли за убитых и умученных евреев во время погромов, но и подсознательной ненавистью к украинск. [2] национ. движению. Если-бы был убит не Петлюра, а Деникин, то Винавер и Голдштейн реагировали-бы совсѣм иным образом – и даже не согласились-бы фигурировать в кач. членов комиссии. Возьмите ~~№№~~ Евр. Трибуны во времена евр. погромов, чинимых Деник. армией – и Вы увидите, что с именем Деникина наши русские патриоты-евреи обращались весьма осторожно. Боюсь я, конечно, не самого факта ненависти большинства евр. лидеров (не-сионистов) к укр. сепаратизму, а отраженія этой ненависти на направлениі и предварит., и судебного следствія. Почему евреи так терпимы, наприм., к В. В. Шульгину, этому главному антисемиту, автору «Пытки страхом»? Пихно и Шульгин воспитали поколѣніе антисемитов [3] в т.н. Юго-Западном краѣ. А теперь евреи с нетерпѣніем ждут появления новой книги Шульгина – и, конечно, первые ее раскупят – раньше христиан. Все это – рабское преклонение пред антисемитами из больших дворян, пред силой, хотя-бы и бывшей. Кстати, в этой книгѣ, по отзыву скрытаго антисемита, А. Л. Яблоновскаго, Шульгин констатирует с радостью, что русск. народ снова наливается национальными «соками». Яблоновскій ржет от восторга по этому поводу – обрадуются, навѣрно, когда выйдет книга Шульгина, и наши патриоты – а вот я боюсь этих самых соков, и больше прихожу к заключению, [4] |что| нам, евреям, |будет| здоровее, если большевистк. власть просуществует еще 10 лѣт..... Во всяком случаѣ – раз Joint упорно ведет свою «колониционную» политику в Украинѣ и Крыму, то не следует, параллельно с ним, сжигать последніе мосты между нами, евреями, и украинцами.

Вы мнѣ писали о недоразумѣніях в связи с моей книгой об Украинѣ и полит. Антанты (1922). Эти недоразумения являются результатом невнимательн. чтенія книги этой тѣм, кто бросает по моему адресу упреки. Конечно, я и теперь думаю, что Петлюра не был антисемитом – но и теперь, как и в моей книгѣ, я убежден, что в первые 3 мѣсяца вся Директорія не принимала решит. мер против погромов. И в этом – писал я в моей книгѣ – Винниченкѣ и Петлюрѣ придется еще дать ответ пред судом современников и [5] пред судом исторіи (стр. 335).

Все это пишу Вам в надеждѣ на то, что Вы прислушаетесь к моему |«одинокому»| голосу и сдѣлаете возможное для избѣжанія обостреній в украино-еврейск. взаимоотношеніях, и без того весьма враждеб-

ных..... Объ стороны вносят страстность в этот процесс и хотят превратить эго в «суд истории», что является опасным и вредным для объих сторон, т. к. чѣм больше излишняго вреда мы причиним репутации украинск. народа и укр. движения пред всѣм читающим мирем, тѣм глубже будет чувство обиды с их стороны – и тѣм труднѣе будет наладить впоследствии сожительство обоих народов на одной территории.

[6] Снова, как и в предыдущих письмах, повторяю, что я отнюдь не предлагаю замалчивать факты, но совѣтую очень бережно относиться к тѣм выводам и заключеніям относит. личности Петлюры, которые дают теперь новые, впервые появившіеся, свидѣтели.

С истинным уваженіем,
Ваш А. Марголин

Translation

Dear Lev Efimovich,

I am writing to you this time – as a Zionist (and a former Territorialist from long ago) – to one of the founding fathers of Zionism³ – and I request that you consider this letter as personal, intended only for you but not for any other members of the committee to organize Schwarzbard's defense.

I am constantly pursued by the fear that the majority of the members of the committee – especially Goldstein (M. A. [sic]) and Vinaver – are obsessed not only with the natural and justifiable feeling of pain for the Jews who were killed and tortured during the time of the pogroms but also with a sub-conscious hatred toward the Ukrainian [2] national movement. If it had not been Petliura who was killed but Denikin, then Vinaver and Goldstein would have reacted entirely differently and would even have not agreed to appear among the members of the committee. Get ahold of the issues of *Yevreyskaya tribuna*⁴ from the time of the pogroms that were carried out by the Denikin Army, and you will see that our Jewish Russian patriots have treated the name

3 Motzkin was one of the first east European Jews to support the program of Theodor Herzl against that of the earlier *Hibbat Ziyon* movement. However, he broke with Herzl in 1901 over the issue of Zionist support for educational and cultural projects. He also opposed Herzl's proposal to pursue a Jewish homeland in British East Africa – a proposal that led to the formation of the Jewish Territorialist Organization, with which Margolin had identified for a brief interval.

4 Russian-language Jewish newspaper published in Paris, edited by Vinaver.

of Denikin quite cautiously. To be sure, I do not fear the hatred of the majority of Jewish (non-Zionist) leaders itself toward Ukrainian separatism, but rather the channeling of that hatred into the preparations for the investigation and trial. Why are the Jews so tolerant, for example, toward V. V. Shulgin, that leading antisemite, the author of “Torture by Fear”?⁵ Pikhno⁶ and Shulgin raised a generation of antisemites |3| in the so-called Southwestern region. And now the Jews impatiently await the appearance of Shulgin’s new book – and of course to buy the first copies before the Christians. All of this – the slavish admiration for the antisemites from the great nobility, for the powerful, even if they were so only in the past. By the way, in this book, in response to a review by the secret antisemite, A. L. Yablonovsky, Shulgin states happily, that the Russian people is once again filling itself with nationalistic “juices.” Yablonovsky is laughing with delight over this – our patriots, too, will surely rejoice when Shulgin’s book comes out – but I am afraid of precisely those juices and incline more to the conclusion |4| ‘that| it |will| be healthier for us Jews if the Bolshevik regime lasted another 10 years ... In any event – when the Joint is vigorously carrying out its “colonization” policy in Ukraine and Crimea, it doesn’t follow that at the same time we should burn the last bridges between us Jews and the Ukrainians.⁷

-
- 5 Vasilii Vitalevich Shulgin (1878–1976), Russian right-wing politician and journalist, uncle of Ukrainian exile leader Oleksandr Shulhyn. The article “Torture by Fear” (*Pytka strakhom*) appeared in the Kiev newspaper *Kievlianin*, notorious among Jews for what they perceived as its Judeophobic editorial stance, on 8 October 1919. The article called upon Jews to “acknowledge [their misdeeds] and repent” for their support of Bolshevism and other radical currents; failure to do so, it suggested, would subject them to continued violence.
- 6 Dmitrii Ivanovich Pikhno (1853–1913), editor of *Kievlianin* and head of Kiev branch of the Great Russian nationalist organization, the Union of the Russian People. Despite his general hostility toward Jewish political demands, he condemned the false charges of ritual murder brought against Mendel Beilis in the infamous trial of 1913.
- 7 Reference to a project begun as part of a 1924 agreement between the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and the government of the Soviet Union, according to which the former would train Jews to become farmers and support their settlement on agricultural lands in Ukraine donated by the latter. More than 150,000 Jews eventually settled on the land under the auspices of this program, in which the Joint built factories, purchased modern agricultural machines, and introduced advanced farming techniques into Soviet Ukraine. The impact of this activity on Jewish-Ukrainian relations was of some concern to its promoters, and the possible negative implications of Petliura’s assassination on the project’s future were noted by some Jewish leaders, including Margolin. Notable in this regard is Jabotinsky’s

You have written to me about the misunderstandings in connection with my book about Ukraine and the Politics of the Entente (1922). These misunderstandings result from lack of a careful reading of the book by those who are throwing criticism at me. Of course, even now I think that Petliura was not an antisemite – but even now I am convinced, as I wrote in my book, that during the first three months the entire Directory did not take decisive measures against the pogroms. And in this sense – I wrote in my book – he and Vynnychenko will still need to answer before the court of their contemporaries and [5] before the court of history (p. 335).⁸

I am writing all of this to you in the hope that you will listen to my [“lonely”] voice and will do what you can in order to bring about a mutual rapprochement in Ukrainian-Jewish relations, which are quite hostile even without this [latest incident]..... Both sides are bringing passion into this trial and seeking to turn it into the “tribunal of history,” which is dangerous and harmful to both sides, because the more unnecessary harm we do to the

linkage of the two matters in his initial commentary on the assassination: Jabotinsky, *Di "Krim"-kolonizatsye*. On the Jewish colonization project generally, see Jonathan L. Dekel-Chen, *Farming the Red Land: Jewish Agricultural Colonization and Local Soviet Power, 1924–1941*, New Haven Conn. 2005.

- 8 Reference to Margolin, *Ukraina i politika Antanty*, in which Margolin had defended Petliura generally against criticism by Vynnychenko, including the assertion that Petliura had not properly punished Ivan Semesenko, the officer of the Ukrainian National Army who had ordered a punitive expedition against the Jews of Proskurov in February 1919. In that connection he had suggested that doing so not only would have robbed Petliura of the services of “one of the bravest and most daring fighters against Bolshevism” but would also have exposed him to an assassination attempt by “chauvinists and fanatics of the Ukrainian national idea” who believed that the Jewish youth of Proskurov had tried to facilitated a Bolshevik takeover of the town. *Ibid.*, 328 f. On the other hand he had also stated clearly that “during the first 2–3 months (January – March), both [Vynnychenko and Petliura] demonstrated lack of care by using ill-considered words about the Jewish role in Bolshevism. Petliura displayed confusion and indecision from the first day, when the army began to lose cohesion, by not taking the most merciless and decisive measures against the pogromists.” *Ibid.*, 333. On 335 he had written that “when Vynnychenko and Petliura spoke about the role of the Jews in Bolshevism, they were simply pointing to a fact that was serving as a motive for the pogroms.” For such verbal carelessness, he declared, both would “still owe an answer and an explanation ... to the court of their contemporaries and to the court of history,” but in the next sentence he insisted that “there are also many enlightened aspects in the common democratic world view and the principled way in which both of these men relate to Jewry and to its natural right to complete equality with other nations.”

reputation of the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian movement in the eyes of the entire reading public, the deeper will be the feeling of resentment on their part – and the more difficult it will be subsequently to bring about the cohabitation of the two peoples in a single territory.

[6] Again, as in previous letters, I repeat that I have by no means proposed suppressing the facts, but I advise to exercise great care toward the inferences and conclusions concerning Petliura as an individual that are being offered today by new witnesses who are showing up for the first time.

With genuine respect,
Your A. Margolin

Document 28

Leo Motzkin to Arnold Margolin
Paris, 17 July 1926
Typewritten letter, 2 pages
Language: Russian
САНДР, P243/4

17 Июля [192]6 г.

Г-ну А. Д. МАРГОЛИНУ

Нью-Йорк

Дорогой
Арнольдъ Давидовичъ,

Я только что получилъ Ваше письмо отъ 6-го Июля и спѣшу отвѣтить, боясь, что въ противномъ случаѣ отвѣтъ мой будетъ отложенъ на продолжительное время /у меня такое количество работы, что я никакъ не успѣваю во время отвѣчать на письма/.

По существу вопроса о защитѣ Ш. я могу сказать Вамъ, что у насъ существуетъ сильнѣйшее желаніе сдѣлать все, чтобы на почвѣ этого процесса не испортились взаимоотношенія между украинцами и евреями. Съ другой стороны, мы не можемъ и не должны пропустить такого случая, чтобы не обнародовать передъ всемъ міромъ, и раньше всего

передъ самими украинцами, весь ужасъ пережитого евреями мученичества. Мнѣ кажется, что прежде всего украинцы сами должны признать дѣйствительность фактовъ и очистить себя отъ нихъ не всевозможными увертками и заявлениями, которыя къ тому же легко будутъ спровергнуты на судѣ, а проведеніемъ определенной черты между собою и подобными актами. Въ особенности, мнѣ кажется, такой тактики долженъ держаться А. Шульгинъ, о которомъ лично я слышалъ много хорошаго. Поэтому, Вы хорошо сдѣлали, что написали ему, чтобы онъ вошелъ въ сношенія съ Комиссіей по организаціи защиты Ш.

Мнѣ очень досадно, что Ваша книга вызываетъ различныя недоразумѣнія и будетъ, повидимому, использована тѣми элементами, которые хотятъ затушевать преступления 19 и 20-го гг. По всей вѣроятности, она будетъ использована также для возстановленія чести имени Петлюры, о чемъ приходится жалѣть по той простой причинѣ, что по нашимъ даннымъ, поведеніе Петлюры не даетъ никакого повода къ какой-либо его реабилитации. Суть не въ томъ – являлся ли онъ главнымъ или не главнымъ виновникомъ погромовъ, а въ томъ, что во всякомъ случаѣ являлся однимъ изъ ихъ виновниковъ вообще. На той позиціи, которую занималъ Петлюра по своему положенію, недостаточно сказать, что я, молъ, не былъ погромщикомъ, а необходимо доказать, что имъ были приняты дѣйствительныя мѣры противъ погромовъ и при томъ – во время, а не тогда лишь, когда на этотъ шагъ побуждалъ голосъ всего міра. Наши же данныя доказываютъ, что Петлюра цѣлыми мѣсяцами не проявлялъ никакой инициативы въ смыслѣ антипогромныхъ мѣръ, и даже не возмущался, узнавая ежедневно все о новыхъ [2] и новыхъ насиліяхъ. Его антипогромныя воззванія ни для кого не убѣдительны, если съ ними не связаны существенныя преслѣдованія погромщиковъ и если одновременно съ ними его атаманы, запятнавшіе себя потоками еврейской крови, остаются начальниками частей его арміи.

Во всякомъ случаѣ, я долженъ Вамъ сообщить, что ни Шульгинъ, ни кто-либо другой изъ украинскихъ вождей /противниковъ погромовъ/ пока къ намъ не являлся, хотя они легко могутъ узнать нашъ адресъ. Мы даже полагали вначалѣ, что кто-либо изъ нихъ сдѣлаетъ это уже потому, что съ нашей стороны въ прежнее время неоднократно предпринимались шаги, доказывающіе, что мы къ мести не стремимся. За то я могу сообщить Вамъ, что со стороны отдѣльныхъ украинцевъ и даже организацій уже слышатся угрожающіе голоса, смыслъ которыхъ очень ясенъ. Какъ всегда послѣ погромовъ, виноватыми оказываются жертвы погромовъ. Впрочемъ, угрозы направляются совершенно открыто въ сторону тѣхъ, которые хотятъ возстановить картины пережитыхъ ужасовъ.

Вы сами понимаете, дорогой Арнольдъ Давидовичъ, что подобныя угрозы никого не остановятъ. Одно только могу Вамъ сказать, что у меня и у многихъ моихъ коллегъ есть сильнѣйшее желаніе, чтобы трагедія, пережитая еврействомъ, не была бы фальсифицирована никакими тенденціями и чтобы все дѣло было поднято на высшій этический уровень. Нашему народу справедливые историки приписываютъ созданіе мученичества, и я не хотѣлъ бы, чтобы это мученичество было кѣмъ-либо запятнано.

Сердечно кланяюсь Вамъ и Вашимъ

Уважающій Васъ⁹

Translation

To Mr. A. D. M A R G O L I N

New York

Dear Arnold Davidovich,

I have just now received your letter of 6 July, and I am making haste to answer it, for I fear that if I do not do so my reply will be put off for a long time (I have such a volume of work that I can never manage to answer letters on time).

Regarding the matter of S[chwarzbard's] defense, I can tell you that we have a powerful desire to do everything so that the mutual relations between Ukrainians and Jews will not become fouled over this trial. On the other hand, we cannot and should not pass over this occurrence in such a way that we do not bring to the attention of the entire world, and first of all to the Ukrainians themselves, the full horror of the martyrdom that the Jews have experienced. It seems to me that first of all the Ukrainians themselves need to recognize the reality of the facts and to cleanse themselves of them, not through all sorts of evasive tactics and statements such as can easily be put to the test at the trial but by establishing a definite boundary between themselves and such acts. In particular it seems to me that O. Shulhyn, about whom I personally have heard many positive things, should adopt such tactics. For that reason you did the right thing by writing him that he should develop a relationship with the S[chwarzbard] Defense Committee.

9 Signature absent on archival copy.

We regret very much that your book¹⁰ gives expression to various misunderstandings and will evidently be exploited by those elements that wish to paint over the crimes of 1919 and 1920. In all probability it will be used as well for restoring the honor of Petliura's name, which is to be regretted for the simple reason that according to our data Petliura's behavior gives no ground for any sort of rehabilitation. The essence of the matter isn't whether he was or wasn't the main culprit in the pogroms but whether in either case he was among the culprits at all. Given the position that Petliura held, it isn't enough to declare on your authority that he wasn't a pogromshchik; it is rather necessary to prove that he took real measures against the pogroms, and in a timely manner – not when the voice of the whole world was urging such a step. Our data show that for months Petliura did not undertake any initiatives with a mind to ending the pogroms, nor did he even show indignation over them while he was receiving daily reports about [2] new acts of violence. His appeals against the pogroms were not convincing, because they did not include convincing action against the perpetrators and because at the same time he was issuing them his generals, stained with rivers of Jewish blood, remained at the head of units of his army.

In any event I need to inform you that neither Shulhyn nor anyone else among the Ukrainian leaders (opponents of the pogroms) has yet been to see us, even though they could find out our address easily. We even thought in the beginning that no one from their side will ever do this because several times in the past we had undertaken steps in which we had indicated that we did not aim at revenge. Additionally I can inform you that individual Ukrainians and even Ukrainian organizations are already making threatening noises whose sense is quite clear. As always after pogroms, the victims of the pogroms are made out to be the ones responsible for them. By the way, the

10 See above, Document 27, n. 8. Cf. Arnold D. Margolin, *Jews in Eastern Europe*, New York 1926, in which the author placed the primary onus for the pogroms in Ukraine on Denikin (131). He also warned Jews against blaming the entire Ukrainian people for the pogroms: "Even as we, Jews, justly disclaim responsibility for the acts of the Jewish Bolshevik commissars and for the disgraceful actions of those Jews who participated in the work of the Bolshevik chekas, the Ukrainian people has a full right to disclaim any responsibility for those who have besmirched themselves by pogrom activities. Suppose there are among the Ukrainian people two, three, five hundred thousand criminal 'pogromshchiks,' still one may not extend this into a generalization embracing the remaining thirty odd millions of the Ukrainian population. And when we say: 'All Ukrainians are pogromshchiks,' we become like those who assert: 'All Jews are Bolsheviks'" (136).

threats are being issued altogether openly toward those who seek to resurrect a picture of past horrors.

Dear Arnold Davidovich, you yourself understand that threats like these will not stop anyone. I can tell you only this – that I and my many colleagues have the strongest wish that the tragedy that the Jews lived through will not be falsified tendentiously and that the entire affair will be raised to a higher ethical standard. Honest historians represent our people as the original martyrs, and I would not like to see anyone treat that martyrdom as self-evident. I send heartfelt greetings to you and yours.¹¹

Respectfully,¹²

Document 29

Marcel Peyre (Examining Magistrate)

Paris, 17 July 1926

Typewritten copy of deposition, 1 page

Language: French

YIVO, RG80/427/37037

DEPOSITION du Monsieur MOTZKIN

—:—:—:—

Le 17 juillet 1926.

Nous PEYRE juge d'instruction
entendons le témoin:

Sieur MOTZKIN Léon, 58 ans, président du Comité Sionniste du Monde
83, avenue de la Grande Armée

11 Margolin replied with an 8-page letter in which he warned that if Schwarzbard's trial turned effectively into one of Petliura, the consequences for Ukrainian-Jewish relations would be ruinous. He complained about hostile voices in the Jewish press and urged that if the trial was to be used as a forum for calling attention to the sufferings of Ukrainian Jewry during the pogroms, then the full range of perpetrators should be called to account. He discussed possible interlocutors on the Ukrainian side and promised to facilitate Jewish-Ukrainian talks. Margolin to Motzkin, 3 August 1926, YIVO, RG80/476/39225–39228.

12 Signature absent on archival copy.

DEPOSE:

serment prêté

Je ne puis vous fournir aucun renseignement sur les circonstances dans lesquelles Petlioura a été tué. Mais j'étudie tout particulièrement la question des pogromes au cours des 20 dernières années, et je puis vous dire que les pogromes qui ont eu lieu alors que DENIKINE et PETLIOURA commandaient en Ukraine, ont été [é] parmi les plus cruels; je considère même que ceux qui ont été exécutés sous l'administration de Petlioura ont été plus violents que ceux qui se sont produits sous l'autorité de DENIKINE.

Je ne crois pas que Petlioura ait ordonné les pogromes, je ne sais même pas s'il les a voulus, mais il les a tolérés pendant un certain temps. 5 ou 6 mois plus tard il a réagi et par proclamations a interdit les pogromes et a pris les mesures les plus urgentes pour les empêcher.

Les pogromes qui ont eu lieu alors que Petlioura était hetman de l'Ukraine, ont pu causer le mort de 50.000 victimes environ.

----- et signe -----¹³

Document 30

Marcel Peyre (Examining Magistrate)

Paris, 20 July 1926

Typewritten copy of deposition, 2 pages

Language: French

YIVO, RG80/451/38077-38078

CONFRONTATION KOVAL-SCHWARTZBARD

— : — : — : — : —

Le 20 juillet 26.

Nous PEYRE juge d'instruction

entendons le témoin:

Sieur KOVAL Waldemar 42 ans, professeur dr à PRAGUE, 132 Horni Cernosice [sic], Tchéco-Slovaquie.

¹³ Signature absent on archival copy.

DEPOSE:

serment prêté

Le 14 ou le 15 avril je me trouvais à la terrasse d'un café de Boulogne sur Seine, en compagnie de PETLIOURA et de LEVITZKI qui habite [à] Varsovie. Je parlais très fort et comme Petlioura me priait de baisser la voix, je lui demandais en riant s'il avait peur. Me désignant un consommateur qui se trouvait à un|e| table voisine et qui semblait suivre attentivement notre conversation, Petlioura me dit que cet individu le suivait depuis quelques jours. Cet homme était en compagnie d'une femme élégante. Au moment où Petlioura allait prendre le tramway, après avoir quitté le café, j'ai aperçu une puissante limousine dans laquelle l'homme qui surveillait Petlioura avait pris place en compagnie de 2 autres individus. S'adressant à ces derniers, le chauffeur de l'automobile dit: « Jacquet, il est là » l'homme qui était dans la voiture répondit: « alors file ». Cette conversation avait lieu en russe.

Je reconnaîtrais, je crois, l'homme qui surveillait Petlioura s'il était mis en ma présence.

EST INTRODUIT SCHWARTZBARD assisté de Mtre TRUC, substituant Mtre TORRES. Lecture est faite de ce qui précède:

par Mr KOVAL:

Je reconnais SCHWARTZBARD pour l'individu qui surveillait [[2]] Petlioura dans un café de Boulogne sur Seine. La seule chose qui m'ait donné quelque hésitation lorsqu'il est entré est la couleur de ses cheveux, j'avais conservé l'impression d'un homme brun, mais lorsque je regarde SCHWARTZBARD de trois quart, je suis sûr que c'était l'homme de Boulogne sur Seine, il portait alors un costume noir et un chapeau noir.

par SCHWARTZBARD:

Le témoin se trompe, je ne suis jamais allé a Boulogne sur Seine, le 14 avril je ne connaissais pas encore Petlioura.

par Mr KOVAL:

Je tiens à déclarer que mon témoignage ne saurait être suspect étant donné que j'ai été moi-même blessé en 1905, alors que je protégeais les Juifs, victimes des pogromes.

sur question de Mtre TRUC:

par Mr KOVAL:

Je suis de nationalité ukrainienne.

----- et signent -----¹⁴

Document 31

Marcel Peyre (Examining Magistrate)

Paris, 20 July 1926

Typewritten copy of deposition, 2 pages

Language: French

YIVO, RG80/451/38069–38070

CONFRONTATION CHAPOVAL-SCHWARTZBARD

— :- :- :- :- :-

Le 20 juillet 26

Nous PEYRE juge d'instruction

entendons le témoin:

Sieur CHAPOVAL Mykola 40 ans, ancien général ukrainien, 13, rue du Sommerard.

serment prêté

DEPOSE:

J'étais avec Petlioura alors qu'il était Président de la République d'Ukraine.

A cette époque il y a eu des pogromes, mais non seulement Petlioura ne les a pas ordonnés, mais il les a interdits dans des ukases.

Je suis membre du parti ukrainien des socialistes-révolutionnaires et notre parti blâmait l'alliance de Petlioura et de la Pologne.

J'habite rue du Sommerard, non loin de l'hôtel où logeait Pétioura et dans le mois qui a préc[é]dé son meurtre j'ai remarqué la présence de nombreux bolchéviks ukrainiens qui antérieurement ne fréquentaient pas le quartier. Parmi eux se trouvait un nommé NORITCH-ISOLIKOWSKI¹⁵ qui, sachant que je ne partageais pas les opinions de Petlioura, critiquait devant moi violemment les agissements de ce dernier. A plusieurs reprises il m'a de-

¹⁴ Signatures absent on archival copy.

¹⁵ Actually Virhel Norich-Dzhikovskii. See above, Document 15, n. 5.

mandé dans quel restaurant déjeunait Petlioura, mais je lui ai répondu que je n'en savais rien.

Un jour que je rencontrais un russe du nom de VOLODINE, qui [[2]] habite à Champigny chez le professeur NEUMANN,¹⁶ il me demanda brusquement où habitait Petlioura. Je lui ai répondu que je n'en savais rien. A différentes reprises et sous divers prétextes il insista pour que je lui procure l'adresse de Petlioura.

Après l'assassinat de Petlioura j'ai rencontré VOLODINE, ou plutôt VOLODINE est venu chez moi et comme je lui parlais de SCHWARTZBARD il a rougi et m'a dit qu'il le connaissait bien.

Je considère que NORITCH et ses camarades peuvent être moralement responsables du crime, mais je ne puis dire s'ils y ont participé.

----- et signe -----¹⁷

Document 32

Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv to Schwarzbard Defense Committee

Berlin, 10 August 1926

Typewritten letter, 1 page; printed letterhead

Language: Yiddish

CAHJP, P243/1

Verein
Ostjüdisches Historisches
Archiv e.V.
Berlin

פאַראיינ
מזרח־אידישער היסטארישער
אַרכיוו
ברלין.

¹⁶ Joë Neumann, prominent French anarchist intellectual. In 1928 he wrote the introduction to Dobkowski, *Affaire Petliura-Schwarzbard*.

¹⁷ Signature absent on archival copy.

|10.VIII.1926|

צום "פארטיידיגונגסקאָמיטעט"

פאריז

זייער חשובע הערן!

אויף דער זיצונג פון דעם "מזרח-אידישן היסטאָרישן ארכיוו" אין בערלין, וועלכע איז פאָרגעקומען דעם 7-טן אויגוסט, אונטערן פאָרזיץ פון ש. דובנאָוו, איז אָנגענומען געוואָרן ווענדן זיך צו אייך מיט פאָלגנדיגע באשלוסן און פאָרשלאגן:

(1) אלס פארטרעטער פון דער בערלינער גרופע פונם "מזרח-אידישן היסטאָרישן ארכיוו" אינם פארטיידיגונגס-קאָמיטעט אין פאריז ווערן באשטימט פאָלגנדיגע פערזאָנען:
ש. דובנאָוו, מ. קריינין, א. טשעריקאָווער און נ. גערגעל.
די בערלינער גרופע באשטייט, אויסער די אָנגערופענע, נאָך פון: יעקב לעשטשינסקי, י. קלינאָוו און וו. לאצקי.

(2) עס ווערט פאָרגעלייגט, אז ה" לאצקי זאָל אויך אריינגענומען ווערן אלס מיטגליד פונם פארטיידיגונגס-קאָמיטעט.

(3) דער פארטיידיגונגס-קאָמיטעט דארף זיך באראטן מיט זיינע מיטגלידער אויסער-האלב פאריז אין אלע **וויכטיגסטע** פראגן. ער איז אויך מחויב צו שיקן זיי פראָטאָקאָלן פון זיינע זיצונגען און באריכטן.

(4) דער פארטיידיגונגס-קאָמיטעט דארף אָננעמען תיכף אלע מיטלען, אז ס'זאָל גע-שאפן ווערן א פאָנד פאר ארויסגעבן די ביכער וועגן די פאָגראַמען, וואָס זיינען אָנגעמערקט געוואָרן פון דעם היסטאָרישן ארכיוו. עס דארף צו דעם צוועק תיכף געמאכט ווערן אן אסיגנירונג און צוגעטראַטן ווערן צו דער פאָרבארייטונגס-ארבעט.

די ביכער דארפן דערשיינען אין אידיש און רוסיש – און ביי די ווייטערדיגע מעגליכ-קייטן איז זייער געוואונשן, אז די ביכער זאָלן דערשיינען אויך אין איינער א מערב-אייראָ-פעאישער שפראך – אין גאנצן אָדער אין א פארקירצונג.

מיר זיינען אייך מודיע וועגן די דאָזיגע באשלוסן אונזערע און בעטן אייך אונז געבן אייער ענטפער.

מיט גרויס דרך ארץ |ש. דובנאוו|

|Prof. S. Dubnow, Charlottenbrunnerstr. 3, Grunewald| אונזער אדרעס:

*Translation***On the Defense-Committee Paris**

Most Esteemed Gentlemen,

At the meeting of the “Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv” in Berlin that took place on 7 August, chaired by S. Dubnow, it was determined to approach you with the following resolutions and proposals:

1. The following persons are confirmed as representatives of the Berlin group of the “Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv” to the Defense Committee in Paris: S. Dubnow, M. Kreinin, E. Tcherikower, and N. Gergel.

In addition to those mentioned the Berlin group consists of Jacob Lestschinsky, Y. Klinov, and W. Latzky.

2. It is proposed that Mr. Latzky also be admitted as a member of the Defense Committee.

3. The Defense Committee should consult with its members from outside Paris in all *important* matters. It is also obligated to send them minutes of its meetings and reports.

4. The Defense Committee must immediately adopt all means to establish a fund for publishing the books about the pogroms that have been specified by the Historisches Archiv. To that end assignments must be made and the preparatory work taken up.

The books must appear in Yiddish and in Russian, and should there be further possibilities it is highly desirable that they appear also in a west European language, in either unabridged or abridged versions.

We are advising you of these resolutions and request your reply.

With great respect, |S. Dubnow|

Our address: |Prof. S. Dubnow, Charlottenbrunnerstr. 3, Grunewald|

Document 33

Oleksandr Shulhyn to Arnold Margolin

Paris, 12 August 1926

Typewritten letter,¹⁸ 2 pages

Language: English

YIVO, RG80/400/35107–35108

Extract from a letter received by Dr. Arnold Margolin from Prof. Alexander Chulgin,¹⁹ former Secretary of Foreign Affairs in Ukraine (1917) and representative of Ukrainian National Movement before the League of Nations. Prof. Chulgin is well known to Dr. Motzkin and other European Jews as one of the most honest and liberal minded men among the Ukrainians. He is also one of the chief advocates of Minority Rights. He is now Professor at the Ukrainian University in Prague but for the direction of the Schwartzbard trial, he is in Paris at the head of the Ukrainian Forces.²⁰

August 12, 1926.²¹

M. L. Goldstein and others are committing a terrible mistake against their people in Ukraine. There was enough danger in the sense of anti-semitic propaganda in the very fact that a Jew killed Petlura, the real hero and idol of all the Ukrainians. (I never witnessed such an enthusiasm and love among the Ukrainians towards Petlura as at the present time; even his enemies bowed before him, although deceased). This fact already evoked in certain Ukrainian circles an outburst of anti-semitism. We, however, turned our whole attention from the very first moment not toward the Jews, but toward the Bolsheviki. We said to the Ukrainian emigres as well as to the Ukrainian population in Ukraine that the culprits must be found in Moscow, that

18 English translation of a letter presumably written originally in Ukrainian; original not in file.

19 Oleksandr Shulhyn.

20 Introductory note attached to document.

21 Evidently Shulhyn had written to Margolin earlier on the same subject. Cf. Margolin to Leo Motzkin, 7 July 1926, YIVO, RG80/476/39224: "I have received a letter from A. Ya. Shulhyn from Prague indicating that he is coming to Paris at the invitation of all of the united Ukrainian organizations in Paris for the purpose of defending the honor and the [good] name of the slain S. V. Petliura and that all of those organizations are also asking me to come to Paris in connection with this matter."

Schwartzbard was only the tool in their hands. All the declarations of all the Ukrainian parties were written in this spirit. Thousands of those declarations are now distributed in Ukraine.

You see that the Ukrainian intellegenzia did all it could to stop the anti-semitic propaganda in connection with this murder. And now not the "Black Hundreds," not the anti-semites but the Jews themselves say, "We are those who killed the pogromstschik Petlura." This is a grave mistake on the part of the Jews and if they will not change this attitude in a decisive way, I am horrified for the possible consequences. It would be safe if only "anti-semitic feelings" would be the result. But it can be much worse; terrible pogroms can happen! The blood of innocent persons will be shed again, tragic events will happen about which it is terrible to think.

The members of the commission defending Schwartzbard ought to realize that if such personalities like Petlura are accused without foundation, it offends the whole Ukrainian people. They must not forget that Petlura is already canonized as a great [2] hero and patriot, that his name like the name of Zhevchenko²² became the property of the whole nation.

I understand how difficult it is for you to come to Paris. Your absence is a great blow for Ukrainians and a still greater blow for the Jewish population because you are a man who always sincerely and without fear says to all the parties exactly what he thinks even if it be disagreeable matter. In any case you must be present as a witness at the trial.

Document 34

Eliyahu Tcherikower to Yitshak Giterman

Paris, 26 August 1926

Typewritten letter, 1 page recto and verso

Language: Yiddish

CAHJP, P243/3

פאריז, 26-טן אויגוסט 1926

ה"י גיטערמאן

ווארשע

22 Probably Taras Shevchenko (1814–1861), Ukrainian national poet, regarded as the father of modern Ukrainian literature.

ליבער פריינט גיטערמאן !

איך ווענד זיך צו אייך אין נאָמען פונם פארטיידיגונגס-קאָמיטעט פאר שוואַרצבארדן וועגן פּאָלגנדיגן ענין. אין פּוילן געפינען זיך זייער פּיל עדי-ראיה און געליטענע פון די פּאָג-ראַמען, וועמנס עדות וואָלטן געווען זייער נוצליך פארן פּראָצעס. אייניגע פון זיי האָבן אונז שוין געמאכט פּאַרשלאַגן וועגן ארויסטרעטן אויפן פּראָצעס אדער פּאַרגעלעגט מאטע-ריאלן. אזוי ווי מיר פון דאנען זיינען ניט ביכולת צו קאָנטראָלירן, אויף וויפּיל די פּאַרשלאַגן זיינען ערנסט און נוצליך, האָבן מיר באשלאָסן צו בילדן אין פּוילן א ספּעציעלע קאָמיסיע, וואס זאָל איבערנעמען דעם קאָנטראָל איבער אזעלכע מיני פּאַרשלאַגן. די עדי-ראיה אדער די מאטעריאל-באזיער וועלן זיך דארפן ווענדן צו דער קאָמיסיע.

מיר האָבן אָנגעמערקט, אלס מיטגלידער פון דער קאָמיסיע, די ה"ה" י. גרינבוים, הארט-גלאס און אייך. ה"ה גרינבוים איז דאָ געווען און האָט צוגעשטימט אריין אין אזא קאָמיסיע, ה"ה הארטגלאס וועט זיך אויך געוויס ניט אָפּזאָגן. מיר האָבן זיי געשריבן זיי זאָלן אייך אויך צוציען. גלייכצייטיג ווענדן מיר זיך צו אייך דירעקט מיטן ענליכן פּאַרשלאַגן. מיר ווייסן, אז איר זייט שטארק פארנומען מיט אייערע "דזשאַינט"-ענינים, אבער מיר ווייסן אויך אז איר האָט גרויס אינטערעס צום ענין שוואַרצבארד און וועט געוויס געפינן אביסל צייט פאר דער קאָמיסיע. קיין פּאסיגערן פון אייך, וואס זאָל אזוי גוט קענען די פּאַרהעלטענישן אין אוקראינע, ווייסן מיר ניט און מיר האָפּן, אז [11] איר וועט אונזער פּאַרשלאַג אָננעמען. מיר ווארטן אויף אייער באלדיגער תשובה און דאנקען אייך אפריער.

מיט גרוס און דרך ארץ
אייער א. טשעריקאווער

אונזער אדרעס:
Comité des délégations Juives
avenue de la Grande Armée, 83
Paris (16^e)

Translation

Dear Comrade Giterman,

I am writing you in the name of the Schwarzbard Defense Committee regarding the following matter: In Poland there are very many eyewitnesses to the pogroms and people who suffered from them, whose testimony would be quite useful in the trial. Some of them have already proposed to us to testify at the trial, or they have presented us with materials. Since from here we do not have the ability to assess how serious and useful these proposals are, we have decided to establish in Poland a special commission for the purpose of taking over assessment of proposals of this type. The eyewitnesses or those in possession of materials will need to turn to the commission.

As members of the commission we have designated Messrs. Gruenbaum and Hartglas along with you. Mr. Gruenbaum has been here and has confirmed his participation in such a commission; Mr. Hartglas also will surely not refuse. We have written to them that they should also include you. At the same time we are writing to you directly with a similar proposition. We know that you are extremely busy with the affairs of the Joint,²³ but we also know that you have great interest in the Schwarzbard affair and will surely give a little time to the commission. We know of no one more suitable than you, who knows relations in Ukraine so well,²⁴ and we hope that you will accept our proposal.

We await your prompt reply and thank you in advance.

With greetings and respect,
!Yours, E. Tcherikower!

!Our address:
Comité des délégations Juives
83, avenue de la Grande Armée
Paris (16^e)!

Document 35

Schwarzbard Defense Committee
Paris, 13 September 1926
Typewritten minutes, 7 pages
Language: French
CZA, A126/52/20
Some words effaced

23 The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. Giterman had recently been named the organization's director of operations in Warsaw.

24 Giterman was born and educated in Ukraine and worked there as a social worker until 1921, when he migrated to Poland. In 1919–1920 he had been involved in relief work for pogrom victims.

SEANCE
 du Bureau du « Comité de Défense »
 du 13 Septembre 1926.
 dans les locaux du Comité des Délégations Juives
 83, Avenue de la Grande Armée à Paris.

Présents:

Mr. L. MOTZKIN.
 Mr. J. EFROYKIN.
 Mr. E. TSCHERIKOWER.
 Mr. H. SINDER.²⁵

Mr. Motzkin communique, en résumé, le compte-rendu de la réunion qu'il a eue à Berlin, mardi, le 7 septembre 1926, avec les membres berlinois du Comité de Défense. A cette réunion assistaient MM. Kreinin, Lestschinsky, Dubnow et Gergel, Mr. Klinow n'ayant pu être présent par suite d'un empêchement imprévu.

Mr. Motzkin les a mis au courant de ce qui a été entrepris par le Comité de Défense, tant à Paris qu'à Genève. Son rapport très détaillé a duré une heure environ. Un échange de vues a eu lieu ensuite. Tous les problèmes liés avec les travaux du Comité de Défense ont été discutées d'un point de vue général, sans s'arrêter sur les détails de réalisation et d'application.

Il est intéressant de retracer les points les plus marquants des débats.

1°) Les membres berlinois du Comité, y compris Mr. Dubnow, ont modifié leur attitude à l'égard du caractère devant être donné au procès. Ils rentrent actuellement dans les vues du Comité parisien, à savoir que le procès ne saurait en [a]ucun cas prendre l'allure d'une action engagée par les Juifs contre le peuple ukrainien. Ce revirement est très satisfaisant. Ils vont même plus loin et insistent sur la nécessité de mettre à jour au cours du procès, que les Juifs, en tant que peuple, furent depuis toujours du côté du mouvement national ukrainien de libération. Les membres berlinois appréhendent que certains témoins ne soient portés à déposer dans un esprit différent, ce qui trancherait complètement avec les véritables sentiments des masses juives et nuirait à la cause.

Mr. Tscherikower considère qu'il sera très difficile de faire la leçon à ces témoins, il faut pourtant espérer, qu'étant donnée la gravité de la question, ils sauront peser toutes ses paroles.

25 Haim Sinder, secretary of the Comité des Délégations Juives.

Mr. Motzkin: 2^o) A Berlin on a insisté encore sur la nécessité de faire participer un second avocat à la Défense. Connaissant les idées de Torrès sur ce point, il leur a proposé de nous adresser une lettre officielle dans ce sens afin que nous puissions. Le cas échéant, nous en faire valoir auprès de Mr. Torrès et lui expliquer que ce n'est pas par simple caprice seulement que nous mettons en avance cette exigence, mais que l'opinion publique juive, très alarmée, l'exige impérieusement.

Mr. Efroykin est lui aussi d'avis qu'il faudra envisager sérieusement ce problème. Le point capital est de savoir comment s'y prendre. Si nous proposons à Torrès un confrère, il est susceptible de s'en trouver offensé, ce qui créera des frictions. D'autre part, il est aussi très délicat d'agir par l'intermédiaire de l'accusé, ou de sa femme. D'une part ceux-ci sont sous l'influence de Torrès qui, sur une demande de cette nature formulée par Mme. S., lui avait répondu qu'en attirant un second avocat à la défense elle ferait perdre à son mari le procès; d'autre part, si S. le demandait lui-même à la suite de nos démarches auprès de lui sans en souffler mot à Torrès, nous risquerions de susciter des malentendus fâcheux, dans |3| le cas où Torrès l'apprendrait d'une autre source. Mr. Efroykin est d'avis qu'il serait nécessaire d'avoir à ce sujet une entrevue avec Mr. Blum, quitte à aller le trouver à la campagne. Dans le cas même où la candidature de celui-ci ne pourrait être envisagée, pour telle ou telle autre raison, il serait toujours à même de nous donner son sentiment sur la question et de nous signaler des candidats qui conviendraient à ce rôle. Mr. Efroykin croit, d'ailleurs de pas devoir figurer parmi les témoins pour avoir son entière liberté d'action. Il se propose d'aller voir S. et de lui parler de la question.

Mr. Sinder croit lui aussi que le seul moyen d'agir est celui d'une influence directe sur l'accusé; toute autre tentative est vouée à un échec certain. Quant au second avocat il aurait proposé, comme d'ailleurs il l'avait déjà fait une fois, Mr. Pierre Masse.

On parle ensuite de la date probable du procès et on indique les mois de novembre-décembre.

Mr. Motzkin: 3^o) A Berlin on désirerait que le procès fût remis à une date plus reculée. Les motifs luttent pour cela sont: I^o) laisser se dissiper l'impression défavorable produite par le récent voyage de Torrès en Russie; II^o) la crainte que nous ne soyons pas suffisamment préparés à temps.

Mr. Efroykin constate que Torrès n'a pas tenu la promesse qu'il avait faite s'abstenir en Russie de toute déclaration au sujet de l'affaire. Les réactions brillantes lui auraient tourné la tête et il s'était laissé aller à dire des paroles qu'il n'aurait pas dû prononcer.

Mr. Tscherikower remarque que la presse juive mène grand |4| bruit autour du voyage de Torrès à Moscou. Ainsi l'opinion « Torrès le communiste »

s'incrute de plus profondément dans les esprits, ce qui peut évidemment [nuire] à nos intérêts.

Mr. Efroykin considère qu'il ne faut pas envisager cette question uniquement sous l'angle de notre psychologie juive. Nous sommes par[fois] trop nerveux. Les Français regardent ces choses là tout-à-fait d'une autre façon. D'ailleurs, la presse française a complètement passé sous silence le voyage de Torrès à Moscou; même « l'Action Française » ne l'a pas mentionné.

Mr. Sinder estime que la nuance politique de Torrès ne peut jouer dans le procès le rôle qu'on voudrait lui attribuer. Au Palais, devant la Cour, l'homme politique disparaît, il ne reste que l'avocat, rien que l'avocat. Peu important ses considérations et conceptions politiques, pourvu qu'il soit à la hauteur de sa tâche et qu'il assume la défense en se conformant aux traditions du Barreau.

Mr. Motzkin communique la teneur de la lettre adressée par Mr. Grusenber à Mr. Naiditsch. Dans cette lettre celui-ci se plaint d'être sciemment évincé de toute l'action. Il prétend qu'on se sert maintenant de la documentation qu'il avait recueillie et il demande qu'on la charge de la rédaction de la brochure à paraître.

Les membres berlinois se sont à l'unanimité prononcés contre ces exigences. Ils considèrent que Grusenber ne pourrait être d'aucune utilité et qu'en raison de son caractère difficile il pourrait seulement entraver tout effectif. Quant à la prétendue documentation qu'il aurait recueillie, les archives du Comité des Délégations Juives n'en ont conservé aucune trace, de même qu'il n'a jamais collaboré aux Archives des Pogromes de Berlin.

[5] Mr. Motzkin considère qu'il faut, en tout cas, soumettre cette question à la commission juridique et, lorsque celle-ci aura donné son avis, écrire une réponse officielle à Mr. Grusenber.

Tous les membres du Bureau sont entièrement de l'avis de Mr. Motzkin.

On s'entretient de la liste des témoins à citer.

Mr. Motzkin dit qu'à Berlin on est d'avis qu'il convient de faire citer tous les ministres juifs, y compris Revoutski. Quant à la déposition de Mr. Silberfarb les membres berlinois estiment que l'utilité de cette déposition ne saurait faire l'ombre d'un doute. Tout en représentant un point de vue particulier, Mr. Silberfarb adopte une attitude très énergique contre les pogromes et ses paroles produiront à n'en pas douter, une impression profonde sur l[a] Cour.

Mr. Efroykin estime que cette question a été déjà décidée positivement par le bureau, dans une des ses séances précédentes, et qu'il ne convient pas d'y revenir.

Mr. Tscherikower lit ensuite la liste des témoins à citer.

Mr. Tscherikower fait part de l'opinion de Mr. #####²⁶ que le général Freydenberg²⁷ de ###²⁸ n'a rien de commun avec celui qui était à la tête des troupes françaises à Odessa.

On décide de demander à Torrès d'entreprendre des démarches auprès de Ministère de la Guerre pour établir l'identité de Freydenberg et son lieu de résidence actuel.

Mr. Efroykin se charge d'en parler à Torrès ou, à son défaut à son secrétaire.

On discute ensuite sur l'opportunité de faire venir des témoins d'Amérique et on décide d'entreprendre la nécessaire pour faire entendre Koralnik et Bogen.

[6] Mr. Motzkin considère que, plus particulièrement, la déposition de ce dernier, citoyen Américain, parlant l'Anglais, ayant une certaine autorité et prestance, citant à l'appui de sa déposition des chiffres, des statistiques et des et des faits précis, pourrait produire une impression très favorable sur les jurés.

On décide d'écrire à Mr. Bogen s'il serait disposé à venir témoigner (Mr. Motzkin s'en charge).

On décide en outre d'écrire à Mr. Tsatskin d'aller en Suisse pour intervenir [sic] auprès de la Croix Rouge Internationale, en vue d'une déposition éventuelle de ses représentants.

On discute ensuite sur question des témoins-victimes des pogromes.

L'opinion émise est celle qu'il serait utile de faire entendre 2–3 témoins par pays.

Sur ce point les décisions suivantes sont adoptées:

1°) Etats Unis d'Amérique: On prie [sic] Mr. Kreinin de s'occuper de cette question, lors de son prochain séjours à New-York. Il ### à convoquer quelques représentants de grands journaux de l'american Jewish Congress (Barondess) et d'autres organisations centrales juives en vue de former un petit Comité qui choisirait, avec l'aide des « Landsmannschaften », ²⁹ 2–3 personnes capables de déposer utilement. A cette occasion Mr. Kreinin aura le soin de recommander aux journalistes américains de modérer le bruit mené

26 Name effaced in original.

27 Henri Freydenberg (1876–1975), chief of staff of the French occupation army in Odessa. The commander of the force ("celui") was General Philippe d'Anselme (1864–1936). In 1926 Freydenberg was commander of the French colonial troops in Meknes, Morocco.

28 Word effaced; perhaps "Maroc."

29 See Introduction, at n. 194.

autour de l'affaire et de procéder, en tous cas, à la mission de sélection des témoins, sans aucune publicité quelconque.

2°) Pologne: Ecrire à Grunbaum et Hartglas à ce sujet.

3°) Bessarabie: Entretenir Mr. Yanovsky, partant le 14 septembre pour la Roumanie, de cette affaire et le prier de former à Kichinew un Comité qui s'occuperait de la sélection des témoins qui doivent [7] être légion en Bessarabie, sur les confins du Dnester.

4°) Palestine: Ecrire, dans le même sens, à MM. Schwartz et Tschernowitz.

5°) Paris: On confie à Mr. Sinder la mission de se mettre en rapport avec le Comité de la Rue de Provence pour trouver parmi les orphelins, victimes des pogromes, amenés par ce Comité en France, de[s] enfants qui pourraient faire des dépositions intéressantes, surtout en français. D'autre part Mr. Sinder s'efforcera de rechercher à Paris parmi les victimes des pogromes, plus particulièrement, parmi les personnes parlant le français, des témoins intéressants.

Document 36

Levko Chykalenko, "Zionists and 'Zionists'"

Paris, 26 September 1926

Published journal article

Language: Ukrainian

Tryzub, Vol. 2/2, no. 49, pp. 2–6

СІОНІСТИ І «СІОНІСТИ»

Українські демократичні кола прийняли вбивство Головного Отамана С. Петлюри якимсь Шварцбардом не як акт жидівський, а як акт большевицький, скерований проти української демократії, а особі вождя її, видвинутого нею в збройній боротьбі за державність [3] України. Той факт, що Шварцбард є жид розцінювався нами, як страшна провокація з боку совітської влади. Почуваючи вже непевний ґрунт під ногами, передчуваючи незабаром вибухи народного гніву, але й добре розуміючи заплутанність жидівсько-українських відносин, сучасна совітська влада, антисемітична сама по суті, зумисне таким вибором убивці хоче скерувати ненависть пригнічених нею мас не по лінії політичної боротьби та помсти, а по лінії заплутаних і давньої історією і недавньою практикою московського самодержавного уряду,

національних відносин. Ці національні, чи швидче соціальні расові та релігійні антагонізми використовувала не тільки черносотенна московська політика, але, як довідуємося, з книжки Ів. Алексеєва-Небутьова («Із воспомінаній леваго есера» Подпольная работа на Украине. Главполитпросвет 1922 р. ст. 35) використовують її по своєму і сучасні «черносотенці». Свідомо спровокувавши, разом з своїма колегами жидами, Проскурівську різню тим, що підняли в місці розположення укр. армії повстання проти неї, ці добродії, видавши з головою очевидно тих своїх колег, що були жидівської національності, самі рятуються з цієї різни, прикриваючись своїм українським чи може й «християнським» походженням. Автор так описує момент кривавої розплати: «члени Проскурівського Ревкома, за исключением одного, били растерзаны все, Жмеринчан спасло то, что все они находились в одном доме і когда погромщкі добралісь до него, к нім вишел Литвиненко. Его українськое проісхождение і «посвідчення» с большімі полномочіями спаслі от погрома дом. Вернулись они в Жмеринку морально і нравственно расбітими, счїтая себя невольними (Чому ж невольними? Хїба ж вони не мусіли сподіватися такого кінця? Л. Ч.) вїновниками етого погрома ...»

Отже версія, настирливо пропагована збоку українських «сіоністів» школи Крушевана чи Самосенка, що, мовляв, жиди убили Симона Петлюру видавалася якоюсь безглуздою і тупою, і наша демократія відкидала її з такою ж огидою, як колись доводи славетніх московських діячів жанру Пурішкева та Шмакова, що «жиди убили Ющїнскаво».

Вбачаючи в ширенню такої версії, серед широких українських мас, один из засобів скомпрометувати спроби української та жидівської демократії на Україні до розуміння та щоб абсурдом якимсь виставити закон про національно-персональну автономію, що його уряд Центральної Ради видав, як символ цього порозуміння, наши чорносотенні [sic] жидобойські кола, неждано і негадано для самих себе, були підтримані в своєму твердженню цілою майже жидівською пресою.

Так, каже жидівська преса, жид убив Симона Петлюру! Далі йдуть коментарі причин цього злочину. Пояснення ці жадну об'єктивну людину, що перебувала на Україні за часів революції, переконати не можуть. Можуть переконати вони тільки таких, зовсім сторонніх людей, як Шварцбард, що наприклад, на останньому допиті у суді показав, що поняття не має про особу міністра УНР Олександра Шульгіна, автора в де-якій мірі закону про національно-персональну автономію і весь час плутає його з Василієм Шульгіним, редактором [4] «Кїевляніна». Для таких людей, яким по суті байдуже, що на Україні робилося і як робилося, тим може такі пояснення і заїмпонують. Але зараз і це не має значіння.

Факт лишається фактом: «жид убив Симона Петлюру». Це голос цілої жидівської преси.

І потрошку потрошку із всіх писань цієї преси, навіть у демократа українського йде голова обертом, коли він придивиться до цієї картини, яку представляє собою те жидівство, що стоїть за пресою, як воно дивиться на жидівсько-українські відносини і чого воно від них жде.

Перш за все — Шварцбард є герой, Шварцбард — це новітній «Маккабі». Але вже самі обставини убивства, на людину сторонню, роблять страшне і огидне вражіння. Повалену на землю першою кулею жертву убивця добиває ще п'ятьма чи шістьма кулями. Цього робити герой не може! Це може зробити тільки найординарніший містечковий різник. Що ця людина далека від емоціонального жертвенного екстазу, вже видно по тому, що в сім'ї своїй справу карности чи безкарности такого вчинку убивця обмірковував. Пані Шварцбардова, коли вірити газетам, в першу хвилину, коли довідалася про «удачу» свого чоловіка, заявила, що за свого чоловіка вона не боїться, бо чого оборонятиме, мовляв, сам Торес. Складається таке вражіння з цього всього, начебі на консультацію до тов. Тореса ходив Шварцбард, коли готувався до свого «геройського» вчинку. Незасліплені люде, прийнявши все це на увагу, ледве чи назвуть Шварцбарда героєм та ще коли приймуть на увагу, що й сама «вина», яку закидає Покійному Головному Отаману жидівська преса, а саме, що він «не досить активно боровся з погромами» (самих погромів вже тепер здається ніхто не закидає) була якихось п'ять-сім літ тому назад.

Але нехай так! Нехай Шварцбард не різник, нехай він і не холоднокровний кат, який добре знав, що за страту буде йому тільки нагорода, Нехай і так! Припустім і це, хоч і як це видається неймовірним.

Але ж в чому геройство? В тому, що в українсько-жидівські відносини Шварцбард увів акт політичної кривавої помсти, акт убивства?

Існування погромів на Україні ніхто не відкидає. Але чи хто може закинути українській інтелігенції, українській демократії, що вона їх похваляла, що вона ними керувала? Чи хто може трактувати погроми на Україні, особливо за часів революції, як з'явище не стихійне, а планомірне, обдумане, як з'явище, яке було планово впроваджене, як засіб політичного впливу? Найбільші вороги українського національного руху цього не відважуються говорити, тим більше — кинути це, як обвинувачення, українській демократії, що стояла на чолі цього руху. Не будемо говорити про Винниченка з його «Відродженням Нації»; цей твір є щось патологічне і не на сторінках преси і не сьогодні нам його розбірати та пояснити.

І от, за злочини темних мас і мас часто навіть злочинних, бож за часів

революції, всім відомо, злочинні елементи, в морі анархії, роблять свої жнива; за кров цих жертв, невідомих, здебільшого, перед тим нікому, навіть самим убивцям, жертв випадкових — новітній «Маккабі» убиває цільнішого вождя політичного руху української демократії ...

Як не жорстоко, як не криваво найтемніші елементи нашого народу [5] мстилися за свою темноту, за своє соціальне та національне приниження на невідомому їм і невинному часто жидівському населенні, але перед актом політичної обдуманості помсти це все темніше і меркне.

Від нині рукою Шварцбарда, під аплодисменти цілої майже жидівської преси, цілої улицы, і, як складається вражіння може й цілого суспільства, відкрито книгу національних кривавих розрахунків. І з одного боку записано в ній ім'я Симона Петлюри. І хто відкриває ці розрахунки, і хто їх вітає? Дійсні представники того населення, за яке начебто мстився Шварцбард? Як Шварцбард розуміється на справах українсько-жидівських відносин, здається, досить яскраво свідчить наведений факт про плутання ним Олександра то Василя Шульгиних. Не краще очевидно розуміються в цих відносинах і ті панове, що нацьковують зараз жидівську улицу, що, на жаль зберегла в своїй психиці багато ще свого давнього східного темпераменту.

Чи пойдуть ці добродії на Україну? Чи будуть вони, во ім'я блага своїх соплеменників, своїх одновірців, брати участь в політичній боротьбі на Україні, в умовах середньовіччя, запроваджених большевицькою практикою? Мабуть ні! Натуралізувавшись скрізь по закордонних державах з гаслом «де мені добре, там моя батьківщина» — ці добродії своїм писанням, своїм нацькуванням тільки обтяжують і без того важку ситуацію на Україні і просто унеможливають яку будь працю для нас, для української і жидівської демократії, при ліквідації важкої спадщини минулих віків. І для мене стає питання: яка по суті різниця межі сіоністами з «Разсвета» чи «Хвилі» та «сіоністами» з «Кієвляніна»? Як для тих так і для цих те, що досі робилося, то дурниці, то дрібниці, а порозуміння українсько-жидівське для них непотрібна і шкідлива річ. І ті і другі бачуть далеко десь Сіон. І одні во ім'я цієї далекої, може й фантазії, кличуть за собою зруйновані і спантеличені історичними злиднями жидівські бідні маси, годуючи їх писаниною, що український народ своєю місією, на земній кулі, вважає знищення жидівського народу і виховують ці маси вчинками новітнього «Маккабі»-Шварцбарда, як треба ставитися до таких, як Петлюра, про кого навіть Рафес і навіть в покайній своїй перед совітською владою пише; що «одной із ізлюблених ідей Петлюри, как і многих других українських націоналістів всегда идея союза украинской і еврейской демократії. Поставить еврейскую інтелігенцію і торговий клас на службу української государ-

ственной ідеє, значило для ніх спасі «самостійность». Более гарячіє із ніх говорілі даже о созданіі «Україно-Иудеї». Почті накануне сверженія гетьманщини, при встрече со мною в гетманской тюрме Петлюра говорілі о свойом страстном желаніі осуществіть етот союз і только об етом і говорілі». (М. Рафес. «Два года революцііна Украине». Госиздат. Москва. 1920 г. ст. 133).

Другі — «сіоністи» так само, як і перші, кепкують з цієї «Україно-Иудеї», розбивають всі спроби порозуміння демократій і не кличуть вже до Сіону, а випірають всіма найбрутальнішими способами, жидівську людність, жидівську голоту з України у той милий їхньому серцеві Сіон

...

Але де зараз голос жидівської демократії? Чому вона мовчить? |6| Чому вона не виступить, проти жидівської преси, проти жидівської вулиці і холодним розсудливим словом не утихомирить тої божевільно істерики, яку морем розливають ріжні «Хвілі» та «Разсвети»? Хто не дезертир політичної боротьби, хто не дезертир своєї батьківщини України, той мусить і сьогодні думати про політичне завтра. Українська демократія бореться з своїми «сіоністами», жидівська демократія мусить боротися з своїми сіоністами. І спільними зусиллями мусять припинити їхню спільну працю, бо для всіх нас одинаково страшний той вузол, в який злочинно зав'язують зараз з обох боків жидівсько-українські відносинь.

Левко Чикаленко.

Translation

ZIONISTS AND "ZIONISTS"

Ukrainian democratic circles have regarded the killing of Chief Otaman Petliura by a certain Schwarzbard as the doing not of the Jews but of the Bolsheviks, directed against Ukrainian democracy and the person of its leader, who had been leading an armed struggle for the independence |3| of Ukraine. The fact that Schwarzbard is a Jew seems to us to be a horrible provocation by the Soviet authorities. Sensing that the ground under their feet is insecure, anticipating impending outbursts of popular anger, but nevertheless keenly aware of the complexity of Jewish-Ukrainian relations, the current Soviet regime, itself essentially antisemitic, has, by its calculated choice of the assassin, revealed a desire to divert the animosity of its downtrodden masses from

the lines of political struggle and vengeance toward lines consistent with the convoluted past and recent practice of the Muscovite autocracy concerning relations among national groups. Not only has Moscow's Black Hundred-like policy exploited these national – or, more frequently, social, racial, and religious – antagonisms, as we can learn from Iv[an] Alekseev-Nebutyov in his pamphlet, "From the Memoirs of a Left Socialist Revolutionist, Field Work in Ukraine" (published by Glavnolitprosvet,³⁰ 1922, p. 35); so too are the current "Red Hundreds."³¹ Together with their Jewish associates they deliberately provoked the massacre of Proskurov,³² instigating uprisings against the Ukrainian army wherever it was. These gentlemen then handed over their associates of Jewish nationality, hiding behind the smokescreen of their Ukrainian, or better, "Christian" origins. The author describes a bloody act of vengeance as follows: "All of the members of the Revolutionary Committee of Proskurov except one were brutally tortured. The residents of Zhmerynka³³ were saved only because all of them came together in a single house, and when the pogromists entered the house, *Lytvynenko came across them. His Ukrainian origins and his credibility with the higher authorities saved the house from the pogrom.* They returned to Zhmerynka morally and emotionally ruined, *feeling like unintentional* (Why unintentional? Perhaps because they were not compelled to face such an end? – L[evko] Ch[ykalenko]) *perpetrators of the pogrom ...*"

The story, obsessively propagated by the Ukrainian "Zionists" of the school of Krushevan or Semesenko,³⁴ that the Jews, so to speak, killed Symon Petliura, seemed somewhat pointless and stupid, and our democratic elements rejected it with the same disgust as they did the proofs once offered by

30 The General Committee for Political Education of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

31 On the Black Hundreds see above, Document 26, n. 2. The phrase "Red Hundreds" suggests that the Soviet government was pursuing policies toward Ukrainians and Jews reminiscent of the tsarist Black Hundreds.

32 Site of the largest of the Ukrainian pogroms, in which some 1,500 Jews were killed on 15–18 February 1919.

33 A town in Vinnytsia Oblast, central Ukraine.

34 Pavel Krushevan (1860–1909) was a journalist who promoted the Black Hundred movement. His writings in the newspaper *Bessarabets* from 1897 on are widely believed to have played a significant role in fomenting the 1903 Kishinev pogrom. He also published an early edition of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Ivan Semesenko was a commander of the unit of the army of the Ukrainian National Republic responsible for most of the killing of Jews in Proskurov in February 1919.

noted Muscovite writers of the category of Purishkevich and Shmakov that “the Jews killed Yushchinskiy.”³⁵

Our Black-Hundred, Judeophobic circles saw in the spread of such a version of events among the broad Ukrainian masses a way to compromise the efforts of Ukrainian and Jewish democratic forces in Ukraine to reach an understanding and to portray the law concerning national personal autonomy, which the cabinet of the Central Council issued as a symbol of that understanding, as meaningless.³⁶ Surprisingly, they found their claim supported by nearly the entire Jewish press.

Indeed, the Jewish press says that a Jew killed Symon Petliura! It follows with observations about the reasons for the crime. No objective person who lived in Ukraine during the revolution can be convinced by these explanations. The explanations can persuade only people who, like Schwarzbard, are altogether detached from reality. At his latest interrogation in court, for example, Schwarzbard showed that has no idea of the identity of Oleksandr Shulhyn – the UNR minister who authored particular legal measures related to national-personal autonomy. He constantly confused him with Vasili Shulgin, the editor of *Kievlianin*.³⁷ Such explanations may impress people who don't really care what happened in Ukraine and how. But at the moment this doesn't matter. The fact remains: “A Jew killed Symon Petliura.” That is the voice of the entire Jewish press.

And gradually, from everything that is written in the press, even Ukrainian democrats find their heads spinning when they take a close look at the way in which the Jews who stand behind the press are representing themselves along with their view and expectations of Jewish-Ukrainian relations.

First of all – Schwarzbard is a hero, a modern Maccabee.³⁸ But from a human point of view the very circumstances of the murder make a terrible, disgusting impression. After his first bullet threw the victim to the ground, the killer finishes him off with his fifth and sixth shots. A hero doesn't do this!

35 References to figures in the 1913 ritual murder trial of Mendel Beilis in Kiev. Andrey Yushchinskiy was the twelve-year-old boy whose death in 1911 prompted the ritual murder charges. A. S. Shmakov was a Moscow attorney who represented Yushchinskiy's family in the civil action that accompanied the trial. Vladimir Purishkevich was the founder of the Black Hundreds, a member of the Russian Imperial Duma, and a leader in the anti-Beilis agitation.

36 On this law, promulgated in January 1918, see Abramson, *A Prayer for the Government*, 61–65.

37 See above, Document 27, n. 5.

38 Reference to the leader of a popular revolt in Judea against the Seleucid empire in the second century BCE, the principal hero of the Jewish holiday of Hanukah.

Only the most ordinary provincial butcher acts this way. That this person is far from the ecstatic emotional state of one who offers a sacrifice is evident from the fact that among his own people the question of whether his murderous act should be punished or not has not been considered. If the newspapers are to be believed, when Mrs. Schwarzbard first learned about her husband's "success" she said that she does not fear for her husband, because she was told that Torrès himself will be defending him. All of this leaves the impression that Schwarzbard was acting on Torrès's advice when he prepared his "heroic" deed. People who are not blind and who take all this into account will hardly call Schwarzbard a hero when they consider that the "guilt" that the Jewish press attaches to the late commander-in-chief, namely that he "was not sufficiently active in fighting against the pogroms" (it seems that today no one is ignoring the pogroms) was incurred some five or seven years ago.

But so be it! Let's not call Schwartzbard a butcher, let's not say that he is a coldblooded executioner who knew well that the death penalty would be his only reward. Let even that be the case! Let us suppose all that, even though it seems incredible.

But where is the heroism? Does it lie in the fact that Schwarzbard introduced a bloody act of political revenge, of murder, into Ukrainian-Jewish relations?

No one denies the existence of pogroms in Ukraine. But can the Ukrainian democratic intelligentsia be charged with encouraging or directing them? Can anyone regard the pogroms in Ukraine, especially during the revolution, not as a spontaneous phenomenon but as systematic and deliberate, as something initiated according to a plan, as a way to gain political influence? The greatest enemies of the Ukrainian national movement do not dare to say this, much less to hurl accusations at Ukrainian democratic circles that they led this movement. We shall not speak about Vynnychenko and his book, *The Rebirth of the Nation*; this work is something pathological that has not been explained or analyzed in the press to date.

So, for the crimes of the dark, often even the criminal masses – because everyone knows that in times of revolution the criminal elements reap their harvest in the sea of anarchy – for the blood of these victims of random events, most of them unknown even to the murderers themselves, the modern "Maccabee" kills the most devoted leader of the Ukrainian democratic political movement ...

No matter how cruel or how bloody it is for the most benighted elements of our people [5] to have taken revenge, out of ignorance and out of social and national humiliation, upon an unfamiliar and often innocent Jewish population, a premeditated act of political revenge is far more sinister.

From this moment Schwarzbard's hand, applauded by nearly the entire

Jewish press, by the entire street, and perhaps, one gets the impression, by the entire Jewish community, has opened a book of bloody national reckoning. The name of Symon Petliura is written on one side. Who has begun this reckoning, and who welcomes it? The true representatives of the group of people purportedly avenged by Schwarzbard? Schwarzbard's understanding of Ukrainian-Jewish relations has been displayed rather clearly by his confusion of Oleksandr Shulhyn with Vasili Shulgin. Evidently those gentlemen who agitate on the Jewish street and who, unfortunately, retain much of their old eastern temperament, do not understand these relations any better.

Will these gentlemen be going to Ukraine? Will they, for the benefit of their fellow tribesmen, their coreligionists, be taking part in the political struggle in Ukraine under the medieval conditions that Bolshevik practice has introduced? Most likely not! They can make their home in any foreign country according to the slogan "Wherever it is good, there is my homeland." These gentlemen only aggravate through their writings and agitation an already difficult situation in Ukraine and simply make it impossible for us to accomplish anything on behalf of Ukrainian and Jewish democratic circles toward the goal of liquidating the weighty legacy of past centuries. So for me the question becomes: what, in essence, is the difference between the Zionists of *Razsvet*³⁹ or *Chwila*⁴⁰ and the "Zionists" of *Kievlianin*? Up to now what both have done has been foolish and petty, and they have treated Ukrainian-Jewish understanding as something unnecessary and harmful. Both are looking somewhere far away from Zion. And some, in the name of this far-fetched, perhaps even fantastic goal, are calling upon the impoverished Jewish masses, ruined and bewildered by the vagaries of history, and shouting at them in their writings that the fundamental mission of the Ukrainian people is the destruction of the Jewish people and present the deeds of this modern "Maccabee" – Schwarzbard – as an example of how one should deal with people like Petliura, about whom even Rafes,⁴¹ even in his confession before the Soviet authorities, wrote, "one of Petliura's favorite ideas, as of many other Ukrainian democrats, was always the idea of uniting the Ukrainian and Jewish democratic elements. Putting the Jewish intelligentsia and commer-

39 Name of the weekly newspaper of the Zionist Federation of Russia, published in St. Petersburg, 1907–1915, later reestablished in Berlin and Paris, where Vladimir Jabotinsky was among its major contributors.

40 Daily Polish-language Jewish newspaper published in Lwów, 1919–1939. Its editorial position was aligned with the Zionist Federation of East Galicia.

41 Moshe Rafes (1883–1942), onetime leader of the Jewish Socialist Bund in Russia, who joined the Jewish Section of the Soviet Communist Party (*Yevseksiya*) after the October 1917 revolution.

cial class in the service of the idea of Ukrainian statehood meant to reserve ‘autonomy’ for them. They spoke even more warmly about creating a ‘Ukraino-Judea.’ On the very eve of the overthrow of the Hetmanate, when he met me in the Hetman’s prison, Petliura spoke about his passionate desire to implement that alliance and spoke only about it” (M. Rafes, *Dva goda revolyutsii na Ukraine*, Gosizdat, Moscow, 1920, p. 133).

The second group – the “Zionists” – just like the first, sneer and laugh at the idea of a “Ukraino-Judea” and smash all attempts at understanding between the democratic circles. They have long since ceased to promote Zion; instead, using every brutal tactic, they push away the Jewish population, the Jewish poor, from Ukraine toward the Zion that is dear to their heart ...

But where now is the voice of the Jewish democratic circles? Why are they silent? [6] Why do they not speak out against the Jewish press, against the Jewish street; why do they not use calm and reasonable words to quiet that mad hysteria that has spewn forth like an ocean from publications like *Chwila* and *Razsvet*? Whoever will not desert the political struggle, whoever will not desert his Ukrainian fatherland, must think already today about the political future. Ukrainian democratic circles are struggling against their “Zionists;” Jewish democratic circles must struggle against their own Zionists. And through joint efforts they must put a stop to the joint efforts of the others, because for all of us the entanglement of Jewish-Ukrainian relations with criminal acts is equally frightening for both sides.

Levko Chykalenko

Document 37

Schwarzbard Defense Committee

Paris, 7 October 1926

Typewritten report (copy), 4 pages; front page on printed letterhead; subsequent pages printed “Feuille de continuation;” typewritten page number in upper right corner; “C.d.D.J.” (Comité des Délégations Juives), with “N°” on the following line, printed in upper left corner

Language: Yiddish

CAHJP, P10/4/1

COMITÉ DES DÉLÉGATIONS JUIVES
COMMITTEE OF JEWISH DELEGATIONS

ועד הדלגציות היהודיות
קאמיטעט פון די אידישע דעלעגאציעס

N°

83, AVENUE DE LA GRANDE ARMÉE, PARIS (16^e)
ADRESSE TÉLÉGRAPHIQUE: DELISRAEL PARIS
TÉLÉPHONE: PASSY 65-78

פֿאַרטייִטיגונגס-קאָמיטעט.

Paris, le |7 octobre| 1926⁴²

קאַנפידענציעל

ניט צו פארעפענטליכן

קורצער באריכט וועגן דער טעטיקייט פונם פארטיידיגונגס-קאמיטעט

אין פֿאַרײַז.

פאר די חדשים אויגוסט, סעפטעמבער און אָקטאָבער, 1926.

1. דער אפאראט פון ביוראָ האָט זיך שוין פון יולי אָן קאָנסטרוואירט. מיטע אויגוסט איז פון בערלין געקומען א. טשעריקאָווער. אין ביוראָ ארבעט אויך, אלס שטענדיגער מיט ארבעטער, י. שעכטמאן. עס איז אויך אנגעלאדן געוואָרן א שטאב פאר טעכנישער ארבעט.
2. דער טייל פונם "מזרח-אידישן היסטאָרישן ארכיוו", וואָס אנטהאלט די מאטעריאלן וועגן די אוקראינישע פאָגראָמען, איז אינגאנצען איבערגעפירט געוואָרן פון בערלין קיין פאריז און געפינט זיך אין לאָקאל פון קאָמיטעט. עס איז אויך אריבערגעפירט געוואָרן אהער די פאָגראָם-פילם פונם אויבנדערמאנטן ארכיוו.
3. עס ווערן סיסטעמאטיזירט און באארבעט די צייטונגס-אויסשניטן פון דער גאנצער אידישער און אויך פון דער אלגעמיינער פרעסע, וואָס האָבן א שיקות צום פראָצעס. מיט א באזונדערער אויפמערקזאמקייט ווערט באארבעט די אַוקראַינישע פרעסע, וועלכע מיר באקומען איצט.
4. טעגליך קומען פאָר באראטונגען פונם סעקרעטאריאט מיטן פאָרזיצער וועגן דער לויפנדער ארבעט. עס קומען אויך פאָר רעגולארע זיצונגען פונם 12| ביוראָ, אָפט צוזאמען מיט די מיטגלידער פון דער יודישער קאָמיסיע.
- די הויפט-ארבעט פון ביוראָ איז – צוגרייטן דעם אויספאָרשונגס-מאטעריאל און אויס-זוכן די עדות צום פראָצעס, בכדי צו רעקאָמאנדירן זיי דעם פארטיידיגער. דאָ זיינען אָנגע-נומען געוואָרן פאָלגענדיגע שריט.
5. כדי אויפזוכן עדות אין פוילן און קאָנטראָלירן, וואָס זיי האָבן צו דערציילן, געפינט זיך דאָס ביוראָ אין א שטענדיגן קאָנטאקט מיט די סיים-דעפוטאט י. גרינבוים און א. האר טגלאס אין ווערשע [sic]. דאָס ביוראָ האָט באשלאָסן, אז עס איז גענוג צו רעקאָמאנדירן צו 3-2 מער וויכטיגערע עדות פון יעדן לאַנד, וואס זאָל קומען צום פראָצעס.

42 Last digit of the year typed; month and day filled in in pencil.

6. קיין ארגענטינע זיינען אָפגעשיקט געוואָרן בריוו צו דער פּראָסקוראָווער לאַנדסמאַן שאַפּט און צום אָרטיגן כלל-טווער ה" רעגאַלסקי מיטן פּאַרשלאַג אויסצוווּכן און דעלעגירן צום פּראָצעס 2-3 עדות פון די פּאַגראַם-געליטענע. געלד מיטלען דערצו דאַרף באשאפן ווערן אויפן אָרט.
7. וועגן די עדות, וועלכע געפינען זיך אין ארץ-ישראל, האָט זיך דאָס ביוראָ געשטעלט אין פאַרבנדונג מיט די ה"ה" טשערנאָוויץ אין תל-אביב און ש. שוואַרץ אין ירושלים, ווי אויך מיטן פאַרוואלטער פון דער קינדער-קאָלאָניע פאַר די פּאַגראַם-יתומים ה" פונגאַטשאוּו. עס זיינען אָנגענומען געוואָרן אויך אנדערע שריט, כדי צו געפינען די דאסיגע עדות אין אנדערע לענדער (בעסאַראַביע וכדומה).
8. דאָס ביוראָ האָט באקומען פון די געוועזענע אידישע מיניסטאַרן אין אוקראַינע, דר. מ. זילבערפאַרב און א. רעוואַצקי מעלדונגען, אז זיי זיינען גרייט ארויסצוטרעטן אלס עדות אויפן פּראָצעס; דערביי האָבן זיי אָנגעוויזן, וואָס פאַר אַ פּאָזיציע זיי וועלן פאַרנעמען ביים עדות-זאָגן. דאָס ביוראָ האָט אויך געפירט וועגן דעם אונטערהאַנדלונגען מיטן געוועזענעם געהילף פונם אוקראַינישן האַנדלס-מיניסטער ה" גאַלדעלמאַן, וועלכער האָט זיך צו-פעליג געפינען אין פאַריז. די פּרגע וועגן רעקאַמאַנדירן רעוואַצקי און גאַלדעלמאַנען, אלס עדות, 13| איז אין ביוראָ אין פּרינציפּ נאָך ניט באשטימט געוואָרן.
9. לויט דער אינציאַטיוו פון ביוראָ האָט זיך טאַרעס געווענדעט דורך די פאַריזער אידישע צייטונגען צו די אוקראַינישע פּאַגראַם-געליטענע, וואָס געפינען זיך אין פּראַנקרייך גופא און האָבן עפעס וויכטיגעס צו דערציילען, - זיי זאָלן זיך צו אים מעלדן. אין ביוראָ מעלדן זיך אויך איצט פּערוואַנען, וועלכע האָבן צו דערציילן וועגן איינצעלנע פּאַקטן פון די פּאַגראַמען. דאָס ביוראָ האָט פּאַרגעשלאָגן ה" טאַרעס ארויסרופן אלס עדות אייניגע פון זיי.
10. דאָס ביוראָ גרייט צו און איבערזעצט אין פּראַנצויזיש פאַרן פּראָצעס א רייע מאַטעריאַלן און דאָקומענטן וועגן די פּאַגראַמען.
11. לויט אונזער רעקאַמאַנדאַציע האָט טאַרעס צוגעשטעלט צום אויספאַרשונגס-רייכטער די רשימה פון די עדות - ה"ה" טיאָמקין, קאַראַליניק און טשעריקאָווער, וועלכע זיינען ארויסגעטרעטן אויפן פאַרהער דעם 14-טן אָקטאָבער.
12. ה"ה" מאָצקיין האָט, זייענדיג אין בערלין, געהאַט א רייע באַראַטונגען מיט די בער-לינער מיטגלידער פונם פאַרטיידיגונגס-קאָמיטעט און פונם "מזרח-אידישן היסטאָרישן ארכיוו", אונטערן פּאַרזיץ פון פּראָפ. ש. דובנאָוו. ה"ה" מאָצקיין האָט זיי אָפגעגעבן א באריכט וועגן דער טעטיקייט אין פאַריז, און עס זיינען אָנגענומען געוואָרן א רייע באַשלוסן צו רע-קאַמאַנדירן דעם קאָמיטעט אין פאַריז (וועגן די עדות, וועגן דער טאַקטיק אויפן פּראָצעס, וועגן געלט-מיטלען ארויסצוגעבן די פּאַגראַם-מאַטעריאַלן וכדומה).
13. דאָס בוך וועגן פּאַגראַמען, וואָס ווערט ארויסגעגעבן פונם קאָמיטעט, ווערט פאַר-ענדיקט; איצט ווערט געמאַכט די איבערזעצונגען אין פּראַנצויזיש און אין ענגליש.
14. דאָס ביוראָ געפינט זיך אין א שטענדיגן קאָנטאַקט מיטן פאַרטיידיגונגס-קאָמיטעט אין לאַנדאָן, וועלכער איז ניט לאנג געגרינדעט געוואָרן. א פאַרשטייער פונם קאָמיטעט, ד"ר זאַלקינד, איז, לויט דער איינלאַדונג פון ביוראָ געווען אין פאַריז.
15. כדי אויסצומיידן אויף להבא דאָס ערשיינען פון סענסאַציאָנעלע 14| און אמאָל אויך פאַלשע ידיעות וועגן די פּאַגראַמען און וועגן דעם פּראָצעס, האָט זיך דאָס ביוראָ געווענדעט מיט א בריוו (געחממעט פון ל. מאָצקיין און ש. אש) צו די רעדאַקציעס פון די וויכטיגע אידישע צייטונגען מיט א בקשה זיי זאָלן זיך מיט דער גרעסטער פּאַרזיכטיקייט

באציהען צו די פארשיידענע ידיעות וועגן די פאָגראַמען און וועגן דעם פּראָצעס, און האָבן זיי פּאַרגעלעגט, אז זיי קאָנען די ידיעות קאָנטראָלירן דורך דעם קאָמיטעט, פארבינדענדיג זיך מיט אים.

פּאַרזיצער:
סעקרעטאר:⁴³

Translation

Confidential
Not for publication

Brief Report on the Activities of the Defense Committee
in Paris,
August, September, October 1926

1. The office has been set up and running since July. In the middle of August E. Tcherikower arrived. J. Schechtman is also working in the office as a permanent member of the staff. A staff for technical work has also been engaged.

2. The portion of the "Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv" that contains the materials about the Ukrainian pogroms has been transferred entirely from Berlin to Paris and is located on the Committee's premises. The pogrom film has also been transferred here from the above-mentioned archive.⁴⁴

3. The newspaper clippings from the entire Jewish and also from the general press that have a bearing on the trial have been worked through and arranged systematically.⁴⁵ The Ukrainian press, which we now obtain, is being worked through with special attention.

4. Daily briefings take place between the Secretariat and the Chairman concerning the ongoing work. Regular |2| office staff meetings also take place, often together with the members of the Judicial Committee.

43 Signatures absent in archival copy.

44 Reference unclear. Some film footage of the 1919 pogroms is held in the Central State Film, Photo and Sound Archive at the Ukraine National Archives in Kiev, Ukraine, with copies at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D. C. (RG-60.3175, film ID 2489).

45 The extensive newspaper files collected by the Defense Committee are located in CAHJP, P243/5-32.

The main task of the office is to prepare the investigation material and to search for witnesses for the trial in order to recommend them to defense counsel. The following steps have been taken in this regard.

5. In order to search for witnesses in Poland and to assess what they have to relate, the office is in regular contact with the Sejm deputies I. Gruenbaum and A. Hartglas in Warsaw. The office decided that it is sufficient to recommend 2–3 more important witnesses from each country to come to the trial.

6. Regarding Argentina letters were sent to the Proskurov landsmanshaft and to the local communal leader Mr. Regalski⁴⁶ with a proposal to search for and to send 2–3 witnesses from among those who suffered in the pogrom to the trial. Funds for these purposes must be raised there.

7. Regarding the witnesses in Palestine, the office has made contact with Messrs. Tchernowitz⁴⁷ in Tel Aviv and Sh. Schwarz⁴⁸ in Jerusalem, together with the director of the children's village for pogrom orphans, M. Pugachev.⁴⁹

Additional steps have also been taken find appropriate witnesses in other countries (Bessarabia etc.).

8. The office received from the former Jewish ministers in Ukraine, Dr. M. Silberfarb and A. Revutsky, reports that they are prepared to testify at the trial, indicating thereby what sort of a position they will adopt in their testimony.⁵⁰ The office also conducted negotiations on this issue with the former assistant to the Ukrainian minister of commerce, Mr. Goldelman, who happened to be in Paris. [3] The office has not yet determined in principle whether to recommend Revutsky and Goldelman as witnesses.

9. On the initiative of the office, Torrès used the Paris Yiddish newspapers to approach those who suffered from the Ukrainian pogroms who are now in France and who have something important to relate with a request to report

46 Probably Marcos Regalski, a prominent figure in Jewish immigrant absorption, publishing, and politics in Buenos Aires.

47 No doubt Shmuel Tchernowitz (1879–1929), an editor of the newspaper *Haaretz* and secretary of the General Council (*va'ad le'umi*) of Jews in Palestine.

48 Journalist and editor.

49 The children's village (*kefar yeladim*) in question was established in 1923 by Israel Belkind (1861–1929), a pioneer of the modern Jewish settlement in Palestine, who had founded the country's first Hebrew-language general school in 1889 and an agricultural school for children and youth who had fled the infamous Kishinev pogrom in 1903) as a home for 140 orphans of the Ukrainian pogroms. It was located in the Jezreel Valley. Shneur Zalman Pugachev (Amiav, d. 1934), a well-known progressive educator of Ukrainian Jewish origin, became director of the village in 1924.

50 Many in the Jewish world expected Silberfarb and Revutsky to defend Petliura. See Documents 21, 25.

to him. People who can tell about particular facts relating to the pogroms are now also reporting to the office.

10. The office is preparing and translating into French a series of materials and documents about the pogroms for the trial.

11. On our recommendation Torrès presented the examining magistrate the list of the witnesses – Messrs. Tiomkin, Korálnik, and Tcherikower – who appeared at the hearing on 14 October.⁵¹

12. When Mr. Motzkin was in Berlin he had a series of consultations with the Berlin members of the Defense Committee and of the “Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv,” chaired by Prof. S. Dubnow. Mr. Motzkin presented them with a report about activities in Paris, and a series of decisions was taken for recommendation to the Committee in Paris (concerning the witnesses, trial tactics, financial resources for publishing the pogrom materials, etc.).

13. The book about pogroms that the Committee will be publishing is being completed; translations into French and English are now being made.

14. The office maintains ongoing contact with the Defense Committee in London, found not long ago. A representative of that committee, Dr. Zalkind,⁵² was in Paris at the office’s invitation.

15. In order to avoid in the future the appearance of sensational [4] and also once and a while false news items about the pogroms and about the trial, the bureau approached the editorial boards of the most important Jewish newspapers, in a letter (signed by L. Motzkin and Sch. Asch), with a request that they should relate to the various news items about the pogroms and about the trial with the greatest caution and a suggestion that they can assess the news items by working together with the Committee.

Chairman:

Secretary:⁵³

51 Tiomkin actually gave his testimony to the examining magistrate on 1 October.

52 Probably Jacob Meyer Zalkind (1875–1937), an orthodox rabbi and Yiddish writer with both Zionist and anarchist ties.

53 Signatures absent on archival copy.

Document 38

Mykyta Shapoval to Ilya Dobkowski

Prague, 15 October 1926

Typewritten letter (copy), 4 pages

Language: Russian

YIVO, RG80/448/37831–37834

Копія

15.X.1926

Уважаемый товарищ Добковскій,

Благодарю за письмо. Я признаюсь, что совсѣм [не]⁵⁴ понимаю Ваш план дѣйствій. В чем он состоит?

Моя точка зренія: по полученіи от брата письма о Вашей готовности выступить публично против еврейской буржуазно-шовинистической вахханаліи /по дѣлу Шварцбард-Петлюра-погромы/ путем опубликованія статьи в нашем органѣ «Нова Украина» при условіи изданія этой статьи по французки отдѣльной брошюрой – я отвѣтил согласіем. Попутно брат сообщил мне Ваше желаніе, чтобы мы подготовили возможность отвѣтов Ваших по франц. органах. Об этом подумал тоже и рѣшил просить своих политических друзей /по Междунар. Бюро рев. соц. партій/ об оказаніи содѣйствія. Потому Вы имѣли бы возможность говорить через франц., нѣм., итал., и американскую прессу. Я имѣл в виду просить своего друга Мирослава Сичинскаго /укр. социалиста, убившаго 1908 наместника Галиціи Графа Потоскаго/, имѣющаго большія политическія связи в Америкѣ и отчасти Европѣ, чтобы он побыл в Парижѣ и устроил прессу по этому дѣлу.

Мнѣ кажется, что этого вполне достаточно.

Однако, меня смущает теперешняя Ваша позиція: что стоит препятствіем к Вашему выступленію? Кромѣ того Вы совершенно не дооцѣниваете значеніе Вашего выступления: не только надо выступить против еврейскаго шовинизма, но и против украинскаго антисемитизма /который поднял голову как раз вслѣдствіе преступленія Шварцбарда/.

Вѣдь главная наша цѣль говорить к украинскимъ масса[м], гдѣ [2] нарастает злобное чувство к евреям вслѣдствіе агитаціи укр. шовинистов и

54 Undoubtedly a copyist's omission.

еврейских. За еврейской прессой у нас следят, и шовинисты указывают на изумительный факт: почти никто из евреев не осуждает Шварцбарда и не пробует по человечески сказать слово к украинской массѣ.

Вы правильно пишете в статьѣ, что главный вопрос – устранение вражды между 40 миллионным укр. народом и 8-мя миллионами евреев, живущих на укр. землѣ. Вѣдь в этой враждѣ заложены тяжелые моменты.

Вы должны говорить к укр. массѣ.

Потому напечатание В. статьи в «Н. Укр.» есть необходимость, которую нельзя откладывать.

Центр Вашего вниманія в том, что когда Вы выступите, то на Вас нападет евр. пресса. Можно этого ожидать, но не забывайте, что Вас будет защищать вся украин. пресса, а это для еврейскаго народа и тысячу раз полезнѣе, чѣм замѣтки и статьи во франц. прессѣ. Франц. газет наш народ не читает и не будет знать того, что Вы там напишете. Он узнает только то, что напишем мы в «Нов. Укр.» и др. изданіях наших. Это важнѣе для будущаго обоих народов. Потому Вы должны говорить к еврейскому и украинскому народам в первую очередь. Я увѣрен, что еврейская «улица» очень внимательно будет читать укр. прессу.

Вы не будете одни: Я увѣрен, что и другіе еврей-соціалисты Вас поддержат. Мы также не одиноки в своей средѣ.

Потому и надо немедленно выступить.

Одновременно с печатаніем статьи в «Н. Укр.» я поручу в Парижѣ напечатать В. статью отдѣльной брошюрой, которую мы вездѣ разошлем, и она свое дѣло сдѣлает. Необходимо немедленно дѣйствовать.

По выход Вашей статьи и выступлю в еврейской прессѣ /вѣдь уже моя больш. статья «Укр. государственность и евреи» была печатана в 1919 г. в еврейской соц. газетѣ. Думаю, что бундисты в Варшавѣ напечатывают |з| – я в сношеніи с Эрлихом и Альтером/.

Благоволите мнѣ сообщить скорѣе:

1. Согласны ли Вы немедленно выступить со статьей в нашем органѣ «Н. Укр.» и отдѣльной брошюрой по фр., которую мы издали бы одновременно с выходом в свѣт очередной книжки «Н. Укр.».

2. Если да, то пришлите сѣкончателѣнный /исправленный/ текст В. статьи: если он не будет сильно отличаться от перваго текста, а если разница будет большая, то старый набор разсыпем, а новый текст наберем наново /хотя это причиняет нам лишніе расходы, а мы вѣдь не богаты/.

3. Напишите Ваше условія – вѣдь надо же точно обо всем уговариваться, чтобы не было недоразумѣній /сколько экземпляров брошюры по франц. О каких органах фр. прессы Вы говорите и почему Вас не удовлетворяет возможность отвечать в «Пари Суар»?

Благоволите не задерживать отвѣта, так как я должен знать, что дѣлать с набором статьи: печатать или разсыпашать?

Я знаю, что Вам не легко все это: евр. улица будет, вѣроятно, кричать о Вашей «измѣнѣ», но это для нас не страшно – черносотенцы всѣх націй одинаковы и кричат об «измѣнѣ» социалистов, но мы игнорируем этот буржуазный рев и дѣлаем свое дѣло. Но еще хуже крики с другой стороны: укр. улица кричит, что всѣ евреи стоят на анти-укр. точкѣ зрѣнія, и мы, укр. социалисты до сих пор не имѣем возможности опровергнуть это указаніем на то, что евр. социалисты не одинаково думают с евр. буржуазіей. Вот почему Ваше выступленіе необходимо, а его потом поддержат и другіе евр. соц. /думаю, что и Шт. и др. [sic] Донской и др./ – ведь частно не раз говорили мнѣ евр. т. т. то же, что пишете Вы.

Жалѣю, что я не в Парижѣ, чтобы все лично выяснить. В декабрѣ |4| или январѣ я приѣду в Париж и тогда лично выясню возможность дальнѣйшей кампаніи. Я уверен, что нас поддержат и рус. с-ты.

Прошу отвѣтить скоріе.

С товарищеским привѣтом
М. Шаповал

П. С. По оригиналу я уже поправил перевод статьи. Я боюсь, что Вы колеблетесь в основании, надо или не надо выступать. Жду точнаго отвѣта.

М. Ш.

Translation

Copy

15 October 1926

Esteemed Comrade Dobkowski,

Thank you for your letter. I confess that I [do not]⁵⁵ understand your plan of action at all. Of what does it consist?

My perspective: after receiving from my brother a letter about your readiness to come out publicly against the Jewish bourgeois-chauvinist Bacchana-

55 Ibid.

lia (over the Schwarzbard-Petliura-pogroms affair) by publishing an article in our newspaper, *Nova Ukraina*,⁵⁶ on condition that the article also be published as a separate brochure in French, I responded with agreement. On the same occasion my brother told me of your wish that we prepare a possible response for you in the French organs. I thought about that as well and decided to ask my political colleagues (in the International Bureau of the Social Revolutionary Party) for help, because you would have the chance to speak via the French, German, Italian, and American press. I had in mind asking my colleague Miroslav Sichynsky (a Ukrainian socialist who in 1908 assassinated the viceroy of Galicia, Count Potocki)⁵⁷ to come to Paris and set up a press [campaign] about this matter, since he has many political contacts in America and to an extent in Europe.⁵⁸

It seems to me that this is entirely sufficient.

However, I am bothered by your current position: Who is placing obstacles in the way of your article? Besides, you don't draw out fully the significance of your article: you need to come out not only against Jewish chauvinism but also against Ukrainian antisemitism (which has raised its head as of old as a result of Schwarzbard's crime).

You see, our main aim is to speak to the Ukrainian masses, [2] among whom a hateful feeling toward the Jews is growing as a result of the anti-Jewish agitation of the Ukrainian chauvinists. They follow the Jewish press, and the chauvinists point to the astounding fact that almost no one among the Jews condemns Schwarzbard or tries to say a word to the Ukrainian masses on a human level.

In your article you write correctly that the main issue is to remove the enmity between the 40 million members of the Ukrainian nation and 8 million Jews living in the Ukrainian lands.⁵⁹ But difficult moments are bound up in that enmity.

You must speak to the Ukrainian masses.

That is why publication of your article in *Nova Ukraina* is a necessity that must not be brushed aside.

56 A bi-weekly Ukrainian emigré journal published in Prague beginning in 1922 under the editorship of Mykyta Shapoval. Vynnychenko became coeditor in 1923. The journal generally took an anti-Petliurist, left-socialist line.

57 On this episode see, most recently, Larry Wolff, *The Idea of Galicia. History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture*, Stanford Calif. 2010, 331, 336

58 Sichynsky escaped from prison in 1911 and settled in the United States, where he founded and edited several Ukrainian emigré newspapers.

59 The Soviet census of 1926 gave the total population of the Ukrainian SSR as slightly more than 29 million, of whom 1.6 million were Jews.

Your attention is centered on this: that when you publish, the Jewish press will attack you. That can be expected, but don't forget that the entire Ukrainian press will come to your defense, and that is a thousand times more useful for the Jewish nation than notes and articles in the French press. Our nation does not read French newspapers and will not be aware of what you write there. It will know only what we write in *Nova Ukraina* and in our other publications. That is more important for the future of both nations. That is why you need to speak in the first instance to the Jewish and to the Ukrainian nations.

You will not be alone: I believe that other Jewish socialists will support you. We are also not alone in our milieu.

That is another reason why we need to publish right away.

Together with the publication of your article in *Nova Ukraina* I will give instructions in Paris to publish it as a separate brochure, which we will distribute all over, and it will have its effect. It is essential to act immediately.

Once your article appears I too will publish something in the Jewish press (after all, my major article, "Ukrainian statehood and the Jews" was published in 1919 in a Jewish socialist newspaper.⁶⁰ I think that the Bundists in Warsaw will publish [3] – I am in relations with Ehrlich and Alter.)⁶¹

Could you kindly inform me as soon as possible:

1. Do you agree immediately to publish an article in our organ, *Nova Ukraina*, and a separate pamphlet in French that we would publish simultaneously with the appearance of the regular issue of *Nova Ukraina*?

2. If yes, then send the completed (amended) text of your article if it is not significantly different from the original version, but if the difference is great, then we will destroy the old galleys and set the new text from scratch (even though this will involve additional costs, and we are not rich after all).

3. Write us your terms – surely it will be necessary to come to a precise agreement about them so that there will be no misunderstanding (how many copies of the French pamphlet, which French press organs to you have in mind, and why are you not satisfied with the chance to respond in *Paris Soir*?)

Please be so kind as not to delay your reply, because I need to know what to do with the galleys of your article: to print or to destroy?

I know that this is not easy for you: the Jewish street will most likely scream about your "betrayal," but that doesn't frighten us – the Black Hun-

60 Not located.

61 Henryk Ehrlich (1882–1942) and Wiktor Alter (1890–1943) were the most prominent leaders of the General Jewish Workers Federation of Poland, which operated as a socialist political party commonly known as the Bund (the Yiddish word for "federation").

dreds of all nations similarly scream about “betrayal” by the socialists, but we ignore that bourgeois howling and go about our business. But the screams on the other side are even worse: the Ukrainian street is screaming that all Jews take an anti-Ukrainian attitude, and we Ukrainian socialists have not had a chance to refute this by pointing out that Jewish socialists do not think like the Jewish bourgeoisie. That is why your article is essential, and other Jewish socialists will republish it as well (I have in mind St[einberg], Dr. Donskoi,⁶² and others) – after all, Jewish comrades have told me privately more than once the same thing that you write.

I regret that I am not in Paris in order to clarify everything in person. I will be coming to Paris in December [4] or in January, and then I will talk to you about the possibility of a more extended campaign. I am confident that the Russian socialists will also support us.

Please reply soon.

With comradely greetings

M. Shapoval

P.S. I have already corrected the original translation of the article. I fear that you will vacillate in deciding whether or not to go forward. I await a precise answer.

M. Sh.

Document 39

Mykyta Shapoval to Mikhail Volodin

Prague, 15 October 1926

Typewritten letter (copy), 2 pages

Language: Russian

YIVO, RG80/448/37829–37830

Копія

15.X.1926

гос. Володину

62 Reference unclear.

Уважаемый Товарищ,

Ваше письмо и письмо т. Добк. получил. Спасибо за разъяснение ситуации, но мне все таки многое не ясно.

Из моего отвѣта т. Д-ому увидите мой взгляд на дѣло. Я Вас очень прошу помочь, чтобы немедленно я мог знать, что дѣлать с набором статьи т. Д-го: печатать или нѣт.

Если печатать, то пришлите мне просто новый /или исправленный/ русский текст, а я здѣсь немедленно поручу сдѣлать точный и хороший перевод.

Меня просто удивляет эта волокита.

Выясните с братом это недоразумѣние о перепиской и отправкой статьи. Ведь это мелкий вопрос.

Статья т. Д., конечно, не является квази-социалистической: она трактует об отношеніи народов с соц. точки зрѣнія. О «явкѣ» анархистов можно и совсѣм не писать – не это важно.

Думаю, что надо выбросить нѣсколько строчек, гдѣ т. Д. говорит, что Шварцбард хороший человек и что он готов бороться за освоб., если бы и т.д. Это противорѣчит с общим тоном статьи о неискренности Шварцбарда, которую т. Д. разоблачает. Стиль статьи надо нѣсколько выравнять – она написана нервно, но постановка всѣх вопросов в ней правильна.

Моя просьба: перепишите наново с т. Д. его статью и присылайте.

Кромѣ того; во всяком дѣлѣ необходима точность, т.е. «условія» исполненія его. Я потому и говорю об условіях, ибо дѣло требует |2| ясность.

Я печатаніе задержал и жду немедленнаго рѣшенія. И Вы и Д. проувеличиваете значеніе фр. прессы. Меня удивляет, почему В. и Д. не удовлетворяют тѣ возможности, о которых я писал, между тѣм не пишете, чего хотите, какой прессы, в какой газетѣ хочет т. Д. отвѣчать на могуція быть нападки.

Относительно статьи Волина брат мне писал. Я отвѣтил согласіем и просьбой, чтобы Волин написал сцѣнку Махновщины. Поговорите об этом с братом – он имѣет всѣ указанія нашего парт. комитета.

О высылкѣ денег подтвердил распоряженіе – через нѣсколько дней Вы их получите.

Кстати вообще об этом: на будущее пишите прямо т. Залевскому, секрет. «Н. У.» в Подибрадах. Он имѣет постановленіе редакц. комитета об этом.

С товарищеским привѣтом
М. Шаповал

*Translation*Copy

15 October 1926

To Mr. Volodin

Esteemed Comrade,

I have received your letter and the letter of C[omrade] Dobk[owski]. Thank you for clarifying the situation, but there is still much that is not clear to me.

From my response to C[omrade] D[obkowski] you will see my view of the matter. I strongly request your help so that I might know immediately what to do with the galleys of C[omrade] D[obkowski]'s article: to publish or not.

If [you want] to publish, then send me right away a new (or revised) Russian text, and I will immediately give an instruction here to produce an exact and proper translation.

I am simply surprised by all these petty details.

Clear up this misunderstanding about rewriting and sending the article with my brother. But this is a small problem, isn't it?

Of course, C[omrade] D[obkowski]'s article doesn't turn out to be quasi-socialist: it deals with the relations between peoples from a socialist point of view. It isn't necessary to write at all about how the anarchists "look" – that isn't what's important.

I think it is necessary to cut out a few lines in which C[omrade] D[obkowski]owski says that Schwarzbard is a good man and that he would be prepared to fight for his liberation if only etc. This stands in contradiction to the overall tone of the article with regard to Schwarzbard's lack of sincerity, which C[omrade] D[obkowski]owski exposes. The style of the article needs to be made a bit more even-keeled – it is written in a nervous tone, even though the formulation of all of the questions in it is correct.

My request: rewrite C[omrade] Dobkowski's article together with him and send it [to me].

Otherwise, accuracy is essential in any case; that is a "condition" that must be fulfilled. For that reason I too am talking about conditions, because the matter demands |2| clarity.

I have held up publication and expect an immediate decision. Both you and C[omrade] D[obkowski] overestimate the significance of the French

press. I am surprised why you and D[obkowski] aren't satisfied with the opportunities about which I have written, while you don't write what it is you want, which press, in which newspapers does C[omrade] D[obkowski] want to respond to whatever attacks there may be.

Regarding Voline's article my brother has written me. I responded with agreement and with a request that Voline write a small piece about the Makhno movement.⁶³ Discuss this with my brother – he has the full instructions of our party committee.

I have confirmed the order to send money – you will receive it in a few days.

By the way, in general on this matter: in the future write directly to Comrade Zalewski, the secretary of *Nova Ukraina*, in Poděbrady.⁶⁴ He is in possession of the Editorial Committee's policy about this.

With comradely greetings,
M. Shapoval

Document 40

Executive Committee, American Jewish Congress

New York, 17 October 1926

Language: English

Typewritten minutes, 10 pages, extract from pages 7f; handwritten corrections AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144, file: "American Jewish Committee, 1926"

63 Reference to Vsevolod Mikhailovich Eichenbaum (1882–1945), a prominent Russian anarchist who had fought with Nestor Makhno during the Russian Civil War (see above, Introduction, n. 72) and had been a leader of the Ukrainian anarchist organization Nabat. From 1924 he lived in Paris, where, under the pseudonym Voline, he wrote prolifically on anarchist themes. On Makhno, see above, Introduction, n. 72.

64 Town in central Bohemia, 50 km east of Prague. At the time this letter was written it was the site of several Ukrainian exile political and academic institutions, including the League of Ukrainian Nationalists (*Legiia ukrains'kykh natsionalistiv*) and the Ukrainian Economic Academy (*Ukrains'ka hospodars'ka akademiia*, also known as the Ukrainian Husbandry Academy).

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Meeting of the Executive Committee held on
October 17, 1926

MINUTES

[7] [...] A letter was presented from Doctor Arnold D. Margolin transmitting a memorandum on the assassination in Paris last summer of Semion Petlura, former leader of the Ukrainian independence movement, by a Jew by the name of Sholom Schwartzbard.⁶⁵ In his memorandum, Doctor Margolin, after reviewing ### the history of the event and of the Ukrainian movement, expresses the view that the manner in which the defense of Schwartzbard is being conducted by Jews in Paris and in which the matter is being discussed in the Jewish press is calculated to arouse violent anti-Jewish feeling on the part of the Ukrainians among whom Petlura was and is held in great honor. The Ukrainians are being irritated by the attempts which are being made on the part of the Jews who are assisting in defending Schwartzbard to prove that Petlura was not only officially but also personally responsible for pogroms, and by the attitude of some of the Yiddish newspapers in various countries, including [8] the United States, which have held Schwartzbard's act as that of a national hero. The Ukrainians on the other hand, are causing irritation among Jews by insisting that Schwartzbard acted either knowingly or unknowingly as an agent of the communist international.

Doctor Margolin suggests in his memorandum that the Committee use its influence and authority in persuading the leading Yiddish papers to change their attitude toward this question. He suggests further that "it would be of great importance and value if the American Jewish Committee would express its authoritative opinion to the Jewish Committee of Defense in Paris" in order to strengthen the position of those members of the Committee in Paris such as Henri Sliosberg who believes with him (Doctor Margolin) that a more conciliatory attitude on the part of the Jews toward the Ukrainians might avert serious consequences for the Jews in the Ukraine.

It was the sense of the Committee that it do whatever is in its power to influence the Jewish press to abandon its dangerous attitude.

65 See Document 41.

Document 41

*Arnold Margolin to Executive Committee, American Jewish Committee
New York, 17 October 1926⁶⁶*

Typewritten letter and memorandum, 14 pages

Language: English

AJC, B22 F4 (Russia: Margolin, A. 1924–1928)

On the assassination of Petliura, its background, and the reactions among the Jewish and Ukrainian publics. Suggestion to the American Jewish Committee to influence Jewish public opinion toward a more conciliatory tone in order to calm tensions with Ukrainians.

TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE:

Gentlemen:

The assassination of Simon V. Petliura by Sholom Shwarzbard [sic] which occurred on May 25th last in Paris has become one of the central issues both in Jewish and Ukrainian life in Europe. Due to the excitement created by this act among the Jews on the one hand and Ukrainians on the other hand, the relations between these two people[s] have become very strained. The Ukrainian and the Jewish press, with a few exceptions, adopted an entirely wrong attitude towards this act since the very beginning. Instead of trying to employ a conciliatory tone, nearly all the leading Yiddish newspapers gave vent to passion and opened their columns to extremely dangerous demonstrations of feelings of blind revenge which quite naturally arise in the psychology of the masses but which ought to be out of place in the press. The same can be said of the attitude toward this case of some Jewish communal workers in Paris who are participating in the organization and direction of the defense for the assassin Schwarzbard.

This lamentable affair is of vital moment to the American Jewish community which has been deeply interested since the armistice⁶⁷ in European Jewish affairs in general, and in further development of events in Ukraine in particular; the amelioration of the condition of the Jewish population in

66 The document itself is undated. The date given is the date on which the document was presented to the addressee. Cf. Document 40.

67 Reference to the armistice ending the First World War, 11 November 1918.

Ukraine is one of the main problems in the program of the Joint Distribution Committee.⁶⁸

Being one of those who have closely watched many events connected with the Russian revolution and being especially acquainted with the Ukrainian national movement and with all the phases of the [2] Jewish-Ukrainian inter-relations, I feel it to be my duty to present to the American Jewish Committee the following memorandum outlining the ramifications and implications of the Shwarzbard case, the dangers which it holds for Ukrainian Jewry at the present time and in the future coupled with a few modest suggestions concerning the measures which may be taken to eliminate or at least to lessen these dangers.

Respectfully yours,
Arnold D. Margolin

MEMORANDUM ON PETLURA [sic]-SCHWARZBARD CASE

I. THE ASSASSINATION OF S. PETLIURA.

The assassination of Petliura occurred on Boulevard St. Michel, Paris, about 2 o'clock P. M. Petliura had just left the restaurant and was walking, unaccompanied, on the Boulevard when suddenly a man confronted him and emptied the six chambers of a revolver at him. Petliura fell bleeding from several wounds. The passers-by, ignorant of the motives of this act but outraged by the very fact of a murder, started to beat the assassin, who did not make any attempt to escape and who gave himself into the hands of the police. In the meantime Petliura was taken to a hospital where he died soon after.

The assassin, who turned out to be a Jew, Sholom Shwarzbard, declared to the police that he had decided some years before to kill Petliura in revenge for the Jewish pogroms in Ukraine, but had waited for a favorable opportunity to act. He also added that he did not know Petliura personally and that he had recognized [3] him a few months before by the resemblance to his photograph. After that, he followed Petliura to restaurants and on the streets until the day of the murder.

⁶⁸ See above, Document 6, n. 36.

Sholom Shwarzbard. In accordance with the most reliable available data, Shwarzbard is 36 years old.⁶⁹ He was born in a Jewish family in Russia. Already as a boy he became active in revolutionary activities and was compelled to leave Russia as early as in 1905 when only fifteen.⁷⁰ He settled in Paris and became a watchmaker.⁷¹ From early youth he belonged to the anarchistic party and from time to time contributed articles for the Freie Arbeiter Stimme,⁷² a New York Yiddish weekly, and to Arbeiter Fraind, a London weekly, both papers of anarchistic tendency. In his capacity as a French citizen he joined the French army as a volunteer during the World War, was wounded and received a decoration for courage. After the Russian revolution and the Bolshevik coup d'état he went to Petrograd and joined the Red Army. He fought in Ukraine as a commander of a regiment of the "International red division" both against the Ukraine army under Petliura and against Denikin's army. In ~~1922~~ 1920, however, he returned to Paris. The Jewish newspapers have declared that according to information from Shwarzbard's relatives several members of his family including two uncles, an aunt and a cousin who permanently lived in Ukraine were brutally killed during the pogroms in 1919. His wife is quoted as stating that Shwarzbard was deeply impressed by thig [sic] tragic fate of his relatives and that he often spoke about the pogroms. She added, however, that he never informed her of his intention to kill Petliura.

Jewish Pogroms in Ukraine and Simon Petliura. There were no pogroms in Ukraine during 1917 and 1918, when the first Ukrainian government under Vinnichenko,⁷³ Petliura and others, and, later, the [4] government of the Hetman Skoropadsky⁷⁴ were in control of the Ukrainian territory. The "Central Rada" (Ukrainian parliament) gave to all the national minorities in Ukraine national autonomy. The policy of the Ukrainian government led by Vinnichenko, Shulgin,⁷⁵ Petliura and others was democratic and was ### {friendly} towards the Jews. The same policy was inaugurated by the Ukrainian Directorate which replaced Skoropadsky at the end of December 1918. The pogroms, however, immediately began after the defeats of the armies of

69 He was actually 40 years old (born 1886). At the time it was widely reported that he had been born in 1888. See Document 18. The source of Margolin's error is unclear.

70 An obvious error: In 1905 he would have been 19 years old. Had he been born in 1890, as Margolin evidently thought, he would have been 15.

71 He first came to Paris in 1910.

72 Margolin used the German spelling to Romanize the Yiddish title.

73 Volodymyr Vynnychenko (see above, Introduction, n. 68).

74 Pavlo Skoropadskyi (see above, Introduction, n. 67).

75 Oleksandr Shulhyn.

the Ukrainian Directory at the hands of the Bolsheviks. The more precipitate were the retreats of Petliura's troops, the greater was the extent and the cruelty of pogroms which were perpetrated by the corrupted elements of the armies and also by irregular bands.

The most popular leaders of the Ukrainian movement were (1) Professor Hrushevsky, an eminent historian and President of the Central Rada in 1917 and 1918,⁷⁶ (2) Vinnichenko, eminent writer, first President of the Directory in December 1918 and early in 1919, and (3) Petliura, Commander in Chief of the Army from December 1918, and, later, President of the Directory. Vinnichenko and Petliura belonged to the Ukrainian Social Democratic party; Hrushevsky was the leader of the Ukrainian Socialists revolutionists [sic].

The formal responsibility for the conduct in the army lay on Petliura. All the Ukrainian intellectuals are unanimous in their assertions that Petliura was quite free from any trace of anti-Semitism. As an ardent patriot and eloquent orator, Petliura became in 1918 and 1919 the idol of [the] Ukrainian peasantry. Nevertheless, although so popular, he was unable to control the situation during the retreats of the army. Some impartial observers, however, who are well informed about this period (January-March 1919) accuse Petliura of having omitted to try even at the risk of losing his power and maybe his life, [5] to suppress the pogroms by radical measures. There is no doubt, on the other hand, that from April 1919 on Petliura and his government struggled against the pogroms in an efficient way. This is proved by many documents to the public, and by executions of a number of persons found guilty of having participated in pogroms after April 1919.

In April 1920 Petliura was compelled by the conjuncture of events to sign an agreement with the Polish government, in which he indirectly sanctioned the annexation of Eastern Galicia and some other Ukrainian territories by Poland. By this act Petliura lost his popularity among many of his former adherents, and incurred the bitter enmity of the great majority of Galician Ukrainians. The failure of the Pilsudsky⁷⁷ [sic]-Petliura offensive against [the] Bolsheviks which followed the Polish-Ukrainian agreement in the autumn of 1920 could not but increase the eclipse of Petliura's fame and popularity in many Ukrainian circles. Significant intellectual groups, however, continued to support this Polish-Ukrainian orientation of Petliura, which was partly due to the personal friendship which had existed between Pilsudsky and Petliura for many years, since they both were engaged in the fight

76 Mykhailo Hrushevsky (1866–1934) was elected head of the Ukrainian Central Council in 1917 but fell out with Petliura's Directory. In exile he joined the Ukrainian SRs and advocated reconciliation with the Soviet regime. In 1924 he returned to the USSR.

77 Józef Piłsudski (see above, Introduction, at n. 56).

against the Russian Tsarism. After the defeat of his army, Petliura made his residence in Poland. In 1925 he moved to Paris where he lived in poor conditions until he fell under Shwarzbard's bullets.

Jewish Public Opinion about Petliura.

The Ukrainian national renaissance was a movement which was entirely new to the Jewish population of Ukraine, which was ignorant about the real genesis and character of the Ukrainian aspirations which had been somnolent for centuries and had their roots in the Ukrainian peasantry and among the small group of Ukrainian intellectuals. Very few Jews personally knew the Ukrainian leaders, as Jews never participated in the Ukrainian political parties before the Revolution.⁷⁸ Hrushevsky [6] and Vinnichenko were comparatively well known to the intellectual Jews as savant and litterateur respectively, because of their books.⁷⁹ The name of Petliura, however, did not mean anything to the Jews before he assumed the leadership of the Ukrainian movement. The fact that he had been editor of a Ukrainian social-democratic weekly in Moscow before the Revolution was known only to the Ukrainian intellectuals. Considering these circumstances, it is not to be wondered at that the Jewish masses in Ukraine and other countries were not and are not now informed about the real personality and character of Petliura. The Jews heard his name mainly in connection with the dreadful pogroms committed by the corrupted elements of the army under his official command. The soldiers of the Ukrainian army were called by the peasants "Petliurovzi." Later also the city population adopted this nickname. The result was that the bulk of the Jewish population associated the pogroms of this period with the name of Petliura. "Petliura" – the symbol of liberation and of national heroism for Ukrainians – became the symbol of pogroms and atrocity in the imagination of the frightened Jewish masses, exhausted by all the privations and horrors of the civil

78 In the event, some Jewish participation in Ukrainian political parties has been noted. Yury Boshyk, *Between Socialism and Nationalism. Jewish-Ukrainian Political Relations in Imperial Russia, 1900–1917*, in: Peter J. Potichnyj/Howard Aster (eds.), *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, Edmonton 1988, 173–202.

79 Vynnychenko was well known in prerevolutionary Ukraine for his short stories, plays, and poems, among which were several pieces that portrayed Jewish characters in a generally positive light. For a listing see Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern, *The Anti-Imperial Choice. The Making of the Ukrainian Jew*, New Haven Conn. 2009, 285, n. 9. Hrushevsky would have been known primarily for his *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, the first volumes of which were published in 1898, and his *Iliustrovana istoriia Ukrainy*, first published in 1911. See Serhii Plokhly, *Unmaking Imperial Russia. Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History*, Toronto 2005.

war. Only those few Jews who happened to know a little more about Petliura and his role in all the events during the civil war were and are able to realize the great difference between Petliura on one hand and Denikin under whose regime there occurred still worse pogroms, on the other hand. The bulk of the Jews, however, identified Petliura with Denikin and other real anti-Semites.⁸⁰ There also were and are many Jews who believed and believe that Petliura even organized pogroms himself, or that, in any case, he condoned them.

First Reaction of Ukrainians and Jews After Petliura's Assassination.

Sholom Shwarzbard's act evoked unparalleled excitement among [7] both Jews and Ukrainians. Shwarzbard became overnight a national hero, hailed by nearly all the Jewish papers throughout the world. Petliura was called in these papers "pogromstchik," "bandit," leader of bandits. On the other hand, nearly all the Ukrainians immediately without hesitation came to a hasty persuasion that Shwarzbard was but an agent of the Comintern [sic] (Communist International) and had killed Petliura by order of that body. Ukrainian political leaders in their printed manifestoes [sic] and Ukrainian journalists in their papers started a campaign to prove this assumption. The arguments advanced to support it were:

First, it is known that the Comintern in Moscow had adopted, a few weeks before Petliura's assassination, a secret decision to direct terroristic acts against dangerous political enemies of the Comintern and the Soviet regime.

Second, the assassination was committed just on the eve of Pilsudski's coup de main in Poland which meant the possibility of a new Pilsudski-Petliura offensive against the Soviet Republics.⁸¹

Third, recently the Bolshevist leaders in Ukraine openly declared that they recognize the fact of the existence of an unofficial Ukrainian government under Petliura's leadership abroad.

Fourth, the motive of revenge for slaughtered relatives or for pogroms in general could not have remained alive and intense for such a long time, i.e. about seven years.

80 Well before Petliura's assassination Margolin had insisted on a fundamental difference in the attitudes of Petliura and Denikin toward Jews. In 1922 he had written, "When Denikin suggested to a Jewish delegation that it influence the Bolshevik 'Jewish youth,' one could sense [...] the antisemite who even refused to issue a declaration [supporting] Jewish equality." Margolin, *Ukraina i politika Antanty*, 335. Cf. his quite different interpretation of Petliura's comments about Jewish ties with the Bolsheviks; see above, Document 27, n. 8.

81 See above, Introduction, at n. 57.

Fifth, Petliura's personal friends who used to accompany him during his walks or at his meals in restaurants say that for a few months before the assassination, they often saw suspicious individuals who were evidently "shadowing" Petliura.

Sixth, Shwarzbard engaged as his chief defender Torres, who had gained prominence by reason of his previous employment in a number [8] of cases to defend communists and anarchists, and who himself is suspected of leanings toward communism.

In their printed manifestoes all the Ukrainian parties proclaimed Petliura as a martyr; his faded popularity revived and regained its original vigor and reached its climax by uniting and bringing together Petliura's Ukrainian friends and enemies, political adherents and opponents. Grief and sorrow among the Ukrainians abroad were intense and were demonstrated in an unprecedented manner. Petliura the martyr became the Ukrainian Garibaldi⁸² [sic] or Washington not only for the Ukrainian refugees but also for the Ukrainians who live in the Soviet Ukraine of today and who do not openly manifest their attitude in this case only because they are under the iron regime and argus-eyed surveillance of the Soviet government.

On the other hand, all the Ukrainian parties pointed out in their published statements that Shwarzbard killed Petliura not as a Jew but as a Bolshevik, or a Bolshevik agent, that the Jews as a people had nothing to do with this act, and that the majority of the Jews are enemies of the Soviet regime and suffer from Bolshevism to the same extent and degree as the Gentile population. This thought and this sincere belief of the Ukrainians that Shwarzbard was either a conscious or blind weapon of the Comintern became their *idée fixe*, and was further strengthened after the revelations of a Russian Communist (Badian) who succeeded in reaching Berlin and of publishing there in the Russian daily *Rul* a series of articles in which he explains the causes of his disappointment with the Soviet government. In the course of his revelations he states that in Moscow he personally saw documents which prove the participation of the Comintern in Petliura's assassination.⁸³ The editor of the

82 Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807–1882), general and iconic leader of the nineteenth-century movement for Italian unification.

83 Yakov Badian was a Soviet official who in mid-1926 became one of the first defectors to the West. On 10 August 1926 he began to publish a series of letters to the editor of *Rul*, a major Russian emigré newspaper known for its coverage of intellectual and cultural affairs, describing the Soviet terror apparatus and its employment at home and abroad. No set of the newspaper available in the West is complete, and none contains an article matching the description here. However, on 31 August 1926 Defense Committee member Nahum Gergel circulated a note to the Berlin members of the

Rul, Joseph Hessen, a Jew and one of the old leaders of the Russian Kadet [9] party,⁸⁴ expressed the opinion that Badian's revelations are quite ### reliable.

Further Development of Events in Connection with Petliura's Assassination.

A special Jewish committee in Paris for directing the defense of Shwarzbard was organized. Its chairman is Dr. Leo Motzkin, and among its members are lawyers H. B. Sliosberg, M. L. Goldstein and several Jewish communal workers and journalists. The Ukrainians who read the Jewish Daily Bulletin,⁸⁵ there are also Ukrainian philologists who can read Yiddish, became very much alarmed by the hostile tone of the Yiddish press towards Petliura, by the open approval of Shwarzbard's act in many articles which appeared in the Yiddish papers. In their talks with and private letters to their Jewish friends, the Ukrainians show that it is their impression that the entire Jewish people identifies itself with Shwarzbard and his act. Following the example of the Jews, the Ukrainians also organized a committee in Paris with the aim of defending Petliura's name and of finding out the real motives of this murder. The heads of this Committee are Mr. V. Prokopovich, former Prime Minister of Ukraine, and Professor A. Shulgin*

its former Minister of Foreign Affairs. Shulgin's point of view in this matter is given in the enclosed extract from a letter to the present writer.⁸⁶ There is also enclosed a copy of a letter from Dr. A. M. Livicky, former attorney at law in Kiev, one of the foremost Ukrainian leaders.⁸⁷ This letter reflects the attitude of the Ukrainian intellectuals towards Shwarzbard's act.

* Prof. A. Shulgin is not to be confused with V. Shulgin, the notorious anti-Jewish agitator.⁸⁸

Committee disputing Badian's assertions and attacking his credibility. N. Gergel to "dorigie druzya," 31 August 1926, CAHJP, P243/3.

84 Josef Vladimirovich Gessen (1866–1943), Russian liberal emigré, best known as editor of the *Arkhiv russkoi revoliutsii* [Archive of the Russian Revolution], a series of volumes of collective studies, written mostly by former members of the Constitutional Democratic (Kadet) party, discussing the events of 1917.

85 Daily publication of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

86 Document 33.

87 Document 26.

88 The references are to Oleksandr Shulhyn and Vasili Shulgin (see above, Document 27, at n. 5).

[10] |###| Mme. O. Petliura, the wife, and A. Petliura, the brother of the late S. Petliura, will be represented by two French attorneys who are in contact and cooperate with the Ukrainian Committee.

The Atmosphere of Conflict.

All the above facts leave no doubt that the atmosphere which has been created by the combined efforts of Jews and Ukrainians around the fact of Petliura's assassination are full of mutual conflict and antagonism and that the trial of Shwarzbard may become an arena for an open and bitter fight between the Jews and Ukrainians. This pending danger is very serious and full of perilous possibilities in the future. Immediate steps must be taken both to allay already existing antagonism and to prevent the development of further hostility, as far as possible.

Official Preliminary Investigation.

Many witnesses – both Jews and Ukrainians – have already been examined by the investigating magistrate. Among them were prominent Jewish and Ukrainian leaders. The Jewish commission of defense is said to be preparing printed material and data about pogroms. The Ukrainian Committee is collecting all available documents about the measures against the pogroms which were applied during the Petliura regime in 1919 and 1920. The Ukrainians seem to ignore the very existence of Vinnichenko, former President of the Ukrainian Directory, because of his conciliatory attitude in the present conflict and because of his avowal in his book and in his public declarations that the Directory in general and Petliura in particular did not fight in an efficient way against the pogroms during the first three months of 1919.⁸⁹ The Jews, on the other hand, do not care to summon [11] those Jews who personally knew Petliura ### and who declared (long before the assassination) that Petliura was not an anti-Semite, or gave a generally favorable characterization of Petliura's personality.⁹⁰ This partial, subjective attitude of both "belligerents" towards each other is very harmful for both nations involved, but especially for the Jews, who are but a small and weak minority among the Ukrainian peasant masses composing the majority of the population of Ukraine.

There are rumors that the preliminary investigation will be brought to its end in a few weeks and that the trial before the jury will be held in December. This, however, seems hardly realizable as the drawing up of the indictment

89 See above, Document 27, n. 8.

90 Probably a reference to Silberfarb and Revutsky.

and many other features of the procedure are likely to take a few months more.

A Few Words Pro Domo Sua.

All the Ukrainian parties and organizations abroad have expressed their unanimous desire to have me as a witness at the trial, because of my intimate knowledge of all the phases of the Ukrainian movement in 1919 and 1920. Although they [they] know from my book about Ukraine (published in Russia in 1922) that I also placed a certain amount of responsibility for the pogroms in January-March 1919 upon Petliura's and Vinnichenko's shoulders, for their omission to take drastic measures to suppress them,⁹¹ they nevertheless seem to appreciate my objective favorable attitude towards the Ukrainian national aspirations and my favorable opinion about the general traits of Petliura's character. They have also expressed their desire to see me in Paris before the trial as I might bring about (as I did in 1919 during the Peace Conference in Paris) informal talks between their leaders and Jewish leaders. I have declined, however, their invitations to come to Paris as a witness because I could not add anything new to what I have written about the pogroms and about Petlura [sic] in [12] my Russian book which they can always cite if they like. I have also explained to the Ukrainians that I hardly can leave New York for Europe at the present time, although the purpose of creating in Paris a bridge for the informal meetings of both sides in some neutral place, it seems to me would have salutary results.

The Proper Attitude for Both Sides.

The Ukrainian[s] commit a great mistake by making as many efforts to prove in the coming trial that Shwarzbard is a Bolshevik or was but a weapon of the Comintern. They should leave this task to the official prosecutor, i.e. to the attorney general of the French state, and limit their role in the trial to the defense of the name of Petliura against the attacks of Shwarzbard's counsel. The defense of Shwarzbard, on the other hand, should be confined within the limits of explaining the real motives which led Shwarzbard ~~into~~ ~~into~~ this act. Any attempt of the defense to convert this trial of Shwarzbard into a trial of Petliura and the Ukrainian movement is not only a violation of the fundamental principles of the criminal procedure, but also carries within it the seeds of the greatest danger for the Jews in Ukraine. A jury of twelve French citizens is not competent to decide questions which can be decided only by the future historians of our era. An accusation of a man in his absence is strictly forbidden by the laws of criminal procedure in all the civilized

91 Margolin, *Ukraina i politika Antanty*; see above, Document 27, n. 8.

countries. On the other hand, Shwarzbard's defender is naturally entitled to submit to the jury all the facts about the pogroms and all such evidence as would tend to prove that Shwarzbard could have been and was sure of Petliura's personal responsibility for the pogroms. Such evidence can be easily adduced from the simple fact that the overwhelming majority of the Jews in Ukraine believe that Petliura was guilty in a greater or smaller measure of the pogroms, [13] and that Shwarzbard could have had the same sincere belief which was further fortified by the tragic fate of his relatives during the pogroms. How far this belief was objectively right or wrong – i.e. how far it corresponded to the real facts – is a question which cannot and need not be decided by the jury as it is out of their competence. To summarize, it seems accurate to state that there is no necessity for the Ukrainians to aggravate Shwarzbard's situation in the trial by retaining their passionately hostile attitude towards him, and that it would be the greatest blunder on the part of the Jews to attack the character of Petliura who thanks to Shwarzbard is now canonized by the Ukrainians and whose monument will very likely at some future time be erected in Kiev.

* Since the above was written the following dispatch, dated Lemberg, October 7, appeared in the Jewish Daily Bulletin of October 5, 1926: "The Ruthenians of Eastern Galicia are to be drawn into the Ukrainian propaganda in connection with the Shwarzbard trial by the Semion Petlura League which was ### founded here for that purpose.

The League announced its intention to collect documents for the Schwartzbard [sic] trial and to raise funds for the expenses of the trial. It will also maintain Petlura's family and plans to erect a monument on Petlura's grave. The League states it will also publish Petlura's biography and found schools and libraries and establish scholarships in Petlura's name."

SUGGESTIONS

In case that the facts presented and the comments thereon advanced by me in this memorandum are found by the American Jewish Committee worthy of consideration, I would respectfully suggest that the American Jewish Committee use its influence and authority in persuading the leading Yiddish papers to change their attitude towards this question. It also would be of great importance and value if the American Jewish Committee would express its authoritative opinion to the Jewish Committee of defense in Paris among whose members there are [14] represented different points of view. This last step could strengthen the position of those members of the Committee in

Paris who share the opinion of Dr. H. Sliosberg expressed in his letter to me and entirely coinciding with the views brought forward in this memorandum. A copy of an extract from Sliosberg's letter is enclosed herewith.⁹²

A more discreet and conciliatory attitude on the part of Jews towards questions which touch the sensibilities of the Ukrainians would enable me to reach some positive results in my endeavor to persuade the Ukrainians also to change their hostile attitude and the tone of their press towards all that which concerns this case and to create a more peaceful atmosphere in Ukrainian-Jewish relations.

Document 42

Marvin Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress

Paris, 26 October 1926

Typewritten letter, 2 pages; handwritten annotation ("Strictly Confidential") in upper left corner; handwritten annotation ("Marvin Lowenthal") in upper right corner

Language: English

CZA, A405/73

Document partly effaced, with handwritten corrections.

34 Quai de Béthune

Paris IV.

Oct. 26, 1926.

The American Jewish Congress,
New York.

Gentlemen:

A week ago I attended a meeting of the Schwartzbard Committee of Defense, held – as usual – in the offices of the Committee of Jewish Delegations. Of a committee of about 40, a dozen persons were present. Except for Spire, [Lecache], and a M. Blum (the journalist, not the deputy),⁹³ the French Jews were absent.

⁹² Not reproduced.

⁹³ Probably René Blum (1878–1942), the brother of “the deputy” Léon Blum.

M. Lecache, a journalist on the "Paris-Soir" (and a Jew), gave in detail his impressions of his recent trip to Russia, the Ukraine, and Crimea. You will find a substantial account of these impressions in the J.T.A.⁹⁴ Bulletin of Oct. 6, so I will not repeat them.

The report was followed by a discussion of the relations between the Ukrainians and Jews as affected by the trial. About two months ago the executive committee of this Defense Committee [sic] held a conference with Ukrainian leaders in Paris in an endeavor to make them understand that whatever the Jews might think of the pogromists and Petlura there was no antagonism against the Ukrainian people as such – on the contrary, any serious rift between these peoples because of the Schwartzbard trial would be looked upon by the Jews as disastrous. Before entering into this conference, it appears that the Ukrainians bound both sides to absolute silence. It likewise appears that the gist of the conference, if it could be publicized, would appear completely favorable to the Jews in the eyes of public opinion and in no way harmful to the Ukrainians. But the executive committee of the Defense [Committee] is still bound by their promise, and since all relations have been broken with the Ukrainians – who persist on [sic] looking at the Jewish defense of S. as an attack on the Ukrainian people and Ukrainian patriotism – there is no way of getting it rescinded. But since this conference – in fact at Geneva during the European Minorities Conference – Motzkin and Gruenbaum (of Poland) had a long talk with the Ukrainian leaders at Geneva on the invitation of those latter, and no word was asked or given as to silence. At this talk the same ground was covered as at the previous Paris conference. Our committee was asked to decide, then, whether it would be proper for Motzkin to publish the Geneva talk. We unanimously decided it was.⁹⁵

Finally, the question of a second lawyer, to assist Torres, was thrashed out. At the present time, as you know, Torres is handling the case alone. It is one of a dozen in his office. Perhaps a month before the trial he will sit down, master the essential facts, and fight the case as a French criminal lawyer thoroughly at home with French procedure, French judges and French juries. I have talked with a number of French Jews on the matter and they [[2]] are confident that in the ordinary run of things S. will be acquitted. A political murder committed by a man who fought in the French army, under emotions evoked by brooding over the pogroms – acquittal seems apparent.

But this whole point of view is, as you likewise know, in a sense repugnant to the Russian Jews, certainly those on the Committee and no doubt those at large. There is a feeling that Jewish honor requires that Petlura be found guilty

94 Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

95 No record of publication has been located.

of the pogroms, that the whole story of the responsibility and perpetration of the pogroms be exposed to the world, that not only S. be acquitted but that the Ukrainian pogromists be condemned. People sharing this feeling believe that Torres unaided is not equal to the task, which – they believe – requires an intimate ~~detail~~ mastery of a thousand details of Ukrainian and Jewish life during the span of a number of years. Therefore they demand that Torres accept a colleague – of his own choosing – a Russian Jewish lawyer with the necessary equipment of language and knowledge and ### background.

The two points of view are not irreconcilable – to my mind – although it would be impossible to be certain of this without knowing Torres' proposed plan of defense. No one on the committee knows what this plan will be. The real difficulty, I feel, has come about through some unfortunate clash of personality, or lack of proper tact in the relations between Torres and the Russians. At the present time, there has been no intimate contact between Torres and the leaders of the committee. The committee – through its executive group – has amassed evidence and sent this evidence on to Torres. The only connecting link is M. Tzatzkis⁹⁶ who has done, I believe, the best that could be done in a tight place and who explained to the committee that M. Torres was always open to an interview, welcomed suggestions, etc. but that he (Torres) hadn't as yet got around to master the case or give much information as to how he intended to proceed.

Anyway, at the meeting of a week ago, the views of the Russians were strongly but respectfully stated and MM. Lecache and Blum – both friends of Torres – were asked to express as nicely as possible to the maître that the committee insisted on a second lawyer. Let the suggestion appear to come from Torres himself, let him name whom he pleases, let him feel that there exists no lack of confidence in his ability, but a second lawyer there must be. Lecache and Blum agreed to do this. S., too, it appears, has asked Torres for an additional lawyer. "But my dear man, do you want to get five years hard labor?" Torres is reported to have replied. "Never mind what happens to me," said S., "so long as the pogromists will be condemned before the world."

Since this meeting I have talked with Spire, who is a member of the executive committee, and he informed me in the strictest confidence that the relations are now very strained between Torres and the |executive| committee, and it looks as though T. would refuse a second lawyer. The executive has in fact received a hot letter from T. It seems to me that only a French Jew could

96 N. Tsatzkis, a staff member of the Comité des Délégations Juives. Also called Ttaskine in some sources.

heal the breach and one should be found. M. – perhaps fortunately – is now in Berlin.

Obviously not a word of this should be bruited about.

Sincerely yours,

xxx⁹⁷

Document 43

Marvin Lowenthal to Stephen S. Wise

Paris, 30 November 1926

Typewritten letter, 3 pages; typewritten and handwritten corrections, insertions, and passages underlined by typewriter and by hand

Language: English

AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 91

Nov. 30, 1926.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise,
American Jewish Congress,
New York.

Dear Dr. Wise:

Schwartzbard.

I have just come from a three hours' meeting of the Schwartzbard Defense Committee. Nine members were present, including two French Jews (Spire and LeCache) and Herr Waldman,⁹⁸ editor of the *Jued. Rundschau* of Berlin.⁹⁹

A resumé of the activities of the Executive since the last meeting brought out the facts that it is probable a witness has been found who actually received orders from Petlura to foster the pogroms;¹⁰⁰ that the Berlin branch

97 Signature effaced.

98 Moses Waldmann (1885–1954).

99 *Jüdische Rundschau*, the official organ of the *Zionistische Vereinigung für Deutschland*, published 1902–1938.

100 See above, Introduction, at nn. 330, 331.

of the Committee insists on a second lawyer of consequence; that the Jewish press is excited about the Marshall statement;¹⁰¹ that the examining judge has summoned a number of witnesses for the other side; that the Executive has produced a draft of a declaration disavowing the responsibility of the Committee for the conduct of the defense; and that the Executive has been debating the dissolution of the Committee.

The first fact, regarding the new witness, was noted without comment – and naturally is a matter of the utmost secrecy.

The insistence of Berlin on a second lawyer provoked discussion in which it came out (as I knew some time ago) that meanwhile Torres has appointed an assistant lawyer – Gutschov – a man, however, of no consequence, a French Jew unfamiliar with Yiddish, Russia, and the Jewish mind. It likewise appears that Torres has taken into his office, as an employee, a certain M. Boris Suvarin né Livschitz¹⁰² to master and work up the technical details of the case. The members of our Committee who know M. Suvarin (né Livschitz) explained that he was a young man of great talent, thoroughly familiar with Russia and Russian Jewish life; but that he is a Communist and a member of the Trotsky party.¹⁰³ A number of the members expressed fear and indignation over this appointment of Suvarin; for they felt that his Communist principles would prejudice 'the' Jewish cause and his Communist inclinations lead him, in his work of preparing the case, to give an undesirable slant to the facts. It was pointed out, however, that Suvarin was merely an employee in Torres' office, that he would in no way appear at the trial, and that it was carrying our sensitivity rather far to worry over the principles of Torres' clerks or the religion of his telephone girl. As I wrote you before, Torres has absolutely refused to accept another lawyer of the type and importance the Committee has desired.

With regard to the Marshall statement, the Committee decided to appoint a ~~small~~ |sub|-committee to draft a letter which is |2| first to be submitted to the approval of Torres and then sent to the American Jewish Committee and simultaneously to the press. The letter will of course point out that Mr. Marshall is not conducting the defense of the indicted party nor is he a

101 Ibid., Introduction, at n. 285.

102 Boris Souvarine, born Boris Konstantinovich Lifschitz, (1895–1984), political activist and one of the early leaders of the PCF beginning in 1921. He was excluded from the PCF in 1924 as a follower of Trotsky and subsequently became associated with anti-Stalinist activists. In 1926 he founded the Marx-Lenin Communist Circle (Cercle communiste Marx et Lénine), which included Soviet ambassador to France and prominent Trotskyist Christian Rakovsky (see above, Introduction, at n. 33).

103 Perhaps a reference to the Marx-Lenin Communist Circle.

witness in the preliminary examination which, incidentally, has already declared Schwartzbard's mental responsibility.

The Committee itself has likewise, apparently, come to the realization that neither is it conducting the defense – a realization which if it had come earlier would, I think, have spared many misunderstandings and allayed many uneasinesses. Anyway the Executive, which has been debating this matter for some time now and taken into full account, on the one hand, the firm refusal of Torres to accept another lawyer, and, on the other hand, the disquietude of the Jewish public, presented to the Committee a draft of a resolution – which I herewith enclose.¹⁰⁴ Please note that the wording of this draft is to be entirely changed in the final form, the editing of which has been given to a special committee. The sense of the draft, after much debate, was likewise changed. As you see (and I send it to you as an indication of the spirit of some of the members of the Executive), the present and now discarded draft implies that the Committee is dissatisfied with Torres and suggests, however faintly, a certain Pharisaical, more in sorrow than in anger, injured and superior washing of the hands. The majority of the Committee, after much discussion, managed to remove from the sense of the resolution these implications and suggestions. As the matter now stands, a sub-committee is to work out a resolution which shall, we hope, really represent the position of the Committee and allay all disquietude in the public mind. It will point out, what the Jewish public and especially the Jewish press is apt to forget, that the French court is in charge of the trial, Torres is in charge of the defense, and the work of the Committee is limited to furnished [sic] the defense with evidence, a work which it is carrying out. It will be a resolution which Torres can take no offence at, and which will ~~indicate the~~ {imply} confidence of the committee in the defense.

It so happens that during this debate I asked as many direct questions of the Executive as I could. The answers (of Motzkin and Tcherikover) {revealed} that the Committee actually has no knowledge whatever of what line of defense Torres will take and therefore has no positive grounds, in any sense, to be dissatisfied with a line of defense of which it is completely ignorant. These answers made apparent (at least to me) that the only differences between ~~the~~ certain members of the Committee and Torres are differences of temperament ~~and~~ {aggravate[d]} by fears arising from them. It is a case of Jewish nerves.

Finally the Committee discussed its own dissolution, and decided eventually to call a meeting of its members, not only in France but elsewhere, to consider this question. But if I know anything about a Jewish committee, I know it will not dissolve until the last lights are turned out.

104 Not in file.

I think that the temper and work of this meeting reveals a number of plain facts which it is time our journalists and other creators of Jewish opinion realized. Fundamentally the [3] disquietors of Jewish public opinion, together with and similarly as certain members of the American Jewish Committee, are suffering from a mistaken and inflated idea of the nature of Jewish life. We all too readily assume that because we are Jews and associate with Jews – and in some instances proclaim the existence of a Jewish nation – we are therefore living in a Jewish world, as it were in a Jewish state governed by Jewish laws and interests. Some of us assume, in the present instance, that if we proclaim Schwartzbard insane, a court responsive to our declaration will grant that we are right. Others assume that if we protest against the defense of Schwartzbard as it is now conducted, the defense will be changed; and others that if the Committee washes its hands of the affair the great Jewish public will – somehow or other – render justice itself.

But what are the real facts. S., a French citizen, committed a murder in France; he is being tried by a French lawyer – the best of his kind – in a French court, according to French law, before a French jury. Not only that, but there is no factual evidence to show that in any way S.'s defense is endangered, badly handled, or prejudiced – either on the part of the lawyer or the court. Finally, there is no factual evidence, not a scrap, to show that in the course of the trial the full story of the pogroms and their responsibility will not be laid before the world. Let us consider this point. It is agreed that the defense will not take the position that S. is insane. What – from the point of view of Jewish national interests – is the next weakest defense that is possible? Well, it is possible that the defense will not attempt to prove to the hilt that Petlura was responsible directly and personally for the pogroms, but, instead, will be satisfied to prove that S. had reason to be convinced that Petlura was responsible. Without such proof, it is inconceivable that S. can be defended at all. It is likewise inconceivable that the convincing probability of Petlura's guilt can be demonstrated without telling all that is known of import with regard to the pogroms. We can be assured the story, then, will come out. We can likewise be assured that if S. is declared not guilty, it will follow that the jury and hence the world will be convinced that a sufficient probability of Petlura's guilt was demonstrated. S. set free inevitably means that by general consent Petlura's party could not establish Petlura's innocence beyond all reasonable doubt. Is not this enough? And if it is not enough, it is still in no way evident that the lawyer of the defense does not intend to go further. Indeed if the full story of the pogroms comes out – as it must – and if Petlura was really guilty beyond a doubt – whether the lawyer emphasizes his guilt or not, it will be revealed to the world.

What, then, is all the fuss about? I repeat, Jewish nerves. They must be calmed.

Incidentally, Dr. Wise, I learned that you were invited here – I am not sure from what you wrote that you gathered this impression – not as a lawyer, but as a witness. Perhaps you wonder what you were a witness of. You were to be summoned as a witness of the impression the pogroms made on opinion in America. What has this to do with S. who was never in America? Those Jewish nerves!

Sincerely,
 !Marvin Lowenthal!

Document 44

Leo Motzkin to Louis Marshall

Paris, 30 January 1927

Typewritten letter, 2 pages; serial number (“5657 M/M”) in upper left corner of both pages

Language: English

CAHJP, P243/4

COMMITTEE OF DEFENCE

January 30th [192]7

Mr. Louis Marshall
 67, East 72nd Street
 New York City.

Dear Mr. Marshall,

In view of the approaching trial of Schwarzbard we have the honour of addressing the following letter to you:

At the last annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee you thought fit to refer to the Schwarzbard case using strong language about the activity of certain public bodies concerned with Schwarzbard’s defence and you even expressed views on Schwarzbard’s motives and mental sanity in a form that may embarrass his Counsel.¹⁰⁵

105 See above, Introduction, at n. 285.

Our Committee which deeply feels its responsibility to all Jewry was greatly perturbed by your statement and could only explain it by misinformation on your part. We have to call your attention to the fact that the majority of the members of our Committee of Defence are men who had been entrusted many times to act on their behalf by the Jewish masses in Russia, Ukraina [sic], Poland, France and Germany for similar purposes, who took an active interest in the Beilis trial and have defended in an untiring way the interests of millions of Jews. Whilst individual members of the Committee hold widely differing views on many matters, the Committee has had one aim and endeavour only: to lay bare at the coming trial the whole truth about the tragic events that took place in the Ukraina in 1919 and 1920 and to supply Counsel for the defence with all the available evidence. The Committee is endeavouring to obtain Schwarzbard's acquittal as it would signify not a justification of Schwarzbard's deed, but a condemnation of those who committed or connived at the pogroms. Averse from any publicity and devoting itself entirely to the difficult cumbersome and ungrateful preparatory work of the defence, the Committee which needless to say has no sympathy with individual terrorist acts even if inspired by national feelings, has always tried to do what it could to bring peace and moderation into the minds and hearts of the millions of excited people who directly or indirectly have suffered in the Ukrainian pogroms, and in particular we have endeavoured to influence in the sense of moderation the Jewish press although in general it expresses the public opinion of the Jewish masses.

[2] That was the reason why at the time you made your remarks we deemed it our duty to refrain from any public observation or polemics.

But now we must place before you our request in consideration of the impending trial to take some suitable opportunity of making some addition to or comment upon the opinion you had expressed in such a way that it could not strengthen the hands of our adversaries. We would not have made to you this proposition if we were not certain that since those words of yours were spoken you must have seen that what you said of Schwarzbard's person and also of our work in assisting the defence was not just.

Trusting that we are not mistaken therein we send you this letter asking you to transmit your reply or comment at your early convenience to enable us if necessary to produce that evidence of your present opinion on this grave matter.

Yours sincerely

L. Motzkin

Document 45

Chaim Nachman Bialik to Leo Motzkin

Tel Aviv, 11 February 1927

Typewritten letter, 2 pages; printed letterhead with logo on both pages; English and Hebrew dates inserted with typewriter; handwritten corrections in black ink; marginal markings, brackets, and underlined words in pencil

Language: Hebrew

CAHJP, P243/2¹⁰⁶

THE "DVIR" COMPANY LTD.

(PUBLISHING HOUSE)

TEL-AVIV; Palestine



חברת 'דביר' בע"מ

(בית הוצאת ספרים)

תל-אביב, ארץ-ישראל.

Tel-Aviv, the 11. 2. 27

תל-אביב, יום ט' אדר תרפז'

לכבוד

הד"ר ל. מאצקין

פריס.

ידידי היקר!

מר דרויגוב מסר לי את בקשתך להמציא לך |חומר| מן הארכיון בענין השחיטות הפטלוריות באוקראינה. |הנני רואה חובה לעצמי להודיעך כי כאן נמצאת חבורה אחת – ואני עבדך בתוכה – שבידה מרוכז חומר עצום וחשוב מאד המתאר בפרוטרוט רב על פי דוקומנטים נאמנים ועל פי אלפי גביות עדויות בכתב ובע"פ במקום המעשה, ומפי עדי ראיה ונפגעים, עצם את כל מהלך המאורעות של השחיטות והפרעות באוקראינה מתחלתן ועד סופן בכל עיר וקהלה על פי סדר אלף בית. אפשר לאמור, שהחומר בשלימותו משמש כעין אנציקלופדיה של המאורעות ההם|). תולדות החומר הזה וכנוסו מופלאים במינם. |האיש| שעסק בכינוס החומר ובסדורו במשך שנים אחדות בא לידי כך מתוך צורך נפשי|, פנימי|, להשאיר לדור ספר זכרון נורא על המאורעות, שהוא עצמו היה עד ראיה להם וכלם עברו לעיניו והרבה מהם על ראשו ממש. לא אחת ושתיים היה הוא עצמו נתון בסכנות מות ובאחת משעות סכנה כאלו, כשידה| |כשן|ה|חרב| החדה היתה מונחת על צוארו ממש, נדר נדר גדול לאלהי ישראל להקדיש את שארית שנותיו (הוא עכשיו כבן שבעים מעלה) |—|¹⁰⁷ לכנוס החומר הזה וסדורו. הוא רואה את עבודתו כעבודת הקדש ועסק בו לשמה וגם מתוך סכנות נפשות. הוא עצמו חזר על כל המקומות הנפגעים בשעת מעשה ולאחר מעשה, בקר את כל מקומות המקלט של הפליטים ו|ה|נסים מנוסת חרב, אסף תעודות וגבה עדויות, חטט בכל הארכיונים של כל המוסדות, שנאסף לשם חומר ממין זה, ומתוך כך עלה בידו לרכז כמעט

106 Cf. published version in Lachower, Igrot, vol. 3, 186–188.

107 Line break with handwritten indication that lines should be joined.

את כל החומר החשוב ביותר שיש בו משום ציור שלם מפורט ומקיף את כל המאורעות ההם. כל החומר הזה נמצא לפני זמן מה בגבולות רוסיה ברשותו של בעלי ונשקפה לו סכנת ביעור ואבדון, ורק |ן| ברוב עמל ותחבולות עלתה ביד חבורה אחת בארץ ישראל, שנוסדה מלכתחילה לשם כך, להציל את החומר ההוא |2| מכליון ולהעבירו לארץ ישראל. ועתה הוא נמצא לשמחתי ברשותנו מסודר כלו לדפוס. כל החומר יכיל בערך 50-60 גליונות דפוס כתוב כלו עברית ומסודר, כאמור, על פי אלף בית לפי שמות הערים הנחרבות והנפגעות. אחרי תאור מפורט של המאורעות של כל עיר באה גם רשימה מפורטת של הנהרגים (שמותיהם, גילם, מלאכתם ופרנסתם וכדומה) זה יהיה דוקומנט נורא אשר יחריד את כל העולם. ומסופקני אם יש עוד בהיסטוריה שלנו דוקומנט שני דומה לזה במוראיו ופחדיו|ן|. שם הספר "מגלת הטבח". החבורה טרודה עתה למצוא מקור לכסף לשם הוצאת הדפוס. אם מעונינים אתם בפריו להחיש את דבר צאת הספר הזה למטרתכם – ואני חושב כי אמנם כדאי ושוה לכם לעשות את הדבר הזה – כי עתה עליכם להמציא להחבורה הזאת סיוע כספי ולתת לה את היכולת להוציא לפועל בזריזות את דבר ההדפסה. לפי השערתי יספיק לזה סיוע של מאה או מאה ועשרים ל"ט בערך. לפי שהחבורה [sic] מביאה בחשבון עוד מקור אחד והיא הכרזת חתימה על הספר ואולם, לסמוך על שיוצאים לאור |כך| בלבד אי אפשר. על כל פנים מצאתי לחובה להודיעך זאת ואתם בפריו עשו כטוב בעיניכם. לבסוף עלי להודיעך כי אמצעי ההדפסה בארץ ישראל הם עתה במצב משובח מן הצד הטכני, ואם תעשה העבודה מתוך אמצעים כספיים |מספיקים| אפשר להוציא את הספר כלו בזמן של שנים שלשה חדשים, אם נדפיסו כמובן בזמן אחד בשנים שלשה בתי דפוס.

והנני אומר לך שלום וברכה
ידידך הנאמן
|ח. נ. ביאליק|

Translation

To
Dr. L. Motzkin
Paris.

My dear friend,

Mr. Druyanov¹⁰⁸ has sent me your request to provide you with archival material concerning the Petliurite massacres in Ukraine. I feel that it is incumbent upon me to let you know that there is a group here – I am part of it – that holds a vast and extremely important concentration of material describing in great detail, on the basis of reliable documents and of thou-

108 Alter Druyanov (1870–1938), Hebrew journalist and editor, a close associate of the writer, resident in Tel Aviv since 1921.

sands of written and oral testimonies taken where the events occurred, from eyewitnesses and victims themselves, the entire course of the massacres and mob riots in Ukraine from beginning to end in every town and community in alphabetical order. One can say that the material taken together serves as a sort of encyclopedia of those events. The history of this material and its compilation is extraordinary. The person who compiled the material and arranged it over several years came to the project out of an internal emotional need to bequeath to the current generation a book that preserves the awful memory of the events that he himself witnessed with his own eyes and many of which he experienced quite directly.¹⁰⁹ More than once he himself was in mortal danger. In one of those hours of danger, when the sharp sword had in a real sense been placed upon his throat, he vowed to the God of Israel to dedicate his remaining years (he is currently over 70 years of age¹¹⁰) to gathering this material together and to setting it in order. He views this task as holy labor and has been undertaking it for its own sake, even in the face of mortal danger. He has personally revisited all of the affected locations while the violence was going on and afterwards; he has visited all of the places where the refugees and escapees have found shelter, collecting documents and recording testimonies, searching in all of the archives of all of the institutions where material of this type has been gathered, and in the course of doing so he has managed to bring together almost all of the most important material containing a complete, detailed, and comprehensive picture of all of those events. All of this material was located until a short time ago inside Russia, in the possession of its owner, and it was in danger of being destroyed and lost; only with considerable effort and guile did a group in Palestine that had been established for precisely this purpose manage to save the material [2] from destruction and to bring it to Palestine. Now I am happy to report that it is in our possession, ready to go to press. The entire body of material will encompass about 50–60 printer's sheets;¹¹¹ it is written entirely in Hebrew and arranged, as I have said, in alphabetical order according to the names of the towns that have been destroyed or damaged. Following a detailed description of what happened in each town there is a detailed list of

109 Eliezer David Rosenthal (1856–1932). See above, Introduction, at nn. 220, 221.

110 Rosenthal marked his seventieth birthday on 23 June 1926.

111 The standard printer's sheet in use in Hebrew printing houses in Palestine was folded into 16 printed pages. The writer thus anticipated a publication of approximately 800–1,000 pages. This turned out to be a significant underestimate. In the event the three volumes that were actually published, representing some one third of the total amount of material available, ran to nearly 1,800 pages. See above, Introduction, n. 221.

those killed (their names, ages, professions, sources of livelihood, etc.). This will be a horrible document that will make the entire world recoil in revulsion; I doubt if in our entire history there is a document comparable in the fright and awe it arouses. The name of the book is *Megilat ha-tevah*.¹¹² The group is occupied now with finding a source of funds for printing costs. If you in Paris are interested for your purposes in helping the book to appear more quickly – and I think it is indeed worth your while to do this – then you should extend financial aid to this group and give it the ability to carry out the printing speedily. By my estimate, aid in the amount of approximately 100 or 120 pounds should suffice. The group is taking into account another source, namely selling subscriptions to the volume, but we cannot count on that source alone. In any case I believe that it is my duty to tell you this; you in Paris will do as you see fit.¹¹³

In conclusion I must tell you that printing facilities in Palestine are now quite excellent from the technical aspect, so that if the project is carried out with sufficient financial support it will be possible to publish the entire book within two or three months, assuming of course that we print in two or three printshops simultaneously.

I send you greetings,
Your faithful friend,
Ch. N. Bialik¹¹⁴

112 Literally, “The Scroll of the Slaughterer.”

113 Motzkin appears to have given no indication of interest, perhaps because the material did not highlight specifically the pogroms attributed to Petliura’s forces.

114 Chaim Nachman Bialik (1873–1934), the most prominent Hebrew poet of the first third of the twentieth century, celebrated as the national poet of Israel. In 1903 he had visited the Bessarabian city of Kishinev to gather testimonies from witnesses to an infamous pogrom that had taken place there earlier the same year. Though he had initially intended to publish the testimonies, he used them instead as the basis for a provocative poem, *Be-Ir ha-haregah* (In the City of Slaughter), which aroused a deep response among Jews throughout the world (many of whom read it in Bialik’s own Yiddish translation or in a Russian version prepared by Vladimir Jabotinsky). Bialik thus had a longstanding interest in the type of project described in this letter. The testimonies that he gathered in Kishinev were published only close to a century after the fact: Ya’akov Goren (ed.), *Eduyot nifge’ei Kishinev 1903 kefi she-nigbe’u al-yedei H. N. Bialik ve-ḥaverav* [The Testimonies of the Victims of Kishinev 1903 as Collected by H. N. Bialik and His Associates], Tel Aviv 1991.

Document 46*Henry Torrès to Louis Marshall**Paris, 14 February 1927**Typewritten translation of open letter, 4 pages**Language: English**AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144**Open letter originally published in Yiddish (presumably in translation from French) in *Morgen zhurnal*, 14 February 1927. The English version was transmitted to Marshall by Harry Schneiderman on 4 March 1927.¹¹⁵*

Translation.

Morning Journal,
February 14, 1927.

REPLY OF HENRI TORRES TO LOUIS MARSHALL

...“The declaration of Mr. Louis Marshall, president of the American Jewish Committee, is particularly astonishing because it comes from a man who carries especially weighty responsibility in Jewish affairs, and who at the same time is prominent as a jurist in America and is highly esteemed in Europe. The public opinion, on both sides of the Atlantic, that shows a warm interest in the Petlura affair, will therefore not understand the action of the

115 Harry Schneiderman (1885–1975), assistant secretary of the American Jewish Committee and editor of the American Jewish Yearbook. In his cover letter to Marshall Schneiderman commented: “Mr. Torres may be a very sincere and honest man but he is nonetheless known to be affiliated with radicals of both the communist and the anarchist schools. It is true that the Ukrainians who are satisfied to be under Soviet rule are not concerned so much with the good name of Petlura [sic], and it is from such Ukrainians that Mr. Torres is most likely to acquire his views. Mr. Torres says that insofar as can be judged in Europe, you were misled through interested Ukrainian influence. While it is possible that Doctor Margolin may be charged with a lack of impartiality, this cannot be said of Doctor [Genrikh] Sliosberg who shares fully the views of Doctor Margolin. Doctor Sliosberg was never and is not now interested in the Ukrainian independence movement. He is not in favor of it and yet he also holds the view that the acquittal of Schwartzbard can be secured without sullyng the name of Petlura.” Schneiderman to Marshall, 4 March 1927, AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144.

defence, if there will remain unanswered the regrettable words of Mr. Marshall, which he himself will undoubtedly regret upon further consideration.

“As the defender, of not only Schwartzbard but also -- and that in particular -- of Jewish rights, which cannot be separated from human rights, I consider it my duty to oppose the untrue statements of my prominent American colleague with the facts which are a result of a thorough study of the material collected in this great case, and of a conviction based on documents that are incontestable.

“Mr. Marshall is not unacquainted with the tragic fate of the Jewish population in Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, it seems, he is not familiar with all the horror of the Ukrainian pogroms, and especially the slaughters that were carried on by Petlura’s soldiers, on the direct responsibility of their leader; nor could I myself believe it before I began to investigate the matter.

[2] “The act of Schwartzbard, reviving a sentiment which had become less poignant in course of time, has rekindled the interest of the civilized world in the suffering Jewish population, has brought to life numerous witnesses who procured innumerable proofs which will all be brought before the French court.

“Mr. Marshall points out that the sensibilities of certain Ukrainians would be irritated. No one person that I know, has even thought of identifying Petlura with Ukraine, of holding Ukraine responsible for Petlura’s acts. One must not confuse the mental state of a small number of the last Petlurian emigrants with the sentiments of the Ukrainian nation proper. Besides, Mr. Marshall does not know, it appears, how unanimously the Ukrainians in Ukraine, as well as the numerous Ukrainian organizations abroad, wish to shake themselves clear of the bloody dictatorship of Petlura, of the devastations and brutalities, with which ~~the~~ he distinguished himself. Above all, he does not know that, by being friendly with the Polish and Roumanian [sic] enemies of the Ukrainian independence, promising them Ukrainian territories, which he had not the slightest right to do, and thus placing the solidarity of anti-Semitism above the national feeling, Petlura lost the majority of his own followers, antagonized them, -- as is likewise proven actually in the Ukrainian press abroad.

“In so far as can be judged here in Europe, Mr. Marshall was misled through interested Ukrainian influence. I believe, however, that he will not refuse to investigate his information, and for that purpose I am ready to place at his disposal documentary material of first value which has been collected with complete impartiality, for the sole purpose of seeking the truth and justice.

[3] “It is possible that in the heat of discussions that were raised in connection with this matter, some exaggerations may have been made, as for

instance a tendency to make of Schwartzbard a national hero. In such cases there are always expressed extreme views. But these do not give Mr. Marshall the right to use them against the defence of a man, the nobility and purity of whose motives are so far above every suspicion that they command the esteem even of his opponents. In particular they do not justify the indefensible statement about the mental condition of the accused at a time when the report of the court physicians -- Claude, Truél and Maris¹¹⁶ -- confirms the complete responsibility of Schwartzbard [sic], as well as his profound sincerity and the nobility of motives.

“Certainly, his act cannot be explained otherwise than as a result of a condition of extraordinary excitement. One can only seek the primitive cause of his state of mind, and the cause can be found in the pogroms, of which Schwartzbard was not only a witness but a victim as well, through the loss of his parents¹¹⁷ and of a large number of his fellow-Jews. The Schwartzbard-trial must therefore inevitably be transformed into a trial of the pogroms and pogromists. Only the adherents of militant anti-Semitism have reason to complain thereof. The civilization will only be the gainers.

“The defence is not happy to be obliged to come out against the memory of a man who has already paid with his life for the sinister happenings with which his name remains indissolubely [sic] bound. But it is forced to it through the persistent efforts to clear the dictator of his guilt. The discussion should be governed only by historical truth. This is not merely a question of Schwartzbard’s fate. The fate of thousands of Jews who are still being threatened [4] with pogroms is involved therein. The well-being of this unfortunate people depends to a great extent upon the sympathies of honest-thinking people of the whole world. When the responsibility will be brought fully to light, these sympathies will become strengthened. At the same time it will help to make more harmonious the mutual relations of the Ukrainians, Russians and Jews, who are in close contact with one another in the regions of Southern Russia, which is stepped in blood shed in pogroms.

“Mr. Marshall was too hasty to influence unfavorably the verdict of the jury and the opinion of the enlightened world. Perhaps he could now withdraw his words uttered in haste and show faith in the defender, who seeks only the truth and who is inspired solely through the interest in justice, which in this case coincides with the welfare of his race.”

116 The examining magistrate ordered three separate medical evaluations of Schwarzbard’s mental competence. All found no diminished capacity.

117 In the event, Schwarzbard’s mother died when he was a child; his father passed away in 1917 from illness. Schwarzbard, *In’m loyf fun yorn*, 18, 76.

Document 47

B. S. Goret (Police Inspector) to Marcel Peyre (Examining Magistrate)

Paris, 17 March 1927

Handwritten police report, 6 pages; darkened with blotches, writing partly effaced; handwritten (“C.2.173”) and typewritten (“RF 18/3/27 BJ -3-”) archival notations on left margin of front page, written vertically from bottom to top; stamp (“B. S.”) in upper left corner, along with annotation (“Urgent”) and three illegible lines written diagonally in a hand different from that of the document author; stamp (“## Mar 1927” in upper right corner, along with notation (“6/3”) in hand different from that of document author; interlineal additions and pagination in handwriting different from that of document author

Language: French

APP, C2.173

B. S.

Goret

No. 501

Paris le 17 mars 1927

!Soit t##!

!M. Peyre!

!brig. Goret!

!aff. # Schwartzbard!

Rapport.

Monsieur!r! le Receveur du Bureau des postes, No 113, place de l'Hôtel-de-Ville, consulté en exécution de la commission rogatoire ci-jointe, a déclaré que l'heure de dépôt du pneumatique adressé par l'inculpé Schwartzbard, à sa femme est à 5 minutes près, celle indiquée par !|2!| le cachet opposé sur les deux timbres d'affranchissement, soit 14 heures 35.

A ce sujet, il a fait connaître que le dit cachet a été apposé à l'aide d'un composteur mobile, dont les numéros horaires sont changés toutes les 5 minutes.

Vérification faite au !Au! Commissariat de Police du quartier de l'Odéon où a été conduit le Ne Schwartzbard aussitôt après le !|3!| crime commis, il a été répondu par l'Inspecteur qui !a! lui-même a fouillé à l'inculpé !a fait savoir! qu'à ce moment, celui-ci n'était pas nanti du pneumatique en question, lequel n'a été découvert qu'au cours de la perquisition effectuée à son domicile 82 boulevard de Menilmontant à Paris.

Etant donné que le crime reproché au Ne !|4!| Schwartzbard a été perpétré vers 14 heures 10 ou 14 heures 15, il paraît anormal que le pneumatique

envoyé par le meurtrier à son épouse, puisse avoir demandé été déposé place de l'Hôtel de Ville, au Bureau 113, vers 14 h 35.

Cette anomalie n'a pu être élucidée, et il y a lieu de se demander s'il ne s'agit pas là d'une erreur du postier.

||5| Le Receveur du dit bureau consulté spécialement sur ce point, a fait connaître que ce fait paraissait impossible, attendu que l'employé chargé de la réception des pneumatiques, se barre à charger toutes les 5 minutes, les chiffres indiquant les minutes horaires. Il faudrait alors admettre que le dit employé ||6| s'est trompé lorsqu'il a chargé le chiffre indiquant l'heure, et que l'en| dans l'occurrence il a mis le chiffre 14 au lieu de 13, ce qui expliquerait tout.

Il n'a pu être établi s'il en est ainsi.

Aucun autre renseignement n'a pu être recueilli.

Ci-joint les pièces communiquées.¹¹⁸

Goret

Document 48

"Schwarzbard's Most Recent Hearing"

Paris, 24 March 1927

Published newspaper article

Language: Yiddish

*Parizer haynt,*¹¹⁹ *vol. 2, no. 353, p. 1*

שווארצבארד'ס לעצטער פארהער

נעכטען נאָכמיטאָג איז אין קאַבינעט פֿון ריכטער פֿער פֿאַרגעקומען אַ ווייטערדיגע אויספֿאַרשונג פֿון אייניגע עדות וועלכע די ציוויל־פֿאַרטיע פֿון פֿעטליוראַס פֿאַמיליע האָט אַרויסגערופֿען.

118 Enclosures (not reproduced): instruction from Peyre to determine when the express letter was posted and French translation of the express letter.

119 Paris edition of the Warsaw mass-circulation Yiddish-language daily *Haynt*. It began publication in January 1926 and initially had difficulty finding an audience. Coverage of the Petliura assassination and the preparation for Schwarzbard's trial likely saved it from an early closing. See Haim Finkelstein, *Haynt. A tsaytung bay yidn 1908–1939 [Haynt. A Newspaper for Jews]*, Tel Aviv 1978, 31–35.

עס זענען אויסגעפרענגט געוואָרען שאַפּאַוואַל, אַ ברודער פון אוקראַינישן געוועזענעם מיניסטער, אַ רוסישער עמיגראַנט וואָלאָדין און אַ איד דאָבאַקאָוסקי.

מצד דער ציוויל פּאַרטיע איז געקומען דער אידישער אַדוואָקאַט וואָס וועט פּער טיידיגען פּעטלוראַן – כּהן. מצד שוואַרצבאַרדען זענען געקומען די אַדוואָקאַטען טאַרעס און גוטשו.

שאַפּאַוואַל האָט עס געברענגט די נייע 2 עדות וועלכע האָבען געזאָלט בעשטעטיגען פּערשיעדענע אויסגעטראַכטע בלבלים אויף שוואַרצבאַרדען. דאָבאַקאָוסקי ערקלערט, אַז דער עדות וואָלאָדין האָט איהם דערזעהלט, אַז אַ טאַג פאַר דער דערשיסונג פון פּעטלוראַן האָט ער מיט שוואַרצבאַרדען געגעסען אין אַ רעסטאָראַן אויפן סאַן מישעל. אין דעם רעסטאָראַן זענען דאַמאַלט געוועזען פּעטלוראַס פּרוי מיט דעם קינד.

וואָלאָדין ערקלערט, אַז מיט שוואַרצבאַרדען האָט ער ווירקליך געגעסען מיטאַג אין אַ רעסטאָראַן, אָבער ניט אַ טאַג פאַר דעם שאַס, נאָר עטליכע טעג פאַר דעם. עס איז מעגליך אַז אין רעסטאָראַן זאָלען האָבען דאַמאַלט געוועזען פּרוי פּעטלוראַס מיט איהר קינד – דער עדות און שוואַרצבאַרד האָבען אָבער דערפון נישט געוואוסט.

ווייטער לייקענט וואָלאָדין קאַטעגאָריש אַז ער זאָל האָבען געפרעגט ביי שאַפּאַוואַלען אויף פּעטלוראַס אדרעס און ווי אזוי קען און ווען קען מען פּעטלוראַן זעהען.

וואָלאָדין לייקענט אויך, אַז ער זאָל האָבען שפּאַצירט אַ שעה נאָך פּעטלוראַס [sic] ערמאַרדונג מיט שאַפּאַוואַלען אויף דעם סאַן מישעל און זעהענדיג אַנאַנגעלויף מענשען אופן עק גאַס ראסי, זאָל ער האָבען אויסגערופען:

– דאָס האָט מען געמוזט ערמאַרדען פּעטלוראַן!

מען פיהרט אַריין שלום שוואַרצבאַרדען און מען פרעגט איהם אויס וועגען פּנעאר מאַטיק, וועלכען ער האָט פאַר דעם שאַס געשיקט זיין פּרוי – עס האַנדעלט זיך דאָ אינם געזענגונגס־בריעף וואָס שוואַרצבאַרד האָט געשיקט זיין פּרוי און אין וועלכען ער ענטשולדיגט זיך פאַר איהר צוליעב זיין האַנדלונג.

שוואַרצבאַרד ערקלערט, אַז דעם פּנעאומאַטיק האָט ער אריינגעוואָרפען אין פּאַסט ביורא פון האַטעל דע וויל 2 אַ זייגער בייטאַג. די פּאַליצייאישע אויספּאַרשונג בעווייזט אויך אַז מען האָט עס געשיקט פון האַטעל דע וויל, אָבער דער סטעמפעל איז געשטעלט 2 מיט 35 מינוט. דער פּאַסט בעאַמטער האָט אין זיין בעריכט איבערגעגעבען, אַז ער סטעמפעלט די פּנעאומאַטיקעס אַלע 5 מינוט.

שוואַרצבאַרד ערקלערט אַז דער פּאַסטבעאַמטער האָט מסתמא ניט רעגולער געסטעמפעלט.

כּעת דער אויספּאַרשונג רעגט זיך שאַפּאַוואַל שטאַרק אויף און שטעלט אַ צוהיצטער פּאַלגענדע אומגעלומפּערטע פּראגען:

– צי איז פּעטלוראַס ניט געזעסען מיט שוואַרצבאַרדען אין איין טורמע אין קיעוו?

– צי האָט שוואַרצבאַרד ניט אַנגעפיהרט מיט אַ באַלשעוויסישען רעגעימענט געגען

אוקראַינאַ?

– צי האָט שוואַרצבאַרד ניט געקענט שאַפּאַוואַלען פּריהער?

שוואַרצבאַרד לייקענט נאָטירליך דאָס אַלעס. דער ריכטער וויל אפילו די פּראגען ניט פּראַטאַקאָלירען, נאָר טאַרעס פּאַדערט מען זאָל יאָ דאָס פּראַטאַקאָלירען כדי מען זאָל זעהען מיט וואָס פּאַר אַ מיטלען די ציוויל־פּאַרטיע בענוצט זיך. עס ווערט פּראַטאַקאָלירט.

דערמיט ווערט די אויספֿארשונג פֿערענדיגט.
טאַרעס און זיין געהילף פֿערזיכערען, אַז דאָס איז שוין די לעצטע אויספֿארשונג.
איצט זענען שוין די אקטען איבער אין טריבונאַל.

Translation

Schwarzbard's Most Recent Hearing

Yesterday afternoon, in Judge Peyre's chambers, an additional interrogation took place of several witnesses that the civil party of Petliura's family had summoned.¹²⁰

Interrogated were [Mykola] Shapoval, a brother of the former Ukrainian minister;¹²¹ a Russian emigrant, Volodin; and a Jew, Dobkowski.

Representing the civil party was the Jewish attorney who will defend Petliura – Cohen.¹²² Attorneys Torrès and Goudchaux¹²³ appeared on behalf of Schwarzbard.

Shapoval brought the two new witnesses¹²⁴ who were supposed to confirm various made-up charges about Schwarzbard. Dobkowski declares that the witness Volodin told him that on the day before Petliura was shot he had eaten with Schwarzbard in a restaurant on Boulevard Saint Michel. Petliura's wife and child were in the restaurant at the time.

Volodin declares that he did indeed eat lunch with Schwarzbard in a restaurant, but not on the day before but rather several days before the shooting. It is possible that Mrs. Petliura and her child were in the restaurant at the time, but the witness and Schwarzbard did not know it.

Volodin further denies categorically that he asked Shapoval for Petliura's address or about when and how he could see Petliura.

Volodin also denies that he was walking with Shapoval on Boulevard Saint Michel an hour after Petliura's murder and that upon seeing people running to the corner of Rue Racine he called out:

120 See above, Introduction, n. 159.

121 Mykyta Shapoval had served briefly as Minister of Posts and Telegraph in the Ukrainian Central Council from November 1917 through January 1918 (before the Council proclaimed an independent Ukrainian republic).

122 Most likely a junior associate of either César Campinchi or Albert Wilm, the two lead attorneys who represented the Petliura family.

123 Serge Weill-Goudchaux, a Yiddish-speaking associate of Henry Torrès.

124 Shapoval himself had testified earlier, on 20 July 1926. See Document 31.

“They must have murdered Petliura!”

Scholem Schwarzbard is led in and asked about the express letter that he sent his wife before the shooting – this is the farewell letter that Schwarzbard sent his wife in which he asks his forgiveness for his behavior.¹²⁵

Schwarzbard declares that he sent the express letter from the post office in the Hotel de Ville at 2 pm. The police investigation also shows that it was sent from the Hotel de Ville, but the time stamp shows 2:35. The postal clerk reported in his account that he stamps the express letters every five minutes.

Schwarzbard explains that the postal clerk must not have stamped [the letters] regularly.

During the investigation Shapoval becomes quite agitated and heatedly poses the following awkward questions:

- Did Petliura not sit with Schwarzbard in the same prison in Kiev?¹²⁶
- Did Schwarzbard not serve in a Bolshevik regiment against Ukraine?
- Did Schwarzbard not know Shapoval earlier?

Naturally, Schwarzbard denies all of this. The judge does not even wish to record the questions, but Torrès demands that they be recorded so that people what sort of means the civil party is employing.

A record is made.

That was the end of the interrogation.

Torrès and his assistants promise that this is the last hearing.

The documents have now reached the tribunal.

Document 49

Marvin Lowenthal to Stephen S. Wise

Paris, 25 March 1927

Typewritten letter, 2 pages; typewritten and handwritten corrections, insertions, and passages underlined by typewriter and by hand

Language: English

AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 91

March 25, 1927.

!Confidential!

¹²⁵ Text of the letter in Schwarzbard, *In'm loyf fun yorn*, 215f.

¹²⁶ Cf. Shapoval's account for the relevance of this question; below, Document 51, at n. 153.

Dear Dr. Wise:

The day before yesterday I attended a meeting of the Schwartzbard Committee, at which a report was rendered of the work done to date and of the present situation.

First (and foremost) complete amity reigns now between the Committee and Maitre Torres.

The trial is scheduled for June, although further postponements are always possible.

An ocean of material has been supplied the defense; it includes, besides a documented history of the pogroms and a multitude of statements of eye-witnesses, elaborate chronological tables of the excesses and synchronistic tables indicating the relation between the pogroms and general political events in the Ukraine, briefs of every possible argument that may be advanced by the opponents and answers to these arguments, photos, newspaper clippings, etc. Petlura's defense has, for example, already 'submitted' to the Court (in accordance with French procedure) a hundred page statement of their side of the case; this statement has, in another hundred pages, been rebutted point by point. Again it seems probable that the Petlura defense will play up ### the friendly relations between his government and the Allies; accordingly, a long brief has been drawn up indicating the relations between the Petlura government and the Germans. Finally films have been procured, which were taken in the pogrom devastated regions immediately after the disaster; every endeavor will be made to introduce these films into the court, or at least to give a private showing of them in some connection with the trial.¹²⁷

Witness(es) of the facts and character witnesses have been provided from many countries, including Palestine, Poland, the Ukraine, and the Argentine. With the exception of the [sic] some of the character witnesses, which are still subject to discussion, Torres and the Committee are agreed as to whom shall appear.

The Schwartzbard affair has recently provoked a violent discussion in the ranks of the Second International; the Revue Socialiste printed two articles bringing into question and rebuke the part played by the Ukrainian Socialist party in the pogrom government; the Ukrainians have joined issue and the matter is being thrashed out; a mass of material was accordingly supplied the International by the Schwartzbard Committee.

In the near future (this sort of thing is peculiar to France where, as in ancient Athens, everything is thrashed out in the agora) a public debate on the

¹²⁷ See above, Document 37, n. 44.

Schwartzbard case will take place at the Club Faubourg.¹²⁸ From my previous experiences at the Club, it will [2] be lucky, I should say, if the meeting passes off without a few additional murders. In any case there will be forty policemen outside the hall and broken chairs inside.

A quantity of literature has been prepared on the case. In the first place the Committee has printed, in English, French, and German (the English edition is now going through the press in England) a full history of the pogroms.¹²⁹ It will not appear, however, earlier than a month before the trial in order to have its full effect. The *Ligue des Droits de l'Homme*¹³⁰ has likewise prepared a pamphlet. And a small booklet has been written by a miss Feinberg.

Finally there has appeared this week-end a book by Bernard Lecache (the French-Jewish journalist who lately visited the Ukraine on behalf of the *Quotidien*) entitled "Quand Israël meurt ..." and published by the Editions du Progrès Civique.¹³¹ I have sent you under separate cover a copy of this book, which you might be interested in turning over to an American publisher. The English rights are still unsold. For terms ask the publisher to apply to Bernard Lecache, 4 rue Lentonnet, Paris IX. I suggest Albert and Charles Boni.¹³² I must confess, tho [sic], the book is too horrible to read. I have likewise sent a copy to Jacob Fishman,¹³³ for the

128 Prominent Parisian debating society founded by journalist, satirist, and left-wing political activist Léo Poldès (Léopold Szeszler, 1891–1970) in 1918.

129 The English version was published as Committee of the Jewish Delegations (ed.), *The Pogroms in the Ukraine under the Ukrainian Governments (1917–1920)*. Historical Survey with Documents and Photographs, London 1927. The French version appeared as Comité des Délégations Juives (ed.), *Les pogromes en Ukraine sous les gouvernements ukrainiens*. No German edition has been located.

130 League for Human Rights, founded in Paris in 1898 to promote the cause of Alfred Dreyfus.

131 Bernard Lecache, *Quand Israël meurt ... Au pays des pogromes*, Paris n. d.[1927].

132 Albert Boni (1892–1981) was a founding partner of the publishing house Boni and Liveright, which published such noted authors as William Faulkner, Ernest Hemingway, Theodore Dreiser, and Ezra Pound. His younger brother, Charles Boni (1894–1969), was proprietor of a New York bookstore that had published an inexpensive, small-format series of classics. In 1923 they formed a new publishing house, Albert & Charles Boni, Inc., which published works by Marcel Proust, Romain Rolland, D. H. Lawrence, and Leon Trotsky.

133 Jacob Fishman (1878–1946) served as editor of the New York Yiddish-language daily *Morgen zhurnal* from 1916 to 1938.

Yiddish rights are likewise unsold as yet.¹³⁴ A German publisher has been provided.¹³⁵

Naturally, all of this activity has cost money. Something should be done to stir the American Committee to new efforts toward paying the bills; for the Paris committee is broke and many expenses are as yet unmet and other heavy ones (transportation of witnesses etc) are still to come.

Sincerely yours,

!Marvin Lowenthal!

It will be well to call !to! the attention of any publisher that there is one grave exaggeration in the Lecache book. He speaks of 300,000 killed in the pogroms. The Soviet government (who would not err on the wrong side) gives the estimate of killed as 70,000. Motzkin thinks that 40,000 is more accurate. But, in translation, the figure could be modified to “300,000 victims” (that is, not the dead alone) without too great an overstatement.

!ML.!

Document 50

Arnold Margolin to Louis Marshall

New York, 31 March 1927

Typewritten letter, 2 pages; page 2 headed “Louis Marshall, Esq. 3–31–27”

Language: English

AJC, B22 F4 (Russia: Margolin, A. 1924–28)

March 31, 1927.

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Mr. N. Shapoval,¹³⁶ the Ukrainian leader, who is at the present time in New York, has told me that he wrote you a letter, and Mr. Schneiderman

134 A Yiddish edition appeared as Bernard Lecache, *Ven dos folk yisroel shtarbt* [When the Jewish People Dies], Warsaw 1927.

135 No German edition has been located. A Russian version was published as Bernard Lecache, *Kogda Izrail' umiraet* [When Israel Dies], Leningrad 1928.

136 Mykyta (Nikita) Shapoval.

asked me about a week ago for data about Mr. Shapoval's personality for your information. In my view, it is extremely desirable that Jewish leaders in this country show Mr. Shapoval some consideration, and I am sure that if, in addition to replying to his letter, you can find the time to have him call upon you, it will have a very good effect. He would come to see you together with my good friend, Mr. N. Ceglinsky,¹³⁷ who is an American citizen and the leader of the democratic Ukrainian groups (Galicians) in the United States.

Enclosed I am sending you a very important dispatch from Moscow which recently appeared in the New York Times.¹³⁸ Its contents prove that all my fears of the always increasing influence which the Polish-Roumanian ruling circles have upon the Ukrainians were not without a serious foundation. I am sorry to state that all my best Ukrainian friends like Alexander Shulgin, Procopovich and many others, upon whom I had some influence in 1917–1920, are becoming more and more involved in the Polish-Roumanian scheme.¹³⁹

Mr. Shapoval represents the groups definitely opposed to this scheme and is more friendly rather towards Russia than Poland. Although he is from the Russian Ukraine, he cooperates [2] with the Galician Ukrainians in this country.

As a leader of the most numerous Ukrainian party (Socialists-Revolutionists), Shapoval had and will later have a very great influence upon the Ukrainian peasantry, and for this reason, I think that the present opportunity to gain his friendship and good will should not be missed. I strongly urge you, dear Mr. Marshall, not only to respond to Shapoval's letter but also to invite him to see you.

Sincerely yours,
[Arnold D. Margolin]¹⁴⁰

137 Nicholas Ceglinsky, also Mykola Tsehlynsky (b. 1886), manager of the Ukrainian Bureau of the Foreign Language Information Service, an American nongovernmental organization that engaged in education work among immigrant groups.

138 Not in file.

139 See Document 57.

140 Signature absent on archival copy.

Document 51*Mykola Shapoval to Isaac Nachman Steinberg**Meudon, France, 14 April 1927**Handwritten letter, 10 pages recto and verso**Language: Russian*

NYPL, *QGA 73–3936, no. 6

Медон, 14 апреля 1927.Уважаемый Исаак Захарович! ^{4*141!}

Сейчас получил от Вас письмо относительно Володина. Это как есть кстати. Это тем более, что я должен был о нем написать к Вам, как это постановили несколько дней пред этим наши здешние товарищи и просить Вас нам Ваше мнение о нем и сообщить принадлежит ли он к Вашей политической группировке, к партии левых есеров или к союзу максималистов. Важно это тем, что он, Володин, сам этого никогда не утверждал, относился к Вам и т. Шрейдеру и вообще к партии левых есеров весьма критически и отрицательно. В таком же духе отзывался и относительно Международного Бюро. А т. Добковский не один раз нам заявляя, ||1v|| что Володин человек совершенно неизвестный, неизвестно откуда он взялся и что про него как максималиста, он сомневается и не верит. А Шрейдер, который познакомил меня с Володиным и ввел его в нашу среду, в последствие не хорошо отзывался о нем очень часто. А тепер, как вспоминаю, что и Вы, когда во время последнего Вашего пребывания в Париже я спросил Вас о нем, Вы также дали о нем своего рода такой отрицательный отзыв, который поразительно был точный с тем впечатлением, которое Володин вызывал у меня все время моего знакомства с ним. Также и среди наших здешних товарищей он вызывал аналогичное впечатление и все ставились к нему с каком то невероятным подозрением. Ни я и никто из моих товарищей никак не могли |2г| его понять. Даже при самых частых с ним встречах, всегда он оставался чем то непонятным и загадочным. А постоянная его скрытность и то, что всегда и везде он бывал, ко всем ходил, со всеми встречался, и с анархистами и с большевиками (бывал очень часто в большевицкому Генконсульстве, как выяснилось в последствии),

141 Archivist's mark pointing to notation at bottom of page ("Штейнберг", Shteinberg) in different hand from that of writer of document (presumably the archivist's own).

все это еще больше укрепляло сомнения и подозрения в среде наших товарищей.

И если к Вам писал Никита Ефимович и спрашивал о Володине, то я полагаю, что это могло быть в связи с теми письмами, в которых я несколько раз писал ему о всех наших сомнениях и подозрениях и желал собрать о нем сведения. Это нужно было тем более, что с некоторого времени он с удивительной настойчивости и $||2v||$ энергией старался все время быть в нашей среде, почти и дня не проходил, чтоб он не бывал у меня или в кого-нибудь из товарищей и всеми силами старался втянуть себя в круг нашей работы.

Познакомил меня с ним, как я уже говорил, т. Шрейдер. Это было впервые время как Володин прибыл во Францию. Шрейдер попросил приютить его на несколько дней. Прожил он у меня не пару дней а два месяца. Недели три после этого он еще приходил ко мне. А потом вдруг прекратил самым неожиданным образом, хотя и не было никакого повода и хотя он жил в Париже, как оказалось в последствии. Месяца 4 перед убийством Петлюры также сам с неожиданно стал снова ко мне являться, а месяца 2 перед самым убийством так стал ходить ко мне почти ежедневно.

Бывая так часто у меня в продолжении этих двух месяцев, он $|3r|$ как-то странно часто стал заводить разговоры и все о Петлюре. Бывало даже так, что при моей отрицательном оценке Петлюры за его польскую политику, он выступал в его защиту. А иногда наоборот соглашался со мной и ругал его.

В это же время я заметил, что бывая у меня ежедневно, он почти всегда уходил от меня и уезжал к каким то своим знакомым, в одно место, что это было возле кладбища Père Lachaise. На мои иногда вопросы относительно этих его ежедневных поездок к Père Lachaise, избегал ответов или отвечал как-то неясно, намеками не называя имен и т. д.

Несколько раз в разговорах о Петлюре, когда он его защищал, он мне в доказательство приводил случай, что он имеет одного знакомого, который будь-то бы хорошо знает его, лично знаком $||3v||$ с ним а знает его как интеллигентного, умного человека, как демократа и социалиста и т.д. Что этот знакомый будто бы сидел с Петлюрой в тюрьме в Кіеве и т.д.

И такіе разговоры Володин заводил несколько раз.

В таких разговорах, когда я с ним гулял по улицах моего квартала (где жил и Петлюра), пару раз он задавал мне вопросы не знаю ли я где тут, в каком доме, живет Петлюра. Отвечал я на этот вопрос отрицательно. При других разговорах Володин стал снова мне говорить про этого человека, что сидел вместе с Петлюрой в тюрьме, что у этого че-

ловека остались очень хорошие, приятные воспоминания и что он очень хотел бы повидаться с Петлюрой. При этом Володин осведомляется не знаю ли я, как это можно сделать, чтоб этот человек мог повидать Петлюру. Я отвечал, что для этого, я думаю, нужно |4r| будет просто обратиться к приближенном Петлюры, к его адъютантом, они доложат, и что Петлюра в такой способ и сможет принять. А препятствие не будет, Петлюра всех принимает, отвечал я. Володин же в ответ на это отвечал, что это не подойдет, это сложно, это если бы просто так, без всяких посредников.

На 23 мая, за два дня до убийства, должен был быть конгресс украинских организаций, вызывавших Петлюру. Уже задолго до этого конгрессу Володин как то усиленно стал интересоваться этим конгрес[s]-ом, все рас[s]прашивал о нем, а одного разу спросил будет ли на этот конгрессе Петлюра или нет. Я ответил: не знаю. А вы будете на конгрессе? задал он мне вопрос. Я отвечал, что нет, что наша Громада постановила не принимать участия в этот конгрес[s]е и из наших никто ||4v|| туда не пойдет. В ответ на это, Володин стал мне доказывать, что на конгресс нужно идти и высказывал сильное желание пойти самому. Потом даже несколько раз подымал со мной вопрос, как бы для него и одного его товарища добыть два билета на право посещения его. Я, конечно, уклонился от этого, добывать ему эти билеты.

В день самого убийства Володин очень рано пришел ко мне, а к часом 10 ушел.

После обеда меня навестили несколько друзей. Пошел я купить хлеба. Встречаю на моей улице Володина: шел ку мне. Это было 3½ – 3¾ часа (значит, прошло после убийства Петлюры какой-нибудь один час времени). Пошли вместе к булочной на Сен-Мишелю (угол улицы Расина и бульв. Сен-Мишеля). При входе в булочную Володин остался вне у дверей. В булочной я услышал разговор |5r| среди публики про какого-то только-что убитого русского генерала на бульваре. Я спросил об имени этого генерала, никто не знал. Выхожу и говорю Володину, что здесь где-то убито русского генерала. И Володин с какой-то немного нервной настроении говорит: это наверно Петлюру.

Вошли ко мне. По дороге Володин спрашивает: у вас кто-нибудь есть? Да, ответил. Стасив и другие – так вот Стасиву ничего не говорите что Петлюру убито, а то еще обрадуется (Стасив – Галичинин).

На другой день приходит ко мне Володин, застает у меня Стасива и в каком-то нервно возбужденным состоянии говорит: а знаете, убито Петлюру. Начался разговор. В конце разговора обращаюсь к Стасиву и говорю ему, что он посмотрел на плане Парижа (Тарид) где это в ||5v|| Париже живет этот самый убийца Петлюры Шварцбард. Стасив по-

искав отвечает: возле Père Lachaise а Володин почему-то в это время странно покраснел и побледнел. Стасив ушел. А Володин и говорит мне, кто бы это мог подумать, что убищен [sic] Петлюры будет этот Шварцбард. Это же мой знакомый и сколько я в нем бывал.

Все это вместе взятое тогда же вызвало у меня убеждение, что Володин так или иначе сильно связан с убийством Петлюры, что если он не активный участник убийства, то был посвящен и знал очень многое.

Про все это тогда же, сейчас же после убийства, я написал в Прагу и некоторым лицам разогнащим здесь в Париже.

31 июля (почти два месяца после убийства) меня вызвали к следователю.

|6r| При моем показании я между прочим показал все это и про Володина, а именно:

1. Что Володин знаком с Шварцбардом, что Володин месяца полтора-два перед убийством Петлюры почти ежедневно навещал Шварцбарда в его доме.

2. Что недели три перед убийством Володин спрашивал у меня несколько раз адрес Петлюры.

3. Что тогда же он рас[с]прашивал меня как делает приемы Петлюра.

4. Что час спустя после убийства Петлюры, когда еще никто не знал и на мое заявление, что говорят об убитом русском генерале, Володин ответил, что это наверное Петлюра.

На вопрос следователя считаю ли я Володина участником в убийстве, я ответил, что нет, но что он может многое знать и что это послужит ||6v|| к облегчению в разыскании правды.

На 23 марта (в этом году) к следователю были вызваны я, Володин и Добковский.

Добковский между прочим дал показание, что Володин накануне убийства Петлюры обедал с Шварцбардом в одном ресторане на б. Сен-Мишелю и что в этом ресторане тогда же обегала жена Петлюры с дочерью и что Володин боится очной ставки с женой Петлюры, что она может его узнать.

После этого показания Добковского и отдельного допроса Володина была сделана очная ставка всех нас вместе с адвокатами сначала без Шварцбарда а потом и при Шварцбарде.

Когда мое и Добковского показания были прочитаны, Володин ни с чем не |7r| согласился кроме того, что он знаком с Шварцбардом и что перед убийством бывал у него очень часто, почти ежедневно.

Еще до ввода Шварцбарда, когда Володин отрицал случай в булочной, следователь спросил, видал ли Володин в том день вообще меня

или нет. Володин категорически заверил, что он меня в том день совсем не видел. А где же вы провели время в этот день? спросил следователь. Володин стал путать, потом согласился, что один раз он меня видел, утром, но после обеда у меня не был и меня не видел. Это странно: около 4 часов Володина видели у меня несколько человек.

Потом я задал несколько вопросов к Володину.

– Скажите, Володин, бывал ли между мною и вами разговор о Шварцбарде до его убийства Петлюры.

– Нет, я с вами никаких разговоров о Шварцбарде не имел, отвечал Володин.

||7v||– Вы давно знакомы с Шварцбардом.

– Месяца 4 перед убийством.

– Часто бывали вы в Шварцбарда?

– Почти каждый день.

– А у меня часто бывали?

– Тоже почти каждый день.

– Хорошо, говорю я дали, каждый день вы бывали в меня, каждый день бывали у Шварцбарда, это тянулось несколько месяцев, вы утверждаете что я и вы были друзья, то как же могло случиться, что при этому нас не разу не бывало разговору о Шварцбарде?

– Да, но я не знал, что Шварцбард есть Шварцбард, я не знал его фамилии, я только узнал ее с газет после убийства.

Здесь уже не выдержал и следователь, скочил с своего места и подошел к Володину и спрашивает: как же |8r| так, вы бывали в доме Шварцбарда, где так бывало много людей, где все знали его как Шварцбарда, что в него на квартире была вывеска часового маистра с его фамилию – и вы не знали что он был Шварцбард!

После этого был введен Шварцбард.

Шварцбарда спросили знает ли он Вологина. Шварцбард ответил утвердительно.

– Вы с ним давно знакомы и бывал ли он в Вашем доме и как часто вы с ним виделись, далее спросили Шварцбарда.

Шварцбард ответил: познакомился я с ним случайно на улице, в доме он у меня не бывал, всего я его видел 2–3 раза за все время.

– Когда вы виделись с Володиным последний раз?

– Дней десять перед убийством. Тогда я случайно его встретил на Сен-Мишелю и запросил его на обед, ||8v|| ответил Шварцбард.

После этого прочитывают нам и Шварцбарду данное показание Володина когда его допрашивали отдельно. В этом показании Володина сказано, что он, Володин, знаком с Шварцбардом давно, более 4 месяцев еще перед убийством, бывал у Шварцбарда почти каждый

день, часто обедали вместе и, главное, что в день убийства он заехал к Шварцбарду а вместе из дому Шварцбарда поехали на Сен-Мишель и что вместе обедали.

Так они оба путали и ввали. А мы все вынесли еще больше убеждение, что Володин причастен к убийству.

Вот таким образом представляется все это дело с Володиным.

Что Володин написал в «Parizer Haint», я еще не знаю, через некоторое время постараюсь, что мне кто-нибудь [9г] переведет. Но знаю, как ведет Володин себя с некоторого времени, какую он ведет агитацию, какая [sic] он распространяет гнусности, а главное, что во всем этом его поддерживает Шрейдер.

Между прочем Володин страшно муссирует и распространяет сведения, что он был мой друг и приятель и т.д.

Это неправда, это просто легенда. Он меня всегда страшно тяготил. Он, правда, ко мне одно время очень часто ходил, особенно это было месяца два перед убийством, даже тогда на его желание, я с ним сфотографировался. Но во всем этом я не проявлял никакой инициативы, у него никогда не бывал и про все свои сомнения и подозрения относительно его я еще до убийства высказывал [9v] всем своим товарищам; а после убийства, то он, Володин, сам почти перестал ходить ко мне, тоже без всякого повода, поддержався иногда связь чисто формально относительно печати его статей та денег за эти стати. Я же не разорвал после убийства Петлюры с Володиным и этих формальных отношений, надеясь не спагнуть его и еще больше в своих наблюдениях за ним укрепить свои подозрения относительно участи его в убийстве. Но зато про эти все мои подозрения в первый же день сообщил многим товарищом и как-только был через два месяца вызван к следователю, так же сам показал и следователю.

[10г] Между прочем, т. Добковский кроме того показания, какое он дал следователю, он имеет еще целый ряд и других, меньших или больших фактов и наблюдений относительно причастности Володина к убийству и высказывает повальное свое глубокое убеждение в действительность этого.

Вот такова картина целого этого дела Володина. Подавая Вам это к сведению, мы были бы рады услышать Ваше мнение о Володине, поскольку Вы его раньше встречали в Берлине и вообще было бы интересно знать откуда он вся така явился среди нас и действительно ли он принадлежал [10v] к союзу максималистов.

В ожидании ответа, с товарищаским приветом,

Мыкола Шаповал

*Translation*Meudon, 14 April 1927.Dear Isaac Zakharovich [Steinberg]!¹⁴²

I have now received the letter from you concerning Volodin. This is something of a coincidence, all the more so because, by decision of our local comrades taken a few days ago, I was supposed to write you about him and ask your opinion of him, whether he belongs to your political group, to the Left SRs or to the Union of Maximalists. This is important because he, Volodin, never confirmed this himself; his attitude toward you and C[omrade] Schreider¹⁴³ and toward the Left SR Party in general has been quite critical and negative. In precisely that spirit he spoke about the International Bureau as well. And C[omrade] Dobkowski reported to us more than once $||1v||$ that Volodin is completely unknown, that it is not known from whence he appeared, and that he [Dobkowski] doubts and does not believe that he is a Maximalist. And Schreider, who introduced me to Volodin and brought him into our circle, has subsequently spoken ill of him often. And now, as I recall, when I asked you about him during your last visit in Paris, you too gave him a sort of negative review, which was strikingly accurate with regard to the impression Volodin has made on me during all the time I have known him. Among our local comrades as well he has generated a similar impression, and everyone related to him with a sort of incredulous suspicion. Neither I nor any of my comrades could $|2r|$ figure him out. Even though I met with him most frequently, he always remained sort of incomprehensible and puzzling. And another indication of his constant secretiveness: whenever and wherever he turned up, wherever he went, with whomever he met, whether with anarchists or with Bolsheviks (he often spent time at the Bolshevik Consulate-General, as later became apparent), he always strengthened doubts and suspicions among our comrades.

And if Nikita Efimovich¹⁴⁴ has written you and asked about Volodin, I suppose that this may have been in connection with the letters in which I wrote him several times about all of our doubts and suspicions and asked him to gather information about him. This was all the more necessary because for some time he has been trying with amazing perseverance and $||2v||$ energy to be constantly in our midst; hardly a day has passed when he has not

142 See previous note.

143 See above, Introduction, at n. 154.

144 Mykyta Shapoval.

come to see me or someone from among our comrades and did all he could to become involved with our activities.

As I have already said, it was Comrade Schreider who introduced me to him. This was when Volodin had just arrived in France. Schreider asked me to put him up for a few days. He stayed with me not for a few days but for two months. For the next three weeks he still came to see me. But later he stopped unexpectedly, even though there was no reason and even though he was living in Paris, as became apparent later. Four months before Petliura's murder he started unexpectedly showing up at my place once again, and two months before the murder he began coming to me nearly every day.

When he showed up at my place so often during those two months, he [3r] would often begin in a strange way to carry on, always about Petliura. It even happened that when I would offer a negative evaluation of Petliura for his Polish policy, he would come to his defense. But sometimes it would be the reverse; he would agree with me and excoriate him.

At the same time I noticed that on his daily visits he almost always left me to go to one of his acquaintances in a place that was near the Père Lachaise cemetery.¹⁴⁵ When I would occasionally ask him about these daily trips to Père Lachaise, he would avoid answering or would answer ambiguously, giving hints but not naming names, etc.

Several times, in conversations about Petliura, when he would defend him, he would offer me as proof the case of one of his acquaintances whom he claimed to know well, [who] was personally acquainted [3v] with him and knew him to be an intelligent, sensible person, a democrat, a socialist, etc, who purportedly sat with Petliura in prison in Kiev, etc.¹⁴⁶

Volodin initiated conversations like this several times.

During such conversations, as I walked with him through the streets of my neighborhood (where Petliura lived as well), he asked me a couple of times if I didn't know in which house Petliura lived. I answered this question in the negative. In other conversations Volodin would tell me again about the person who sat together with Petliura in prison, that this person retained very

145 The largest cemetery in Paris, located in the twentieth *arrondissement* on Boulevard de Ménilmontant, the street where Schwarzbard resided. Schwarzbard's apartment was located approximately 100 meters from the Père Lachaise metro station.

146 Shapoval appears to have been suggesting that the friend in question was Schwarzbard and that Schwarzbard had known Petliura during the time of the Civil War. Cf. Document 48. There is no evidence that such was the case. Petliura had been imprisoned from July to November 1918, not in Kiev but in Belaya Tserkov (see above, Document 1, n. 1). Schwarzbard placed himself in Odessa during this period, where he recovered from an episode of typhus. See Johnson, Sholem Schwarzbard, 108.

good, pleasant memories and that he would like to see Petliura. At the same time Volodin would inquire whether I knew how this could be done, so that the person could see Petliura. I would reply that for this I thought it would be necessary [4r] simply to apply to those close to Petliura, to his adjutants; they would report, and in this way Petliura would be able to receive him. I would reply also that there would be no obstacle; Petliura receives everyone. In response Volodin would answer that it wouldn't work, that it is complicated, if only it could simply be without any intermediaries.

On 23 May, two days before the assassination, a congress of Ukrainian organizations that recognized Petliura as their leader was supposed to take place. Long in advance of this congress Volodin began persistently to express an interest, kept asking about it, but more than once he asked whether Petliura would be at the congress or not. I replied, "I don't know." "And will you be at the congress?" he asked me. I answered that I would not, that our Association¹⁴⁷ had resolved not to take part in this congress and that none of our members would [4v] go to it. In reply Volodin began to argue that it was important to go to the congress and expressed a strong desire to go himself. Several times thereafter he even raised the question how he and one of his comrades could obtain two tickets that would give them the right to attend. Naturally I avoided getting him the tickets.

On the day of the assassination Volodin came to me quite early and left around 10 o'clock.

After lunch I visited some friends. I went to buy bread. I ran into Volodin on my street, walking toward me. This was around 3:30–3:45 pm (that is, about an hour had passed since the murder of Petliura). We walked together toward the bakery on Boulevard Saint Michel (on the corner of rue Racine and Boulevard Saint Michel). At the entrance to the bakery Volodin stayed outside the door. Inside the bakery I heard a conversation [5r] among the people there about some Russian general who had just been killed on the boulevard. I asked the name of the general; no one knew. I come out and tell Volodin that a Russian general had been killed somewhere near here. Whereupon Volodin says somewhat nervously, "It must have been Petliura."

We went to my home. On the way Volodin asks, "Is anyone staying with you?" "Yes," I replied. "Stasyv¹⁴⁸ and some others. Don't say anything to Stasyv about Petliura being killed; he might actually take pleasure in it" (Stasyv is a Galician).¹⁴⁹

147 The Ukrainian Association in France (*Ukrains'ka Hromada u Frantsii*).

148 Ivan Stasyv, since 1924 head of the Ukrainian Council in France.

149 He was born in Lubaczów, in western Galicia, north of Przemyśl.

Another day Volodin comes to me, finds Stasyv in my home in a state of nervous excitement saying, “Did you know that Petliura has been killed?” A discussion started. At the end of the discussion I turn to Stasyv and tell him to look up in the map of Paris (Taride)¹⁵⁰ ||5v|| where Schwarzbard, Petliura’s murderer, lives. Searching, Stasyv answers, “Near Père Lachaise,” and at that moment Volodin strangely blushed and turned pale. Stasyv left. And Volodin says to me, “Who could have thought that Schwarzbard would be the murderer of Petliura? He is my acquaintance and I have visited him a lot.”

All of this together aroused in me the conviction that Volodin was one way or another strongly connected with the murder of Petliura, that if he had not been an active participant in the murder, he was committed and knew quite a lot.

Immediately after the murder I wrote about all of this to Prague and to several assorted people here in Paris.¹⁵¹

On 31 July (nearly two months after the murder¹⁵²) I was summoned to the examining magistrate.

|6r| In my testimony, among other things, I related all of this about Volodin, specifically:

1. That Volodin was acquainted with Schwarzbard, that for a month and a half or two before the assassination Volodin visited Schwarzbard almost every day in his home.

2. That three weeks before the murder Volodin asked me for Petliura’s address several times.

3. That at that time he asked me how Petliura admits people to see him.

4. That one hour after Petliura’s assassination, when no one yet knew, and I had said that people were talking about a Russian general who had been killed, Volodin responded that it must be Petliura.

To the question of the examining magistrate whether I thought that Volodin was a participant in the assassination, I replied that I didn’t but that he might know much and that this would make it easier ||6v|| to find out the truth.¹⁵³

150 A. Taride Publishers was known for its high quality maps and tourist guides.

151 No such correspondence has yet been located in the Shapoval archive.

152 Shapoval was actually interrogated on 20 July 1926. See Document 31.

153 Shapoval’s account of his testimony does not comport with the official record of his interrogation. According to the official record, Shapoval mentioned only that Volodin had asked him several times for Petliura’s address, that they had run into one another “after the assassination” (the amount of time was not specified), and that when Shapoval named Schwarzbard as the assassination, Volodin “blushed and told me that he knew him well.” Shapoval implicated an entirely different person, a “Ukrai-

On 23 March (this year), I was summoned to the examining magistrate along with Volodin and Dobkowski.

Among other things Dobkowski testified that on the eve of the murder Volodin ate lunch with Schwarzbard at a restaurant on Boulevard Saint Michel, and that at the same time Petliura's wife and daughter were having lunch in this restaurant, and that Volodin fears making eye contact with Petliura's wife, for she might recognize him.

Following Dobkowski's testimony and a separate interrogation of Volodin all of us were brought together face to face with the lawyers, at first without Schwarzbard and then in his presence.

When Dobkowski's statement and mine were read aloud, Volodin [7r] agreed with nothing except that he was acquainted with Schwarzbard and that prior to the murder he spent time at his home very frequently, almost every day.

Even before Schwarzbard was brought in, when Volodin denied what happened in the bakery, the examining magistrate asked whether Volodin had seen me at all that day or not. Volodin categorically assured that he had not seen me that day at any time. "And where did you spend time that day?" asked the magistrate. Volodin began to obfuscate, then he admitted that he saw me one time, in the morning, but after lunch he was not at my house and did not see me. That is strange: several people saw Volodin at my house around 4 o'clock.

Then I put a few questions to Volodin.

"Tell me, Volodin, were there conversations between you and me about Schwarzbard before he assassinated Petliura?"

"No, I had no such conversations about Schwarzbard with you," Volodin answered.

||7v|| "Have you known Schwarzbard for long?"

"Four months before the assassination."

"Did you go to Schwarzbard's home often?"

"Nearly every day."

"And did you go to my house often?"

"Also nearly every day."

"All right," I continue, "every day you went to my house, every day you went to Schwarzbard's house, this went on for a few months, you claim that

nian Bolshevik" named Noritch-Isolikowski (actually Norich-Dzhikovskii), who asked several times where Petliura ate lunch. Shapoval is quoted as follows: "I consider that Noritch and his comrades could be morally responsible for the crime, but I can't say whether they took part in it." Ibid. On Norich, see above, Document 15, n. 5.

you and I were friends, so how could it have happened that during that time not a single conversation about Schwarzbard took place between us?"

"Yes, but I didn't know that Schwarzbard was Schwarzbard, I didn't know his last name, I only recognized him from the newspapers after the assassination."

The examining magistrate couldn't put up with this anymore either; he jumped up out of his seat and walked over to Volodin and asks, "How can it be [8r] that you spent time in Schwarzbard's home, where many other people also spent time, where everyone knew him as Schwarzbard, in whose apartment hung the sign of a watchmaker with his last name – and you didn't know that he was Schwarzbard!"

After that Schwarzbard was brought in.

Schwarzbard was asked whether he knew Volodin. Schwarzbard answered in the affirmative.

"Have you known him for a long time and has he spent time in your home and how often did you meet with him?" Schwarzbard was asked further.

Schwarzbard replied, "I met him by chance on the street; he never spent time in my home. All together I saw him 2–3 times during the entire interval."

"When did you last meet with Volodin?"

"Ten days before the murder. At that time I accidentally ran into him on Saint Michel and asked him to eat with me," [8v] Schwarzbard answered.

After this Volodin's testimony, given when he was interrogated separately, is read to us and to Schwarzbard. In this testimony Volodin said that he, Volodin, had known Schwarzbard for a long time, even more than 4 months before the murder, that he had visited Schwarzbard almost daily, that he had often eaten with him, and mainly, that on the day of the murder he went to Schwarzbard's house and together they went from Schwarzbard's house to Saint Michel and ate lunch together.

Thus they both obfuscated and lied. And all of us became even more convinced that Volodin was involved in the assassination.

That's how the whole business with Volodin looks.

I don't know yet what Volodin wrote in *Parizer Haynt*; I have been trying to get someone [9r] to translate it for me for a while. But I know how Volodin has been conducting himself for some time, what sort of agitation he is carrying on, how he has been spreading calumnies, and most importantly that Schreider is supporting him in all this.

By the way, Volodin is horribly exaggerating and spreading the word that he was my friend and companion, etc.

That is not true; it's just a legend. He was always a horrible burden upon me. True, there was a time when he would come to me quite often, in particular two months before the assassination; at that time, at his request, I

even had my picture taken with him. But during all that time I never showed any initiative; I never visited him in his home, and I expressed all my doubts and suspicions concerning him ^{9v} to all of my comrades even before the murder. And after the murder he, Volodin, himself virtually stopped coming to me, also for no reason, sometimes maintaining a purely formal connection concerning the publication of his articles and about money for them. I did not cut off these formal ties with Volodin following the assassination of Petliura, hoping not to drive him away and by observing him even more to strengthen my suspicions about his role in the murder. Nevertheless I informed my comrades about these suspicions of mine from the very first day, but it was two months before I was called before the examining magistrate, so that's when I told the examining magistrate.¹⁵⁴

^{10r} By the way, besides the testimony that C[omrade] Dobkowski gave to the examining magistrate, he has a whole series of additional lesser or greater facts and observations about Volodin's role in the assassination and is expressing everywhere his deep conviction that this really happened.

Here is the picture of this entire business with Volodin. In bringing it to your attention we would be glad to hear your opinion of Volodin, since you had met him earlier in Berlin, and in general it would be interesting to know how he brought all of this about among us and if he really belonged ^{10v} to the Union of Maximalists.

Awaiting an answer, with comradely greetings,

Mykola Shapoval

Document 52

Isaac Nachman Steinberg to Mykola Shapoval

Berlin, 22 April 1927

*Typewritten letter, 2 pages; stamp ("Berlin W. 15, Meinekestr. 51 ### ##")
along top of page one*

Language: Russian

*NYPL, *QGA 73-3936, no. 7*

¹⁵⁴ The official record of the interrogation presents a somewhat different picture. See Document 31.

Апреля 22, 1927 года.

Уважаемый Николай Ефимович!

Спасибо Вам за подробное В. письмо от 14 апреля. Прежде всего, я хочу сообщить Вам то, что мне известно о М. Володине. Еще будучи в Москве, я знал, что в Владивостоке существует максималист Володин. Когда я в 1923 году приехал в Берлин, русские синдикалисты познакомили меня с ним. Я запросил тогда о нем моих друзей-максималистов в Москве, и они подтвердили его принадлежность к Союзу с.-р. максималистов. Я знаю, что оттуда с ним переписывался максималист И. Куковский-Кук, сейчас находящийся в ссылке. В течении некоторого периода, примерно до середины 25 года, он работал вместе со мною при нашей заграничной делегации. После этого он уехал в Париж и с тех пор не состоит ни в каких отношениях с Делегацией.

Что касается характера М. Володина, то на время моего знакомства с ним у меня составилось о нем следующее впечатление. Это – человек слабохарактерный, болезненный, неуравновешенный. Пережитые им в Восточной Сибири годы партизанской борьбы с белыми, болезнь легких, материальная необеспеченность – все это тяжело давит на душевную природу. Рядом с вынужденным бездельем живет в нем и зуд любопытства ко всем и всяким общественным течениям эмиграции. Его можно поэтому встречать, как это было и в Берлине, в самых разнообразных кругах, хотя он ни к какой мере с ними не связан. Для придания себе значения он любит окружать себя таинственностью, хотя за нею ничего реального не скрывается. Вследствие того, что он не нашел для себя в эмиграции никакой почвы, он уже давно стремится поехать в Россию. Этим об, ясняется, что он в Берлине и – как я теперь слышу от Вас – в Париже ходит в Советское Консульство для хлопот о возвращении в Россию. В Берлине консульство в паспорте ему отказало.

[2] Все эти черты характера Володина, действительно, у многих вызвали недоумение в отношении его. Я не думаю, чтобы кто-либо, после длительного знакомства с ним, мог бы ему поручить или сообща с ним готовить какое либо ответственное дело. Вот почему, если Шварцбард действительно был близко знаком с Володиным, он – по моему убеждению – не мог бы посвятить его в свой замысел. Я не лично уверен, что Володин по своему характеру не мог бы принять участия ни в принципиальной, ни в технической подготовке этого убийства. Достаточно характерно и то, что он все это время – как в Берлине так и в Париже – живет в непрерывной нужде.

Вы указываете на Добковского, который убежден в причастности

Володина к убийству. Но меня удивляет одно: разве Вы не заметили, что Добковский еще более неуравновешенный и болезненный человек, чем Володин? Именно из-за этого я принужден был еще в 1924 г. прекратить с ним всякие сношения. Он – старый ### 'член' Союза с.-р. максималистов, но тяготеющая над ним мания совершенно лишила его душевного равновесия. Как Вы с ним познакомились? Ведь он совершенно отошел от всякой общественной работы? Кстати, именно о нем, а не о Володине (как Вы по ошибке пишете мне) однажды запрашивал меня Никита Ефимович '(Шаповал.)'¹⁵⁵

В заключение я хочу спросить Вас, Николай Ефимович, об одном вопросе, который меня занимает. Я вижу, что Вы придаете большое значение факту привлечения Володина к делу; но мне непонятно, какое это все имеет значение для существа дела. Вы, конечно, понимаете, как волнует меня такое необычайное столкновение еще недавно близких людей. Примите товарищеский привет
'И. Штейнберг'

Вчера я получил открытку от Никиты Ефимовича.

Translation

22 April 1927.

Dear Nikolai Efimovich,¹⁵⁶

Thank you for your detailed letter of 14 April.¹⁵⁷ First of all I want to tell you what I know about M. Volodin. Even while I was still in Moscow I knew that the Maximalist Volodin was living in Vladivostok. When I came to Berlin in 1923, Russian syndicalists introduced me to him. At that time I asked my Maximalist friends in Moscow about him, and they confirmed his membership in the Union of S. R. Maximalists. I know that since that time the Maximalist I. Kukovskii-Kuk, who is now in exile, has corresponded with him. During a certain interval, until about the middle of 1925, he worked together with me in our foreign delegation. Later he left for Paris, and since that time he has not maintained any relations with the delegation.

¹⁵⁵ Addition in different hand from signature of letter writer, presumably by archivist.

¹⁵⁶ Steinberg used the Russian version of Shapoval's name.

¹⁵⁷ Document 51.

Concerning the character of M. Volodin, I can say that during the time when I was acquainted with him I formed the following impression: He is a person of weak character, unhealthy, unbalanced. During the years of the partisan struggle against the Whites in Eastern Siberia he lived through lung disease, material insecurity – all of which weighed heavily upon his inner nature. The enforced idleness aroused in him a burning curiosity regarding any and all of the public currents within the emigré community. For that reason he can be seen, as was the case in Berlin, in the most varied circles, even though he is not connected with them in any way. In order to make himself important he likes to wrap himself in mystery, even though he has nothing of importance to conceal. Because he didn't find any soil on which to implant himself abroad he has been trying for a long time to go to Russia. This, it turns out, is why in Berlin and, as I hear from you now, in Paris he has been going to the Soviet consulate, to make arrangements to return to Russia. The consulate in Berlin denied him a passport.

[2] All of these aspects of Volodin's character have really puzzled many people about him. I don't think that anyone who has known him for a long time could entrust him with such an important deed or could make preparations for it with him. That is why, in my opinion, if Schwarzbard was really closely acquainted with Volodin, he could not have let him in on his scheme. Personally I do not believe that Volodin's character could have allowed him to take part in either the theoretical or the technical planning of this assassination. From the point of view of his character it is sufficient to note also that throughout this entire period, both in Berlin and in Paris, he has been living in unbroken poverty.

You indicate that Dobkowski is convinced that Volodin was involved in the assassination. But one thing surprises me: have you really not noticed that Dobkowski is an even more unstable and unhealthy person than Volodin? For that reason I was compelled already in 1924 to sever all relations with him. He is a veteran member of the Union of S. R. Maximalists, but his manic tendencies completely robbed him of his emotional equilibrium. How did you meet him, since he left all public activity entirely? By the way, it was about him, and not about Volodin (as you wrote mistakenly), that Nikita Efimovich¹⁵⁸ (Shapoval)¹⁵⁹ once asked me.

In conclusion I want to ask you, Nikolai Efimovich, about one question that concerns me. I see that you place great significance upon Volodin's involvement in the matter, but I don't understand what significance all of this has for the essence of the affair. Surely you understand how worried I

158 Mykyta Shapoval.

159 Addition in different hand from signature of letter writer, presumably by archivist.

am by this uncharacteristic clash between people who until recently were close.

With comradely greetings,
I. Steinberg

Yesterday I received a postcard from Nikita Efimovich.

Document 53

Schwarzbard Defense Committee to Joseph Krinsky

Paris, 21 April 1927

Typewritten letter, 2 pages; corrections mostly by hand; registry notation in upper left corner of both pages ("6006 T/L.")

Language: English

YIVO, RG80/445/37744–37745

DEFENCE COMMITTEE.

April 21st [192]7

Dr. Joseph KRIMSKY
BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Krinsky,

Your letter dated April 9th enclosing cheque for \$400 arrived here in the absence of Mr. Leo Motzkin who is in Palestine just now.

On behalf of the Committee we acknowledge receipt of this sum. Mr. Joseph Barondes[s] wrote us on March 17th¹⁶⁰ that he had handed you a cheque for about \$300 which had been collected by the "Vorwards"¹⁶¹ we take it that your remittance of \$400 includes those \$300.

As regards the \$1000 you sent two months ago we have not yet acknowledged the receipt thereof as we did not know by whom it was sent. Only your letter of April 9th¹⁶² makes it clear to us that the \$1000 is intended for the Defence Committee.

¹⁶⁰ YIVO, RG80/435/37734.

¹⁶¹ The Yiddish-language newspaper *Jewish Daily Forward* (*Forverts*). See above, Document 24, n. 52.

¹⁶² YIVO, RG80/435/37745.

We thank you for your contribution and for the active interest which the New York Committee is taking in the requirements of the preparatory work of the defence. We regret however to have to say that the money received so far is considerably less than the amount necessary to complete the work.

Owing to reasons entirely beyond our control the trial [2] has been put off and is not likely to be opened before the middle of June. This regrettable delay has exhausted all our means and now at the critical moment when the trial is due to be commenced we find ourselves in a most difficult position. We require considerable funds for the expenses of witnesses whom we propose bringing here from Poland, Russia, Palestine and elsewhere, for the preparatory campaign in the French press, for issuing the English edition of our book on the pogroms (the French edition is already in print) etc. A total of \$10,000 is the minimum required to enable us to complete the work. We look for at least half that amount to our American friends. Mr. Joseph Barondes[s] had written us that a meeting of your Committee was due on the 3rd of April, and we are sure that on that occasion you considered all the necessary steps to raise these funds. You write the [sic] “the Ukrainian Federation¹⁶³ is calling a conference for May 7th and it would be helpful if we could hear [sic] from you before that date.”¹⁶⁴ We assume that you would like to have a report on the work of the Defence Committee to be placed before the Ukrainian Federation and we will send you the report very soon. but you understand of course that the report must be treated as entirely confidential: it cannot be communicated to the meeting, and only partial information based thereon may be given privately to a few leading and responsible members of the Committee of the Federation.

We shall be glad to hear from you again,

Yours sincerely¹⁶⁵

163 Probably the Federation of Ukrainian Jews in the United States.

164 YIVO, RG80/435/37745.

165 Signature absent on archival copy.

Document 54

*Scholem Schwarzbard and François Coty*¹⁶⁶

Paris, 19 May 1927

Published newspaper article, 1 page

Language: French

Le Figaro, Vol. 102, No. 189, 19 May 1927, p. 1

« UN FRONT UNIQUE »
CONTRE LE COMMUNISME

M. Samuel Schwarzbard, détenu à la Santé pour avoir assassiné l'hetman d'Ukraine Petlioura, nous adresse la lettre suivante, que nous publions intégralement.

Prison de la Santé.
Paris, le 16 mai 1927.

A M. le Directeur du *Figaro*¹⁶⁷
Paris.

Monsieur le Directeur,

Dans le *Figaro* du vendredi 13 mai,¹⁶⁸ vous avez cru devoir publier un article signé François Coty, dans lequel, à propos de questions étrangères à ma personne, à mes idées, et à mes actes, vous prétendez me mettre en cause.

Le caractère diffamatoire de cet article, tant par les affirmations grossièrement erronées que par les intentions injurieuses, m'impose de rompre un silence dont je croyais ne me départir que devant la justice. J'espère n'avoir besoin de invoquer que les usages pour obtenir l'insertion de ma réponse dans le plus prochain numéro du *Figaro*, à la place et dans les caractères mêmes de l'article outrageant.

Vous avancez que j'ai fréquenté « assidûment » un « repaire » établi « 114, boulevard de la Villette » et que j'y ai rencontré « le délégué du *Secours Rouge*,

166 François Coty (1874–1934), born Joseph Marie François Spoturno, cosmetics manufacturer, businessman, and right-wing publisher. In 1933 he founded the National-Socialist league Solidarité Française.

167 Coty was listed on the newspaper masthead as “directeur politique,” Robert de Flers as “directeur littéraire.”

168 See above, Introduction, at n. 55.

Efim Gheller ». A l'appui de ces assertions vous ne pouvez – et pour cause – apporter le moindre preuve, voir la plus infime présomption.

Je vous donne le démenti le plus catégorique. Je n'ai, de ma vie, fréquenté, ni « assidûment » ni autrement, aucun « repaire », ni au « 114, boulevard de la Villette », où je n'ai jamais mis les pieds, ni ailleurs, et je n'ai jamais rencontré aucun « délégué du *Secours Rouge* », pas plus M. « Efim Gheller », dont j'ignore l'existence, qu'aucun autre. J'ajoute que je n'ai jamais appartenu du parti communiste, ni entretenue de relations avec lui.

Vous affirmez aussi qu' « au moment où Petlioura fut criblé de balles au Quartier Latin, il allait partir pour Varsovie, afin de concerter avec le maréchal Pilzudsky, en Pologne, une offensive de l'Ukraine contre les Soviets ». N'ayant jamais été dans le secret des intentions ni de Petlioura, ni du maréchal Pilzudsky, j'apprends grâce à vous, pour la première fois, ce projet d'offensive. Mais en ce qui me concerne, il est une offensive, non à venir, mais accomplie, dont j'ai été le témoin meurtri: c'est l'offensive atroce de Petlioura, de ces atamans et de ses cosaques contre le malheureux peuple juif désarmé.

Vous prétendez ensuite, selon votre propre expression, « aisément », que « l'assassinat de Petlioura fut décrété à Moscou et réglé à Paris, pour sauver les Soviets d'un péril imminent ». Sachez que l'exécution de Petlioura ne fut inspirée que par ma conscience de juif résolu à venger ses innombrables frères de race massacrés. Vous inclinez trop « aisément » à penser que l'on frappe, comme d'aucuns écrivent des articles, par procuration. Sachez aussi que j'ai, en effet, voulu sauver quelqu'un d'un péril, imminent ou non, mais je ne songeais pas alors aux Soviets: je ne pensais qu'aux pacifiques populations juives de l'Europe Orientale, que j'espérais sauver du péril de futurs pogromes, hélas non encore conjuré.

Vous insinuez enfin que j'ai bénéficié de « la puissance du *Secours Rouge* » et de « l'abondance de ses ressources financières ». Je n'ai jamais eu de rapports d'aucune sorte avec aucun *Secours Rouge*, et n'ai pu en rien bénéficier de son aide, pas plus d'ailleurs, que du secours de qui que ce soit en dehors de l'appui de mon défenseur, Mr Henry Torrès.

« Nous prévoyons – dites-vous – que le procès prendra aux Assises de la Seine une ampleur et une importance inattendues ». Cette ampleur et cette importance ne seront « inattendues » que pour ceux qui méconnaissent l'horreur des pogromes et la malfaisance de l'antisémitisme armé dont vous vous faites l'allié complaisant. Mais c'est précisément pour que le monde civilisé ne puisse plus ignorer l'hécatombe juive que je me suis résolu à l'acte dont je répondrai bientôt devant le jury. L'ampleur et l'importance du procès ne pourront jamais atteindre à l'énormité du crime des atamans pogromistes.

Quant aux « congénères, » que vous m'attribuez, ils ne peuvent être que mes congénères en Israël, victimes d'une séculaire oppression. Plus de cent

mille, après la guerre, ont été suppliciés par une soldatesque déchaînée. Ceux qui ne sont pas privés de sépulture reposent sous de longs tumulus en Podolie, en Volhynie et dans toute l'Ukraine. Les centaines de milliers d'orphelins et de veuves qui leur ont survécu sont maintenant dispersés sur toute la terre, de la Palestine à l'Amérique. Sans doute quelques-uns de ces survivants donneront-ils au procès « une ampleur et une importance inattendues », par le vivant témoignage de leurs familles et de leurs corps mutilés.

Etranger à la politique et, d'ailleurs, depuis un an séparé du monde, j'ignore à quels mobiles vous obéissez en essayant de dénaturer mes intentions et l'attentat dont je rendrai compte au jury. Je sais seulement que votre conduite envers un prisonnier dont personne, jusqu'à présent, n'avait suspecté l'idéalisme, donne la mesure de votre courage et de votre dignité. Et je doute qu'elle ajoute à votre autorité.

Témoin du cauchemar des pogromes, j'ai, en frappant l'un des auteurs responsables, obéi à l'impératif de ma conscience. J'ai tiré sur Petlioura, bourreau du peuple juif, comme, en août 1914, j'avais pris les armes dans l'armée française contre le militarisme allemand. Engagé volontaire dès le début des hostilités au 1^{er} régiment étranger, combattant de Carency, versé en 1915, après l'attaque d'Arras au 363^e régiment d'infanterie, blessé en 1916 à la Chapelote (Vosges) au poumon et au bras, j'ai reçu la Croix de guerre avec la citation suivante, que je m'excuse d'être obligé de produire, – simplement pour répondre à votre provocation:

« Excellent soldat, toujours volontaire pour les postes dangereux. Le 1^{er} mars 1916, à La Chapelote, étant en sentinelle à l'extrémité d'une sape avancée, a été grièvement blessé au moment où il jetait des grenades. »

Il faut, que vos propres mérites soient grands, Monsieur, pour que vous vous permettiez de passer outre à mes modestes états de service. J'attends que vous fassiez connaître vos titres. Mais quels qu'ils puissent être, je ne sais pas qu'ils vous donnent le moindre droit, même et surtout à l'égard d'un homme en prison, d'accomplir sous le signe de Figaro une besogne qui est dans la tradition de Basile.¹⁶⁹

S. SCHWARZBARD.

169 Reference to Don Bazile, music teacher of the heroine Rosine in the eighteenth-century plays *Le Barbier de Séville* and *La Folle Journée, ou Le Mariage de Figaro* by Pierre-Augustin Caron de Beaumarchais and in the several comic operas based upon them. Bazile's character was of a schemer and spreader of false rumors whose loyalties shifted as necessary to secure his immediate personal advantage.

Selon notre coutume, nous avons rappelé l'affaire Petlioura-Schwarzbard, dans notre article du 13 mai, très objectivement et sans injures. Les termes outrageants de la réponse nous autoriseraient à en refuser l'insertion; mais je ne veux pas marchander la publicité du *Figaro* à l'inculpé que nous avons mis en cause.

Le fait que M. Schwarzbard se trouve sous les verrous n'a qu'une apparence dramatique: il lit les journaux et il use librement du droit de réponse; il est bien conseillé; il sera défendu à merveille; il a autour de lui et derrière lui toutes les Forces capables de le sauver. Donc, en ce qui nous concerne, les verrous n'existent pas; ils nous protégeraient seulement contre la violence matérielle, et nous supposons que M. Schwarzbard ne songe pas à reprendre son browning tout de suite: l'abus deviendrait flagrant.

Je crois avoir fait mes preuves d'indépendance et de courage en attaquant ici, à visage découvert, un certain nombre de personnages plus puissants, plus redoutable que M. Schwarzbard, et qui sont encore en liberté.

Le fait acquis est celui-ci: en pleine rue de Paris, M. Schwarzbard a tué avec préméditation et guet-apens un homme qui était l'hôte de la France.

Nous n'avons jamais dit qu'il l'eût tué « par procuration ». M. Schwarzbard assassine lui-même, et il s'en glorifie: ce qui nous permet de l'écrire avant le verdict. C'est assurément notre droit. Il n'y a là aucun acte d'antisémitisme. Je n'ai jamais fait et je ne ferai jamais d'antisémitisme – (en supposant que le mot ait un sens) – parce que la doctrine du *Figaro* s'y oppose; toute ma vie a été un long exemple de libéralisme en cette matière; les nombreux et distingués israélites qui collaborent avec moi dans mes journaux et dans mes industries en sont de vivants témoignages.

Mais nous revendiquons et nous exercerons plus résolument que jamais notre droit de dénoncer tous les hommes, juifs ou autres, qui sont en France des auteurs de troubles, de violences, d'espionnage, de trahison, qui se livrent à toutes les sortes de fraudes, qui versent le sang ou qui dérobent des secrets, qui travaillent isolément ou qui se liguent pour travailler à la destruction de notre patrie, si accueillante, si généreuse à leur égard.

Nous ne serions pas à la hauteur de notre tâche si nous n'avions pas souligné des coïncidences suggestives entre plusieurs faits notés dans notre article: Efim Gheller, agent des Soviets, présent à Paris, avec de l'argent plein ses poches, au moment où Petlioura donne des inquiétudes à la IIIe Internationale; Efim Gheller, affilié du *Secours rouge* qui a préparé l'attentat de Sofia pour tuer le roi, les ministres, les états-majors civils et militaires de Bulgarie; Efim Gheller, Juif de Pologne; l'assassin de Petlioura, Juif de Pologne, naturalisé français; l'assassin de Petlioura, se disant étranger au *Secours rouge* et au communisme, ayant pour avocat le défenseur attitré du *Secours rouge*, le défenseur puissant des communistes français et des com-

munistes d'importation. Il n'y a vraiment pas de témérité à tirer des conclusions!

Quels que soient les griefs de M. Schwarzbard contre l'homme qu'il a tué, nous ne voyons qu'une chose: il a tué, et il a troublé la paix publique en France. Les victimes qu'il prétend avoir vengées, il en parlera au jury. Nous connaissons cette histoire, toujours la même depuis le temps où la belle Esther et l'honorable Mardochee firent massacrer préventivement le peuple entier des Amalécites, égorger les fils d'Aman et pendre le ministre patriote.

Des victimes, il y en a eu d'autres: les trente millions de Russes que les nouveaux maîtres de la Russie, qui ne sont pas Russes, ont exterminés par la guerre civile, par la famine, et dans d'épouvantables supplices. Il y a les millions de soldats européens que les nouveaux maîtres de la Russie, qui ne sont pas Russes, ont condamnés à mort en abattant notre allié le tsar et en signant avec l'Allemagne la paix de Brest-Litovsk. Tout cela n'est pas encore payé.

L'Europe est pleine, la France est pleine, non pas « de centaines de milliers », mais de millions de veuves et d'orphelins dont Apfelbaum, Braunstein, Sobelsohn¹⁷⁰ et leurs congénères ont fait périr les pères, les maris, les enfants.

Pour nous, la victime qui compte avant les autres, la grande victime, l'éternelle victime de toutes ces machinations, de toutes ces félonies, de toutes ces conspirations, C'EST LA FRANCE; la France que nous défendons, nous, « à tous risques », avec un absolu désintéressement. Beaucoup n'en pourraient pas dire autant.

La défense de M. Schwarzbard est imprudente; elle abonde en contradictions. Il affirme d'abord qu'il a tué Petlioura de sa propre initiative, sans connaître ce que pouvaient méditer l'hetman ukrainien et le maréchal Pilzudsky; ensuite, il déclare qu'il a tué Petlioura pour prévenir de « futurs pogromes ». Alors, il savait que Petlioura projetait des pogromes. Ou l'assassinat n'empêchera pas les pogromes, si Petlioura n'y devait être pour rien.

L'inculpé me demande mes « titres ». Je veux bien lui dire qu'ils sont notables, que j'ai aussi des services et des blessures de guerre, et qu'on en reconnaîtra la valeur quand il me plaira d'en faire état. Mais, pour le moment, ce n'est pas moi qui suis sur la sellette, c'est l'assassin de Petlioura.

M. Schwarzbard, qui a fait la guerre en France, aurait dû la faire au front russe, puisqu'il était sujet du tsar en Pologne. Il a obtenu une brillante citation; son défenseur en tirera le meilleur parti aux assises. Mais nous prétendons que les services de guerre ne confèrent pas une immunité pour les crimes du temps de paix. Deux millions de Français ont été mutilés ou blessés

170 Original family names of Bolshevik leaders Grigoriy Zinoviev (1883–1936), Leon Trotsky (1879–1940), and Karl Radek (1885–1939), all of Jewish origin. For additional information see below, Document 55, nn. 173, 174, 176.

grièvement par les Allemands sans acquérir et sans réclamer le droit de tuer ensuite les autres Français ou les hôtes de la France. M. Schwarzbard ne peut pas le réclamer d'avantage. Autrement, notre pays ne serait plus habitable.

D'autant plus que, logiquement, si la France devient un libre territoire de chasse pour les congénères et les émules de M. Schwarzbard, elle doit être un libre territoire de chasse pour les Russes émigrés, pour les officiers de notre allié le tsar, qui ont à venger l'égorgeement de leurs proches, le pillage et la confiscation de leurs biens, des assassinats et des viols monstrueux, des tortures inouïes. Nos villes seraient inondées de sang par ces vendettas et contre-vendettas!

Quant au « trait » littéraire de la fin, qui dénote chez le polémiste une certaine liberté d'esprit, nous le trouvons maladroit. Le *Figaro* reste fidèle à la tradition de son patron quand il dit la vérité en face, même aux Puissances formidables qui ont ordonné la mort de Petlioura; tandis que le nom de Basile revient de droit aux scélérats qui conspirent dans les ténèbres, qui enseignent à leurs affidés l'art de mentir, et qui arment le bras des assassins en esquivant eux-mêmes la responsabilité du coup.

François Coty.

Document 55

B. Sendrowicz, Der „Figaro“ für Petljura

Vienna, 24 May 1927

Published newspaper article, 1 page

Language: German

Wiener Morgenzeitung,¹⁷¹ No. 2959, p. 2, 24 May 1927

Der „Figaro“ für Petljura.

Eine Kampagne des Parfumeurs Coty gegen Schwarzbart und das Judentum.

Von B. Sendrowicz, Paris.

Seit einigen Tagen bildet die Schwarzbart-Affäre den Gegenstand einer erregten Diskussion. Die großen Zeitungen hatten sich mit ihr seit dem

171 Vienna-based Zionist-oriented daily, published between January 1919 and September 1927. During the years of its existence it was the only daily Jewish newspaper in the German language.

Attentat nicht mehr beschäftigt, nur hie und da gaben kurze Notizen dem Publikum einige nebensächliche Details über den schleppenden Verlauf der Untersuchung bekannt. Mit einemmal wurde aber Schwarzbart in einem der einflußreichsten Blätter Frankreichs in einem unerwarteten Zusammenhang genannt.

„Le Figaro“, die Zeitung der „guten Gesellschaft“, der Hochindustriellen, Adeligen, Geistlichen usw., führt unter der Feder ihres Direktors Francois Coty, des bekannten Parfumbabrikanten, eine heftige Kampagne gegen die Kommunisten und Bolschewiken, deren nächstes Ziel nach der Auffassung Cotys die Zerstörung Frankreichs sei. Diese unter der Devise „Eine Einheitsfront gegen den Kommunismus“ geführte Kampagne findet in ganz Frankreich lebhaften Widerhall. Die Artikel Cotys suchen zu beweisen, daß die Kommunisten Frankreich systematisch mit einem Zellennetz umspannen, um im gegebenen Zeitpunkt seine jetzige Staatsform zu vernichten. Tatsächlich ist die kommunistische Propaganda in Frankreich außerordentlich stark, und was noch wichtiger ist, auch sehr erfolgreich. Es wäre also selbstverständlich, daß sich die kompetenten Kreise Frankreichs gegen die Gefahr wenden.

Man könnte nun glauben, daß eine solche Kampagne sich darauf beschränken würde, den Kommunismus theoretisch und praktisch zu bekämpfen. Die Argumentation ist, solange es sich um Tatsachen handelt, meistens unanfechtbar. Ganz anders wird aber der Eindruck, sobald Coty den Keim, den Ursprung, die Ziele des Kommunismus aufdeckt. Während er bisher offen und verständlich schrieb, wird er nun mystisch, deutet an, spricht von „unsichtbaren Mächten“, von „internationaler Finanz“, derer Ziel die Vernichtung Frankreichs sei. Bezeichnend für seine Hintergedanken ist, daß er diese Meinung dadurch unterstützt, daß er nicht mehr von Trotzki, Litwinoff¹⁷² spricht, sondern von Apfelbaum¹⁷³ und Sobelsohn,¹⁷⁴ von Leuten, die keine Russen sind, die aber trotzdem dem russischen Volke ihre Ideen aufdrängen wollen.

172 Maxim Maximovich Litvinov (1876–1951), born Meir Henoeh Mojszewicz Walach-Finkelstein, Bolshevik revolutionary and Soviet diplomat of Jewish descent.

173 Grigoriy Yevseevich Zinoviev (1883–1936), born Ovsei-Gershon Aronovich Radomyslovsky Apfelbaum in Yelisavetgrad, Russian Empire, Bolshevik revolutionary and leading politician in the Soviet Union, of Jewish descent. He was member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union 1921–1926, and served as first Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Comintern 1919–1926.

174 Karl Radek (1885–1939), born Karol Sobelsohn in Lemberg, Austria-Hungary, Marxist revolutionary and left-wing politician in Austria-Hungary, Germany, and the Soviet Union, of Jewish descent. Member of the Executive Committee of the Comintern 1920–1924.

Der Mitteleuropäer, der solche Argumente, solche Ausdrücke, solche Andeutungen liest, ist überrascht, er erinnert sich, daß er dieses Lied schon gehört hat, damals war es aber ... das Deutsche Reich, das von diesen geheimnisvollen Mächten bedroht war, die unter der Patronanz der französischen Finanz stehen sollten. Während aber Hitler und Genossen den Juden offen als Inspirator meinten und nannten, ergeht sich Coty immer in Umschreibungen. Frankreich ist ein Land, dessen Liberalismus ein zu alter, zu wirklicher ist, als daß man den Juden für alles verantwortlich machen könnte.

Aus welchen Gründen auch immer Coty seine Kampagne gegen den Kommunismus begonnen hat – da er nun einmal einen Zusammenhang zwischen Kommunismus und der internationalen Finanz, diesen zwei Gegenpolen, behauptet, mußte er die Glaubwürdigkeit seiner Behauptung durch Argumente und Beweise stützen.

Aber als er auf den Grund seiner Theorie kam, als er die wirkliche Ursache, den wirklichen Zweck dieser merkwürdigen Ehe zwischen Finanz und Kommunismus bekanntgeben sollte, fand Coty dieselbe Erklärung wie die deutschen Reaktionäre, wie die ungarischen und rumänischen. Hitler sagt: Die jüdische internationale Finanz will Deutschland vernichten, um Frankreichs Hegemonie zu ermöglichen. Coty behauptet: Die internationale Finanz wolle Frankreich vernichten, um Deutschlands Hegemonie zu sichern.

Nach Coty hat diese kommunistisch-finanzielle Gesellschaft überall Komplizen. Die französische Regierung wolle gegen sie nicht mit der nötigen Energie einschreiten. (Warum, zum Kuckuck, nennt Coty nicht die Gründe dieses Verhaltens einer Regierung, in der die Anwesenheit eines Marin,¹⁷⁵ eines Poincaré die Wahrung der französischen Nationalinteressen gewährleisten sollte?) Wer ist diese unheimliche Macht, der solche Männer nicht offen die Stirne zu bieten wagen, die selbst Coty, der Champion des Anti-Kommunismus, nicht beim Namen zu nennen wagt, die er nur andeutet?

So geschah es, daß Coty, um die außerordentliche Ausdehnung der kommunistischen Organisation, ihre Mittel, ihre Methoden aufzudecken, in einem am 13. Mai in seinem Organ erschienen Artikel unter anderen Beweisen, den Tod Petljuras anführte. Er schrieb, daß Elfim [sic] Gheller, dieser legendenhafte Spiritus rector aller politischer Attentate der Nachkriegszeit, mit Schwarzbart verkehrt und ihm den Befehl erteilt habe, Petljura zu töten, um diesen an seiner Absicht, mit Hilfe des Marschalls Pilsudsky die Sowjets aus Rußland zu vertreiben, durch dieses wirklich zweckmäßige Mittel zu verhindern.

175 Louis Marin (1871–1960), French politician, Minister for the Liberated Regions, 1924, and Minister of Pensions, 1926–1928.

In einem Brief, der im „Figaro“ am 18. Mai veröffentlicht wurde, weist Schwarzbart in scharfen Worten die Beschuldigungen Cotys zurück. Er erklärt, er sei niemals Kommunist gewesen, er kenne diesen Gheller nicht, habe nie mit ihm verkehrt, auch nicht bei der „Roten Hilfe“. Schwarzbart weist auf sein Verhalten während des Weltkrieges hin und erklärt, er habe Petljura getötet, um die Pogromopfer zu rächen und um neue Pogrome zu verhüten.

Coty kommentiert dieses Schreiben. Er bemüht sich aber nicht, die Behauptungen Schwarzbarts zu entkräften. Coty schleppt Argumente herbei, die nicht die Richtigkeiten seiner Beschuldigungen bekräftigen, sondern darauf angelegt sind, Schwarzbart, den Fremden, unsympathisch erscheinen zu lassen.

Er weist die Gemeinschaft mit den osteuropäischen Antisemiten, die ihm Schwarzbart vorwirft, zurück, indem er auf die vielen „Israeliten“ hinweist, die in seinen Unternehmungen beschäftigt sind. Er schreibt: „Ich habe niemals Antisemitismus getrieben, werde es niemals tun, vorausgesetzt, daß dieses Wort ‚Antisemitismus‘ überhaupt einen Sinn habe.“ Dagegen spricht er von den „Juden“, den Ruhestörern, den Spionen, den Blutvergießern. (Welch feine Unterscheidung zwischen Israelit und Jude!).

Wie, sagt Coty, und das ist das einzige, aber sehr schwache Argument – Schwarzbart leugnet seine Verbindung mit der „Roten Hilfe“ ab? Ist nicht Torres, der anerkannte Anwalt dieser kommunistischen Organisation, auch sein Verteidiger?! Herr Coty hat hier eine nicht gerade überzeugende Begründung gefunden. Henry Torres ist ein Advokat, der keinem Menschen sein Verteidigungstalent verweigern würde, der aber auch genügend ambitioniert ist, um sich, trotz seiner bisherigen Erfolge, einen solchen Prozeß, wie den Schwarzbarts, aus rein persönlichen Gründen nicht entgehen zu lassen. Ich erinnere mich, vor einigen Monaten Torres und seinen Sekretär Jolly gesprochen zu haben, die mir erklärten, es würde bei diesem Prozeß auf die indirekte Verantwortung hingewiesen werden, die die Entente auf sich nahm, als sie Petljura und Konsorten, die Pogromisten gegen die Sowjets unterstützte. Aus welchem Grunde immer Schwarzbart gerade Torres zum Verteidiger gewählt hat, so fehlte es diesem sicher nicht an Gründen, diese Verteidigung anzunehmen.

Herr Coty will von den Opfern, für die Schwarzbart zum Mörder wurde, nichts hören, Schwarzbart möge von ihnen vor den Richtern sprechen. Er, Coty, er kenne diese Geschichte. Es sei immer dieselbe, seit der Massenmordung der Amalekiter durch Esther und Mordechai, die selbst den patriotischen Minister Hamman hängen ließen. Woher Coty diesen schönen Satz genommen hat, ist uns nicht bekannt, aber er wurde mehr als einmal von den Hakenkreuzlern aller Länder bereits gebraucht. Sie wagen es, die hunderttausende jüdische Opfer mit einer Handbewegung als nichts im Vergleiche zu

den Millionen von Opfern, die der Kommunismus gefordert hat, abzutun. Nichts wissen diese Hakenkreuzler, nichts Coty von den zahllosen Opfern, die der Kommunismus unter den Juden verursacht hat, von den Opfern, die auch der Krieg unter den Juden gefordert hat.

Coty sagt: „Europa ist überschwemmt, Frankreich ist überschwemmt nicht mit Hunderttausenden, aber mit Millionen von Witwen und Waisen, deren Männer, Väter, Kinder, Apfelbaum, Braunstein¹⁷⁶ und Sobelsohn und ihre Konnationalen haben umkommen lassen“.

Herr Coty hat bis heute immer erklärt: Deutschlands Schuld am Kriegsausbruch sei eine unerschütterliche Tatsache. Coty nimmt nun zu diesem niedrigsten aller antisemitischen Beschuldigungen Zuflucht, nur weil er für eine Anklage, die er fälschlich gegen einen Menschen erhebt, keinen Beweis liefern kann. Schwarzbart hat ihm Verleumdung vorgeworfen, Coty weicht aus. Coty sagt, er sei kein Antisemit, aber er bringt allgemeine Beschuldigungen vor, wo er Argumente, Tatsachen anführen sollte, um den Beweis zu liefern, daß Schwarzbart, der Kommunist, und nicht Schwarzbart, der Jude, Petljura getötet hat. Coty führt überhaupt keinen Beweis.

Document 56

Marvin Lowenthal to American Jewish Congress

Paris, 22 May 1927

Typewritten letter, 2 pages

Language: English

AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 88

May 22, 1927.

The American Jewish Congress,
New York.

Schwartzbard

Dear Sirs:

I attended a meeting of the Schwartzbard Committee on May 19th, attended as usual by a very few members of the committee.

176 Leon Trotsky (1879–1940), born Lev Davidovich Bronstein.

The most important matter discussed was the date of the trial. It would be rather unfortunate to hold it at the present moment because of the political atmosphere in France. A campaign against communism is now under way here; and renewed belligerency against Soviet Russia is manifesting itself in England, with more or less sympathy from France. The result is a public state of mind which might be prejudicial to Schwartzbard whom – as you know – the Ukrainian defenders of Petlura accuse of Bolshevism and of being a Bolshevik agent. The Ukrainians have gone so far, last week, to issue a statement, which was printed in the general French press, that the British raid on the Arcos in London disclosed a document showing that Schwartzbard is a communist agent.¹⁷⁷ Our Committee agreed that it would be best to have the trial postponed until October, when the present disturbances will no doubt have blown over.

On the other hand it seems very possible that the trial might be called for July. This is perhaps even the wish of Torres – on which point however the Committee is still in doubt. July is felt to be likewise an exceedingly bad time, for it is the tail end of the court sessions when the juries and court are exhausted and impatient. In any case, the Committee decided to sound out Torres to see whether he is not agreeable to postponing the matter until the opening of the courts in October.

The second important thing under discussion was the present campaign against Schwartzbard in certain French papers. As one example of this campaign, we have the Ukrainian report already mentioned. Again, Figaro – which is a consequential Right journal, with a name bigger however than its circulation – printed on May 17 an article accusing S. of being a communist agent.¹⁷⁸ Schwartzbard replied with an indignant denial; Figaro printed the reply but joined to it a new attack, practically accusing the Jewish people of being responsible for the Russian revolution and going so far as to say that if

177 On 12 May 1927, ten days before the composition of this letter, London police and Scotland Yard raided the London headquarters of the All-Russian Cooperative Society (ARCOS) in search of a document that had allegedly been taken from the British War Office. The document was not discovered, but 250,000 other items found on the premises were confiscated. The raid indicated that the ARCOS office was serving as a base for Soviet-sponsored political activities hostile to the British government. The incident led to the severing of diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union until 1929. The claim that Schwarzbard was implicated as a Soviet spy in a document discovered during the raid has not been verified. On the episode see Harriette Flory, *The Arcos Raid and the Rupture of Anglo-Soviet Relations, 1927*, in: *Journal of Contemporary History* 12 (1977), 707–723.

178 Actually 13 May; see above, Document 54.

there is any question of individuals taking revenge for the sufferings endured by their people, innumerable Russian refugees in France would have the excuse to attack the Jews recently immigrated here, a prospect which the Figaro did not find displeasing.¹⁷⁹ In the milieu of the Quai d'Orsay the atmosphere (created in part by Poland) is unfavorable toward the Jews. Even such a friend of the Jews as De Monzie¹⁸⁰ is reported to have said that the existence of "sixty men working night and day" on the Schwartzbard Committee was a suspicious circumstance. [2] The Committee decided that the time had come to open a pro-Jewish campaign in the Left press and to win over, as far as possible, the great neutral "journaux d'information" such as the Matin, Petit Parisien, Journal [des Débats] etc. It had been hoped, hitherto, to hold off this activity until the last moment in order to give the Ukrainians the least opportunity to react and reply. It was likewise decided to begin influencing the Foreign Office etc. through Leon Blum, to set M. De Monzie right, etc. The friendly and neutral journalists are to be called together at a luncheon. The Ukrainian Arcos rumour is to be denied through the J.T.A.¹⁸¹

The financial situation of the Committee continues discouraging. If the trial must be postponed until October, more money than [sic] ever is needed. An effort will be made to reawaken American interest by featuring the present anti-S. campaign in the French press.

Sincerely yours,
 !Marvin Lowenthal!

Document 57

Jan Tokarzewski-Karaszewicz

Paris, 7 August 1927

Typewritten draft, 5 pages

Language: Polish

HURI, Jan Tokarzewski-Karaszewicz, box 5, folder: "Schwarzbard process 1927"¹⁸²

¹⁷⁹ See Document 54.

¹⁸⁰ Anatole de Monzie (1876–1947), *inter alia* chair of the Russian Affairs Commission of the French Chamber of Deputies, 1924–1927.

¹⁸¹ Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

¹⁸² The draft was written in response to the publication in the organ of the French Communist Party, *L'Humanité*, of documents implicating the author, who had served both the Skoropadskyi regime and the Ukrainian National Republic in various diplomatic

Paryż, 7 sierpnia 1927.

Czemu przypisać publikację fałszywych dokumentów, które mi przypisują? Wymyślono i sfalszowano całą tę korespondencję między Panem Prezydentem Liwickim a mną, dla tego tylko, żeby mnie skompromitować w Opinji Francuskiej przed rozpoczęciem sprawy Szwarzbarda, podczas której przyjdzie mi się występować. Jest to oszczercza robota bolszewików, na którą odpowiedziałem podawszy odpowiednie skargi do Władz Sądowych i pociągający do odpowiedzialności „Humanité” i inne pisma. Robota ta jednak była bardzo niezręczną. Falszerze tak nic nie wiedzą o naszych sprawach, że popełnili grube błędy faktyczne. Nie zwrócili uwagi na to, że opuściłem moje stanowisko Wice-Ministra i Kierownika Ministerstwa Spraw Zagranicznych jeszcze 3 kwietnia 1924 i, nie piastując żadnego urzędu, żadnej politycznej korespondencji z Panem Prezydentem Liwickim nie prowadziłem. Mieszkam w Paryżu od trzech lat, jako całkiem prywatny człowiek i zajęty pracą ściśle osobistą, nie mogłem brać udziału w oficjalnych rządowych wystąpieniach. Kierownictwo polityki zewnętrznej, po mojem ustąpieniu, jeszcze za życia ś. p. Atamana Petlury, zostało powierzone Panu Profesorowi Aleksandrowi Szulhinowi i śmiesznym wymysłem jest, przypisywać mnie w tym samym czasie funkcję, którą piastuje ktoś inny dobrze znany w sferach politycznych.

Pragnienie stworzenia wokół mnie specjalnej atmosfery, przeszkodziło fałszerzom zorjentować się, że ja, pomimo osobistego szacunku i przyjaźni dla oddzielnych jego członków, stoję w stosunku do Rządu naszego w wyraźnej opozycji, jako monarchista i konserwatysta, którego nie zadawalniają demokratyczna frazeologia i republikańskie hasła.¹⁸³

[2] Otóż na dalsze Pańskie pytania mogę odpowiadać tylko w imieniu własnym, nie angażując nawet moich politycznych przyjaciół.

capacities, in a British-sponsored anti-Soviet intrigue. The author responded immediately by suing *L'Humanité*. He also issued a public statement according to which “the communists are interested in compromising” him, because “in the trial of Petliura’s killer, Schwarzbard, he will produce documents confirming that Schwarzbard acted as a Soviet agent.” Anonymous, *Sprawa Tokarzewskiego* [The Tokarzewski Affair], in: *Kurjer warszawski*, 2 August 1927. The author eventually testified at the Schwarzbard trial, but he did not produce any such documents (see Document 63). The identity of the intended addressees is not known.

183 An alternate version in the same archival file contains the following wording: “stoję w stosunku do Rządu naszego w wyraźnej opozycji, ze względów politycznych, społecznych, klasowych itp.” (I stand in clear opposition to our government from the political, social, class, etc. standpoint.)

Jakie są widoki na powodzenie naszych zmagania o niepodległość? Odpowiada na to najdobitniej dzisiejszy stan rzeczy na Ukrainie. Wytrwały opór sowieckim zakusom skomunizowania kraju: Systematycznie wydzieranie od władz okupacyjnych Ustępstw w dziedzinach językowej, ekonomicznej i społecznej. Rozrost świadomości i sił narodowych, pomimo prześladowań, krwawych walk i ciężkiej niewoli. Cechuje to stan umysłów, odporność i energię zbudzonego Narodu, który nie da się już nigdy zakuć w kajdany. Jeżeli do tych sił wewnętrznych dodamy koordynację naszych planów z analogicznymi [planami] w innych krajach okupowanych przez Rosję Sowiecką i coraz lepsze rozumienie sprawy Ukraińskiej przez Rządy i Społeczeństwa Wielkich Mocarstw, możemy śmiało powiedzieć, że odzyskanie niepodległości jest dla nas kwestją blizkiego czasu. Bolszewicy sami nam do tego dopomagają. Na Ukrainie najlepiej się daje zauważyć, jak ich cała organizacja jest zbutwiałą i cały aparat zardzewiały, a w Narodzie Ukraińskim zanadto żywą jest jeszcze pamięć czterech lat niepodległości (1917–1921), lat walki, lat nieszczęść i ruiny, ale pomimo wszystko czterech lat życia własnego, z przeblaskami sławy na szerokim horyzoncie.

Zadaniem emigracji, na której nie ciąży bezpośrednio codzienne jarzmo bolszewickie, jest podtrzymywanie ducha Narodu, rozniecanie wiary w lepszą przyszłość, wlewanie nadzieje i solidarna praca w szerzeniu znajomości Ukrainy, tak zapoznanej, po szerokim świecie, gdzie nas rzucił srogi los.

Pyta mię Pan jaką rolę odgrywa na emigracji i jakie ma widoki na przyszłość Pan Hetman Skoropadski? Mam wrażenie, że przedstawianie go jako pretendenta do tronu nie jest niczem innym jak złą intrygą |3| naszych wrogów. Od swej abdykacji, Pan Hetman Skoropadski mieszka jak prywatny człowiek w Berlinie, i wątpię bardzo, by można było traktować na serio te plany, które mu są przypisywane. Jego filantropijna działalność (pomoc udzielając emigracji, inicjatywa w organizacji kulturalnego ośrodka Ukraińskiego w Berlinie) jest bezwarunkowo najwyższej pochwały godną. W Berlinie zebrali się kilku wybitnych i ze wszech miar zasługujących na szacunek naszych naukowych i społecznych działaczy, ale przypisywane im plany, według mego ściśle osobistego zapatrywania, nie mogą spodziewać się powodzenia i realizacji. Najważniejszą tego przyczyną jest niewyraźność proponowanej polityki zewnętrznej i na przykład stosunku do Rosji, która zawsze będzie odstraszać nacjonalistyczne koła naszego społeczeństwa. Naród Ukraiński przelał za wiele krwi w walce z Rosją, by można było dziś przejść nad nią do porządku dziennego i zmuszać rozbudzony nacjonalizm do milczenia.

Na razie, Naród Ukraiński ma legalną rządową organizację i legalnego Naczelnika Państwa w osobie następcy Pana Prezydenta Petlury, Pana Andrzeja Liwickiego. Możemy być z rządu niezadowoleni, krytykować jego działalność, lub brak działalności. Protestować energicznie przeciw nadzie-

jom utrzymania na Ukrainie dzisiejszych Ustaw i Ustroju Republikańskiego, ale obecnie, kiedy musimy zespolić wszystkie nasze siły przeciw wrogowi zewnętrznemu, należy nas godzić się z temi tymczasowymi formami.

Wrogowie nasi insynuują, że Rząd nasz otrzymuje zasiłki pieniężnych od Rządów Angielskiego, Polskiego, Rumuńskiego. Wszystko to są brednie. Tak w tym czasie, kiedy zarządzałem naszym Ministerstwem Spraw Zagranicznych, jak i obecnie, jak mię zapewniają dzisiejsi członkowie Rządu, żadnych nieukraińskich i nie stanowiących własności Narodu Ukraińskiego pieniędzy w swem rozporządzaniu Rząd nie miał. Niech [4] służy na przykład akcja naszych Komitetów Uczczenia Pamięci S. P. Atamana Petlury. Komitety zebrały znaczne sumy z dobrowolnych częstokroć drobnych składek. Wpływ składek trwa dalej. Otóż możemy spokojnie słuchać zarzuty i odpowiadać na nie tylko pogardą.

Najwyższym celem naszym jest walka o niepodległość, czyli walka z Bolszewizmem i Rosją. Wszystko dziś powinno być u nas podporządkowane wymogom tej walki i ta zasada powinna wpływać na nasz stosunek do Polski i Rumunii. Położenie geograficzne Ukrainy, wiekowa historia nasza, zmuszają nas do wyboru, albo z Europą przeciw Rosji, albo z Rosją, wtedy przeciw Europie. Tak było zawsze, ale tego Europa nie rozumiała. My, Ukraińcy, Polacy i Rumuni, nie mamy prawa tego nie rozumieć. Zawsze byłem rzecznikiem ukraińsko-polskiego i rumuńskiego porozumienia i uważam, że Ukraina, mając przed sobą jeszcze straszne walki z Rosją, musi zabezpieczyć sobie przyjaźń swych zachodnich sąsiadów, nawet drogą terytorjalnych ustępstw. W Ukraińsko-Polsko-Rumuńskim sojuszu leży uspokojenie Wschodu Europy. Nie należy jednak wskrzeszać straszaka federalizmu, bo wszelkie federalistyczne plany jako nierealne i dla naszych narodów szkodliwe, znajdują u nas, Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów, bezwzględny opór, a jak nam może zależeć na polskiej i rumuńskiej przyjaźni, tak i dla Polski i Rumunii ukraińskie sympatje nie są bez wartości.¹⁸⁴

Chociaż stoję bardzo daleko od wszelkiej politycznej aktywności, sądzę, że bliska przyszłość przyniesie nam rozwiązanie całego wschodniego pytania, które od tak dawna ciąży jak koszmar nad życiem Europy. Jestem pewien, że Ojczyzna moja przy tem rozwiązaniu odegra pierwszorzędną rolę. Odzyska-

184 The alternate version renders the final sentence of this paragraph as follows: "Nie należy jednak mówić o federalizmie, który spotka się z oporem ukraińskich Nacjonalistów. Jak nam winno zależeć na polskiej i rumuńskiej przyjaźni, tak samo i dla Polski i Rumunii ukraińskie sympatje mogą się okazać wielkiej wagi." (It is not necessary to speak about federalism, which will meet the resistance of Ukrainian nationalists. Just as we must depend upon Polish and Romanian friendship, so too Ukrainian sympathies may turn out to carry great weight for Poland and Romania.)

nie niepodległości, stworzenie nad Czarnym Morzem silnego Państwa Ukraińskiego, to będzie [5] nie tylko naprawa popełnionych przez Europę błędów, ale i odnowienie równowagi straconej od dłuższego czasu.

Translation

Paris, 7 August 1927.

To what should the publication of the false documents ascribed to me be attributed? The entire correspondence between President Livytskyi and me has been invented and falsified only in order to discredit me in French public opinion regarding the Schwarzbard affair, during which I will be making a public statement. This is the libelous handiwork of the Bolsheviks, to which I replied by submitting the appropriate complaints to the judicial authorities and calling *Humanité* and other newspapers to account. However, the work was not very skillful. The falsifiers know so little of our affairs that they have committed gross factual errors. They have not paid attention to the fact that I left my position as deputy foreign minister and director of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 3 April 1924, and since I hold no official position, I have not conducted any political correspondence with President Livytskyi. I have been living for three years in Paris as an altogether private individual, involved in strictly personal work, so I could not have taken part in official government actions. Following my withdrawal the conduct of foreign policy was entrusted, even while the late General Petlura was alive, to Professor Olexsandr Shulhyn, and it is a ridiculous invention to attribute to me functions that someone else well known in political circles performs.

The desire to create a special atmosphere around me hindered the falsifiers from noticing that, despite my personal respect for and friendship with certain of its individual members, I stand in clear opposition to our government. I am a monarchist and a conservative who finds democratic phrase-making and republican slogans unsatisfying.¹⁸⁵

[2] Accordingly I can answer your remaining questions only in my own name, without involving even my political friends.

What are the prospects for achieving our demands for independence? The clearest answer lies in the present state of affairs in Ukraine. There is steadfast opposition to the Soviet attempts to communize the country, a systematic outcry against the concessions of the occupation authorities in the areas of language, economy, and society, a growth in national consciousness

185 See above, Document 57, n. 183.

and strength despite persecution, bloody struggles and hard slavery, featuring a state of mind of resilience, energy, and national awakening that can no longer ever be restrained. If we add to those internal forces the coordination of our plans with those of other countries occupied by Soviet Russia and the growing understanding of the Ukrainian question by the governments and societies of the Great Powers, we can safely say the achievement of independence is for us a matter of the short run. The Bolsheviks themselves are helping us. In Ukraine it is most readily observed how their entire organization has become superfluous and the entire apparatus has rusted, while among the Ukrainian people the memory of the four years of independence (1917–1921) is still alive. These were years of struggle, of misery and ruin, but in spite of everything they were four years of living our own life, with flashes of glory on the wide horizon.

The task of the emigré community, upon which the Bolshevik yoke does not bear down directly every day, lies in keeping up the spirit of the nation, igniting faith in a better future, instilling hope, and working in solidarity to spread knowledge of Ukraine, so misunderstood in the wider world, into which cruel fate has thrown us.

You ask what role Hetman Skoropadskyi plays in the emigré community and what are his views about the future? I have the impression that representing him as a pretender to the throne is nothing more than an evil intrigue [3] by our enemies. Since his abdication Hetman Skoropadskyi lives in Berlin as a private individual, and I doubt very much that the plans that are ascribed to him can be taken seriously. His philanthropic activity (distributing aid to the emigré community, the initiative in organizing the Ukrainian cultural center in Berlin) is definitely worthy of high praise. Several of our outstanding academic and social figures, who by all measures merit respect, have gathered together in Berlin, but the plans that have been attributed to them have, in my own strictly personal view, no expectation of reaching successful fruition. The most important reason is the lack of clarity of the proposed foreign policy, for example regarding relations with Russia, which will always scare away the nationalist circles in our society. The Ukrainian nation has shed too much blood in the struggle with Russia to pass over it in a way that will compel the reawakened nationalism to remain silent.

For now the Ukrainian nation has a legal governmental organization and a legal head of state in the person of President Petlura's successor, Mr. Andrii Livytskyi. We may be dissatisfied with the government and criticize its actions or lack of action; we may protest energetically against its plan to retain a democratic constitution and legislation in contemporary Ukraine. But at present, when we need to unite all our forces against the external enemy, we must consent to these temporary forms.

Our enemies insinuate that our government receives cash benefits from the governments of England, Poland, and Romania. This is utter nonsense. Just as when I was in charge of our Ministry of Foreign Affairs, so too now, as current government members assure me, the government controlled no non-Ukrainian funds or funds that were not the property of the Ukrainian nation. Let [4] the actions of our Committees for Honoring the Memory of the late General Petliura serve as an example. The committees raised significant funds from repeated small voluntary contributions. Those contributions continue to pour in. So we can listen to the accusations calmly and respond to them with nothing but contempt.

Our highest goal is to fight for independence, which means to fight against Bolshevism and against Russia. Everything we do today must be subordinated to the demands of this battle, and this principle should influence our attitude toward Poland and Romania. Ukraine's geographical location, our centuries-long history, force us to choose to go either with Europe against Russia or with Russia against Europe. It has always been this way, but Europe has not understood this. We – Ukrainians, Poles, and Romanians – have no right not to understand this. I have always been an advocate of Ukrainian-Polish and Ukrainian-Romanian understanding, and I believe that Ukraine, which yet faces a terrible struggle with Russia, must secure the friendship of its western neighbors, even via territorial concessions. Bringing peace to Eastern Europe lies with a Ukrainian-Polish-Romanian alliance. It is not necessary, however, to raise the bogey of federalism, because all federalist plans are unrealistic and harmful to our nations and will thus arouse uncompromising resistance among us Ukrainian nationalists; and as we can depend upon Polish and Romanian friendship, Ukrainian sympathies are also not without value for Poland and Romania.¹⁸⁶

Though I am quite far removed from any political activity, I believe that the near future will bring us a solution to the entire eastern question, which has for so long weighed like a nightmare over the life of Europe. I am certain that my homeland will play a role of the first order in achieving this solution. Achieving independence, establishing a strong Ukrainian state on the Black Sea, will [5] not only correct Europe's mistakes but will restore a long-lost balance.

186 See above, Document 57, n. 184.

Document 58*Schwarzbard Defense Committee**Paris, September 1927¹⁸⁷**Typewritten report, 4 pages**Language: Yiddish**CAHJP, P10/4/1*די טעטיגקייט און די לאגע פונם שווארצבארד פארטיידיגונגס-קאמיטעט

דער פארטיידיגונגס-קאמיטעט איז געשאפן געווארן אין פאריז אין יוני 1926, לויט דער איניציאטיוו פונם קאמיטעט פון די אידישע דעלעגאציעס. אינם קאמיטעט גייען אריין אין פאריז 30 פארזאן – אָנגעזעהענע כלל-טוער און זשורנאליסטן פון פארשידענע ריכ-טונגען!; הן פראנצויזישע אידן, הן מזרח-אייראָפּעישע. די אָפּטיילונג פונם קאמיטעט אין בערלין בילדעט דאָס ביוראָ פּונם] מזרח-אידישן היסטאָרישן ארכיוו אין באשטאנד פון די ה"ה" ש. דובנאָוו, ליעשטשינסקי, קריינין, קלינאָוו, גערגעל. בראש פונם קאמיטעט שטייט אן אויספיר-ביוראָ פּונם] 10 פּערזאָנען אונטערן פּאַרויז פון ל. מאָצקין. די טאָג-טעגליכע ארבעט ווערט דורכגעפירט פונם סעקרעטאריאט אינם באשטאנד פון ה"ה" טשעריקאָווער – (צייטווייליג אָפּגערייזט), צאצקיס און שעכטמאן.

דער קאמיטעט שטייט אין א שטענדיגן קאָנטאַקט מיט זיינע פּאַרשטייערשאפטן אין ווארשוי (סיים-דעפּוטאַטן] גרינבוים און הארטגלאס), אין א"י (די ה"ה" דרויאנאָוו און טשערנאָוויץ אין תל-אביב, ש. שווארץ אין ירושלים), אין בערלין (דאָס ביוראָ פון דעם אויבן אָנגערופענעם מזרח אידישן היסטאָרישן ארכיוו), אין ארגענטינע (פּראָסאָקאָווער ךאַנדסמאַנשאפט [sic]) און ענדלאנד [sic] (5 פארטיידיגונגס-קאמיטעטן אין לאַנדאָן, גלאָזאָגאָ, לידס, קארדיף און מאנטשעסטער]). אין א ענגען קאָנטאַקט שטייט דער קאמיטעט אויך [sic] מיטן פארטיידיגונגס-קאמיטעט אין ניו-יאָרק.

אין רשות פון קאמיטעט זיינען איצט אריבער אלע מאטעריאלן פונם בערלינער מזרח-אידישן היסטאָרישן ארכיוו און פונם קאמיטעט פון די אידישע דעלעגאציעס. צווישן דעם קאמיטעט און שווארצבארדס פארטיידיגער טאָרעס עקזיסטירן איצט די בעסטע באציהונגען, א שטענדיגער קאָנטאַקט און הארמאָנישע צוזאַמענארבעט. דער קאָ-מיטעט האָט צוגעשטעלט טאָרעסן ניט וועניגער פון 1000 בויגענס באארבעטע מאטע-ריאלן, מאמאָראַנדומס [sic] און דאָקומענטן.

די וויכטיגסטע פון זיי זיינען:

(1) סינכראָנישטישע טאַבעלן פון אלגעמיינע אידישע געשייענישן אין אוקראינע

פאר די יאָרן 1917-1921.

[2] וואָס געבן א קלאָרן בילד פון די געשייענישן פון יענער צייט.

(2) א רשימה פון אלע פּאַגראַמירטע פּונקטן (לערך 500), מיט דער אָנווייזונג פון

דער צאָל קרבנות, פון דאטום און פון די שולדיגע מיליטער-טיילן.

¹⁸⁷ The original is undated. The date has been established from internal evidence.

- 3) ערקלערונגן און ענטפערס אויף די גביות-עדות פון דעם צד-שכנגד.
 4) אויף אלע דערקלערונגען פון די עדות פון די פארטיידיגונג¹⁸⁸ ווערט געגעבן אן אויסשעפענדר ענטפער אויף גרונד פונם רייכן מאטעריאל, וואָס דער קאָמיטעט פאר מאָגט, און אויף גרונד פון די ערקלערונגען פון זאך פארשטענדיגע.
 4) ביאָגראַפישע ידיעות וועגן יעדן עדות פון דער באשולדיגונג.
 5) אויסארבעטונג פון דער רשימה פון די עדות מצד דער פארטיידיגונג. טאַרעס האָט דיִדאַזיגע רשימה אינגאנצן אָנגענומען.
 6) פעטלירעס ביאָגראַפיע.
 7) א מעמאָראַנדום וועגן "פּאָוסטאַנצעס און פעטלירען", וואָס שטעלט פעסט פעטלירעס פאראנטוואָרטליכקייט פון די פּאָגראַמען פון פארשידענע באנדעס און אטא-מאנעס.
 8) זאמלונג פון נייע מאטעריאלן, וועלכע קומען כסדר אָן פון פארשידענע לענדער און ווערן מיט דער גרעסטער פּאָרויכטיגקייט קאָנטראָלירט] און אויסגענוצט דורכן קאָ-מיטעט.
 9) די פראנצויזישע ליגע פאר מענטשען-רעכט האָט דעם 10-טן סעפטעמבער, לויט דער איניציאטיווע פונם קאָמיטעט, ארויסדעלאָזט [sic] א ספעציעלע] נומער פון איר פע-ריאָדישן ביולעטען אונטערן קעפל "דאָס לאנד פון שרעק". דער ביולעטען האָט א גרויסע באדייטונג פאר דער צוגרייטונג פון דער פראנצויזישער עפענטליכער מיינונג.
 10) דער קאָמיטעט האָט ארויסגעלאָזט אין פראנצויזיש און אין ענגליש א גרויסן בוך (מער ווי 250 דרוקזייטן) וועגן די אידישע פּאָגראַמען] אין אוקראינע און וועגן פע-טלירעס פאראנטוואָרטליכקייט פאר זיי. דאָס בוך גיט א פולשטענדיג בילד פון די פּאָגראַם-געשעהענישן אין אוקראינע |3| בשעת פעטלירעס ממשלה אויף גרונד פון נייע, ניט פארעפענטליכע אָפיציעלע און אנדערע דאָקומענטן.
 ס"ווערט איצט צוגעגרייט א גרויסע פּאָליטישע אקציע אין דער פראנצויזישער פרעסע.

* *

*

- דאָס איז, אין קורצע שטריכן, די ביזאציטיגע טעטיגקייט פון דעם פארטיידיגונגס-קאָמיטעט. איצט, ווען ביז צום פּראָצעס איז געבליבן ניט מער ווי א חודש, האָט פאר זיך דער קאָמיטעט די אחריות"דיגע אויפגאבע צו דערפירן זיין ארבעט ביז צום סוף און צו רעאליזירן אלע יענע שריט און מאסנאמען, וואָס ער האָט חדשים ווייז צוגעגרייט.
 1. די ערשטע אויפגאבע איז צו ברענגען קיין פאריז צום פּראָצעס א רייע עדות, וואָס וואוינען אין פארשידענע לענדער (פוילן, דייטשלאנד, אמעריקע, ארץ-ישראל, אוראגוואי א. אנד.). דאָס זיינען דאָס רוב וויכטיגסטע עדות, הויפטזעכליך ניט-אידן.
 2. צו דעקן די באדייטענדע הוצאות, וואָס דער פארטיידיגער טאַרעס האָט געמאכט פאר דער גאנצער צייט, כדי צוגרייטן דעם פּראָצעס פון זיין זייט.
 3. רעזערווירן אן ענטשפרעכענדן האָנאָראַר פאר דעם פארטיידיגער] וועלכער האָט אייניגע מאָל געגעבן צו פארשטיין, אז ער רעכנט דערויף.

188 Undoubtedly an error. Should read באשולדיגונג.

4. רעזערווירן א געוויסע סומע פאר שווארצבארדן און זיין פאמיליע, אין פאל, ווען ער וועט באפרייט ווערן, ווייל אין פאריז קען ער בשום אופן ניט בלייבן. אויב ער וועט פאראורטיילט ווערן, מוז מען זאָרגן פאר זיין פרוי.

5. דעקן די הוצאות פון דער ענגלישער אויסגאבע פון דעם גרויסן פאָגראַם-בוך און א טייל פון די הוצאות פון דער פראנצויזישער אויסגאבע (וואָס איז נאָך ניט אינגאנצן באצאָלט). |4| 6. אָרגאניזירן דאָס סטענאָגראפירן פון אלע פראַצעס-פארהאנדלונגען און דאָס ארויסגעבן פונם סטענאָגראפישן באַריכט.

דאָס זיינען לערך די הויפט אויפגאבן, וואָס שטייען פארן קאָמיטעט אין די דאָזיגע לעצטע וואָכן פארן פראַצעס, אין די 2 וואָכן בשעת"ן פראַצעס גופא און אין משך פון א געוויסער צייט (4-6 וואָכן) נאָכן פראַצעס. לויט דעם באדייטענדסטן חשבון מוז דער קאָמיטעט, כדי דורכצופירן אין לעבן די אלע אויפגאבן, האָבן ניט וועניגער פון 15.000 דאָלאַר. דעם גרעסטן טייל פון דער דאָזיגער גרויסער סומע מוז ער האָבן אין משך פון די נאָהענסטע 10-12 טעג, ווייל אנדערש וועט אוממעגליך זיין באצייטנס צו באוואַרענען די נויטיגסטע שריט, אָהן וועלכע זיין גאנצע ביז-איציטיגע ארבעט וועט גייען לאַבור: די איינלאַדונג פון עדות, די אויסגאבע פון דעם פאָגראַם-בוך אין ביידע שפראַכן, די אקציע אין דער פרעסע און אנדערע.

Translation

The Activities and the Situation of the Schwarzbard Defense Committee

The Defense Committee was established in Paris in June 1926 on the initiative of the Comité des Délégations Juives. Thirty people comprise the Committee in Paris. They include both French and east European Jews, well-respected people active in the Jewish world and journalists of various political orientations. The office of the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv, consisting of Messrs. S. Dubnow, Lestschinsky, Kreinin, Klinow, and Gergel, constitutes the Berlin branch. An executive bureau of 10 people under the chairmanship of Leo Motzkin heads the Committee. Daily operations are conducted by the secretariat, consisting of Messrs. Tcherikower (temporarily on leave), Tsatskis, and Schechtman.

The Committee is in regular contact with its representatives in Warsaw (Sejm deputies Gruenbaum and Hartglas), Palestine (Messrs. Druyanov and Tchernowitz in Tel Aviv, Sh. Schwarz in Jerusalem), Berlin (the office of the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv), Argentina (the organization of Jews from Proskurov), and Britain (5 defense committees in London, Glasgow, Leeds, Cardiff, and Manchester). The Committee is also in close contact with the defense committee in New York.

The Committee now holds in its possession the full set of materials from

the Berlin Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv and from the Comité des Délégations Juives.

At present the best of relations exist between the Committee and Schwarzbard's attorney, Torrès, with whom there is regular contact and harmonious collaboration. The Committee has placed at Torrès's disposal no fewer than 1000 printer's sheets¹⁸⁹ of digested materials, memoranda, and documents.

The most important of these are:

1. Chronologies of general events in Ukrainian Jewish history prior to 1917–21 [2] that provide a clear picture of the events of that time.

2. A list of all places that suffered pogroms (approximately 500), indicating the number of victims, the dates, and the military units guilty of them.

3. Explanations and responses to the testimony of witnesses for the other side. An exhaustive answer has been prepared to every statement made by witnesses for the [prosecution]¹⁹⁰ on the basis of the Committee's rich holdings and on the basis of the statements of the experts.

4. Biographical information about every witness for the prosecution.

5. Elaboration of the defense witness list. Torrès has accepted this list completely.

6. Petliura's biography.

7. A memorandum about "The Insurrectionists and Petliura," which ascertains Petliura's responsibility for the pogroms by various bands and generals.

8. Gathering additional materials, which are coming in regularly from various countries and are evaluated and used by the Committee with the greatest care.

9. On the Committee's initiative, the French Ligue pour les droits de l'homme put out on 10 September a special issue of its bulletin under the head, "The Land of Horror." The bulletin has great importance for the preparation of French public opinion.

10. The Committee has put out in French and in English a large volume (more than 250 printed pages) about the Jewish pogroms in Ukraine and about Petliura's responsibility for them.¹⁹¹ The book provides a complete picture of the episodes of pogroms in Ukraine [3] during the time of Petliura's government on the basis of new, unpublished, official and other documents.

189 16,000 pages.

190 The original "defense" is obviously an error. See above, Document 58, n. 188.

191 See above, Introduction, nn. 294, 319.

A large-scale political action in the French press is currently in preparation.

* *
*

This is, in brief outline, the activity of the Defense Committee to date. Now, with no more than a month until the trial, the Committee is facing the serious task of bringing its work to a conclusion and of carrying out all of the steps and measures that it has been preparing for months.

1. The first task is to bring to the trial in Paris a series of witnesses who live in various countries (Poland, Germany, America, Palestine, Uruguay, etc.). Most of these are important witnesses, mainly non-Jews.¹⁹²

2. To cover the significant costs that defense counsel Torrès has incurred throughout in order to prepare the trial from his end.

3. To set aside an appropriate honorarium for the defense counsel, who has indicated several times that he expects this.

4. To set aside a certain amount for Schwarzbard and his family should he be set free, because he will not be able to stay in Paris under any circumstances. Should he be convicted, it will be necessary to care for his wife.

5. To cover the expenditures for the English edition of the large pogrom book and a portion of the expenditures for the French edition (which is not yet paid for in full).

[4] 6. To arrange for a transcript of all trial proceedings and for its publication.¹⁹³

Those are, more or less, the main tasks facing the Committee in the final days before the trial, in the two weeks during which the trial itself will be taking place, and for a certain time (4–6 weeks) following the trial. Ac-

192 In September 1926 Torrès submitted to the prefecture of police a list of 13 witnesses from abroad for whom he requested visas. *Témoins dans le procès Schwartzbart-Petlioura cités pour la défense* (M^e Henri Torrès), APP, B9/2204. The list included Henryk Przanowski and Leon Bienko, who were to provide ostensible eyewitness testimony that Petliura had personally ordered attacks upon Jews. See above, Introduction, at n. 330. On 26 September 1927, the French foreign ministry indicated that visas would be granted nine of them. *Communiqué à l'intérieur* (Sûreté Générale), 26 September 1927, AN, Ministère de la Justice, 1538 A 126.

193 A transcript, presumably commissioned by the court, exists only in mimeograph form. Edited transcriptions of several testimonies for the defense were published by Torrès, along with his own concluding speech and several letters or declarations in Schwarzbard's support. Torrès, *Le procès des pogromes*. The Defense Committee did not publish an edition of the trial proceedings.

ording to the most definitive accounting, the Committee will need no less than \$15,000 to carry out all of these tasks. It must have the major portion of that amount within the next 10–12 days, because otherwise it will be impossible to guarantee in a timely fashion the necessary steps of inviting witnesses, publishing the pogrom book in both languages, the press campaign, etc. Without doing these things its entire labor to date will be rendered nil.

Document 59

Leo Motzkin

Paris, September 1927

Typewritten memorandum, 4 pages

Language: Russian

YIVO, RG80/400/35120–35123

Summary of Motzkin's view of the upcoming trial

ЗАМѢТКА О ДѢЛѢ ШВАРЦБАРДА¹⁹⁴

[...]

Вы обратились ко мнѣ съ вопросомъ о томъ, ### какое общественое значеніе по моему мнѣнію имѣеть предстоящій процессъ Шварцбарда.

194 The text presented here comprises the final four pages of an anonymous fourteen-page typescript summarizing the results of the author's investigations into the pogroms of 1919–1920 and reflecting upon the significance of the upcoming Schwarzbard trial. It was written “on the eve of the impending trial” following “sixteen months that have transpired since the murder of Petliura” – that is, in late September or early October 1927 (*ibid.*, YIVO, RG80/400/35111). Parallel passages appear in an otherwise quite different text published by Motzkin in Yiddish following the conclusion of the trial; Leo Motzkin, *Unzer shtelung tsum Shvartsbard-protses* [Our Attitude Toward the Schwarzbard Trial], in: *Di idishe shtime*, 28 October 1927, 3 (Document 68). The document takes the form of a response to questions that have been put to the author by would-be interviewers. The author had previously declined numerous interview requests, “having been satisfied with the modest task of directing the preparation of the material necessary to shed light on the Ukrainian agony” (*ibid.*). Now, however, he felt it incumbent upon him to express his view about “how the trial affects the Jews and how they ought to react to the distinct stages of the trial” (*ibid.*).

Я охотно воспользуюсь Вашимъ вопросомъ, но опредѣлю его нѣсколько иначе: какое интернаціональное значеніе имѣетъ сей процессъ.

Ибо поневолѣ въ данномъ процессѣ будутъ затронуты взаимныя отношенія двухъ народовъ – украинскаго и еврейскаго. А въ настоящее время отношенія двухъ народностей затрагиваютъ весь интернаціональный міръ. Стоитъ только упомянуть о томъ, насколько, благодаря новѣйшимъ интернаціональнымъ теченіямъ, на каждомъ шагу проявляется проблема соединенія разныхъ народовъ, какъ для совмѣстныхъ идейныхъ стремленій, такъ и для охраны собственныхъ интересовъ, а часто для обѣихъ цѣлей совместно. Стоитъ только упомянуть о многочисленныхъ конгрессахъ, ассоціаціяхъ 'въ пользу' Лиги Націй, конгрессовъ меньшинствъ, пацифистскихъ обществъ и другихъ, не говоря уже о социалистическомъ интернаціоналѣ, на которомъ издавна встрѣчаются представители разныхъ національностей. Мнѣ лично эти цѣли объединенія народностей настолько дороги, настолько ### 'онѣ проникли' не только въ сознаніе, но и въ плоть и кровь моей дѣятельности, что я не съ легкимъ сердцемъ смотрѣлъ на надвигающіяся событія и все время мечталъ о томъ, какъ бы посредствомъ предварительныхъ переговоровъ и взаимныхъ внушеній ### 'уменьшить' эту опасность. Я все надѣюсь, что всѣ эти шаги приведутъ къ той цѣли, что по крайней 'мѣрѣ' другъ друга поймутъ, что данный процессъ не долженъ быть источникомъ вражды, а долженъ въ концѣ концовъ усилить взаимную интернаціональную связь.

[2] Раньше всего должны наконецъ понять всѣ, что не можетъ быть такого положенія, въ которомъ цѣлая народность постоянно находится подъ страхомъ истребленія. Нѣсколько лѣтъ тому назадъ евреи сами смотрѣли фаталистически на положеніе живущихъ на Украинѣ около 3-хъ милліоновъ евреевъ, какъ на обреченныхъ, для которыхъ существуетъ только вопросъ не о самой судьбѣ, а о времени. Мы, евреи, понятно, также как и другіе народы, горевали о техъ сотняхъ тысячъ нашихъ братьевъ, которые пали ### 'на' различныхъ фронтахъ, будь это на войнѣ или во время революцій, но мы относились къ этому, какъ къ общему горю, не разъединяющему насъ съ другими народами. То, что насъ потрясло, было то добавленіе, которое создано исключительно для евреевъ – добавленіе, что еврей, какъ таковой, подвергается чрезвычайнымъ жестокостямъ. Мне всегда казалось, что всѣ безъ различія направленій должны были бы не только говорить, что они принципиально противъ рѣзни евреевъ, но еще больше, чѣмъ евреи сами, внутренне страдать отъ этого положенія, позорящаго все человѣчество. Мне всегда казалось, что тѣ незабвенные и исключительные голоса, которые рождались въ писаніяхъ Щедрина (его замѣчательная статья «Юльскія

вѣянiя» [sic]¹⁹⁵) и Владимiра Соловьева, который не могъ спокойно умереть при этой мысли, должны были бы быть достоянiемъ всѣхъ тѣхъ, которые признають какое-нибудь культурное сожительство съ еврейской народностью, какую-нибудь мораль во взаимныхъ отношенiяхъ.

Увы. По поводу мученичества украинскаго еврейства, мученичества глубокихъ стариковъ и младенцевъ, не понимавшихъ даже в чемъ ихъ обвиняють и почему ихъ такъ мучають, в свое |3| время раздались лишь слабые голоса. Правда, евреи сами устраивали необычайныя манифестацiи противъ погромовъ во всѣхъ частяхъ свѣта, устраивали ### въ такихъ городахъ, какъ Нью-Йоркъ, шествiя протеста сотенъ тысячъ человекъ, но изъ неевреевъ возставали противъ неслыханныхъ звѣрствъ лишь оффиціальныя лица, или тонкiй слой интеллигенцiи и то лишь въ ограниченной мѣрѣ. Время было тяжелое. Въ чести всѣхъ культурныхъ людей мы хотимъ думать, что только поэтому почти двухлѣтнiя мученiя украинскаго еврейства не были ими замѣчены или отмѣчены, хотя мы хорошо знаемъ, что и въ то время немало было случаевъ, когда по поводу несравнимо меньшихъ мученiй поднимались сильные крики негодованiя.

Мы уже стали забывать о томъ несчастiи, которое постигло украинское еврейство и мы только мечтали о томъ, чтобы не было повторенiя, чтобы не было продолженiя. Случай, актъ, который мы осуждаемъ, какъ таковой, вызвалъ въ нашей памяти къ новой жизни всѣ эти ужасы. Вотъ тутъ мы себѣ сказали, что наступилъ моментъ испытанiя. Насъ не интересуеть судьба Шварцбарда, насъ интересуеть одинъ вопросъ – будетъ ли страдать человечество съ нами совмѣстно, когда оно узнаеть о томъ, какъ десятки тысячъ невинныхъ людей были изрѣзаны, изнасилованы, искалѣчены, какъ миллионы жили годами однимъ страхомъ, – дадутъ ли имъ еще жить завтра, какъ ### цѣлая народность дошла до того сознанiя, что она будетъ истреблена и даже не будетъ человеческого голоса противъ этой возможности, а быть можетъ и противъ всего факта. Мы хотѣли бы раньше всего, чтобы украинцы сами страдали вмѣстѣ съ нами, чтобы они, больше чѣмъ мы, отстаивали требованiе, что виновники такихъ ужасовъ – прямые или косвенные – должны быть ими самими наказаны или отброшены. Я лично по крайней |4| мѣрѣ представляю себѣ, что если бы подобное настроенiе было бы хоть въ какой бы то ни было части моей народности по отношенiю къ другой, что отношенiе, связанное съ какой бы то ни было мыслью !о! ненависти къ другой народности, до готовности дѣйствовать посредствомъ погромовъ, или допущенiя такихъ, или хладнокровнаго

195 Actually Июльское Вѣянiе.

отношенія къ нимъ, то я бы считалъ одной изъ главныхъ задачъ своей жизни позорить этихъ людей, требовать наказанія, уничтожить въ корнѣ всякую подобную тенденцію. А какъ могутъ молчать украинцы послѣ тѣхъ гекатомбъ еврейскихъ жертвъ, которыя покрыли всю Украину.

Я хочу надѣяться еще въ послѣдній часъ, что украинскіе представители будутъ кричать въ унисонъ съ евреями противъ виновниковъ и не будутъ стараться уничтожить впечатлѣніе естественно вызываемое всѣми повѣствованіями, которыя услышать невольно во время процесса. Я лично хотѣлъ бы, чтобы этотъ процессъ былъ чистилищемъ и чтобы онъ явился лозунгомъ міровой борьбы противъ возможности всякихъ погромовъ, противъ возможности разбора погромовъ холоднымъ нечеловѣческимъ анализомъ. Мы не хотимъ этимъ создать какое бы то ни было средостѣніе между евреями и неевреями, а наоборотъ помочь новому кодексу нравовъ между народами.

Translation

A NOTE ON THE SCHWARZBARD AFFAIR

[...]

You have asked me what social significance the upcoming trial of Schwarzbard has in my opinion. I will gladly take advantage of your question, but I will define it a bit differently: What international significance does this trial have?

[I do this] because no matter what happens, the relations between two nations – the Ukrainians and the Jews – will be affected by the trial. And at present the relations between the two national groups touch the entire international arena. One need only recall the extent to which, thanks to the most recent international trends, the problem of uniting different nations manifests itself every step of the way, in joint efforts on the level of ideas just as in the defense of real interests, and often with regard to both goals combined. One need only recall the many congresses, associations [on behalf] of the League of Nations, minorities congresses, pacifist societies, and others, not to mention the Socialist International, in which representatives of different nations have long since encountered one another. For me personally the goal of uniting national groups is so dear and has [penetrated] not only my consciousness but also the flesh and blood of my activity that I have not taken the upcoming events lightly and have been dreaming constantly about how preliminary talks and mutual consultations might [mitigate] the danger. I hope completely that all of these steps will lead to this goal, that at the very

{least} each group will grasp that the trial need not become a source of enmity but must in the end strengthen mutual international ties.

[2] First of all everyone has to understand that a situation must not exist in which an entire national group finds itself constantly in fear of extermination. A few years ago the Jews themselves looked upon the situation of some three million Jews living in Ukraine fatalistically, as if they had been condemned to death and the only question about them was not what their actual fate would be but when it would come. Understandably we Jews mourned those hundreds of thousands of our brothers who fell {on} various fronts, whether during the war or in the time of the revolution, just as other nations [mourned their brothers]. But we looked upon this as a common misfortune that did not distinguish us from other nations. The thing that made us shudder was the additional measure that was created exclusively for the Jews – an additional measure to which Jews were subjected with extraordinary cruelty. It has always seemed to me that all of the [political] streams, without exception, would not only have to say that they are against the massacre of Jews on principle, but even more than the Jews themselves they would have to be troubled internally by this situation, which disgraces all humanity. It has always seemed to me that those unforgettable and exceptional voices that came to life in the writings of Shchedrin¹⁹⁶ (his outstanding article *Yul'skoe veyanie* [“The Spirit of July”])¹⁹⁷ and of Vladimir Solovyev,¹⁹⁸ who could not die in peace at the thought, ought to have been the property of all those who recognize some sort of cultural coexistence with the Jewish nation, some sort of morality in their mutual relations.

Alas. With regard to the martyrdom of Ukrainian Jewry, the martyrdom of the very old and infants who did not even understand what the charge

196 M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin (1826–1889), leading Russian political satirist of the mid-nineteenth century.

197 Published in 1882 in *Otechestvennyye zapiski* in response to the wave of anti-Jewish violence that had begun the previous year in the southwestern regions of the Russian Empire. Noting that “in the area of martyrology the Jewish tribe occupies first place,” it declared, “There is nothing more heartrending than to recount the story of this endless torture of one human being by another.” The text of the article has been reproduced at <http://www.lechaim.ru/ARHIV/87/salt.htm#_ftn1> (10 December 2015).

198 1853–1900, major Russian religious philosopher, known among Jews for his 1884 pamphlet *Yevreystvo i khristianskiy vopros* [Jewry and the Christian Question], which included the statement, “The Jews have always treated us in accordance with the Jewish faith; we Christians, on the contrary, have yet to learn to treat the Jews in Christian fashion.” For the text see <<http://www.vehi.net/soloviev/solovevr.html>> (10 December 2015).

against them was and why they were being tortured so, [3] only the weakest voice was heard. True, the Jews themselves organized extraordinary demonstrations against the pogroms in all parts of the world, in cities like New York, protest marches of hundreds of thousands of people, but among non-Jews only official personalities spoke out against the unheard-of atrocities, or a thin slice of the intelligentsia, and even then in limited measure. The times were difficult. Out of respect for all civilized people we want to think that that is the only reason why the almost two-year-long martyrdom of Ukrainian Jewry did not enter their consciousness or draw their attention, although we know well that at that time too there were not a few incidents where powerful cries of indignation were raised over incomparably lesser suffering.

We had already begun to forget the misfortune that overtook Ukrainian Jewry and were dreaming only that there be no repetition. The incident, the act, which we condemn as such, brought all of those horrors back to life in our memory. Hence we said to ourselves, the moment of reckoning has come. We are not interested in Schwarzbard's fate; we are interested in one question only: will humankind suffer along with us when it learns that tens of thousands of innocent human beings were cut to pieces, brutally raped, maimed, that an entire people became aware that it was to be exterminated and not even a single human voice would be raised against that possibility, or perhaps even against the fact. Before everything else we want the Ukrainians to suffer along with us. We want them, more than us, to support our demand that those guilty of such horrors, directly or indirectly, must themselves be condemned and shunned. I personally, at [4] least, imagine that if a similar attitude existed in even some part of my people toward another, an attitude connected with any sort of idea [of] hatred toward another people, of readiness to employ pogroms or to tolerate them, or of a coldhearted attitude toward them, then I would regard it as one of the chief tasks of my life to shame those people, to demand their punishment, to eliminate any similar tendency at the root. How can the Ukrainians be silent in the face of those hecatombs of Jewish victims that covered the entire Ukraine?

I still hold out the hope that in the near future Ukrainian representatives will shout in unison with the Jews against the guilty ones and will not try to wipe away the impression that will naturally be aroused by all of the sworn testimonies at the trial. Personally I would hope that this trial would have a cathartic effect and that it would produce a rallying cry for a worldwide struggle against the possibility of all pogroms, against the possibility that the pogroms will be examined via cold-hearted analysis devoid of human feeling. We do not wish thereby to cause any sort of wall of separation between Jews and non-Jews but on the contrary, to bring about a new code of conduct among nations.

Document 60

Schwarzbard Defense Committee

*Paris, October 1927*¹⁹⁹

Typewritten report, 6 pages

Language: German

CZA, A18/50/6

UEBERBLICK UEBER DIE TAETIGKEIT DES
VERTEIDIGUNGSKOMITEES IN DER SACHE SCHWARZBART.

Als Schwarzbard am 25. Mai 1926 in Paris den ehemaligen Chef der ukrainischen Regierung, Petljura, getoetet hatte, herrschte in grossen juedischen Kreisen von Paris eine ausserordentliche Aufregung. Der Gedanke lag nahe, dass die Aufrollung der Motive, welche Schwarzbard zu seiner Tat gefuehrt hatten, die fuerchterlichen Erlebnisse der ukrainischen Juden vor aller Welt aufdecken wuerden. Das Buero des Komitees der Juedischen Delegationen wurde schon wenige Tage nach dem Attentat von allen Seiten bestuerzt und aufgefordert, ein spezielles Verteidigungskomitee zu schaffen, um einerseits zu verhindern, dass die Tat Schwarzbarts zu ganz anderen Propagandazwecken ausgenutzt werden und damit dem Judentum unabsehbarer Schaden bereitet wurde [sic], um andererseits das Martyrium des ukrainischen Judentums voellig aufzuklaeren. Das Buero des Komitees zog sodann ueber den Attentaeter Erkundigungen ein und erfuhr aus verschiedenen Quellen, dass er zu seiner Tat durch die Absicht gedraengt worden sei, wenn auch verspaetet, die Aufmerksamkeit der Welt auf die Leiden seiner ukrainischen Brueder, die er selber waehrend der Pogromzeit miterlebt hatte, zu lenken und der Welt zu beweisen, dass zehntausende von Juden, die voellig unschuldig waren, in der grausamsten Weise ermordet worden seien.

Aus Initiative des Komitees der Juedischen Delegationen entstand dann Anfang Juni das sogenannte Verteidigungskomitee.

1.) Das Komitee begann seine Wirksamkeit [sic] etwa zehn Tage nach dem Attentat, nachdem jedoch der Attentaeter schon selbst seinen Rechtsanwalt gewaehlt hatte.²⁰⁰ Es setzte sich sowohl aus Juden aus Russland und der Ukraine zusammen, die die ganzen Jahr [sic] hindurch den in der Ukraine leidenden Bruedern zuerst durch Aufklaerung der oeffentlichen Meinung,

¹⁹⁹ Date established by internal reference.

²⁰⁰ Torrès was engaged on 27 May 1926, two days after the assassination. Anna Schwarzbard to Schwarzbard, 27 May 1926, YIVO, RG 85/876/70056.

später durch materielle Hilfsarbeit zu helfen bestrebt gewesen waren, so dann aber auch aus einer Anzahl französischer Juden. In erster Reihe traten diesem Komitee die Mitglieder des Komitees der Juedischen Delegationen und die Mitglieder der Executive der ehemaligen Juedischen Welthilfskonferenz bei,²⁰¹ aber ausserdem noch eine Anzahl anderer Personen, die sich auf den Standpunkt stellten, dass, so peinlich es auch sei, dass [sic] die Aufhellung der furchtbaren Wahrheit gerade im Anschluss an eine von einem Juden begangene Mordtat geschehe, [2] es doch eine heilige Pflicht sei, das selbst von vielen humanen Geistern wenig beachtete blutige Kapitel jener tausende## von Tragoedien, die sich in Osteuropa abgespielt haben, zu beleuchten. Das gesamte Komitee, welches aus Angehörigen verschiedenster Richtungen sich bildete, musste sich naturgemäss seiner Zahl nach Beschränkungen auflegen und ging ueber die Zahl dreissig nicht hinaus. Das Komitee waehlte sodann ein Bureau, bestehend aus den Herren L. Motzkin (Vorsitzender), Advokat H. Sliosberg, Advokat M. Goldstein, Wl. Temkin,²⁰² J. Jefroykin,²⁰³ A. Spire, B. Lecache, E. Tscherikower, J. Schechtman, N. Tsatskin²⁰⁴ (letztere drei waren Sekretaere). Dem Komitee gehoerten sodann noch u. a. Redakteur Solomon, Dr. V. Jacobson, H. Hertz, Oberrabbiner Dr. Eisenstadt u. a. an. Auch der vor einem Jahr verstorbene bekannte Advokat M. Winawer²⁰⁵ stand dem Komitee nahe, er vermochte jedoch aus physischen Gruenden nur noch mit Rat an dessen Arbeiten teilzunehmen. (Die von ihm beabsichtigte Einberufung einer erweiterten Sitzung des Komitees in seinem eigenen Hause kam infolge seines ploetzlichen Ablebens nicht mehr zu Stande). Das Komitee setzte sich auch noch mit verschiedenen anderen Personen in Verbindung, so auch mit Leon Blum, mit dem es einzelne Momente durch seine Vertreter beraten liess.

2.) Von dem Gedanken ausgehend, dass es nur vorbereitende Arbeiten zu leisten habe, soweit es sich um die Klarstellung der Pogrome handle, uebernahm das Verteidigungskomitee zunaechst das Material, welches im Komitee der Juedischen Delegationen schon seit dem Fruehling 1919 sich angesammelt hatte und setzte sich mit der Verwaltung des osteuropaeischen Pogromarchivs in Verbindung, die unter Leitung von Prof. Dubnow in Berlin

201 A Jewish World Relief Conference was held in Karlsbad in 1920, largely at the initiative of the Comité des Délégations Juives, with the participation of 105 delegates from some 60 Jewish philanthropic organizations in Europe, North America, and beyond. A second conference was held in 1924.

202 Vladimir Tiomkin.

203 Israel Efroykin.

204 In other documents the name appears as Tsatskis.

205 Maxim Vinaver.

im Besitz einer grossen Kollektion von Materialien war, welche die verschiedenen betroffenen Gemeinden und wichtigsten Hilfskomitees sowie das sogenannte nationale Sekretariat in der Ukraine und Russland in der Zeit von 1918–1920 ueber die Pogrome gesammelt hatte. Die Leitung dieses Archivs (Prof. Dubnow, M. Kreinin, J. Leszynsky, H. Gergel, E. Tscherikower und J. Klinoff) schloss sich dem Pariser Verteidigungskomitee an, mit dem sie als ein Teil des Komitees saemtliche wichtigen Momente der Arbeit gemeinsam mitbeschloss. Zwecks Verstaerkung des Pariser Bureaus wurde sodann E. Tscherikower, unter dessen Redaktion bereits zwei Baende von Materialien des Pogromarchivs erschienen waren, fuer den groessten Teil der Zeit nach Paris entsandt.

3.) Das Verteidigungskomitee vereinigte nicht nur die Sammlungen des Komitees der Juedischen Delegationen und des Pogromarchivs, es ergaenzte diese Sammlungen noch durch eine sehr grosse Korrespondenz mit den in Betracht kommenden Instanzen, indem es noch weitere neue Dokumente, Berichte, Photographien u. dgl.²⁰⁶ herbeischaffte. Das Material wuchs infolgedessen zu einer ungeheuren Masse an, die von den obengenannten Sekretaren des Pariser Bureaus bearbeitet wurde. Dazu kamen noch die massenhaften neuen Auszuege aus der juengsten ukrainischen, polnischen und juedischen Presse, welche vielfach Fingerzeige fuer die Erforschung der Pogrome gaben.

4.) Das Buero des Verteidigungskomitees beschaeftigte sich sodann mit der Sichtung des Materials, schuf eine vollstaendige Karte der Pogromorte, eine Kartothek ueber jeden Pogrom und jede mit den Pogromen verbundene Persoenlichkeit, vereinigte die in Bruchstuecken gesammelten Listen der Ermordeten – nur einen Teil der Opfer – (vorlaeufig 17.000 Namen), pruefte alle Dokumente auf ihre Authentizitaet, verschaffte sich zusaetzliche Photographien aus der Pogromzeit, uebernahm einen Film ueber reale Vorgaenge waehrend einiger Pogrome und systematisierte das gesamte Material.

5.) Das Verteidigungskomitee setzte sich sodann mit verschiedenen Laendern in Verbindung, in denen Augenzeugen der Pogrome von besonderer Wichtigkeit sich befunden, es schuf zu diesem Zweck spezielle Kommissionen in Polen (unter Direktive des Juedischen Nationalrats und des Sejmko der juedischen Abgeordneten und Senatoren²⁰⁷), in Bessarabien und in anderen Gebieten Rumaeniens, in Palaestina (Waad Leumi)²⁰⁸, in den Vereinigten Staaten, in Argentinien usw. Zweck dieser Arbeit war, einerseits die Materia-

206 Und dergleichen.

207 The caucus of representatives of Jewish political parties in the two houses of the Polish parliament.

208 The General Council of the Jewish Community in Palestine, established 1920, the legal representative of Palestinian Jewry vis-à-vis the British mandatory authorities.

lien zu vervollstaendigen, andererseits solche Augenzeugen und Sachverstaendige ausfindig zu machen, die infolge ihrer grossen Erfahrungen und ihres inneren Wertes wichtige Beitraege zur Beleuchtung der Pogromepoche und zur Aufhellung der Schuld der Pogromstifter gewaehren koennten.

[4] 6.) Zu demselben Zweck wurde auch der Schriftsteller B. Lecache beauftragt, eine laengere Reise durch die Ukraine und Russland zu unternehmen und an Ort und Stelle den noch jetzt vorhandenen Spuren der Pogrome nachzugeben. Hierbei handelte es sich nicht um neue dokumentarische Belege, die auf anderem Wege die ganzen letzten Jahre hindurch gesammelt und nachtraeglich vom Pariser Bureau aus reichlich ergaenzt wurden, sondern um die Feststellung der in der dort verbliebenen juedischen Bevoelkerung noch vorhandenen Impressionen, Erinnerungen, Befuerchtungen und Stimmungen, soweit sie ein Echo der erlebten Pogrome darstellen. Diese persoelichen Erlebnisse aus 80 Ortschaften, die Lecache besucht hat, hat er in einem Buch „Quand Israel meurt“ niedergelegt, das eine sehr grosse Verbreitung gefunden hat.²⁰⁹

7.) Das Bureau des Verteidigungskomitees hat sodann im Laufe seiner 16-monatigen Arbeit eine grosse Zahl von Monographien ausgearbeitet, welche es dem Verteidigen zur Verfuegung stellte. Es waren Monographien ueber die historische Entwicklung des politischen Lebens in der Ukraine im Zusammenhang mit den verschiedenen Pogromperioden, ueber die Beziehungen zwischen den Ukrainern und den Juden unter Beruecksichtigung der den Juden von den ukrainischen Regierungen gewaehrten weitgehenden Minderheitengesetze und der Selbstverwaltung in kulturellen Dingen, ueber die schuldigen Pogromstifter, ueber die Person Petljuras und zahlreiche andere Themata, deren Aufklaerung fuer den Verteidiger wichtig waren. Vielfach wurden auch Auszuege aus grossen Protokollen, in deren Besitz das Bureau sich befand, oder ausgiebige Beantwortungen der tendenzioesen Erklarungen, welche die Anhaenger der Zivilpartei machten, dem Verteidiger uebermittelt. Insgesamt hat das Bureau fuer alle diese Zwecke dem Verteidiger ueber tausend Seiten vorarbeiteten Materials uebergeben.

8.) Das Bureau des Verteidigungskomitees hat der franzoesischen, juedischen und internationalen Presse regelmaessig zahlreiche Einzelheiten aus den Materialien ueber die Pogrome, sowie Communiques ueber die neuen Informationen uebermittelt. [...] ²¹⁰

[5] 9.) Das Bureau des Verteidigungskomitees hat seinerseits ein grosses Dokumentenbuch, mit einer Anzahl Illustrationen versehen, ueber die Pogrome

209 See above, Document 49, n. 131.

210 Lengthy section listing names of public figures who made statements about pogroms omitted.

veroeffentlicht, das eine Widerspiegelung der schrecklichen Zeit auf Grund von unanfechtbaren authentischen Belegen, offiziellen Berichten und Protokollen enthaelt und zugleich einiges Material ueber den mannigfaltigen Kampf gewaehrt, welchen das Judentum schon seit Beginn der Pogrome in den verschiedenen Laendern, insbesondere in Amerika, (Vereinigte Staaten), Kanada, Argentinien, Frankreich, England, sowie in zahlreichen Orten Zentraleuropas durch Demonstrationen, Proteste, Interventionen usw. gegen die schweren Massaker gefuehrt hat.²¹¹ In diesem Buche ist auch das umfangreiche Memorandum enthalten, welches das Komitee der Juedischen Delegationen schon im Jahre 1920 der ersten Vollversammlung des Voelkerbundes ueberreicht hat.²¹² Das Dokumentenbuch ist gleichzeitig auch in englischer Sprache erschienen, waehrend ein Auszug in jiddisch veroeffentlicht ist.²¹³ Demnaechst soll dasselbe Dokumentenbuch, das gerade wegen seines Bestrebens, alle Uebertreibungen zu vermeiden und nur die wirklichen Greuel und Schrecken festzuhalten, auf jeden unbefangenen Leser einen dauernden Eindruck macht, auch in deutscher Sprache zum Abdruck gelangen.²¹⁴ Diese offizielle Zusammenstellung [6] der besonders wichtigen Teile der Materialien wird jetzt allen in Betracht kommenden Pressorganen, Persoenlichkeiten und Institutionen zugesandt, wobei erwartet wird, dass die darin enthaltenen Materialien anlaesslich des Prozesses, dessen Beginn auf den 18. Oktober angesetzt ist, als Grundlage fuer das Verstaendnis der kommenden gerichtlichen Verhandlungen dienen wird.

10.) Das Komitee ist jetzt im letzten Stadium seiner Arbeiten damit beschaeftigt, alle Vorbereitungen zu treffen, um kurz vor dem Prozess die gesamte Oeffentlichkeit ueber die wahren Erlebnisse des ukrainischen Judentums zu informieren, um die schaendlichen Unwahrhaftigkeiten auszumerzen, die von boeswilliger oder schuldbewusster Seite ueber die Haltung der Juden in der Ukraine verbreitet worden sind, um die wirklichen Schuldigen ruecksicht[s]los der Schande zu uebergeben und damit moeglicherweise aehnlichen Henkerstaten und Brutalitaeten ein Ende zu machen. Die Blos[s]stellung der Realitaeten, die Brandmarkung der zahlreichen blutigen oder raffinierten Moerder, Mordstifter und Urheber von Frauenschaendungen und kaum vorstellbaren Bestialitaeten soll in weitester Masse nicht nur zur Genugtuung der hunderttausende[n] von Opfern, sondern auch zur Prophylaxe in der Zukunft dienen. Diese Tendenz soll aber gleichseitig aus Gruenden der Gerechtigkeit und eines hoeheren Opportunismus keineswegs mit einer

211 See above, Introduction, nn. 294, 319.

212 Documents 8, 9.

213 No Yiddish edition was actually published.

214 No German edition has been located.

Verhetzung des ukrainischen und juedischen Volkes gegeneinander verbunden sein. Das Verteidigungskomitee steht auf dem Standpunkt, dass alles zu vermeiden sei, was die ukrainische Freiheitsbewegung irgendwie herabsetzen oder stoeren koennte; ein Teil des Komitees verhaelt sich sogar entschieden positiv gegenueber den ukrainischen Bestrebungen, sodass jedenfalls eine Gesamtsynthese herauskommt, welche eine dauernde Freundschaft zwischen den beiden Voelkern erstrebt. Das Komitee selbst ist seinem Wesen nach ein voellig unpolitisches, es betrachtet es indes, gerade weil es so entschieden fuer die Klarstellung der Wahrheit ueber die Pogrome arbeitet, zugleich als seine Aufgabe, durch seine Haltung alles versorglich zu tun, um die gegenseitigen Beziehungen zwischen Ukrainertum und Judentum nicht zu schwaechen, sondern zu staerken. Dazu dienen auch die vielfachen Unterhandlungen zwischen den Fuehrern des Komitees und den ukrainischen Fuehrern der zivilen Partei,²¹⁵ um waehrend des Prozesses in der Tonart auf beiden Seiten sich das staerkste Mass aufzuerlegen und damit die weiteren Moeglichkeiten gegenseitiger guter Beziehungen der beiden Voelker nicht zu verhindern.

Document 61

Comité des Délégations Juives

Paris, 2 October 1927

Typewritten letter, 2 pages; front page on printed letterhead with day and month typewritten; page 2 marked “C.d.D.J. (Comité des Délégations Juives) N°” in upper left corner and “Feuille de continuation” in upper right corner

Language: French

AAIU, III.D.11 (Comité des Délégations Juives)

COMITÉ DES DÉLÉGATIONS JUIVES
COMMITTEE OF JEWISH DELEGATIONS

ועד הדלגציות היהודיות
קאמיטעט פון די אידישע דעלעגאציעס
83, AVENUE DE LA GRANDE ARMÉE, PARIS
(16^e)

N°

ADRESSE TÉLÉGRAPHIQUE: DELISRAEL PARIS
TÉLÉPHONE: PASSY 65-78

Paris, le 2 Octobre 1927

²¹⁵ See above, Introduction, n. 159.

Monsieur,

Nous avons l'honneur de vous envoyer, par le même courrier, sous pli séparé, le livre sur les pogromes d'Ukraine que nous venons de publier.

Cet ouvrage est basé sur des documents véridiques, et c'est pourquoi il porte un caractère d'authenticité absolue.

En composant ce livre, nous avons été inspirés par un double désir: en premier lieu, nous voulions présenter au public français un tableau exact du martyre du judaïsme en Ukraine pour qu'il puisse voir par lui-même où il faut chercher les vrais responsables de ces événements; d'autre part, nous voulions que les rapports entre Juifs et Ukrainiens n'aient pas à souffrir du fait d'exagérations et attaques injustifiées, et c'est pourquoi nous nous étions efforcés de ne relater que des faits attestés par des documents authentiques ou par le témoignage de personnes et institutions dignes de toute confiance.

Tout en nous rendant compte qu'un recueil de documents alourdit l'exposé des événements, nous n'en avons pas moins préféré cette méthode à toute autre. Le martyre du peu-[[2]]ple juif d'Ukraine est trop grand pour qu'on ait le droit d'avoir recours à l'imagination. Tous ceux qui sont sensibles à la souffrance humaine ne pourront pas lire ce recueil de documents sans en être bouleversés et sans ressentir le devoir de tenter un effort pour que ces actes de cruauté sur des personnes innocentes ne se renouvellent pas.

Nous savons très bien qu'encore à l'heure actuelle, il existe de nombreux individus et des groupes entiers qui, par ignorance ou malveillance, nourrissent des instincts cruels, qui sont capables, dans des conditions déterminées, de provoquer des actes horribles du genre de ceux qui sont décrits dans notre ouvrage et qui constituent une honte pour l'humanité tout entière. Voilà pourquoi nous avons crû de notre devoir de présenter à tous ceux qui ont à cœur de connaître la vérité et d'empêcher les ignominies de se répéter, un tableau véridique des événements qui se sont déroulés en Ukraine au cours des années terribles auxquelles a trait notre ouvrage.

Veillez agréer, Monsieur, l'assurance de nos sentiments distingués.

Le Secrétaire:

!J. Schechtmann!

Part Four: The Trial

Document 62

*Trial testimony of Scholem Schwarzbard*¹

Paris, 18 October 1927

Typewritten transcript, pp. 12–127, passim; handwritten corrections and additions; pagination irregular (no pages numbered 39, 60 through 78, 102 through 121; seven successive pages numbered 88)

Language: French

YIVO, RG85/486/39474–39564

[...]²

[12] [...]

M. le PRESIDENT.³ – [...] Maintenant que je vous ai présenté,⁴ c'est le cas de le dire, à M.M les Jurés, et avant de [13] fournir vos explications, situons le drame et voyons les faits.

Le 25 Mai, 1926 vers 1h 1/2, une scène de sang se déroulait rue Racine, presque à l'angle du Bd St Michel, en face de la librairie Gilbert [sic],⁵ sous les yeux des passants et d'agents accourus au bruit. Vous avez attendu Petlura, vous avez quitté l'endroit où vous vous étiez posté, vous vous êtes avancé sur le trottoir, à droite de la rue, en allant vers le boulevard. Vous l'avez interpellé en langue étrangère, un vif colloque s'est échangé et à ce moment-là vous avez sorti un revolver de votre poche, pendant que Petlura levait sa canne pour se défendre, et vous avez tiré sur lui un premier coup de feu, suivi de deux autres très rapprochés. Au second ou au troisième coup, la rapidité du drame n'a pas permis de préciser davantage, Petlura s'affaissa, renversé sur le dos, étendu dans le caniveau, presque parallèlement au trottoir, et vous, très maître de vous, avez, a-t-on dit, tiré un quatrième coup de feu sur Petlura qui, dans une attitude de souffrance et de supplication, vous criait: « Mon Dieu!

1 The entire transcript of Schwarzbard's trial, authorized by the Tribunal Civil de la Seine and recorded and compiled by the stenographic office of Victor Bluet, 5, Avenue de l'Observatoire, Paris (VI^e), runs to more than 1,200 pages. Four key testimonies are presented here.

2 Interrogation concerning Schwarzbard's biography before 25 May 1926 omitted. The exchange presented here begins at the bottom of page 12 (YIVO 39474).

3 Presiding Judge Georges Flory.

4 Earlier the presiding judge had asked the defendant a series of questions required by criminal procedure aimed at establishing the defendant's identity.

5 Joseph Gibert.

Assez! [14] assez! Vous avez déchargé encore trois coups de votre arme sur Petlura, à bout portant, en donnant aux témoins qui étaient là l'impression de vouloir absolument achever votre victime [»].

Un agent, l'agent Massier est alors survenu, il vous a désarmé sans que vous lui opposiez aucune résistance.

Le revolver dont vous vous étiez servi venait d'ailleurs de s'enrayer.

Monsieur l'Audencier, veuillez présenter le revolver à l'accusé.

C'est bien celui-là?

R.⁶ – Oui.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Monsieur l'Audencier, veuillez montrer le revolver à M.M. les Jurés.

Et comme l'agent vous demandait pourquoi vous aviez commis votre crime, vous lui avez répondu: « Je viens de tuer un assassin. »

D'après certains témoins de la scène, vous paraissiez très satisfait de l'acte que vous veniez d'accomplir.

[15] Le général Petlura qui était sans connaissance fut transporté [sic] à l'hôpital de la Charité par deux agents; il mourut quelques instants après son admission.

Pendant ce temps, vous étiez conduit au commissariat de police par l'agent Massier qui a dû vous protéger contre la fureur de la foule qui vous frappait à coups de poing.

Au commissariat, vous avez fait connaître votre identité, Schwartzbard. Et comme un agent revenait de l'hôpital, annonçant la mort de Petlura vous auriez manifesté la plus grande joie, vous vous seriez élancé vers l'agent pour lui serrer la main.

R. – Oui.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Vous avez été fouillé et vous avez été trouvé porteur d'une somme très minime ainsi que d'un papier sur lequel était collée une reproduction [reproduction] photographique de Petlura, découpée dans le Larousse, et d'un numéro du journal « Les Nouvelles Ukrainiennes »,⁷ contenant un portrait de Petlura, plié de façon à le mettre en évidence.

6 Réponse.

7 Ukrain's'ki visti (see above, Introduction, at n. 99).

[16] Votre arme que vous venez de voir et qui a été présentée a M.M. les Jurés était un pistolet automatique de calibre 7,35. Elle était enrayée et contenait encore une douille non éjectée et une cartouche non tirée.

R. – Oui.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Vous avez fait des aveux complets; vous avez reconnu que vous aviez longuement prémédité votre crime.

Vous avez donné les explications suivantes: Vous avez dit qu'après avoir [sic] quitté l'armée, en 1918 et 1919 dans votre pays d'origine, en Crimée, à Odessa, vous avez vu des pogroms. Les événements qui se sont produits dans différentes villes et dont vous avez été le témoin, ont produit sur vous une impression très forte. Vous avez rendu responsable de ces événements l'hetman Petlura, qui était président du gouvernement à ce moment-là; vous avez supposé qu'il en avait été l'instigateur. Vous êtes rentré en France, vous vous êtes installé à Paris dans les conditions que j'ai pré-|17|cisées tout à l'heure, et à la fin de l'année 1925 vous avez appris par un journal que Petlura était à Paris.

R. – Oui.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Il collaborait au journal ukrainien le « Trident ». ⁸

R. – Oui.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Et il manifestait, avez-vous dit, par ses discours et par ses écrits, le mêmes sentiments, tendant à de nouvelles persécutions contre les Juifs de l'Ukraine.

C'est alors que, pour en éviter le retour, avez-vous dit, vous avez pris la résolution de le tuer. Vous n'avez plus eu qu'une pensée, et tous vos actes ont tendu à découvrir la domicile de Petlura, à rencontrer cet homme que vous ne connaissiez pas, que vous n'aviez jamais vu auparavant, et à vous approcher de lui.

Vous avez alors acheté un pistolet automatique, en vue de tuer Petlura?

R. – Oui.

[18] M. le PRESIDENT. – Vous avez découpé son portrait et l'avez collé sur un papier. Vous avez parcouru presque chaque jour le quartier latin, ou vous pensiez qu'il habitait.

⁸ Tryzub (see above, Introduction, at n. 81).

Quinze jours avant votre crime, vous avez entendu, sur le boulevard St Michel, des passants qui s'exprimaient en lange ukrainienne. Vous avez été frappé de cette circonstance. Vous êtes revenu le lendemain au même lieu et vous avez rencontré un homme que vous avez cru être Petlura.

Pendant quelques jours, vous l'avez suivi. Vous avez découvert et l'hôtel où il logeait, 17 rue du Sommerard, et le restaurant où il prenait ses repas, le restaurant Chartier, rue Racine.

Pendant une semaine, vous vous êtes rendu au même endroit. Vous avez toujours conservé le portrait de Petlura. Une fois, vous avez déjeuné avec un nommé Polonine,⁹ dans le même restaurant, deux ou trois jour avant le crime – vous prétendez que c'était vinq [sic] jours avant le crime – peu importe. Vous n'avez pas parlé de Petlura. Vous n'étiez pas très sûr de son identité.

Mais le samedi 22 Mai, avant le crime, vous [19] avez trouvé dans le journal « Les Nouvelles Ukrainiennes » un nouveau portrait de Petlura, et à partir de ce moment, vous avez eu la conviction que l'homme que vous suiviez était bien Petlura.

Dès lors, vous avez décidé de mettre votre projet à exécution.

Mais plusieurs jours de suite, Petlura s'étant présenté accompagné d'une femme et d'une fillette[,] la présence de ces personnes vous a empêché de passer à l'acte, craignant de les blesser.

Mais, le 26, le rencontrant tout seul, vous l'avez tué.

Je vais m'arrêter à ce point là. Je viens de poser les faits, d'indiquer les conditions dans lesquelles vous avez prémédité et consommé votre crime[.] Je voudrais bien qu'à votre tour et avant ce continuer à vous faire certaines remarques, vous expliquiez toute l'affaire à M.M. les Jurés.

Je vous donne la parole. Expliquez-vous, racontez comment vous avez eu l'idée de faire ce que vous avez fait, comment vous l'avez fait, et nous verrons ensuite comment nous devons reprendre votre interrogatoire.

[20] SCHWARTZBARD. – C'était à la fin de 1925, au mois de novembre ou au commencement de décembre. J'ai beaucoup de relations à Paris, je suis connu parmi les Russes, parmi les Ukrainiens, parmi les juifs comme parmi les autres; on vient souvent me demander des ouvriers ou du travail.

C'est ainsi qu'au mois de novembre ou commencement de décembre 1925, il est venu chez moi un Tusse [sic], un Russe non juif, qui sortait de l'hôpital. Il vint et me raconta une histoire. Il me dit: « Je viens de sortir de l'hôpital, d'une croix rouge russe. » Il était dans la salle, parmi les malades, et là il a entendu une conversation. C'étaient deux officiers de l'armée blanche, ou l'armée de Petlura, car c'est la même chose. C'était la salle où l'on soignait

9 Perhaps a misspelling of Volodin by the stenographer.

les maladies vénériennes. Un de ces officiers racontait que lui seul avait violé trente sept femmes juives; il racontait avec un cynisme sadique tous les détails. Et les autres riaient, étaient très contents. Le second officier a aussi raconté ses hauts faits. Lui, avec son sabre, avait tué quinze juifs en un seul jour. [21] Le Russe qui me racontait cela, et qui était un homme de cœur, n'avait pas voulu rester en pareille compagnie[,] il avait quitté l'hôpital alors qu'il n'était pas guéri, et quand il est venu chez moi, il avait les lèvres toutes bleues. Il me racontait cela les larmes aux yeux, me disant: « Je ne peux pas rester là-bas! »

Vous pouvez imaginer dans quel état j'étais moi aussi. J'avais moi-même assisté à des pogroms, j'avais vu les atrocités commises et je m'efforçais de les oublier. Mais ce Russe, venant me raconter ces choses, réveillait en moi tous les souvenirs et cela produisait sur moi un grand effet.

Quelques jours plus tard, peut être deux semaines plus tard, je lisais le journal russe les « Dernières Nouvelles », quand je trouvai un petit passage disant que l'Hetman Petlura se trouvait à Paris.

Quand j'ai lu ces deux lignes, j'ai été tellement énervé que j'ai dit tout de suite: « Moi-même, je vengerai tous ces massacres qui se sont produits là-bas. »

[...] ¹⁰

[26] C'était le 25 Mai 1926. Je n'étais pas encore sûr. J'avais écrit ce jour-là un pneumatique pour ma femme, parce que je savais que ma femme était malheureuse avec moi; elle avait souffert pendant la guerre, alors que je m'étais engagé volontaire, et elle n'était pas contente de mon départ; j'avais été blessé, ce qui l'avait beaucoup affecté; enfin, quand j'étais revenu à Paris, elle croyait qu'elle serait tranquille, et

voilà qu'elle allait encore avoir des ennuis à cause de moi. Je disais: « Cette pauvre femme! ... » et je cherchais quelque [27] chose pour adoucir sa peine. Je lui avais préparé un pneumatique où je lui disais mon cas, mon état pour lui expliquer mon geste, et je la priais qu'elle veuille bien me pardonner, je lui disais d'être courageuse, mais que mon acte, je ne pouvais pas ne pas l'accomplir, je ne pouvais pas vivre sans cette vengeance. J'avais donc écrit ce pneumatique et l'avais mis dans ma poche. Je n'étais pas encore sûr que Petlura se trouverait seul.

10 Schwarzbard's recitation of his movements on 25 May and details concerning the picture of Petliura (pp. 21–26) omitted.

[...] ¹¹

[28] Le 25 Mai, quand j'avais avec moi le pneumatique et aussi le revolver bien chargé, je me promenais à une heure, j'attendais Bd St Michel près du musée de Cluny, et je vis Petlura qui arrivait tout seul, habillé tout à fait autrement qu'il était habillé les autres jours où je l'avais suivi[.] Il portait un veston, un complet tout neuf, le tout bien arrangé. Il était tout seul. J'ai dit: « Voilà le bon moment. »

A ce moment-là, je pensais que le pneumatique n'était pas bien, il ne me donnait pas tout à fait satisfaction. Je pris encore deux petits morceaux de papier dans ma poche et j'écrivis au crayon quelques phrases, pour bien m'excuser auprès de ma femme; je ne trouvais [sic] pas bien mes pensées et mes paroles: à ce moment-là; je ne peux pas dire que j'étais tout à fait tranquille. Alors [29] j'ai écrit quelques phrases; je les ai mises dans le pneumatique. Et comme je savais que le repas de Petlura durait de 3/4 d'heure à une heure, je ne me demandai pas s'il y avait près de là un bureau de poste; au lieu d'aller au plus près, ou même de prendre le chemin le plus court; je fis le tour par le Bd St Germain, et je ne savais même pas où je me trouvais. Puis tout d'un coup, j'ai eu peur de rester trop longtemps, j'ai couru jusqu'à l'Hôtel de ville, et j'ai vu à l'horloge de l'hôtel de ville qu'il était déjà plus de deux heures; deux heures étaient passées de quelques minutes. J'ai couru tout de suite à la poste, j'ai mis le pneumatique et j'ai couru en vitesse vers le Bd St Michel où je suis arrivé en quelques minutes. À ce moment-là j'ai cru que j'arrivais trop tard et j'ai été bien ennuyé, j'ai dit: « J'ai raté le coup; je vais peut être le rater; il est peut être déjà parti! » J'ai attendu quelques minutes et tout d'un coup j'ai vu Petlura qui sortait du restaurant Chartier à pas très lents, marchant tout doucement sur le Bd St.Michel.

Moi, j'étais en face, sur le boulevard. Je [30] traverse le boulevard et je suis venu en face de Petlura. Je l'ai bien regardé, j'avais toujours le journal plié avec sa photo, et je le regarde bien encore une fois en face.

J'ai passé à côté de lui, comme cela, et puis je me suis mis en attente d'un pas ou deux, et je lui ai dit: « Pan Petlura », en ukrainien. Il s'est retourné tout de suite.

Je voulais être sûr que c'était lui et je l'ai appelé. Il s'est retourné brusquement.

Je lui ai dit: « C'est bien vous, Pan Petlura? »

11 Details concerning how Schwarzbard had been able to recognize Petliura from a newspaper photo (pp. 27–28) omitted.

Il ne m'a rien répondu; seulement j'ai vu qu'il faisait un geste agressif et qu'il serrait sa canne. Habituellement on tient la canne comme cela; tout de suite, il l'a retournée et a pris une attitude agressive.

A ce moment-là, je savais que c'était bien lui.

Alors, je lui dis à haute voix.. [sic] Jusque là[,] j'avais parlé a voix basse, comme on parle avec un homme très poli. A ce moment-là, comme je savais que c'était bien lui, je lui dis à haute voix: « Défends-|31|toi, canaille! »

Il a levé sa canne, mais au même moment, j'ai tiré cinq coups de revolver, l'un après l'autre, sans m'arrêter. Voilà. Je ne me suis pas arrêté. Vous savez, c'est un revolver automatique; quand on tient la gachette – comme j'ai été soldat, je le sais très bien – quand on tient la gachette, on ne peut pas s'arrêter. J'ai tiré les cinq coups les uns après les autres, tout de suite, sans arrêt.

Quand les balles l'ont atteint, il s'est tourné comme cela (Schwarzbard tourne sur lui-même); au deuxième ou au troisième coup il s'est tourné; moi, je l'ai suivi, parce que je me trouvais dans une rue pleine de personnes et je ne voulais pas atteindre un innocent. Je l'ai bien visé et bien suivi. J'ai tiré ~~le~~ cinq coups l'un après l'autre, et au cinquième coup il est tombé.

Il s'est allongé sur la chaussée parallèlement au trottoir. Quand il est tombé, tout de suite il était convulsé. Il n'a pas parlé. Il n'a pas dit un mot. Tout le temps que j'ai parlé, il n'a pas répondu. Il n'a pas dit une parole. Seulement des cris |32| de douleur: « Aïe! Aïe!.. » C'étaient des cris, mais non des paroles. Il est tombé et tout de suite, il était convulsé. Quand il est tombé, je savais bien que les cinq balles avaient porté et étaient bien entrées. Je me suis baissé près du trottoir et j'ai déchargé mon arme. J'ai fait cela par précaution, pour ne pas faire de malheur et ne pas blesser un innocent. On ne peut pas dire que j'ai tiré sur un homme [parce] que j'étais sûr qu'il était mort déjà. Je l'ai vu tout de suite. Quand il est tombé, les yeux étaient déjà révulsés et il avait des mouvements convulsifs. J'ai tiré ces deux coups vers le sol. Tout le public s'était écarté et personne n'aurait pu entendre un mot. Parce que, quand on a entendu les coups de revolver tout le monde s'est sauvé comme des mouches; ils sont partis tous. Le premier qui s'est avancé, c'est l'agent. Quand je l'ai vu avancer, je déchargeais mon arme que je tenais vers la terre. Il est venu vers moi tranquillement, tout doucement il marchait vers moi. Il m'a dit: « Ca [sic] y est? – Oui. Donne-moi ton arme. » Je la lui ai rendue et il l'a prise. Quand je lui ai eu rendue mon arme, le public a sauté sur moi. J'ai dit: « J'ai tué un |33| grand assassin. C'est un grand massacreur que j'ai tué! » On m'a dit: « Pourquoi l'avez-vous tué? » J'ai répondu: « Je viens de tuer un grand massacreur, un grand assassin! » Voilà, ce que j'ai dit /

Au poste, j'ai fait ma déclaration.

[...] ¹²

[35] M. le PRESIDENT. – Sans commentaires qui affaibliraient la netteté de l'attitude que vous prenez dans cette affaire, il est certain que vous reconnaissez que, voyant en Petlura le meurtrier de vos coreligionnaires, vous aviez depuis longtemps l'intention de le tuer, que vous avez acheté le revolver en conséquence, que vous vous êtes livré à des investigations nombreuses pour arriver à découvrir son refuge, et qu'après de minutieuses recherches, l'ayant trouvé, un beau jour, vous l'avez tué, et cela avec l'intention de le frapper à mort?

R. – Oui, Monsieur.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Je ne veux affaiblir en rien votre déclaration. Messieurs les Jurés l'ont entendue: dans leur conscience, ils l'apprécieront. Je tiens néanmoins à préciser certains faits pour rentrer dans le cadre de l'accusation. Vous connaissiez M. Koval Valdemar? ¹³

R. – Non.

M. le PRESIDENT. – C'est un professeur de Prague. Il a rapporté que le 14 ou le 15 avril étant en France avec Petlura, il causait avec lui [36] à voix haute. Petlura l'a prié de baisser le ton en lui faisant remarquer la présence à une table voisine d'un consommateur qui suivait attentivement la conversation, ajoutant que cet individu le suivait depuis quelques jours. Etait-ce vous?

R. – Non, Monsieur le Président.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Ceci m'amène à vous poser une question. Avez-vous agi tout seul? avez-vous agi de votre propre mouvement, ou n'êtes-vous pas l'exécuteur d'un groupe qui vous a chargée de tuer Petlura?

R. – Non, Monsieur le Président.

12 Description of details of arrest and Schwarzbard's repeated explanation of how he had identified Petliura (pp. 33–34) omitted.

13 Waldemar (Volodymyr) Koval. Schwarzbard had confronted Koval during an interrogation on 20 July 1926 (Document 30).

M. le PRESIDENT. – Vous prenez une attitude très nette; c'est pour cela que je vous pose la question, afin que vous puissiez prendre sur ce point également la même attitude.

L'homme que Petlura avait désigné était accompagné d'une femme. Quand ils ont quitté le café une puissante automobile est survenue; l'homme y a pris place avec deux autres individus.

Le conducteur de l'automobile a dit: « Jacques il est là. » Sur quoi l'homme a répliqué: « Alors [37] qu'il ... » (un mot non entendu par le sténo).

Cette conversation a eu lieu en langue russe.

Ce n'était pas vous?

R. – Ce n'était pas moi. Jamais je n'ai été à Boulogne sur Seine.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Pourtant vous avez été confronté avec M. Kobal qui a reconnu en vous, l'homme qui surveillait Petlura à Boulogne. Vous avez déclaré que le témoin se trompait.

R. – Parfaitement.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Vous savez que Kobal a dit qu'il vous reconnaissait?

R. – Oui, je le sais.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Vous parliez tout à l'heure d'un pneumatique que vous avez envoyé à votre femme.

(M. le President donne le détail des timbres de la poste et lit intégralement le pneumatique).

[38/39]Voici ce que vous écriviez: (1)

(1) Texte donné sans garantie, l'audition ayant été défectueuse (Note de sténo).¹⁴

« Ma chère Anna;
 « J'accomplis le devoir de notre pauvre
 « peuple, je vais venger tous les pogroms,
 « le sang et la haine des juifs. Petlura est
 « coupable du malheur de notre peuple. Il

14 Footnote at bottom of p. 38/39.

« doit payer de son sang. Quant à toi, conduis-
 « toi en héros, hardiment. Je ne t'oublierai
 « jamais, si tu es courageuse. N'accuse
 « personne. C'est moi qui suis coupable, mais
 « je ne puis vivre sans venger cette grande offense.
 « Que Dieu préserve.....
 « »

C'est bien votre télégramme?

R. – Oui, Monsieur.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Vous l'avez envoyé avant le meurtre?

R. – Oui, avant.

[40] M. LE PRESIDENT. – Mardi 25 Mai, vous avez quitté votre domicile vers midi et demie?

R. – Oui.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – C'est avant de partir que vous avez rédigé, en russe, la lettre pneumatique destinée à votre femme?

R. – Oui.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Vous avez ensuite gardé cette lettre sur vous?

R. – Parfaitement.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Vous l'aviez préparée pour l'avoir prête à l'avance?

R. – Oui, je l'avais préparée pour pouvoir l'envoyer, si par hasard je pouvais tuer Petlura.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Arrivé rue Racine, vous vous êtes posté un instant et vous avez vu Petlura rentrer au restaurant Chartier.

Certain qu'il ne sortirait pas de table avant trois quarts d'heure ou une heure, vous vous êtes rendu au bureau de poste de l'hôtel de ville?

[41] [R. -] Oui.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Après avoir rédigé deux billets au crayon, vous les avez insérés dans la lettre pneumatique que vous aviez préparée?

R. – Oui.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Et vous avez expédié le tout à votre femme?

R.- Oui.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Il pouvait être 13 h. 1/2 ou 14 heures, c'est à dire 1 h. 1/2 ou 2 heures après-midi; le timbre de la poste porte, au départ, 14 h. 35, c'est à dire une heure postérieure à celle du crime. Et là se révèle une anomalie; l'employé de la poste n'avait pas changé son composteur.

Quand vous avez été de retour rue Racine, vous avez encore attendu quinze minutes?

R. – Quelques minutes.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Dix minutes?

R. – Je ne peux pas préciser: quelques minutes.

[42] M. LE PRESIDENT. – Après avoir attendu, vous avez vu Petlura sortir seul du restaurant et se diriger vers le Bd St Michel?

R. – Oui.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Il suivait le trottoir de droite de la rue. Il était alors une heure un quart, d'après les témoins.

Lorsque Petlura est arrivé a hauteur de la librairie Gilbert,¹⁵ vous vous êtes approché de lui et là, vous l'avez interpellé en l'ange étrangère, en lui disant en effet: « Pan Petlura » ce qui signifie: « Seigneur Petlura ».

Petlura s'est alors retourné?

R. – Oui, Monsieur.

[M. LE PRESIDENT. -] Vous lui avez demandé si c'était bien lui?

R. – Oui.

15 Joseph Gibert.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Il n'a pas répondu?

R. – Non.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Mais alors, vous, sûr de ne pas vous tromper, vous vous êtes écrié: « Défends-toi, [43] canaille ».

Vous supposiez que vous pouvier [sic] avoir affaire à une autre personne?

R. – Non.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Vous étiez sûr que c'était lui?

R. – J'étais certain, à ce moment-là. Je suis passé devant lui; puis derrière; quand il était déjà passé, j'ai appelé: « Pan Petlura. » Il s'est retourné brusquement. Avec cela et la photographie, j'étais bien sûr que c'était lui. Un autre ne se serait pas retourné comme il l'a fait.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Alors, Petlura a simplement levé sa canne?

R. – Oui, Monsieur.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Et vous, vous avez sorti de votre poche le révolver, vous avez relevé le cran d'arrêt?

R. – Oui.

[44] M. LE PRESIDENT. – Et vous avez fait feu?

R. – Oui, Monsieur.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Vous avez tiré sans vous rendre compte, je pense, du nombre des cartouches. Et après chaque coup, vous vous êtes écrié: « Voilà pour les pogroms, voilà pour les massacres. » Est-ce exacte?

R. – C'est exact.

[...] ¹⁶

16 Section (pp. 44–50) omitted in which the presiding judge sought to clarify certain discrepancies of detail between Schwarzbard's account and that of witnesses and between Schwarzbard's various recitations of his actions following the shooting.

[50] M. LE PRESIDENT. – [...] Les faits ainsi établis par les aveux très circonstanciés que vous en avez faits, aveux qui caractérisent la préméditation, il est une seconde circonstance aggravante qui est retenue par l'accusation, c'est celle du guet-apens, étant donné que [51] vous avez attendu Petlura rue Racine pour le tuer.

[...] ¹⁷

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Eh bien, comment savez-vous que ces pogroms avaient été organisés par Petlura?

R. – Je suis venu en 1917 en Ukraine, à [52] Balta, non loin d'Odessa. Ma femme a des parents à Odessa; mes parents sont à Balta; il y a 125 à 130 kilomètres entre ces deux villes.

J'ai passé deux ou trois mois chez mes parents; après, je suis allé à Odessa, chez les parents de ma femme. Là-bas je me suis installé comme horloger en chambre et j'ai travaillé.

A ce moment-là, l'Ukraine était comme la Vendée en France pendant la Révolution. Pendant la révolution française, la Vendée s'est levée contre la révolution; c'est ce qu'a fait l'Ukraine contre la révolution russe. Ils ont commencé par massacrer les juifs. C'étaient les gens de Petlura qui s'appelaient les Rada. Les rada étaient le gouvernement provisoire. Petlura a pris le pouvoir; il l'a pris avec force. Il était le chef du gouvernement, le chef des cosaques et des |Hai|domacs.¹⁸ Les |Hai|domacs sont des gens sans cœur et sans âme, de vraies brutes; de plus ce sont des lâches, des hommes qui n'attaquent jamais en face, des hommes qui venaient chez les gens pendant leur sommeil, parce qu'ils savent que la population juive est sans défense. Ils viennent dans les maisons, violent [53] les femmes devant leur mari, les filles devant leur père et leurs frères. Ils brûlent, ils pillent, ils font le pogrom; le pogrom, c'est l'assassinat, le pillage et le viol. Voilà le pogrom.

Ce n'est pas la première fois, Messieurs les Jurés; il y a trois siècles qu'ont commencé ces massacres dans ces vallées de sang et de larmes.

Petlura était le petit-fils d'un grand massacreur qui s'appelle Potdamenski |Bogdan Khmelnizki|. C'était en 1648 que ce |« |grand| »| ataman a fait, avec les cosaques, le massacre des Juifs et des Polonais catholiques. Il s'est soulevé contre la Pologne à ce moment-là et a fait de grands massacres de Polonais, en même temps que de juifs.

¹⁷ Court recessed for three hours. Section from p. 51, in which Schwarzbard repeated that he had no accomplices, omitted.

¹⁸ Haidamaks; see above, Introduction, n. 242

Le massacre a duré de 1648 à 1654 sur la population juive; il y a eu plus de 500.000 tués, enfants, femmes, vieillards.¹⁹

Cent vingt ans après, s'était encore des atamans, *Secundiki* 'Gonta' et *Zedden* 'Zheleznyak',²⁰ qui ont organisé le carnage au même endroit, en Ukraine. Ils ont encore massacré la population juive. Il est resté dans l'histoire des documents très pénible sur ces évènements. Les Juifs ont fait sur ces massacres [54] des psaumes et des lamentations.

A ce moment-là, il y a eu aussi des massacres de Polonais. On massacrait les Juifs et les Polonais. C'était le deuxième grand massacre.

La troisième fois, c'est Petlura qui est venu, en 1918. Il a recommencé les mêmes massacres. Les poètes et les historiens ukrainiens ont écrit sur ces massacres. C'est toujours à la population inoffensive qu'on s'en est pris; on a massacré des femmes, des enfants, des vieillards. Voilà leur travail. Tout le temps les massacres ont duré, du jour où le tyran Petlura a pris le pouvoir, c'est à dire en 1918, 1919 et 1920; tous ces massacres ont eu lieu sous le régime de Petlura.

Il y avait des atamans ukrainiens qui, en 1917, s'étaient armés contre la Russie, pour favoriser la politique de Guillaume II, un 'grand ami de la France, n'est-ce pas?²¹ C'est alors qu'ils ont voulu séparer la Russie, la démoraliser. Les prisonniers ukrainiens et autrichiens, trouvés sur le territoire russe, il les a fait habiller d'uniformes allemands et les a fait combattre pour l'Allemagne.

[55] Les soldats de Petlura avaient sur la manche sur un brassard: « Tue les Juifs et sauve l'Ukraine. »²² De même sur leur casque était la devise: « Tue les juifs et sauve l'Ukraine ». C'était leur mot d'ordre.

[...]²³

[72] M. LE PRESIDENT. – Vous avez, à l'instruction, fait certaines déclarations sur l'attitude de Petlura envers les populations israélites en Ukraine alors qu'il était président du gouvernement provisoire. Ces déclarations ont

19 Recent estimates place the actual number killed at no more than 20,000. See above, Introduction, n. 202.

20 See above, Document 25, n. 66.

21 A reference to Skoropadskyi, supported by the Germany of Kaiser Wilhelm II.

22 This slogan was also attributed to the Black Hundreds in Russia.

23 Section omitted (pp. 55–71; p. 56 absent in transcript, page following p. 58 headed “59 à 70”) in which the presiding judge resumed questions aimed at examining Schwarzbard's claim that he had acted without accomplices and had discussed his plan with no one.

un peu varié. Tantôt vous affirmiez que Petlura avait été l'inspirateur et même l'organisateur de ces pogroms, tantôt vous déclariez que vous supposiez qu'il avait été l'inspirateur, l'instigateur, parce que ces événements s'étaient produits alors qu'il était chef.

Dites-vous qu'il a été l'inspirateur, qu'il a été l'instigateur ou qu'il a laissé faire?

R. – C'est la même chose.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Non.

Vous faisiez partie d'un comité d'israélites ayant pour but la défense des israélites qui avaient souffert et résident encore en Ukraine?

R. – Oui.

D.²⁴ – Qui est à la tête de ce comité?

R. – C'est, je crois, le Dr Motskine [sic].

[73] M. LE PRESIDENT. – Les anciens membres du gouvernement provisoire comme Procovitch²⁵, anciens officiers ou universitaires comme le général Chapoval et d'autres, des Français même, ont fait connaître que Petlura s'était toujours montré favorable aux israélites.

R. – On peut dire cela |de même d'Aman? Il a donné des monceaux |des 2000 pièces| d'argent à Jeffreski |le Roi de perse et modai| pour massacrer les Juifs:²⁶ Titus²⁷ était, lui aussi, un grand ami du peuple juif, ¶### comme tous ceux qui ont massacré les juifs pour leur bien: ils les envoyaient au ciel. |Petlura lui aussi|

24 Demande.

25 Vyacheslav Prokopovych.

26 Cf. Esther 3:9. The sum actually mentioned in the Bible is 10,000 pieces of silver; the actual name of the King of Persia and Medea is Ahashverosh or Ahasuerus.

27 Titus Flavius Caesar Vespasianus Augustus (39–81), Roman military commander responsible for the siege and conquest of Jerusalem (70), later emperor (79–81). Subsequent Jewish tradition portrayed Titus as an implacable enemy of the Jews. The source of Schwarzbard's description of Titus as "a great friend of the Jewish people" is unclear.

Me²⁸ CAMPINCHI.²⁹ – Vous comprenez bien, Messieurs les Jurés, qu’il s’agit d’histoire biblique et non de Petlura?

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Ces gens connus ont déclaré que loin d’avoir inspiré ou organisé des pogroms, Petlura les avait réprouvés et interdits par des proclamations et publications.

R. – Je n’ai pas connaissance de cela.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Ils ont déclaré qu’il n’avait pas dépendu de lui de les prévenir, de les empêcher, en présence des éléments mauvais de l’ancienne armée russe.

[74] Me TORRES. – Qui étaient sous leurs ordres.

Me WILM.³⁰ – Non, ils n’étaient pas sous leurs ordres.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Ils prétendent que Petlura avait même menacé et pris des sanctions sévères contre certains chefs auteurs de troubles et plus ou moins rebelles à son autorité, faisant même fusiller un certain Simiensko³¹ avant les événements, que vous connaissez bien, de Proskouroff?

R. – Non, un an et demi ou deux ans après, et pour une autre affaire.

D. – Après les événements de Proskouroff?

R. – C’était au commencement de 1918,³² et pour une autre affaire, Petlura a suivi les massacres de Masiensko³³ et était présent à un autre massacre. Pendant trois jours il a suivi les pogroms sans cesser. Les populations juives et chrétiennes sont venues lui demander grâce. Il n’a rien voulu savoir. Une dé-

28 Maître.

29 César Campinchi, attorney representing Oskar Petliura, the decedent’s brother, in a wrongful death action against Schwarzbard held concomitantly with the criminal trial.

30 Albert Wilm (also Willm, 1868–1944), journalist, socialist politician, and attorney representing Olha Petliura, the decedent’s widow, in her wrongful death action against Schwarzbard.

31 Ivan Semesenko. See above, Document 36, n. 34.

32 Most likely Schwarzbard meant to say 1919, or the stenographer may have misheard.

33 Probably Semesenko.

légation juive est venue lui demander, un jour, de faire cesser les pogroms. Il a répondu qu'il ne savait ce que faisait son armée. Mais il savait bien [75] que son armée était venue pour massacrer des innocents. Tout cela, il le tolérait. Il ne pouvait pas faire autrement. S'il avait interdit les pogroms, personne n'aurait marché. Ils ont marché seulement pour cela. Ce n'étaient pas des gens qui allaient attaquer en face des gens armés. Non, quand ils voyaient des gens armés, ils disparaissaient.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Ces mêmes témoins que je viens d'indiquer ont dit que, dans ses déplacements, Petlura avait, plusieurs fois, reçu des représentants de communautés juives venus le remercier de ce qu'il avait fait pour les juifs.

R. – De tous ses massacres, cela se peut.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Parmi vos coreligionnaires un certain nombre, Goldstein,³⁴ Tchedioblen,³⁵ Mlle Grimberg,³⁶ un nommé Moralyck,³⁷ ont considéré que Petlura avait été, en effet, l'organisateur, par lui-même et par ses sous-ordres, des massacres et des pogroms. Au contraire, Motzine, Siasberg,³⁸ Tranckine³⁹ professent une opinion plus libérale. Ils ne croient pas, eux, que Petlura ait organisé les pogroms. Ils ont même dit qu'il ne les avait pas voulus.

[-76-] Mais les a-t-il tolérés? Oui, pendant un certain temps, cinq à six mois, ne pouvant faire autrement. Après, il a réagi. Par des proclamations il les a interdits formellement et a pris les mesures les plus urgentes pour en empêcher le retour.

R. – C'est tout à fait ce qu'a fait Pilate. Lui, le gouverneur, le plus puissant, il a condamné le christ, et avec des moqueries, et s'en est ensuite lavé les mains.⁴⁰ Petlura, en cachette, donnait l'ordre de faire de la propagande antisémite car, au vingtième siècle, on ne peut faire publiquement ce qu'on faisait au seizième, au dix-septième et au dix-huitième siècles. Officiellement,

34 Most likely M. L. Goldstein.

35 Perhaps Eliyahu Tcherikower.

36 Haya Greenberg (also spelled Grimberg in several places in trial transcript); see Document 65.

37 Reference unclear.

38 Actually [Leo] Motzkin and [Genrikh] Sliosberg.

39 Perhaps Tiomkin.

40 Cf. Matthew 27:24.

devant le monde civilisé, il s'en défendait. C'était une physionomie hypocrite, un Janus. D'un côté il disait: il faut faire les pogroms; de l'autre, officiellement, il disait: il ne faut pas les faire. Mais il les a faits! Pendant les trois ans que Petlura régna sur l'Ukraine il y a eu des pogroms! Les massacres n'ont pas cessé tant qu'il n'a pas été chassé!

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Les traductions de journaux ukrainiens et les proclamations de Petlura montrent qu'il a condamné les pogroms et les massacres et était décidé [-77-] à lutter catégoriquement contre ces manifestations qu'il qualifiait d'infâmes et anti-gouvernementales. Dans un télégramme du 9 Juillet 1919 il a renouvelé sa réprobation des pogroms. Il a insisté sur la nécessité de les réprimer et d'en prévenir le retour. Il a affirmé que l'agitation en question émanait d'agitateurs bolcheviks.

R. – Vous avez la preuve, Monsieur le Président, que Petlura a fait cesser les massacres pendant sa présidence? Ce n'étaient pas les bolcheviks qui les provoquaient, c'était lui!

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Il a pris des mesures pour faire cesser les pogroms.

R. – Officiellement, pour le monde civilisé. Il a dit qu'il ne fallait pas les faire, oui. Mais en se cachant il donnait des ordres contraires. Les faits sont là! Les massacres n'ont pas cessé.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Il y a des témoins de nationalité ukrainienne qui demeuraient à l'étranger, notamment à Kanitz, ainsi qu'un officier français, le capitaine de Bayeux,⁴¹ qui ont émis des opinions favorables sur Petlura. Ils ont écrit qu'il ne voulait nullement des pogroms et les empêchait.

R. – Les faits sont tout à fait contraires.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Vous avez prétendu que vous aviez relevé dans les publications du « Trident » des projets de massacres. Or, le directeur de ce journal, Kossenko,⁴² a protesté contre ces allégations. Il a déclaré que le président n'avait jamais conseillé les pogroms?

41 References unclear.

42 Ilarion Kossenko (1888–1950), managing editor of *Tryzub*. Kossenko was deposed by examining magistrate Peyre on 29 June 1926. According to the transcript of his deposition, he stated: « Je proteste contre les allégation[s] de SCHWARTZ-BARD; jamais le journal « Le Trident » n'a annoncé ou conseillé les pogromes ... Je

R. – J'ai trouvé des petites annonces. Ce sont les mêmes qui étaient faites au dix-septième siècle. Ils ont produit une lettre de Russie, d'Ukraine, ou un Ukrainien écrit à son amie: maintenant, ce ne sont pas les popes, l'Eglise, qui nous dominent, ce sont les juifs.

Tous ces petits crochets antisémites, tout cela était fait pour monter les cerveaux ignorants, pour faire voir qu'en Ukraine c'étaient les juifs qui dominaient. Ils ont voulu utiliser les mêmes méthodes que les instigateurs des pogroms des dix-septième et dix-huitième siècles. Je l'ai trouvé, c'est certain, Monsieur le Président. Il ne le dira pas ici, évidemment, à Paris, devant un public civilisé. Il ne peut pas dire [-79-] ici: nous voulons faire des pogroms, nous allons en faire. Il veut jeter les crimes sur d'autres.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Au début de mon interrogatoire j'ai indiqué les condamnations que vous aviez subies à l'étranger.

Les pièces officielles qui sont communiquées suivant la loi à MM. les Jurés contiennent certains renseignements sur lesquels je tiens à vous interpellier afin que vous puissiez fournir vos explications.

En 1908, alors que vous étiez à Vienne, vous avez été condamné aux travaux-forcés pour vol par la juridiction pénale. Pourquoi?

R. – Je vais m'expliquer ...

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Expliquez-vous. C'était à l'étranger?

R. – C'était en 1905, au moment où le tsarisme était forcé de donner une constitution au peuple russe. A ce moment-là on a fait des massacres. Cela a toujours été le méthode des tsaristes et des réactionnaires. Ils ont toujours bouleversé, massacré les populations inoffensives [sic].

En 1905 donc, ils ont commencé les pogroms dans toute la Russie et, surtout en Ukraine. A Balta, je [-80-] finissais mon apprentissage d'hosloger [sic]. J'avais dix-szpt [sic] ou dix-huit ans. Ce fut un terrible pogrom. Toute la ville, tout le quartier juif de la ville, était vide. Il y eut beaucoup de victimes.

Après ce pogrom, mes parents étaient ruinés. Mon maître d'apprentissage avait été complètement pillé. On ne put rester en Ukraine. J'avais trouvé le moyen de passer la frontière autrichienne. Je suis venu à Cernovitz,⁴³ qui est maintenant en Roumanie. C'était, à ce moment-là, Boukovine. Je suis

soutiens d'autre part que les pogromes de l'Ukraine ont eu lieu sans avoir été ordonnés par Petliura ... » Confrontation Kossenko-Schwartzbard, 29 June 1926, YIVO, RG80/451/38071–38073.

43 Czernowitz.

venu à Cernovitz comme horloger et ai [sic] trouvé tout de suite du travail. Après, j'ai passé à Budapest, en Hongrie, qui était à ce moment-là sous la domination autrichienne également. J'ai travaillé là presque un an. Je suis passé ensuite dans une autre ville qui est maintenant tchéco-slovaque, Sangotha.⁴⁴ C'était plutôt un village mais il avait là une fabrique d'horlogerie et j'étais très calé pour le travail de fabrique. J'ai donc travaillé quelques mois dans ce pays. Mais, dans ce métier, il y a beaucoup de morte-saison. Je suis donc allé à Meiroum,⁴⁵ qui est maintenant tchéco-slovaque et était autrefois à l'Autriche. J'ai travaillé là jusqu'en mai 1908. Puis ce fut la fermeture des fabriques, la morte-saison. Je suis partisan, me disant: je veux passer à [-81-] Vienne; dans cette capitale, je trouverai facilement du travail. Je n'ai pas trouvé de travail à Vienne. Dans mon syndicat, j'ai rencontré beaucoup d'horlogers venus comme moi de toutes les provinces, sans travail eux aussi. Il y avait des Autrichiens, des Russes.

Nous avons décidé de faire ensemble, à pied, la route pour aller en Suisse, où l'on fait beaucoup d'horlogerie. C'était au mois de juin. Nous avons fait 38 kilomètres en un seul jour et sommes arrivés à Nalimbar.⁴⁶ Nous étions bien fatigués. Nous avons vu un grand établissement où se trouvait une enseigne indiquant qu'il s'agissait d'un asile de nuit pour les touristes édifié par Sa Majesté le roi François-Joseph; dont le nom était suivi de tous ses titres. Un vieil Autrichien nous dit que nous avions bonne chance de trouver là la soupe et le coucher. Nous ne pouvions rester dehors toute la nuit après avoir fait 38 kilomètres.

Nous avons demandé asile. La première chose que l'on nous demanda fut nos papiers. En Autriche, chaque ouvrier a un livre de travail où est indiqué son âge et mentionnés tous ses certificats de travail. Nous avons montré notre livre. On nous a demandé notre âge. Aucun de nous n'avait vingt ans. Nous étions tous mineurs. Nous ne savions pas les lois autrichiennes, [-82-] d'après lesquelles les mineurs n'ont pas le droit de circuler ainsi. On nous a mis deux mois dans un asile, mais dans un asile qui était un cachot. Nous étions trois

44 Reference unclear. In an autobiographical piece from 1928 Schwarzbard noted that between Czernowitz and Vienna he worked at a clockmaker's shop in a Moravian village whose name he rendered in Yiddish as Tsnoim (צנאײם). Shalom Schwarzbard, *Mayn viner legende* [My Vienna Legend], in: *Haynt*, 2 January 1928, 3. This place may be Znaim, today Znojmo, Czech Republic.

45 Probably Mähren (Moravia). Schwarzbard passed through this province on his way to Vienna.

46 Schwarzbard, *Mayn viner legende*, mentioned a place called Nalinbach (נאלינבאך), located 36 km. from Vienna, which he reached on the first day of his journey to Switzerland.

dans une petite chambre. Il y avait des poux, comme cela. Pas de linge! Personne ne s'occupait de nous.

Nous sommes restés sept semaines sans communiquer avec personne ...

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Mais ce n'est pas le vol.

R. – Je parle pour le col, Monsieur le Président. J'y viens.

Le gardien eut pitié de nous. Il nous dit que nous pouvions rester là des années si personne ne s'occupait de nous. Il faut, nous dit-il, que vous écriviez à quelqu'un de venir vous retirer. Autrement, vous y resterez tout le temps.

J'ai écrit à des amis de Budapest. J'avais dans cette ville des amis horlogers. Ils ont envoyé de l'argent, 72 francs, et on m'a relâché. Je suis revenu à Vienne, au mois d'août, sans travail. Je me suis présenté à la fabrique Kohen et Cie, pour avoir du travail. On me répondit: Pour le moment, les fabriques sont fermées. J'ai laissé mon livre de travail et mes outils, et je suis sorti. Je n'avais pas de domicile. [-83-] Là-bas, il y a comme un jardin. Je demandai aux gens comment trouver du travail et où aller manger. On m'emmena dans un restaurant, dans un café, prendre un bock. Après, on demanda le garçon de cagé [sic]; lui disant que je n'avais pas de domicile pour formir [sic]. Le garçon de café consentit à me laisser dormir dans l'établissement, me donna une clef pour ouvrir. Je suis resté toute la nuit. Le lendemain, on me trouva dan[s] l'établissement et on me demanda pourquoi j'y étais. Je racontai ce qui s'était passé. Mais comme je n'avais pas de domicile, on me prit pour un voleur. Et l'on m'a condamné, non pas comme voleur mais parce que je n'avais pas de domicile et parce qu'on a trouvé sur moi deux livres dont l'un d'un philosophe individualiste allemand⁴⁷ et l'autre, une petite brochure dont je ne me souviens plus de l'auteur ... Jean ...⁴⁸ Non, je ne sais plus. On m'a demandé: Vous êtes anarchiste? J'ai répondu: Oui. Et on m'a condamné à quatre mois de travaux forcés ...

M. le PRESIDENT. – Pourquoi avez-vous été interdit séjour?

47 Perhaps a reference to Max Stirner (born Johann Kaspar Schmidt, 1806–1856), widely regarded by anarchists as an intellectual forebear. Cf. Schwarzbard's mention below (Document 62, at n. 52) of "Max Tirmer," undoubtedly a transcriber's error for "Stirner."

48 Perhaps John Henry Mackay (1864–1933), Scottish-born German anarchist thinker, author of *Die Anarchisten* (1891), an account of the author's encounter with the philosophy of Stirner. A Yiddish translation appeared in 1908.

R. – Je suis allé ensuite à Budapest, où j’avais habité un an avant. On est venu me chercher sans motif et on m’a expulsé après m’avoir donné à un délai de quelques jours. On ne voulait pas de moi en Autriche-|-84-|Hongrie. A ce moment-là, c’était le même pays.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Au cours de l’instruction, estimant que vous n’étiez peut-être pas entièrement responsable, on vous a fait examiner par MM. les docteurs Marie, Truel et Claude, experts. Ces trois experts vous ont reconnu comme pleinement responsable de vos actes. Vous reconnaissez les faits. Vous vous êtes, suivant vos déclarations, constitué le vengeur de la race juive, imputant à Petlura d’être l’organisateur ou d’avoir laissé faire les pogroms dont ont été victimes vos amis israélites. Vous vous êtes mis longtemps à la recherche de Petlura et, dans des circonstances qui ont été précisées par l’interrogatoire, vous avez fini par trouver sa trace à Paris. Vous avez acheté un révolver [sic] et ayant enfin trouvé Petlura rue Racine, étant bien certain que c’était lui, froidement, comme dans un guet apens, vous l’avez abattu à coups de révolver. Lorsque vous avez été certain que c’était bien lui, que vous aviez tué, vous avez exprimé votre contentement. C’est bien cela?

R. – Oui, Monsieur le Président.

[...] ⁴⁹

|-92-| [Me CAMPINCHI. -] [...] Me [sic] Schwarzbard a pris, tout à l’heure, ses responsabilités avec un courage auquel il convient de rendre hommage. Il n’a pas essayé de mettre, comme l’on dit vulgairement, son drapeau dans la poche.

Il a peut-être essayé d’établir, – mais nous reviendrons là-dessus, – qu’il n’a pas tiré sur l’hatman [sic] Petlura quand celui-ci s’est écroulé dans le ruis-

49 Pp. 84–92 omitted. The presiding judge asked Torrès if he wished to clarify anything. Torrès raised the following points:

1. Neither Schwarzbard nor his defense counsel requested a medical examination; such an examination was ordered by the examining magistrate of his own accord. Schwarzbard has from the outset assumed full responsibility for his actions. Torrès sent the judge a note to that effect at the time the examining physicians were appointed. 2. Jabotinsky should not be named as a Jew who does not share Schwarzbard’s opinion concerning Petliura’s responsibility for the pogroms.

The presiding judge then asked Campinchi if he had anything to add. After speaking briefly about Jabotinsky’s position Campinchi took up the matter of Schwarzbard’s assumption of full responsibility, leading to the next series of questions.

seau, mais il a tiré cinq balles. Il a mimé la scène et, à deux reprises, eut un rire qui indiquait qu'il en était satisfaisant. Je m'incline.

Quand on lui a demandé s'il n'avait pas été con-|-93-|damné, il a répondu à M. le Juge d'instruction: Jamais. C'est déjà, au point de vue de la véracité de l'homme, quelque chose qui peut avoir quelque importance ...

(Schwarzbard fait un signe de dénégation)

M.e CAMPINCHI. – Non, permettez-! Défendez votre liberté ou votre vie, et croyez qu'il ne viendra de ma part aucune parole qui vous blessera inutilement. Mais je ne plaide pas pour l'instant. Vous répondrez.

Le juge d'instruction lui demande: N'avez-vous jamais été condamné? Il répond: Non.

Cependant, je trouve, cote 137, copie d'une lettre de la légation d'Autriche à Paris qui dit: Le 25 mai dernier l'ancien hetman Petlura a été assassiné par un nommé Schwarzbard. N'est-ce pas le même Schwarzbard qui a été condamné pour vol en Autriche-Hongrie?

Alors, M. le Président de poser la question: Avez-vous été condamné, Schwarzbard?

Il a mis vingt-cinq minutes à tourner autour de la question. Il a expliqué qu'il avait fait un jour une marche de près 40 kilomètres, était arrivé à la porte d'un asile aux armes de l'empereur d'Autriche, qu'il n'avait pas vingt ans et pas de papiers, |-94-| ce qui est bien singulier dans un pays où les nationalités se touchent, se confondent, dans un pays où il ne fait pas bon circuler sans avoir avec [avec] soi la loi et les prophètes, qu'il passe la nuit dans un restaurant après qu'on lui eut donné les clefs ...

Ce n'est pas cela?

SCHWARTZBARD. – Oui.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Ce document de la légation d'Autriche indique qu'il a été condamné exactement pour cambriolage effectué avec un complice inconnu le 18 août 1918 [1908].⁵⁰ Schwarzbard fut arrêté et condamné par la suite à quatre mois de travaux forcés.

Plusieurs questions.

Vous disiez tout à l'heure que vous n'avez pas 29 ans. Est-ce que je me trompe en disant que vous en aviez 22? Vous êtes né en 1886?

R. – Oui.

⁵⁰ Undoubtedly a stenographer's error.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Par conséquent, vous aviez 22 ans au moment du cambriolage.

D'autre part, si les autorités austro-hongroises vous ont arrêté, pourquoi avez-vous donné, puisque [-95-] vous n'étiez pas coupable, un autre nom que le vôtre?

Voulez-vous avoir l'obligeance de répondre?

Vous n'aviez-rien fait, dites [sic]-vous. On vous a demandé: Qui êtes-vous? Vous avez répondu: Je m'appelle Wesseimberger,⁵¹ ouvrier mécanicien, né en Galicie.

R. – En Russie, après les pogroms, je n'ai pu me procurer de papiers. Je suis parti sans papiers. Je suis né en 1886 mais mes papiers ont toujours porté 1888. Mes papiers français, depuis mon passage en Autriche, jusqu'à maintenant, tous portent 1888.

Me Campinchi dit: Vous avez donné un autre nom. C'est vrai. Quand on m'a pris dans le restaurant, je n'ai pas voulu dire mon vrai nom parce que je savais que, par la suite, si je me présentais dans une fabrique pour trouver du travail on ne voudrait pas de moi. On ne voudrait pas de quelqu'un qui a été arrêté. C'est pourquoi j'ai donné le nom de famille de ma mère au lieu du nom de mon père, et cela pour les journaux.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Puisque vous n'aviez rien fait, vous ne deviez pas redouter la publicité?

R. – Mais on me demandait tout cela ...

[-96-] Me CAMPINCHI. – N'insistons pas. Vous apprécierez, Messieurs. Le rapport dit encore:

« Il a été établi ... »

Et les faits devaient avoir une certaine importance pour que ce document ait été envoyé spontanément.

« ... qu'il entretenait pendant son séjour à

« Vienne des rapports suivis avec les milieux

« anarchistes ... »

Etes-vous ou n'êtes-vous pas anarchiste?

R. – Je suis anarchiste.

51 Probably a stenographer's error. Schwarzbard's mother was (Khaye) Vaysberger, a name Schwarzbard used according to his subsequent testimony.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Vous avez été arrêté un an après à Budapest pour atteindre à la sécurité de la propriété et frappé d’interdiction de séjour.

Pourquoi?

R. – Messieurs les Jurés, quand j’ai été arrêté, on a trouvé dans ma poche deux livres. L’un était d’un philosophe individualiste allemand, d’un philosophe anarchiste allemand, Max Tirmmer.⁵² Puisque vous avez ce livre-là, vous êtes anarchiste, m’a-t-on demandé. J’ai répondu oui. C’est pour cela qu’on m’a condamné, [-97-] pas pour le cambriolage mais seulement parce que j’avais dit que j’étais anarchiste. J’ai travaillé un an à Budapest; j’étais bien vu dans mon magasin. On m’a cependant condamné comme anarchiste et expulsé d’Autriche-Hongrie pour cela, après la condamnation.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Il résulte de vos explications que parce que vous vous êtes dit anarchiste et aviez sur vous un livre de Max Tirmmer, on vous a expulsé?

Tout cela prouve que l’on est plus content de se vanter d’être le vengeur de sa race que d’avouer que l’on a commis un acte qu’en langue bourgeoise et banale nous appelons: le vol!

Schwartzbard a déclaré qu’il avait, en 1919, fait partie de la mission française en Russie.⁵³ Je crois qu’il n’a pas fait partie de cette mission mais qu’il avait simplement demandé, en France, à être rapatrié avec quelques autres russes dans son pays d’origine. Il a été rapatrié sur un vaisseau qui s’appelle le Melbourne.⁵⁴ Peut-il s’expliquer sur la propagande qu’il a effectuée sur ce bâtiment et l’agitation qu’il a essayé d’y soulever?

R. – En 1914, je m’engageai dans l’armée française, tout simplement pour souffrir avec ces millions de martyrs déguisés en soldats ... Je suis révolutionnaire [-98-] et les souvenirs de la Révolution française me soulevaient bien fort. Je suis parti pour défendre la France quand elle était en danger, pour défendre les souvenirs de la Révolution, ceux qui sont restés de la Révolution française, contre le militarisme allemand.

En 1915, un colonel nommé Rosnobitch demanda les engagés russes pour les rapatrier. Je n’ai pas voulu être rapatrié. Je reste en France, dis-je, répétant avec le poète: Ingrate patrie, tu n’auras pas mes os.⁵⁵

52 Actually Max Stirner. See above, Document 62, n. 47.

53 See above, Introduction, n. 30.

54 Ibid. Schwarzbard’s disavowal of his earlier testimony to police interrogators follows.

55 Reference to Scipio Africanus (236–183 BCE), the Roman general who defeated Hannibal in the Second Punic War but subsequently left Rome following charges of corruption, who reputedly ordered that his tomb bear the inscription “Ingrata

J'ai été versé dans un régiment français. Je fus blessé, blessé gravement, et en 1919, j'ai été proposé pour la réforme.

A ce moment-là, la Russie, était sous le Gouvernement de Kerensky⁵⁶ qui demandait à tous les réfugiés, à tous les émigrés politiques de revenir en Russie et leur donnait toutes facilités pour cela.

J'étais, dis-je, proposé pour la réforme avec pension. J'attendais avec quelques camarades volontaires. On m'a dit que l'on rapatrierait les volontaires en Russie. J'ai laissé là la réforme et suis allé aux Invalides demander à aller défendre la Révolution russe. En 1917, la Russie était devenue ma patrie, la patrie de la Révolution. Je n'avais pas voulu défendre le tsarisme, mais j'allais défendre la Ré-|-99-|volution russe.

J'arrive au cas du Melbourne.

J'étais considéré comme volontaire, rapatrié en Russie comme tel. Ma femme n'avait pas le droit de venir avec moi. Mais ma femme ne voulait pas être séparée de moi, elle voulait partir avec moi.

En Russie, j'étais socialiste avant de devenir anarchiste. Le consul provisoire a donc donné à ma femme un passeport où il y avait: une femme d'émigrant politique russe. Avec ce passeport, ma femme avait le droit de rejoindre la Russie avec moi.

Ainsi, quand nous sommes venue sur le « Melbourne » on a lu sur notre passeport: une famille d'émigrants politiques. Chacun sait ce que cela voulait dire. Cela voulait dire: socialiste révolutionnaire anarchiste. C'est pour ce fait-là seulement, parce qu'il y avait sur le passeport de ma femme: émigrant politique, qu'on a dit que j'avais fait de la propagande.

Or, j'ai été malade pendant les dix-neuf jours de la traversée. C'était ma première traversée. J'ai été malade du premier jour an [sic] dernier. Je ne me suis pas levé de mon lit. Je n'ai ni mangé ni parlé. Je n'ai donc pu faire de la propagande. Voilà la vérité.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Je conclus d'abord que, contraire-|-100-|ment à ce que vous aviez déclaré, vous n'avez en aucune façon fait partie d'une mission française.

R. – Non.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Vous l'aviez déclaré, cependant.

patria, ne ossa quidem habebis" (Ungrateful fatherland, you will not have even my bones).

56 The Kerensky government left power in November 1917. Schwarzbard appears to have been confused regarding dates.

D'autre part, embarqué sur le « Melbourne », sous la conduite du lieutenant Charpentier qui allait en Russie comme membre d'une mission française destinée à renforcer, à encourager l'armée russe qui était alors sous le Gouvernement de Kerenski, vous avez fait sur le bateau une propagande que cet officier qualifiait de regrettable et contraire à celle qu'il faisait, lui.

Vous n'avez pas été incorporé dans l'armée rouge?

R. – Jamais.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Vous n'avez pas déclaré cela à l'instruction?

R. – Non.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Nous essaierons [sic] de retrouver cette déclaration dans les trois mille cotes du dossier.

Mais, vous n'auriez pas répugné à y être incorporé, puisque, d'une part, vous êtes anarchiste et que, [-101-] d'autre part, la Révolution est, avez-vous dit, votre patrie?

Répondez-moi nettement. Vous n'avez jamais été enrôlé dans l'armée rouge?

R. – Jamais.

Me TORRES. – Me Campinchi, qui est très exigeant et cherche à faire commettre à Schwartzbard, lequel prend pourtant à fond ses responsabilités ...

Me CAMPINCHI. – Pas toutes!

Me TORRES. – ... le péché par intention, dit: Vous n'auriez pas répugné à être incorporé dans l'armée rouge?

Je voudrais à ce propos préciser quelques points. J'ai peur que MM. les Jurés n'aient pas compris parce que Schwartzbard ne parle un français très clair.

Il explique que lorsqu'il est parti en Russie avec une mission française, sa femme avait un passeport d'émigrant politique. Quel était l'intérêt de ce passeport? Kerenski, président du Gouvernement provisoire russe, avait pris un décret aux termes duquel les femmes des émigrants politiques russes étaient rapatriées gratuitement en Russie.

Mme Schwartzbard était d'autant plus fondée à [-102- /120|] vouloir regagner la Russie avec un tel passeport qu'elle était femme d'un émigrant poli-

tique. Mais cette indication sur le passeport était peut-être de nature, malgré les brillants états de service de Schwartzbard sur le front français, à introduire certains préjugés dans l'esprit de certains officiers français autour de sa personne.

Ceci dit, je veux maintenant en ce qui concerne les incidents de Vienne et de Budapest, marquer nettement deux points:

D'abord, Schwartzbard n'a encouru à Budapest aucune condamnation. Il a été l'objet d'une mesure d'expulsion, c'est à dire d'une mesure administrative qui, dans notre pays notamment, suit automatiquement pour un étranger la condamnation et ne constitue pas contre cet étranger une circonstance aggravante supplémentaire. Cette mesure est la suite naturelle et logique de la condamnation. Si bien que si, pour un menu délit, un étranger est condamné à Paris à quatre mois de prison par un Tribunal correctionnel, il est automatiquement l'objet d'un arrêté d'expulsion de M. le Ministre de l'Intérieur.

[121] En ce qui concerne Vienne, je commence par vous expliquer dans quelles conditions les faits se sont passés.

J'ai tenu, pour ma part, et dès l'instruction, à ce qu'il s'expliquât. Ses explications se sont produites dès qu'est intervenue, dans ce dossier, une lettre de la Légation d'Autriche, qui signalait d'autant plus volontiers que Schwartzbard avait eu cet incident à Vienne que la Légation d'Autriche était peut-être comptable de quelque reconnaissance à l'égard de l'hetman Petlura et de ses amis pour cette double raison qu'elle ne pouvait pas oublier que Petlura était entré autrefois dans Kiev à la tête des armées austro-hongroises et que, pendant que Schwartzbard était sur le front français, des lieutenants et des émissaires de Petlura recrutaient dans les camps de prisonniers austro-allemands, des volontaires contre la Russie, sous la protection des autorités autrichiennes. Il était donc normal que l'Autriche témoignât quelque gratitude à la mémoire de M. Petlura et à ses amis.

Eh bien, lorsque cette déclaration a été produite au dossier, j'ai tenu, pour ma part, – parce [122] que c'était le sentiment de Schwartzbard, à ce que Schwartzbard [sic] s'expliquât. Mais j'ai le droit de dire que si nous l'avions voulu, si nous n'avions pas eu le souci d'un débat loyal, il n'appartenait à personne ici de faire état de cette légère condamnation de Schwartzbard, parce qu'elle est effacée par la loi d'amnistie ...

[...] ⁵⁷

[126] [Me CAMPINCHI. –] [...] Je finis sur une autre question, si vous le voulez bien, Monsieur le Président:

57 Sparring between Torrès and Campinchi (pp. 122–126) omitted.

Schwartzbard, lorsque vous êtes revenu en Russie, vous n'avez jamais été incorporé dans l'Armée.

SCHWARTZBARD. – Mais non.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Jamais?

R. – Non.

D. – Pourquoi avez-vous déclaré, « en Septembre 1917 [...]»⁵⁸ j'ai été incorporé dans l'Armée russe. [»] (Cote 226).

R. – Ah! pardon ... Quand nous sommes arrivés, en août 1917, j'étais un soldat parce que je suis venu comme volontaire. L'autorité française nous [127] donnait à l'autorité russe. C'était le Gouvernement provisoire Kerensky, tout de suite on nous incorporait dans l'armée russe. Seulement, à moi et à quelques-uns encore, on donnait une longue convalescence tout de suite, c'était au mois de septembre.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Je viens de vous le dire.

SCHWARTZBARD. – Nous avons été incorporés dans l'armée russe. Seulement, on ne peut pas prendre tout de suite un homme blessé qui avait le bras comme cela ... On m'a donné une convalescence pendant longtemps.

Je suis parti de Petrograd à Odessa, en Ukraine, et je suis resté deux mois. Les Bolcheviks sont venus. Le Gouvernement a été renversé et on ne peut pas venir à Petrograd, parce que l'Ukraine s'est détachée de la Russie. J'y suis resté et voilà. C'est cela, parfaitement.

[...]»⁵⁹

58 Brief exchange between Campinchi and Wilm omitted, in which Campinchi indicated to the jury that Wilm had located and handed him the page from which he wished to read.

59 Exchanges between attorneys regarding Campinchi's interrogation of Schwarzbard's activities in 1917 omitted.

Document 63

Trial testimony of Jan Tokary Tokarzewski-Karaszewicz

Paris, 19 October 1927

Typewritten transcript, pp. 127–150 (6), complete

Language: French

YIVO, RG8/487/39688–39716

[127] DEPOSITION DE M. LE PRINCE DE TOKARY

-:-

(M. le Prince de Tokary Tokarzewski Karaszewicz est introduit et prête serment.)

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Veuillez vous tourner vers MM. les Jurés et dites ce que vous savez au sujet de cette affaire.

M. de TOKARY. – Je suis venu pour vous dire, Messieurs, ce que je sais de la personne du défunt avec lequel j'étais lié par mes fonctions auxquelles j'ai été appelé par sa confiance.

Tout d'abord, travaillant sous sa direction, puisque c'est à moi qu'il a confié pendant deux ans la direction de notre politique étrangère, je peux vous dire quelles étaient ses opinions et quelles directives j'ai toujours obtenues de lui.

Je sais que ses sympathies, qui n'ont jamais changé, étaient pour les alliés et pour la France. C'est guidé par cette sympathie qu'il est venu profiter de l'asile de la France à Paris, en octobre 1924. C'est alors que, ayant aussi quitté mes [128] fonctions, je suis venu à Paris et c'est ici que nous nous sommes rencontrés.

Depuis octobre 1924 jusqu'au jour du drame et de sa mort, nous avons habité la même maison, nous avons habité ensemble. Nous nous sommes vus tous les jours. L'émotion m'étreint encore quand je pense à la perte de cet ami et de ce chef que j'ai vénéré.

Que puis-je vous dire? Je sais, par les voix de la presse, que l'assassin veut se disculper en jetant sur lui la calomnie qu'il avait soi-disant ordonné ou toléré les pogroms. Je sais, au contraire, ayant été membre de notre gouvernement, je peux l'affirmer, qu'il protégeait toutes les minorités nationales en Ukraine, quand il était à la tête de l'Etat. Nous l'avons toujours, même en exil, considéré comme le chef de notre état, jusqu'au dernier jour de sa vie.

A Paris, ayant vu sa vie, je peux affirmer que cet homme intègre a gardé toute la simplicité dans sa vie quotidienne. Il habitait un petit hôtel de la

rive gauche alors qu'on veut le représenter comme un dictateur qui aurait pu profiter [129] pour lui-même et pour sa famille d'avoir détenu le pouvoir dans un pays de quarante millions d'habitants. Au contraire, il a vécu dans la pauvreté. Et, malgré ses petits moyens, il nous est toujours venu en aide lorsque chacun le lui a demandé.

Sa figure noble, son esprit pur, ces qualités morales resteront pour nous toujours indiscutables. Je le dis non seulement au nom des ses amis et collaborateurs, mais au nom même de mes amis politiques qui, parfois, lui reprochaient bien des choses. Nous n'étions pas toujours d'accord avec sa politique puisque, personnellement, j'appartiens au groupe conservateur ukrainien, au groupe monarchiste même. Nous lui reprochions diverses choses, dis-je mais nous nous inclinions devant lui non seulement comme chef de notre état mais aussi comme l'homme le plus vénéré que nous ayons parmi nous. Son intégrité, son patriotisme, sa valeur morale nous faisaient voir en lui le vrai chef de la nation.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Vous avez terminé, Monsieur?

R. – Oui, Monsieur le Président.

[130] Me ALBERT WILM. – J'ai une question à poser à M. de Tokary.

M. de Tokary peut-il exposer au jury quels étaient exactement les pouvoirs de Petlura. On a prétendu à un moment donné qu'il était dictateur. N'avait-il pas à côté de lui un gouvernement? N'a-t-il pas été à un moment donné chef de l'armée mais ayant à coté de lui des ministres responsables?

M. de TOKARY. – Simon Petlura ne fut jamais dictateur. Nous avons une constitution et un ministère responsable. Ce ministère changeait souvent. Il y eut des cabinets entièrement socialistes. Vous verrez, du reste, d'anciens Présidents du conseil passer devant vous. Il y avait des gouvernements modérés. L'un des derniers gouvernements, le cabinet Levizky,⁶⁰ dont j'ai fait partie en qualité de sous-secrétaire d'Etat et de ministre intérimaire des affaires étrangères, était un cabinet de coalition.

Simon Petlura était chef suprême de l'armée, comme tous les Présidents de la République. Mais il y avait toujours à coté de lui ou bien un commandant d'armée ou, et même en tout cas, un ministre [131] des affaires militaires responsable.

60 Andrii Livytskyi.

Me ALBERT WILM. – On a prétendu que l'ataman Petlura n'avait jamais été choisi par les Ukrainiens et n'avait jamais été l'objet de manifestations de sympathie, de confiance, qu'il ne représentait rien en Ukraine. Voulez-vous dire à MM. les Jurés quelle impression a laissé en Ukraine l'assassinat dans les conditions lâches que vous connaissez de l'ataman Petlura?

M. de TOKARY. – C'était une impression ... enfin tous ceux qui ont connu Petlura, qui savaient ce qu'il était pour l'Ukraine, ont été indignés, évidemment. Ce fut un effroi qui traversa toute la nation. Je le sais par des lettres reçues personnellement.

A la question qui m'a été posée: Est-il vrai qu'il n'ait jamais été élu, je réponds: au contraire. Tout d'abord, quand le directoire s'est formé, en 1918, c'était évidemment un directoire révolutionnaire, un directoire qui organisait la lutte, mais ses pouvoirs ont été confirmés par un parlement provisoire, par le congrès travailliste qui fut convoqué à Kiew en 1919.

[132] Quand est-il devenu président du directoire et, par conséquent, chef de l'Etat? Ce ne fut qu'après la retraite du premier président du directoire. Ses collègues, les autres membres du directoire, l'ont alors élu. Et le gouvernement de ce moment l'a confirmé à raison de son attitude et de la façon dont ses collègues lui avaient remis ses pouvoirs.

Me HENRY TORRES. – J'ai deux observations à faire après la déposition de M. de Tokary.

Il entend bien que je ne veux pas, pour le moment, ouvrir une controverse sur les lois constitutionnelles ukrainiennes. Mais il faut retenir de la déposition du témoin, deux points. Premièrement, Petlura était président du directoire, c'est à dire chef de l'Etat, ainsi que vous l'avez dit vous-même tout à l'heure, n'est-ce-pas? ...

Je vous demande, Monsieur le Président, de poser la question au témoin.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Vous avez entendu, Monsieur, la question de Me TORRES. Voulez-vous y répondre? Petlura était-il chef du pouvoir?

[133] M. de TOKARY. – Oui, puisque le pouvoir suorême [sic], en Ukraine, était confié à un directoire de cinq puis de quatre membres dont Simon Petlura était le Président. A partir du mois de novembre 1919, ses collègues les autres membres du directoire lui ont remis tous leurs pouvoirs et se sont retirés à l'étranger. Par conséquent, à partir de 1919, du mois de Novembre, Simon Petlura est resté seul chef de l'Etat.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Il a été seul chef de l'Etat après avoir été d'abord chef de l'Etat comme président du directoire, en compagnie d'autres directeurs. C'est un premier point. Et vous le qualifiez vous-même de chef d'Etat. Vous ajoutez même qu'il est resté à un moment donné seul comme chef de l'Etat. C'est un deuxième point que j'aborde maintenant: Est-ce que Petlura n'était pas en même temps une sorte de commandant en chef de toutes les forces ukrainiennes?..

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Répondez.

M. de TOKARY. – Il était chef de toutes les forces ukrainiennes comme chef d'Etat. [134] Il a exercé le commandement par lui-même seulement du mois de juin 1919 jusqu'au mois de novembre de la même année. Autrement, dans le commandement effectif de l'armée: il était toujours remplacé par un chef d'armée.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Assisté par un chef d'armée, plutôt. Car il était ataman général. Il avait été ministre de la guerre et il s'était nommé déjà à ce moment-là ataman général. Ensuite, devenu président du directoire, en compagnie d'autres directeurs jusqu'au jour où il restera tout seul, il était en même temps ataman général des armées ukrainiennes. C'est bien cela?

M. de TOKARY. – Ataman général, cela répond au plus haut grade de l'armée et signifie en même temps qu'il était le chef suprême. Mais, Messieurs les Jurés, permettez-moi de dire: comme M. Doumergue⁶¹ est le chef des armées françaises.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Ce n'est pas exact, d'ailleurs.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Ou le ministre de la guerre.

[135] Me HENRY TORRES. – Ce n'est pas plus exact pour le ministre de la guerre. Il y a un ataman général qui s'appelle généralissime. C'est exactement la grade de Petlura, avec cette différence que Petlura était un général qui, comme dans certaines républiques sud-américaines, n'avait, auparavant, jamais servi dans l'armée.

61 Gaston Doumergue (1863–1937), president of France, 1924–1931. The comparison of his position to that of Petliura as “ataman général” is misleading. The presidency of the Third French Republic was mainly a ceremonial office. Responsibility for the military rested with the Minister of War (at the time Paul Painlevé).

Je demande également au témoin si lui-même n'a pas été conseiller d'ambassade à Vienne, sous le gouvernement de Skoropatzki;⁶² protégé par l'Allemagne?

M. de TOKARY. – Oui. J'ai même été ensuite chargé d'affaires.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Je m'excuse alors de vous avoir rétrogradé.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Comme suite à cette question, j'en pose une autre. Nous sommes sur un pied, si je peux parler de cette façon triviale. M. le Prince de Tokary habite la France. Ses sentiments à l'égard de la France ne peuvent pas être plus discutés que ceux de l'ataman Petlura et de ses directeurs; nous [136] avons à cet égard des certitudes militaires très hautes ...

Me HENRY TORRES. – Ce que je sais c'est une vérité de fait très nette; c'est que l'ataman général Petlura, qui venait de se nommer lui-même général, est entré lui-même à Kiew à la tête des armées austro-allemandes.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Ce n'est pas vrai!

Me ALBERT WILM. – Cela est tout à fait inexact: C'est de la fable.

Me CAMPINCHI. – C'est de l'improvisation.

Mais en ce qui concerne le prince Tokary, le fait qu'il ait été chargé d'affaires à Vienne, est-ce une chose personnelle contre lui?

Me HENRY TORRES. – Non, c'est une chose qui m'intéresse. De même qu'il m'intéresse de savoir du témoin quelles étaient, de manière précise, les fonctions de Petlura. Sur ce point il a répondu. J'ai eu satisfaction.

J'ajoute deux questions. Et, voyez, ce sont les vôtres qui m'ont provoqué. Je me refusais à [137] intervenir dans le droit constitutionnel ukrainien mais je constate qu'il n'a jamais été nommé président du directoire, l'ataman Petlura.

Vous parliez tout à l'heure de M. Doumergue, qui n'est d'ailleurs pas généralissime des armées françaises ...

Me CAMPINCHI. – Constitutionnellement, il est le chef des armées françaises.

62 Pavlo Skoropadskyi; see above, Introduction, n. 65.

Me HENRY TORRES. – M. Doumergue a été élu à l'assemblée de Versailles dans des conditions régulières. Est-ce que Petlura a été élu comme Vinitchenko,⁶³ qui a donné ensuite sa démission de président du directoire? Ou n'est-ce pas plutôt lui-même qui s'est imposé comme président du directoire? Est-ce que, d'autre part, sous le directoire de Petlura, il y avait un parlement devant lequel son gouvernement était responsable et pouvait décharger une partie de ses propres responsabilités?

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Vous avez entendu, Monsieur. Répondez.

M. de TOKARY. – Oui.

[138] Me CAMPINCHI. – Ce sont des questions un peu longues. Tâchez de serrer ...

M. de TOKARY. – Le Président Petlura a été élu Président de directoire par ses collègues. C'est un fait fixé par la décision de ses collègues et, de plus, approuvé et exécuté par le gouvernement qui était alors au pouvoir.

A la question: Y avait-il un parlement devant lequel le gouvernement était responsable: je réponds qu'il y avait l'exécutif du congrès travailliste qui était resté; et que le congrès s'étant dissous avait décidé de convoquer des conseils. Le dernier de ces conseils fut le conseil de la République, convoqué encore en Ukraine et qui s'est assemblé en Pologne déjà en 1921. Alors, le Président du directoire le gouvernement et le commandement de l'armée se sont rendus, sous la poussée soviétique, en Pologne, à Tarnof.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Est-ce qu'au moment des pogroms de Gitomir et de Proskoureff — je ne cite parmi les cent cinquante localités dévastées par les pogroms que deux deux [sic] pogroms dont on vous parlera [139] Messieurs les Jurés, parce qu'ils sont parmi les plus caractéristiques et les plus affreux — est-ce qu'au moment des pogroms de Gitomir et de Proskoureff le général Petlura était président du directoire de l'Ukraine?

M. de TOKARY. – Je voudrais bien que l'on citât la date des pogroms auxquels on pense puisque le président Petlura a été président du directoire au mois de mai 1919.

63 Volodymyr Vynnychenko; see above, Introduction, n. 68.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Je crois que c'est en février.⁶⁴

Me HENRY TORRES. – Le premier pogrom de Proskouroff.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Et l'autre?

Me HENRY TORRES. – Je vais vous donner la date tout de suite.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Nous faisons notre instruction avec vous.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Ah! Eh bien! Ce cahier volumineux qui est devant moi, Messieurs les Jurés, et qui a l'air d'un rapport ou d'un mémoire, c'est [140] tout simplement un tableau, un tableau des pogroms sans commentaire: lieu, gouvernement, date, nombre des blessés, des violées, remarques. Ce tableau qui n'est qu'une simple énumération, j'en signale à MM. les Jurés l'ampleur et l'épaisseur!

Me CAMPINCHI. – Et voilà un bouquin, Messieurs les Jurés, qui contient les proclamations de Petlura et de son gouvernement contre les pogroms. Il a 300 pages!

Me ALBERT WILM. – Qui a fait ce rapport?

Me HENRY TORRES. – Nous l'avons établi sur les documents, sur les commissions d'enquête qui sont dans notre dossier, sur les témoignages d'un homme que vous connaissez bien, M. Vinitchenko, par exemple, qui a été Président du directoire de l'Ukraine avant Petlura. Nous l'avons établi aussi avec d'autres témoignages, avec ceux des victimes, des rescapés, des survivants, avec les témoignages de tous ceux que nous aurions pu faire venir ici: pères, mères, vieillards, enfants.

Je pose alors tout naturellement cette question au témoin: Oui, ou non, Petlura était-il le chef de [141] l'Etat?

Me CAMPINCHI. – A quelle époque?

Me HENRY TORRES. – A quelle époque Petlura était-il le chef de l'Etat?

M. de TOKARY. – A partir du 9 Mai 1919.

64 The pogrom in Proskurov took place 15–18 February 1919. See above, Document 20, n. 30; Document 27, n. 8; Document 36, n. 34.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Est-ce que, dès la constitution du directoire, c'est à dire après que M. Skoropatzki, dont vous étiez le chargé d'affaires à Vienne, eut quitté l'Ukraine, avec les troupes allemandes qui étaient elles-mêmes obligées de l'évacuer est-ce que, dès cette époque, Petlura était ataman général des armées ukrainiennes?

M. de TOKARY. – Vous me permettrez d'abord une rectification. J'ai été chargé d'affaires à Vienne au mois de mai 1919 et au mois de juin 1919, du temps que Mgr l'hetman Skoropatzki n'était plus chef de l'Etat. J'ai été nommé conseiller à Vienne, en 1918, c'est vrai ...

Me HENRY TORRES. – C'est ce que je vous avais demandé, d'ailleurs.

[142] M. de TOKARY. – Oui, je le répète.

... et j'ai présenté ma démission en novembre 1918 ne pouvant me rallier à la nouvelle politique de l'hetman Skoropatzki. Je me suis retiré et j'ai été renommé conseiller de légation à Vienne en janvier 1919 par Petlura et par le directoire à la tête duquel se trouvait Vinitchenko. J'ai été chargé d'affaires à Vienne, je le répète, en mai et en Juin 1919.

Encore une fois, sur la question du grade d'ataman général et de généralissime, je répète que c'est le plus haut grade de l'armée en premier lieu et, deuxièmement, que le commandement effectif de l'armée est exercé par l'entremise d'un général ou d'un commandant en chef. L'ataman général, quoique membre du directoire, était simplement le chef honoraire de l'armée et le commandement effectif de l'armée n'était assumé par le Président Petlura qu'en juin ou en Juillet — je ne me rappelle pas exactement parce qu'à ce moment j'étais déjà à Rome ou à Constantinople. Et il l'a gardé jusqu'en novembre 1919 seulement.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Alors, en Juin ou Juillet 1919 jusqu'en Novembre 1919 le général Petlura, Président du Directoire, exerce en même temps les [sic] [143] commandement direct de l'armée et, par conséquent, tous les pogroms commis pendant cette période tombent directement sous sa responsabilité.

Me CAMPINCHI. – C'est un peu facile!

Me HENRY TORRES. – Mais auparavant, lorsque le général Petlura, membre du directoire et ataman général, exerçait, comme vous avez dit, le commandement par l'intérim d'un général et n'était, comme vous l'avez dit, que le chef honoraire de l'armée, ne pensez-vous pas que Petlura ne porte

pas moins la responsabilité des pogroms qui ont été commis pendant cette période alors que le chef réel de l'armée était quand même sous ses ordres et, par conséquent, sous sa responsabilité?

M. de TOKARY. – S'il s'agit de sa responsabilité, moi, qui étais à Vienne, et ensuite à Rome et à Constantinople, je l'assume aussi. Je suis de cet avis que nous étions sous ses ordres, nous avons tâché de les exécuter fidèlement.

Mais il y a autre chose. Un ordre est exécuté. Or, ses ordres, ce sont ses proclamations, ses directives, et la force avec laquelle il luttait [144] contre les pogroms. Ceci a été exécuté, dans la mesure des possibilités du pouvoir.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Vous dites que le général Petlura était responsable mais que sa responsabilité s'affirmait dans ses proclamations?

Me CAMPINCHI. – Oui, nous acceptons cela.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Alors le général Petlura général en fait ou général en droit, n'est pas responsable des pogroms commis sous sa direction s'il n'y a pas eu de proclamation ou il exorte formellement ses troupes à commettre des massacres? C'est la thèse du témoin.

Me CAMPINCHI. – C'est à moi que vous vous adressez? Je vais vous répondre tout de suite. Vous permettez, Monsieur? Je me substitue à vous quoique vous connaissiez mieux la question que moi mais vous m'avez un peu inspiré ce que je vais dire.

Vous défendez un homme qui a tué, Maitre Torrès. Cet homme prétend que Petlura est responsable jusqu'au sang des pogroms qui se sont produits en Ukraine. Vous allez entendre, Messieurs les Jurés, trente témoins et soixante lectures qui vous [145] démontreront que Petlura était en effet président du directoire puis, concurremment ou postérieurement, ataman en chef, que sa responsabilité pouvait être celle d'un chef d'armée qui commande sur un territoire plusieurs fois grand comme la France où l'état des routes est impossible et le système ferroviaire complètement démoli.

Si, Maitre Torrès – je pose hypothétiquement la question mais je suis bien sur [sic] que vous répondrez affirmativement – vous plaidez l'acquittement parce que Petlura était responsable des pogroms personnellement, jusqu'au crime ou jusqu'au martyr selon le côté de la barricade où l'on se trouve, j'attends votre démonstration curieusement.

Petlura, commandant en chef, président de la République si vous le voulez et généralissime agissant sur le monde ukrainien, sur les partis ukrainiens

sur l'armée ukrainienne dont une très grosse parties [sic] échappait à son influence, je vous le présente par des documents incontestables, par des documents de lui, mille fois répétés, s'adressant aux nationalités juives, ayant des relations cordiales avec les Juifs d'Ukraine, réservant des remerciements [146] des organismes juifs, envoyant des proclamations aux troupes, des adjurations aux cosaques, notamment à ceux de Don particulièrement féroces. Je résume sur ce point ma discussion que Me Torrès voudra bien écouter aussi: responsabilité sur un vaste territoire, chaque fois que Petlura a eu à s'occuper de la question des pogroms ce fut pour la flétrir. Il y a des expressions de lui, de sa plume, où il dit que le pogrom est un mouvement abject. Voilà Petlura agissant!

Mais si vous voulez dire qu'il a la responsabilité nominale, parce qu'il était chef, comme un ministre qui vient au Parlement où l'on parle de la faute d'un expéditionnaire et qui dit: je la couvre parce qu'il est de mon administration; dans cette limite, en effet, Petlura avait des responsabilités. Mais de là à le rendre responsable dans sa chair, dans sa vie, jusqu'au crime! Il y a une marge et votre client l'a un peu aisément franchie.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Pas de responsabilité devant le Parlement, Maître Campinchi, pour cette raison élémentaire qu'il n'y avait pas de Parlement, ce qui ajoute encore à la responsabilité de ce chef [147] non seulement chef d'Etat mais commandant de l'armée et qui exerçait sur l'armée un prestige formidable.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Oui.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Il a écrit quelques proclamations tardives ...

Me CAMPINCHI. – Non!

Me HENRY TORRES. – ... et posthumes dans lesquelles il regrettait [sic] les massacres. Mais, sur quelque territoire que l'on commande, lorsqu'on est chef de l'Etat, lorsqu'on est à la tête non pas d'une bande de pillards ou d'assassins mais d'une véritable armée, l'action contre les pogroms, comment s'exerce-t-elle, et comment l'a-t-il exercée? Par la sanction immédiate? Qu'est-ce que le pogrom? C'est l'assassinat. Il n'y a même pas besoin de recourir au code de justice militaire, il n'y a qu'à prendre le code de droit commun. C'est l'assassinat le plus abject, le plus lâche parce qu'il est exercé sur des vieillards, sur des hommes désarmés, sur des femmes et des enfants. On arrivera avec un conseil [148] de guerre impiotoyable [sic] qui prononcera les terribles sanctions qui arrêteront les bras des assassins du lendemain en châtiant les assassins de la veille.

Or, il n'est pas un chef de gouvernement qui ait eu à cette époque l'autorité de fait qu'exerçait Petlura parce qu'il était à la fois Président du directoire et ataman général de l'armée, parce qu'il incarnait pour ses troupes et ses cosaques l'autorité, parce qu'il était le chef absolu, parce qu'il n'avait même pas un Parlement pour partager avec lui les responsabilités ou pour les reprendre à son compte.

La défense di [sic] tout de suite, au risque d'allonger ces débats mais parce que, lorsque cette démonstration aura été faite elle n'aura même plus besoin de se faire entendre, que si, dans quelques proclamations le général Petlura a exprimé devant le monde civilisé l'horreur que pouvaient lui inspirer les pogroms, il n'a pas châtié les assassins, que comme à Proskoureff il est venu en plein pogrom ainsi qu'à Gitomir au moment du second pogrom, que les pogroms ne se sont pas arrêtés, que les assassins qui les commettaient n'ont pas été punis, n'ont pas [149] été fusillé au coin des rues par l'autorité militaire!

J'ai connu la loi dure et implacable de la guerre et mon cœur de soldat en a souffert. J'ai vu pour certaines violences, pour de petits pillages anodins des soldats de notre armée que la sanction impitoyable de notre commandement frappait de mort.

Mais en Ukraine il ne s'agissait pas de petits chapardages ou de petits délits correctionnels que les circonstances de la guerre transforment en crimes dans le code de justice militaire. Il s'agissait de l'assassinat le plus barbare, le plus lâche!

Je vous pose la question, a vous qui venez ici chargés de vos proclamations. Je vous demande: où sont vos sanctions, où sont les conseils de guerre justiciers qui ont suivi sur le champ?

On nous répondra: C'est Semesenko⁶⁵ le responsable des pogroms de Proskoureff ... Je m'excuse de me passionner lorsque je prononce le nom de cet assassin. L'ataman Semesenko n'a pas été l'objet de sanctions immédiates. Il a été arrêté et fusillé un an et demi après ce pogrom qui a fait des milliers [150] de victimes mais pour d'autres ### crimes que ceux-là..

Me CAMPINCHI. – Je voudrais un peu moins d'émotion et un peu plus de certitude, Maître Torrès! Vous avez ici une démonstration à faire. Je comprends votre émotion. Tout le monde comprend que même un avocat lorsqu'il plaide peut créer une atmosphère émotive. Nous allons l'entendre à plusieurs reprises pendant ces quinze jours d'audience au sujet des pogroms. Je ne défends pas les pogroms, ce serait trop commode. Mais il y a trop de choses dans vos interventions. Vous mêlez les territoires, les hommes, les constitutions, les responsabilités et les victimes. J'ai l'habitude de dissocier les

65 See above, Document 36, n. 34.

idées et selon moi l'idée n° 1 ne doit pas nécessairement être développée en même temps que l'idée n° 1 bis.

Petliouora [sic] est responsable des pogroms, dites-vous. Mais il faudrait d'abord poser cette question: avez-vous, vous, citoyen français, à juger la politique et les agissements d'un gouvernement situé à quelques centaines, à quelques milliers de kilomètres? Charger un jury français, en quinze jours, par des couplets alternés de la défense et de la partie civile |150 |bis| de juger la politique ukrainienne de 1917 à 1921 – cela ressemble assez à une dérision. Car on ne peut rechercher la vérité sur ce point par des accusations d'un côté et des répliques de l'autre. Ce n'est pas là une atmosphère de justice.

L'assassin prétend qu'en assassinant Petlura, il a entendu abattre l'homme qui était responsable personnellement des pogroms qui se sont produits en Ukraine. Ainsi la question n'est qu'amo[r]cée. Vous verrez, Messieurs les Jurés, qu'il y a eu [d]es pogroms en Ukraine, comme en Russie, un peu à toutes les époques, qu'il y en aura peut être encore pendant des années après ces débats et que, notamment, en Ukraine il y a eu des pogroms bolchevistes, des pogroms de Denikine, de Mackno⁶⁶ ...

Me HENRY TORRES. – C'est certain.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Ne m'approuvez pas de façon si bruyante: cela couvre ma voix. Je n'aime pas que vous m'embrassiez de trop près: j'ai peur que vous m'étouffiez.

Il y a eu en Ukraine des pogroms anarchistes de Gregorieff,⁶⁷ un de vos coreligionnaires, et plusieurs autres.

|150 ter| En un mot, chacun a fait des pogroms. Il semble que les malheureux juifs d'Ukraine aient été des proies toutes désignées pour toutes les armées en déroute et n'obéissant plus à aucune discipline, à aucun chef, de Kiew ou d'ailleurs. Cette ville a été prise et reprise une quinzaine de fois ... dix-sept fois me dit Me Albert Wilm qui a l'amour de la précision. Aujourd'hui les troupes de Petlura, demain les troupes de Denikine, après-demain celles de Mackno et de tous les autres qui, n'ayant pas de ravitaillement régulier, tombent sur ceux qui, à raison de leurs habitudes commerciales ou de leurs habitudes tout court sont censés avoir la plus grosse partie de la fortune du pays.

Voilà les raisons générales. Mais ce que vous devez faire, Maître Torrès, ce en quoi votre client doit vous aider, ce qui n'est pas indigne de votre talent mais ce qui serait difficile à votre talent, c'est de me montrer que l'attitude de

66 Nestor Makhno; see above, Introduction, n. 72.

67 Matvii Hryhoriiv; see above, Introduction, n. 71.

Petlura ait été une attitude équivoque ou non équivoque, que quand il s'est agi de pogroms cet homme qu'on a assassiné comme victime expiatoire de tous les pogroms d'Ukraine à quelque époque qu'ils se soient produits [150 quater] cet homme a toujours eu une attitude conciliante. Je vous ouvrirai ce livre que je présume que vous ne connaissez pas encore. Vous y verrez deux cents pages de proclamations de Petlura en termes fervents, ardents, pressants, disant: moi, ataman en chef, sous ma responsabilité et devant assurer l'ordre, j'interdis, cosaques de Zaporoff, citoyens de l'Ukraine qui pouvez être trompés, égarés par les haines politiques, j'interdis les pogroms. Il y a même dans une proclamation: que pas un cheveu ne tombe d'une tête juive innocente!

Voilà ce qu'était Petlura.

Encore une fois, nous n'en sommes encore aujourd'hui qu'à la préface, mais la charge est à l'accusation. C'est l'accusation qui doit démontrer que Petlura était un de ceux qui fautaient les pogroms. Vous verrez ici, à chaque moment, le contraire. Vous verrez qu'à chaque moment il a pris la plume pour s'élever contre les pogroms.

Vous trouverez aussi dans un livre que je vous ferai passer au cours des débats, une rubrique: instructions, proclamations de l'ataman en chef Petlura concernant l'affaire des pogroms, numéro 3: [150 quinquès] sentence des juges et condamnations en cas de pogroms.

Ce qui est singulier c'est qu'en Ukraine un seul homme se soit élevé avec ses amis politiques contre les pogroms et c'est lui qui est tombé sous les balles de l'assassin.

M. le prince de Tokary ne vous fait pas l'effet d'un assassin? M. le professeur Djordine, professeur d'histoire, vous le jugerez lui aussi sur sa mine. Vous verrez que c'est un honnête homme lui aussi. Avec lui vous pourrez juger la question des pogroms qu'il connaît mieux que vous et moi, Maître Torrès.

De l'autre côté, que voyons-nous? L'auteur de « Quand Israel meurt » a certes beaucoup de talent, mais c'est tout. A l'enquête romancée dûe à M. Bernard Lecache, nous répondrons par des certitudes et des précisions.

S'il nous faut donner l'explication de cette attitude un peu singulière peut-être en Russie, en Ukraine, d'un homme qui protège les Juifs – car on n'a vraiment pas abusé de la protection des Juifs dans ces pays-là! – vous assurez que Petlura était un social-démocrate, appartenant au même parti que M. Léon Blum, par exemple, qui a été cité par la [150 sexiès] défense. Il appartenait à la deuxième internationale. Et vous, conservateurs, M. de Tokary, faisiez quelques réserves même à ce sujet sur la politique du chef d'Etat Petlura. Comme social-démocrate il avait donc des idées qui n'étaient pas sanguinaires.

Enfin, point peut-être le plus important, Petlura était un homme politique trop fin et trop documenté pour ne pas s'être rendu compte que l'unité de l'Ukraine seule permettrait la libération de l'Ukraine. Aussi, protéger les Juifs, c'était, pour lui, faire preuve d'abord de sentiments d'humanité, mais c'était aussi l'attitude de l'homme politique qui comprenait que cela était nécessaire à la libération du territoire national.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – L'audience est suspendue.

Document 64

Trial testimony of Mykola Shapoval
Paris, 20 October 1927
Typewritten transcript, pp. 110–127, passim
Language: French
 YIVO, RG85/488/39835–39852

[...] ⁶⁸

[110] [...]

M. L'AVOCAT GENERAL. – Alors, pour en finir avec la déposition de M. CHAPOVAL, pourrait-il en deux mots, rappeler à M.M. les Jurés quelles sont les mesures et spécialement les mesures d'ordre militaire que prenait l'Ataman Petlura contre les pogroms et pour la protection des israélites. Il a été le collaborateur [sic] de Petlura, il s'est associé à ces mesures, il les connaît.

68 Shapoval was called initially to the stand on 19 October, but his testimony was soon continued to the following day. The initial part of that day's session was devoted to consideration of the letter submitted by Ilya Dobkowski (see above, Introduction, n. 45). The initial parts of Shapoval's testimony, concerning the following subjects, have been omitted: a general description of Ukrainian-Jewish relations and of Jewish attitudes toward the Ukrainian national movement, attribution of pogroms to Russian elements, tales of Jewish expressions of gratitude to Petliura, a description of Petliura's personal intervention against a pogrom, an assertion that Petliura was a philosemite (as witnessed by appointment of Jewish ministers), and a list of sums allocated by the Directory under Petliura for relief to pogrom victims.

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – Il est assez difficile de répondre sans entrer dans des détails, à la question qui m'est posée.

Il y avait en effet, deux sortes de troupes en Ukraine. Il y avait les troupes régulières, comme celles que je commandais ...

Me CAMPINCHI. – Voilà ce qu'il faut retenir.

M. CHAPOVAL. – Il y avait également des détachements indépendants, qui se gouvernaient eux-mêmes, qui n'acceptaient pas facilement l'autorité.

Mais les troupes régulières comme celles que je commandais et qui étaient sous la dépendance directe de Petlura, recevaient régulièrement des circulaires de Petlura, nous enjoignant tout ce que nous avions à faire. Petlura est venu bien des fois lui-même au milieu des troupes en nous donnant des directives.

En mai 1919, alors que je menais l'offensive dont j'ai déjà parlé,⁶⁹ près de Kamenetz,⁷⁰ en Podolie, Petlura est venu lui-même au milieu des troupes et nous a donné des ordres très sévères en ce qui concerne les pogroms.

C'est précisément parce que j'ai exécuté les ordres très nets de Petlura, de la façon la plus scrupuleuse, et que j'ai détourné des troupes du front de bataille pour surveiller les fauteurs de pogroms et les empêcher de réaliser leur projets, c'est peut-être à cause de cela que j'ai dû reculer devant l'ennemi; tandis que si j'avais pu lui opposer la totalité de mes troupes, j'aurais peut-être été victorieux.

[112] Me CAMPINCHI. – Voilà une réponse qui mérite une certaine considération.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Vous avez satisfaction, Monsieur l'Avocat Général?

M. L'AVOCAT GENERAL. – J'ai satisfaction, et ma satisfaction est partagée par la partie civile.

Me WILM. – Le témoin a été entendu à l'instruction au sujet de démarches d'un nommé Volodine⁷¹ auprès de lui.

69 Cf. 39816–39820. The witness had actually spoken of events that had occurred during a period of retreat, not during an offensive.

70 Kamenets-Podolski (today Kamianets-Podilskyi, Ukraine).

71 Mikhail Volodin.

Je voudrais que le témoin expose à M.M. les Jurés dans quelles circonstances il a eu la visite de Volodine; quels sont les renseignements qui lui ont été demandés par Volodine; notamment, s'il n'a pas rencontré le jour de l'assassinat de Petlura.

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – Je propose à M. le Président de vouloir bien me permettre, pour abréger et pour éviter des explications qui seraient certainement plus longues, de lire une lettre que j'ai adressée à un de mes camarades ...

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Ce n'est pas possible. La loi ne le permet pas.

[113] Me CAMPINCHI. – Qu'il réponde aux questions; il pourrait répondre par oui ou par non: « Avez-vous rencontré Volodine? » Il peut dire « oui » ou « non ».

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Vous allez voir!
Avez-vous rencontré Volodine?

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – Je suis convaincu que Volodine est un agent de Moscou qui a été envoyé auprès de moi.

J'en suis convaincu précisément parce que, appartenant au parti socialiste révolutionnaire, les hommes politiques de Moscou avaient jugé plus facile d'atteindre Petlura par un Ukrainien qui était d'un parti opposé à Petlura.

C'est dans ces conditions que Volodine est venu auprès de moi et que nous nous sommes liés d'amitié.

Me WILM. – Je demande au témoin de répéter devant M.M. les Jurés la déposition qu'il a faite devant le juge d'instruction, où il a indiqué dans quelles conditions il a reçu la visite de Volodine [114] et les renseignements que Volodine lui a demandés.

[...] ⁷²

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – J'ai fait la connaissance de Volodine au congrès socialiste S.F.I.O.⁷³ le 8 août 1925, à Paris.

A cette époque, Volodine était venu en France d'une façon illégale...

72 Complaint by Torrès that the testimony of the prosecution and civil witnesses is taking too much time omitted.

73 Section Française de l'Internationale Ouvrière.

[...] ⁷⁴

[115] M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – C'est alors que Volodine s'est adressé à moi pour me dire de l'aider à régulariser ses papiers et à ses [sic] créer une situation régulière en France.

Me WILM. – Pour ne pas abuser des instants de M.M. les Jurés et de la défense, je demande au témoin de dire s'il a reçu la visite de Volodine au moment de l'assassinat ou un peu avant.

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – Volodine est venu chez moi tous les jours, pendant la durée de deux mois.

Pendant ce temps, il s'est souvent entretenu [116] et au cours de ces entretiens revenait assez fréquemment le nom de Petlura.

Bien qu'étant l'adversaire politique de Petlura et ayant eu à l'attaquer assez souvent à se point de vue, j'ai constaté que Volodine défendait plutôt Petlura; il disait qu'il avait été en prison avec lui, sous le régime allemand,⁷⁵ qu'il le connaissait bien, et que c'était un homme très humain, un bon social-démocrate.

Me WILM.- Voulez-vous demander au témoin si Volodine lui a demandé l'adresse de Petlura et s'il l'a rencontré le jour du crime.

M. CHAPOVAL (en français). – Je vais vous le dire Monsieur l'Avocat. –

(par l'interprète). – Trois semaines avant le crime, en se promenant avec moi dans le quartier latin, Volodine m'a demandé si je ne savais pas où demeurait Petlura.

Cette question, il me l'a posée à plusieurs reprises. Je lui ai toujours répondu qu'il vivait quelque part, à Paris, que je ne savais où.

[117] Me WILM. – A-t-il rencontré Volodine le jour de l'assassinat?

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – Le jour de l'assassinat, Volodine était chez moi à 10 heures du matin.

Je l'ai ensuite rencontré non loin de ma propre demeure, vers 3 heures 1/2.

Et à 4 heures, il était de nouveau chez moi.

⁷⁴ Sparring between Torrès and Campinchi omitted.

⁷⁵ Reference to the Skoropadskiyi hetmanate.

A ce moment là, le président de l'association ukrainienne en France, M. Stassif,⁷⁶ se trouvait chez moi.

Me WILM. – Que vous a dit Volodine, à ce moment-là?

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – Lorsque j'ai rencontré Volodine, à 3 heures, dans la rue /...

[...] ⁷⁷

[118] M. CHAPOVAL (en français). – rue du Sommerard. Je l'ai rencontré rue du Sommerard à 3 heures 1/2.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Que vous a-t-il dit?

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – Avec lui, je me suis rendu jusqu'au coin de la rue Racine, pour acheter du pain chez le boulanger. C'est là que j'ai appris le drame.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Mais, qu'est-ce que Volodine lui a dit? Voilà ce qui nous intéresse.

M. CHAPOVAL. (par l'interprète). – Me trouvant à l'intérieur de la boulangerie, j'ai entendu dire au public qu'un général russe avait été tué.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Est-ce que Volodine vous en a parlé, à ce moment-là?

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – A ce moment-là, [119] lorsque j'étais dans la boulangerie en train d'acheter du pain et que j'entendais ce discours, Volodine était resté devant la porte.

Je suis sorti de la boulangerie et j'ai dit à Volodine: « Un général russe a été tué. » Volodine m'a alors répondu: « C'est certainement Petlura. »

[...] ⁷⁸

76 Ivan Stasyv (above, Document 51, n. 148).

77 Questions by Wilm and Campinchi concerning the name of the street omitted.

78 Interjections by Campinchi and Torrès omitted.

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – Cette explication qui m'a été fournie par Volodine m'a surpris parce que Volodine ne connaît pas le français, ne le parle pas, ne le lit pas.

Me TORRES. – J'ai un mot à dire. Il y a dans la déposition de ce témoin, deux parties.

La première partie, extrêmement longue, historique, politique, militaire, fera l'objet de mes explications; nous y reviendrons. M.M. les Jurés entendront des témoins plus qualifiés, comme M. Choulguine⁷⁹ et nous aurons l'occasion d'en reparler.

[120] Quant à la seconde partie, je veux seulement montrer ce qu'est le témoin.

Premier point. – Le témoin a été entendu deux fois à l'instruction. La première fois, en juillet 1926, il a déjà dénoncé Volodine, le 20 juillet 1926, comme susceptible d'avoir joué un rôle; mais il n'a pas de tout raconté l'histoire du général russe tué dont on aurait parlé dans la boulangerie, et dont Volodine aurait dit spontanément: « Ce doit être Petlura. »

Il s'est borné à dire dans cette déposition:

« Un jour, j'ai rencontré un Russe
 « du nom de Volodine. Il me demanda où ha-
 « bitait Petlura. Il insista pour que je
 « lui procure l'adresse de Petlura.
 « Après l'assassinat de Petlura, j'ai
 « rencontré Volodine, ou bien il est venu
 « chez moi, et comme je lui parlais de
 « Schwartzbard, il a rougi et m'a dit qu'il
 « le connaissait bien. »

Il dénonce par conséquent Volodine le 20 juillet 1926; mais ne raconte pas encore cette histoire [121] de la boulangerie du Boulevard St. Michel.

Le 12 mars 1927, ses souvenirs deviennent plus précis et il raconte l'histoire du général russe dont il apprend la mort dans la boulangerie.

Seulement, voilà qui va juger le témoin et peut-être aussi l'autorité que vous pourriez attacher à son témoignage, en ce qui concerne l'éloge et la justification de Petlura en ce qui concerne les pogroms.

Le témoin dénonce Volodine le 20 juillet 1926 au juge d'instruction.

Vous dites que ce Volodine est bolchevik. Pas du tout. Volodine, c'est un ami du témoin. Quelques semaines après cette dénonciation, en août 1926, ce témoin se fait photographier avec Volodine. La photographie qui est là le

79 Oleksandr Shulhyn.

prouve. On croirait deux jeunes mariés. Voici Volodine et Chapoval, photographiés ensemble en août 1926: le bolcheviste Volodine, avec Chapoval. Cette photographie a été faite un mois après que Chapoval est venu dire chez le juge d'instruction: « Je crois que ce Volodine a pris part, a collaboré au meurtre de Petlura. »

[122] Il y a plus encore. Une photographie, cela correspond à une certaine intimité, surtout lorsque les sujets sont pris dans cette pose amicale. Mais il y a quelque chose de plus déterminant.

En septembre 1926, dans la revue que dirige Nicolas Chaboval [sic],⁸⁰ c'est à dire le frère du témoin...

[...] ⁸¹

Me HENRY TORRES. – [...] est publié un article de Volodine. Et dans la revue que dirige à Prague le frère du témoin, comme si celle d'ici ne suffisait pas, un article de Volodine du 7 Octobre 1926, a également été publié.⁸²

Voilà un singulier témoin qui vient ici accuser un homme d'avoir plus ou moins été mêlé à l'attentat de Schwartzbard contre l'ataman Petlura, et qui par la suite, ouvre à ce même homme les colonnes de son journal et se fait photographe avec lui.

Volodine est un ami de Chapoval, qui l'a dénoncé à la police française et qui, postérieurement à cette dénonciation, se fait photographe avec [123] lui et le prend comme collaborateur dans la revue qu'il dirige.

Ah, Monsieur Chaboval [sic], je sais que vous comprenez bien le français. Vous parliez tout à l'heure d'un parti pour lequel j'ai quelques raisons d'avoir des sympathies. Je me demande ce que vous y faites, et j'espère ne plus vous y rencontrer.

[...] ⁸³

[125] M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – J'ai tout entendu et j'ai compris ce qu'a dit Me Torrès.

Deux mois après l'assassinat de Petlura, j'ai été appelé chez le juge d'instruction. J'ai déclaré à ce magistrat que je connaissais beaucoup de détails concernant l'assassinat de Petlura; mais que je devais exercer encore une cer-

80 Mykola Shapoval.

81 Brief exchange between Torrès and Shapoval omitted.

82 The articles in question have not been located.

83 The court recessed. Brief exchange between attorneys and presiding judge after court reconvened over whether to recall Shapoval omitted.

taine surveillance et que je désirais que les renseignements fournis par moi ne deviennent pas la proie de la [126] presse, avant qu'ils ne soient précisés. On m'a dit que c'était impossible et que les détails fournis par moi pourraient tomber, de toute façon, entre les mains de la presse.

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Dite-lui qu'il s'explique sur la question de la carte postale.

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – J'étais dès les premiers jours persuadé que Volodine était un des complices de l'assassinat de Petlura; mais n'ayant pas encore recueilli tous les renseignements nécessaires à ce sujet, je décidai de ne pas rompre mes relations avec lui, de continuer à être en bons termes, pour trouver le moyen d'obtenir des indications plus précises.

[...] ⁸⁴

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – A ce moment, [127] Volodine insistait pour resserrer encor plus les relations d'amitié qui nous unissaient. C'est pourquoi j'ai publié dans ma revue les articles signée de lui.

C'est au cours de ces relations de plus en plus rapprochées et des rapports que j'ai eu avec d'autres personnes de son entourage, que ma conviction de sa complicité dans l'assassinat de Petlura devint de plus en plus profonde.

Le jour où je me rendis complètement compte et où je fus convaincu que cette complicité était certaine, j'ai rompu toutes relations avec lui.

Me HENRY TORRES. – Voilà ...

M. LE PRESIDENT. – Qu'il s'explique sur la photographie.

M. CHAPOVAL (par l'interprète). – C'est dans la même ligne de nos relations amicales qu'à la demande de Volodine je me suis fait photographier avec lui. Si j'avais refusé, une rupture se serait produite, alors que je ne voulais éveiller en lui aucun soupçon.

[...] ⁸⁵

84 Brief exchange between Campinchi and Torrès omitted.

85 Exchange between presiding judge, Campinchi, and Torrès omitted.

Document 65

*Trial testimony of Haya Greenberg*⁸⁶

Paris, 24 October 1927

Typewritten transcript, pp. 73–110, passim; pagination irregular (no pages numbered 91 through 99)

Language: French

YIVO, RG85/491/40341–40368

DEPOSITION DE Mlle GRIMBERG [sic]

29 ans, étudiante

M. l'AVOCAT GENERAL. – Le témoin a été entendu à l'information et a fourni des opinions personnelles [sic] sur le rôle de M. Petlura vis à vis des pogroms.

Me Henry TORRES. – Comment, des opinions personnelles! Et comment donc appelleriez-vous, Monsieur l'Avocat Général, des opinions qui ne seraient pas personnelles?

M. l'AVOCAT GENERAL. – J'ai dit « des opinions personnelles », parce qu'elles m'ont paru ne reposer sur rien du tout.

Me Henry TORRES. – C'est à MM. les Jurés d'en juger. Mlle Grimberg [sic], qui est étudiante en médecine, qui a soigné les blessés de [sic] Proskouroff vient déposer ici; si vous trouvez que son opinion ne repose sur rien du tout!

M. l'AVOCAT GENERAL. – Que le témoin dise quel [74] a été le rôle de Petlura dans les pogroms.

M. le PRESIDENT. – Parlez des pogroms de Proskouroff et du rôle de l'ataman Petlura dans ces pogroms.

Mlle GRIMBERG. – J'étais chez mes parents. Je devais partir le 16 février, pour aller me présenter à des examens. Le 15 février, le pogrom éclata. Tout

86 This testimony was frequently cited by observers as having left a particularly profound impression upon spectators.

avait été organisé. Le vendredi, à 4 heures 1/2 je suis sortie du cabinet de physique et j'ai été effrayée par les adamacs⁸⁷ du 3ème régiment, avec leur coiffure rouge qui les distinguait des autres adamacs, poussant des cris de sauvages. Ils se dirigeaient vers les rues de Proskouroff les plus peuplées par les juifs.

C'est seulement le lendemain matin vers midi que les premières victimes ont été relevées. La première a été Mlle Wartenberg, une amie à moi, qui m'avait interrogée justement vendredi sur l'anatomie. Elle a été tuée par une balle tirée par un adamac à cheval qui passait devant se [sic] fenêtre.

Vers 2 heures et demie, nous avons entendu de la musique et des chants. C'étaient les adamacs du 3ème régiment qui se dirigeaient, musique en tête, [75] et en chantant, accompagnés de médecins et de gardes-malades vers la population juive qui avait été massacrée la veille.

J'y suis allée et je les ai vus dans le même endroit qu'ils sont passés le samedi. Selon le récit des blessés qui j'ai soignés [sic], ils avaient massacré tout, avec des cris terribles.

Voilà par exemple Mlle Kisis, une jeune fille de dix-neuf. Huit membres de sa famille sont blessés: son père, à la tête, son petit frère qui a sept ans, blessé au dos; un autre est blessé à la nuque, un autre à la tempe et au bras. Son sein droit était percé de trous profonds, et ce n'est que grâce à une opération [opération] habile du docteur Golviof que l'amputation du sein a pu être évitée.

Elle a raconté que la première victime de sa maison avait été sa mère.

Un des adamacs se jeta sur elle en criant: « Vive notre père Petlura! » Il se jeta sur elle avec son sabre et la tua.

J'ai vu devant moi tous les blessés qui sont passés le dimanche matin. Quand je suis entré à la maison de mes grands-parents, où était organisé un hôpital, parce que, par manque de place dans les [76] hôpitaux, les maisons particulières [sic] avaient été aménagées pour hospitaliser les blessés, quand je suis arrivée, il y avait des blessés qui se trouvaient dans la rue depuis la veille. Plusieurs étaient dans la neige, tout gelée, et je ne pouvais pas me décider à soigner les blessés, parce que j'avais pour [peur] de leur faire mal. Je leur donnais à boire du thé chaud, pour les ranimer un peu.

A 9 heures 1/2, quand je suis entrée à la maison de mes grands parents, c'est le docteur Poldsof, un Russe orthodoxe, qui m'avait soignée auparavant, qui était là; il m'a reconnue [sic] et m'a dit: « Mademoiselle, suivez-moi, je vous indiquerai les soins à donner aux blessés qui ont besoin d'une opération immédiate. »

J'ai vu devant moi des petites fillettes de douze et quatorze ans qu'il m'a indiquées pour les expédier directement à l'hôpital de Sempz.

87 Haidamaks. See above, Introduction, n. 242.

A coté d'elles, un petit garçon de trois ans qui se taisait toujours; je l'ai posé sur une petite table dans la cuisine, et toutes mes caresses n'ont pas pu arriver à lui tirer un mot.

[77] C'est seulement le soir, quand je l'ai déshabillé que j'ai vu son dos couvert de blessures. Il se taisait parce que, se trouvant dans une atmosphère étrangère, n'ayant pas sa mère qui avait été tuée, il n'osait pas dire qu'il avait mal. Tout en pleurant, j'ai commencé à le laver, et c'est le docteur Zelsman qui se trouvait poursuivi [sic] par les cosaques qui l'avait pris et porté dans notre hôpital qui était protégé par le drapeau de la croix-rouge danoise, dont le représentant était M. Chanoski.

Ce petit garçon, le soir, ne parlait pas non plus.

Le lendemain, une femme est venue chez nous avec un bébé de trois semaines. Elle nous a raconté qu'on avait brisé sa fenêtre et qu'on avait lancé le petit bébé sur une pique. Les cris poussés par ce bébé, je ne peux pas les oublier!

J'ai commencé à la soigner; je n'avais pas la possibilité de lui donner à manger, ce n'était que du lait mélangé d'eau. Je ne pouvais pas le calmer.

Le mardi, la petite sœur retournait, une des deux fillettes était morte.

[78] L'autre, après l'opération, je l'ai portée sur un brancard, dans la cuisine.

Le petit garçon se jeta alors sur elle, la prit par le cou et lui a raconté comment il avait donné le dernier baiser à sa maman.

J'entends encore les cris déchirants, dans la cuisine, de cette petite fille de douze ans.

Ces cris réveillèrent le petit bébé blessé, qui était son frère.

Je ne peux pas oublier tous ces souvenirs qui sont comme toujours devant moi.

Tout cela, pour détruire la population juive: c'est surtout les enfants qui étaient frappés, les enfants, qui sont morts dans de terribles souffrances.

Je ne peux pas oublier un petit garçon de cinq ans qui, à la suite des blessures qu'il avait reçues, a été atteint de méningite et est mort dans de terribles souffrances; je ne pouvais pas lui desserrer les dents pour lui faire boire un peu d'eau et le rafraichir.

Lundi soir, une femme percée par une balle à la gorge, qui ne pouvait pas avaler une goutte [79] de liquide, est morte dans mes bras.

Huit personnes de sa famille sont restées. Elle est morte le lundi soir.

Le lendemain matin, sa fillette, âgée de quatorze ans, a voulu absolument voir le cadavre de sa mère que j'avais fait transporter dans la cuisine pour ne pas effrayer les autres blessés; elle a perdu la raison en se jetant sur le lit où était sa mère; elle a pris la jaquette de sa mère et l'a embrassée on disant: « Viens, maman, nous allons à la synagogue (elle se trouvait justement dans la cour de notre maison), nous allons prier pour toi. » C'est comme cela qu'elle a perdu la raison.

Un souvenir terrible pour moi, c'est celui des traîneaux qui sont passés le mardi matin et que les paysans amenaient pour enlever les cadavres dans les rues, où elles se trouvaient depuis le samedi.

Au retour, j'ai vu les mêmes traîneaux, avec les corps entassés, plusieurs corps, avec tantôt une main ou un bras pendant, ou une jambe ou la tête.

Je vois aussi une petite fillette de quatorze ans, avec quatre doigts coupés. Elle a eu de terribles souffrances. Elle a été atteinte de la gangrène |80| et a fini par perdre la raison. On a dû l'envoyer dans une maison d'aliénés.

Toujours la même chose, toujours le même souvenir! En voyant ces blessés, je ne peux pas les oublier! Vous ne pouvez pas vous imaginer combien la population juive était terrorisée. Toujours les mêmes affichages sur les murs: « Juifs, peuple [peuple] détesté et maudit, youpins⁸⁸ maudits par tout le monde, tenez-vous calmes. N'oubliez pas ce que vous êtes. Taisez-vous et sachez que nous sommes là encore, bien forts, pour vous châtier. »

Des officiers ukrainiens qui se trouvaient dans notre maison, le lendemain, quand ils sont venus à l'hôpital pour s'assurer si notre famille était sauvée, avaient honte; l'un d'eux m'a dit: « Mademoiselle, j'ai honte devant vous, je ne peux vous exprimer à quoi point ... » Il m'a dit, en voyant les adamacs qui passaient, avec la musique en tête: « J'ai honte, je ne peux pas vous dire à quel point. »

Trois jours après, il nous a dit que Petlura, l'ataman ukrainien, se trouvait à la gare.

Nous n'avons pu le voir.

Deux fois il est venu à Proskouroff; il n'a pas voulu recevoir la délégation juive qui venait le |81| supplier de nous donner la possibilité de respirer et de faire partir Semesenko qui restait toujours avec les mêmes menaces et les mêmes injures.

Mon beau-frère, qui était alors le fiancé de sa [sic] sœur, étant blessé à la main, s'est sauvé. Son père avait été tué et sa mère blessée à la tête. Il est allé chez lui pour voir s'il lui restait sa mère; chemin faisant, on l'a arrêté, on l'a conduit à Semesenko qui a commencé par lui exprimer sa douleur, et puis qu'il l'a insulté.

Nous nous sommes sauvés par miracle.

Le dimanche, vers 1 heure 1/2, je suis rentrée à l'hôpital pour voir ce qu'étaient devenus mes parents. J'ai vu trois adamacs armés qui s'approchaient de notre maison et qui sont entrés dans la cour. Nous nous sommes sauvés à la cave et je suis restée derrière mon père qui n'a pas voulu aller à la cave; il nous a dit que pour une jeune fille le plus terrib[le] malheur était

88 Derogatory slang for Jews.

d'être violée, il nous a envoyées à la cave et a pensé qu'il pourrait nous sauver avec de l'argent.

Je me rappelle que six personnes à cheval sont passées devant nos fenêtres. C'est la garde, selon [82] l'ordre donné par le maire de notre conseil municipal. C'est grâce à lui qui nous avons été sauvés, parce que les trois adaramacs [sic] ont pris sont sortie de notre cour.

Chemin faisant, ils ont rencontré un de nos associés, M. Dirajne; ils lui ont coupé l'oreille.

Toutes nos souffrances, vous ne pouvez pas les imaginer.

Je me rappelle, le dimanche, vers 4 heures [sic] 1/2, nous avons attendu le docteur qui devait soigner les blessés. Nous sommes sorties sur la terrasse, moi avec mes cousines, un dentiste et une garde-malade.

Soudain, nous voyons un traineau qui passait chargé d'officiers qui ont crié: « Qu'est-ce que vous faites là? Vous n'avez pas de travail? Nous allons venir vous en donner. »

Mon père, qui était membre du conseil municipal, recevait toujours des membres de la communauté juive des autres endroits, des dépêches le suppliant de dire ce qu'étaient devenus tel et tel qui était venu à Proskouroff et qui n'avait pas reparu. Plusieurs avaient été jetés du train et entes-[83]rés [enterrés] dans un terrain, près de la gare.

Nous étions toujours terrorisés; toujours ayant peur de sortir dans la rue. Nous ne pouvions pas sortir jusqu'à 5 heures; c'était absolument interdit.

Et quand Petlura, l'ataman ukrainien, est venu, nous espérions que nous serions satisfaits par le châtement de Semesenko. Mais il n'a pas voulu entendre ce qui s'était passé et faire attention au nombre des victimes qui avait été établi par une enquête du conseil municipal et du comité juif.

Il a promis de faire quelque chose, mais aucune sanction n'est intervenue, et Semesenko est resté chez nous. Soigné par un de nos médecins, il continuait à se moquer et se vantait toujours de ce qu'il avait fait.

Devant le conseil municipal, il se vantait de ce qu'il avait fait. Il annonçait ouvertement qu'il avait bien voulu recevoir la somme de 300.000 roubles ukrainiens que la population juive avait dû lui donner, ayant peur d'être en retard parce qu'il fallait accomplir cet acte avant midi. Il a dit par ironie qu'il avait bien [84] voulu recevoir cet argent de la reconnaissante population juive.

Vous ne pouvez vous imaginer de quelle façon nous avons souffert.

Même maintenant, après 8 ans écoulés, je ne peux pas me rappeler tout cela sans trembler.

Je vois toujours devant moi ces blessés qui luttaien contre les adamaks [sic] petluriens.

Voilà une jeune fille de 19 ans qui a eu une pleurésie à la suite de ses

blessures. Le soir, pendant deux semaines, elle a eu la fièvre à 40°. C'est moi qui la soignais. Elle croyait reconnaître en moi un adamak [sic] et me disait toujours: « Allez-vous en. Que voulez-vous? »

Je ne peux pas oublier ce petit enfant qui pleurait toujours et que je ne pouvais pas soigner; j'étais tout à fait dans la première année de la médecine. J'étais incapable de faire quelque chose d'utile. C'est seulement après que le docteur m'a forcée de commencer à panser les blessés.

M. l'AVOCAT GENERAL. – Nous venons d'entendre le tragique récit des évènements, mais c'est la question des pogroms.

[85] Je reviens à ma question de tout à l'heure, sur laquelle nous avons l'opinion du témoin, à savoir que c'est Petlura qui a organisé les pogroms.

Ces pogroms ont eu lieu, nous le reconnaissons, nous le déplorons, il nous paraissent horribles. Mais pourquoi pe[n]sez-vous que c'est l'ataman Petlura qui en est responsable. C'est tout le procès.

Le TEMOIN. – C'était la conviction non seulement de la population j[u]ive, mais même des Ukrainiens.

Les officiers qui l[o]geaient c[h]ez nous disaient que malheureusement ils étaient sûrs que c'était sur l'ordre de Petlura que c'était fait, Semesenko lui-même l'a déclaré.

M. l'AVOCAT GENERAL. – C'était la rumeur publique!

Me Henry TORRES. – Et cela ne vous suffit pas!

M. l'AVOCAT GENERAL. – C'est contradictoire pas se que nous avons entendu.

Me Henry TORRES. – Parce que vous avez entendu!

[86] M. l'AVOCAT GENERAL. – Nous avons entendu des Ukrainiens dire que Petlura était le défenseur des juifs.

Me Henry TORRES. – Monsieur l'Avocat Général, je comprends, je me permets de vous le dire, je comprends que dans cette affaire, où j'ai derrière moi Schwartzbard qui, pour la première fois, a pleuré aujourd'hui, non pas lorsque vous demandiez contre lui une peine ou lorsque vous le menaciez ou lorsque vous lui marquiez ses responsabilités, mais lorsqu'il a entendu ce que vous appelez l'opinion personnelle du témoin, je comprends que du point de vue de la loi, du point de vue du code, vous demandiez une condamnation contre cet homme.

Mais quand on parlait tout à l'heure des autres pogromistes, qui portent

aussi des responsabilités, que vous marquiez vous-même, Me Wilm, et qui s'appellent Denikine et ses pareils, j'avais raison de dire que j'aurais défendu avec la même ferveur Schwartebard [sic] justicier de Denikine que Schwartzbard justicier de Petlura. Je songeais, en entendant la question de Me Wilm, qu'alors que Petlura est entré à Kiew à la tête des armées austro-al-|87|lemandes, Denikine, hélas!, fut à un moment donné l'allié de la France. On n'a pas toujours les amis que l'on veut!

Mais si dans des circonstances douloureuses de notre histoire, la France a pu avoir parfois des alliés qui n'étaient pas absolument dignes [sic] d'elle il faut que dans un procès comme celui-ci, la magistrature française, permettez-moi de vous le dire, Monsieur l'Avocat Général, dans la même même [sic] où il lui appartient de demander, c'est entendu, au nom du code, une sanction contre cet homme, désolidarise notre opinion officielle, qui compte à l'étranger, de ces responsabilités terribles qui sont marquées dans le crime de Proskoureff contre l'ataman Petlura.

Parce que, Monsieur l'Avocat général, vous pourrez produire à cette barre les dépositions des anciens lieutenants, des anciens colonels ou des anciens généraux de Petlura, de ceux qui peut-être eux aussi se précipitaient sur les victimes aux cris de « Vive notre petit père Petlura », mais vous ne pourrez rien contre ces dépositions terriblement accablantes, vous ne pourrez rien contre cette |88| circonstance que Petlurz [sic] est venu à la gare de Proskouloff [sic], qu'il n'a pris aucune sanction, que Semesenko est resté impuni, et que 100.000 morts juifs sont restés invengés.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Je fais appel à mon confrère Torrès. Il est évident que si nous instaurons une discussion qui n'a, pour base, aucune preuve, nous n'arriverons jamais. Chacun lutte avec ses moyens. Mais quelles que soient les difficultés, Mademoiselle, quand on est un homme s'adressant à une femme, quand on est un avocat s'adressant à une victime, quelles que soient les difficultés de ma position à l'heure actuelle, je suis tout de même obligé de poser, avec tout le respect que je dois à votre infortune, une question brutale, si vous voulez, une question bête.

En ce moment, nous ne sommes pas en train de faire du sentiment. Si mon confrère Me Torrès veut nous faire mépriser les pogromistes, si nous devons souhaiter qu'on les ait châtiés, s'il veut traduire à la barre, non pas un, non pas vingt-cinq, non pas 50 ou 80 témoins, mais 100.000 témoins, nous serrons d'accord.

|89| Tous les témoins qui viendront ici vous diront, sur ce ton, – et croyez bien, Mademoiselle, que je ne cesse pas d'être respectueux – sur ce ton de lamentation sincère que nous avons entendu, le récit de ces abominables scènes de massacre connues sous le nom de pogroms.

Mais je me permets de le dire à MM. les Jureés de la Seine: Vous êtes des hommes probes et libres; intelligents, expérimentés, il faut que vous sachiez ce qu'on vous demande.

Vous allez entendre la voix éloquente de la défense. Je suis la partie civile. Je ne suis pas l'ennemi de Schwartzbard, parce que je suis avocat. Je ne défends qu'une mémoire. Je n'accuse pas.

Il faut que vous demandiez, après des dépositions comme celle-ci, comme après toutes celles qui viendront de témoins de faits abominables comme ceux qu'on a retracés tout à l'heure, sur un ton que vous n'avez pas oublié, il faut que vous vous posiez une seule question:

Où trouve-t-on, là-dedans, la main de l'ataman Petlura?

[90 à 100] Jusqu'à présent, Me Torrès se tenait sur ce plan, sur ce terrain de discussion. Il était le chef, il était l'ataman, membre du Directoire, donc il est responsable.

Me TORRES. – Et ataman général des armées, avec son nom marqué en tête des affiches, après l'apposition desquelles les pogroms éclataient.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Nous sommes d'accord sur ce terrain-là, nous comprenons la discussion.

Me Henry TORRES. – Ces troupes régulières, ces régiments d'aldamaks [sic] poignardaient leurs victimes au cri de « Vive Petlura », leur chef!

Me CAMPINCHI. – Il faut bien que, depuis six jours que nous discutons, nous ayons fait un pas, autrement ce serait humiliant pour l'esprit humain!

Est-ce qu'une voix s'est élevée ici pour dénber les pogroms et le fait qu'il y a eu des troupes irrégulières, des atamans indisciplinés et, aussi des tropes régulières qui échappaient à la main-|101|mise de l'ataman général ou du président du Directoire Petlura? C'est indiscutable. Si vous voulez que nous admettions cela, je vous l'accorde dès maintenant.

Mais vous disiez jusqu'à présent, Maître Torrès. Il était le chef, donc il devait être responsable, et nous comprenions ce que cela voulait dire ... Et moi, je vous disais: responsabilité officielle, responsabilité administrative, politique, théorique, oui, mais pas jusqu'au sang, jusqu'au crime!

Si nous nous laissons émouvoir, – et je le suis autant que vous, du moins je l'é[t]ais tout à l'heure et le suis un peu moins maintenant, – par tous ceux qui furent mutilés ou blessés et ont échappé à peine au massacre ou y ont perdu leurs enfants et leurs parents, cela fera honneur à notre cœur mais pas à notre intelligence. Il n'y a ici qu'une discussion possible: la justification d'un

acte criminel. L'homme sans défense qui a été abattu avait-il ou non sur les mains du sang de juif inoffensif opprimé?

[102] Quand le témoin dit: J'ai vu de petits enfants qui souffraient, j'en ai vu qu'on égrogeait [sic] nous le plaignons ainsi que ses malheureux compatriotes qui ont souffert [sic]. Il faudrait n'être pas un homme pour n'être pas ému. Mais je me permets de dire maintenant et je le redirai à chaque déposition: La question n'est pas là. Qu'on vous plaigne, qui ne vous plaiderait pas? Mais une preuve doit être faite qui, jusqu'à maintenant, n'a même pas été esquissée: Est-ce Petlura qui a ordonné les pogroms officiellement, en qualité de chef?

Vous parliez du cri des aïdamaks: « Vive notre petit père Petlura! »

Oui, Petlura était le chef de l'Ukraine, il avait un prestige immense en Ukraine. C'est pourquoi d'ailleurs tout le bien et tout le mal était rapporté à Petlura. Mais devant la Cour d'assises, mon Cher Confrère et ami, où il convient de serrer de près les documents, les témoignages et les personnages, quand nous essayons de savoir d'il y a oui ou non une responsabilité officielle, personnelle, nous nous trouvons devant une carence qui se répètera encore plusieurs fois...

[103] Mlle GRIMBERG [sic]. – La réponse est que je ne connais pas personnellement tout ...

Me Henry TORRES. – La réponse du témoin vaut dans la mesure où elle représente de malheureux juifs persécuté!

Me CAMPINCHI. – Mademoiselle, cet homme a tué l'ataman Petlura à Paris dans des conditions que vous n'ignorez certainement pas. Cet homme a dit: Petlura a ordonné les pogroms et je savais qu'il en préparait d'autres: je l'ai vu dans « Le Trident ».

Mlle GRINBERG [sic]. – Personnellement, je ne connaissais pas Petlura, je ne l'avais jamais vu.

Mais c'est la conviction non seulement de la population juive d'Ukraine mais des Ukrainiens que les massacres ont été ordonnés par l'ataman Petlura. Mlle Kitsis [sic], que je viens de vous nommer, m'a raconté que le crime de Semesenko a été commis aux cris de « Vive notre petit père Petlura ». C'est comme cela qu'on a tué sa mère.

L'ataman Petlura est venu le 21 et le 22 fé-|104|vrier, trois jours après. Je le sais bien. L'officier ukrainien qui était chez nous a dit: « Petlura est là, je suis sûr qu'une sanction est intervenue. »

Mais Semesenko est resté à Proskoureff. Le 27, il a placardé sur les murs

de Proskouroff des affiches toujours dans le même sens, portant les mêmes mots: « Peuple juif maudit, détesté par tout le monde ... » C'étaient toujours les mêmes menaces, les mêmes injures que nous étions obligés de subir. C'est pour cela qu'on nous a obligés à envoyer de l'argent et à le remercier pour ce qu'il a fait.

Je ne peux pas dire que j'ai vu Petlura rodner [ordonner] le massacre, que je l'ai entendu. Mais c'était la conviction de toute la population, non seulement des Juifs, mais de toute la population, même des Ukrainiens et des Russes, que les pogroms avaient été ordonnés par Petlura.

Des Russes me l'ont dit à moi personnellement lorsque je faisais mes études au Gymnase de notre empereur. J'avais beaucoup de connaissances parmi |105| les Russes orthodoxes et tout le monde en me voyant avait honte de me regarder en face.

A Proskouroff, le massacre de février, a officiellement duré trois jours. Isolément, on a tué encore le dimanche et le lundi. Ce jour-là, vers une heure, je rentrais dans la maison de mes parents, après m'être tenue trois heures à l'abri, j'ai entendu du bruit dans la rue. On tirait encore sur le propriétaire d'une fabrique de savon.

Encore une fois, je ne peux pas dire que j'ai entendu donner des ordres, car j'ai juré de dire la vérité. Je ne peux dire que ce que je sais.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Je ne vous pose que cette question, Mademoiselle: C'est la votre sentiment, ce sont des indications personnelles?

Mlle GRINBERG. – Je l'ai dit au Juge d'instruction qui me posait la même question. J'ai dit que c'était mon opinion à moi et aussi celle, je peux vous le jurer, comme je l'ai déjà dit, de la population, non seulement juive mais même Ukrainienne et russe: c'est sur l'ordre de Petlura que les pogroms ont eu lieu.

|106| Me CAMPINCHI. – Je m'excuse d'insister encore une fois. Vous dites: c'est également l'opinion de toute la population ukrainienne. Je crains que cela infirme d'autres parties de votre témoignage.

Nous avons entendu des Ukrainiens. Nous en entendrons encore. Je peux vous dire que tous les Ukrainiens qui sont à travers le monde, près de quatre cents associations ukrainiennes qui sont ici, en Roumanie et ailleurs, ont pleuré Petlura comme un héros national, comme le cœur le plus noble de l'Ukraine.

Aussi, quand vous me dites que tous les ukrainiens pendaient que Petlura était responsable des pogroms, je me permets de vous dire que c'est là une impression personnelle.

Mlle GRINBERG. – Le moindre mot de Petlura aurait suffi pour arrêter les massacres!

[...] ⁸⁹

[108] Me CAMPINCHI. – Vous savez, Mademoiselle, que Petlura était arrivé à Proskouroff?

R. – Oui.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Quand?

R. – C'était le 22 février.

Me CAMPINCHI. – C'était Semesenko qui commandait?

R. – Semesenko était l'ataman du 3^{ème} régiment d'aïdamaks qui était au nom de Petlura. C'étaient les deux brigades ...

Me CAMPINCHI. – Eh bien, je me permets de vous apprendre, car vous n'étiez pas à l'audience ce jour-là, qu'un jeune homme qui fut aide de camp de Petlura a dit: Petlura est arrivé mais il n'avait pas la possibilité d'arrêter Semesenko parce que celui-ci était au milieu de ses troupes et que Petlura avait fait un geste, c'est lui qui aurait été arrêté.

Vous étiez parmi les victimes. Je suppose que vous ne deviez pas avoir grandes fréquentations avec les généraux, colonels, et atamans ...

[109] Me TORRES. – Heureusement pour elle! Elle vous les laisse pour témoins.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Comment pouviez-vous alors savoir de qui s'était passé dans le haut commandement ukrainien?

R. – Il y avait des officiers ukrainiens logés à la maison, chez nous. Et ce sont eux qui m'ont raconté cela. Ils ne pouvaient pas le nier: c'était évident.

Me CAMPINCHI. – Ils vous ont dit: c'est Petlura qui est responsable des pogroms et donné des ordres?

89 Asides by Torrès and Campinchi to jury omitted.

R. – Ils disaient: Il suffirait que Petlura donnât un seul ordre, dît un seul mot – parce qu’il était adoré dans l’armée ukrainienne – pour que les massacres s’arrêtent. Il était très populaire.

Me CAMPINCHI. – C’est pour cela qu’on lui impute tous les crimes!

Mlle GRIMBERG [sic]. – On ne peut nier que la mère de Mlle Kistis [sic] a été tuée aux cris des aïdamaks: « Vive notre petit père Petlura. » C’est en son nom |110| qu’ont été tuées les populations juives.

[...] ⁹⁰

90 Exchange between Campinchi, Torrès, and the witness omitted.

Part Five: Aftermath

Document 66

Peter Wiernik to Louis Marshall

New York, 27 October 1927

Typewritten letter, 1 page; printed letterhead

Language: English

AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144

THE JEWISH MORNING JOURNAL¹
THE ONLY JEWISH MORNING PAPER
NEW YORK CITY

—
PHONE ORCHARD 8400

P. WIERNIK
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

October 27, 1927.

Mr. Louis Marshall,
120 Broadway,
New York City.

My Dear Mr. Marshall:

I was in doubt whether your statement dated October 25² and addressed to me personally was meant for publication. At any rate I was convinced, even before the glorious acquittal of Schwartzbard, that the publication of your statement would arouse considerable resentment, and it was in justice to yourself as well as to the Jewish Morning Journal that I decided to consider it a private ~~publication~~ |communication|. The anticipated verdict and the outburst of joy among the Jews of New York, meaning of course the immigrant Jews from Russia, when the glad news was spread like wildfire through the Jewish neighborhoods on that memorable afternoon, justifies me in believing that our point of view of the entire matter has been vindicated.

One must be a native of Russia³ and understand the European trend of mind to be convinced that the severely logical and coolly objective point of

1 English name of the Yiddish newspaper *Morgen zhurnal*.

2 Not in file.

3 Wiernik was a native of Wilno who had also lived in Riga, Kaunas, and Białystok before migrating to the United States at age 20.

view which is the correct thing for an American is out of place and of sympathy with the Jewish world among Russians in a matter like this. Schwartzbard could not be considered like a Czolgosz,⁴ neither was Petlura a McKinley, and matters of this sort are very often decided in Europe in the way in which Petlura met his fate. We are as much against cold blooded murders as you are, but we look facts straight in the face, and while we never said it in publication, it is my private opinion and the opinion of hundreds of thousands of intelligent and law abiding Jews and Gentiles on both sides of the ocean that the fate of Petlura was well deserved even if [it] took so long a time until he was overtaken by retribution. Privately I am not afraid to use that word, and if you had grown up in Russia and compared this deed to other political murders in which revenge had a considerable share, you would probably feel about it in the way that most of us felt and had the courage to express what was in their minds. We also do not fear any reprisals, and knowing the Russians as we do the chances are that the Petluras, small and big, are more frightened by this verdict than the Jews in Ukraine or anywhere else.

Cordially yours,
!Peter Wiernik!

Document 67

Louis Marshall to Peter Wiernik
New York, 29 October 1927
Typewritten letter (copy), 2 pages
Language: English
AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144

October 29, 1927.

My dear Mr. Wiernik:

I am in receipt of yours of the 27th instant.⁵

You correctly surmise that my letter of the 25th instant⁶ was addressed to you personally and was not intended for publication, although even if it

4 Leon Czolgosz (1873–1901), an American anarchist who assassinated United States President William McKinley on 6 September 1901.

5 Document 66.

6 Not in file.

had been published I would have felt justified in every word that I uttered. You very correctly say that I approached the subject from the standpoint of an American lawyer, as well as of a Jew. My mind is, of course, tinctured with the jurisprudence of English speaking countries, where such a trial as that which took place in Paris, with all of its hearsay, its theoretical opinions, its wild conclusions, its disorder and perfervid elocution, would have been impossible. You, of course, recognize the fact that I took no position against Schwarzbard. What I tried to do was to discourage an effort to convert one who had killed a human being into a national Jewish hero. I recognized the probability that his mind had been unbalanced by the agony suffered by him because of the shocking pogroms which had taken place in the Ukraine, and I suggested that the line of defense should be built up on [a] theory of mental irresponsibility, in a legal sense of the term. If the act had been committed anywhere in the United States or in England that defense would doubtless have been successfully interposed without attempting to justify the act as that of a hero. It is far from heroic, from my point of view, for a man to wait six years after the pogroms had been committed, and, far from the scene of the horrors, to shoot a defenseless man, and then to glory in the act. That very fact would have strengthened the argument that he was mentally irresponsible. I am quite convinced that that was the view taken by the jury. There is nothing in the record to indicate any other ground for the verdict.

But that is not the reason I am now writing to you. I observe in the press that Mr. Bernstein⁷, the owner or manager of Libby's Hotel,⁸ and others, are seeking to bring Schwarzbard to this country for the purpose of hailing him as a redeemer and avenger, of having him met by a committee of leading Jewish citizens, of giving him a banquet, etc., etc. Cannot that be prevented? Shall we so associate ourselves with the assassination that the followers of Petlura and Ukrainians in general, who have looked upon Petlura as a national hero, shall make reprisals upon the Jews of the Ukraine, shall attack the Jews whom we have placed upon the land in that country and in Crimea,⁹ shall develop an intense hatred against the Jews?

[2] Can we not let well enough alone? Must we always do the wrong thing in order to have a momentary alleviation of high-strung nerves? Can we not occasionally, to use your words, take "the severely logical and coolly objective

7 Max Bernstein (1889–1946), Russian-born New York restaurateur and developer, owner and operator of Libby's Hotel, named for his late mother.

8 Luxury hotel at Chrystie and Delancey Streets in Manhattan, New York, catering to a Jewish clientele, opened in 1926.

9 See above, Document 27, n. 7.

point of view which is the correct thing for an American"? I implore you, Mr. Wiernik, to use your influence to put an end to this dangerous project.

Cordially yours,¹⁰

Peter Wiernik, Esq.,
Care Jewish Morning Journal,
77 Bowery, New York City.

Document 68

Leo Motzkin
Kaunas, 28 October 1927
Published newspaper article, 1 page
Language: Yiddish
Di idische shtime, no. 2433, p. 3¹¹

אונזער שטעלונג צום שווארצבארד-פראצעס.

פון ל. מאצקין, — פארזיצער פונם "קאמיטעט פון אידישע דעלעגאציעס".

צו מיר, ווי צו איינעם פון יענע אידישע כלל-טוער, וואס האָט זיך שוין אין פריערדיקער צייט שטאַרק פארנומען מיט דער אויספארשונג פון די אנטי-אידישע פאגראַמען און וועלכער אינטערעסירט זיך אויך אקטיוו אינאיינעם מיט אַ קרייז פון אַנדערע כלל-טוער מיט די ענינים, וועלכע וועלן פארקומען אינם שווארצבארד-פראצעס, האָבן זיך געווענדט פארשיידענע פארטרעטער פון דער פרעסע וועגן אן אינטערוויו.

אין משך פון 16 חדשים, וואס זיינען אריבער זינט פעטלורא איז דערהרגעט געוואָרן, האָבן זיך אלע מאָל ענערגיש אָפגעזאגט פון וועלכע-עס-איז אינטערוויען און האָבן זיך באַנוגנט מיט מיין באַשיידענער ראָלע אלס לייטער פון דער אַרבעט צוצוגרייטן די מאָ-טעריאלן, וואס זיינען נויטיק אָף צו באַלויכטן די אידישע טראַגעדיע אין אוקראַינע בשעת די פאגראַמען פון 1919-1921. איצט, בעתן שווארצבארד-פראצעס, האלט איך עס אבער פאר מיין חוב ארויסצוזאגן מיין מיינונג וועגן דער פראַגע, וואס באַשעפטיקט אַזוי שטאַרק פיל אידישע כלל-טוער און די ברייטע אידישע, און צום טייל נישט-אידישע עפנטלעכע

10 Signature absent on archival copy.

11 Nominally a Zionist daily, the dominant Yiddish-language organ of Lithuanian Jewry during the interwar years. This article is a condensed and substantially modified version of Document 59.

מיינונג, די פראגע וועגן דעם, אף וויפיל דער ענין באַרירט דאָס אידישע פאלק און ווי אזוי די אידישע עפנטלעכע מיינונג דארף רעאגירן אף די איינצלע מעאַמענטן פונם פראצעס. עס קומט מיר, אלזאָ, אויס אין דער לעצטער שעה צו געבן אן ענטפער די פערזאָנען, צווישן זיי אויך זייער חשובע, וועלכע מיינען, אז דאָס אידנטום האָט געקאָנט בלייבן פון דער זייט פונם פראצעס. די רואיקע און באדאכטע פון צווישן זיי באַגרינדן עס קודם־כל, דערמיט, וואס קיינמאָל האָבן נאָך אידן, אַלס אַזעלכע, זיך נישט אריינגעמישט אין א פאר־טיידיקונג פון אַ איד וועלכער האָט געהרגעט אַ מענטשן. זיי דערמאָנען דעם פאקט, אז יעדעס מאָל, ווען עס האָט זיך געהאַנדלט וועגן א גראַנדיעזן אידישן פראצעס, איז דער אידישער אנגעקלאַגטער געווען אן אומשולדיקער מענטש, פון וועלכן מיר האבן געוואוסט קלאר אז ער האָט גארנישט ניט געטאָן, אז ער איז נישט באַגאַנגען קיין שום פארברעכן און אז ער ליידט נאָר דערפאר, ווייל ער איז א איד (ווי אין די פראצעסן פון דרייפוס און שטייגער), אדער, אז ער זיצט אף דער באשולדיקונגס־באנק אלס אַנגעקלאַגטער צוזאמען מיטן גאנצן אידישן פאָלק (ווי אין די פראַצעסן פון עלילת־דם). דעם שטאַנדפונקט האָבן הויפטזעכלעך אנגענומען עטלעכע אידישע כלל־טוער, וואס זיינען ווייט פונם אוקראינישן אידנטום און נישט איבערגעלעבט די מארטיראלאגיע פון יענע מיליאָנען אידן. זיי האָבן באַהויפטעט, אז מיר אידן מוזן פארנעמן די קריוודעס און אכזריותדיקע מעשים, וועלכע מען האָט אונז אנגעטאָן, און טראַגנדיק שטאַלץ די קרוין פון מארטירערטום, און נישט עפנענדיק די אלטע וואונדן, זאלן מיר לאָזן דעם געריכט זיך פאנאנדערקלייבן אין דעם גאנצן ענין. עס זיינען אויך געווען אזעלכע, וועלכע האָבן געראטן, אז די פארטיידיקונג זאל צוגעבן עס דעם כאַראַקטער פון אַ טאָט פון אַ משוגענעם, כדי אף אזא אופן אפצוגרעניצן פון דער טאָט דאָס אידישע פאלק און צורייבן דעם גאנצן ענין. נאָך אין די לעצטע טעג האָבן איך געהערט אַזעלכע שטימען, וואס האָבן געפרעגט: צי איז דען באמת נויטיק אפצודעקן דאָס גאנצע שרעקלעכע בילד פון דער מארטיראלאגיע פונם אוקראינישן אידנטום? צי קאָן מען זיך נישט באַציען פאטאַליסטיש צו דעם, וואס קומט פאר?

עס פארשטייט זיך, אז די פראגע האָבן מיר זיך געשטעלט אין דעם ערשטן מאמענט, ווען עס איז אונז באַקאַנט געוואָרן וועגן דעם מאָרד, וואס איז באַגאַנגען געוואָרן איבער פעטלוראָן, ד. ה.¹² אַף מאָרגן נאָך דעם טאָט. שוין אין יענעם טאָג האָבן מיר זיך דערוואוסט, אז שווארצבאָרד האָט זיך אויסגעקליבן אַ באַוואוסטן אַדוואקאַט, וועלכער איז, אלזא, נישט דורך אידישע געזעלשאַפטלעכע טוער, נאָר דורך אים פערזענלעך איינגעלאדן געוואָרן. מיר האָבן זייער גוט פארשטאַנען, אז נישט דער אַדוואקאַט און נישט קיין אַנדערער וועט נישט דערלאָזן, אז בשעת אזא פראצעס זאל מען בכלל נישט ריידן פון די שרעקלעכע ליידן, וואס עס איז אויסגעשטאַנען דאָס אוקראינישע אידנטום אין משך פון מער, ווי צוויי יאר. אַזאָ טאַקטיק, ווי מען האָט זי אונז געראטן, וואלט געווען אינגאנצן נישט צוועקמע־סיק און וואלט נישט געווען אין הסכם אויך מיט אונזערע אייגענע איבערלעבענישן. היות ווי די שרעקלעכע פאסירונגען וועלן דאָך באַרירט ווערן, האָבן מיר געהאַלטן פאר אונזער חוב ארויסצונעמען און צו שאַפן דעם מאַטעריאַל, וועלכער קען באלויכטן די פראַגן אין זייער גאנצן פארנעם. עס איז נישט געווען פאר אונז די פראַגע פון שווארצבאָרד און פון דעם גורל, וואס ווארט אַף אים, נאָר וועגן דעם, צי אַף זיין פראצעס וועט פאר דער גאנצער וועלט דערציילט ווערן וועגן דער מוראדיקער טראגעדיע פון צענדליקער טויזנטער קדר

12. דאָס הייסט

שים, וועלכע זיינען צום טויט פארפייניקט געווארן, און פון הונדערטער טויזנטער, וואס האָבן יאָרן־לאַנג געלעבט אונטערן פחד פון אומפארמיידלעכן טויט. עס לעבט נאָך אין מיין זכרון א שטענדיגער אַרטיקל, וואס האָט אין יענער צייט געשריבן א באַקאַנטער אַ טיטעמיטישער זשורנאליסט, און וועלכער רופט אָן די איבערלעבענישן פון די אידן אין אוקראַינע "די פייניקונג דורך שרעק". יענער שרייבער האָט אפשר ניט געהאַט קיין רעכט איבערצוגעבן די ליידין פון דער אידישער נשמה. אבער אינסטינקטיוו האָט ער געגעבן די בולסטטע באַצייכנונג פאר די אידישע ענינים אין אוקראַינע. מיט עטלעכע יאָר צוריק, אין דער צייט פון דער גרעסטער קאַטאַסטראָפּע אין אוקראַינע, האָבן מיר מיט אַלע מיטלען פון פראפאגאַנדע דורך אומציייליקע קאָמוניקאַטן און ביולעטעניען, דורך דעם אפּעל פון די פראנצויזישע אינטעלעקטועלע, דורך א גרויסן און אין אלע איינצלהייטן אויסגעאַר-בעטן מעמאָראַנדום צום "פעלקער־בונד", דורך א גרויסער צאָל דעמאָנסטראַציעס אין דער גאַנצער וועלט געזוכט אופצואוועקן דאָס געוויסן פון דער מענטשהייט, אבער עס איז אונז געלונגען בלויז אין א באשריינקטער מאָס, און דער עיקר, אין אייראָפּע איז בא דער ניט אידישער וועלט ארויסגעקומען נאָר אַ שוואכער עכאָ. ווען מען זאל איצט וועלן די דאָזיקע ליידין פון דעם דריימיליאָניקן אוקראַינישן אידנטום איבערגעבן אפילו אין א קליינער פאר-קריפּלער פארם, ווען מען וואלט נישט געווען צונויפגעזאמלט די מאטעריאלן, וועלכע כאַראַקטעריזירן די עפאָכע און נישט געהאַלפן דערמיט אופקלערן דעם אמת – וואלט פון דעם פראצעס געבליבן בלויז דער איינדרוק, אז אַט די אלע ענוים און יסורים פון אונזערע אומגליקלעכע ברידער זיינען נאָר געווען א באַשיידענער און אומפארמיידלעכער עפיזאד פונם בירגערקריג. דאָס וואלט געהייסן, אז נישט נאָר מיר ווילן פארגעסן די ווירקלעכקייט, נאָר אַז מיר העלפן בפועל־ממש צו פאלסיפּיצירן די ווירקלעכקייט. איך בין טיף איבער צייגט, אַז פון אַזאַ מין רעזולטאַט און אויך פון אזא מין טאַקטיק וואלטן זיך באַלד דער שראַקן און זיך אפגעזאגט אויך יענע געזעלשאַפטלעכע טוער, וואס האָבן צוליב אַן אומבאַ-רעכנטן און אונמעגלעכן אפארטוניזם געגעבן די עצה זיך אַפּצוהאַלטן פון וועלכע־אסיאז פארבארייטונגען פונם נויטיקן מאַטעריאל איבער יענער צייט.

אַט פארוואס מיר האָבן נישט געקאָנט פאלגן די דאָזיקע עצות, פונקט אזוי, ווי מיר האָבן נישט געקאָנט פאלגן די אנאלאגישע עצות פון די אוקראַינישע טוער. איך לייקן נישט, אז די געשפרעכן, וואס מיר האָבן געהאַט עטלעכע מאָל מיט באַוואוסטע אוקראַינישע פירער פון דעם אנדער צד, האָבן אף אונז געהאַט אַ סך אַ גרעסערע ווירקונג, ווי די פארשלאגן פון אייניקע פאראנטווארטלעכע און אנדערע נישט־פאראנטווארטלעכע אידישע טוער. ווען זיי האָבן דירעקט צו אונז אין אַנהויב גערעדט וועגן די פריינדשאַפטלעכע באַציאונגען, פלעגט דאָס אף אונז מאַכן שטענדיק אַ געוויסן רושם. דערצו איז נאָך צוגעקומען אן אנדער אומשטאַנד. טיף דורכגעדרונגען פון דער הייליקער איבערציגונג, אז די שטרעבונגען פון יעדן פאלק און בפרט נאָך פון אַזאַ גרויסצאָליקן ווי דאָס אוקראַינישע, וועלכעס האָט דערצו אין פארשיידענע געזעץ־פּראָיעקטן זיך ארויסגעזאגט פאר זייער גרויסע נאַציאָנאַלע רעכט פונם אידישן פאלק, טאָרן מיר אף קיין פאל נישט שטערן, האָבן מיר זיך אבער געזאגט, אז אין דעם פאל פון אופדעקן פאגראַמען קאָנען מיר נישט גיין אף קיין שום הנחות. בא די באגעגענישן מיט די אוקראַינישע טוער וועלכע טרעטן ארויס אין דעם פראצעס מצד דער באַשולדיקונג, האָבן מיר זיי נישט איין מאָל אָנגעוויזן, אז וועגן אונזער באַציאונג צום אוקראַינישן פאלק איז די גאַנצע זאך פאר אונז א טראגישע איבערלעבונג, אבער אן אומ־פארמיידלעכער, אויב מיר ווילן נישט שענדן דעם זכרון פון אונזערע קרבנות, און ווען עס

האנדלט זיך וועגן דעם כבוד פון צענדליקער טויזענטער קרבנות, האָט דאָס אידנטום נישט דאָס רעכט צו שווייגן. קיין שום פאליטישע מאטיוון קאָנען און טאָרן נישט ווירקן אף די האַנדלונגען פון די אידישע פארשטייער דעמאָלט, ווען עס רעדט זיך וועגן פאָרגאַמען. דאָס איז געווען אונזער שטענדיקער פרינציפ. דער פרינציפ מוז אויך איצט אנגעווענדט ווערן. מיר האָבן דעריבער יעדעס מאָל געגעבן צו פארשטיין די אוקראינער, מיט וועלכע מיר פלע-גן זיך דורכריידן, און געזוכט זיי צו איבערצייגן, אַז זיי מוזן נישט נאָר פארשטיין אונזער שטימונג, נאָר אז זיי טאָרן פון זייער זייט נישט מאַכן די פאָרגאַמען צו קליין-געלט, נישט זען פארדעקן שולדיקע, נאָר אפּוואַרפן די שולדיקע פון זיך. מיר וואלטן וועלן, אַז בשעת דעם גאַנצן פראצעס זאל די הויפט-אופּמערקזאַמקייט געשיינקט ווערן יענע צענדליקער טויזנטער אידן, צווישן זיי אזוי פיל זקנים, פרויען און קינדער, וואס זיינען אזוי אכזריותדיק אומגעקומען און וועלכע מען רופט אָן בא אידן "קדושים". מיר וואלטן געוואלט אז דאס ציל פון אונז און פון די אוקראינער זאל אין דעם פאל זיין א געמיינזאמעס און דעמאָלט – אזוי האָבן מיר זיי געזאגט – וואלטן מיר געקאָנט גרינגער דערגרייכן די דאזיקע אופּגאַבע – נישט צו באַרירן די אינטערעסן פון דער אוקראינישער באַוועגונג. מיר האָבן באַ יעדער געלעגענהייט דערקלערט, אז דאָס ציל פון דער גאַנצער פארטיידיקונגס-אַקציע, אף וויפיל מיר פארשטייען זי, זאל נאָר באַשטיין אין פאלגענדן: פון איין זייט אופּדעקן דעם גאַנצן אמת וועגן די אידישע פאָרגאַמען און פון דער אנדער זייט אופּקלערן דעם פאַקט, אז די אוקראינישע פארשטייער באַגייען אַ טיפן טעות, ווען זיי אידענטיפיצירן פעטלוראַן מיטן גאַנצן אוקראינערטום און באַמיען זיך אף יעדן פאל אראַפּצונעמען פון אים די אחריות פון די געשעענישן אין אוקראַינע. זייער טאַקטיק איז נישט נאָר אַן אינטערנאַציאנאלער פעלער, נישט נאָר אַ קורצזיכטיקייט, נאָר אויך אַן אומגליקלעכע באַציאונג צום גאַנצן היסטאָרישן אמת.

אף דער באַשולדיקונגס-באַנק זיצט א אידישער אנגעקלאַגטער, אבער דער באַשולדי-קער איז יענן דריימיליאָנענדיק אידנטום, וועלכער האָט אזוי געליטן.

מיר האָבן אָפּט נישט נאָר אוקראינישע פירער, נאָר אויך אידישע פאליטיקער און פּר בליציסטן איבערגעחזרט, אז דעם אידנטום פאלט נישט איין צו באַשולדיקן דאָס גאַנצע אוקראינישע פאלק און אז דאָס אידנטום אין אוקראַינע האָט גענוג אָפּט אַרויסגעוויזן זיין ווירקלעכע סימפּאַטיע צום אוקראינישן פאלק. דאס אידנטום באַשולדיקט אָבער יענע, וועל-כע זיינען באמת שולדיק אין דעם מאַרטירערטום פון די אידן אף אוקראינע און באַשול-דיקט אויך, אין א געוויסער מאָס יענע, וועלכע ווילן פארקלענערן די אידישע ליידין ביז צום מינימום און ווילן נישט אנערקענען קיין שום פאראַנטוואַרטלעכקייט, ווייניקסטנס פון געוויסע קרייזן, פון געוויסע פּערזאָנען פאר די געשעענישן. אין אונזערע געשפּרעכן מיט די אוקראינישע פירער האָבן מיר געטראַכט וועגן דעם, ווי מען זאל אלץ טאָן, אז עס זאל נישט ארויסשפּרינגען קיין שנאה צווישן דעם אידישן פאלק און דעם אוקראַינישן. דורכפירנדיק ערלעך און באַוואוסטזיניק די דאָזיקע ליניע, האָפּן מיר, אז גראד דערפאַר, ווייל אין א געוויסן זין טרעטן די אידן ארויס אלס באַשולדיקער, וועט די גאַנצע אידישע געזעלשאַפטלעכקייט אין דער אייגענער צייט באַווייזן אַן אומגעוויינלעכע פארויכטיקייט און טראַכטן נאָר וועגן דעם הייליקן אמת און אז זי וועט זיך אָפהיטן פון צו רייצן וועלכע-נישט-איז אינסטינקטן, און מאַכן פאראַנטוואַרטלעך פאר די פאָרגאַם-מעשים דעם אוקראַינישן פאלק אַלס אזעלכן. איך שטעל זיך, נישט אָפּ אף דער פראגע, ווי גרויס עס איז דער טייל פון די אוקראַינער, וועלכע זיינען שולדיק אין די חטאים, ווייל אויב אַפילו דער טייל

זאל זיך ארויסווייזן אין צאָל אלס זייער א גרויסער, וואלטן מיר אויך געדארפט געדיינקען וועגן יענע אוקראינער, וואס זיינען באמת קעגן אלע פאגראַם־טאַטן. איך זאג דאס נישט נאָר דערפאר, ווייל פאר די אידן, וואס זיינען געצוואונגען צו לעבן אין גרויסע מאסן מיט דעם אוקראינישן פאלק, וואָלט געווען שרעקלעך זיך שטעלן אָפּ אַ שטאַנדפונקט פון קעגנ־זייטיקע פיינטלעכע באַציאונגען; נישט דערפאר, ווייל איבער דעם וואלטן געליטן געוויסע פאליטישע פאראייניקונגען צווישן אידן און אוקראינער אין איינצלנע מלוכות, נאָר קודם־כל, אויך דערפאר, ווייל מיר, אידן, טאָרן אָפּ קיין פאל אנערקענען פאראלגעמיינערונגען וועגן גאנצע פעלקער, ווייל מיר אידן, טאָרן זיך נישט לאזן אריינטרייבן אין א נאַציאנאַלער האסישטימונג. מיר ווילן זיך נישט רעכענען וואס אפילו געוויסע פראגרעסיווע אוקראינישע טוער, וועלכע אונטערשטרייכן כסדר זייער נעגאטיווע באַציאונג צום אַנטיסעמיטיזם, האָבן נישט אַלץ געטאָן, כדי צו פארמיידן א פיינטלעכע פראפאגאנדע קעגן אידן ארום דעם פראצעס. מיר ווילן האָפּן, אז דער אַנדער צד וועט געדיינקען יענע ערלעכע קעגנזייטיקע פארשטענדיקונג וועגן דעם, מען זאל נישט זייען קיין האַס.

מיר געדיינקען די גאנצע צייט אז נישט אין פאריזש האָבן מיר צו באַשליסן די פראגע וועגן די קעגנזייטיקע באַציאונגען צווישן דעם אידישן און אוקראינישן פאלק; מיר זיינען אין פאריזש נאָר אָפּ אזוי פיל באַשולדיקער, אָפּ וויפיל עס האַנדלט זיך, וועגן דעם בילד פון די פאגראַמען. ווייטער אבער ווילן מיר מיט אַלע קרעפטן דערצו העלפן, אז דערפון זאָל נישט ארויסקומען קיין אומגעהויער שאדן.

נישט אָפּט קומט־פאָר, אז די אופמערקזאַמקייט פון דער גרויסער אייראָפּיאישער גע־זעלשאַפטלעכקייט זאל צוגעצויגן ווערן צו דער אידישער טראגעדיע, און אז דאָס קומט יעצט פאר, מוזן מיר עס אויסנוצן אין דער געהעריקער מאָס.

מיר דארפן נישט ערשט ערקלערן, אז מיר זיינען אַלע מאָל קעגן מאָרד־טאַטן און אויך קעגן דעם מאָרד פון פעטליוראן, אבער דאָ האַנדלט זיך פאר אונז נישט וועגן דעם אַקט גופא, נאָר וועגן די אוקראינישע אידן און וועגן זייער געפאר.

Translation

Our Attitude Toward The Schwarzbard Trial

by L. Motzkin – Chairman of the Comité des Délégations Juives

Because I am one of those servants of the Jewish community who has, from early on, been deeply involved in investigating the anti-Jewish pogroms and who, together with a circle of other communal servants, has taken an active interest in the matters that will be raised at the Schwarzbard trial,¹³ various representatives of the press have approached me regarding an interview.

13 The article is based on a memorandum prepared before the trial began (Document 59).

During the 16 months that have passed since Petliura was killed I have always energetically refused all interviews and have been satisfied with my modest role directing the work of preparing the materials necessary to illuminate the Jewish tragedy in Ukraine during the pogroms of 1919–1921. Now, however, during the Schwarzbard trial, I regard it as my obligation to express my opinion on the question that is occupying so very many Jewish communal leaders along with the broadest Jewish – and in part non-Jewish – public opinion – the question of the extent to which the matter impinges upon the Jewish people and of how Jewish public opinion ought to react to particular points in the trial.

So it falls to me at this late moment to give an answer to those individuals, among them many highly esteemed people, who believe that the Jews as a whole could have stayed out of the trial. The calm and thoughtful among them base their argument first of all that Jews have never interfered as such in the defense of a Jew who killed a human being. They mention the fact that whenever a high-profile Jewish trial was involved, the Jewish defendant was an innocent person, about whom we knew clearly that he had done nothing, that he had committed no crime, and that he was enduring what he was solely because he was a Jew (as in the trials of Dreyfus and Steiger¹⁴). Sometimes he stood accused together with the entire Jewish people (as in the blood libel trials¹⁵). That point of view has been adopted by a few Jewish community leaders who are far removed from Ukrainian Jewry and who did not live through the martyrdom of those millions of Jews. They have claimed that we must take the wrongs and cruel deeds that have been done to us and, proudly wearing the crown of martyrdom and without opening old wounds, allow the court to sort out the entire affair. There have also been those who have advised the defense to plead insanity, so as thereby to cordon the Jewish people off from the deed and erase the entire matter. As recently as in the last few days I have heard such voices, who have asked: Is it really necessary to un-

14 Stanisław Steiger, a Jewish student from Lwów, was falsely accused of plotting to assassinate Polish President Stanisław Wojciechowski in 1924. A Ukrainian nationalist, Teofil Olszanski, actually claimed credit for the plot. Nevertheless Steiger was held in custody for over a year before being acquitted in November 1925. See Pawel Korzec, *The Steiger Affair*, in: *Soviet Jewish Affairs* 3 (1973) 2, 38–57.

15 Reference to trials of Jews for alleged murder of Christians for ritual purposes. Five such trials had taken place in Europe since 1880, the most recent and most notorious of which – the 1913 trial of Mendel Beilis in Kiev – had attracted worldwide attention. Arnold Margolin had played a significant role in Beilis's successful defense effort.

cover the whole horrible picture of the martyrdom of Ukrainian Jewry? Can we not simply take a fatalistic attitude toward whatever comes?

Obviously, we posed those questions to ourselves from the first moment after we found out about Petliura's murder; i.e., the morning following the deed. That very day we learned that Schwarzbard had engaged a well-known attorney who was selected not by the Jewish community but by him personally.

We understood quite well that neither that attorney nor any other would permit a situation in which, at such a trial, the terrible suffering that Ukrainian Jewry endured for more than two years would not be mentioned at all. Such a tactic, which we were advised to adopt, would have been entirely pointless, nor would it have been compatible with our own experience. Because the frightful events were going to be mentioned in any case, we regarded it as our obligation to elicit and to produce material that could illuminate the issues to their full extent. We were not concerned with Schwarzbard and with the fate that awaited him but only with whether the frightful tragedy of tens of thousands of martyrs who were tortured to death and of hundreds of thousands who lived for years with the fear of unavoidable doom would be told at the trial before the entire world. I still recall a disgraceful article written at the time by a well-known antisemitic journalist that called the experiences of the Jews in Ukraine "torture by fear."¹⁶ Perhaps that writer did not have any right to convey the sufferings of the Jewish soul. But instinctively he provided the most outstanding definition of the Jewish situation in Ukraine. A few years ago, during the great catastrophe in Ukraine, we tried, using all means of spreading information – countless communiqués and bulletins, an appeal to the French intellectuals, in a long and highly detailed memorandum to the League of Nations,¹⁷ through many demonstrations throughout the world – to awaken the conscience of humanity, but we were able to do so only to the most limited extent. Most significantly, in Europe the non-Jewish world responded with only a faint echo. If now we want to relate the suffering of those three million Ukrainian Jews in even a tiny, distorted measure, then gathering together the materials that characterize the epoch and clarify the truth is essential to avoid having the trial leave the impression that all of the tortures and sufferings of our unfortunate brethren were only a peripheral and unavoidable episode of the civil war. That would mean not only that we wish to forget reality but that we are actively abetting the falsification of reality. I am deeply convinced that people would be shocked by such a result and would also immediately reject those communal leaders who, on account

16 Reference to V. V. Shulgin, *Pytky strakhom*. See above, Document 27, n. 5.

17 Documents 7–9.

of an ill-considered, untenable opportunism, advised refraining from any preparation of the necessary material from that time.

That is why we could not follow such advice, just as we could not follow the analogous advice of Ukrainian leaders. I do not deny that the talks we had a few times with Ukrainian leaders from the other side had a much greater effect than the suggestions of some responsible and other irresponsible Jewish communal servants. When they spoke to us at the outset about hostile relations, it would always make a certain impression upon us. An additional consideration also came into play. Deeply imbued with the sacred conviction that we must never interfere with the efforts of every nation, and certainly of one so numerous as the Ukrainian nation, which in various bills had legislated quite extensive national rights for the Jewish nation, we nonetheless stated that in the case of exposing pogroms we cannot give any discounts. In meetings with the Ukrainian leaders who will be appearing at the trial on behalf of the prosecution we demonstrated more than once that the entire affair is a tragic occurrence for our relations with the Ukrainians, but it is an unavoidable one if we do not wish to shame the memory of our victims. And when the honor of tens and thousands of victims is at stake, Jewry has no right to remain silent. No political considerations could have been allowed to affect the dealings of Jewish representatives when pogroms are on the table. That was our constant principle. Now, too, this principle must be applied. We made it clear every time to the Ukrainians with whom we carried on negotiations and sought to persuade them that they need not only understand our view but that for their part they must not make light of the pogroms, not cover up for the guilty, but expel the guilty from among them. We would like that throughout the entire trial the main attention be devoted to those tens of thousands of Jews, among whom were so many old people, women, and children, who perished so cruelly, whom Jews call *kedoyshim* (sacred martyrs). We would like that in this case our goal and that of the Ukrainians be a common one. If that were to happen – so we told them – we could more easily complete the task of not disturbing the interests of the Ukrainian national movement. At every opportunity we declared that the goal of the entire defense effort consists, to the best of our understanding, solely of the following: on one hand to uncover the whole truth about the Jewish pogroms and on the other hand to bring to light the fact that the Ukrainian representatives are committing a grave error by identifying Petliura with all Ukrainians and by striving in all events to absolve him of responsibility for what happened in Ukraine. Their tactic is not only an international blunder, not only short-sighted, but is also an unfortunate attitude toward historical truth altogether.

A Jewish defendant is sitting in the dock, but the accusers are really the three million Jews who suffered so terribly.

We have often repeated not only to Ukrainian leaders but also to Jewish political figures and journalists that it does not occur to the Jews to accuse the entire Ukrainian nation and that Ukrainian Jewry has often enough demonstrated its real sympathy for the Ukrainian people. However, Jewry does accuse those who actually are guilty of turning the Jews of Ukraine into martyrs and to a certain extent also those who wish to minimize Jewish suffering and to recognize no responsibility at all, even of specific circles and specific individuals, for what happened. In our discussions with the Ukrainian leaders we thought about how to do everything so that hatred should not spring up between the Jewish and Ukrainian peoples. Pursuing this line forthrightly and consciously, we hope that, precisely because Jews are in a certain sense playing the role of accuser, the entire Jewish public will show extraordinary caution, keeping in mind only the sacred truth and taking care not to arouse any instinct to assign responsibility for the pogroms to the Ukrainian people as such. It does not matter to me how large a proportion of the Ukrainians is guilty of the sins, because even if it should turn out that the proportion is very large, we would still have to think about the Ukrainians who are truly against all pogrom acts. I say this not only because for Jews, masses of whom must live together with the Ukrainian people, it would be terrible to put ourselves in a position of mutual hostility, and not because it would cause certain political alliances between Jews and Ukrainians in particular countries to suffer, but first of all because we Jews must in no case countenance generalizations regarding entire nations, because we Jews must not allow ourselves to be drawn into exchanges of national hatred. We do not wish to recount that even certain progressive Ukrainian leaders who emphasize regularly their negative attitude toward antisemitism have not done everything to avoid hostile propaganda about Jews surrounding the trial. We want to hope that the other side will remember that honest mutual understanding that there should be no hatred.

We remember all the time that it is not in Paris that the question of the mutual relations between the Jewish and the Ukrainian peoples will be decided. We are in Paris as accusers only insofar as the representation of the pogroms is at stake. Beyond that we will assist with all our strength to make sure that no great harm ensues.

It does not happen often that the attention of the greater European society is directed to the Jewish tragedy. Since this is happening now, we must make appropriate use of it.

We do not need to declare that we are always against murder and also against the murder of Petliura. Here we are talking not about the act itself but about Ukrainian Jews and the danger that faces them.

Document 69*Cabinet of the Ukrainian National Republic**Paris, 30 October 1927**Published declaration, 2 pages**Language: Ukrainian**Tryzub, no. 42 (110), 13 November 1927, pp. 1–2*

Від Уряду Української Народньої Республіки

Червоні окупанти України, рятуючи своє становище та відводячи від себе смертельну небезпеку, вбили торік найманою рукою Голову Директорії, Головного Отамана Військ Української Народньої Республіки С. Петлюру, того, хто був втіленням самої ідеї української державности.

Щоб одвести від себе гнів народній, скерувати увагу в інший бік, Москва, скористовувавшись для свого огидного злочину жидівською рукою, кинула ганебний наклеп на світлу пам'ять Вождя нації і на добре ім'я всього нашого народу, обвинувачуючи їх в погромах.

Провокаційній роботі большевиків пішли на зустріч численні жидівські кола на еміграції. Ставши в оборону вбивці, вихваляючи його як местника та національного героя, вони зєднали свої зусилля – вкрити ганьбою борців за Україну – з намаганнями совітів знищити саму ідею самостійної держави української. В цій роботі їм охоче стала в допомогі московська еміграція всіх відтінків. На цьому зійшлися всі вороги нашої державности.

Цьому єдиному фронтові ворожому українське громадянство, яке мало змогу вільно висловитися, тоб-то громадянство, що перебуває на чужині, протиставило свої об'єднані сили, згуртувавшись коло пам'яті Покійного Отамана та віддаючи усю увагу її обороні на процесі.

Не рівні були сили, і становище ускладнялося тим, що треба було вести справу серед незвичних обставин, в чужому суді, перед чужими людьми, які не могли як слід розібратися в наших ділах.

І от судова справа скінчилася виправданням убивці, який ще на суді цінично вихвалявся своїм нелюдським вчинком.

Як торік трагічна смерть Головного Отамана, так тепер виправдання його убивці глибоко вразили все українське громадянство.

[2] І в цей тяжкий момент Правительство Української Народньої Республіки вважає за свій обов'язок звернутися до всіх українсь-

ких громадян, як тих, що на еміграції перебувають, так і на Україні суцільних.

Перш за все Правительство зазначає, що процес судовий був і зостається тільки одним з моментів в неперервній боротьбі за українську державність. В боротьбі цій окупанти, рятуючи своє панування, беруться всяких способів, не гудуючи підступом, брехнею та наклепом. Ми ж, не зважаючи на всі ворожі заходи, ані на хвилину не припинимо одвертої і твердої боротьби за визволення України та відновлення її державности.

Ганебна, жалюгідна і шкідлива позиція, яку зайняли жидівські еміграційні організації, що перейняли на себе вчинок убивці і відповідальність за нього, обурила весь український народ.

Плямуючи нерозважний вчинок засліплених ненавистю проводирів еміграційного жидівства, Правительство вважає, що не тими шляхами злоби, ворожнечі і неправди рішаються відносини між українським народом, господарем на своїй землі, та жидівською меншістю, що живе в нашій краї.

Не тут, не такими способами, не з цими сліпими, одірваними від ґрунту представниками жидівства розважати про міжнаціональні відносини на Україні.

Разом з тим Правительство глибоко певне, що той факт, що убивця являється тільки знаряддям в руках Москви, що він є тільки слухняним агентом її, – на що й судове слідство і розправа сама постачили чимало доводів – вийде таки на світло денне і викриє раніше чи пізніше ту ганебну провокацію, якої допустилися наші вороги.

Подаючи вищезазначене до відома українського громадянства, Правительство закликає його заховати повний спокій, утриматися від всяких нерозважних виступів і, продовжуючи енергійну оборону чести лицарської армії Української Народньої Республіки та її незабутнього Вождя і доброго імени всього народу нашого, об'єднати всі свої сили, всі свої зусилля коло єдиної мети – визволення рідного краю і відновлення його державної незалежности.

Вячеслав ПРОКОПОВИЧ (–)

Голова Ради Міністрів

Володимир САЛЬСЬКИЙ (–)

генерального штабу-хорунжий,

Міністр Військових справ

30 жовтня 1927 року.

*Translation***From the Cabinet of the Ukrainian National Republic**

Last year the Red occupiers of Ukraine, seeking to preserve their position and to divert mortal danger from themselves, employed a hired hand to kill the Head of the Directory and Commander-in-Chief of the Armies of the Ukrainian National Republic S. Petliura, who embodied the very idea of Ukrainian statehood.

In order to redirect popular anger and to turn attention toward the other side, Moscow, using a Jewish hand to carry out its hideous crime, shamefully slandered the pure memory of our national leader and the good name of our entire people by accusing them of pogroms.

Numerous Jewish emigré circles fell for the Bolshevik provocations. Standing in defense of the murderer, exalting him as an avenger and a national hero, they joined forces with the efforts of the Soviets to destroy the very idea of an independent Ukrainian state. In this task they willingly came to the assistance of Muscovite emigrés of all shades, thereby uniting all of the enemies of our statehood.

The Ukrainian community, which, existing in exile, has insufficient ability to speak freely, turned their united forces against this uniformly hostile front and came together around the memory of the late Ataman, giving its entire attention to defending it at the trial.

The forces were unequal, and the situation was complicated by the necessity of dealing with the matter in unfamiliar surroundings, in a foreign court, in front of strangers who could not properly follow our affairs.

And so the matter before the court ended in the acquittal of a murderer who took pride at the trial in his inhuman deed.

Like last year's tragic death of the Chief Ataman, so now did the acquittal of his assassin make a profound impression upon the entire Ukrainian community.

[2] And in this difficult moment the government of the Ukrainian National Republic regards it as its duty to appeal to all Ukrainian citizens, those living abroad and those in Ukraine proper.

First of all, the government notes that the trial was and remains only one aspect of the ongoing struggle for Ukrainian statehood. In the struggle the occupiers, in their effort to preserve their rule, take all sorts of measures; they do not disdain underhandedness, lies, and slander. We, however, ignoring all of these hostile acts, do not desist for a moment from the outspoken, unwavering struggle for the liberation of Ukraine and the restoration of its statehood.

The disgraceful, deplorable, and harmful position that Jewish emigré organizations have taken in adopting the killer and assuming responsibility for his deed has outraged the entire Ukrainian nation.

Condemning the ill-considered action of Jewish emigré leaders blinded by hatred, the government considers that the relations between a Ukrainian nation that is master in its own land and a Jewish minority that lives in our country will not be resolved through such paths of anger, enmity, and lies.

Not here, not in this fashion, not with these blind representatives of Jewry who are devoid of any foundation, will we negotiate over interethnic relations in Ukraine.

Nevertheless the government is profoundly confident that the fact that the murderer is only a tool in the hands of Moscow, that he is simply its obedient agent – a fact of which the judicial investigation and the trial itself provided quite a bit of proof – will see the light of day and will expose sooner or later the disgraceful provocation that our enemies have committed.

In bringing the above notice to the attention of the Ukrainian community, the government urges it to maintain complete calm, to refrain from any rash steps and to continue the vigorous defense of the chivalrous honor of the army of the Ukrainian National Republic and its unforgettable leader, along with the good name of our entire nation, to unite all of its forces, all of its efforts, around a single purpose – the liberation of our native land and the restoration of its independent statehood.

Vyacheslav PROKOPOVYCH (–)
Head of the Council of Ministers

Volodymyr SALSKEYI (–)
General of the Cavalry on the General Staff
Minister of Military Affairs

30 October 1927.

Document 70

Oleksandr Shulhyn to Arnold Margolin

Paris, 31 October 1927

Typewritten letter, 2 pages

*Language: English*¹⁸

AJA, MS Coll. 359 (Louis Marshall), box 144

A. Choulgine
42, rue Denfert Rocherau,
Paris V.
October 31, 1927.

Dear Arnold Davidovich:

I wrote you not so long ago, but as I see, this letter[,] as well as a few others of mine, seem[s] to have been lost in the mail.

What can I tell you at the present time? I have a very bad feeling after the trial. The solitary voices of Mr. Louis Marhsall [sic] and yourself softened this heavy impression which was created by the testimonies of Goldshtein, Cherikover, Tiomkin, Sliosberg and Motzkin. I said in the *Tryzub*, in my article "Answer to Jabotinsky,"¹⁹ what I thought about these leaders. My thoughts now are still more black. The greatest misfortune for the Jewry is that Schwartzbard is acquitted. At least the minimum sentence should have been imposed, to placate the sentiments of the Ukrainians. At the present time, however, the sentiment of hatred is implanted even in the hearts of those Ukrainians who were absolutely foreign to any anti-Semitism. Especially irritating were the testimonies of Goldshtein (his testimony was simply mean) and of Cherikover. All these men are similar to those stupid historians who take only one page of history and forget about all the rest of events and facts. The representation of pogroms in such a way as if there was tranquility and peace in Ukraine at that [t]ime, was the thing which excited us in the greatest measure. I wrote how I wept over the pogroms, but I also

18 Margolin evidently prepared this version of a letter originally written to him in Russian or Ukrainian for circulation among colleagues at the American Jewish Committee. No other version has been located.

19 Oleksandr Shulhyn, *Odpowid' Zhabotins'komu* [Response to Jabotinsky], in: *Tryzub*, 16 October 1927.

mentioned about our great pogrom -- [2] the pogrom of Ukraine. Why, they did not even mention it! No one mentioned it! And Goldshtein said in plain words that all was quiet in Ukraine, until Petlura came and created anarchy! To all this, Torres (the notorious communist, who became associated with Motzkin and Sliosberg) threw upon us such filth that it was difficult to repeat it. All this is put on account not so much of Torres as of Motzkin's and Tiomkin's.

This trial is a catastrophe, a catastrophe for Jewish-Ukrainian relations, and no one knows how and when the possibility will arise to repair them. The excitement from the judgment of the French jury among the Ukrainians is tremendous. But the French are also indignant. One of the well-known French radicals said to some of the Jewish leaders that they committed an unheard-of stupidity, giving the court to an agent of Cheka, Schwartzbard. This will only lead to make all France in a short time anti-Semitic.

So, dear Arnold Davidovich, if all people were like you, if all would have the courage to go also against the masses, if necessary, and be sometimes above racial fanaticism -- then there would not be such trials. Although you are lonely among the Jews, Ukraine, and still more I personally, appreciate your civilian courage, and I warmly embrace you across the Atlantic Ocean and the ocean of human hatred.

Yours,
(signed) A. Choulgine

Document 71

Comité des Délégations Juives

Paris, November 1927²⁰

Extract from final two pages of 15-page typewritten report

Language: German

CZA, A126/52/22

20 Handwritten date: "1927." Month determined from internal evidence.

COMITE DES DELEGATIONS JUIVES

[...]²¹

[14] Schon im Juli 1919 hatten die Vertreter Delisraels²² mit den Leitern der ukrainischen Delegation 3 sehr stuermische Unterhaltungen, nach denen der erste wirkliche Appell Petluras gegen Pogrome erfolgte²³ und die Aufforderung an das Comitee kam, durch Entsendung einer Spezialuntersuchungskommission nach dem in Petluras Haenden noch befindliches Gebiet kam; von dieser Aufforderung, die nach Feststellung gewisser Modalitaeten akzeptiert wurde, hat aber das Comitee wegen des Zerfalls der Macht Petluras, keinen Gebrauch machen koenne.

In einer viel spaeteren Zeit bot sich Delisrael die Moeglichkeit der Welt in erschuetternder Weise zu zeigen, welchen Martyrium das ukrainische Judentum erlebt hatte.

[15] Als im Mai 1926 Schalom Schwarzbard einen der Hauptschuldigen der Exzesse, Hetman Petlura, in Paris ermordet hatte, erkannte Delisrael sofort, dass hier eine ~~Gelegenheit~~ unerwartete Gelegenheit sich bot, das schreckliche Blatt der juedischen Erlebnisse aufzurollen und die Empoerung der ganzen Welt hervorzurufen. Das Comitee gruendete zu diesem Zweck ein besonderes Verteidigungscomitee [sic], das in dem Buero Delisraels und mit seinem Apparat und unter seiner Leitung arbeitete. Dieses Verteidigungskomitee hat sowohl alle frueheren Materialien Delisraels zusammengefasst und ausserdem das historische Pogromarchiv (Vorsitzender Dubnow) aus Berlin heruebergebracht und damit die Grundlage fuer die gesamte Verteidigungsarbeit geschaffen. Saemtliche Eingaben des Verteidigers wurden von diesem Buero vorbereitet, alle in Betracht kommenden Zeugen ausfindig gemacht und mehrere Publikationen veroeffentlicht. Verschiedenen Zeitschriften und allen juedischen wie nicht juedischen Journalisten wurde das noetige Material uebergeben. ### Eine umfangreiche Korrespondenz auch mit den weitesten Laendern fuehrte dazu, dass die meisten Personen, die als Zeugen diese Vorgaenge zu schildern vermochten, nach Paris zum Prozess kamen, darunter solche nicht nur aus Russland, Polen, Rumaenien etc. sondern auch aus Amerika. Dazu gab Delisrael in franzoesischer und englischer Sprache ein grosses

21 Report of the activities of the Comité des Délégations Juives unrelated to the Schwarzbard affair omitted.

22 Abbreviation for Comité des Délégations Juives, used in addressing cablegrams.

23 Evidently a reference to a statement issued by Petliura on 26 August 1919 proclaiming, « L'armée ... ne doit pas être l'instrument du malheur des Juifs! » Ordre à l'armée de l'Ataman en chef du 26 août 1919, No. 31, in: Comité commémoratif Simon Petlura (ed.), Documents sur les pogromes en Ukraine et l'assassinat de Simon Petlura, 104 f.

Buch ueber die ukrainischen Pogrome heraus, indem, neben einer historischen Darstellung, hauptsaechlich Dokumente zusammengebracht waren (verfasst von J. Schechtmann unter Redaktion von L. Motzkin).²⁴ Der Prozess Schwarzbard selbst verlief unter dramatischen Szenen und liess tatsaechlich die gesamte Kulturwelt das Martyrium des Judentums in der Ukraine miterleben. Der Freispruch Schwarzbards entsprach der allgemeinen Stimmung aller Menschheitsfreunde und machte ## der franzoesischen Justiz Ehre.

Document 72

*Mykola Shapoval to Editor, Dni*²⁵
*Berlin, undated [November 1927]*²⁶
Handwritten letter, 5 pages
Language: Russian
 NYPL, *QGA 73–3936, no. 3

Отвѣт Н. Шаповала на письмо М. Володина

В этом своем отвѣтѣ на письмо М. Володина, которое было напечатано в «Днях» от 22 октября, я коснусь только той его части, которая посредственно или непосредственно касается лично меня, оставляя вопросы касающіеся Главного Комитета ЗОУПСР в сторонѣ для отвѣта самим Комитетом.

Вызванный в концѣ июля 1926 года первый раз к слѣдователю, ведущему слѣдство по дѣлу убійства С. Петлюры Шварцбардом, я заявил слѣдствателю, что зная многое об убійствѣ Петлюры, я смогу все это показать при условіи, что мое показаніе не будет достояніем третьих |2| лиц и прессы. Слѣдователь заявил, что этого он гарантировать не может и что все мое показанія может быть завтра опубликовано в прессѣ. Тогда я отвѣтил, что показывать всего не буду, а только часть. И дѣйствительно

24 See above, Introduction, n. 294.

25 Russian emigré daily published in Berlin from 1922 to 1925 and in Paris from 1926 to 1928. It was associated with the former head of the Russian Provisional Government, Aleksander Kerensky.

26 Applied handwritten note in Ukrainian, perhaps by collection curator: “November 1926” (листопад 1926). The year is clearly inaccurate. The text was written in response to an item that appeared in the press on 22 October 1927.

показал только часть своих свѣдѣній относительно убійства С. Петлюры. Сдѣлал я это потому, что в первый же день убійства С. Петлюры я стал подозрѣвать Володина как активного участника убійства. Чтобы укрѣпить свои подозрѣнія и расширить еще болѣе свои свѣдѣнія об участии Володина в убійствѣ, я не разорвал с ним своего знакомства и продолжал его до тѣх пор, пока не убѣдился окончательно, что Володин не «идейный вдохновитель», как он пишет, а главный и фактический организатор убійства С. Петлюры, спеціально для этого прибывшій во Францію.

На слѣдствіи я не показывал, что Володин взял у меня адрес С. Петлюры [3] а передал его Шварцбарду, а что Володин нѣсколько раз спрашивал у меня адрес С. Петлюры и что я каждый раз ему в этом отказывал.

Утвержденіе Володина, что он поставил в порядкѣ информаціи в извѣстность И. Штейнберга, тоже неправда: на письмо Штейнберга ко мнѣ, я его точно поинформировал о случившемся и в послѣдующем письмѣ он мнѣ это подтвердил.

Володин не захотѣл принять третейскаго суда, что ему предложил Комитет ЗОУПСР. А что же хотѣл Володин от Комитета, обращаясь к нему. [4] Не хотѣл ли он 'получить' только такое рѣшеніе, какое уже сам ~~опредѣлил~~ 'предопредѣлил'. Ранѣе я и сам хотѣл третейскаго суда и многим высказывал свое желаніе об этом. Но позднѣе это совершенно отпадало. Тѣм болѣе, что Володин не принадлежит ни к партіи лѣвых есеров (русских) ни к союзу максималистов, как это видно из письма ко мнѣ Штейнберга и как это утверждает французскій социалист Нейман, русскій максималист Добковскій и многіе другіе.

Утвержденіе Володина о моем предательствѣ его еще тѣм болѣе удивительно, что на основаніи этого можно было 'бы' предположить, что я с ним вел какое то одно дѣло и стремился с ним к совершенію одного совмѣстно с ним задуманаго плана.

Ибо как социалист я против смертной казни за преступленія, не взирая, кто будет присуждать к смертной [5] казни, государство или отдѣльная лица. А тѣм болѣе невинных или виновность которых оспаривается. И считаю долгом и честью не только социалиста, а вообще каждаго человѣка не скрывать проступленій. Болѣе того, принадлежность к ~~###~~ социал партіи или к данной политической группировки не может служить причиной укрывательства и солидаризаціи с преступником. А тѣм болѣе с уголовным. Сомнѣваюсь, чтобы вообще принадлежность даже к одной партіи могла меня обязывать кого нибудь из членов ея, напримѣр, совершавшаго воровство.

Н. Шаповал

*Translation*Reply of N. Shapoval²⁷ to the letter of M. Volodin

In this reply of mine to the letter of M. Volodin, which was published in *Dni* on 22 October,²⁸ I will deal only with those portions that relate directly or indirectly to me personally, leaving questions touching upon the Chief Committee of the Foreign Organization of the Ukrainian Social-Revolutionary Party for the Committee itself to answer.

When, in late July 1926, I was summoned for the first time before the examining magistrate in the matter of the murder of S. Petliura by Schwarzbard, I told the magistrate that, as I know many things about Petliura's murder, I could testify to all of them, but on condition that my testimony will not come into the possession of any third [2] party or of the press. The magistrate indicated that he could not guarantee this and that my entire testimony could be published in the press tomorrow.²⁹ At that point I replied that I would not testify in full but only in part. And in fact I related only a part of what I know about the murder of S. Petliura. I did this because from the first day, when Petliura was killed, I had begun to suspect that Volodin was actively involved in the murder. In order to fortify my suspicion and to broaden even more my knowledge of Volodin's role in the murder, I did not cut off my acquaintance and maintained it up to the present, as long as I was not completely convinced that Volodin was not the one who "inspired the idea," as he has written, but the primary, actual organizer of the murder of S. Petliura, who came to France expressly for that purpose.

During the investigation I did not testify that Volodin took the address of S. Petliura from me [3] and gave it to Schwarzbard but that Volodin asked me several times for S. Petliura's address and that I refused him every time.³⁰

Volodin's claim that he kept I. Steinberg regularly informed is also untrue: in answer to Steinberg's letter to me I informed him exactly about what was happening and in a following letter he confirmed this to me.

27 In this document Shapoval used the Russian form of his name, Nikolai.

28 Volodin, a Pis'mo M. Volodina.

29 French criminal procedure did not regard the investigations of an examining magistrate as confidential.

30 See Documents 31, 48.

Volodin did not wish to accept the arbitration hearing that the Committee of the Foreign Organization of the Ukrainian Social-Revolutionary Party offered him. And what did Volodin want from the Committee? [4] Didn't he want 'to obtain' only a predetermined decision? Earlier I myself had wanted an arbitration hearing, and I had expressed my wish to many. But later this passed altogether. Moreover, Volodin is not a member of either the (Russian) Left SRs or of the Maximalist Union, as can be seen from Steinberg's letter to me and as confirmed by the French Socialist Neiman,³¹ the Russian Maximalist Dobkowski, and many others.

Volodin's claim concerning my treachery toward him is even more surprising because on that basis one 'might' assume that I committed some deed with him and strove together with him to carry out a plan that he and I thought up together.

As a socialist I am opposed to capital punishment for crimes no matter who is [5] punished, the state or individuals, especially the innocent or those whose guilt is disputed. And I believe that everyone, not only socialists but all human beings, is honor-bound not to cover up crimes. Moreover, membership ~~### social~~ in a party or in a given political group cannot serve as an excuse for harboring or expressing solidarity with a criminal. I doubt that even membership in the same party could obligate me toward one of its members who, for example, carried out a theft.

N. Shapoval

Document 73

Jean Tripier (French chargé d'affaires, Warsaw), to French Foreign Minister³²

Warsaw, 2 November 1927

Typewritten report (copy), 5 pages

Language: French

AN, Ministère de la Justice, 1583A 1926

31 See above, Document 31, n. 16.

32 Aristide Briand (1862–1932), prime minister in eleven French governments (1909–1911, 1913, 1915–1917, 1921–1922, 1925–1926, 1929), foreign minister 1925–1932.

51

COPIE

M. J. Tripier, Chargé d'Affaires de la République Française à Varsovie.
#.#. le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères.

N^o. 343 Varsovie, le 2 Novembre 1927

Impression provoquée
par le procès Schwarzbard [sic].

La nouvelle de l'acquittement de l'assassin de Petlura a produit en Pologne la sensation que l'on pouvait prévoir.

Dans les milieux d'ailleurs restreints, qui constituent l'élément antibolcheviste de la minorité ukrainienne en Pologne, la déception causée par le verdict a pris le caractère de la consternation. Un Ukrainien en vue, qui a fait partie de l'entourage de Petlura et qui vit à Varsovie, rencontrant mon collègue M. Barbier lui a parlé de cette affaire avec beaucoup de vivacité. Il s'[est] exprimé dans des termes que je m'efforce de rendre aussi exactement que possible: « Petlura, a-t-il dit, avait assuré aux Israélites un régime de complète liberté dans tous les domaines et il s'était appliqué de ses mieux à empêcher les pogromes; ce n'était pas de sa faute qu'il n'avait pu toujours y réussir et il avait en tout cas servi avec une rigueur extrême contre les auteurs des massacres. Plusieurs membres de son Gouvernement étaient d'ailleurs [2] israélites; bien plus, la plupart de ses représentants à l'étranger étaient juifs ce qui constitue un fait rare dans les annales de la diplomatie d'un Etat. Le crime commis par Schwartzbard, sur la personne de Petlura, ami des Juifs, présentait donc un caractère particulièrement odieux et le souvenir de son acquittement ne s'effacera jamais de la mémoire des patriotes ukrainiens. Ceux-ci n'étaient pas auparavant antisémites, mais, à calomnier et à insulter comme on l'a fait l'atame défunt, on les contraint presque inévitablement à devenir tels. »

C'est d'ailleurs en termes à peu près identiques que s'exprime le « Dilo », principal organe des partis ukrainiens antibolchevistes en Pologne, que s'imprime à Lwow. « En accusant injustement la nation ukrainienne devant le monde entier, les juifs ont porté un coup mortel aux bonnes relations entre eux et les Ukrainiens » écrit le « Dilo ». « Les juifs devraient se souvenir dans leur propre intérêt qu'ils ne constituent qu'une petite minorité au milieu de la mer ukrainienne ».

On m'assure d'autre part que l'entente qui s'était, paraît-il, établie entre certaines fractions des minorités ukrainienne et juive en vue des prochaines élections viendrait d'être rompue. Le « Nasz Przegląd », l'un des principaux

organes de la presse juive à Varsovie, publie d'ailleurs lui-même qu'à la suite de l'acquiescement de Schwartzbard, des représentants qualifiés des partis juifs ont proposé à certaines personnalités ukrainiennes la réunion d'une conférence ukrainienne-juive pour le maintien [3] d'un accord entre les deux minorités et que cette suggestion a été rejetée.

Il est remarquable que les principaux organes de la presse polonaise, de la droite à la gauche, donnent eux aussi une impression de déception et presque de douleur. Je crois devoir en citer quelques uns.

Les journaux de droite, souvent hostiles au Maréchal Pilsudski et au plan de fédération slave qu'ils attribuent au Maréchal paraissent oublier que c'est à la réalisation de ce plan que Petlura a travaillé en 1920 en entraînant la Pologne dans sa défaite, et ils ne cachent pas leur tristesse de voir absoudre le meurtrier du chef ukrainien.

« Le verdict acquittant Schwartzbard produit une impression vraiment déprimante, » écrit le « Kurier Warszawski », journal important de la droite modérée.

La « Rzeczpospolita » (droite) déclare que « la vie de l'ataman valait plus que le franc de dommage-intérêt que devra payer l'assassin » et elle déplore que « d'un procès Schwartzbard, on ait cru devoir faire un procès Petlura ».

De son côté le « Robotnik », organe du parti socialiste, publie la déclaration suivante: « Un grand nombre de socialistes polonais ont connu Petlura avant la guerre comme {un} des leaders du mouvement social-démocrate. Nous avons ensuite suivi de près toute l'épopée des luttes [sic] pour la libération de l'Ukraine. Nous n'approuvons pas tous les actes de Petlura. Nous savons qu'après la guerre, Petlura avait quitté le parti socialiste ukrainien. Nous savons aussi qu'il y a eu des pogroms juifs en Ukraine. Mais nous ne croyons pas que là ### national ukrainien soit responsable de ces pogroms. [4] Une appréciation équitable de la situation en Ukraine à cette époque nous fait une loi de le dire. ### !Nous!, socialistes polonais, devons ces quelques paroles à la nation ukrainienne, si cruellement éprouvée à cette heure. »

Non moins frappante sont les déclarations du « Głos Prawdy » et du « Kurjer Poranny », qui, comme le sait le Département, passent pour suivre l'inspiration du Maréchal Pilsudski.

« L'action de Schwartzbard n'a rien d'un geste héroïque », écrit le « Głos Prawdy », il a tué le grand chef ukrainien au moment où celui-ci était un exilé plus pauvre que son assassin. Comment glorifier un tel acte? Comment le défendre? Si les juifs se plaignent de l'indifférence du monde à leur malheurs, les Ukrainiens ont plus de raisons encore d'en plaindre car ils ont perdu un million ½ dans leur lutte pour l'indépendance ... »

Le « Kurjer Poranny », bien connu du Service de la Presse au Département, met parallèle le verdict acquittant S[ch]wartzbard et la condamna-

tion du meurtrier de M. Voïkoff, Kowerda, dont il demande par analogie la prompte libération.³³

Le même Ukrainien que j'ai toute raison de croire en rapports fréquents avec le Maréchal Pilsudski a du reste affirmé que celui-ci s'est montré élu de l'acquittement de Schwartzbard. Petlura était pour Pilsudski un ami et un compagnon d'armes; tous deux s'étaient toujours intéressés aux Juifs; la personnalité dont je viens de faire mention remarquait à ce propos que, si Pilsudski était assassiné à Paris par un israélite et que celui-ci fut ensuite acquitté, [5] un tel fait ne serait pas plus surprenant que le verdict dont vient de bénéficier Sch[w]ar[t]zbard. Je rapporte ce propos, non parce qu'il paraît juste, mais à titre d'indication d'un état d'esprit.

Dans les milieux varsoviens où l'on est très familiarisé avec nos mœurs et où l'on sait par suite que les jurés français ont en général tendance à acquitter les auteurs des crimes imputables aux passions politiques, l'étonnement s'exprime d'une manière moins vive. Plusieurs fonctionnaires du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères m'ont même dit à ce sujet qu'ils n'avaient pas été outre mesure surpris. Mais, dans ces milieux mêmes, on paraît au fond convaincu que l'acte de Schwartzbard a été prémédité et que le meurtrier de Petlura a agi à l'instigation formelle du Gouvernement de Moscou. Le fait que le crime a été accompli quelques jours seulement après la révolution de Varsovie de mai 1926 paraît, à vrai dire, frappant, et on ne peut s'empêcher de le rapprocher des signes de vives inquiétude qui furent donnés du côté soviétique aussitôt après le retour au pouvoir du Maréchal Pilsudski. Il ne faut donc pas s'étonner de l'unanimité des regrets qui avec des nuances diverses se sont manifestés ici l'annonce du verdict./.

33 Reference to the murder of the Soviet legate to Poland, Pyotr Voikov, by a Ukrainian emigré, Boris Kowerda, in Warsaw, 7 June 1927. Eight days later a Polish court sentenced Kowerda to fifteen years in prison.

Document 74

Anonymous

New York, 7 November 1927

Published magazine article, 2 pages

Language: English

Time: The Weekly Newsmagazine vol. 10 (1927), issue 19, 7 November 1927, pp. 13–14

[13]

FRANCE

Petlura Trial

Court. In the dim court of Assizes, in Paris, during the past fortnight, more than 400 spectators saw the beginning and the end of one of the most gruesome, bloodcurdling, impassioned trials ever to be held in that vaulted hall of justice. Quivering flappers sat to gasp with astonishment beside white & black bearded Jews who exchanged shocked glances with flat-faced Slavic Ukrainians under the noses of red & black-robed judges. Within and without the courtroom was a triple guard of gendarmes to prevent disorder.

Culprit. The accused man, who not only admitted committing the crime but even boasted of it, was a young Jewish Ukrainian, now a naturalized Frenchman, Sholem (Samuel) Schwartzbard, a watchmaker by profession. Short, ugly, he yet commanded the attention of the whole court, for he told his story, not as do many prisoners, shamefaced and haltingly, forced to reveal their crimes and motives by harassing lawyers – no, Watchmaker Schwartzbard openly confessed with gleaming eyes and hysterical mien, his body trembling with passion, how he slew “General” Simon Petlura to avenge the deaths of thousands of Jews slain in pogroms, which he charged “General” Petlura instigated.

Victim. Simon Petlura, in the opinion of many, was an adventurer. The son of a Russian cabman, he is said to have been active in plotting against the Tsar. In 1918 he entered Kiev, capital of the Ukraine, with the Austrian and German armies, under whose auspices he took the lead in trying to separate that province from the rest of Russia. He not only promoted himself a general but also declared himself ruler of the Ukraine. He failed and was obliged to flee. Two years later he reappeared, this time under the Poles, becoming president of a short-lived Ukrainian republic. He played off the Poles against the Bolsheviki and the Bolsheviki against the Poles and, eventually, again fell

from power, this time to flee to France, where he lived in Paris until slain there by M. Schwartzbard. Under his regime, it is charged, more than 50,000 Jews were killed.

Lawyers. Henri Torres, chief counsel for the defense, florid, bloated, dynamic, put his histrionic abilities to the test when, leaping past his colleagues into the middle of the courtroom, he brandished a revolver, produced from under his voluminous black gown. Shrieks of terror mingled with gasps met this display. Flappers sat with blanched faces; bewhiskered Hebrews rocked back and forth with suppressed excitement; Ukrainians, more pallid than ever, glanced nervously through their narrow eyes. Maitre Torres, aiming at a chair, pulled the trigger – there was a dull click, followed by sighs of relief. He was attempting to prove that M. Schwartzbard could not have shot Simon Petlura as he lay prone on the ground.

Cesare [sic] Campinchi, flaccid, verbose, excitable, chief prosecution lawyer representing the Petlura family, particularly Widow Petlura, who was in court, proved himself the equal of Maitre Torres in oratorical and theatrical ability. Accused of suppressing evidence by M. Torres, he roared: “Don’t accuse me of suppressing evidence, Torres!”*

“Don’t force me to place in evidence your personal pedigree!” yelled Torres. And thus they continued.

Crime. Simon Petlura was shot at the corner of the Rue Racine, and the Boulevard St. Michel, on May 25, 1926. As M. Schwartzbard described the murder to the court:

“Here’s my chance, I thought. ‘Are you Petlura?’ I asked him. He did not answer, simply lifting his heavy cane. I knew it was he.

“I shot him five times. I shot him like a soldier who knows how to shoot, and I shot straight so as not to hit any innocent passerby. At the fifth shot he fell. He didn’t say a word. There were only cries and convulsions.

“When I saw him fall I knew he had received five bullets. Then I emptied my revolver. The crowd had scattered. A policeman came up quietly and said: ‘Is that enough?’ I answered: ‘Yes.’ He said: ‘Then give me your revolver.’ I gave him the revolver, saying: ‘I have killed a great assassin.’

“When the policeman told me [14] Petlura was dead I could not hide my joy. I leaped forward and threw my arms about his neck.”

“Then you admit premeditation?” asked the judge.

“Yes, yes!” replied M. Schwartzbard, his face lit with fanatical exultation.

* It is customary in French courts to employ the title “maitre,” a term of respect.

Trial. The case opened with M. Schwartzbard telling the court in a high pitched voice and halting French, his beady eyes gleaming, his face suffused with joy, how he had tracked Petlura down. With a photograph of his intended victim in his pocket and a loaded pistol in another, he was wont to roam the street peering into the faces of passers-by to see if they were Petlura. All this, he said, he did to avenge the assassinations of his co-religionists. Finally, he found and killed him.

One Reginald Smith, an Englishman, a reputed eye-witness of the crime, was called to describe the crime. Quoting Shakespeare, he ended his testimony by referring to Schwartzbard's expression as Petlura fell: "He wore an expression of 'exaltation mixed with anguish.'"

Many witnesses called by the prosecution declared that Petlura was not an enemy of the Jews, but Maitre Torres insisted that "Petlura's proclamations expressing indignation over the pogroms were mere bluffs. While murdering Jewish men, women & children, he had to maintain a straight face before the opinion of the world. He also wanted money from Jewish bankers."

"No," said a massive Slav, "Petlura was not anti-Semitic. He was a humanitarian – a friend of the Jews."

"No, no, no, he lies!" chorused a dozen people in the court in as many languages.

"They cut them down with naked blades," screamed M. Schwartzbard.

"I accuse that man of being an agent of Moscow. I swear it a thousand times!" roared another witness for the prosecution, pointing an accusatory forefinger at M. Schwartzbard.

"You—! You—!" yelled Schwartzbard, jumping to his feet, incoherent with rage, his shoulders quivering in spasmodic jerks. Recovering his power of speech, he continued:

"Do you remember the terrible days of 1910 and 1911 at Kiev?³⁴ Do you remember the accusations that Jews were using Christian blood for Easter ceremonies? You hate me because I am a Jew!"

"No," screamed the other in a high falsetto, "because you are a Bolshevik!"

"Prove it! Prove it, then!" flung back the defiant Schwartzbard, dropping his limp, into his seat.

A squat Slav, called by the prosecution, who described himself as an "historian, a man of letters and at present an assistant to a stonemason," gave evidence in [sic] Petlura's philo-Semitism, denying with a grief-contorted face that the "General" had ever killed Jews or caused them to be massacred.

34 Evidently a reference to the ritual murder trial of Mendel Beilis in Kiev. See above, Introduction, n. 123.

“Yes! Yes! He massacred them!” shouted Schwartzbard, unnerved.

The most notable witness called, however, was Mlle. Haia Greenberg, 29, a curly bobbed-haired nurse. In a soft, low voice, she told of the carnage and rapine ordered by Simon Petlura and of the blood-bathed home of her grandparents. Murmured she:

“I shall never forget the reddened snowsleds, filled with the hacked bodies, going to the cemetery to deposit their sad burden, in a common pit. They brought the wounded to the hospital – armless and legless men, mutilated babies and young women whose screams became faint as their wounds overcame them.”

Then breaking down and sobbing convulsively she screamed: “Oh, no, no! I cannot go on! They are before my eyes!”

“Petlura was responsible. Even Ukrainian officers said so. His soldiers killed our people, shouting his name. One regiment had a band and it played while knives fell on the heads of innocent babies. Petlura could have stopped it, but he wouldn’t listen to our pleas.”

Verdict. Amid tense excitement, after an absence of 35 minutes, the jury returned a verdict for the young, pale faced Jew’s acquittal. Frenzied cheering greeted the decision. M. Schwartzbard, calm, kissed his lawyer, Maitre Henri Torres. “Vive la France!” shouted somebody. “Vive la France!” echoed some 500 voices.

In addition to setting M. Schwartzbard free, the verdict ordered the Petlura family, represented by Maitre Caesare [sic] Campinchi, to pay the costs of the trial, but awarded damages of one franc each to Mme. Petlura, widow of the slain “General,” and to M. Petlura, his brother.

The outcome of the trial, which gripped all Europe, was regarded by the Jews as establishing proof of the horrors perpetrated against their co-religionists in the Ukraine under the dictatorship of Simon Petlura; radical opinion rejoiced, but the conservatives saw justice flouted and the decorum of the French courts immeasurably impaired.

Schwartzbard, free, went into hiding, fearing assassination at the hands of anti-Semites.

Document 75*Joseph Barondess to Stephen S. Wise**New York, 9 November 1927**Typewritten letter, 1 page; printed letterhead; handwritten note (“Personal Special delivery”) along top**Language: English**AJHS, Stephen S. Wise, box 88*

JOSEPH BARONDESS

1440 BROADWAY

NEW YORK

◇◇◇

Phone Pennsylvania 6635-6-7

Nov. 9, 1927

Dr. Stephen S. Wise

40 West 68 St.

New York City

My dear Dr. Wise:

As it is impossible for me to get you on the phone, or otherwise, I am sending you this letter, by Special Delivery, urgently requesting that you be kind enough to let me have your answer as soon as possible.

Dr. Yochelman of the Ukrainian Jewish Federation of England³⁵ is in this country, and Dr. Coralnik is arriving within the next few days from Paris where he had attended the Schwartzbard trial. We are anxious to have a meeting where a report of the Schwartzbard Trial should be rendered. Truly speaking we ought to have the sort of a celebration in honor of the acquittal of Schwartzbard, but most of us feel that if we did so it might possibly arouse the passions of the Ukrainian pogromists, so we have decided to have a meeting in memory of the pogrom victims in Ukraine, where a report of the Schwartzbard trial will be rendered. This meeting is to be under the auspices of the Federation of Ukrainian Jews in America in cooperation with the Polish, Galician and other Jewish Federations, and, if you think it proper, in cooperation with the American Jewish Congress.

35 Rabbi Dr. David Yochelman (also Jochelman) served as chairman of the Federation of Ukrainian Jews, 26a Soho Square, London, during most of the 1920s.

I wrote to Mr. Lee Shubert³⁶ asking that he should give us a theatre some Sunday afternoon, which he is willing to do. He asks me for a definite [sic] date and before doing so, I am writing to find out which Sunday afternoon would be convenient for you to appear for ten minutes only and no more. I think it is very urgent that you, as the President of the American Jewish Congress, should make use of the opportunity to say a word about the position taken by Mr. Marshall throughout this entire Trial. I think that I told you that on the Monday, prior to the acquittal of Schwartzbard I communicated with Mr. Marshall, at the request of the Committee in Paris, to request him to soften up a bit his statement which was used as very strong evidence against Schwartzbard at the trial. Mr. Marshall asked me to send him copies of the cables which appeared in the Jewish Morning Journal and copies of the articles which appeared in the other papers, also requesting him to soften up his statement. The thing that I definitely requested him to do, at the suggestion of the Paris Committee,³⁷ was to send a cable to Torres, Schwartzbard's attorney, stating, that the statement he made to the American Jewish Committee was by way of advice to the Jews and it was not intended to be used as evidence against Schwartzbard. He promised to send a statement to the Jewish Morning Journal which might be communicated to the Paris Committee. He did make a statement. Mr. Fishman, of the Jewish Morning Journal,³⁷ told me that if his statement would have been published, Mr. Marshall would have exposed himself to the severest possible criticism and enmity of the Jewish people the world over. I have not seen that statement yet, but I told Mr. Fishman that I regret sincerely that he did not publish the statement. Mr. Marshall is a responsible man and if he wishes to have a statement published at his own risk, it should have been published.

I think, therefore, that it is very urgent that you honor us with your presence at the meeting, in order that we may be able to see the difference between the "sublime and the ridiculous." I urge you again, to kindly let me have your immediate attention.

Sincerely yours,

!Joseph Barondess!

JB:#

!P. S. I greatly cherish your letter of yesterday and your generous sentiments to me for my humble efforts in the Schwartzbard matter. J. B.!

36 Lee Shubert (1876–1953), Lithuanian-born Jewish theatrical producer and owner, together with his brothers Samuel (Sam; 1875–1905) and Jacob J. Shubert (1877–1963), of a large chain of theatres across the United States.

37 Jacob Fishman (Document 49, n. 133).

Document 76

Alter Kacyzne

"Shvartsbard"

Published play

Language: Yiddish

Alter Kacyzne, *Shvartsbard*, Paris 1980, pp. 152–155³⁸

[152] הערן ריכטער! כאָטש נאָך אזעלכע מוסטערן פון הויכער רעדנער־קונסט האָב איך מורא... אז מיינע בלאָסע רייד קאָנען מיר מער שאַדן ברענגען ווי נוצן. אַנטשולדיקט מיר, מעטר טאַרעס, אויב איך וועל מיט מיינע לעצטע פּאַר ווערטער פארערגען מיין גורל. אָבער, הערן ריכטער, צי האַנדלט זיך דאָ טאַקע בלויז וועגן מיין אייגענעם גורל? איך האָב אויפּמערקזאַם זיך צוגעהערט צו מיינע באַשולדיקער און פּאַרטידיקער און זאָל מיר דער לויבט זיין, הערן ריכטער, זיך אַנלעגן אויף אַ פּאַר ציטאַטן פון זיי. מעטר טאַרעס האָט געזאָגט: ס'איז אן אומגליק צו דערהרגענען אַ מענטשן! ס'איז אן אומגליק אַליין נקמה צו נעמען! הערן ריכטער! דערלויבט מיר צו זאָגן: ס'איז טאַפּלט דאָס אומגליק פאַר אַ מענטשן פון ייִדישן בלוט, פון ייִדישן שטאַם.

איך האַלט נישט, אז מייין ראַסע איז די אַריסטאָקראַטיע פון דער וועלט, ווי דאָס מיינט מעטר קאמפּיניקי, וועלכער האָט אַזוי דיסקרעט און צוריקגעהאַלטן מיר אויסגעדריקט [153] זיינע פּאַרוורפן. אָבער, הערן ריכטער! שוין אַ פּאַר טויזנט יאָר, אַז מיר ייִדן לעבן נישט אויף אונדזער שווערד. און דאָס האָט אונדז שלעכט געטון. עס האָט אין אונדז אַנטוויקלט אַ גאַנץ אַנדערע מאָס... אַ העכערע מאָס פאַר דעם ווערט פון יענעם לעבן. פאַר אַ ייִדן איז טאַפּלט שווער צו זיין אַ בלוטיקער העלד און אין גאַנצן נישט מעגלעך צו באַרימען מיט אַזאַ העלדישקייט. אויך איך, מיינע ריכטער, שטיי דאָ נישט פאַר אייך אין דער שטאַלצפּאַזע פון אַ פּאַלקס־העלד. איך בין אָבער אויך נישט דער מענטש, וועלכער באַדויערט זיינע מעשים און מוז אַנקומען נאָך רחמים פון געריכט. ניין, הערן ריכטער, איך קום צו אייך מיט מיינע טענות!... מיט דעם טיפּסטן גלייבן, אַז איר וועט דערהערן מיין געשריי... דאָס געשריי פון אַ מענטש, וועלכער קלאַמערט זיך נישט אין זיינע אייגענע פּאַר יאָר. הערן פּראַנצווישע ריכטער, איר, אייניקלעך פון יענע שטאַלצע קעמפּער, וועלכע האָבן אַראַפּגעריסן קרוינען ביי טיראַנען – איר וועט מיך דערהערן און פאַרשטיין. שטאַמט איר דאָך אליין פון די נביאים פון 18-טן יאָרהונדערט! פאַר אייך וויל איך אַנקלאַגן אונדזער יאָרהונדערט! די גאַנצע ציוויליזירטע וועלט. ווי אַזוי האָט זי געקאָנט דערלאָזן צו אַזאַ אומרעכט! צו אַזאַ... ניאַגאַראַ פון אומשולדיק פּאַראַסענעם בלוט?!

מען וועט מיר זאָגן: מיט וואָס איז דאָס בלוט פון דייע שוועסטער און ברידער חשר בער, פאַר יענע בלוטיקע טייכן, וועלכע זענען אַפּגעפּלאָסן אין דער וועלט־מלחמה?
הערן ריכטער! די מלחמה קאָן איך דאָך פון דער נאַענט!

38 This fictional speech is placed in Schwarzbard's mouth in the final scene of Act III, before the jury pronounces its verdict. The play was first produced in 1937, although the script was published only in 1980.

כ'האָב דאָך מיין אייגן בלוט פאַרגאַסן און דעם שונאס נישט געשוניט אין די פראנצויזישע שוין-גראַבנס. איך האָב געזען ווי מענטשן שטאַרבן, איינגעגראָבן מיט די פינגער אין דער פייכטער ערד און מיט דעם לעצטן וואָרט פון 1154 פאַרווורף און פון בענקשאַפט אויף די ליפן מיט דעם וואָרט: מאַמע! כ'האָב געזען ווי די מענטשן לויפן פון ביידע פיינטלעכע שוין-גראַבנס געטריבן צום שטורעם דורך דער אייגענער אַרטילעריע. כ'האָב געזען, ווי זיי לויפן מיט אויפגעהויבענע הענט און מיט קינדערשע טרערן אויף די בערדיקע פנימער, נישט צו וויסן, וועלכער צד איז דער פאַנגער און וועלכער דער געפאַנגענער. איך האָב געזען דעם אומזין אין זיין פולער גרייס און איך האָב מיר אויסגעקעמפט דאָס רעכט אָט דעם אומזין צו פאַראורטיילן. אָבער וויפל זין האָט די מלחמה אין פארגלייך מיטן פאַגראַם! דאָרט קעמפן דאָך גלייכע מיט גלייכע! מיט די זעלבע שאַנסן פון זעלבן אומגליק! הערן ריכטער! צי האָט איר געהערט, ווי דער פראַקוואַר, האָט זיך אויסגעדריקט וועגן פאַגראַמען: פאַגראַמען – האָט ער געזאָגט – זענען געווען און וועלן זיין. דאָס איז א שרפה, וואָס אין איין אָרט לעשט זי זיך – אין צווייטן פלאַמט זי אויף מיט אַ טאַפּלעך קראַפט! נביאישע ווערטער הערן ריכטער! אַ גרויזאַמער אמת! נאָך זענען נישט אויסגעוויינט די לעצטע טרערן אויף אוקראַינע – און שוין שטיקן אונדז די גיפטיקע גאַזן פון אַ נייער, טליענדיקער שרפה! ווי אַ פייערדיקער ים וועט זי זיך צעגיסן אויף אַ ריזיקן שטח איבער אונדזערע קעפּ – אָבער יידישע קעפּ! און די וועלט! די ציוויליזירטע וועלט וואָס וועט זי טון, צוקונדיק אונדזער נייעם חורבן?

די וועלט וועט זיך אָפּגרענעצן – לויט דער קלוגער עצה פון פראַקוואַר – זי וועט זיך אָפּגרענעצן און, אין בעסטן פאַל, זיך אָפּשאַקלען פון די פאַרברעכערישע לענדער. הערן ריכטער! מען האָט אונדז הונדערטער יאָר געפייניקט פאַר קרייצקן אַ ייד קריסטוסן. און איצט – וועט מען אונדז אָנהייבן פייניקן פאַר אָנבינדן אַ יידישן קריסטוס דער וועלט! דאָס איז אַן אויסרייד! מען שלאָגט אונדז – ווייל מיר לאָזן זיך. דאָס פאַרויס לויפן אין דער געשיכטע 1155 – איז אונדזער אומגליק! שריי איך: יידן – צוריק – אין דער געשיכטע! טע! צוריק מיט דער פויסט! מיט דער שפיז! מיט דער קויל! אָט איז מיין ביישפּיל – אין נאָמען פון מענטשן-ווערדע... נישט ווי קיין ייד דאַרף איך דאָ שטיין פאַר אייך! נישט ווי קיין ייד – זיך פאַרענטפערן! ווען אַ פראַנצויז, ווען אַ רוס, ווען אַ כינעזער זאָל באַגיין מיין איצטיקע טאַט – דאָן וואָלט מען דאָך געגלייבט אין זיין אַביעקטיוון פראַטעסט, אין זיין פראַטעסט פאַר הונדערטער טויזנטער געפייניקטע! ... בעת מיך... וויל מען דאָ פאַרענטפערן פערן מיט מיין בלוטאַנגעהעריקייט צו דער געפייניקטער ראַסע! ווילט איר מיך פארענטפערן – דאָן פארענטפערט מיך מיט מיין בלוטאַנגעהעריקייט צו די געפייניקטע פון דער וועלט! איך שטיי דאָ נישט אַליין פאַר אייך, הערן ריכטער! הינטער מיר שטייט אַ ריזן-אַרמיי פון שאַטנס! דאָס זענען שאַטנס פון געפייניקטע, וועלכע דער איצטיקער פראַצעס האָט אויפֿגעהויבן פון זייערע קברים. אין זייער נאָמען בין איך באַרעכטיקט צו אָפּעלירן צו אייך מיט די אייגענע ווערטער ווי דער פראַקוואַר: גערעכטיקייט, הערן ריכטער! גערעכטיקייט און נאָר גערעכטיקייט!

Translation

[152] Your lordships!³⁹ After such examples of great forensic art I am afraid ... that my pale speech may do me more harm than good. Forgive me, Maître Torrès, if I make my fate worse with my final few words. But, your lordships, is it really my personal fate that is at stake here? I have listened to my accusers and defenders attentively, and hope, my lordships, that it will be permitted me to add to a few of their statements. Maître Torrès has said that it is a terrible thing to kill a human being! It is a terrible thing to take individual revenge! My lordships! Permit me to say: for people of Jewish blood, of Jewish origin, the misfortune is a double one.

I do not believe that my race is the aristocracy of the world, as does Maître Campinchi,⁴⁰ who has expressed his charges against me in so discrete and restrained [153] a fashion. But, your lordships! It has been several thousand years since we Jews have lived by our swords. And this has had a bad effect upon us. A completely different set of standards has developed in us ..., a higher standard of regard for another's life. It is doubly hard for a Jew to be a bloody hero and altogether impossible to brag about such heroism. I, too, my judges, do not stand before you here in the proud guise of a folk hero. But neither am I one who regrets his actions and must throw himself on the mercy of the court. No, your lordships, I come to you with my own charges ..., with the deepest faith that you will hear my cry ..., the cry of someone who does not cling to his own few years. Your French lordships, you, the grandchildren of those proud fighters who pulled crowns off the heads of tyrants – you will hear me and understand. You yourselves are descendants of the eighteenth century prophets! Before you will I bring accusations against our century! The entire civilized world, how could it have permitted such an injustice, such a ... giant waterfall of innocent spilled blood?!

People will say: How is the blood of your sisters and brothers more deserving of respect than the rivers of blood that flowed during the World War?

Your lordships! I know that war from up close!

After all, in the French trenches I spilled my own blood and did not spare the enemy's. I saw how men died, dug in with their fingers in the damp soil, cursing with their last word [154] and crying longingly for their mothers. I saw men running from both enemy trenches, driven to the attack by their own artil-

39 The trial was heard in front of a panel of three judges.

40 In his actual summation to the jury, Campinchi had quoted Ernest Renan's characterization of Jews as "the world's oldest aristocracy." TT, 26 October 1927, 9 (YIVO, RG80/494/40645). Kacyzne rendered the passage with reasonable accuracy in his fictional version of the attorney's remarks. Kacyzne, Shvartsbard, 148 f.

lery. I saw them running with raised hands and children's tears on their bearded faces, not knowing which side was the captor and which the captive. I have seen the absurdity in its fullest, and in battle I have earned the right to judge it. But how can the war be compared to a pogrom? In war, equals fight equals; they have the same chance to suffer the same misfortune! My lordships! Have you heard how the prosecutor has described pogroms? He said that pogroms have been and will be.⁴¹ It is a fire that is extinguished in one place but then flames up doubly strong in another! Prophetic words, my lordships! A gruesome truth! The last tears have not yet been shed over Ukraine, but already the noxious fumes of a new, smoldering fire are choking us to death! Like a flaming sea it will spread over an enormous area over our heads – Jewish heads! And the world? What will the civilized world do as it looks on at our latest destruction?⁴²

The world will set a boundary, as the prosecutor cleverly advises – it will set a boundary and in the best case wash its hands of the criminal countries.

Your lordships! We have been tortured for centuries because a Jew crucified Christ. And now we are about to be tortured for tying the world to a Jewish Christ!⁴³ This is a pretext! We are beaten because we allow ourselves to be beaten. To have run in advance of history [155] – that has been our misfortune! My cry to the Jews is: Back into history! Back to the fist! To the spear! To the bullet! Here you have my example, in the name of human values ... I should not be standing before you here as a Jew, not responding as a Jew! Should a Frenchman, a Russian, a Chinese commit the deed that I have committed now, then people would believe that he was making an objective protest on behalf of hundreds and thousands of sufferers! ... whereas I ... am supposed to be justified because of my membership by blood in a tortured race! If you wish to justify me, then do so because of my membership by blood in the ranks of the tortured of the world! I am not standing here alone, my lordships! A giant shadow army stands behind me! They are the shadows of the tortured whom this trial has raised from their graves. It is in their names that I have the right to appeal to you with the prosecutor's own words: Justice, my lordships! Justice, and justice alone!

41 The playwright included such a statement in his rendition of the prosecutor's speech to the jury; Kacyzne, *Shvartsbard*, 147. It appears to have been based on a statement by the prosecuting attorney for the state, Reynaud, in his summation: « Qu'il y ait eu des pogroms sanglants sous Petlura, c'est malheureusement vrai. Il y en a eu sous Petlura, il y en a eu sous d'autres, il y en a eu de tous temps en Ukraine. » TT, 26 October 1927, 9 (YIVO, RG80/495/40667).

42 The playwright appears to have placed in Schwarzbard's mouth an anachronistic reference to the Nazi era from the perspective of the mid-1930s.

43 Ibid.

Biographical Notes

The following notes provide basic biographical information about the authors and recipients of the documents presented in this volume, as well as about most of the principal persons mentioned in them. Deeds that followed the assassination of Petliura and the trial of Schwarzbard are generally not mentioned, so that readers may appreciate the public standing and significance of each individual at the time of the events with which the volume is concerned.

Asch, Scholem (1880–1957). Widely-read Yiddish novelist, playwright, and journalist.

Barondess, Joseph (1867–1928). American Jewish labor leader and political associate of President Woodrow Wilson. A former anarchist who eventually found his way to the Labor Zionist movement, he was among the founders the American Jewish Congress and took part in the Congress's delegation to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. He was active in efforts to bring relief to the victims of the Ukrainian pogroms and headed the Schwarzbard defense campaign in New York.

Beilinson, Moshe (1889–1936). Physician and journalist, among the leading figures in the Jewish labor movement in Palestine. His influence stemmed largely from his frequent contributions to the daily newspaper *Davar*, of which he was an associate editor.

Ben-Adir (pen name of Avraham Rosin, 1878–1942). Leader of the Jewish Socialist Workers Party (SERP, also known as the Sejmists), one of several political trends advocating Jewish national autonomy within the framework of multinational states. At the time of the assassination of Petliura he was editor of the Berlin-based Yiddish newspaper *Dos fraye vort*, a publication with an anti-Soviet socialist tendency.

Bergelson, David (1884–1952). Acclaimed writer of Yiddish-language novels and plays and a major entrepreneur and arbiter of cultural activity in Yiddish. At the time of Petliura's assassination he was living in Berlin, where he was editor of a Yiddish-language cultural journal and a correspondent for the New York Yiddish newspaper *Forverts*. Around that time his political views shifted leftward, and he began writing for communist publications in New York and Moscow.

Bialik, Chaim Nachman (1873–1934). Foremost poet of his generation in Hebrew, writer of short stories and essays, and a key cultural entrepreneur in Zionist circles. Two of his poems, written in response to the Kishinev pogrom of 1903, established him throughout the Jewish world as an eloquent voice of protest against ongoing Jewish victimization. At the time of Petliura's assassination he was endeavoring to publish the testimonies about the 1919 pogroms in Ukraine collected by Eliezer David Rosenthal.

Bigart, Jacques (1855–1934). Secretary-general of the Alliance israélite universelle for more than fifty years, from 1881 to 1934. Following the First World War he was the organization's most prominent public spokesman.

- Blum, Léon** (1872–1950). French socialist leader. Eventually to become France's first socialist (and first Jewish) prime minister in 1936, at the time of Petliura's assassination he was best known as a writer and as editor of the socialist daily, *Le Populaire*.
- Bogen, Boris** (1869–1929). Jewish social and communal worker. He organized the relief efforts of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee in eastern Europe between 1917 and 1924. At the time of Petliura's assassination he was a leader of the Jewish fraternal and advocacy organization B'nai Brith and took an active role in the American Jewish effort to defend Schwarzbard.
- Chykalenko, Levko** (1888–1965). Ukrainian archaeologist and political figure. He served as a member of the Central Council of the Ukrainian National Republic before becoming an emigré in 1920, first in Poland, subsequently in Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, and the United States. He published widely in the Ukrainian emigré press, including in *Tryzub*.
- Denikin, Anton** (1872–1947). Imperial Russian general. Arrested by the Provisional Government of Russia in August 1917 for conspiring to establish a military dictatorship, he escaped following the Bolshevik seizure of power and participated in the mustering of the anti-Bolshevik White volunteer army. In May 1919 he led the army through Ukraine in an advance toward Moscow, during which forces under his command perpetrated pogroms in more than 150 Jewish communities.
- Dubnow, Simon** (1860–1941). Historian and Jewish communal and political leader. During the first third of the twentieth century he was the most widely-read writer on Jewish history. His historical work stressed the significance of east European Jewry within the broader Jewish historical spectrum. He was also one of the principal ideologists of the so-called autonomist movement, which sought a place for Jews as a national group among the constitutors of multinational states in territories where they resided in significant numbers. A resident of Berlin from 1922 to 1933, he was a senior figure in that city's Russian Jewish emigré community.
- Efroykin, Israel** (1884–1954). Journalist, writer, and Jewish community worker associated with the Jewish Socialist Workers Party (SERP, also known as the Sejmists). He came to Paris in 1920 to organize relief work for Russian Jews and became an active participant in the work of the Comité des Délégations Juives.
- Eisenstadt, Moshe** (1870–1943). Rabbi in St. Petersburg before the Russian revolution. In 1920 he migrated to France, where he became the leader of the French orthodox Jewish community.
- Fleg, Edmond** (1874–1963). French Jewish writer, known primarily for books and essays in which he endeavored to explain the central aspects of Judaism, Jewish history, and Jewish culture to the French reading public. His *Anthologie juive*, published in 1921, included selections of Jewish literature from antiquity to modern times and established him as one of France's leading spokesmen for Jewish interests.
- Gergel, Nahum** (1887–1931). Ukrainian Jewish social worker who served as deputy minister for Jewish affairs in Ukraine from 1917 to 1918 and played an important role in relief efforts on behalf of pogrom victims from 1919 to 1920. In 1928 he published a comprehensive study of the pogroms of 1919–1920, based largely on the holdings of the *Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv*.

- Giterman, Yitshak** (Isaac) (1889–1943). Director of operations in Poland for the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, 1926–1939. From 1919 to 1920 he played an active role in relief efforts on behalf of victims of the pogroms in Ukraine.
- Goldelman, Solomon** (1885–1974). Acting minister for Jewish Affairs in Ukraine, from December 1918 to January 1919.
- Goldstein, Moisey Leontevich** (1868–1932). Prominent trial attorney in Imperial Russia, known for his role as defense advocate in several high-profile political trials, including the one directed against members of the dissolved First Duma who signed the 1906 Vyborg Manifesto. He was also involved in efforts to prosecute participants in the pogroms that accompanied the 1905 revolution.
- Gruenbaum, Izaak** (1879–1970). Head of the Zionist Federation of Poland and deputy in the Polish Sejm. During the 1920s Gruenbaum was arguably the Jewish political leader with the largest following anywhere in the world.
- Grumbach, Salomon** (1884–1952). Socialist and anticommunist journalist and editor.
- Gruzenberg, Oskar Osipovich** (1866–1940). Russian Jewish lawyer, famous for his successful 1911–1913 defense of Mendel Beilis against the charge of ritual murder.
- Hartglas, Apolinary** (1883–1952). Polish Zionist leader and Sejm deputy; longtime associate of Izaak Gruenbaum.
- Hertz, Henri** (1875–1966). French novelist. He was an active supporter of the Comité des Délégations Juives.
- Jabotinsky, Vladimir** (1880–1940). Founder and head of the so-called Revisionist party within the Zionist movement, which competed vigorously for leadership of the Zionist Organization.
- Jacobson, Victor** (1869–1935). Representative of the Zionist Organization to the League of Nations at Geneva.
- Jarblum, Marc** (1887–1972). Leading figure in the French Labor Zionist movement.
- Klinov, Yeshayahu** (1890–1963). Veteran Jewish journalist who, beginning in 1922, reported from Berlin for numerous Hebrew- and Yiddish-language Jewish newspapers, including *Haaretz*, *Morgen zhurnal*, and *Haynt*.
- Koulicher, Alexandre** (1890–1942). Jewish lawyer from St. Petersburg who migrated to France 1920 and played an important role in the Russian emigré circles that formed around former Russian liberal leader Pavel Miliukov.
- Koval, Waldemar** (Volodymyr, 1885–1927). Agronomist. A former professor at the Kiev Politechnicum, he became active after 1921 in the Ukrainian exile communities in Germany, France, and Czechoslovakia.
- Kreinin, Meir** (1862–1939). Berlin-based Jewish educator who was also a prominent supporter of Simon Dubnow's autonomist movement.
- Lansing, Robert** (1864–1928). United States secretary of state, 1915–1920. He headed the United States Commission to Negotiate Peace at the 1919 Paris Peace Conference, but his opposition to the League of Nations led to a break with President Woodrow Wilson and a diminution of his role in United States foreign affairs.
- Latzky-Bertholdi, Jacob Wolf** (1881–1940). Jewish journalist and leader of the autonomist *Folkspartey* in Ukraine. He served as minister for Jewish affairs in the govern-

ment of the Ukrainian National Republic for a brief interval in 1919. He was also a founder of the Kiev *Folksfarlag*.

- Lecache, Bernard** (1895–1968). Popular French journalist. The son of Jewish migrants to France from Ukraine, he wrote for left-wing French publications. He joined the French Communist Party in the early 1920s but was expelled in 1923. Schwarzbard's defense team sent him to Ukraine to investigate the pogroms and search for witnesses. In the midst of preparations for Schwarzbard's trial he published a book about the 1919 pogroms based on testimonies he had gathered (*Quand Israël meurt ... Au pays des pogromes*, Paris 1927). He also founded the *Ligue Internationale contre les Pogromes*.
- Lestschinsky, Jacob** (1876–1966). Demographer and sociologist. A native of Ukraine, he became involved in various prerevolutionary Russian socialist and Zionist groups. After fleeing the Soviet Union for Berlin in 1921, he worked as a correspondent for the New York Yiddish-language newspaper *Forverts*. In 1925 he participated in the founding of the Yiddish Scientific Institute (YIVO) and served as head of its Economic-Statistical Section.
- Liessin, Abraham** (pen name of Avraham Walt, 1872–1938). Yiddish writer and public intellectual. Beginning in 1913 he edited the Yiddish-language *Di tsukunft*, arguably the most influential journal of ideas published in that language.
- Livytskyi, Andrii** (1879–1954). Minister of justice and director-general of the foreign ministry of the Ukrainian National Republic, 1919. From 1919 to 1921 he headed the Ukrainian mission in Warsaw. A close associate of Petliura, he assumed the functions of head of state and commander-in-chief of the exile Ukrainian National Republic following Petliura's death.
- Lowenthal, Marvin** (1890–1969). American Jewish journalist and essayist. From 1925 to 1929 he served as European representative of the American Jewish Congress.
- Margolin, Arnold** (1877–1956). Jewish and Ukrainian lawyer, political figure, and communal worker. He served the Ukrainian National Republic as a justice of the supreme court, as deputy foreign minister, and as diplomatic representative in London. He was also active in the Jewish Territorialist Organization. In 1922 he migrated to the United States, where he served as an informal adviser on east European affairs to the American Jewish Committee.
- Marshall, Louis** (1856–1929). Dominant figure in the American Jewish Committee and principal spokesman for American Jewry during the 1920s.
- Motzkin, Leo** (1867–1933). Zionist leader and chairman of the Comité des Délégations Juives. He also headed the Schwarzbard Defense Committee in Paris.
- Naiditch, Yitshak** (1868–1949). Leader of Jewish community in prerevolutionary Moscow. A member of the Zionist Executive and head of the Zionist Organization's financial department, he migrated to France after the Russian revolution and became a regular contributor to major Yiddish-language newspapers in the United States.
- Pam, Hugo** (1870–1930). Judge. Local Zionist leader from Chicago.
- Prokopovych, Vyacheslav** (1881–1942). Close political associate of Petliura and prime minister of the Ukrainian National Republic in exile, 1920–1921, 1926–1939; editor of *Tryzub*, 1925–1939.

- Revutsky, Avraham** (1889–1946). Labor Zionist activist who served briefly as minister for Jewish affairs in the government of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1919. At the time of Petliura's assassination he was living in New York writing for various Yiddish-language newspapers.
- Ribalow, Menachem** (1895–1953). Ukraine-born American Hebraist. He was best known as editor of *Ha-Doar*, a Hebrew-language intellectual journal published in New York.
- Rothenberg, Morris** (1885–1950). American Jewish communal leader who held several posts in the United States federal government and in New York City. Active in the Zionist movement, he was among the founders of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.
- Schechtman, Josef** (1891–1970). Revisionist Zionist activist. Long an advocate of Ukrainian-Jewish political cooperation, he edited the Paris-based Russian-language Revisionist publication *Razsvet*. He was one of the central figures in the Schwarzbard defense effort.
- Schipper, Ignacy** (1884–1943). Polish Jewish historian and Sejm deputy.
- Shapoval, Mykola** (1886–1948). Ukrainian military and political leader. A general in the army of the Ukrainian National Republic, he lived in exile following the Republic's defeat, first in Poland, later in Czechoslovakia, and finally (from 1924) in France, where he headed the Paris branch of the Ukrainian Social Revolutionary Party.
- Shapoval, Mykyta** (1882–1932). Ukrainian journalist, intellectual, and political leader. Head of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries, he held cabinet positions in the Ukrainian Central Council and in the Directory and was one of the organizers of the 1918 revolt against the Skoropadskyi government. Although he opposed Petliura's leadership, he represented the Ukrainian National Republic in Budapest (1919–1920) and in Prague (from 1921). In Czechoslovakia he headed the Ukrainian Civic Committee, founded and directed several Ukrainian institutions of higher education, and edited the premier Ukrainian exile intellectual journal, *Nova Ukraina*.
- Shtif, Nahum** (1879–1933). Linguist and member of the Jewish Socialist Workers Party (SERP, also known as the Sejmists). A resident of Berlin since 1922, he was among the founders of the Yiddish Scientific Institute (YIVO) in 1925.
- Shulhyn, Oleksandr** (1889–1960). Ukrainian historian, political figure, and diplomat. He served as minister for nationality affairs of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1918 and was a member of the Ukrainian delegation to the 1919 Paris Peace Conference. In 1926 he was named foreign minister of the Ukrainian National Republic in exile.
- Silberfarb, Moses** (1876–1934). Leader of the United Jewish Socialist Workers Party who served as minister for Jewish affairs in the Ukrainian Central Council (*Rada*) in 1917–1918.
- Slavynskyi, Maksym** (1868–1945). Ukrainian poet and historian. He headed the diplomatic mission of the Ukrainian National Republic in Prague during the early 1920s.
- Sliosberg, Genrikh** (1863–1937). Preeminent Russian Jewish attorney and communal activist. At the time of Petliura's assassination he was a prominent member of the Russian Jewish emigré community in Paris.

- Sokolow, Nahum** (1859–1936). Leading Jewish journalist, writer, and political figure. Chairman of the Zionist Executive throughout the 1920s, he served simultaneously as president of the Comité des Délégations Juives.
- Soloweitschik, Max** (1883–1957). Lithuanian Jewish political figure and scholar. He served as minister for Jewish affairs of the Lithuanian Republic from 1921 to 1923. Subsequently he migrated to Berlin, where, at the time of Petliura's assassination, he was editor of the Bible section of the German *Encyclopedia Judaica*.
- Spire, André** (1868–1966). Prominent French Jewish writer, renowned for his 1895 duel with publisher Edouard Drumont, a leading anti-Jewish voice during the Dreyfus affair.
- Tcherikower, Eliyahu** (1881–1943). Jewish historian. The principal force behind the *Ost-jüdisches Historisches Archiv*, he coordinated the efforts to locate relevant witnesses and documents for Schwarzbard's defense.
- Titel, Jacob** (1850–1939). Jewish jurist. A lawyer and judge in prerevolutionary Russia, he fled to Berlin in 1921, where he founded the local Association of Russian Jews.
- Tiomkin, Vladimir** (1860–1927). Ukrainian Zionist leader. Resident in Paris since 1920, he was a close political associate of Vladimir Jabotinsky.
- Torrès, Henry** (1891–1966). French criminal defense attorney. Active in the French Socialist Party, he served as chief counsel for the defense in the Schwarzbard trial.
- Vinaver, Maksim** (1862–1926). Russian Jewish lawyer and politician, a founder of the Russian Constitutional Democratic (Kadet) Party. He was also active in Russian Jewish communal life, heading, among other organizations, the Historical-Ethnographic Society and the Society for Equal Rights for Jews. In 1919, following the Bolshevik takeover, he emigrated to France, where he became a central figure in the Russian Jewish emigré community. In Paris he founded a newspaper, *Yevreyskaya tribuna*, which sought to dispel the stereotypical association of Jews with Bolshevism.
- Vishniac, Marc** (1883–1977). Expert on international law, especially on matters concerning statelessness and minority rights.
- Vytvytskyi, Stepan** (1884–1965). Ukrainian diplomat. He was deputy chief of the UNR diplomatic mission in Warsaw in 1919 but resigned his position in protest over the UNR alliance with Poland. He later became director of the foreign ministry of the West Ukrainian National Republic in exile. From 1921 to 1923 he headed the West Ukrainian mission in Paris and London. In 1924 he returned to Poland and became active in UNDO.
- Wiernik, Peter** (1865–1936). American Yiddish-language journalist. At the time of Petliura's assassination he was editor-in-chief of *Morgen zhurnal* (the Jewish Morning Journal), one of New York's largest Yiddish dailies. He helped turning his newspaper into a principal platform for Schwarzbard's defense.
- Wise, Stephen S.** (1874–1949). American rabbi. A renowned orator, founder of New York's Free Synagogue (one of the most influential liberal Jewish congregations in the United States), and president of the Jewish Institute of Religion (a rabbinical seminary), he was perhaps best known as the central figure in the American Jewish Congress.

Yeivin, Yehoshua Heshel (1891–1970). Palestinian Jewish writer and editor. At the time of Petliura's assassination he was associated with the labour Zionist movement, but during the months leading up to the trial he gravitated toward the Revisionists.

Zhitlovsky, Haim (1865–1943). Jewish essayist and political theorist. An advocate of Jewish national autonomy within multinational states and a strong advocate of Yiddish as the Jewish national language, he was elected to the second Russian State Duma. He left Russia in 1908 for the United States, where he was among the founders of the American Jewish Congress.

Bibliography

- Abramson, Henry, *A Prayer for the Government. Ukrainians and Jews in Revolutionary Times, 1917–1920*, Cambridge Mass. 1999.
- Adler, Cyrus (ed.), *The Voice of America on Kishineff*, Philadelphia Penn. 1904.
- Adoumié, Vincent, *De la république à l'État français 1918–1944*, Paris 2005.
- Altshuler, Mordekhai, *Ha-yevsekziyah bi-vrit ha-mo'azot 1918–1930. Beyn le'umiyut le-komunizm* [The Yevseksia in the Soviet Union 1918–1930. Between Nationalism and Communism], Jerusalem 1980.
- American Jewish Committee (ed.), *Ninth Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee*, in: *American Jewish Year Book 18 (1916–1917)*, 288–411.
- American Jewish Committee (ed.), *Twentieth Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee*, in: *American Jewish Year Book 29 (1927–1928)*, 391–445.
- Andriievskiy, Dmytro, *Petliura zahynuv – khay zhyve Petliurivshchyna!* [Petliura Is Dead – Long Live the Petliura Movement!], in: *Tryzub*, 27 June 1926.
- Anonymous, *35,000 Jews Killed in Savage Pogroms*, in: *New York Times*, 11 October 1919.
- Anonymous, *Ataman S. Petljura*, in: *Právo lidu*, 27 May 1926.
- Anonymous, *Auch in Wolynien tobt Petljura*, in: *Jüdische Rundschau*, 15 October 1920, 551.
- Anonymous, *British and Foreign Arms No. VI*, in: *United Service Magazine*, 1843, Part 1, 507–517.
- Anonymous, *Cheska presa pro smert' S. V. Petliury* [The Czech Press on the Death of S. V. Petliura], in: *Tryzub*, 19 September 1926.
- Anonymous, *Das Wüten der Petljura-Banden in Ostgalizien*, in: *Jüdische Rundschau*, 20 September 1920, 505.
- Anonymous, *Der Shvartsbard-protses in Pariz* [The Schwarzbard Trial in Paris], in: *Haynt*, 20 October 1927.
- Anonymous, *Di geshikhte fun der pogrom–bavegung in Ukrayne in di yorn 1917–1921* [History of the Pogrom Movement in Ukraine in the Years 1917–1923], Berlin 1923.
- Anonymous, *Di hinriktung fun dem pogroms-ataman* [The Execution of the Pogrom Commander], in: *Fraye arbeter shtime*, 4 June 1926.
- Anonymous, *Die Hölle in Ostgalizien*, in: *Jüdische Rundschau*, 6 October 1920, 525.
- Anonymous, *Die Pogrome der Petljura-Banden*, in: *Jüdische Rundschau*, 6 October 1920, 529.
- Anonymous, *General Petlura Is Fatally Shot in Paris By Russian Student Seeking Revenge*, in: *New York Times*, 26 May 1926, 1.
- Anonymous, “Hands Off Britain” Campaign. A Victory Rally, in: *The Times*, 16 July 1927.

- Anonymous, *Ḥazon ha-shavua* [What Is Happening this Week], in: *Ha-Olam*, 28 May 1926.
- Anonymous, *Id shist Petlyurn in Pariz* [Jew Shoots Petliura in Paris], in: *Morgen zhurnal*, 26 May 1926.
- Anonymous, *Jews Slain in Ukraine. Their Former Minister in that Country Sends a Review of the Pogroms*, in: *New York Times*, 14 September 1919.
- Anonymous, *L'acquittement de Schwartzbard*, in: *L'Écho de Paris*, 28 October 1927.
- Anonymous, *L'assassin de Petlura devant les jurés de la Seine. Il s'est glorifié de son crime pendant toute l'audience*, in: *L'Écho de Paris*, 19 October 1927.
- Anonymous, *L'assassinat de l'hetman Petlioura. L'instruction s'aiguille vers la recherche des complicités*, in: *L'Action française*, 30 June 1926.
- Anonymous, *La Note des Soviets*, in: *Le Figaro*, 19 May 1927.
- Anonymous, *La panique à Kamenetz-Podolsk*, in: *Le Peuple Juif*, 8 October 1920.
- Anonymous, *La situation. L'affaire Schwartzbard*, in: *L'Ouest-Éclair*, 27 October 1927.
- Anonymous, *La vie des Juifs à Odessa et en Ukraine*, in: *Le Peuple Juif*, 21 November 1919.
- Anonymous, *Le nouveau procureur général près la Cour d'appel de Rennes M. Marcel Peyre*, in: *L'Ouest-Éclair*, 18 July 1937.
- Anonymous, *Moscow and Pilsudski Coup*, in: *The Times*, 19 May 1926.
- Anonymous, *Nokh der ermordung fun Petlyura* [After the Murder of Petliura], in: *Haynt*, 1 June 1926.
- Anonymous, *Nosii velykoi idei* [The Bearer of a Great Idea], in: *Dilo*, 29 May 1926.
- Anonymous, *Nous voulons la paix des rues*, in: *Le Figaro*, 24 August 1927.
- Anonymous, *Ob'iednannia ukrains'koi emihratsii v Chekhii* [Associations of Ukrainian Emigrés in Czechoslovakia], in: *Tryzub*, 19 September 1926.
- Anonymous, *Ohydna lehenda* [An Abominable Legend], in: *Dilo*, 30 May 1926.
- Anonymous, *One Enormous Pogrom*, in: *The Times (London)*, 5 August 1919.
- Anonymous, *Our Weekly Letter from New York*, in: *The Sentinel*, 5 December 1919.
- Anonymous, *Petljura in Paris erschossen*, in: *Berliner Tageblatt*, 26 May 1926.
- Anonymous, *Petlura's Assassin in Hollywood*, in: *Ukrainian Weekly*, 6 October 1933.
- Anonymous, *Petlyura hot aleyn gehetst tsu pogromen* [Petliura Personally Incited the Pogroms], in: *Morgen zhurnal*, 30 May 1926.
- Anonymous, *Petlyura un Petlyurovshytshina* [Petliura and the Petliura Movement], in: *Haynt*, 28 June 1926.
- Anonymous, *Pislia vbyvstva otam[ana] Petliury* [After the Murder of Atam[an] Petliura], in: *Dilo*, 30 May 1926.
- Anonymous, *Polen. Abermals: Pogrome*, in: *Jüdische Rundschau*, 27 July 1920, 398.
- Anonymous, *Presa Rumunii pro vbyvstvo S. V. Petliury* [The Press of Romania on the Murder of S. V. Petliura], in: *Tryzub*, 18 July 1926.
- Anonymous, *Protsees Shvartsbarda v parizhskom sude* [The Schwarzbard Trial in the Parisian Court], Leningrad 1928.
- Anonymous, *Procesul Schwartzbart. O dramă in fața istoriei. Adevăruł asupra pogromurilor lui Petliura* [The Schwarzbard Trial. A Drama in the Face of History. The Truth about the Pogroms of Petliura], Bucharest 1927.

- Anonymous, «Repressii» petliurivtsiv [The “Repressions” of the Petliurists], in: *Ukrains’ki visti*, 18 July 1926.
- Anonymous, Shvartsbard fartaydigungs-fond ruft aroys interes bay ale iden [Schwarzbard Defense Fund Elicits Interest Among All Jews], in: *Morgen zhurnal*, 30 May 1926.
- Anonymous, Skvirer khurbn [The Destruction of Skvira], *Adar 5679 – Kislev 5681 (1919–1921)*, New York 1923.
- Anonymous, Sprawa Tokarzewskiego [The Tokarzewski Affair], in: *Kurjer warszawski*, 2 August 1927.
- Anonymous, The Situation in Poland. Soviet Interest, in: *The Times*, 19 May 1926.
- Anonymous, Ubit S. V. Petliura [S. V. Petliura Murdered], in: *Poslednie novosti*, 26 May 1926.
- Anonymous, Un crime politique, in: *L’Écho de Paris*, 26 May 1926.
- Anonymous, Un verdict de défaillance, in: *Journal des Débats*, 7 May 1926.
- Anonymous, Une victime des pogromes, in: *L’Univers israélite*, 28 May 1926.
- Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Haynt*, 6 December 1926.
- Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Haynt*, 30 January 1927.
- Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Parizer haynt*, 27 January 1927.
- Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Tryzub*, 30 May 1926.
- Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Tryzub*, 6 June 1926.
- Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Tryzub*, 27 June 1926.
- Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Tryzub*, 29 August 1926.
- Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Tryzub*, 12 September 1926.
- Anonymous, Untitled, in: *Tryzub*, 16 October 1927, 1–2.
- Anonymous, Velyka vtrata [A Great Loss], in: *Dilo*, 5 June 1926.
- Anonymous, Vos iz mit’n Shvartsbard-protses? [What Is Happening in the Schwarzbard Trial?], in: *Parizer haynt*, 9 May 1927.
- Anonymous, Vynnychenko v «Dili» [Vynnychenko in “Dilo”], in: *Ukrains’ki visti*, 18 July 1926.
- Anonymous, Zhalibna akademiia pam’iaty S. V. Petliury v Paryzhi [Memorial Ceremony for S. V. Petliura in Paris], in: *Tryzub*, 6 June 1926.
- Anonymous, Zum Attentat auf Petljura, in: *Schweizerbanner*, 15 June 1926.
- Ansky, S., *The Enemy at His Pleasure. A Journey Through the Jewish Pale of Settlement During World War I*, ed. by Joachim Neugroschel, New York 2002.
- Antonovych, Marko/Serbyn, Roman, Dokumenty pro uchasť Shvartsbarda v komunistychnii yacheitsi v Paryzhi [Documents about the Participation of Schwarzbard in Communist Cells in Paris], in: *Naukovyi zbirnyk 4 (1999)*, 334–346.
- Astruc, Aristide et al., *Appel a tous les israélites*, in: *Alliance israélite universelle (ed.), Alliance israélite universelle*, Paris 1860, 18–21.
- Avrich, Paul, *Russian Anarchists and the Civil War*, in: *Russian Review 27 (1968)*, 296–306.
- Azcárate, Pablo de, *League of Nations and National Minorities. An Experiment*, Washington D.C. 1945.
- Bamberger-Stemmann, Sabine, *Der Europäische Nationalitätenkongreß 1925 bis 1938. Nationale Minderheiten zwischen Lobbyistentum und Großmachtinteressen*, Marburg 2000.

- Batchinsky, Julian, *The Jewish Pogroms in Ukraine. Authoritative Statements on the Question of Responsibility for Recent Outbreaks Against the Jews in Ukraine*, Washington D.C. 1919.
- Berenson, Edward, *The Trial of Madame Caillaux*, Berkeley Calif. 1992.
- Berl, Alfred, *La condamnation des pogroms*, in: *Paix et droit*, October 1927.
- Bernstein, Serge/Jeanneney, Jean Noël, *Les raisons de l'échec du Cartel des gauches*, in: *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire Moderne* 23 (1978), 2–15.
- Bein, Alex (ed.), *Sefer Motzkin. Ketavim u-ne'umim nivḥarim, biyografyah ve-divrei ha'arakhah* [The Motzkin Volume. Selected Writings and Speeches, Biography and Words of Appreciation], Jerusalem 1939.
- Berry, David, *A History of the French Anarchist Movement, 1917–1945*, Westport Conn. 2002.
- Byalik [Bialik], Ḥayim Naḥman, *Dvir u-morayah. Sekirah kezarah al gidulam ve-hitpatḥutam* [Dvir and Moriah. A Brief Survey of Their Growth and Development], New York 1926.
- Bonsal, Stephen, *Suitors and Suppliants. The Little Nations at Versailles*, New York 1946.
- Boshyk, Yury, *Between Socialism and Nationalism. Jewish-Ukrainian Political Relations in Imperial Russia, 1900–1917*, in: Peter J. Potichnyj/Howard Aster (eds.), *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, Edmonton 1988, 173–202.
- Boulouque, Sylvain, *Anarchisme et judaïsme dans le mouvement libertaire en France. Réflexions sur quelques itinéraires*, in: Amadeo Bertolo (ed.), *Juifs et anarchistes*, Paris 2008, 113–124.
- Bruski, Jan Jacek, *Petlurowcy. Centrum Państwowe Ukrainiskiej Republiki Ludowej na wychodźstwie (1919–1924)* [The Petliurists. The Ukrainian National Republic and Its Central State Institutions in Exile], Kraków 2000.
- Bugnon, Fanny, *Germaine Berton. Une criminelle politique éclipse*, in: *Nouvelles questions féministes* 24 (2005), 68–85.
- Burns, Michael, *Dreyfus. A Family Affair. From the French Revolution to the Holocaust*, New York 1992.
- Carley, Michael Jabara, *Episodes from the Early Cold War. Franco–Soviet Relations, 1917–1927*, in: *Europe–Asia Studies* 52 (2000), 1275–1305.
- Chasanowitch, Leon, *Der idisher khurbn in Ukrayne. Materyaln un dokumenten* [The Jewish Catastrophe in Ukraine. Materials and Documents], Berlin 1920.
- Claretie, Georges, *Clerc est condamné à trois ans de prison, Bernardon est acquitté*, in: *Le Figaro*, 6 May 1926.
- Claretie, Georges, *L'Affaire de la rue Damrémont. M. Vaillant-Couturier estime que nous sommes au début de la guerre civile*, in: *Le Figaro*, 29 April 1926.
- Code d'instruction criminelle de 1808 (Texte intégral de la version en vigueur en 1929), http://ledroitcriminel.free.fr/la_legislation_criminelle/anciens_textes/code_instruction_criminelle_1929/code_1808_2.htm (10 December 2015).
- Comité commémoratif Simon Petlura (ed.), *Documents sur les pogromes en Ukraine et l'assassinat de Simon Petlura à Paris (1917–1921–1926). Recueil de documents concernant la lutte du Gouvernement de la République Démocratique Ukrainienne contre les pogromes antijuifs en Ukraine et relatifs à l'assassinat de Simon Petlura à Paris*, Paris 1927.

- Comité des Délégations Juives, *Dix-sept ans d'activité*, Paris-Geneva 1936.
- Comité des Délégations Juives (ed.), *Les pogromes en Ukraine sous les gouvernements ukrainiens (1917–1920). Aperçu historique et documents*, Paris 1927.
- Committee of the Jewish Delegations (ed.), *The Pogroms in the Ukraine under the Ukrainian Governments (1917–1920). Historical Survey with Documents and Photographs*, London 1927.
- Cœuré, Sophie, *La grande leuer à l'est. Les Français et l'Union soviétique 1917–1939*, Paris 1999.
- Dekel-Chen, Jonathan L., *Farming the Red Land. Jewish Agricultural Colonization and Local Soviet Power, 1924–1941*, New Haven Conn. 2005.
- Dobkowski, Elie, *Affaire Petliura–Schwarzbard*, [Paris], n. d. [1928].
- Dohrn, Verena, *Diplomacy in the Diaspora. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency in Berlin (1922–1933)*, in: *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book 54 (2009)*, 219–241.
- Donovan, James M., *Magistrates and Juries in France, 1791–1952*, in: *French Historical Studies 22 (1999)*, 379–420.
- Doroshenko–Tovmatskyi, Boris, *Symon Petliura. Zhyttia i diial'nist' [The Life and Deeds of Symon Petliura]*, Kiev 2005.
- Engel, David, *Manhigim yehudim, tikhnun istrategi vеха-zirah ha-beyn-le'umit le-aḥar milḥemet ha-olam ha-rishonah [Jewish Leaders, Strategic Planning, and the International Arena after the First World War]*, in: *Michael 16 (2004)*, 165–178.
- Engel, David, *Being Lawful in a Lawless World. The Trial of Scholem Schwarzbard and the Defense of East European Jews*, in: *Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts/Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook 5 (2006)*, 83–97.
- Feldman, Eliyahu, *Yehudei Rusyah bi-yemei ha-mahapekhah ha-rishonah vеха-pogromim [The Jews of Russia in the Days of the First Revolution and the Pogroms]*, Jerusalem 1999.
- Ferrari, Roberto, *The “Crime Passionnel” in French Courts*, in: *California Law Review 6 (1918)*, 331–341.
- Ferrari, Roberto, *The Procedure in the “Cour d'Assises” of Paris*, in: *Columbia Law Review 18 (1918)*, 43–62.
- Fink, Carole, *Defending the Rights of Others. The Great Powers, the Jews, and International Minority Protection, 1878–1938*, Cambridge Mass. 2004.
- Fink, Carole, *The Genoa Conference. European Diplomacy 1921–1922*, Chapel Hill N.C. 1984.
- Finkelstein, Haim, *Haynt. A tsaytung bay yidn 1908–1939 [Haynt. A Newspaper for Jews]*, Tel Aviv 1978.
- Flory, Harriette, *The Arcos Raid and the Rupture of Anglo-Soviet Relations, 1927*, in: *Journal of Contemporary History 12 (1977)*, 707–723.
- Friedman, Saul S., *Pogromchik. The Assassination of Simon Petlura*, New York 1976.
- Frommer, Morris, *The American Jewish Congress. A History, 1914–1950*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1978.
- Gergel, Nahum, *Di pogromen in Ukrayne in di yorn 1918–1921 [The Pogroms in Ukraine in the Years 1918–1921]*, in: *Shriftn far ekonomik un statistik 1 (1928)*, 106–113.
- Gide, André, *Souvenirs de la cour d'assises*, Paris 1913.

- Gitelman, Zvi Y., *Jewish Nationality and Soviet Politics. The Jewish Sections of the CPSU, 1917–1930*, Princeton N.J. 1972.
- Golczewski, Frank, *Polnisch-jüdische Beziehungen 1881–1922. Eine Studie zur Geschichte des Antisemitismus in Osteuropa*, Wiesbaden 1981.
- Goldberg, Israel (ed.), *Massacres and Other Atrocities Committed Against the Jews in Southern Russia. A Record Including Official Reports, Sworn Statements and Other Documentary Proof*, New York 1920.
- Goren, Ya'akov (ed.), *Eduyot nifge'ei Kishinev 1903 kefi she-nigbe'u al-yedei H. N. Byalik ve-ḥaverav [The Testimonies of the Victims of Kishinev 1903 as Collected by H. N. Bialik and His Associates]*, Tel Aviv 1991.
- Grad, B., *Significance of the Schwarzbard Trial. An Exclusive Interview with Henri Torrès, Chief of Defense Counsel in Slaying of Pogromist Petlura*, in: *The American Hebrew*, 25 March 1927.
- Greenberg, Uri Zvi, *Gezamlte verk [Collected Works]*, 2 vols., Jerusalem 1979.
- Greene, Nathanael, *From Versailles to Vichy. The Third French Republic, 1919–1940*, New York 1970.
- Greysen, Alter/Wohl, Zusia, *Khurbn Proskurov. Tsum ondenken fun di heylige neshomes vos zaynen umgekumen in di shreklikher shkhite, vos iz ongefirt gevorn durkh di haydamakes [The Destruction of Proskurov. In Memory of the Sacred Souls who Perished in the Terrible Slaughter of the Haidamaks]*, New York 1924.
- Grimsted, Patricia Kennedy, *The Odyssey of the Petliura Library and the Records of the Ukrainian National Republic during World War II*, <http://www.archives.gov.ua/Eng/Odyssey.php> (8 April 2014).
- Gruenbaum, Yitshak, *Madua yazarnu et gush ha-mi'utim [Why We Created the Minorities Bloc]*, in: *Yitshak Gruenbaum, Milḥamot yehudei Polanyah [5]673–[5]700 [The Wars of the Jews of Poland 1913–1940]*, Jerusalem 1941, 156–161.
- Gumener, Eliyahu, *A kapitl Ukrayne [About Ukraine]*, Wilno 1921.
- Gusev–Orenburgskiy, Sergey I., *Bagrovaya kniga. Pogromy 1919–1920 gg. na Ukraine [Crimson Book. The Pogroms of 1919–1920 in Ukraine]*, Harbin 1922.
- Häfner, Lutz, *Die Partei der Linken Sozialrevolutionäre in der russischen Revolution von 1917/18*, Köln/Weimar/Wien 1994.
- Häfner, Lutz, *The Assassination of Count Mirbach and the “July Uprising” of the Left Socialist Revolutionaries in Moscow, 1918*, in: *Russian Review* 50 (1991), 324–344.
- Heifetz, Elias, *The Slaughter of the Jews in the Ukraine in 1919*, New York 1921.
- Hidden, John, *Defender of Minorities. Paul Schiemann, 1876–1944*, London 2004.
- Hodorozhnyy, I., *Sovits'kyi antysemityzm [Soviet Anti-Semitism]*, in: *Tryzub*, 12 September 1926.
- Hogenhuis–Seliverstoff, Anne, *Les relations franco-soviétiques 1917–1924*, Paris 1981.
- Holquist, Peter, *The Role of Personality in the First (1914–1915) Russian Occupation of Galicia and Bukovina*, in: *Jonathan L. Dekel–Chen et al. (eds.), Anti-Jewish Violence. Rethinking the Pogrom in East European History*, Bloomington Ind. 2011, 52–73.
- Hyman, Paula E., *From Dreyfus to Vichy. The Remaking of French Jewry, 1906–1939*, New York 1979.
- Hyman, Paula E., *The Jews of Modern France*, Berkeley Calif. 1998.

- Jabotinsky, Vladimir, Di "Krim"-kolonizatsye [The Colonization of Crimea], in: *Morgen zhurnal*, 4 June 1926.
- Jabotinsky, Vladimir, Petliura i pogromy [Petliura and the Pogroms], in: *Poslednie novosti*, 11 October 1927.
- Jabotinsky, Vladimir, Petlyura un di pogromen [Petliura and the Pogroms], in: *Haynt*, 16 October 1927.
- Janowsky, Oscar I., *The Jews and Minority Rights 1898–1919*, New York 1933.
- Jarausch, Konrad, Cooperation or Intervention? Kurt Riezler and the Failure of German Ostpolitik, 1918, in: *Slavic Review* 31 (1972), 381–398.
- Jewish National Organizations in the United States, in: *American Jewish Year Book* 24 (1922–1923), 192–263.
- Jockusch, Laura, *Collect and Record! Jewish Holocaust Documentation in Early Postwar Europe*, New York 2012.
- Johnson, Kelly, *Sholem Schwarzbard. Biography of a Jewish Assassin*, unpublished PhD dissertation, Harvard University 2012.
- Kacyzne, Alter, *Shvartsbard*, Paris 1980.
- Karlip, Joshua M., Between Martyrology and Historiography. Elias Tcherikower and the Making of a Pogrom Historian, in: *East European Jewish Affairs* 38 (2008), 257–280.
- Katz, Shmu'el, Zhabo. Biografyah shel Ze'ev Zhabotinski [Jabo. A Biography of Ze'ev Jabotinsky], Tel Aviv 1993.
- Khiterer, Victoria, Arnold Davidovich Margolin. Ukrainian–Jewish Jurist, Statesman and Diplomat, in: *Revolutionary Russia* 18 (2005), 145–167.
- Klier, John D./Lambroza, Shlomo (eds.), *Pogroms. Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian History*, Cambridge Mass. 1992.
- Kobrin, Rebecca, Contested Contributions. Emigré Philanthropy, Jewish Communal Life, and Polish–Jewish Relations in Interwar Białystok, 1919–1929, in: *Gal-Ed* 20 (2006), 43–62.
- Kobrin, Rebecca, *Jewish Białystok and Its Diaspora*, Bloomington Ind. 2010.
- Kobrin, Rebecca, The 1905 Revolution Abroad. Mass Migration, Russian Jewish Liberalism, and American Jewry, in: Stefani Hoffman/Ezra Mendelsohn (eds.), *The Revolution of 1905 and Russia's Jews*, Philadelphia Penn. 2008, 227–244.
- Koroliv-Staryi, Vasył, Nad svizhoiu mohyloiu [Over the Fresh Grave], in: *Tryzub*, 27 June 1926.
- Korzec, Paweł, Das Abkommen zwischen der Regierung Grabski und der jüdischen Parlamentsvertretung, in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 20 (1972), 331–366.
- Korzec, Paweł, Der Block der nationalen Minderheiten im Parlamentarismus Polens des Jahres 1922, in: *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 24 (1975), 193–220.
- Korzec, Paweł, Der Zweite Block der Nationalen Minderheiten im Parlamentarismus Polens 1927–1928, in: *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 26 (1977), 76–116.
- Korzec, Paweł, The Steiger Affair, in: *Soviet Jewish Affairs* 3 (1973) 2, 38–57.
- Kotik, Me'ir, *Mishpat Shwarzbard. Rezaḥ nakam al reka ha-pogromim be-Ukrainah [The Schwarzbard Trial. A Revenge Murder against the Background of the Pogroms in Ukraine]*, Hadera 1972.

- Kugelmass, Jack/Boyarin, Jonathan, *From a Ruined Garden. The Memorial Books of Polish Jewry*, Bloomington Ind. 21998.
- Kulchyt'skyi, Stanislav V., *Volodymyr Vynnychenko*, Kiev 2005.
- Kulchyt'skyi, Yuri, *Symon Petliura i pogromy [Symon Petliura and the Pogroms]*, in: Volodymyr Kosyk (ed.), *Symon Petliura. Zbirnyk studiyno–naukovoï konferentsii v Paryzhi [Symon Petliura. A Collection of Studies from an Academic Conference in Paris]*, Munich 1980, 137–159.
- Lachower, Fishel (ed.), *Igrot Ḥayim Naḥman Byalik [The Letters of Chaim Nachman Bialik]*, 5 vols., Tel Aviv 1938–1939.
- Landau, Moshe, *Ha-brit she-hikhzivah. Yehudim ve-germanim be-kongres ha-mi'utim ha-ropi 1925–1933 [The Alliance that Failed. Jews and Germans in the European Minorities Congress 1925–1933]*, Tel Aviv 1992.
- Landau, Moshe, *Mi'ut le'umi loḥem. Ma'avak yehudei Polin ba-shanim 1918–1928 [A Fighting National Minority. The Struggle of Polish Jewry in the Years 1918–1928]*, Jerusalem 1986.
- Latawski, Paul, *The Dmowski-Namier Feud, 1915–1918*, in: *Polin* 2 (1987), 37–49.
- Latsky–Bertholdi, Ya'akov, *Gzeyres Denikin [The Denikin Catastrophe]*, Berlin 1922.
- Lecache, Bernard, *Kogda Izrail' umiraet [When Israel Dies]*, Leningrad 1928.
- Lecache, Bernard, *Quand Israël meurt ... Au pays des pogromes*, Paris n. d. [1927].
- Lecache, Bernard, *Ven dos folk yisroel shtarbt [When the Jewish People Dies]*, Warsaw 1927.
- Lederhendler, Eli, *Democracy and Assimilation. The Jews, America, and the Russian Crisis from Kishinev to the End of World War I*, in: Stefani Hoffman/Ezra Mendelsohn (eds.), *The Revolution of 1905 and Russia's Jews*, Philadelphia Penn. 2008, 245–254.
- Leff, Lisa Moses, *Sacred Bonds of Solidarity. The Rise of Jewish Internationalism in Nineteenth–Century France*, Stanford Calif. 2006.
- Levytskyi, Volodymyr, *Chyia zhertva? [Whose Victim?]*, in: *Dilo*, 2 June 1926.
- Lewitsky, Dmitro, *Die Schandtaten der Petljura-Banden*, in: *Jüdische Rundschau*, 19 October 1920, 556.
- Lincoln, W. Bruce, *Red Victory. A History of the Russian Civil War*, New York 1989.
- Lohr, Eric, *The Russian Army and the Jews. Mass Deportation, Hostages, and Violence during World War I*, in: *Russian Review* 60 (2001), 404–419.
- Lohr, Eric, *1915 and the War Pogrom Paradigm in the Russian Empire*, in: Jonathan Deikel–Chen et al. (eds.), *Anti–Jewish Violence. Rethinking the Pogrom in East European History*, Bloomington Ind. 2011, 41–51.
- Lubianiker, Zelig, *Mikhtevei ḥaverim [Letters from Members]*, in: *Davar*, 13 June 1926.
- Lytvyn, Serhii, *Symon Petliura u 1917–1926 rokach. Istoriografiia ta dzherela [Symon Petliura in the Years 1917–1926. Historiography and Sources]*, Kiev 2000.
- Lytvyn, Serhii, *Sud istorii. Symon Petliura i petliuriana [The Court of History. Symon Petliura and the Petliura Movement]*, Kiev 2001.
- Lytvyn, Serhii, *Vbyvstvo S. Petliury i GPU. Do istoriohrafii problemy [The Assassination of S. Petliura and the GPU. On the Historiography of the Problem]*, <<http://www.sbu.gov.ua/sbu/doccatalog%5Cdocument?id=42156>> (9 April 2014).

- Maitron, Jean, *Le mouvement anarchiste en France*, 2 vols., Paris 1975.
- Manfredonia, Gaetano, *L'anarchisme en Europe*, Paris 2001.
- Manger, Itsik, *Shtern oyfn dakh* [Stars on the Roof], Bucarest 1929.
- Margolin, Arnold D., *From a Political Diary. Russia, the Ukraine, and America 1905–1945*, New York 1946.
- Margolin, Arnold D., *Jews in Eastern Europe*, New York 1926.
- Margolin, Arnold D., *Ukraina i politika Antanty* (*Zapiski yevreya i grazhdanina*) [Ukraine and the Politics of the Entente (Notes by a Jew and a Citizen)], Berlin n.d. [1922].
- Martin, Benjamin F., *France and the Après Guerre, 1918–1924. Illusions and Disillusionment*, Baton Rouge La. 1999.
- Martin, Benjamin F., *The Hypocrisy of Justice in the Belle Epoque*, Baton Rouge La. 1984.
- Martin-Chauffier, Louis, « Tu peux tuer cet homme avec tranquillité », in: *Le Figaro*, 28 December 1923.
- Materski, Wojciech, *Na widecie. II Rzeczpospolita wobec Sowietów, 1918–1943* [On the Watchtower. The Second Republic and the Soviets, 1918–1943], Warsaw 2005.
- Melamed, Efim, 'Immortalizing the Crime in History...'. The Activities of the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv (Kiev—Berlin—Paris, 1920–1940), in: Jörg Schulte/Olga Tabachnikova/Peter Wagstaff (eds.), *The Russian Jewish Diaspora and European Culture, 1917–1937*, Leiden/Boston Mass. 2012, 373–386.
- Miliakova, Lidia (ed.), *Le livre des pogroms. Antichambre d'un génocide. Ukraine, Russie, Biélorussie, 1917–1922*, Paris 2010.
- Mohrer, Fruma/Web, Marek, *Guide to the YIVO Archives*, Armonk N.Y. 1998.
- Moss, Kenneth B., *Jewish Renaissance in the Russian Revolution*, Cambridge Mass. 2009.
- Motyl, Alexander J., *The Turn to the Right. The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian Nationalism, 1919–1929*, New York 1980.
- Mykhalchuk, Vasył, *Vbyvstvo ta protses Petliury z perspektyvy 70-richchia* [The Assassination and the Trial of Petliura from the Perspective of Seventy Years], in: Vasył Mykhalchuk /Dmytro Stepovyk (eds.), *U 70-richchia paryz'koi trahedii 1926–1996. Zbirnyk pam'iaty Symona Petliury* [On the Seventieth Anniversary of the Tragedy in Paris 1926–1996. An Anthology in Memory of Symon Petliura], Kiev 1997, 11–40.
- Myroniuk, Dmytro/Myroniuk, Nataliya, *Simon Petlioura. Fondateur du « Trident »*, Chernyvtsi 2006.
- Mytrovych, Kyrylo, *Politychni idealy i zapovity Symona Petliury* [The Political Ideals and Precepts of Symon Petliura], in: Vasył Mykhalchuk/Dmytro Stepovyk (eds.), *U 70-richchia paryz'koi trahedii 1926–1996. Zbirnyk pam'iaty Symona Petliury* [On the Seventieth Anniversary of the Tragedy in Paris 1926–1996. An Anthology in Memory of Symon Petliura], Kiev 1997, 48–53.
- Noiriel, Gérard, *Immigration, antisémitisme et racisme en France (XIXe–XXe siècle). Discours publics, humiliations privées*, Paris 2007.
- Noiriel, Gérard, *Le creuset français. Histoire de l'immigration, XIXe–XXe siècles*, Paris 1988.
- Ostrowskiy, Zalman Solomonovich, *Yevreyskie pogromy 1918–1921* [Jewish Pogroms 1918–1921], Moscow 1926.
- Palij, Michael, *The Anarchism of Nestor Makhno. An Aspect of the Ukrainian Revolution*, Seattle Wash. 1976.

- Palij, Michael, *The Ukrainian–Polish Defensive Alliance, 1919–1921. An Aspect of the Ukrainian Revolution*, Edmonton 1995.
- Petliura, Symon, *Rozpochynaiuchy vydannia* [The First Edition], in: Tryzub, 15 October 1925.
- Petrovsky-Shtern, Yohanan, *The Anti-Imperial Choice. The Making of the Ukrainian Jew*, New Haven Conn. 2009.
- Pidhainy, Oleh S./Pidhainy, Olexandra I., *Symon Petlura. A Bibliography*, Toronto/New York 1977.
- Pisuliński, Jan, *Nie tylko Petlura. Kwestia ukraińska w polskiej polityce zagranicznej w latach 1918–1923* [Not Only Petliura. The Ukrainian Question in Polish Foreign Policy in the Years 1918–1923], Wrocław 2004.
- Planhol, René de, *Le procès des communistes assassins. La défense renonce à ses témoins et la partie civile commence ses plaidoiries*, in: *L'Écho de Paris*, 30 April 1926.
- Plokyh, Serhii, *Unmaking Imperial Russia. Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History*, Toronto 2005.
- Pol'skaya Akademiia Nauk et al. (eds.), *Dokumenty i materialy po istorii sovetsko-pol'skikh otnosheniy* [Documents and Materials on the History of Soviet-Polish Relations], 12 vols., Moscow 1963–1986.
- Prusin, Alexander Victor, *Nationalizing a Borderland. War, Ethnicity, and Anti-Jewish Violence in East Galicia 1914–1920*, Tuscaloosa Ala. 2005.
- Prusin, Alexander Victor, *The Lands Between. Conflict in the East European Borderlands 1870–1992*, Oxford/New York 2010.
- Reinhartz, Jehuda/Shavit, Yaacov, *Glorious, Accursed Europe. An Essay on Jewish Ambivalence*, Hanover N.H. 2010.
- Rejzen, Zalman, *Leksikon fun der yidisher literatur, prese un filologye* [Lexicon of Yiddish Literature, Press, and Philology], Wilno 1929.
- Reshetar, John S., *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1920. A Study in Nationalism*, Princeton N.J. 1952.
- Revutsky, Avraham, *In di shvere teg oyf Ukrayne* [During Hard Times in Ukraine], Berlin 1924.
- Revutsky, Avraham, *Ver hot dershosen Petlyura? Di perzenlikhkayt fun Shvartsbardn* [Who Shot Petliura? The Personality of Schwarzbard], in: *Morgen zhurnal*, 26 May 1926.
- Rodrigue, Aron, *Rearticulations of French Jewish Identities after the Dreyfus Affair*, in: *Jewish Social Studies* 2,3 (1996), 1–24.
- Rojanski, Rachel, *Hashpa'atah shel yahadut arzot ha-brit al hakamat ma'arakhot ha-revahah ha-yehudit be-Polin ba-shanim 1920–1929* [The Influence of American Jewry on the Establishment of Jewish Social Welfare Networks in Poland in the Years 1920–1929], in: *Gal-Ed* 11 (1989), 59–86.
- Rosenfeld, Sh., *Der blok un di demagogye* [The Bloc and Demagogy], in: *Haynt*, 6 October 1922.
- Rosenthal, Eliezer David, *Megilat ha-tevah. Homer le-divrei yemei ha-pera'ot veva-tevah ba-yehudim be-Ukrainah, be-Rusyah ha-gedolah uve-Rusyah ha-levanah* [The Scroll of Slaughter. Texts on the History of the Riots and the Slaughter of the Jews in Ukraine, Great Russia, and White Russia], 3 vols., Jerusalem 1927–1931.

- Rosenthal, Zalman, *Der Shvartsbard–protses* [The Schwarzbard Trial], Paris 1927.
- Rothschild, Joseph, *Piłsudski's Coup d'Etat*, New York 1966.
- Sadikov, M[aks], In yene teg. Zikhroynes vegn der rusisher revolyutsye un di ukrayner pogromen [In Those Days. Memoirs of the Russian Revolution and the Ukrainian Pogroms], New York 1926.
- Saltykov-Shchedrin, Mikhail, *Yul'skoeveyanie* [The Spirit of July], <http://www.lechaim.ru/ARHIV/87/salt.htm#_ftn1> (10 December 2015).
- Sandrow, Nahma, *Vagabond Stars. A World History of Yiddish Theater*, New York 1977.
- Sant'Andrea, Nicolas, *L'assassinat du général Petlioura. Une instruction pour la forme*, in: *L'Action française*, 3 June 1926.
- Satzewich, Vic, *The Ukrainian Diaspora*, London/New York 2002.
- Schapiro, Leonard, *The Origin of the Communist Autocracy. Political Opposition in the Soviet State, First Phase, 1917–1922*, London 1977.
- Schechtman, Joseph B., *The Jabotinsky–Slavinsky Agreement. A Chapter in Ukrainian–Jewish Relations*, in: *Jewish Social Studies* 17 (1955), 289–306.
- Schechtman, Joseph B., *Pogromy Dobrovol'cheskoi armii na Ukraine* [The Pogroms of the Voluntary Army in Ukraine], Berlin 1932.
- Schivelbusch, Wolfgang, *The Culture of Defeat. On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery*, New York 2003.
- Schor, Ralph, *L'opinion française et les étrangers en France 1919–1939*, Paris 1985.
- Senn, Alfred Erich, *The Rakovsky Affair. A Crisis in Franco–Soviet Relations, 1927*, in: *Slavic and East–European Studies* 10 (1965), 102–117.
- Serhiychuk, Volodymyr I. et al. (eds.), *Symon Petliura. Nevidomi lysty z Paryzha yak politychnyi zapovit bortsyam za samostiiny Ukrainu* [Symon Petliura. Unknown Letters from Paris as the Political Legacy of a Fighter for Independent Ukraine], Kiev 2001.
- Serhiychuk, Volodymyr I., *Symon Petliura*, Kiev 2004.
- Shapoval, Mykola, *Pro smert' Petliury* [On the Death of Petliura], Paris 1927.
- Shapoval, Mykyta, *Bol'shevyzm i Ukraina* [Bolshevism and Ukraine], Prague 1926.
- Shapoval, Yu[ri], I., *Vbyvstvo Symona Petliury. Nova informatsiia dla rozdumiv* [The Assassination of Symon Petliura. New Information for Consideration], in: Yu[ri] I. Shapoval, *Liudyna i systema. Strykhy do portretu totalitarnoi doby v Ukraini* [Man and the System. Sketches for a Portrait of the Totalitarian Period in Ukraine], Kiev 1994, 96–107.
- Shtif, Nahum, *Pogromen in Ukrayne. Di tsayt fun der frayviliger arney* [Pogroms in Ukraine. The Period of the Volunteer Army], Berlin 1923.
- Shulhyn, Oleksandr, *Odpowid' Zhabotins'komu* [Response to Jabotinsky], in: *Tryzub*, 16 October 1927.
- [Shvartsbard], Sholem, *Fashizm far'n gerikht* [Fascism on Trial], in: *Fraye arbeter shtime*, 28 December 1923.
- Shvartsbard, Shalom, *Mémoires d'un anarchiste juif*, ed. by Michel Hermon, Paris 2010.
- Shvartsbard, Sholem, *In krig – mit zikh aleyn* [At War with Myself], Chicago Ill. 1933.
- Shvartsbard, Sholem, *In'm loyf fun yorn* [Over the Years], Chicago Ill. 1934.
- Shvartsbard, Sholem, *Mayn viner legende* [My Vienna Legend], in: *Haynt*, 2 January 1928.

- Silberfarb, Moses, *Dos idishe ministryum un di idishe avtonomye in Ukrayne. A bleit geshikhte* [The Jewish Ministry and Jewish Autonomy in Ukraine. A Page of History], Kiev 1918.
- Solovyev, Vladimir, *Yevreystvo i khristianskiy vopros* [Jewry and the Christian Question], <http://www.vehi.net/soloviev/solovevr.html> (10 December 2015).
- Soyer, Daniel, *Jewish Immigrant Associations and American Jewish Identity in New York, 1880–1939*, Cambridge Mass. 1997.
- Stampfer, Shaul, What Actually Happened to the Jews of Ukraine in 1648, in: *Jewish History* 17 (2003), 207–227.
- Subtelny, Orest, *Ukraine. A History*, Toronto 32000.
- Szajkowski, Zosa, *Di geshikhte fun dem itstikn bukh* [The History of This Book], in: *Eliyahu Tcherikower, Di ukrayner pogromen in yor 1919* [The Ukrainian Pogroms of 1919], New York 1965, 333–349.
- Szajkowski, Zosa, *Private and Organized American Jewish Overseas Relief (1914–1938)*, in: *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* 57 (1967) 1, 52–106.
- Tartakower, Arie, *Nedudei ha-yehudim ba-olam* [Worldwide Jewish Migrations], Jerusalem 1941.
- Tcherikower, Eliyahu, *Antisemitizm i pogromy na Ukraine, 1917–1918 gg. (K istorii ukrainsko-yevreyskikh otnosheniy)* [Antisemitism and the Pogroms in Ukraine, 1917–1918 (Toward a History of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations)], Berlin 1923 (Yiddish: *Antisemitizm un pogromen in Ukraine. Tsu der geshikhte fun ukrainish-yidishe batiungen*, Berlin 1923).
- Tcherikower, Eliyahu, *Di ukrayner pogromen in yor 1919* [The Ukrainian Pogroms of 1919], New York 1965.
- Torrès, Henry, *Le procès des pogromes. Plaidoire. Suivie des témoignages*, Paris 1928.
- Trotzki, Leo, *Geschichte der russischen Revolution*, vol. 2: *Oktoberrevolution*, Frankfurt a. M. 1973.
- Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.A. (ed.), *In Memory of Arnold Margolin (1877–1956). Remarks and Reminiscences Presented at the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.A. on the Hundredth Anniversary of His Birth*, New York 1983.
- United States Department of State (ed.), *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919, Russia*, Washington D.C. 1919.
- Unterman, Isaac, *Fun di shkhite-shtedt 1919–1922* [From the Cities of Slaughter 1919–1922], Jersey City N.J. 1925.
- Volodin, Mikhail, A [sic] *erklarung fun M. Volodin, edus in Shvartsbard-frage* [Declaration by M. Volodin, Witness in the Schwarzbard Affair], in: *Parizer haynt*, 30 March 1927.
- Volodin, Mikhail, *Pis'mo M. Volodina* [A Letter from M. Volodin], in: *Dni*, 22 October 1927.
- Wade, Rex A., *Red Guards and Workers' Militias in the Russian Revolution*, Stanford Calif. 1984.
- Wandycz, Piotr S., *The Twilight of French Eastern Alliances, 1926–1936. French–Czechoslovak–Polish Relations from Locarno to the Remilitarization of the Rhineland*, Princeton N.J. 1988.

- Weber, Eugen, *Action Française. Royalism and Reaction in Twentieth-Century France*, Stanford Calif. 1962.
- Weiss, Sh. M., *Der shos oyf Petlyuran (Shvartsbard–protses) [The Shot at Petliura (Schwarzbard Trial)]*, Warsaw 1933.
- Wise, Stephen S., *Challenging Years. The Autobiography of Stephen Wise*, London 1951.
- Wohl, Robert, *French Communism in the Making, 1914–1924*, Stanford Calif. 1966.
- Wolff, Larry, *The Idea of Galicia. History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture*, Stanford Calif. 2010.
- Wolken, K. W., *Les massacres des Juifs en Ukraine*, Lwów 1919.
- Wołos, Mariusz, *Proces Samuela Schwartzbarda w październiku 1927 r. (w świetle prasy francuskiej) [The Trial of Scholem Schwartzbard in October 1927 (as Reflected in the French Press)]*, in: *Dzieje najnowsze* 38 (2006), 71–80.
- Wróbel, Piotr, *The Kaddish Years. Anti-Jewish Violence in East Central Europe, 1918–1921*, in: *Jahrbuch des Simon–Dubnow–Instituts/Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook* 4 (2005), 211–236.
- Yakovliv, A[ndriy], *Paryz'ka trahediia. 25 travnia 1926 roku [The Tragedy in Paris. 25 May 1926]*, Prague 1930.
- Zaderecki, Tadeusz, *Bi-meshol zlav ha-keres bi-Lvov. Ĥurban ha-kehillah ha-yehudit be-enei meḥaber polani [When the Swastika Ruled in Lwów. The Destruction of the Jewish Community as Seen by a Polish Author]*, ed. by Aharon Weiss, Jerusalem 1982.
- Zhitomirer fareynigtes relif komiti [United Zhitomir Relief Committee] (ed.), *Yizkor dem ondeynken fun di zhitomirer kedoyshim [Memorial for the Martyrs of Zhitomir]*, New York 1921.

Index

Persons

- Absalom (Bible) 72
Agag (Bible) 193–194
Ahashverosh (Bible) 359
Aleksander II Nikolaevich 198
Alekshev-Nebutyov, Ivan 233
Allouche, Félix 54, 99, 158–159
Alter, Wiktor 247
Andriievskiy, Dmytro 30
Asch, Scholem 58, 87, 184, 242, 445
- Badian, Yakov 259–260
Barondess, Joseph 88, 90, 102, 227,
439–440, 445
Barrow, George 122
Beaumarchais, Pierre-Augustin de →
Caron de Beaumarchais, Pierre-
Augustin
Begin, Menachem 94
Beilinson, Moshe 81–82, 100, 178, 183,
445
Beilis, Mendel 40, 207, 234, 272, 417, 437,
447
Belkind, Israel 241
Ben-Adir 150, 445
Bergelson, David 150, 445
Bernard, Pierre 184
Bernstein, Max 411
Berton, Germaine 12, 18, 20, 97
Bialik, Chaim Nachman 66, 101, 111,
150, 273–274, 276, 445
Bienko, Leon 92, 329
Bigart, Jacques 76, 99, 115–116, 133, 445
Blum, Léon 87, 184, 187–189, 225, 264,
318, 337, 386, 446
Blum, René 264, 266
Bochkovs'kyi, Ol'herd-Ipolyt 99, 142
Bogdanovich, Nikolai 46
Bogen, Boris 227, 446
Boni, Albert 286
Boni, Charles 286
Bonomini, Ernesto 12
Bonsal, Stephen 25
Bonservizi, Nicola 12
Bourgeois, Léon Victor 131
Brandeis, Louis Dembitz 41
Braunstein → Trotsky, Leon
Briand, Aristide 24, 431
Bułak-Bałachowicz, Stanisław 195
- Caillaux, Henriette 12
Caillaux, Joseph 12
Calmette, Gaston 12
Cambon, Jules-Martin 63
Campinchi, César 8, 14, 48, 90, 283, 360,
366–373, 377–385, 388–391, 394,
401–406, 436, 438, 443
Caron de Beaumarchais, Pierre-
Augustin 309
Ceglinskyi, Nicholas 288
Chamberlain, Austen 24
Chasanowitch, Leon 70
Chmielnicki, Bogdan 118–119, 196, 357;
see also Cossack uprising
Choulgine, Alexandre → Shulhyn,
Oleksandr
Chtchoupak, Samuil 184
Chykalenko, Levko 40, 100, 228, 237, 446
Claude, Henri 279, 366
Colban, Erik 75, 77
Corcos, Fernand 184, 188
Coty, François 14, 21–22, 24, 94, 101, 307,
312
Czolgosz, Leon 410

- Daniels, Josephus 118
 Daszyński, Ignacy 197
 Daudet, Léon 18
 Denikin, Anton 26, 65, 111, 120, 149, 156,
 172, 195–197, 206–207, 212, 214, 255,
 258, 385, 401, 446
 Dobkowski, Ilya 9, 36, 43–52, 100, 217,
 243, 245, 250, 283, 295, 299, 301, 304,
 387, 431
 Doumergue, Gaston 377–379
 Dreyfus, Alfred 54, 56, 58, 198, 286, 417,
 450
 Drummond, Eric 73, 132
 Druyanov, Alter 88, 274, 327
 Dubnow, Simon 68, 86, 88, 100, 164,
 166–167, 185, 218–219, 224, 242, 327,
 337–338, 427, 446–447

 Efroykin, Israel 184–185, 224–227, 337,
 446
 Ehrlich, Henryk 247
 Eichenbaum, Vsevolod → Voline
 Eisenstadt, Moshe 184, 337, 446
 Essad Pasha 12
 Esther (Bible) 311, 315, 359

 Fishman, Jacob 286, 440
 Flechine, Senya 49
 Fleg, Edmond 87, 184, 188, 446
 Flers, Robert de 307
 Flory, Georges 8, 345
 Franz Joseph I. 364, 367
 Frappa, Jean-José 11
 Freydenberg, Henri 227

 Garibaldi, Giuseppe 259
 Gergel, Nahum 60, 150, 219, 224,
 259–260, 327, 338, 446
 Gershuni, Grigoriy 46
 Gessen, Iosif 260
 Gheller, Efim 21–22, 308, 310, 314–315
 Gide, André 13
 Gideon (Bible) 72
 Giterman, Yitshak 88, 100, 221–223, 447

 Goldelman, Solomon 241, 447
 Goldstein, Moisey 110, 184–185, 206,
 220, 260, 337, 361, 425–426, 447
 Gonta, Ivan 196, 358
 Goret, B. S. 9–10, 100–101, 160–161,
 163–164, 280–281
 Grabski, Władysław 39
 Greenberg, Haya 101, 361, 395, 438
 Greenberg, Uri Zvi 61
 Gregorieff → Hryhoriiv, Matvii
 Gruenbaum, Izaak 85–86, 92, 150, 223,
 228, 241, 265, 327, 447
 Grumbach, Salomon 184, 188, 447
 Gruzenberg, Oskar 226, 447
 Gusev-Orenburgskiy, Sergey 59

 Haller, Józef 195
 Haman (Bible) 311, 315, 359
 Hartglas, Apolinary 92, 223, 228, 241,
 327, 447
 Headlam-Morley, James 37, 78
 Herriot, Édouard 11
 Hertz, Henri 184, 188, 337, 447
 Herzl, Theodor 206
 House, Edward Mandell 25
 Hrushevsky, Mykhailo 256–257
 Hryhoriiv, Matvii 27, 69, 120, 139, 385
 Hymans, Paul 132

 Jabotinsky, Vladimir Ze'ev 38, 71, 91, 99,
 140, 142, 144–146, 159, 207–208, 236,
 276, 366, 425, 447
 Jacobson, Victor 184, 337, 447
 Jadwin, Edgar 197
 Jarblum, Marc 87, 184, 447
 Jaurès, Jean 12
 Joab (Bible) 72

 Kacyzne, Alter 55–56, 94, 102, 443–444
 Katznelson, Berl 174
 Kerensky, Aleksander 16, 19, 43, 198,
 370–371, 373, 428
 Khmel'nyts'kyi, Bohdan → Chmielnicki,
 Bogdan

- Klinov, Yeshayahu 219, 224, 327, 338, 447
 Koralnik, Avrom 227, 242, 439
 Kossenko, Ilarion 362–363
 Koulicher, Alexandre 184, 447
 Koval, Waldemar 19, 100, 214–215, 352, 447
 Kowerda, Boris 434
 Kreinin, Meir 150, 219, 224, 227, 327, 338, 447
 Krimsky, Joseph 89, 101, 305
 Krushevan, Pavel 233
 Kukovskii-Kuk, I. 303
- Lansing, Robert 76, 99, 125, 195, 447
 Latzky-Bertholdi, Jacob Wolf 65, 110, 150, 219, 447–448
 Lecache, Bernard 184–185, 188, 264–267, 286–287, 337, 339, 386, 448
 Lechtchinsky, Jacob → Lestschinsky, Jacob
 Lekert, Hirsh 46, 194
 Lemberg, Haim 99, 107, 110
 Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich 44, 268
 Lestschinsky, Jacob 150, 185, 219, 224, 327, 448
 Lévy, Sylvain 76, 99, 133
 Liessin, Abraham 72, 79, 100, 189, 193, 448
 Litvinov, Maxim 313
 Livytskyi, Andrii 41–42, 100, 203–204, 215, 260, 319–320, 322–323, 375, 448
 Lowenthal, Marvin 14, 17, 21, 54, 80, 82–83, 86–87, 89, 91, 94, 100–101, 183, 185, 264, 267, 271, 284, 287, 316, 318, 448
- Mack, Julian 41, 114
 Mackay, John Henry 365
 Makhno, Nestor 27, 69, 251, 385
 Manger, Itsik 55
 Margolin, Arnold 40–42, 53, 80, 84–85, 90–91, 100–102, 182, 194, 203–204, 206–209, 212–213, 220, 252–255, 258, 277, 287–288, 417, 425, 448
- Marshall, Louis 42, 62, 64, 74–75, 78, 80–82, 84, 89–91, 99, 101, 113, 118, 120–123, 126, 131, 268, 271, 277–279, 287–288, 409–410, 440, 448
 Martin-Chauffier, Louis 14
 Maurras, Charles 18
 Mazeppa, Isaak 42
 McKinley, William 410
 Monzie, Anatole de 318
 Mordecai (Bible) 311, 315
 Morgenthau, Henry 75, 197
 Motzkin, Leo 42, 55, 62–64, 66, 73, 78, 83, 85–91, 93, 99–101, 113–114, 117–118, 140, 164, 167, 184–185, 188, 204, 206, 209, 213, 220, 224–227, 242, 260, 265, 269, 271–274, 276, 287, 305, 327, 330, 337, 359, 361, 412, 416, 425–426, 428, 448
- Naiditch, Yitshak 184, 188, 226, 448
 Namier, Lewis 37
 Nastaskin, Iser 99, 107, 110
 Neumann, Joë 217, 431
 Neville, Robert 80
 Norich-Dzhikovskii, Virhel 157–158, 216, 299
- Olszanski, Teofil 417
- Painlevé, Paul 377
 Pam, Hugo 127, 128, 448
 Panafieu, André de 76
 Pasquet, Louis 11
 Patterson, John Henry 146
 Petliura, Olga 48, 162–163, 215, 261, 283, 299, 348, 353, 360, 436
 Petliura, Oskar 90, 261, 360, 438
 Petliura, Symon
 – and Poland 21–22, 145, 156; see also Treaty of Warsaw
 – associated with pogroms 50, 52, 68–71, 81, 84, 87, 90–92, 95–97, 107, 120, 149, 159, 172–173, 175, 187, 214, 221, 252, 254, 257–258, 261–263, 266,

- 268, 271, 276, 311, 315, 328, 358–361, 366, 381–386, 400, 402–405, 427, 435, 437–438, 444, 448
- , biography of 9, 26–28, 163, 257–258, 435–436
 - fears assassination 22, 257, 259
 - , reactions to death of 30–35, 155, 159, 170–173, 176, 180–183, 258–264, 420–424
 - , Ukrainian attitudes toward 26–29
 - , Ukrainian explanations of assassination of 155–158, 420–424
- Petrushevych, Yevhen 26, 38, 145
- Peyre, Marcel 18–20, 48, 100–101, 158, 160, 213–214, 216, 280–281, 283, 362
- Picqueray, May 49
- Pikhno, Dmitrii 207
- Piłsudski, Józef 21–23, 33, 195, 197–198, 256, 258, 308, 311, 314, 433–434
- Plateau, Marius 12
- Plehve, Vyacheslav von 46
- Poincaré, Raymond 10–11, 314
- Poldès, Léo 286
- Potocki, Andrzej Kazimierz 246
- Prokopovych, Vyacheslav 35, 260, 288, 359, 424, 448
- Przanowski, Henryk 92, 329
- Pugachev, Shneur Zalman 241
- Purishkevich, Vladimir 234
- Radek, Karl 311, 313
- Rafes, Moshe 236–237
- Rakovsky, Christian 17–19, 33, 268
- Regalski, Marcos 241
- Revutsky, Avraham 10, 65, 82, 173, 182, 194, 226, 241, 261, 449
- Ribalow, Menachem 70, 73, 79, 100, 167, 449
- Richards, Bernard 87, 125
- Roosevelt, Theodore 122
- Rosenthal, Eliezer David 65–66, 275, 445, 462
- Rosenthal, Zalman 8
- Rosin, Avraham → Ben-Adir
- Rosting, Helmer 77
- Rothenberg, Morris 127–128, 131, 449
- Rustemi, Avni 12
- Sacco, Nicola 17
- Salomon, Robert 184
- Salskyi, Volodymyr 424
- Samuel (Bible) 193–194
- Samuel, Stuart 75
- Saul (Bible) 194
- Schechtman, Joseph 71, 87, 89, 111, 150, 188, 240, 327, 337, 342, 428, 449
- Schiff, Jacob Henry 114
- Schiper, Ignacy 150, 449
- Schmidt, Robert → Gheller, Efim
- Schneiderman, Harry 277, 287
- Schreider, Aleksander 47–48, 295–296, 300
- Schwarzbard, Anna 19, 31, 51, 73, 161, 188, 225, 255, 280–281, 284, 329, 336, 349–350, 353–355, 357, 370–371
- Schwarzbard, Scholem
- , life after acquittal of 55–56, 94, 438
 - , anarchism of 245, 365–366, 368–371
 - as Yiddish writer 10
 - , biography of 9–10, 15–16, 35, 255–256, 357, 363–373, 435
 - , bookplates featuring 55–56
 - explains reasons for killing Petliura 312, 315, 353, 356, 437–438
 - in Austria 364–368
 - in First World War 255, 309, 369–370, 373
 - in Russian revolution 255, 370–371, 373
 - , Jewish strategies for defending 72–89
 - , literary works about 55–56, 58, 441–444
 - recognizes Petliura 31–32, 48–49, 51, 254, 283, 299, 348, 350–351, 354–355, 436
 - , streets in Israel named for 94
- Schwarzbard, Shmuel 162

- Scipio Africanus 369
- Semesenko, Ivan 70, 92, 139, 208, 233,
360, 384, 398–401, 403, 405
- Sendrowicz, Benno 94, 101, 312
- Serge, Victor 16
- Shapoval, Mykola 19, 25, 28, 35–36,
39–40, 43–45, 47–52, 96, 99, 101–102,
153, 155, 158, 216, 283, 289, 301, 387,
393, 428, 449
- Shapoval, Mykyta 25, 27–28, 35, 40,
45–48, 52, 96, 99–100, 142, 153, 158,
243, 246, 248, 283, 287, 295, 304, 449
- Shatov, Bill 16
- Shevchenko, Taras 196–197, 221
- Shmakov, Aleksey 234
- Shtif, Nahum 110, 150, 449
- Shubert, Lee 440
- Shulgin, Aleksandr → Shulhyn,
Oleksandr
- Shulgin, Vasilii 207, 234, 236, 260, 418
- Shulhyn, Oleksandr 35, 41–42, 53,
100–102, 207, 210–212, 220–221,
229, 231, 234, 236, 255, 260, 319–320,
322, 392, 425–426, 449
- Sichynskyi, Miroslav 246
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk 119
- Silberfarb, Moses 150, 177–178, 194, 226,
241, 261, 449
- Sinder, Haim 224–226, 228
- Skoropadskyi, Pavlo 26–27, 43–44, 173,
255, 318, 320, 323, 358, 378, 381, 390,
449
- Slavynskyi, Maksym 37–38, 99, 142,
144–146, 449
- Sliosberg, Genrikh 87, 90, 92, 184–185,
188, 252, 260, 264, 277, 337, 361,
425–426, 449
- Smal-Stotsky, Roman 145
- Smith, Reginald 437
- Sokol, [?] 109, 111
- Sokolovsky, Dmytro 109, 111, 139
- Sokolow, Nahum 38, 63, 76, 99, 133, 140,
147, 450
- Solovyev, Vladimir 332, 334
- Soloweitschik, Max 150, 450
- Souvarine, Boris 268
- Spire, André 87, 184–185, 188, 264,
266–267, 337, 450
- Stalin, Josef 43
- Stasyv, Ivan 291, 297–298, 391
- Steiger, Stanisław 417
- Steimer, Mollie 49
- Steinberg, Isaac Nachman 36, 43–44, 47,
49–51, 101, 248, 289, 295, 301, 303,
305, 430–431
- Stirner, Max 365, 369
- Stoessel, Anatoly 178
- Stolypin, Pyotr 46
- Strouk, Ilya 139
- Szeszler, Léopold → Poldès, Léo
- Talaat Bey 176
- Tcherikower, Eliyahu 54, 65, 68, 72,
87–88, 100, 110–111, 129, 139, 150,
167, 172, 184–185, 188, 219, 221,
223–227, 240, 242, 269, 327, 337–338,
361, 425, 450
- Tchernowitz, Shmuel 228, 241, 327
- Tehlirian, Soghomon 176–177
- Teitel, Jacob 150, 450
- Terpylo, Danylo 109–110
- Thon, Ozjasz 93
- Tiomkin, Vladimir Ze'ev 91–92, 146,
184–185, 188, 242, 337, 361,
425–426, 450
- Titus 359
- Tiutiunnyk, Yurii 111, 139
- Tokarzewski-Karaszewicz, Jan 35, 101,
318–319, 374–386
- Torrès, Henry 8, 14, 20–21, 36, 50, 55,
84, 88–90, 92, 97, 101, 183, 188, 215,
225–227, 235, 241–242, 259,
265–266, 268–269, 277, 283–285,
308, 315, 317, 328–329, 336, 360, 366,
371–372, 376–386, 389–395,
400–403, 405–406, 426, 436–438,
440, 443, 450
- Tripier, Jean 8, 102, 431–432

- Trotsky, Leon 17, 41, 49, 204, 268, 286, 311, 313, 316
- Trumpeldor, Josef 177
- Tsatskis, Nahum 184, 227, 266, 327, 337
- Tshelynskyi, Mykola → Ceglynskyi, Nicholas
- Tymchenko, N. A. 108, 111
- Tyszkiewicz, Mykhailo 99, 115–116
- Ustryalov, Nikolai 157
- Vanzetti, Bartolomeo 17
- Villain, Raoul 12
- Vinaver, Maksim 184–185, 206, 337, 450
- Vishniac, Marc 184, 450
- Voikov, Pyotr 23, 434
- Voline 251
- Volodin, Mikhail 19, 36, 43–52, 97, 100, 217, 248, 250, 283, 295–304, 348, 388–394, 430–431
- Volodymyr of Kiev 29
- Vynnychenko, Volodymyr 26–28, 34, 45, 47, 95, 156, 158, 205, 208, 230, 235, 246, 255–257, 261–262, 379–381
- Vytvytskyi, Stepan 38, 99, 147–148, 450
- Wahl, Viktor von 46
- Waldmann, Moses 267
- Walt, Avraham → Liessin, Abraham
- Weill-Goudchaux, Serge 283
- Weizmann, Chaim 75
- Wiernik, Peter 82, 90, 101, 409–410, 412, 450
- Wilhelm II. 358
- Wilm, Albert 48, 283, 360, 373, 385, 391, 401
- Wilson, Woodrow 25, 64, 195–197, 445, 447
- Wise, Stephen 14, 17, 21, 80, 90–91, 101–102, 114, 118, 127, 183, 267, 271, 284–285, 439, 450
- Wojciechowski, Stanisław 417
- Wolf, Lucien 37, 60, 63, 75–76, 99, 135
- Wrangel, Peter von 156
- Yeivin, Yehoshua Heschel 72–73, 79, 82, 100, 174, 178, 180–182, 451
- Yochelman, David 439
- Yushchinskiy, Andrey 234
- Zalkind, Jacob Meyer 242
- Zangwill, Israel 76, 99, 136
- Zechariah (Bible) 170
- Zekcer, Hirsch 92
- Zeleny → Terpylo, Danylo
- Zheleznyak, Maksym 196, 358
- Zhitlovsky, Haim 150, 451
- Zinoviev, Grigorij 311, 313
- Places**
- America 49, 56–57, 114, 121, 126, 135, 160, 167, 173, 184, 196, 204, 246, 271, 277, 329, 337, 340, 427, 439; see also United States
- Argentina 88, 241, 285, 327, 338, 340
- Austria 9, 15, 62, 364, 367–368, 372
- Austria-Hungary 59, 61–62, 313, 366–367, 369; see also Habsburg Empire
- Avihail 94
- Balkan states 121
- Balta 9, 137, 357, 363
- Baltic provinces 64, 121
- Beersheva 94
- Belarus 59–60, 63, 132, 197
- Belaya Tserkov 107–108, 110–112, 296; see also pogroms
- Belgium 30
- Berdichev 57
- Berlin 26, 43–44, 60, 66, 68–69, 88, 99–102, 140, 148–149, 166–167, 173, 176, 185, 217, 219, 224–226, 236, 240, 242, 259, 267–268, 301, 303–304, 320, 323, 327–328, 337

- Bessarabia 60, 62, 65, 228, 241, 338
 Białystok 57, 63, 409
 Bila Tserkva → Belaya Tserkov
 Botoșani 57
 Boulogne sur Seine 215, 353
 Brest-Litovsk 43, 311
 Budapest 9, 27, 56, 364–366, 369, 372, 449
 Buenos Aires 54, 56, 241
 Bukovina 59, 62, 114, 363
 Bulgaria 310

 Canada 62, 340
 Capetown 55, 94
 Cardiff 327
 Carnegie Hall 74–75, 118
 Champagne 15
 Cherkasy → Tcherkassy
 Chernobyl → Tchernobyl
 Chernyakhiv → Tcherniakof
 Christiania → Oslo
 Constantinople 381–382
 Copenhagen 54, 63
 Crimea 62, 91, 207–208, 265, 347, 411
 Czechoslovakia 25, 34, 62, 114, 127, 142, 210, 446–447, 449
 Czernowitz 9, 363–364

 Danzig 56
 Denmark 77
 Derazhnia 137
 Dnester (river) 228
 Dniepr (river) 139

 East Central Europe 63
 East Galicia 26, 28, 34, 37–39, 59, 62–63, 69, 75–77, 115, 147, 195, 236, 256, 263; see also Galicia
 Eastern Europe 24, 39, 55–58, 61–63, 74–75, 80, 116, 121, 123–124, 126–127, 132–134, 136, 148, 212, 278, 308, 321, 324, 337, 446
 England → Great Britain

 Europe 8, 16–17, 21, 23, 36, 41–42, 49–50, 61–62, 67, 76, 85–86, 95, 118, 128, 135, 160, 184, 243, 246, 253, 262, 277–278, 308, 311, 321–322, 324, 337, 410, 417–418, 438

 Fastov 134
 France 7–8, 10–18, 20–22, 24, 28–30, 34–35, 44, 49, 54, 61–62, 72, 87, 123, 127, 157–158, 161–163, 183–185, 188, 194, 197, 199, 228, 241, 268–270, 272, 285, 289, 296–297, 310–314, 316–318, 340, 342, 345, 347, 352, 357–358, 369, 374, 377–378, 382, 389–391, 397, 401, 426, 430, 435–436, 438, 446–450
 →, Chamber of Deputies in 18, 318
 →, criminal procedure in 7, 20, 48, 262, 345, 430
 →, immigration debate in 11, 17
 →, political assassinations in 12–15

 Galicia 59, 147, 243, 246, 368; see also East Galicia
 Geneva 63, 80, 132–133, 135–136, 224, 265, 447
 Genoa 148
 Germany 10, 12, 59, 61, 80, 88, 95, 195, 267, 272, 311, 313, 316, 329, 358, 378, 446–447
 Gilgal (Bible) 194
 Glasgow 327
 Great Britain 24, 37, 55, 61, 75, 78, 88, 146, 286, 317, 321, 324, 327, 340, 411, 439

 Habsburg Empire 9, 22, 26, 28, 56, 73, 196, 246; see also Austria-Hungary
 Harbin 54
 Horní Černošice 214
 Hungary 9, 364

 Italy 24, 62, 127, 148
 Izmail 9

- Jerusalem 55, 66, 68, 98, 170, 241, 327, 359
- Johannesburg 56–57
- Kamianets-Podilskyi 388
- Karlsbad 38, 99, 140–142, 145, 337
- Kaunas 56, 101, 409, 412–413, 415
- Kharkov 29
- Kiev 18–19, 23, 28–29, 40, 60, 66–67, 69, 92, 99, 107, 110, 129, 137, 139, 148, 156, 163, 207, 234, 240, 260, 263, 284, 296, 372, 376, 378, 385, 401, 417, 435, 437, 447–448
- Kishinev 58, 121, 196, 233, 241, 276, 445; see also pogroms
- Kraków 93
- Kremlin → Moscow
- Leeds 327
- Lemberg → Lwów
- Lityn 137
- London 10, 24, 37, 38, 40, 44, 56–57, 91, 115, 147, 166, 182, 185, 242, 255, 317, 327, 439, 448, 450
- Lwów 9, 37, 57, 61, 95, 107, 195–196, 236, 263, 313, 417, 432; see also pogroms
- Manchester 57, 327
- Melbourne 54, 369–371
- Meudon 101, 289, 295
- Moscow 19–20, 22–23, 25–26, 35–36, 39, 43–44, 49, 51, 60, 73, 96, 145, 157, 163, 220, 225–226, 233–234, 257–259, 288, 303, 308, 389, 423–424, 434, 437, 445–446, 448
- Nalinbach 364
- New York 10, 41, 55–58, 71–75, 78–79, 90, 98–102, 113, 118, 125–126, 128, 167, 173, 183, 185, 187, 189, 204, 227, 251, 253, 255, 262, 264, 267, 271, 286–288, 306, 316, 327, 332, 335, 409–412, 435, 439, 445, 448–450
- Odessa 16, 57, 130, 132, 161, 227, 296, 347, 357, 373
- Oslo 122
- Ovruch 137
- Palestine 60, 62, 66, 72, 88, 136, 173–174, 176–177, 228, 241, 273, 275–276, 285, 305–306, 309, 327, 329, 338, 445
- Paris
- , Peace Conference in 25, 40, 62, 73, 75, 78, 80, 113, 115–117, 122, 127, 135, 147, 196, 262, 445, 447, 449
 - , Austrian Legation in 15, 367, 372
 - , Latin Quarter in 7, 21, 31, 308, 347, 390
 - , Polish Legation in 25
- Père Lachaise 290, 292, 296, 298
- Petrograd 16, 63, 184, 255, 373; see also Sankt Petersburg
- Philadelphia 57, 126
- Pińsk 195–196
- Poděbrady 142, 249, 251
- Podolia 60, 92, 309, 388
- Poland 9, 21–23, 25–26, 28, 32–33, 36, 38–39, 57, 62–63, 69, 71, 75, 78, 85, 88, 95, 118, 127, 145, 147, 153–154, 156, 181, 184, 196–199, 216, 222–223, 228, 241, 247, 256, 257–258, 265, 272, 285, 288, 306, 308, 310–311, 318, 321, 324, 329, 338, 357, 379, 427, 432–434, 446–447, 449–450
- , Jewish parliamentary caucus in 39, 181, 338
- Poltava 107, 110
- Port Arthur 178
- Prague 8, 27, 35, 37, 42, 45, 57, 99–100, 140, 142, 144, 153, 157, 203, 214, 220, 243, 246, 248, 251, 292, 298, 352, 393, 449
- Proskurov 65, 70–71, 92, 134, 140, 172, 208, 233, 241, 327, 360, 379–380, 384, 395–396, 398–399, 401, 403–405; see also pogroms

- Radomyshl' 137, 139
 Riga 22–23, 28, 56, 409
 Rivne 137
 Romania 24, 59–60, 62, 78, 127, 228, 321, 324, 363, 404, 427
 Rome 115, 369, 381–382
 Rostov 62
 Russia 16, 21, 24, 26, 40, 43, 58–60, 62, 64–65, 67, 72–74, 76, 110, 121, 125–127, 130–132, 138, 146, 161–163, 171, 177, 181–182, 194, 196, 198, 203, 225, 236, 255, 257, 262, 265, 268, 272, 275, 279, 288, 304, 306, 311, 314, 320–321, 323–324, 334, 336, 338–339, 358, 363, 368–373, 385–386, 409–410, 435, 446–447, 450–451
- Sankt Petersburg 236, 446–447; see also Petrograd
 São Paulo 56–57
 Sfax 54, 99, 158–159
 Soviet Ukraine 19, 22, 27, 29, 38, 207, 259; see also Ukrainian National Republic, Ukrainian state
 Sudetenland 85
 Switzerland 9, 227, 364
 Sydney 57
 Székely 85
- Taganrog 62
 Tarnów 22, 379
 Tcherkassy 137
 Tcherniakof 137
 Tchernobyl 139
 Tel Aviv 55, 57, 66, 100–101, 174–175, 178, 241, 273–274, 327
 Tel Hai 177
 Transylvania 62, 85
- Ukraine → see Soviet Ukraine, Ukrainian National Republic, Ukrainian state
 Uman 70, 134
- United States 40–41, 55, 57–58, 61, 75–76, 79, 88, 95, 118, 121–128, 130, 147, 227, 240, 246, 252, 288, 306, 338, 340, 409–411, 440, 446–451; see also America
- Vassilkov 137
 Verdun 123
 Vienna 9, 15, 26, 56, 61, 101, 141, 312, 363–365, 368, 372, 378, 381–382
 Vilna → Wilno
 Volhynia 60, 309
- Warsaw 21–23, 25, 32, 41, 57–58, 68–69, 72, 76, 100, 102, 154, 157, 177, 203, 215, 223, 241, 244, 247, 281, 287, 308, 327, 431–434, 448, 450
- West, the → Western Europe
 western countries → Western Europe
 Western Europe 40–41, 54, 57, 61, 63–64, 69, 75, 120–121, 123, 139, 148, 195–196, 219, 259, 324
 Wilno 46, 57, 68, 132, 409
 Wołodarka → Volodarka
- Yelisavetgrad 129, 137, 313
- Zarechiye 108–109, 112–113
 Zbrucz (river) 22
 Zhmerynka 233
 Zhitomir 139, 379, 384
 Zlatopil 137
 Znaim 364
- Subjects**
 Accueil Fraternel Israélite 55
 acquittal 8, 12–13, 39, 47, 51–52, 54–55, 80, 82, 89, 91, 95, 171, 198, 265, 272, 277, 409, 423, 438–440
 Action française 11–12, 18, 87, 184, 226
 agent 20, 33–35, 43, 49–51, 74, 93, 96–97, 157, 252, 258–259, 310, 317, 319, 389, 424, 426, 437

- Alliance israélite universelle 61, 76, 80, 89, 99, 116–117, 131, 133, 135, 159, 445
 Amalekites 193–194, 311, 315
 ambassador 17, 33, 75, 147, 197, 268; see also embassy
 American Jewish Committee 41–42, 61–62, 64, 80–82, 89, 100, 115, 251–254, 263, 268, 270–271, 277, 425, 440, 448; see also colonization
 American Jewish Congress 14, 17, 21, 54, 62–64, 76, 80, 83, 86–87, 89, 93–94, 100–101, 114, 125–127, 183, 227, 251, 264, 267, 316, 439–440, 445, 448, 450–451
 American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee 90, 107, 126, 207, 227, 446–447, 449
 anarchism, anarchists 10, 12, 15–18, 20, 27, 49–50, 78, 97, 217, 242, 250–251, 255, 259, 277, 295, 365, 368–371, 385, 410, 445
 Anglo-Jewish Association 37, 61, 76, 135
 ARCOS (All-Russian Cooperative Society) 317–318
 Armenians 75, 79, 176–177, 195
 anti-Semitism 39–40, 46, 50, 53, 87, 115, 173, 188, 197, 207–208, 220–221, 232, 246, 256, 258, 261, 278–279, 308, 310, 315–316, 361, 363, 418, 420, 425–426, 432, 437–438
 assassination, political 12, 15
 asylum 22
 attorney 8, 14, 20, 36, 40, 44, 48–49, 84, 89–90, 188, 234, 260–262, 283, 328, 360, 373, 393, 418, 440, 443–444, 447, 449–450
 avenger 12, 14, 17, 31, 33, 53, 55, 72–73, 94, 155–156, 170–171, 182, 236, 411, 423, 435, 437; see also vengeance

Balade fun Petlyura 55
 Belarusian Social Revolutionary Party 27
Bessarabets 233
 Bible 72, 170, 359, 450

Bikher velt 177
 Black Hundreds 203, 221, 233–234, 247, 358
 Bloc national 10, 17
 Bloc of National Minorities 39, 71, 85–86, 95
 Board of Deputies of British Jews 37, 76, 135
 British Foreign Office 37, 75
 Bund 68, 177, 236, 247

 Cartel des gauches 10–11, 15, 17
 Central Committee for the Relief of Pogrom Victims 67
 Central Powers 22, 26, 43
 Chamber of Deputies 18, 318
 charitable organizations 54, 67
 Cheka 49, 212, 426
Chwila 236–237
 civil war 9, 14, 16, 18, 24, 26, 138, 171, 195, 251, 258, 296, 311, 418
 Club [du] Faubourg 286
 colonization 91, 207–208; see also American Jewish Committee
 Comintern → Communist International
 Comité de Défense → Schwarzbard Defense Committees
 Comité des Délégations Juives 42, 54, 62–64, 68, 73, 76–77, 80, 82–84, 86, 88–89, 93, 99, 101–102, 113, 115, 117, 125, 133, 135–137, 158–159, 164, 166–167, 184, 222–224, 226, 237–238, 264, 266, 286, 327–328, 336–338, 340–341, 416, 426–427, 446–448, 450
 Committee for the Defense of Ukrainian Honor 34
 Communist International 20–21, 33, 155, 157, 252, 258, 310, 313
 Communist Party (France) → French Communist Party
 Communist Party of Ukraine → Ukrainian Communist Party
 Congress of Organized National Groups in the States of Europe 85–86, 333

- Cossacks 60, 70–71, 111, 113, 118–119, 172, 178, 308, 357, 383–384, 386, 397
- Cossack uprising 60, 119, 178; see also Chmielnicki, Bogdan
- conspiracy 20, 24, 36, 49, 194, 311
- Council to Aid Schwarzbard's Defence 91
- Cour d'assises 7, 13–14, 18, 20, 34, 82, 403
- court 8, 12–15, 18, 21, 40, 46, 49–52, 84, 184, 208, 234, 269–270, 278–279, 285, 317, 329, 350, 357, 393, 417, 423, 426, 434–438, 443, 448
- crimes of passion 14, 82
- culpability 7, 13
- Davar* 73, 82, 100, 174, 178, 180, 445
- "Days of Petliura" 95
- deportation 59
- diaspora 28, 33–34, 36, 56, 142
- Di idishe shtime* 101, 330, 412
- diplomacy 10, 16–17, 24–25, 27, 35, 37–38, 61, 74, 78, 89, 115, 120, 127, 140, 142, 144–145, 195, 313, 317–318, 432, 448–450
- Di tsukunft* 72, 100, 189, 448
- Dilo* 33–35, 432
- Dni* 51–52, 102, 428, 430
- Dvir* 66, 273
- Editorial Board for the Collection and Publication of the Materials concerning the Pogroms in Ukraine 110
- elections 10, 17, 39, 124, 136, 156, 432
- embassy 18, 21, 378; see also ambassador
- émigré → immigrant
- enemy 19, 30, 32, 34, 36, 39, 50–51, 53, 71, 156, 196, 198, 220, 235, 258–259, 278, 323–324, 359, 388, 402, 423–424, 437, 443
- English (lang.) 40, 56, 64, 88, 97, 119, 164, 185, 242, 286, 306, 328–329, 411
- Entente 41, 114, 195, 208, 315, 432
- espionage 19, 49, 310, 315
- European Minorities Congress → Congress of Organized National Groups in the States of Europe
- Examining magistrate 7, 13, 18, 20–21, 36, 48, 50–51, 91–92, 100–101, 160, 213–214, 216, 242, 261, 279–280, 298–301, 362, 366–367, 389, 392–393, 404, 430
- exile 9, 18, 22, 26–28, 30–32, 35–38, 40, 43–44, 47, 49, 52–53, 71, 85, 145, 147–148, 157, 176, 197, 207, 251, 256, 303, 374, 423, 433, 447–450
- expulsion 17, 59, 161–162, 314, 366, 369, 372
- eyewitness → witness
- famine 24, 112, 119, 132, 138, 311
- Federation of Ukrainian Jews in the United States in America 306, 439
- First World War 14–15, 22, 24, 26, 31, 37, 43, 58–59, 65, 78–79, 94, 134, 141, 145, 148, 171, 177, 184, 196, 253, 255, 309, 311, 315–316, 349, 377, 384, 443, 445
- Folksfarlag 66, 68, 110, 448
- Foreign Group of Ukrainian Communist Party 26
- Forverts* 87, 100, 185, 187, 305, 445, 448
- forced labor 59
- Fraye arbeter shtime* 78–79, 97
- Freeland League 44
- French (lang.) 14, 31, 33, 47, 51, 55, 64, 79, 88, 97, 131–133, 140, 142, 185, 242, 246–247, 281, 286, 306, 328–329, 437, 446
- French Communist Party 20, 268, 308, 318, 448
- French Foreign Legion 15
- French Foreign Ministry 16, 21, 76, 318, 329, 375, 425, 432, 434
- French Interior Ministry 24, 96, 372

- French League of Jewish Women →
League of Jewish Women
- French Socialist Party → Socialist Party
of France
- General Jewish Labour [Workers]
Federation) → Bund
- German (lang.) 97, 142, 246, 255,
286–287, 312, 340, 450
- government 9–11, 15–17, 19, 22–24,
26–29, 32, 34, 37–39, 43–44, 47,
53, 59, 61, 67, 69–71, 74–76, 78, 83,
86, 88–89, 93, 114–116, 119–121,
123–131, 137, 139, 147–148, 156–157,
173, 176–177, 182, 194, 196–198, 207,
233–234, 255–256, 258–259, 285–288,
317, 319, 322–324, 328, 347, 357–359,
370–371, 373–376, 378–380, 384–385,
423–424, 428, 431–432, 434, 446, 449
- Ha-Doar* 70, 100, 167, 449
- Ha-Olam* 71
- Haaretz* 241, 447
- Haidamaks 65, 70, 171–172, 196–197,
357, 396
- Haynt* 8, 71–72, 82, 89, 91, 281, 364, 447
- Hebrew (lang.) 66, 71–72, 97, 125, 167,
170–171, 176, 196, 241, 275, 445, 447,
449
- Hebrew Federation of America 167
- hero 45, 53–54, 56, 72, 81–82, 94–95, 118,
171–172, 177, 183, 220–221, 234–235,
252, 257–258, 278–279, 309, 354, 404,
411, 423, 433, 443
- hetman 18–19, 139, 214, 237, 255, 307,
311, 323, 347, 349, 367, 372, 381, 427
- hetmanate → Ukrainian state
- Ḥibbat Ṣiyyon 206
- Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden 61
- honor 14, 32, 34, 55, 70, 81, 89, 94, 129,
181, 204, 212, 220, 252, 265, 402, 419,
424, 431, 439–440
- Hôtel de Ville 19–20, 280–281, 284, 350,
354
- human rights 12, 278
- Human Rights League → League of
Human Rights
- immigrant 7, 10, 19, 26–27, 29–30, 34–35,
42, 44, 46, 51, 53, 55–57, 58, 81, 155,
157–158, 181, 229, 241, 246, 259–260,
288, 304, 312, 323, 370, 409, 423–424,
434, 446–447, 449–450
- immigration 11, 17
- imprisonment 12–14; see also prison
- Israel (Bible) 31, 73, 116, 127, 170–171,
173–174, 178, 181, 194, 275, 286, 308,
315, 339, 386, 432
- Israelitische Allianz zu Wien 61
- Jewish Daily Forward* → *Forverts*
- Jewish Legion 94, 146
- Jewish National Assembly of Ukraine 67,
188
- Jewish press 64, 67, 71, 78, 81, 90, 94,
155, 203, 213, 225, 234–237,
246–247, 252–253, 268–269, 272,
338–339, 433
- Jewish Public Committee for Provision of
Aid to Pogrom Victims 107
- Jewish Telegraphic Agency 57, 260, 265,
318
- Jewish Territorialist Organization 68, 76,
115, 136, 206, 448
- Jewish World Relief Conference 337
- Jews
- perceived as Bolsheviks 20–21,
34–35, 91–93, 95–96, 196, 207–208,
212, 257–258, 316–317, 450
 - , relations between Ukrainians and
25, 33, 36–37, 41–42, 46, 53, 80, 85,
92–93, 156, 177, 182, 197–198, 207,
211, 234–236, 246–247, 252–253,
256–257, 261–262, 264–265, 279,
333, 339, 341, 418, 420, 423
- Joint Distribution Committee →
American Jewish Joint Distribution
Committee

- Joint Foreign Committee 37, 63, 76, 80,
 89, 115, 135
Journal des Débats 14–15
 journalist 7, 11–12, 14, 40, 47, 49, 70, 72,
 78, 81, 135, 145, 184, 188, 207, 227,
 233, 241, 258, 260, 264–265, 270,
 274, 286, 318, 327, 360, 418, 420, 427,
 445–450
Jüdische Rundschau 38, 69–70, 142, 144,
 267
 judge 7–8, 13, 78, 114, 127–128, 157, 178,
 265, 268, 277–278, 283–284, 345, 356,
 358, 366, 386, 389, 393–394, 435–436,
 443–444, 448, 450
 juror 13–14, 227, 345–348, 352, 357, 360,
 363, 369, 371, 374, 376–377, 379–380,
 382, 385, 387, 389–390, 392, 395, 402
 jury 7, 13, 18, 73, 182, 261–263, 270, 279,
 308–309, 311, 373, 375, 385, 405, 411,
 426, 438, 441, 443–444
 justice 12, 15, 20, 73, 75, 78–79, 83–84,
 89, 121, 128, 136, 140, 181, 270,
 278–279, 307, 385, 438, 444

Kievlianin 207, 234, 236
 Kultur-lige 177

La Revue Socialiste 285
 Labor Congress 156
 landsmanshaftn 56–57, 227, 241
L'Écho de Paris 11–12, 14, 31
Le Figaro 12, 14–15, 17, 21–22, 94, 101,
 307, 309–310, 312–313, 315,
 317–318
 Left (polit.) 10–11, 14–16, 19, 25, 28, 34,
 43–44, 47–48, 87, 95, 158, 178, 233,
 246, 286, 295, 313, 318, 431, 445, 448
Le Peuple Juif 69–70
Le Réveil Juif 159
 League for Human Rights 286, 328
 League of Jewish Women 76–77
 League of Nations 38, 40, 73–79, 83, 99,
 118, 121–124, 131–140, 147, 220, 333,
 418, 447
 League of Ukrainian Nationalists 251
 Left Social Revolutionaries 43–44, 47,
 233, 246, 295, 302–303, 429, 431
L'Humanité 318–319, 322
 Ligue d'Action française 12, 18
 looting 59, 63, 111–113, 132, 312, 357,
 384
L'Univers israélite 79

 Maccabee 234–236
 magazine 8, 31, 102, 198, 435, 437
 martyr 30–32, 94, 157, 174, 194, 213, 259,
 369, 418–420
 martyrdom 211, 213, 334–336, 342, 382,
 417–418, 427–428
 Marxism, marxists 28, 313
 Maximalists 43–44, 47, 50, 295, 301,
 303–304, 431
Megilat ha-tevah 65, 276
Menorah Journal 80
 Ministry for Jewish Affairs 37, 173, 177,
 182, 446–447, 449–450
 Minorities Treaties 73–74, 78, 86
 minority 39, 62, 73–75, 77–80, 85–86,
 116, 120–121, 125–126, 131, 184,
 255, 261, 331, 333, 374, 422, 424,
 432–433
 Minorities Congress → Congress of
 Organized National Groups in the
 States of Europe
Morgen zhurnal 10, 15, 70–71, 79, 90–91,
 173, 277, 286, 409, 447, 450
 murder → assassination

 Nabat 251
 Narodnaya volya 198
 nation 25, 27, 29–32, 34, 41, 46, 53,
 74–75, 78, 86, 121–122, 128, 130,
 138, 141, 156, 161, 163, 170, 176, 178,
 181–182, 195, 208, 221, 235, 246–248,
 261, 270, 278, 323–324, 331–335,
 362, 367, 375–376, 419–420, 422, 424,
 432–433
 Nazism 44, 77, 94–95, 444

- newspaper 8, 14, 18, 20–21, 24–25, 30–31, 33, 35, 40, 43, 48, 51–52, 54–58, 64, 67, 69, 71–72, 78–79, 81–82, 87, 90, 100–101, 145, 167, 173–174, 178, 184–185, 188, 195, 197, 206–207, 233, 235–236, 240–242, 246–247, 251–253, 255, 259, 281, 285, 300, 305, 307, 312, 322, 350, 409, 412, 445, 447–450
- Nova Ukraina* 45–47, 246–247, 251, 449
- Obshchestvo Remeslennogo Truda 184
- Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv 66, 68, 72, 88, 99–100, 148–149, 217–219, 240, 242, 327–328, 446, 450
- Ottoman Empire 73, 176
- Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists 95
- Parizer haynt* 19, 21, 48, 50, 90, 101, 281, 300
- Parti communiste français → French Communist Party
- Parti radical (France) → Radical Party (France)
- Parti socialiste de France → Socialist Party of France
- partisan 7, 25, 27, 111, 304, 364
- patriot 18, 78, 116, 122–123, 162, 206–207, 221, 256, 311, 315, 432
- patriotism 265, 375
- penalty 82, 235
- Petliura- Piłsudski Alliance → Treaty of Warsaw
- pogroms
- , descriptions of 107–113, 357–358, 395–400, 403–406, 438; see also rape, violence, looting
 - , documentation of 76, 107–113, 120, 128–130, 133–139, 160, 172, 176–181, 184–185, 187–188, 194–198, 219, 222, 226, 228, 233, 240–242, 260–261, 285–287, 305–306, 328–330, 336–341, 380, 427–428, 445–446, 448
 - in Belarus 60, 194, 197
 - in Belaya Tserkov 107–113
 - in Kishinev 58, 121, 196, 233, 241, 276, 445
 - in Lwów 61, 196
 - in Poland 197, 222–223
 - in Proskurov 70, 172, 241, 360, 379, 384, 395–399, 403–406
 - in Russia 58–59, 184, 279, 338, 393, 368, 385, 447
 - in Zhitomir 379, 385
- police 8–10, 12, 16, 19–20, 24, 30, 33–34, 43, 51, 95–96, 100–101, 112, 118, 122, 160–163, 198, 254, 280, 284, 286, 317, 329, 346, 369, 393, 436
- Polish (lang.) 39, 97, 132, 236
- Polish army 69
- Polish Legions 22
- Polish Socialist Party 22, 197
- Polish-Soviet War 28, 69, 195
- prison 9, 15, 24, 31, 49, 237, 246, 284, 296, 307, 309, 372, 390, 434; see also imprisonment
- propaganda 17, 76, 162, 184, 220–221, 263, 313, 336, 361, 369–371, 420
- Prosvita 115
- Protocols of the Elders of Zion* 233
- public opinion 11, 14–15, 25, 36, 52, 87, 139, 166, 184, 196, 203, 253, 257, 265, 270, 272, 277, 322, 328, 417
- punishment 45, 54, 77, 79, 83, 139–140, 171, 176, 208, 235, 335, 384, 431
- Quai d’Orsay → French Foreign Ministry
- Rada → Ukrainian Central Council
- Radical Party 17, 277, 426
- rape 59, 72, 84, 93, 113, 172, 194–195, 335, 349, 380, 399
- Razsvet* 236–237, 449
- Red Army 18, 23, 26–27, 59, 255, 371
- Red Cross 60, 92, 137, 227, 348, 397
- Red Guard 16, 21, 35
- remorse 7, 170

- refugees 44, 59–60, 77, 126, 259, 275, 318, 370
 revenge → vengeance; avenger
 revolution 9, 12, 14–17, 26–27, 40, 43, 47, 55, 65, 72, 171, 177, 194, 196, 198, 234–236, 254–255, 257, 260, 317, 334, 357, 369–371, 376, 434, 446–448
 Revolutionary Party of Ukraine → Ukrainian Revolutionary Party
 Right (polit.) 10–12, 14–15, 19, 21, 25, 87, 95, 126, 158, 184, 207, 307, 317
 ritual murder 40, 207, 234, 437, 447
Rul' 259–260
 Russian (lang.) 9, 40, 45, 64, 97, 142, 164, 206, 219, 250, 262, 276, 287, 303, 425, 430, 449
 Russian Imperial Army 59, 177
 Russian Civil War → civil war
 Russian Empire 9, 22, 29, 40, 58, 62, 67, 73, 111, 132, 196, 203, 257, 313, 334, 447; see also tsarist regime
 Russian Social Revolutionary Party 27, 43–44, 47, 389
Russkie vedomosti 145
 Russo-Japanese War 122, 178
 Russo-Polish War → Polish-Soviet War
 sacrifice 54, 79, 94, 134, 170, 176, 178, 183, 235
 Schwarzbard Defense Committees 54–55, 84–85, 87–92, 99–101, 160, 166–167, 185, 187–189, 211, 217, 219, 222–224, 227–228, 237, 239–242, 252, 259, 260–261, 263–264, 267–269, 305, 325, 327, 329, 336–339, 341, 359, 427, 448
 Second International → Socialist International
 Second World War 68, 95
 Secours rouge international 21–22, 307–308, 310
 Sejm 39, 71, 85, 93, 181, 241, 327, 338, 447, 449
Shvartsbard 56, 441–444
 sheep 61, 72, 176–178, 180–182
Smena Vekh 157
 Slavs 61, 433
 Social Revolutionary Party (Ukraine) → Ukrainian Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries
 Socialist International 285, 333
 Socialist Party of France 188, 450
 Soviet Embassy in Paris 17–18, 21, 295, 302–304
 Soviet republics → Soviet Union
 Soviet Russia 317, 320, 323
 Soviet Union 16, 18, 21–22, 24, 26, 28, 32, 36, 66, 96, 148, 207, 233, 256, 258, 313, 317, 448
 testimony 7, 16, 19, 21, 36, 49, 51, 64, 66–68, 70, 77, 88, 92–93, 97, 101, 107, 112, 135, 182, 222, 241–242, 275–276, 298–301, 328–329, 355, 345, 368–369, 373–374, 387, 389, 395, 425, 430, 437, 445, 448
 Third International → Communist International
Time: The Weekly Newsmagazine 8, 102, 435
Torture by Fear 207, 418
 treason 54, 178, 310
 Treaty of Brest-Litovsk 43, 311
 Treaty of Riga 22, 28
 Treaty of Warsaw 22; see also Petliura, Symon
 Trotskyites 17, 268
Tryzub 25, 29–30, 32–35, 39–40, 52–53, 100, 228, 347, 362, 421, 425, 446, 448
 tsar, tsarism 26, 120, 178, 195, 197–198, 233, 257, 311–312, 363, 370, 435
 tsarist regime 9, 19, 43, 157, 196, 203; see also Russian Empire
Ukrains'ki visti 30, 34, 346, 348
Ukraine and the Politics of the Entente 41, 208, 258, 262
 Ukrainian Association in France 28, 35, 297

- Ukrainian Central Council 9, 27, 36, 173, 256, 283, 449
- Ukrainian Communist Party 26
- Ukrainian Economic Academy → Ukrainian Husbandry Academy
- Ukrainian governments-in-exile 22, 26–27, 53, 71, 145, 147, 258, 448–450
- Ukrainian Husbandry Academy 142, 251
- Ukrainian National Council in Belgium 30
- Ukrainian National Democratic Alliance 39, 450
- Ukrainian National Republic 8–9, 22, 29, 31, 34–35, 40, 53, 56, 67, 69–70, 101, 115, 140–141, 143–146, 156, 171, 194, 216, 233, 283, 318, 421–424, 446, 448–449; see also Soviet Ukraine, Ukrainian state
- Ukrainian Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries 27–28, 47, 49, 111, 216, 246, 256, 288, 389, 430–431, 449
- Ukrainian Revolutionary Party 9, 26, 28, 285, 389, 433
- Ukrainian Social Democratic Labor Party 142
- Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers Party 28
- Ukrainian state 9, 26–27, 29, 32, 53, 156, 171, 173, 182, 237, 322–324, 384, 374–377, 380–383, 386, 390, 423, 448, 19, 22, 27, 29, 38, 207, 259; see also Soviet Ukraine, Ukrainian National Republic
- Ukrainian statehood 32, 53, 237, 247, 423–424
- Ukrainians
- and Petliura's assassination 8, 25, 30–32, 34–35, 43, 45, 53, 80–81, 86, 93–94, 157, 207, 212, 221, 252, 258–264, 278, 335, 411, 418–419, 425
 - and Poland 28, 37, 39, 71, 197–198, 207, 256, 324
 - and relations with Jews 8, 25, 36, 37, 39, 41–42, 84–87, 92–93, 181, 195, 203–204, 207, 211, 220, 233–234, 236, 244–245, 247–248, 251–252, 257–266, 279, 331, 333, 419–420, 426
 - , self-representations of 32, 36, 38–39, 71, 115
- Ukrains'kyi Prapor* 145
- Union of Socialist-Revolutionary Maximalists → Maximalists
- Union of Soviet Socialist Republics → Soviet Union
- Union of the Russian People 207
- Union of Ukrainian Citizens in France 29–30, 34, 157
- Vayse balade* 55
- vengeance 21, 33, 40, 171, 233, 349; see also avenger
- veteran 15, 94, 177, 304, 447
- victim 8–9, 12, 17, 21, 24–25, 32–33, 36, 48–49, 59–60, 64–67, 71, 73–74, 79, 81–82, 84, 87, 93, 107, 112, 117, 119–120, 129, 135, 138, 140–141, 149, 156, 163, 172, 184, 212, 214–215, 223, 227–228, 234–235, 275, 279, 287, 308, 311, 315–316, 328, 335, 338, 340, 346, 363, 366, 380, 384, 386–387, 396, 399, 401–402, 405, 419, 435, 437, 439, 445–447
- violence 15, 31–34, 45, 58–59, 63, 65, 67–72, 74, 77, 82, 84, 91, 95, 107, 111–112, 118–119, 122, 124, 127–129, 133–135, 138, 156, 172, 176–177, 180, 182–183, 194–195, 198, 206–207, 212, 233, 256, 275, 310, 312, 334–335, 384, 418, 444
- Volunteer Army → White Army
- watchmaker 7, 10, 162, 255, 300, 357, 364–365, 435
- West Ukrainian National Republic 26, 38, 40–41, 145, 147, 450
- Western Hemisphere 29

- White Army 18, 22, 26, 59, 69, 111, 304, 446
- Wiener Morgenzeitung* 94, 101, 312
- witness 7–8, 11, 14, 19, 21, 25, 49, 51–52, 54, 64–65, 67–68, 71, 87–89, 91–92, 96, 107, 112, 136, 188, 196, 204, 209, 213–216, 220–222, 224–228, 241–242, 261–262, 267–269, 271, 275–276, 278–279, 283, 285, 287, 306, 308–310, 328–330, 338–339, 342, 346–347, 353, 355–356, 361–362, 376, 378, 380, 382, 387–390, 392–393, 395, 400–406, 427, 437–438, 448, 450
- World War I → First World War
- World War II → Second World War
- Yevreyskaya tribuna* 206, 450
- Yevreystvo i khristianskiy vopros* 334
- Yevseksiya 236
- Yiddish 10, 42–44, 48, 50, 56–58, 62, 64, 66, 71–72, 78, 81, 90, 97, 164, 170, 173, 177, 185, 189, 196, 217, 219, 221, 237, 241–242, 247, 252–253, 255, 260, 263, 268, 276–277, 281, 283, 286–287, 305, 325, 330, 340, 364–365, 409, 412, 441, 445, 447–451
- Yul'skoe veyanie* 334
- Zion Mule Corps 177
- Zionist Federation 93, 236, 447
- zionists, zionism 37–38, 40–41, 63, 68–69, 71–72, 81–82, 144–146, 159, 177, 206, 228, 232–233, 236–237, 242, 312, 412, 445, 447–451
- Zionist Organization 38, 63, 71, 75, 115, 144, 146, 447–448, 450