

**The Jewish Question in the Ukrainian Revolution (1919-1920):
A Reappraisal of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations Based on the Daily *Ukraïna***

By
Olga Petrova

Submitted to
Central European University
History Department

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Supervisor: **Professor Michael L. Miller**
Second Reader: **Professor Alfred J. Rieber**

Budapest, Hungary

2013

Copyright Notice

Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

Abstract

The Russian Revolution of March 1917 brought about democratization of the Russian society and provided Ukrainians with an opportunity to realize their right to self-determination. The project of the Ukrainian state evolved from the proclamation of autonomy to the daring effort of establishing an independent Ukrainian People's Republic. This republic was one of the first states in the world to recognize the right of the Jewish population to national-personal autonomy and to attempt implementing it in practice.

This effort, however, was doomed to fail due to the mounting Bolshevik threat and as a result of the destructive wave of anti-Jewish violence that swept across ethnically Ukrainian territories, coinciding largely with the period of the so-called Directory, the rule of the provisional body established by Ukrainian national forces at the end of 1918. Therefore, the whole Ukrainian state-building project of 1919-1920 has long been treated in historiography as the bulwark of popular Ukrainian antisemitism.

The aim of my thesis is to review this attitude and treatment of the Directory's rule by critically looking at *Ukraina*, the official newspaper published by the Directory's Army Staff and featuring a considerable amount of Jewish-related content. In my work, I argue that *Ukraina* may serve as an example of how the Ukrainian national leaders of the Directory tried to improve Ukrainian-Jewish relations by the wide press coverage of Ukrainian-Jewish cooperation in the column "From the Life of the Jewry" and in other news items and articles, published in this newspaper. This was done to enhance Ukrainian-Jewish cooperation by acquainting Ukrainian readership with the life of the Jewish population and by fixing a positive and sympathetic image of the Jew and Jewish community.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I want to thank my parents for supporting both mentally and financially my decision to come to Budapest and Central European University – without their support this could have hardly been possible. I would also like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Michael Miller as well as professors Carsten Wilke and Alfred Rieber for encouraging me in my risky endeavor of changing the focus of my research, to Aniko Molnar for bearing with me throughout these changes, and to Eszter Timar for guidance in the writing process. Endless thanks go to all my amazing friends and colleagues at CEU, especially from Jewish Studies Program, – all these people truly inspired me. And most importantly I want to thank Andrei Teliha for introducing me to the whole fount of periodicals in one of the most beautiful Ukrainian cities, Kamianets Podilsky, and for helping me in my search for answers.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1. Theoretical Framework.....	10
1.1. Printed press discourse	10
1.2. Approaches to Ukrainian-Jewish relations	15
CHAPTER 2. Jewish Political Parties and Their Dilemmas	19
CHAPTER 3. The Directory of the Ukrainian People`s Republic and the Jewish Question.....	28
CHAPTER 4. <i>Ukraïna</i> as the Directory`s Mouthpiece with regard to the Jewish Question.....	40
4.1. <i>Ukraïna</i> , a Kamianets Podilsky daily, 1919-1920.....	40
4.2. “From the Life of the Jewry”	44
4.3. Other <i>Ukraïna</i> voices on Jewish subjects.....	48
4.4. <i>Ukraïna</i> on the position of the Jewish population in Ukraine.....	51
4.5. <i>Ukraïna</i> and the pogroms	56
CONCLUSIONS.....	61
BIBLIOGRAPHY	67

INTRODUCTION

“Tragedy of the Jewish people consists... in that, on the one hand, we have extensive rights – the right for National-Personal Autonomy [and other laws and regulations of the government]... and, on the other hand, rivers of Jewish blood, ruined national, economic, cultural, and political life of the Jews”¹ – this most accurate portrayal of the destiny of the Jews in Ukraine in the Ukrainian Revolution was chronicled in 1919 by one of the authors of *Ukraina* as the words of the Minister of Jewish Affairs, Pinkhas Krasnyi. One can hardly argue with his words, since in addition to posing a historiographical problem for historians of Ukraine and other nations, who were caught in the whirlwind of the revolutions of 1917-1920, the events of these turbulent years also served as a source of evaluating and re-evaluating Ukrainian-Jewish relations in the twentieth century as well as the place of Jews in the complex history of this period. For it was no less, or even more complex for Jews than for Ukrainians – with the attempts of creating Jewish Autonomy at the same time as hundreds of Jews were slaughtered in pogroms and all of this happening just when through the Balfour Declaration the Zionist aspirations for Palestine were officially recognized as legitimate. While having a certain picture of these events in mind, does one know how the contemporaries looked upon the drastic changes and instantaneous developments they were witnessing? What was their perception, especially with regard to the Jewish Question?

The years 1917-1920 are mostly known for the so-called Russian Revolution, which encompasses both revolutions that happened on the territory of the Russian Empire in 1917: in February (March) and in October (November), the latter known more as the Bolshevik coup. One more revolution that was unfolding at the same time was the so-called Ukrainian Revolution, the struggle of the Ukrainian people for social reorganization of the Ukrainian

¹ *Ukraina*, issue 3, August 12, 1919, p. 4. All the translations from Ukrainian are done by me, unless otherwise indicated.

society coupled with the search for the path to national self-determination. The Ukrainian Revolution is traditionally divided into several periods, determined by the type of power holding control of the ethnically Ukrainian territories, spanning from 1917 to 1920: the period of the Central Council (*Tsentral`na Rada*)², the Hetmanate, the Directory, and the Bolsheviks` takeover, which in fact put an end to the Ukrainian Revolution.³

In 1917-1920 the Jewish population of the Russian Empire found itself in the heart of the revolutionary events – those of the Russian Revolution, but even more – of the Ukrainian one. The Ukrainian Revolution turned out to be of such importance for the Jews because the major part of the Jewish population of the Russian Empire resided on Ukrainian territories, within the so-called Pale of Settlement.⁴ The Ukrainian Revolution was both the time of opportunities for the Jews with the Law of National-Personal Autonomy and the creation of the Ministry of Jewish Affairs for the first time in European history and the time of tragedy and turmoil with the increasing storm of anti-Jewish pogroms, which mostly happened on the territory of Ukraine and which reached its peak in 1919, the year when the Directory of the Ukrainian People`s Republic struggled not to lose control over Ukrainians. Since approximately 40 percent of the pogroms are identified as perpetrated by the troops affiliated with the Directory⁵, historians still grapple with the problem of whether these pogroms were a state-initiated or at least state-encouraged policy, and if they were, how

² In many publications the Ukrainian *Tsentral`na Rada* is referred to as the ‘Central Rada’, in my work I use translation of both words to be consistent – the ‘Central Council’.

³ In fact, the task of periodizing the Ukrainian Revolution is much more complex and there is a whole variety of approaches to periodization of the events of 1917-1920. For more information on these approaches, see V.F. Soldatenko, “Ukraïns`ka revoliutsiia doby Tsentral`noi Rady: analiz dosvidu periodyzatsii” (“Ukrainian Revolution of the Central Council Period: Analysis of Periodization Experience”), *Ukraïns`kyi istorychnyi zhurnal (Ukrainian Historical Journal)* 3 (1997): 3-25.

⁴ The Pale of Settlement encompassed restrictions on the possibilities of settling and special regulations pertaining to social and economic rights of the Jews in the Russian Empire. The Pale was abolished in the course of the Russian Revolution in 1917 (for more information, see Irina Pohrebinska, “Modern Methodological Approach to the Issues of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations (Late 19th and Early 20th Century),” in *Jews in Ukraine: History, Culture, Traditions*, ed. I.F. Kuras (Kiev, 1997), 209-226; Igor Samartsev, “Ievreï v Ukraïni na pochatok XX st.” (“Jews in Ukraine at the Beginning of the 20th Century”), *Ukraïns`kyi istorychnyi zhurnal (Ukrainian Historical Journal)* 4 (1994): 19-29.

⁵ Serhy Yekelchuk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 81; Henry Abramson, *A Prayer for the Government: Jews and Ukrainians in Revolutionary Times, 1917-1920* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 113.

they could co-exist with the Ukrainian government's concern with the wellbeing of the Jewish minority within an independent Ukrainian Republic.

With the purpose of contributing to understanding this complex problem, I intend to look at the daily newspaper *Ukraina* ("Ukraine"), which was published in Kamianets Podilsky in 1919 and 1920 when Kamianets served as the temporary capital and headquarters of the Directory headed by Symon Petliura, one of the leaders of the Ukrainian national movement. Since during 1919 *Ukraina* was published by the official Army Staff of the Directory, it can be regarded as the "voice" of the Directory as well as of the Kamianets Podilsky community, therefore, my main task is to look at the attitudes expressed directly or indirectly by the authors and editorial staff of this newspaper towards the Jewish question, which will help understand where in reality the Directory stood with regard to Jews.

The printed press of Kamianets Podilsky is of special interest for a number of reasons. First of all, being one of the most important political and cultural centers of Podillia⁶, which constituted a large section of the Pale of Settlement, it hosted a considerably large and influential Jewish community, the roots of which went back to the 18th century, when Jews were settling in Kamianets in defiance of the decree of Augustus II of Poland prohibiting Jewish presence there.⁷ In 1913 Jews were the second largest ethnic group in Podillia and constituted 13.4% of the whole population (Ukrainians were the majority – 79.3%), while in Kamianets Podilsky itself out of 49,249 inhabitants 23,430, i.e. 47.5%, were recorded as the adherents of Judaism.⁸ In other words, at the time *Ukraina* was

⁶ Podillia was one of *guberniyas* (provinces) of the Russian Empire (now – Khmel'nyts'ka and Vinnyts'ka *oblasts* (regions) of Ukraine. Kamianets Podilsky, located on the River Smotrych, has always been one of the most important Podillia centers.

⁷ Y.S. Honigsman and A.Y. Haiman, "Evrei Ukrainy" ("Jews of Ukraine"), in *Kratkii ocherk istorii* (A Short Overview of History), ed. F.Y. Gorovskii, vol. 1 (Kyiv: NMK VO, 1993), 112.

⁸ O.M. Zavalniuk, "Ievreis'ka hromada i Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi derzhavnyi universytet" ("Jewish community and the Kamianets Podilsky State University"), in *Naukovi pratsi KPDP, istorychni nauky* (Scholarly Works of Kamianets Podilsky State Pedagogical University, History), vol. 5 (7) (Kamianets Podilsky, 2001), 338.

published in Kamianets Podilsky, its Jewish community actively participated in the social and cultural life of the city.

The second factor contributing to the importance of this area and this city specifically is that it served as the headquarters of the Directory, the temporary revolutionary organ largely headed by Symon Petliura, one of the most controversial figures in the history of Ukrainian-Jewish relations in the period of the Ukrainian national struggle of 1917-1920. The period when the Directory and the state organs were based in Kamianets Podilsky came to be known and referred to as the “Kamianets period”, the term, which was first used by Isaak Mazepa⁹, one of the ministers in the Directory’s government. So this newspaper published by Petliura’s Army Staff can serve as a mouthpiece of the major values of the Directory and its attitudes to the Jews. Furthermore, Kamianets Podilsky is also important due to its immediate proximity to one of the most violent pogroms of 1919 – that in Proskuriv (now Khmelnytsky).

Thirdly, out of dozens of periodicals circulating at this time in Kamianets Podilsky, *Ukraïna* deserves particular attention not only because of it being published by the Directory’s Army Staff (*Preskvytyra Shtabu Diievoï Armii*), but also because it featured a special column about Jewish life, “From the Life of the Jewry” (“Z ievreis`koho zhyttia”), apparently prepared in most cases by one particular person, signing as S. Zolotarenko. Importantly, this column was not limited to one aspect of Jewish life, either to local life only or to Palestinian issues, but rather covered a variety of topics of concern: pogroms on the territory of the former Russian Empire and abroad, the situation in Palestine, local Jewish life and culture, national-personal autonomy and Jewish attempts of representing themselves in Ukrainian governmental institutions, Zionists` influence and the place of Jewish

⁹ P.S. Hryhorchuk and V.P. Volovyk, “Kam`ianets`ka doba Ukraïns`koï revoliutsii” (“The Kamianets period of the Ukrainian Revolution”), in *Materialy X-oï Podil`s`koi istoriko-kraieznavchoï konferentsii* (*Materials of the Tenth Conference on History and Regional Studies of Podillia*), ed. I.S. Vynokur et al. (Kamianets Podilsky, 2000), 373; Isaak Mazepa, *Ukraïna v ohni i buri revoliutsii* (*Ukraine in blaze and storm of the revolution*), vol. 2 (Prometei Publishers, 1950), 5.

socialism in the political life. Thus, the spectrum of the topics covered is indeed rich. However, apart from reproducing the Directory`s and Petliura`s official documents and proclamations, researchers have not examined this particular “Jewish” column of *Ukraïna* in detail.

Thus, the central question can be formulated as follows: what new perspective and new light on the Ukrainian-Jewish relations of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution can *Ukraïna* and the column “From the Life of the Jewry” provide? How can it make historians understand better the complex character of the revolutions and Civil War of 1917-1920, stormy for both Ukrainians and Jews? How will the story told by the author of this “Jewish” column be different from that accepted by traditional historiography? To be able to answer these major questions, I will need to focus on a number of sub-questions. How were the Jews perceived and how was their place in Ukraine viewed when they found themselves in the very heart of the Ukrainian struggle for self-determination alongside Ukrainians pursuing the ways to incorporate the rights of ethnic minorities into the system of a new-born Ukrainian state? How can it be placed within the larger Ukrainian-Jewish relations debate, and within the historiographical debate on this period and on Symon Petliura`s role? How can it be compared to other newspapers published at the same time in Kamianets by a different group of publishers rather than the Directory`s Army Staff?

The history of the Directory is widely represented in the Ukrainian historiography on the National Revolution of 1917-1920. Probably the largest section of this historiographical block is devoted to the figure of Symon Petliura, who was also active during the Central Council period (1917-1918), but who came to the fore of the national struggle with the formation of the Directory. An extensive study of the Directory is presented in Pavlo Khrystiuk`s *Zamitky i materialy do istoriï Ukraïnskoï revoliutsiï 1917-1920 (Notes and Materials concerning the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1920)*. Though this book provides a

very detailed account of the period under consideration, one should keep in mind that this study was completed by a witness and direct participant of the events in the immediate years after the revolution (in 1921-22). On the whole, this work can be placed within the context of many historical studies conducted in the 1920s and at the beginning of the 1930s – the period characterized by a proliferation of works written by prominent state figures, not historians proper (mostly memoirs).¹⁰ Among the works completed by Ukrainian historians recently, the most complete picture of the Kamianets phase of the Directory's period of the Ukrainian Revolution, including a separate chapter on the policies towards national minorities, is given by Vitalii Lozovyi in his *Vnutrishnia ta zovnishnia polityka Dyrektorii Ukraïns'koï Narodnoï Respubliky (Kam'ianets'ka doba)* (*Domestic and Foreign Policies of the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic (Kam'ianets' Period)*) (2005).

An important publication dealing specifically with Ukrainian-Jewish relations in 1917-1920 is Henry Abramson's *A Prayer for the Government: Jews and Ukrainians in Revolutionary Times, 1917-1920* (1999). It is a coherent and step-by-step reconstruction of the course of events of 1917-1920, in which the evolution of the attitudes to the Jewish question is shown in concurrence with the developments of the Ukrainian National Revolution. Importantly, Abramson gives explanations of the motives of the participating sides without resorting to a judgmental tone, which is a rare phenomenon in the works dealing with this period of Ukrainian-Jewish relations. Abramson also provides an additional bibliographic postscriptum dedicated to the case of Samuel Schwartzbard, the Jew who in 1926 assassinated the leader of the Ukrainian Directory, Symon Petliura, and explains how this assassination and the trial following it influenced the Ukrainian-Jewish historiography of the years to come and contributed, in contrast to the real facts, to

¹⁰ Olena Suchkova, "Istoriia ievreïv Ukraïny v 1920-30-i roky u vitchyznianiï istoriografii" ("History of the Jews of Ukraine in 1920-30s in Ukrainian Historiography"), in *Problemy Kholokosta v Ukraïne (Problems of the Holocaust in Ukraine)*, vol. 1 (Zaporozh'e: Premier, 2002), 13.

reinforcing the image of the Directory as the antisemitic nationalistic Ukrainian government.¹¹

Under the influence of Schwartzbard's trial, in Jewish historiography Symon Petliura has long been treated as an explicit anti-Semite – that is as “the Ukrainian Nationalist leader of the Ukrainian militias that committed unspeakable atrocities against the Jews”.¹² In 1969 Taras Hunczak was among the first to attempt to counterbalance this negative view of Petliura and the Directory in his article “A Reappraisal of Symon Petliura and Ukrainian-Jewish Relations, 1917-1921”.¹³ This article goes hand in hand with Pigido's *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations during the Years of Revolution (1917-1921)* (1956), both publications providing documentary and factual evidence to demonstrate Petliura's and the Directory's innocence in the cause of the pogroms and antisemitic sentiments attributed to them. Thus, Hunczak argues that these pogroms were the spontaneous result of Russian political maneuvering and imposed antisemitism going back to the 19th century as well as an extremely unstable situation in Ukraine, especially in 1919, but not the result of the Ukrainian inherent Jew-hatred or Petliura's commands. Moreover, both Pigido and Hunczak rely on the case of the Kamianets Podilsky Jewish community to prove that the Directory strove to create favorable conditions for Jewish cultural and educational life and to build good-neighborly relations between the Directory and the Jews of Kamianets Podilsky, which for several months served as the Directory's capital.¹⁴

An important milestone in the study of Ukrainian-Jewish relations throughout the whole history of interaction between Jews and Ukrainians is *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in*

¹¹ The main argument used in defense of Samuel Schwartzbard was that he was taking revenge on Petliura as an organizer of the pogroms in the territory of Ukraine.

¹² David A. Chapin and Ben Weinstock, *The Road from Letichev: The History and Culture of a Forgotten Jewish Community in Eastern Europe*, vol. 2 (iUniverse, 2000), 501.

¹³ Taras Hunczak, “A Reappraisal of Symon Petliura and Ukrainian-Jewish Relations, 1917-1921,” *Jewish Social Studies* 31,3 (Jul., 1969): 163-183, accessed January 12, 2013, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4466501>.

¹⁴ Arnold Margolin, “The Ukraine and the Policy of the Entente,” (1921), in *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations during the Years of Revolution (1917-1921)*, ed. F. Pigido (Munich: Ukrainian Information Bureau, 1956), 35.

Historical Perspective edited by Howard Aster and Peter Potichnyj. This 1990 collection of conference papers contains a number of articles on the period of the National Revolution. One of them, Jonathan Frankel's "The Dilemmas of Jewish National Autonomism: the Case of Ukraine 1917-1920" deals with the decisions and choices made by Jewish politicians in 1917-1920. The author argues that the cause of constructing Jewish autonomy was disrupted not only due to the influence of external forces, such as the Bolsheviks' takeover, but also because of the internal "dilemmas" within Jewish political forces and the difficulties with putting the theory of autonomism in practice. Importantly, the author emphasizes the Zionists' opposition and resistance to the cause of autonomism, when they had to face the dominance of the socialist-oriented political forces.¹⁵

While the majority of the previous studies dedicated to this period of Ukrainian-Jewish relations mainly focused on the issue of pogroms, my aim will be to include other aspects of Ukrainian-Jewish interaction at this period, which cannot be reduced to anti-Jewish violence. For this purpose, I worked with the issues of *Ukraina* of 1919 and 1920 available from the rare books library of Kamianets Podilsky, Ukraine, as well as with issues of such newspapers as *Nash Shliakh* ("Our Way") and *Robitnycha Hazeta* ("Workers' Newspaper").¹⁶ In particular, I focused on the column "From the Life of the Jewry" of *Ukraina*. Therefore, my work consisted in the analysis of newspaper material with the extensive support of available secondary literature.

As for the limitations of my research project, it must be noted that I am not using Jewish sources in Yiddish or Hebrew. The task that I have taken on is to concentrate on the Ukrainian press, published for the wide audience of the Ukrainian-speaking population of

¹⁵ Jonathan Frankel, "The Dilemmas of Jewish National Autonomism: the Case of Ukraine 1917-1920," in *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, ed. Howard Aster and Peter J. Potichnyj (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1990), 269.

¹⁶ As part of my project and in search of the documents on the editorial staff of *Ukraina*, I made a visit to the Khmelnytsky State Archive in Khmelnytsky, Ukraine, which now holds the documents previously stored in the Kamianets Podilsky City Archive. Unfortunately, no documents related to the newspaper under consideration were located there.

the Ukrainian People`s Republic. Thus, involving Jewish sources would mean going well beyond this clearly-defined scope. Furthermore, consideration of the Jewish sources, especially Jewish press of the period, and their juxtaposition with the Ukrainian ones would be the task of further research – the comparative work, which has not been done yet. Moreover, in my focus on the Directory of the Ukrainian People`s Republic I am not dealing with economic or social aspects of the Directory`s rule, concentrating instead on the national and inter-ethnic policies and relations. The other aspects may contribute to understanding of the problem but they lie beyond the scope of this particular work.

The main part of this thesis consists of four chapters. The first chapter will outline the theoretical framework for this research project. As for the second chapter, it will deal with the position and attitudes of the Jewish parties with regard to the possible solutions of the Ukrainian national question in 1917-1920, which also embraced the dilemmas pertaining to the Jewish Question. The chapter will especially concentrate on the stance taken by the most popular Jewish parties at that moment, the Bund and the Zionists, as well as transformations in their position, which occurred in the course of the revolutionary developments in 1917-1920. The third chapter will delineate the official position and policies of the Directory and its head Symon Petliura towards the Jewish question, including the Directory`s position concerning the Jewish national-personal autonomy and pogroms, which reached their climax during the time of the Directory. The fourth chapter will be devoted to analyzing the representation of the aforementioned events and policies in the daily newspaper *Ukraina* with the purpose of understanding how the paradigms of Jewish-Ukrainian relations functioned in reality, at this tumultuous and controversial time, and how the government`s and people`s attitudes to the Jewish question and its solutions are reflected in this periodical.

CHAPTER 1. Theoretical Framework

In this chapter I will introduce the main aspects of the approach I will employ in order to analyze the daily newspaper *Ukraïna* from the point of view of its relevance to the history of Ukrainian-Jewish relations. This approach involves examination of the role of the printed media discourse in creating the so-called mental models (meaning both personal opinions and commonly held images/stereotypes) of the relations between a majority (Ukrainians) and a minority (Jews), as well as putting these mental models in the context of the existing, markedly “dichotomous”¹⁷, visions of the correlation between Ukrainian history and Jewish history, between Ukrainian identity and Jewish identity, between the ideas of antagonism and symbiosis.

1.1. Printed press discourse

To start with, in the case of the printed media and its discourse, the part played by the language used should be emphasized. Language represents the meanings hold as common and generally accepted in a particular society. At the same time, language can be and is widely employed in constructing these meanings: “we give things meaning by how we represent them – the words we use about them, the stories we tell about them, the images of them we produce,... the ways we classify and conceptualize them”.¹⁸ In contrast to the semiotic approach, which primarily sees language as a system of signs, the discursive approach is “concerned with the effects and consequences of representation ... [with] how the knowledge which a particular discourse produces connects with power, regulates

¹⁷ Henry Abramson, “Jewish Representation in the Independent Ukrainian Governments of 1917-1920,” *Slavic Review* 50, 3 (Autumn, 1991): 542, accessed May 20, 2013, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2499851>.

¹⁸ Stuart Hall, “Introduction,” in *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, ed. Stuart Hall (London: Sage Publications, 1997), 3.

conduct, makes up or constructs identities and subjectivities”.¹⁹ Therefore, since meanings can potentially be changed, adjusted, and fixed, “power intervenes in discourse”.²⁰

In this manner, the daily newspaper under consideration, *Ukraina*, is both the expression of the meanings characteristic of Ukrainian society with regard to the cultural attitudes to Jews and the instrument of shaping/reshaping or “fixing” the cultural representation of Jews as a minority group by the authoritative bodies of Petliura’s Directory. What kind of meanings the newspaper represents and how this newspaper simultaneously attempts to “fix” the attitude to the “Jewish Question” are two key questions of this research.

To be able to answer these questions, it is first of all necessary to comprehend the nature of the primary source used in this research. *Ukraina* is a daily periodical and thus can be classified as mass media. As suggested by Tudor Parfitt, mass media play quite a decisive role in creating identities through shaping their representations, in particular with regard to minority-majority relations on a representational level and the image of the ethnic “other”. In the case of *Ukraina*, the focus is on “the relationship between the mass media and the general public’s perceptions of the ‘other’”.²¹ The role of media coverage when dwelling on the majority-minority issues consists in engaging in reproducing and at the same time creating identities of “us” and “the other”.

One of the important signs of “othering” in the mass media discourse is “the overall tendency of ingroup favoritism or positive self-representation, on the one hand, and outgroup derogation or negative Other-presentation, on the other”.²² The means of doing this may include nonverbal structures (headlines, page layouts), syntax (active vs passive

¹⁹ Ibid., 6.

²⁰ Ibid., 10.

²¹ Tudor Parfitt, “Introduction,” in *Jews, Muslims, and Mass Media: Mediating the ‘Other’*, ed. Tudor Parfitt and Yulia Egorova (London, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005), 5.

²² Teun A. van Dijk, “Discourse and Racism,” in *The Blackwell Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, ed. David Goldberg and John Solomos (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 147.

sentences), lexical-semantic means (choice of words depending of their connotation – negative or positive), rhetorical devices (metaphor, hyperbole, etc), and the choice of topics covered.²³ Thus, while “headlines and lead may... be used as expedient signals to make effective guesses about the most important information of the text”²⁴, the space occupied by a particular news item on a page may be revealing about connotations that the text itself does not seem to contain. With the help of the shift in the use of active and passive forms the agency of action can be shifted, thus “(de-) emphasizing responsibility for action”²⁵, the tactics useful for either obscuring, or “toning down”²⁶, the doer of action or foregrounding actions beneficial for the image of a particular group. A somewhat similar pattern can be employed in the case with topics, themes, thematic structures covered in different news items: positive topics may be emphasized for “us” and negative topics or their aspects – for “them” (the “other”).

All these elements of discourse contribute to the establishment of certain mental models, which particular groups have of other groups and which constitute a significant part in the representation of these groups. A special role in the reproduction of these mental models is played by the so-called elites.²⁷ As pointed out by Teun van Dijk, “the aim of reading a newspaper article is to construct a particular model of the situation or event... and through such a particular ‘picture’ of the actual situation, to update more general models”.²⁸ Thus, representations are reinforced, but can also be changed and fixed, which is often controlled by the elites.

There is no clearly and unambiguously set definition of the “elites”, but in general the elite implies a group that has controlling power, which “develop[s] fundamental

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Teun A. van Dijk, “Structures of News in the Press,” in *Discourse and Communication*, ed. Teun A. van Dijk (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1985), 77.

²⁵ Dijk, “Discourse and Racism,” 147.

²⁶ Teun A. van Dijk, “Elite Discourse and the Reproduction of Racism,” in *Hate Speech*, ed. R. K. Slayden and D. Slayden (Newbury Park: Sage, 1995), 9.

²⁷ Dijk, “Discourse and Racism,” 148.

²⁸ Dijk, “Structures of News in the Press,” 81.

policies, make[s] the most influential decisions, and control[s] the overall modes of their execution”.²⁹ Moreover, in addition to having access to the instruments of influencing the printed press, the elites often control them entirely: “Through public discourse they indirectly... control access to the minds of the public at large”.³⁰ In other words, their “discursive resources” are much wider than that of the marginalized groups. In the case with *Ukraina*, besides being controlled by the elite group due to the mere fact of it being the printed press, it is in fact the “official” expression of the voice of the elite of the Ukrainian authorities in the period of the Directory. Therefore, examination of the mental models and representational schemata reproduced in *Ukraina* gives an additional insight into the discourse of the Ukrainian elites with regard to the Jewish Question at the time of the National Revolution.

Importantly, van Dijk claims that the news press is “the media genre that is at the basis of most beliefs about minorities”.³¹ Therefore, periodicals featuring news items, especially in the period when there was not much variety of alternative mass media sources (no television, no large-scale radio network), could be regarded as the most important testimony of the general tendencies of representing minority issues in the period of the Ukrainian Revolution.

Raising the question of the objectivity of the Ukrainian printed press as a primary source for historical research, Hryhoriy Rudyi argues that the press of the period of the Ukrainian National Revolution was one of the most democratic institutions of the Ukrainian society of that time³², because before the Bolsheviks` power was finally established in the territory of Ukraine, the printed press had tended to serve as a spokesman of interests and

²⁹ Dijk, “Elite Discourse,” 4.

³⁰ Ibid., 5.

³¹ Dijk, “Discourse and Racism,” 152.

³² Hryhoriy Rudyi, “Periodyka Ukraïny iak ob`iekt dzhereloznavchoho doslidzhennia ukraïns`koï kul`tury (1917-1920)” (“Ukrainian periodicals as an object of source-study of Ukrainian culture (1917-1920)”), (Manuscript of PhD diss.) (Kyiv: The Institute of Ukrainian archeography and source-study named by Grushevsky, NSA (National Science Academy), 2004), 15.

attitudes of different political and social layers of Ukrainian society. Publications flourished allowing various forces to voice their programs, agendas, and views. Furthermore, before 1917 most of the newspapers published on the territory of Ukraine had been printed in Russian, but with the revolutionary changes the number of Ukrainian-language publications increased considerably³³, which also allows this period to be viewed as specifically democratic with regard to the printed press.

Another important aspect characteristic of the periodicals of the period under consideration is the wide use of pseudonyms by the authors contributing to the publications. As pointed out by Rudyi, the question of authorship plays a significant role in establishing the reliability of a particular periodical and contributes to understanding the underlying connotations behind the way a certain group of phenomena is covered by the press.³⁴ Though at that time a pseudonym was used with the purpose of enabling the author to remain either known under a particular category, different from where his/her real name would put him/her under, or to stay unknown, that is completely anonymous, now these pseudonyms can in fact tell us more about the conditions in which the authors contributed to a particular periodical than the author's real name would.

The problem of the objectivity of the periodicals of the period of the Ukrainian National Revolution cannot be examined separately from the fact that many of the archival documents containing information about the editorial teams and authors, which could help to decipher the message of many publications, were lost in the Revolution or preserved only partially by the Bolshevik authorities. This complicating factor prevents a historian from seeing the full picture of the publishing activity of the period of the Ukrainian People's Republic. This, therefore, makes the discursive analysis even more valuable as a method for

³³ Ibid., 18.

³⁴ Rudyi, "Ukrainian periodicals," 15-16; see also P.I. Huba, "Presya yak dzherelo vvychnennia istorii natsional'no-demokratychnoi revoliutsii v Ukraïni (1917-1920)" ("Press as a Source for Researching History of the National Democratic Revolution in Ukraine (1917-1920)"), *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal (Ukrainian Historical Journal)* 4 (1999): 29-40.

understanding the implications and connotations of the news items these newspapers contain. Such an approach is especially relevant in the process of examining articles and news items dealing with Jewish topics in *Ukraïna*. Moreover, with the purpose of better understanding and more exact interpretation, *Ukraïna* will be examined in parallel with some other periodicals published at the same period in roughly the same region.

Finally, the “study of media discourse requires both a comprehensive analysis of the institutions that produce mass media and of the audiences that they are aimed at”³⁵, therefore one of the objectives of this thesis is to clarify the connections between *Ukraïna* and its publishing authorities as well as its audiences.

1.2. Approaches to Ukrainian-Jewish relations

It is important to point out that the period that this research concentrates on, that is 1919-1920, is sensitive not only for forming representations of a Jew as the “other”, but also for shaping and crystallizing a distinct Ukrainian national identity, as there had been no independent Ukrainian state before the events spurred by the Russian Revolution. Thus, Ukrainian national consciousness was still in the process of forming, to a large extent in opposition to the “other”. However, there is the question of who is to be viewed as the “other” within this context. Thus, *Ukraïna* will be scrutinized in search for the answers to this question.

There is a long tradition of viewing the Ukrainian-Jewish relations as antagonistic: “of Ukrainians as fundamental, if not ‘biological’, anti-Semites ready to slaughter Jews at a moment`s notice, and of Jews as economic exploiters and willing tools in the social, religious, and national oppression of the Ukrainian people”.³⁶ Many factors contributed to the creation and intensification of these stereotypes, one of the most important among them

³⁵ Parfitt, “Introduction,” 5.

³⁶ Zenon E. Kohut, “The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the image of Jews, and the shaping of Ukrainian historical memory”, *Gezeirot Ta”h: Jews. Cossacks, Poles and Peasants in 1648 Ukraine* 17, 2 (2003): 141-142.

is that, ironically, the historical periods when the Ukrainian liberation movement (liberation both in social and national terms) was on the rise coincided with the mass attacks on Jews and their slaughter. The most important among these periods are the Bohdan Khmelnytsky Uprising of 1648-54, when Ukrainian Cossacks rose against the Polish power and oppression, the wave that swept away Jews seen as exploiters` ‘agents’ and right hand, and the National Revolution of 1917-1920, with its storm of the severest pogroms. Symon Petliura`s assassination by a Jew in 1926 and later the Ukrainian famine of 1932-33, identified with the Communist (and stereotypically, Jewish) party only served to deepen the gap between the Ukrainian and the Jewish understandings of their common history, which resulted in prevailing view of it as that of antagonism.

An opposite approach to the Ukrainian-Jewish interrelation can be found in Petrovsky-Shtern`s work on Jewish identity within the context of Ukrainian-Russian and colonial-imperial juxtaposition, in which he puts emphasis on the so-called symbiotic relations between Ukrainians and Jews.³⁷ Petrovsky-Shtern argues that though Jews of the Russian Empire are traditionally viewed as those identifying themselves with Russian, that is imperial, culture with the idea that “the more imperial the culture, the better for the Jews”³⁸, there were also Jews “sensitive toward the repressed nationhood of Ukrainians and whose very marginality fueled their sympathy for the fledging Ukrainian cause”.³⁹ The existence of the choice between integration into imperial and integration into colonial brings us back to the question of identity.

As indicated by Petrovsky-Shtern, Ukrainian-Jewish identity, as opposed to Russian-Jewish identity, is traditionally regarded as highly improbable, the first reason for it being

³⁷ Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern, *The Anti-Imperial Choice: The Making of the Ukrainian Jew* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 1.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 1.

that while Jews in the Russian Empire were mostly settled in urban areas⁴⁰, they tended to associate themselves with the other urban dwellers, who were mostly Russians or russified Ukrainians, unlike the major body of Ukrainians, represented by the peasantry and thus considered to be inferior and underdeveloped. Since in the majority of cases Jews could not own land and thus could not extensively engage in agriculture, the peasant culture could not appeal to them so much as the urban one.

The other reason for considering Ukrainian-Jewish symbiotic identity as almost impossible is the aforementioned “reductive competition of victimization”.⁴¹ This tendency to treat the whole history of Ukrainian-Jewish relations through the prism of blaming each other often prevented both Ukrainians and Jews from seeing the instances of cultural symbiosis – the interaction in the cultural sphere, “where Ukrainians and Jews transcend their differences and share”.⁴² In Petrovsky-Shtern’s view, these instances of sharing and in fact cooperating point to the existence of an “anti-imperial” Jewish identity, even up to using the Ukrainian language instead of Russian as “an object of anti-colonialist expression”.⁴³ *Ukraina*, with its extensive entries on Jewish topics, is also an example of this as well as of the “symbiotic relations between the two people”⁴⁴ in spite of the conventional idea of Ukrainians and Jews being drastically opposed to each other and of “authentic Ukrainian antipathy toward Jews”.⁴⁵ However, in his work Petrovsky-Shtern focuses on the cultural area of symbiosis on the level of individual Jews, while the focus of my research will also include the political sphere and the ways the political proceedings were reflected in this official periodical.

⁴⁰ Here ‘urban’ presupposes opposition to ‘peasant’ and thus does not imply a particular number of inhabitants for a settlement to be considered a town (or a city).

⁴¹ Petrovsky-Shtern, *The Anti-Imperial Choice*, 7.

⁴² Ibid., 10.

⁴³ Petrovsky-Shtern, *The Anti-Imperial Choice*, 22; for discussion of the usage of terms ‘anticolonialist’ and ‘anti-imperial’, as well as of the application of the concept of colony to Ukraine, please see Petrovsky-Shtern, “Introduction”, in *The Anti-Imperial Choice*, 1-18.

⁴⁴ Petrovsky-Shtern, *The Anti-Imperial Choice*, 9.

⁴⁵ Kohut, “The Khmelnytsky Uprising,” 155.

Thus, summing it up, with the aim of answering the questions posed in the introduction, I will employ media discourse analysis of minority communities. Teun van Dijk and his works on discourse and representation of ethnic and religious minorities, including the discourse of the elites and racism, give an insight into how an item of mass media can be interpreted with the purpose of understanding the views and attitudes dominant within a particular group and the views and attitudes that are being instilled and cultivated. This directly pertains to the case of *Ukraine*, which is to be scrutinized for the answers of the questions posed. Though van Dijk mostly focuses on racism, his theoretical approach can also be used for the case of antisemitism and anti-Jewish attitudes.

CHAPTER 2. Jewish Political Parties and Their Dilemmas

To be able to understand the peculiarities of attitudes to the Jewish Question in the Ukrainian revolution in 1917-1920, it is first and foremost necessary to consider the attitude of the Jews inhabiting ethnically Ukrainian territories towards the so-called Ukrainian Question. In this chapter I will be looking at the configuration of the political forces on the Jewish side and at the variety of attitudes of the Jewish population towards the idea of the Ukrainian statehood. I will argue that the Jewish position with regard to the Ukrainian autonomy/independence was not univocal and added to the complicating factors in solving the Jewish Question by the Ukrainian nationalist forces.

The Jewish political parties had to face the main dilemma, which was to determine the Jewish political orientation in the revolutionary years 1917-1920: whether to support the Ukrainian National Revolution and work side by side with the Ukrainians for the Ukrainian territories to become a state on its own or to be in favor of preserving the unity of the Jewish population within the boundaries of the former Russian Empire. As Solomon Goldelman, one of the Jewish leaders active in the Ukrainian Revolution, phrased it: “should we remain cold and indifferent in view of the heroic struggle of the nation in whose closest neighborhood we live, whose fate we share...?”⁴⁶ In fact, divisions between the parties were more subtle, while their variety was wider, but it is simplified here for the purpose of understanding the main question that was rising before the Jews of the former Russian Empire at the time of opportunities, with the advent and fast unfolding of the revolutionary events.

Traditionally, in the Russian Empire, “[t]he Russian government, political organizations, and public opinion persistently neglected to recognize openly the Ukrainian

⁴⁶ Salomon Goldelman, “Jews and Ukrainians: An Extract from ‘Letters of Jewish Social-Democrat’” (1921), in *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Pigido, 24.

question”.⁴⁷ This denial of the necessity to resolve the Ukrainian question was partly supported by the Jewish side because they “opposed in principle the idea of the disintegration of the Empire and the creation of a number of independent national states”.⁴⁸ Though Jurij Borys states that this was the position of all the major Jewish political parties, it should be pointed out that it would be an over-generalization to say that all the Jewish parties opposed the idea. Israel Kleiner, for example, in his work on Vladimir Jabotinsky argues that many representatives of the Jewish political elite were ready to side with the Ukrainians and for them “cooperation between the national-liberation forces of both peoples seemed not only desirable but necessary”.⁴⁹ But to what degree were the Jewish parties expected to cooperate with the Ukrainian political forces? Were they expected to side with the projects of the Ukrainian autonomy within the reformed Russian Empire or were they supposed to support even an independent Ukraine? How far could the Jewish political forces go hand in hand with the Ukrainians without harming their own interests at the same time? Thus, the problematic choice was still to be made.

Though the spectrum of the Jewish political parties was rich, two party groupings were the key players on the political arena. These two most influential Jewish political forces were the Bund and the Zionists (though the Zionist bloc encompassed a number of parties, they all stood in opposition to the Bund). The Bund (General Jewish Workers` League), which had more than 170 local branches on the territory of Ukraine by the time the revolutionary events burst out in 1917, being a supporter of the socialist principles, “fought for the national [cultural, i.e. limited to cultural sphere of life] autonomy of the Jews and, consequently, supported Ukrainian demands for autonomy”.⁵⁰ In general, the Bundists

⁴⁷ Jurij Borys, “Political Parties in the Ukraine,” in *The Ukraine, 1917-1921: A Study in Revolution*, ed. Taras Hunczak (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977), 135-136.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 153.

⁴⁹ Israel Kleiner, *From Nationalism to Universalism: Vladimir (Ze`ev) Zhabotinsky and the Ukrainian Question* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1999), 44.

⁵⁰ Borys, “Political Parties in the Ukraine,” 154.

supported the political line of the Provisional government and identified with the Mensheviks, which meant that their platform was to support the Ukrainian autonomy but within the boundaries of the undivided Russian state.

The Zionists, whose primary goal was in establishing a Jewish home in Palestine and in the meanwhile concentrating on achieving “general humanitarian emancipation and the establishment of individual freedoms and social justice”⁵¹, were more reserved, if not opposed in their attitude toward any form of Ukrainian self-determination. As emphasized by Guido Goldman, “Zionist agitation for such rights [for Jewish national rights within Russian empire] was always to take second place to the primary struggle”⁵² of resettling in Palestine, that is why they were much less concerned with the issue of the possible autonomy within the former Russian empire – and therefore – with the issue of cooperation with the Ukrainian political forces.

In addition, opposition between the socialists and the Zionists found its expression in their attitude to language politics. The socialists, first and foremost the Bundists, were in favor of using Yiddish and developing the Jewish educational system without including Judaic elements. The Zionists, on the contrary, defended their position as to the necessity to teach Hebrew as well as the basics of Judaism to all Jewish children. This conflict entered a new phase during the Kamianets period of the Directory, when the question of language became a point of contention between the socialists and the Zionists.⁵³

Within the camp of other, smaller, Jewish political parties, such as the Folkspartey (The People's Party), the Fareynikte (The United Socialist Jewish Workers' Party), both parties being the so-called Diaspora nationalists and, therefore, “the most likely champions

⁵¹ Ibid., 153.

⁵² Guido G. Goldman, *Zionism under Soviet Rule, 1917-1928* (New York: Herzl Press, 1960), 10.

⁵³ V.A. Nesterenko, “Pol's'ka ta ievreis'ka natsional'na osvita na Podilli v period Ukraïns'koï natsional'no-demokratychnoi revoliutsii 1917-1920 rokiv” (“Polish and Jewish National Education in the region of Podillia at the period of Ukrainian national-democratic revolution of 1917-1920”), in *Osvita, nauka i kul'tura na Podilli. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' (Education, Science, and Culture. A Collection of Scholarly Articles)*, ed. O.M. Zavalniuk, vol. 9 (Kamianets Podilsky, 2007), 194, 198.

of Jewish national autonomy”⁵⁴, a peculiar niche was occupied by the Poalei Zion (“Workers of Zion”), or the Jewish Social Democratic Workers’ Party, which presented an attempt “to fuse socialist ideology with Zionist principles”.⁵⁵ These parties largely supported Ukrainian national aspirations and struggle during the Directory period of 1919-1920.

The major split between the socialist camp of the Jewish parties and the Zionists is most precisely described by Henry Abramson:

the Socialists argued that Jews should take complete advantage of Ukrainian offers of “national-personal autonomy”... while the Zionists hesitated, feeling that the deeper the involvement in the fledging Ukrainian state, the more energy would be diverted from the building of the Jewish homeland in Palestine.⁵⁶

Nevertheless, in spite of the initial neutral position or even opposition of the Zionists with regard to the Jewish autonomy project, World War I and the Russian Revolution forced some review of the programs of the Jewish parties and made them reconsider some of the possible solutions to the Jewish question. Importantly, “the dislocation of much of the Jewish population that had been concentrated in the war zone area had strengthened the yearning for national autonomy”.⁵⁷ Having to deal with what the reality of the revolution had offered to them, the Jewish political forces turned out to be ready to participate in the Jewish autonomy project.

This, however, did not mean the end of the crucial opposition. It is important to emphasize that among the Ukrainian political parties the socialists (the Social Democrats and the Social Revolutionaries) tended to play the decisive role. This is especially true of the Central Council and later the Directory and its governmental structures. Importantly, Petliura himself was a Social Democrat. According to Jurij Borys, “the majority of the

⁵⁴ Abramson, *A Prayer for the Government*, 24-30. Abramson groups Jewish parties into: Zionists, socialists, Diaspora nationalists, and religious parties.

⁵⁵ Kleiner, *From Nationalism to Universalism*, 5.

⁵⁶ Henry Abramson, “Historiography on the Jews and the Ukrainian Revolution,” *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 15, 2 (Winter 1990): 34.

⁵⁷ Goldman, *Zionism under Soviet Rule*, 13.

Ukrainian ethnic population belonged to the lower strata of society”⁵⁸, which is why conservative or rightist moods were not popular among Ukrainian national forces while the ideals offered by the socialists were more potent.

On the other hand, the results of the All-Russian Constituent Assembly elections of 1917 (though the elected Constituent Assembly was dissolved by the Bolsheviks after two days of its meeting and though these were the results of all-Russian voting, not specifically Ukrainian) show that the Jews mostly voted for the so-called national coalitions “favouring Jewish civil equality and collective rights within a generally liberal framework”⁵⁹, not socialist parties. Furthermore, the All-Russian Jewish Congress had even more pro-Zionist voting results, but the number of Jews participating in the elections for the Jewish Congress was on the whole much less significant. As a result, there was additional tension between the Zionists (and non-socialist Jewish parties, including religious ones) and the Ukrainian state institutions due to the fact that Ukrainian national bodies, for example, the Central Council (and later the Directory) openly favored socialists at the expense of the Zionists, which also added to the Zionists’ opposition to the Ukrainian self-determination struggle: “All along Syrkin continued to claim on behalf of the Zionist organization in Kiev that the appointment of M. Zilberfarb to the position of deputy secretary for Jewish national affairs came about as a plot between the three Jewish workers’ parties”.⁶⁰

The tendency to exclude the Zionists is obvious in the official declaration of the chairman of the Council of Ministers, Borys Martos, and Minister for Jewish Affairs from August 9, 1919 that claims that “all the Jewish political parties have expressed themselves

⁵⁸ Jurij Borys, “Political Parties in the Ukraine”, 129.

⁵⁹ Simon Rabinovitch, “Russian Jewry goes to the Polls: an Analysis of Jewish Voting in the All-Russian Constituent Assembly Elections of 1917,” *East European Jewish Affairs* 39, 2 (2009): 208, accessed January 12, 2013, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13501670903016316>.

⁶⁰ Mattiyahu Minc, “Kiev Zionists and the Ukrainian National Movement,” in *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, ed. Howard Aster and Peter J. Potichnyj (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1990), 256.

for the complete independence of the Ukraine”⁶¹, including in this list only the Bund (which also seems surprising), the Poalei Zion and the Folkspartey. As expected, the parties mentioned belong to the socialists group. The Chief of the Press Office, Cherkavsky, remarks that the Jewish socialist parties’ approval of the Ukrainian independence was the result of “evolution”.⁶² Avraam Revutskyi, for example, who was a member of the Poalei Zion party, represented the Jewish people both during the Central Council period (as a vice-minister of Jewish Affairs) and in the Directory (as the head of the Ministry of the Jewish Affairs).

Even Jewish reaction to the First Universal⁶³, which proclaimed Ukrainian autonomy “[w]ithout separating from all of Russia, without breaking with the Russian state”⁶⁴, was not unambiguous and “there was no unity among Jews as to their attitude toward the Ukrainian national movement”⁶⁵ at that time. The majority of the Jewish political forces hoped for the All-Russian democratic elections to resolve the problematic issues concerning the position of territorial and extra-territorial minorities, Ukrainians representing a territorial minority in the Russian Empire and the Jews constituting its extra-territorial counterpart. Nevertheless, Jewish political parties’ concern with preserving the unity of the Jewish population of the former Russian empire, in general, did not prevent them from greeting the perspective of the national-personal autonomy granted to Jews (together with Russians and Poles) inhabiting the territory of the Ukrainian People’s Republic by the Third Universal promulgated in November 1917. On the contrary, the Jewish political forces seemed to be getting closer to

⁶¹ “To All the Jewish Citizens and Workers in the Ukraine” (August 9, 1919), in *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Pigido, 63.

⁶² “A Declaration by the Government” (September 6, 1919), in *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Pigido, 74.

⁶³ Universals were legal acts issued by the Central Council.

⁶⁴ “Four Universals of the Ukrainian Central Rada” in Taras Hunczak, *Symon Petliura and the Jews: A Reappraisal* (Ukrainian Historical Association, 2008), 64.

⁶⁵ “A Declaration of a Zionist Leader, Mr. M. Sigal” (July 7, 1919), in *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Pigido, 56.

cooperation with the Ukrainian politicians in the course of implementing the autonomy project.

However, the “progressive alienation”⁶⁶ between the Jews of Ukraine and Ukrainians escalated with the Ukrainian side opting for independence. Therefore, Jewish response to the Fourth Universal proclaiming an independent Ukrainian People’s Republic⁶⁷ on January 25, 1918 was much more “negative and confused”.⁶⁸ All the Jewish parties (Poalei Zion, Folkspartey, Fareynikte, Zionists), except for the Bund, abstained from voting. Striving for at least relative unity of the Jewish communities of the Russian Empire, the Bund voted against it. Moshe Rafes, as the member of the Bund, totally opposed the Central Council’s decision to proclaim an independent Ukrainian Republic. Thus, the Bund “remained adamant in their opposition to Ukrainian independence” and made a point of not entering Ukrainian governments, later joining the so-called Russian camp, particularly the Bolsheviks.⁶⁹

The Fareynikte and the Poalei Zion “had no special links to the Mensheviks [as to the representatives of the all-Russian parties]... and, therefore, were more willing... to see an independent Ukraine as a positive option”.⁷⁰ The leader of the Poalei Zion, Solomon Goldelman, states in his *Letters of a Jewish Social-Democrat* (1921): “For us, the Jewish socialists in the Ukraine, there is only one real revolutionary and national need: the active support of the revolt of the Ukrainian peasants and workers”.⁷¹

In his interview to *The Jewish Chronicle* dated May 16, 1919, Arnold Margolin, a renowned attorney in the Beilis case, answering the question about the Jews’ attitude toward

⁶⁶ Hunczak, “A Reappraisal of Symon Petliura”, 168.

⁶⁷ The essence of the Fourth Universal can be expressed in one sentence: “From this day forth, the Ukrainian People’s Republic becomes independent, subject to no one, a Free, Sovereign State of the Ukrainian People” in “Four Universals of the Ukrainian Central Rada” in Taras Hunczak *Symon Petliura and the Jews: A Reappraisal*, 75.

⁶⁸ Minc, “Kiev Zionists,” 273.

⁶⁹ Hunczak, “A Reappraisal of Symon Petliura,” 171.

⁷⁰ Frankel, “The Dilemmas of Jewish National Autonomism,” 273-274.

⁷¹ Salomon Goldelman, “Jews and Ukrainians: An Extract from ‘Letters of Jewish Social-Democrat’” (1921), in *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Pigido, 22.

a newly-proclaimed Ukrainian state, specified that “[on] the question of independence of the Ukraine the Jews were split into two camps... the assimilated Jews who having been brought up in the All-Russian political spirit took a [hostile] stand... on the other side there were the majority of the Jews – the nationalists, Zionists and the Jewish Socialist Parties”.⁷² However, here Margolin seems to be passing the desirable for the real, since in fact the idea of the Ukrainian independence was received with a kind of reserve by the Jewish political forces. As Lubomyr Wyner sums up, “the majority of Jews in Ukraine did not support Ukrainian independence”.⁷³

Furthermore, it is interesting that he mentions Zionists among those who welcomed the idea of Ukrainian independence, because judging from the other sources, for Zionists it was difficult to accept Ukrainian ‘separatist’ independence because it would have meant the disintegration of the body of the Jewish population of the former Russian Empire. The reason for Margolin’s presentation of the general picture in this light may be that he wished to present Ukrainian national movement, with the representatives of which he co-worked, as going hand in hand with Zionism and Jewish self-determination as opposed to assimilationists with assimilation being perceived as harmful because “denationalization of the Jewish masses threatened the Jewish people’s very existence”.⁷⁴

The necessity for the Jews to make such a difficult choice was directly linked to the question regarding the level of common identification of Jews with Ukrainians. Vladimir Jabotinsky, who is often mentioned as the example of a Zionist who insisted on cooperation between Jews and Ukrainians (as opposed to Jews being on the Russian – “imperial” –

⁷² “An Interview with Dr. Arnold Margolin in 1919” (May 16, 1919), in *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Pigido, 53.

⁷³ Lev Bykovsky, *Solomon I. Goldelman: A Portrait of a Politician and Educator (1885-1974): A Chapter in Ukrainian-Jewish relations*, ed. Lubomyr R. Wynar (New York, Toronto, Muenchen: Ukrainian Historical Association, 1980), 8.

⁷⁴ Kleiner, *From Nationalism to Universalism*, 63.

side), “[felt] close to Ukrainian nationalists and their cause”.⁷⁵ Hesitation with regard to the support that the Jews of the ethnically Ukrainian territories should give to their Ukrainian “brethren” is viewed as “the traditional Russian residues within the Jewish intellectuals”.⁷⁶ This idea is in agreement with what Jabotinsky argued for, calling for the Jews of Ukraine to distance themselves from the Russian culture and from supporting the idea of ‘one and undivided Russia’ and to ally with the Ukrainians, with whom the Jews, as the stateless nation, were believed to have more in common. Thus, Goldelman emphasizes “this internal and natural bond between Ukrainians and Jews”⁷⁷ – a kind of affinity between the Ukrainian and Jewish peoples, especially affinity in terms of historical conditions. Nevertheless, as Michael Stanislawski rightfully observed, Jabotinsky himself grew up in a largely Russified Odessa, so he was mostly identifying with the Ukrainians in the theory of the nation’s self-determination, not so much on an everyday or even domestic basis.⁷⁸

In conclusion, besides bringing emancipation and abolition of the restrictions of the Pale of Settlement, the Russian Revolution arrived with the major dilemmas pertaining to the future of the Jewish population of the Russian Empire. Having to face a difficult choice of the priorities and allies under conditions of the swift changes of power and the Civil War, the Jewish political forces grew divided and fractioned, which further affected the position of the wide Jewish masses in the Ukrainian territories, as well as the potential of Ukrainian-Jewish cooperation.

⁷⁵ Michael Stanislawski, *Zionism and the Fin de Siècle: Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism from Nordau to Jabotinsky* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 158-159.

⁷⁶ Salomon Goldelman, “Jews and Ukrainians: An Extract from ‘Letters of Jewish Social-Democrat’” (1921), in *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Pigido, 22.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁷⁸ Stanislawski, *Zionism and the Fin de Siècle*, 158-159.

CHAPTER 3. The Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic and the Jewish Question

As pointed out in the introduction, the Directory period (1919-1920), which was the longest period of the Ukrainian revolution in chronological terms (if compared to the Central Council period or the Hetmanate of Pavlo Skoropads'kyi)⁷⁹, was also the most controversial, especially with regard to Ukrainian-Jewish relations. In this chapter I will delineate the main features of the Directory period (1919-1920), concentrating on those pertaining to the attempts of solving the Jewish Question in the Ukrainian People's Republic and to the peculiarities of Ukrainian-Jewish relations of the period. I will argue that under extremely unfavorable conditions the Directory still put significant effort in the attempt to build an independent Ukrainian state and solve the Jewish Question at the same time.

Initially, the Directory, which came to power as a result of the uprising against Pavlo Skoropads'kyi's Hetmanate⁸⁰, was envisioned as "a provisional revolutionary organ"⁸¹, which in the course of time was expected to give way to the governmental and representative institutions and bodies of power elected through democratic procedures once the territory of the Ukrainian People's Republic was reconquered from the rival forces. The Directory's revolt against the Hetman's power was successful, which, besides being the result of German and Austro-Hungarian troops leaving the territory of Ukraine, was the proof of the people's dissatisfaction with Skoropads'kyi's regime, who had brought the restoration of the rights of the large capital as well as German and Austro-Hungarian

⁷⁹ In comparison with the Central Council, which existed from March 1917 to April 1918, the Directory lasted for two years – roughly from November 1918 to November 1920.

⁸⁰ On April 29, 1918, Pavlo Skoropads'kyi overthrew the power of the Central Council and established a conservative regime, taking the title of the Hetman of Ukraine, *hetman* being the highest position with the Ukrainian Cossacks' military.

⁸¹ Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, "The Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic," in *The Ukraine, 1917-1921: A Study in Revolution*, ed. Taras Hunczak (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977), 84.

occupation. The Directory, however, which initiated the action against the Hetmanate in mid-November 1918 and took Kyiv on December 14, 1918, “came closest to exercising full power in the Ukraine during the first two months of its existence [only]”.⁸²

At the beginning of February 1919 under the pressure of the Bolshevik threat the Directory was already driven out of Kyiv and had to travel from Kyiv to Vinnytsia, Zhmerynka, and later to Proskuriv. At the end of March the state institutions seemed to have found shelter in Rivne, but May brought new trials and tribulations for the Directory’s state bodies and they had to move again. By June 25, 1919, all the ministries of the UNR⁸³ were functioning in Kamianets Podilsky. Thus, by mid-summer 1919 the Directory’s rule was largely concentrated in the Podillia region. In August 1919 almost all of the Right-Bank Ukrainian territories were under the Directory’s control and on August 14, 1919, the Directory, the Council of Ministers, and the Army gave a pledge of allegiance to the Ukrainian People’s Republic in the city of Kamianets Podilsky.

The Directory was initially headed by Volodymyr Vynnychenko⁸⁴, but it was Symon Petliura, first appointed the Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces of the Directory, who came to be identified with the Directory and to symbolize this whole period of the Ukrainian revolution. It is important to mention that Petliura’s standing for the whole Ukrainian Directory is not a later invention or construction, but the vision of his contemporaries, who referred to the people of the Directory especially those connected to

⁸² Ibid., 86.

⁸³ I.V. Teliachyi, “Ukraïns`ki uriady i rozbudova kul`turno-osvitn`oi sfery na Podilli za Dyrektorii UNR (1919-1920)” (“Ukrainian governments and the development of the cultural-educational sphere in Podillia during the Directory period (1919-1920)”), in *Osvita, nauka i kul`tura na Podilli. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats` (Education, Science, and Culture. A Collection of Scholarly Articles)*, ed. O.M. Zavalniuk, vol. 10 (Kamianets Podilsky, 2007), 135-136. The UNR is the abbreviation used for the Ukrainian People’s Republic (*Ukraïns`ka Narodna Respublika*)

⁸⁴ The initiative and main organizational zeal to put an end to Skoropads`kyi’s Hetmanate belonged to Volodymyr Vynnychenko, Mykyta Shapoval, Andrii Makarenko, Mykhailo Avdiienko, Ievhen Konovalets`, Oleksander Osets`kyi, while Petliura, who had also been in opposition to Skoropads`kyi’s rule, was to later join this group.

the Directory`s Army as *petliurivtsi* – “Petliura-men”.⁸⁵ Petliura was chosen to head the Directory after Vynnychenko left the Directory altogether in February 1919. As Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak points out, for some short period of time the Directory became the stage for rivalry between Volodymyr Vynnychenko and Symon Petliura, in which “[i]t seemed inconceivable to [Vynnychenko]... that the quiet Petliura... could have appeared a spokesman of a national and social movement that Vynnychenko considered his preserve [since he was a popular and recognized Ukrainian writer]”.⁸⁶ In other words, after Vynnychenko left, even though the Directory continued to include other people, in reality Petliura became its head and ultimate leader. Petliura`s leadership was doubtless throughout the Kamianets period of the Directory.⁸⁷ Furthermore, in November 1919 he was “given the powers of chief of state”.⁸⁸

The peculiarity of the Directory was also that the government, the Council of Ministers, was very closely tied to the Directory itself. Though upon arrival at Kamianets Podilsky there was an attempt to delineate the boundaries between the functions of the Directory and the government, they remained blurred. The Directory`s inability to fully reform and reorganize the socio-economic situation on the territories under its control made some of the political forces question the chosen path, which found its reflection in a number of articles with the title question – “Dictatorship or democracy?” – using ‘Dictatorship’ for

⁸⁵ Vitalii Lozovyi, “Dokumenty Tsentral`noho Derzhavnoho Arkhivu Vyshchykh Orhaniv Vlady ta Upravlinnia Ukraïny iak dzherelo do vyvchennia stavlennia selianstva do vladly Dyrektorii UNR u period ïi perebuvannia na Podilli (1919-1920)” (“Documents of the Central State Archive of Supreme Bodies of Government and Administration of Ukraine as a source for understanding the attitudes of peasantry towards the Directory during its Podillia period (1919-1920)”), in *Osvita, nauka i kul`tura na Podilli. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats` (Education, Science, and Culture. A Collection of Scholarly Articles)*, ed. O.M. Zavalniuk, vol. 10 (Kamianets Podilsky, 2007), 152.

⁸⁶ Bohachevsky-Chomiak “The Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic,” 86.

⁸⁷ As indicated in the introduction, the so-called “Kamianets period, or phase” of the Directory lasted from June to mid-November 1919. However, although the Directory had to leave the city of Kamianets Podilsky in November 1919, it returned to Kamianets several times through the following year of its existence (till November 1920).

⁸⁸ Bohachevsky-Chomiak, “The Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic,” 101.

the path chosen by the Galician Ukrainian leaders and by the Bolsheviks and ‘Democracy’ as the path that the Directory adhered to.

Though the Kamianets period of the Directory can be considered a relatively stable phase of the Directory’s rule since the state institutions were based in one place, the fact that the Directory could not keep neither Kyiv nor Kamianets Podilsky as the capital for a long time and had to evacuate its state functionaries so often was already a manifestation of the inability of the Directory to exercise steady control over a particular clearly defined area and enforce its laws effectively. This explains why many of the Directory’s policies had in fact only a declarative character, as well as why the situation with the anti-Jewish violence went out of control of the central authorities.

This period was also specific in terms of the peculiarities of the relations between the Ukrainian and Jewish political parties. The Directory came to power when the Central Council’s Fourth Universal establishing independence of the Ukrainian People’s Republic and thus creating a gap between the Jewish and the Ukrainian political forces had already been issued and the Jewish response to it had already been reconsidered (or not reconsidered) in light of new threats of Bolshevism and the Whites. Out of the most numerous represented Jewish parties the socialist Zionist party Poalei Zion was the one that “opted for a policy of full cooperation”⁸⁹ with the Directory. Solomon Goldelman, one of the Poalei Zion leaders, supported and even “promoted the cause of an independent Ukrainian republic in 1918 and 1919, and directly participated in the activities of the Ukrainian national government”.⁹⁰

In spite of the declarative character of many of the Directory’s decrees and regulations, the general direction of its policies towards the Jews and solution of the Jewish Question was well-disposed and even favouring. It is important to mention that Symon

⁸⁹ Frankel, “The Dilemmas of Jewish National Autonomism: the Case of Ukraine 1917-1920”, 274.

⁹⁰ Bykovsky, *Solomon I. Goldelman: A Portrait of a Politician and Educator*, 7.

Petliura was previously an editor of *Ukrainskaia zhizn`* (“Ukrainian Life”) (started in 1912), which “expressed such pro-Jewish attitudes that it could scarcely be distinguished from Jewish periodicals”.⁹¹ Matters pertaining to the position of the Jews in the Ukrainian People’s Republic were constantly raised at the meetings of the Directory and the Council of Ministers, which is exemplified by the journals and minutes of these meetings.⁹² As emphasized by Arnold Margolin, the Jews of Ukraine were granted “more freedom and rights than they had anywhere in Europe at any time”.⁹³ This points to the contemporaries’ awareness of the special conditions created for the Jews by the national Ukrainian authorities in the sense that they were not only given equal rights, but were allowed to preserve their national-cultural specificity. Even later Solomon Goldelman singled out the Ukrainian project of Jewish national-personal autonomy as unique:

The Jewish national autonomy in Ukraine was not an isolated phenomenon on the territory of Russia during the revolution. Similar phenomena and parallel events were taking place within the framework of some other national revolutions: in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, partially Belarus. But, if we compare national achievements of the Jewish minority in those countries..., we will be convinced of the exceptional singularity of the autonomous status of the Jewish minority in Ukraine.⁹⁴

First of all, the Law of National-Personal Autonomy of the Jews was renewed on January 9, 1919, after Skoropads`kyi officially abolished it on July 9, 1918.⁹⁵ The principle of the national-personal autonomy implied granting autonomous cultural rights to Jews as a group within the Ukrainian state, without resorting to any specific territorial re-configuration of the Jewish population. Importantly, the national-personal autonomy was renewed for the Jews only, not for Polish or Russian minorities, because both reestablished

⁹¹ Kleiner, *From Nationalism to Universalism*, 44.

⁹² For journals of the meetings of the Directory and the Council of Ministers, republished from the archives, please see V. Verstyuk et al., ed., *Dyrektoriia, Rada Narodnykh Ministriv Ukraïns`koï Narodnoï Respubliky 1918-1920. Materialy i dokumenty u 2 tomakh* (Directory, Council of National Ministers of the Ukrainian National Republic 1918-1920. Documents and Materials in 2 volumes) (Kyiv: Olena Teliha Publishers, 2006).

⁹³ “An Interview with Dr. Arnold Margolin in 1919” (May 16, 1919), in *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Pigido, 54.

⁹⁴ Solomon Goldelman, *Zhydivs`ka natsional`na avtonomiia na Ukraïni (1917-1920)* (Jewish National Autonomy in Ukraine (1917-1920)) (Munich: Dniprowa Chwyla, 1967), 11-12.

⁹⁵ Verstyuk, *Documents and materials*, vol. 1, 447.

Poland and Bolshevik Russia (and the Whites) were hostile to the Ukrainian Republic. Furthermore, the Law on the establishment of the Jewish communal administration was published on July 11, 1919. According to this legal regulation, all the Jewish institutions were exempt from the control of the Ukrainian bodies of power and administration and made accountable to the so-called Jewish communal councils (*kehillot*), who were given wide powers in all the aspects of the Jewish life.⁹⁶ Accordingly, the Jewish communal council of Kamianets Podilsky started functioning in the middle of July 1919. Other measures taken with the purpose of guaranteeing the rights of the Jewish population included incorporation of the Minister of Jewish Affairs in the Council of Ministers as well as recognizing the “Jewish language” as one of the official languages and establishing Jewish schools.⁹⁷

Moreover, if one looks through the records of the newly opened national university in Kamianets in 1918, one will notice how well represented the Jews were in this academic institution (in 1920 out of around 1,400 students, there were almost 200 Jewish boys and girls enrolled at the University)⁹⁸, not to mention the fact that the Chair of Jewish History and Literature was established in this University (though due to the lack of staff and material resources⁹⁹, the project was never realized to the full extent). However, as part of this project, history and language of the Jews were taught at Kamianets Podilsky University during academic year of 1919-1920 and there were plans to invite specialists for further developing the field of Jewish history and philology, but the process was disrupted by the

⁹⁶ Vitalii Lozovyi, *Vnutrishnia ta zovnishnia polityka Dyrektorii Ukraïns'koï Narodnoï Respubliky (Kam`ianets`ka doba) (Domestic and Foreign Policies of the Directory of the Ukrainian People`s Republic (Kam`ianets` Period))*, (Kamianets Podilsky: Aksioma, 2005), 147.

⁹⁷ Pigido, *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, 16.

⁹⁸ Zavalniuk, “Jewish Community,” 340-341.

⁹⁹ Zavalniuk in his article “Jewish Community...” emphasizes the fact that by the end of 1919 the University Library could boast of only one book on Semitic philology (p. 341).

war and instability of power in the region.¹⁰⁰ With the final arrival of the Bolsheviks to Kamianets Podilsky, the project came to an end.

One of the important sections of the Directory`s policies with regard to the Jewish population was directed at stopping the pogroms. To start with, the Directory issued the Law on the Criminal Responsibility for Insulting National Honor and Dignity, which did not limit itself to Ukrainians only, but encompassed other *narodnosti* (“ethnic groups”) of the Ukrainian People`s Republic. Furthermore, not only disrespect toward individuals was to be the subject for punishment, but also disrespect expressed towards the state or civil institutions of any of the ethnic groups of the Ukrainian Republic.¹⁰¹ This law was put forward and then published on the same dates as the law about the renewal of the national-personal autonomy. Unfortunately, judging from the timeline of the pogroms of 1919, this law was not implemented effectively, since pogroms were not just an expression of disrespect but a major assault on the Jewish population of the Ukrainian territories. However, this law was the evidence of the benevolent intention of the government to prevent pogroms even before their major wave broke out.

The Directory`s departure from Kyiv was a symbolic start of its losing control over the whole situation in Ukraine, which also relatively coincided with one of the most violent and murderous pogroms, the one in Proskuriv, which happened in mid-February 1919. Trying to balance attempts to organize the governmental structures for effective exercising of the state control and regulation with the military struggle with the Bolsheviks and the Whites, the Directory “was unable to establish effective control even over the military...

¹⁰⁰ O.M. Kukh, “Vykladannia iudaïky ta orïentalistyky u Kam`ianets`-Podil`s`komu Derzhavnomu Ukraïns`komu universyteti (1918-1921)” (“Teaching Jewish and Oriental Studies at Kamianets Podilsky State Ukrainian University (1918-1921)”), in *Osvita, nauka i kul`tura na Podilli. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats`* (*Education, Science, and Culture. A Collection of Scholarly Articles*), ed. O.M. Zavalniuk, vol. 11 (Kamianets Podilsky, 2008), 34-35.

¹⁰¹ Verstyuk, *Documents and Materials*, vol.1, 448.

[when] some *otamans* were anti-Semitic, while others were incapable of coping with anti-Semitic outbreaks”.¹⁰²

Once the pogroms started, commissions were created for investigating the causes of the pogroms, trials were held to punish those responsible, funds were allocated to help the victims recover.¹⁰³ Thus, the ruling about the establishment of a special commission for investigating the pogroms in Proskuriv on February 15-16, 1919 and in Fel'shtyn on February 17, 1919, was adopted on April 9, 1919.¹⁰⁴ Another special commission for investigating the cases of anti-Jewish violence was to be created according to the law of May 27, 1919, with a detailed account of how this commission was to be organized in terms of human resources, financial matters and accountability. The major task of the commission was to investigate both the anti-Jewish pogroms and the agitation against the Jewish people on the territory of Ukraine.¹⁰⁵ The cases with the culprits identified were to be transferred to the military court.

Appeals on the government's behalf were also popular as a means of addressing the population concerning important matters. Pinkhas Krasnyi, who was the Minister of Jewish Affairs (from the Folkspartey) in the governments through 1919-1920, issued a considerable number of appeals to combat the pogroms. On June 12, 1919, he published the appeal to the Jews of Ukraine, emphasizing the work that the government of the Directory had done by then to put an end to the pogroms and encouraging the Jews to appreciate the Ukrainian government's efforts with regard to the Jewish national-personal autonomy. He also expressed hope that Ukrainian people “will not listen to the hateful voice of the Black

¹⁰² Bohachevsky-Chomiak “The Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic,” 87-88.

¹⁰³ A. Kryskov, “Uryad UNR na zakhysti ievreiv” (“The Government of the Ukrainian People's Republic in Defense of Jews”), in *Materialy IX-oї Podil's'koї istoriko-kraieznavchoї konferentsii (Materials of the Ninth Conference on History and Regional Studies of Podillia)*, ed. I.S. Vynokur et al. (Kamianets Podilsky, 1995), 273.

¹⁰⁴ Verstyuk, *Documents and Materials*, vol. 1, 513.

¹⁰⁵ Verstyuk, *Documents and Materials*, vol. 1, 527-529; see also Pavlo Khrystiuk, *Zamitky i materialy do istorii Ukraїns'koї revoliutsii 1917-1920 (Notes and Materials concerning the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1920)*, vol. 4 (Vienna, 1922), 164.

Hundreds` flock, hostile to the Jewish and Ukrainian peoples and inciting Ukrainians to the Jewish pogroms, to expose Ukrainian people to the whole world as wild and not mature for their own state”.¹⁰⁶ Krasnyi also emphasized the idea of brotherhood between the two peoples, as well as some commonness between the historic fates of Ukrainians and Jews. This theme is also characteristic of Petliura`s proclamations and governmental appeals, as well as their highly metaphorical language, which was to create powerful images of “us” vs “the enemy” (the pogrom-makers).

While in Kamianets Podilsky, on June 15, 1919, the Council of Ministers issued another ruling about combating the anti-Jewish pogrom-inciting agitation, emphasizing the need to control the published material and pointing to the exceptional significance of the press and information in the cause of fighting pogrom-makers and those propagating Jew-hatred, with the note that this ruling needs to be promulgated “immediately”.¹⁰⁷ Here it should be mentioned that upon entering Kyiv and taking control of the Ukrainian territories, the Directory issued the Decree about the establishment of the Bureau of Press and Information on December 31, 1918 with the goal of informing the population of Ukraine about the independent-state interests of the Ukrainian People`s Republic as well as defending these interests abroad.¹⁰⁸ Who could have understood the importance of the press for achieving the set goals, those of spreading and defending the idea of an independent Ukrainian republic, better than Petliura himself, who had the experience of working as a journalist?

Therefore, it is not surprising that once the pogrom wave turned out to be on the rise, eyes of the Ukrainian leaders turned to the press and tools of agitation. Thus, the governmental institutions continued to issue rulings and orders against anti-Jewish agitation and propaganda later in 1919 and in 1920. In one such order of the Highest Command of the

¹⁰⁶ Verstyuk, *Documents and Materials*, vol. 1, 538.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 539.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 399.

Army of the Ukrainian People`s Republic dated July 7, 1920, three reasons or explanations of the anti-Jewish agitation among Ukrainians are identified: to deal a fatal blow to the unity of the Ukrainian forces, to leave a stain on the Ukrainian statehood in the eyes of the international community, and to defame “a knight of the Ukrainian army, the defender of his people”.¹⁰⁹ The minutes of the ministerial meetings also suggest that the government realized the crucial importance of the necessity of the Army being particularly inspected and controlled with regard to spreading the pogrom moods. On August 18, the necessity to build normal relations between the Army and the Jewish population was emphasized, as well as the need for the Bureau of Press and Information to contribute to this task by eliminating anti-Jewish propaganda and refuting the blames put on the governmental institutions of the Ukrainian People`s Republic.¹¹⁰

Moreover, in one of the documents containing the minutes of the meeting of the Ministerial Council, taking place in Tarniv on December 29, 1920, the ministers discussed the situation with the pogroms of the Jewish population, emphasizing the fact that the case of pogroms was used outside the borders of the Ukrainian People`s Republic (in European press, in particular) to attack and condemn the Ukrainian national forces. So the resolution was to entrust the ministers of Foreign Affairs, Jewish Affairs and that of Press and Propaganda “to start the corresponding action”¹¹¹ that is to combat the image of the Ukrainian People`s Republic as hostile to the Jews or encouraging anti-Jewish violence. So, the leaders of the Directory were not only concerned with bringing the pogroms to an end, but also with popularizing the Directory`s stance as that opposing the pogroms in any possible way. Importantly, the resolution was accepted unanimously.

What is even more noteworthy is that there is evidence of some practical achievements of the government`s attempts to prevent the pogroms. As Lozovyi stresses,

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 653.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 460-463.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 369-370.

the governmental institutions “efficiently” reacted to the anti-Jewish acts. For example, on July 8, 1919, an attempt of starting a pogrom was prevented among the troops of the UNR in the neighborhood of Gorodok and Smotrych, with the pogrom instigators being killed at their attempt to flee, while in Volochys`k, a local worker, trying to start a pogrom, was arrested by the soldiers.¹¹²

These visible signs of the Ukrainian nationalists` efforts in combating the anti-Jewish violence justify Margolin`s statement that “[t]here is no anti-Semitic tendency in the Ukrainian government”.¹¹³ He did not only speak in defense of the Ukrainian leaders of the Directory and Petliura in particular, stating that they were not responsible for the instigation of pogroms, but also emphasized that they tried to stop the atrocities. Interestingly, Margolin quotes a 1921 proclamation by Petliura in which the main blame that would be in the future used to discredit Petliura and the whole camp of Ukrainian nationalists is set: “[the Bolsheviks] established... newspapers in all languages, in which they brand our sacred cause – the liberation movement of our nation – as the work of bandits and pogrom makers, shouting... about anti-Jewish pogroms, which, they say, are being organized by the Ukrainian revolutionaries”.¹¹⁴ Thus, the Ukrainian nationalists were aware of the Bolsheviks` manipulation of the public opinion by propaganda. Moreover, Lozovyi also argues that Jew-hatred in Ukraine had no state-based source – instead it was intensified due to the Bolsheviks` threat and the popular identification of Jews with the Bolsheviks or with usury and speculation.¹¹⁵

In conclusion, as argued by Verstiuk, the two years of the Directory were not successful for a number of reasons, including external and internal ones. External factors

¹¹² Lozovyi, *Domestic and Foreign Policies*, 145.

¹¹³ “An Interview with Dr. Arnold Margolin in 1919” (May 16, 1919), in *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Pigido, 55.

¹¹⁴ Arnold Margolin, “The Ukraine and the Policy of the Entente,” (1921), in *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Pigido, 41.

¹¹⁵ Lozovyi, *Domestic and Foreign Policies*, 141-142.

included unfavorable geopolitical conditions within which a newly-born Ukrainian People's Republic was struggling to survive and find its place.¹¹⁶ Among important factors of an internal nature were the peasant character of a young Ukrainian nation, lack of determination in terms of ideology (therefore hesitation between parliamentary democracy and revolutionary dictatorship), difficulties with determining an ally and choosing between orientation toward West or East, and the lack of sufficient political experience of the elite.¹¹⁷

While the Central Council was somewhat hesitant about the state aspirations of the Ukrainian people, the Directory proclaimed its unambiguous position of independence from the very beginning. Therefore, one of the most important tasks of the Directory was to engage minorities in the process of building Ukrainian sovereignty. The major portion of this process was directed at the Jewish minority within ethnically Ukrainian borders. However, the idealized portrayal of the Ukrainian population by Solomon Goldelman in his *Letters of a Jewish Social-Democrat* as “peasant fighters” noble in their attitude and treatment of the Jews was unfortunately frustrated by the pogroms, and any possible good wishing on behalf of the Jewish leaders such as Goldelman could not have prevented the disillusionment of the general Jewish population with the politics of cooperating with the Ukrainian nationalists. The terror of anti-Jewish atrocities, unfortunately, overshadowed the fact that besides the pogroms, which are usually presented as the leading aspect of the Ukrainian-Jewish relations in 1919-1920, there was also a campaign against Jew-hatred and a significant amount of work put towards improvement of the Ukrainian-Jewish cooperation and enhancement of the Jewish national-personal autonomy.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶ Rudolf A. Mark, “Social Questions and National Revolution: The Ukrainian National Republic in 1919-1920,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14, 1/2 (Jun., 1990): 116, accessed February 11, 2013, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036358>.

¹¹⁷ Verstyuk, *Documents and Materials*, vol. 1, 31.

¹¹⁸ Lozovyi, *Domestic and Foreign Policies*, 141.

CHAPTER 4. *Ukraina* as the Directory`s Mouthpiece with regard to the Jewish Question

In this chapter I will deal with the case of the daily newspaper *Ukraina* in detail, reviewing the treatment of the Jewish-related subjects by the authors contributing to this periodical. Based on the particular place of *Ukraina* within the larger context of the Ukrainian press of Kamianets Podilsky`s period of the Directory and on its wide coverage of the Jewish topics, I will attempt at drawing conclusions about the general implications of the portrayal of the Jews for the larger picture of Ukrainian-Jewish relations during the Ukrainian National Revolution of 1917-1920.

4.1. *Ukraina*, a Kamianets Podilsky daily, 1919-1920

Ukraina, which was prepared and censored by the Press Office of the Army of the Ukrainian People`s Republic in 1919, consisted of four pages that abounded in articles and news items dealing with the Jewish subjects. This becomes especially clear when one compares this periodical to other Kamianets Podilsky dailies that flourished at this period of national and cultural revival spurred by the revolution. For example, in comparison with *Ukraina*, *Nash Shliakh* (“Our Way”), which was published in 1919-1920, had hardly any Jewish-related entries at all. *Nash Shliakh* positioned itself as a daily democratic unaffiliated newspaper, thus, distancing itself from the political forces fighting at this period and concentrating more on the cultural and academic life in Kamianets Podilsky. Its special focus was on the academic life of the National University of Kamianets Podilsky founded during the Hetmanate period and blossoming in 1919-1920 under the Directory. *Nash Shliakh* had some items on developments in Palestine in 1920 and on celebration of the

results of the San Remo conference, which by giving the Mandate for Palestine to the British basically confirmed the Balfour Declaration¹¹⁹, but it had no regular Jewish column.

However, in 1920, when Kamianets Podilsky lost the status of the Directory's "capital", *Ukraina* also underwent a transformation, becoming shorter in size (2 pages instead of 4) and losing its focus on the Army operations, apparently because there had been a change in the publishing center, with the Army Staff substituted by the Information Bureau. There was also a change in the editorial team: Mykhailo Kovenko, who performed the functions of the editor-in-chief throughout 1919, left for Romania. This shift of the publishing location and Petliura's Army Staff losing grip on the content of the newspaper coincided with the drastic decrease of the Jewish representation in *Ukraina*. The column "From the Life of the Jewry" was almost entirely absent in *Ukraina* issues of 1920 with only a few somewhat detached items and short commentaries on the Jewish situation. Interestingly, Zosa Szajkowski, who published a "rebuttal" of Hunczak's reappraisal of Symon Petliura's role in the pogroms, claims that Kovenko was "a notorious pogrom-monger... removed [from the position of the head of the commissions investigating the pogroms] at the insistence of both the Jewish and non-Jewish socialist parties".¹²⁰ However, the author does not support this claim by any reference to a reliable source or even citation. Moreover, judging from the content of the newspaper that Kovenko was editing, it seems highly improbable that such a person would participate in a pogrom while articles in his publication constantly condemn the pogroms and speak in favor of the Jewish population. Jewish authors contributing to *Ukraina*, edited by Kovenko, would have hardly been willing to contribute to the daily, run by an anti-Semite.

¹¹⁹ *Nash Shliakh*, issues 93-94, May 14-15, 1920, pp. 4.

¹²⁰ Zosa Szajkowski, "'A Reappraisal of Symon Petliura and Ukrainian-Jewish Relations, 1917-1921': A Rebuttal," *Jewish Social Studies* 31, 3 (Jul., 1969): 198, accessed May 20, 2013, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4466502>.

Another interesting parallel can be drawn between *Ukraïna* and *Robitnycha Hazeta* (“Workers’ Newspaper”), the daily published by the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers’ Party from 1917 to 1920. In a manner somewhat similar to that of *Ukraïna*, the editorial staff of *Robitnycha Hazeta* had to move from one city to another together with the governmental institutions due to constant changes in the territories controlled by the Ukrainian nationalist forces. There is even more similarity between these two newspapers due to the fact that both of them reflected more or less the dominant or elite discourses since Social Democrats constituted the core political group in the Directory. However, unlike *Ukraïna*, which was edited and published by the Army Staff, *Robitnycha Hazeta* was the printed organ of the party. *Robitnycha Hazeta* also featured a number of entries on Jewish topics. With the editorial team’s arrival to Kamianets Podilsky there is even an instance of a news item being titled “From the Life of the Jewry”¹²¹, which once again points to the significance of Kamianets Podilsky and its special place in mapping the destinies of Jews in this period.

As for the general layout of the newspaper, the front page was usually allotted to the Army reports, news from the frontline, and articles dealing with burning issues. The second page featured more articles on current problems, as well as literary pieces, both prose and poetry. The rest of the issue was normally dedicated to various pieces of news from other Ukrainian cities and regions and from abroad (section “Radio and Telegrams) and news items of the local level, with the last, fourth page also containing some advertisements. In 1919 “From the Life of the Jewry” was as a rule located on the third or fourth page of the newspaper, but Jewish topics were sometimes covered in other sections as well. The title of the column also deserves special attention. For instance, in the first issue of *Ukraïna* published on August 9, 1919, the column “From the Life of the Jewry” is followed by

¹²¹ *Robitnycha Hazeta*, issue 483, August 27, 1919, p. 2.

“From the Local Life”, or “From the Life of the Locals” (“*Z mistsevoho zhyttia*”), which sets these two categories, “Jewry” and “locals”, apart. On the one hand, it may be a positive development that Jewry is singled out as a category of population, whose life and activities deserved particular coverage, which means interest and attention. On the other hand, it may also indicate that Jews were still perceived as substantially different, even separate from the rest of the population, from the locals seen as native, of Jews perceived as the “other”.

Some articles of the Jews-related content even appeared on the front pages. Interestingly, a considerable percentage of the editorial staff seems to have been Jewish, since some of the issues had a note that due to the Jewish holidays, the newspaper had to come out in a shorter version, which was half its regular size, 2 pages instead of 4, because some of the members of the publishing staff could not participate in the preparation of the issue. This deserves special attention if one considers that this newspaper was basically the platform for expressing the official position of the Directory and its Army and therefore – of Petliura. The fact that a supposedly large portion of the press staff was Jewish¹²² speaks for the favorable if not benevolent attitude to Jews. Thus, this newspaper is important not only due to the high level of representation of Jewish topics covered but also because of the high level of representation of Jews among the press staff. It may not necessarily be visible on the pages of the newspaper, but it becomes clear from the note on the Jewish holidays. Moreover, these were most probably not just Jews by last name, but more or less observant Jews, since they regarded Jewish holidays as important to keep.

¹²² The conclusion about the significant representation of the Jews among the editors and authors of *Ukraina* is made based on the following statements: “Due to the Jewish holidays, majority of Jewish members of the editorial team do not work and the newspapers for 4th and 5th October are issued in a shortened format” (*Ukraina*, issue 44, October 4, 1919, p. 1), “Because majority of the members of the editorial team are Jews who celebrate [the Jewish holidays], the newspaper is issued in a shortened format” (*Ukraina*, issue 54, October 17, 1919, p. 1.).

4.2. “From the Life of the Jewry”

The column, however, as pointed out by the editorial staff in one of the newspaper issues, was run by a particular author, namely S. Zolotarenko.¹²³ First appearance of Zolotarenko as the author of the column “From the Life of the Jewry” can be noted in the very first issue of *Ukraïna*, while two other similar sections (“From the Local Life” and “Academic Life”) had no authors indicated. There is no information provided on the pages of the newspaper about who Zolotarenko is. What becomes clear from the articles he contributed to the newspaper, though, is that this person is most probably a Jew since he seems to be extraordinarily knowledgeable in diverse areas of Jewish life, or, as put by the editorial team, “well-informed in Jewish affairs”.¹²⁴ Moreover, the articles written by Zolotarenko seem to hint at an obvious supporter of the Poalei Zion, since in a number of written items he criticized or even vehemently opposed Zionism proper but defended the position of the Poalei Zion¹²⁵, largely for the reason that the Zionists gave priority to the “struggle for the establishment of a national home in Palestine”¹²⁶ over the local autonomy. It is important to note that Zolotarenko did not only write on Jewish subjects, but also dealt with the general topics, his written pieces manifesting his profound interest in contemporary political and social life as well as in the dilemmas of the Ukrainian Revolution.

In his article “The Way to Mutual Understanding” (“*Shliakh do porozuminnia*”), published on the front page of the very first issue of *Ukraïna*, Zolotarenko states that “[m]any mistakes have been made during the two years of revolution by the leaders of the Ukrainian national movement in the cause of building mutual understanding with the non-Ukrainian intelligentsia, particularly with the Jewish one”.¹²⁷ The first major mistake, as Zolotarenko declares, is suspicion and lack of trust on the Ukrainians’ behalf with regard to

¹²³ *Ukraïna*, 29, September 16, 1919, p. 2.

¹²⁴ *Ukraïna*, 7, August 16, 1919, p. 3.

¹²⁵ *Ukraïna*, 29, September 16, 1919, p. 1-2.

¹²⁶ Goldman, *Zionism under Soviet Rule*, 10.

¹²⁷ *Ukraïna*, 1, August 9, 1919, p. 1.

Jews and their participation in the process of Ukrainian state-building. The other mistake is equating Jews with the anti-Ukrainian movement – Bolshevism. According to Zolotarenko, these mistakes and wrong preconceptions prevented Ukrainian leaders from realizing the potential of Ukrainian-Jewish cooperation during the revolutionary turmoil. Zolotarenko sees this suspicion, directed in the Ukrainian state at all national minorities, as the red line running through all Ukrainian attitudes. However, he emphasizes, though this kind of attitude may be justifiable towards Russians and Poles, since they have their own states and could hardly be willing to contribute to the Ukrainian struggle for self-determination, Jews as a stateless nation should have been trusted because they would be interested in the majority's (Ukrainians') support and approval: "The Jews, in contrast, have no state of their own and therefore have to strive for the mutual understanding with majority, have to find the common ground with the Ukrainian people"¹²⁸.

Thus, the author of "From the Life of the Jewry" emphasizes the need for compromise between Ukrainians and Jews as well as the Jews' interest in building such a compromise. According to Zolotarenko, this is the reason why Jewish socialists' attitude towards national-personal autonomy was such a serious "phenomenon not characteristic of either Russians or Poles"¹²⁹. In other words, he singles out Jews as the obvious and most suitable partners of Ukrainians in building a state. Moreover, he presents Jewish activism as exceptional and emphasizes that "that very law about the national-personal autonomy was developed exclusively by the Ministry of Jewish Affairs, so other 'minorities' received the rights as a rather unexpected gift".¹³⁰

As already mentioned, Zolotarenko opposes equation of Jews and Bolshevism, stating that there has not been anything anti-Ukrainian in Jewish vision of socialism, Jewish socialists having nothing against an independent Ukrainian state. The solution suggested by

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

the author is in leaving the so-called tsarist legacy of discriminatory treatment of Jews behind and consequently “in the... involvement of the Jewish intelligentsia in our administrative apparatus”¹³¹ of the Ukrainian People’s Republic. This, according to Zolotarenko, would prevent the Jewish population from being “terrorized by the failing representatives of the local administrative authorities, which are in absolute disagreement with the policies of the center or even do harm on purpose”.¹³²

Upon pointing out the mistakes of the Ukrainian national leadership, Zolotarenko admits the guilt on the Jewish side as well: “During the two years of revolution there have been many instances of making the same mistake by the Jewish democratic forces – their policy “It is no concern of mine” [*Moya khata z kraiui*]. This policy should be changed once and for all”.¹³³ Thus, the author acknowledges certain aloofness of the Jewish political forces from the cause of the Ukrainian state-building.

In the research process the enigma of Zolotarenko’s evident interest and concerned attitude to Jews in the articles he presented in *Ukraina* was resolved, because “Zolotarenko” turned out to be the pseudonym used by Solomon Goldelman, one of the most prominent Jewish leaders in the Ukrainian Revolution 1917-1920, holding ministerial positions during both the Central Council and Directory periods. First of all, it became practically certain that “Zolotarenko” was a pseudonym, when I realized I could not locate this name in any other records of that time, while it would be hard to imagine that the author so knowledgeable and conversant in many aspects of political life could have avoided publishing somewhere else. Secondly, there is an obvious connection in the names – “Zolotarenko” and “Goldelman”, both having the same root – “gold” (“zoloto” in Ukrainian and Russian). Furthermore, Zolotarenko never revealed his first name, indicating only “S.”, which coincides with the first letter of Goldelman’s first name, Solomon. Finally, as it has already been discussed,

¹³¹ *Ukraina*, 1, August 9, 1919, p. 2.

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ Ibid.

Zolotarenko indubitably supported the Poalei Zion, one of the leaders of which was Goldelman, so their rhetorics perfectly match¹³⁴.

The question is then why Goldelman chose to publish his articles in *Ukraïna* under such a Ukrainian-sounding pseudonym. Importantly, he also avoids open identification with the Jewish party in his articles as if wishing to pass for a Ukrainian – saying, “we” when referring to Ukrainians: “Again *we* were not able to distinguish Jewish Bolsheviks from Russian ones...”¹³⁵, “the step towards this [mutual understanding] *we* see in the increased involvement of the Jewish intelligentsia in *our* administrative apparatus”¹³⁶, “On the way to full mutual understanding with Jews, this will be on *our* behalf the first effective real step”¹³⁷? Thus, he in fact claims to be speaking for Ukrainians. Would it mean that the articles signed by a Jewish author would not get such attention and respectful treatment? Was it intended as a declaration, with which Ukrainians could identify themselves in their attitude to Jews? This leaves space for guessing, but it seems to be in accord with Goldelman’s use of the Ukrainian-like pseudonym.

The editorial team of *Ukraïna* refers to him as Zolotarenko only, without revealing the author’s true identity. Interestingly, Khrystiuk in his *Notes and Materials concerning the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1920* cites Zolotarenko, stating that it is a pseudonym of a Jewish socialist, also without explicitly stating that it was Solomon Goldelman.¹³⁸ Furthermore, the author of “From the Life of the Jewry” published his articles using the pseudonym Zolotarenko even when writing on some general political and economic problems, like in issues 4 and 5 of *Ukraïna*, – “Dictatorship or democracy?” In these pieces Goldelman criticized the Bolsheviks for being similar to tsarist Russia in its “class”

¹³⁴ Initially, the idea of identifying Zolotarenko with Goldelman emerged after my conversation with some of the professors from History Department of the Kamianets Podilsky State University.

¹³⁵ *Ukraïna*, 1, August 9, 1919, p. 1.

¹³⁶ *Ukraïna*, 1, August 9, 1919, p. 2.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*

¹³⁸ Khrystiuk, *Notes and Materials*, 169.

treatment of the power and authorities and blames them for destroying the economic potential of the region by their military assaults and anarchic influence. Importantly, there is no hint of anything Jewish, anything that could have revealed that the author was a Jew in these articles. Goldelman`s name, however, appears on the pages of *Ukraina* when it comes to the Poalei Zion issues. For instance, in issue 17, Goldelman (as the Head of the Guberniya Committee) was listed as one of the contact persons for the organization of the Poalei Zion conference.¹³⁹ The fact that Goldelman was also the Minister of Labour may serve as an example of one of the ways to mutual understanding suggested by him under the name of Zolotarenko in the first issue of the newspaper – that of attracting Jewish cadres to the Ukrainian administrative bodies.

4.3. Other *Ukraina* voices on Jewish subjects

These questions are also directly related to whether Spyrydon Cherkasenko, a Ukrainian writer, who in issue 3 of *Ukraina* replied to Zolotarenko`s piece on the complexities of Ukrainian-Jewish cooperation in revolutionary times, “The Way to Mutual Understanding”, knew that Zolotarenko was in fact Solomon Goldelman, a prominent Jewish leader and a government minister. Cherkasenko and his “Roundabout Ways vs an Easy Road” (“*Manivtsi i prostyi shliakh*”) stand in opposition to Goldelman`s article. It is worth noting that Cherkasenko, who had quite a number of pen names, using which he published his articles and literary pieces in *Ukraina* and elsewhere, signed his real name under his response to Zolotarenko (Goldelman). When replying to an attack on one of his articles by an anonymous author, published in another periodical, *Trudova Hromada* (“Labour Community”), Cherkasenko distanced himself from the party leaders, pointing out to the breach between these leaders “adopting resolutions” and the masses of people,

¹³⁹ *Ukraina*, 17, August 30, 1919, p. 4.

between ‘talking shops’ and real needs and concerns of Ukrainians.¹⁴⁰ Therefore, opinion he expressed in *Ukraina* would stand for many things popular and Ukrainian, first of all in his attitude to Jews.

Thus, being unaffiliated with any party, he is, nevertheless, a conscious carrier of anti-Jewish suspicion and, knowing that, he seems to be convinced that he is right. In his response to Zolotarenko, he stresses that mutual understanding should be built not only between respective democracies (political forces) of both Ukrainians and Jews, but first and foremost between the broad masses of Ukrainian and Jewish people. Cherkasenko’s demands for the Jews echo what is known as traditional *quid pro quo* demands for Jewish emancipation – Jews’ serving in the army and Jews’ changing their economic activities – only then, according to Cherkasenko, the problem of misunderstanding and hostility towards Jews will be resolved. The measures to be taken by the Jews are to stand against usury, to help improve the currency rates, to help with the articles of trade the people are in need of, and in military defense of the region: thus, “Ukrainians will feel sincere support in action and Cossacks will see how for an independent Ukrainian People’s Republic the blood of their brothers, Jews, is shed”.¹⁴¹ According to Cherkasenko, this is a simple road to mutual understanding, unlike “the roundabout ways” suggested by Zolotarenko (Goldelman).

Thus, this Ukrainian author does not deny the fact that hostility towards Jews exists among ordinary people. Importantly, Cherkasenko was not known as an anti-Semite, but he seems to be against unreserved and unconditional readiness to cooperate with the Jews: “I do not belong to that expansive part of our citizenry, which assumes the possibility of cooperation without any second thought, just on the basis of a few expressions of sympathy on the part of the party, which has been so hostile not so long ago”.¹⁴² His attack on Zolotarenko’s (Goldelman’s) reflections about the state of mutual understanding between

¹⁴⁰ *Ukraina*, 14, August 26, 1919, p. 3.

¹⁴¹ *Ukraina*, 3, August 12, 1919, p. 4.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*

Ukrainians and Jews speaks for the fact that by his entry Goldelman touched the sensitive nerve. Moreover, Cherkasenko questioned the potency of Jews` support of the Ukrainian cause, referring to Russian-Jewish (even if only alleged) allying as the “wounds burning like fire”¹⁴³ and suggesting that Ukrainian national movement`s democratic focus on guaranteeing the rights of minorities may have been the reason why Ukrainians had to leave Kyiv so many times, that is since their attentions were dispersed in the attempt to be ‘good to everyone’.

Furthermore, Cherkasenko seems to be irritated by Zolotarenko`s disapproval of the behavior of Ukrainian national leaders and does not express any doubt as to the pogroms being instigated by other forces, for example, Denikin`s army. For him, the fact that Jews are suspected and mistrusted is reasonable and to accept Jews in the administrative apparatus without suspicion is a delusion of a way to mutual understanding. Additionally, he did not see any merit in the Jewish parties trying to be responsive and supportive in their attitude to Ukrainians and their state building, because “that would have been a surprise if minorities would have refused to cooperate, which is to work for their own benefit”.¹⁴⁴ It is important to emphasize that the editorial team left an explanatory note on Cherkasenko`s response to Zolotarenko (Goldelman), probably sensing significant polemics between the lines and the danger of being too categorical in such issues. The editors stated that Cherkasenko`s response to Zolotarenko (Goldelman) was published according to the principle *Audiatur et altera pars*, which in a way distanced the editorial staff from the particular points of view expressed, which speaks in favor of a democratic character of this newspaper (neither of the authors was banned or attacked, they were allowed to voice their views on the Jewish Question).

¹⁴³ *Ukraïna*, 3, August 12, 1919, p. 4.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

4.4. *Ukraïna* on the position of the Jewish population in Ukraine

The same issue of *Ukraïna* features the column “From the Life of the Jewry” presenting an overview of the current state of the Jewish affairs on the territory of Ukraine. One of the important points covered is an attempt at providing an explanation for the pogroms:

For two years there has been the storm of the Civil War, for two years there has been the Bolshevik bacchanalia – all these excited the most base instincts of the masses. People have grown wild and all this caused not only a general state anarchy, but also pogroms, anti-Jewish acts. Anarchy is on the rise along with the pogroms.¹⁴⁵

Writing about the pogroms, Zolotarenko (Goldelman) contrasts Ukrainians with the “Polish imperialist bourgeoisie” and the “Red Communist Army”, who, according to the author, were the true instigators of the pogroms.¹⁴⁶ This article is an example of how “[i]n this seeming ‘war of all against all’”¹⁴⁷, Ukrainians were portrayed in *Ukraïna* as the Jews’ most benevolent allies.

Ukraïna’s “From the Life of the Jewry” features a significant number of pieces confirming Jews’ support of the Directory, the national-personal autonomy, and the Ministry of Jewish Affairs. Thus, issue 15 presents an account of the meeting of Proskuriv Jewish Community, expressing loyalty to the existing government, while issue 20 emphasizes agreement and mutual understanding between Ukrainian and Jewish ‘democracies’ and Ukrainian government’s support of the Jewish socialist parties, the Poalei Zion in particular.¹⁴⁸

Though in general the newspaper may tend to present an idealized version of the portrayal of the Jewish-Ukrainian agreement at this period, at least at the level of parties and official authorities, the tensions which existed between the socialist Jewish parties and the

¹⁴⁵ *Ukraïna*, 3, August 12, 1919, p. 4.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Zvi Gitelman, *A Century of Ambivalence: the Jews of Russia and the Soviet Union, 1881 to the Present* (New York: Schocken Books, 1988), 89.

¹⁴⁸ *Ukraïna*, 15, August 27, 1919, p. 4; 20, September 3, 1919, p. 4.

Zionists could not have gone without a significant impact on the relations between the Ukrainian Social Democrats and the Zionists. Moreover, since the Directory, like the Central Council, gave noticeable preference to the socialist forces within the Jewish political camp, the Zionists could not but feel disappointed.

Interestingly, though the Poalei Zion was a socialist Zionist party, Goldelman sometimes openly criticized Zionists in his articles. Thus, in “On Jewish Mutual Relations” (“*Pro zhydivs`ki vzaiemovidnosyny*”) Zolotarenko (Goldelman) develops extensive criticism of Zionists, blaming them for employing the idea of Palestine with the purpose of distracting Jewish masses from building the national-personal autonomy ‘here and now’, as well as for insisting on using Hebrew instead of Yiddish. Goldelman portrays Jewish political forces as divided along two main lines: “one line – everything for people, for the working masses, with the ideal of the national center in Palestine being viewed as the way to drastically improve the state the people are in; the other line – Palestine – first and foremost, everything is for Palestine”.¹⁴⁹ Calling for unity of the Jewish forces, he maintains that the Zionists create additional tension within the Jewish camp, complicating the situation, which is already problematic for Jews in the light of the pogroms and the Bolshevik threat. Goldelman, who stood firmly on the position of cooperating with the Ukrainian national forces, challenged the breach existing between Jewish parties of opposing orientations. It is worth noting, that this criticism of the Zionists by Goldelman is peculiar to *Ukraina*, as in his *Zhydivs`ka natsional`na avtonomiia na Ukraïni (1917-1920)* (*Jewish National Autonomy in Ukraine (1917-1920)*) it is much milder.

The fact that Goldelman`s articles, which attack Zionism proper, are published by *Ukraina* speaks for the publishing authorities` silent approval of the author`s point of view

¹⁴⁹ *Ukraina*, 13, August 24, 1919, p. 4

and attitude. Can it mean open contradictions between the Zionists and the Directory? It may definitely serve as a sign of some tensions existing between these two political forces.

The speech given by the leader of Kamianets Podilsky's Zionists, Altman, at the meeting of Kamianets Jewish Community, attests to such disappointment in spite of the attempts of both Jewish and Ukrainian leaders to ignore that: "it would be a mistake to think that national-personal autonomy has been realized in life. In fact we have a party autonomy, not the national autonomy".¹⁵⁰ Altman claims, that none of the Ministers of the Jewish Ministry – Zilberfarb, Revutskyi, or Krasnyi – could be considered as true representatives of Jewish masses, because the Jewish affairs should have been delegated to the elected, not appointed body of power. Since the Zionists tended to get the majority of votes at this period, which signaled their popularity, in this way they hoped to take the seats at the governmental institutions. Altman's most bitter critique of the current Jewish minister was directed at Krasnyi's support of Yiddish schools seen as "a matter of principle". This piece of news containing criticism of the governmental policies with regard to the Jewish autonomy issues was followed by the defensive note by the editorial team stating that Zilberfarb was supported by at least four Jewish parties as well as pointing at the achievements of the ministers decried by Altman: "all the laws that serve as the basis for the existence of the Jewish communities including that of Kamianets were promulgated during the ministries of Zilberfarb, Revutskyi, and Krasnyi".¹⁵¹ On the whole, the Zionists do not feature too often in the column "From the Life of the Jewry" of *Ukraina*. Instead, the focus is, as it has already been pointed out, on the socialist parties: "taking into account that the Ministry of Jewish Affairs gathers around it all the Jewish democracy and relies exclusively

¹⁵⁰ *Ukraina*, 12, August 23, 1919, p. 4.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

on democracy, the organizations of the Bund and the United Jewish Socialists of Proskuriv entirely support the Ministry of Jewish Affairs in its current state”.¹⁵²

Next to the news items and articles-reflections on the problems of Ukrainian state-building, a large portion of the newspaper is allocated for creative writing pieces, often occupying central parts of the newspaper, a rather surprising fact for a daily published by the Army Staff. Most of the fiction-pieces dwell on patriotic topics or the issues related to the complicated political struggle happening on the Ukrainian territories – these are either poems or short stories, sometimes short drama pieces. Interestingly, though the content related to Ukrainian issues prevails, a large part of issue 16 of August 28, 1919 is devoted to a short story about a Jew, titled “About a Little Jew Tailor” (*Pro zhydka kravchyka*). This is a sad story about the young Jewish family, who hoped for the improvement of their status and general acceptance by the society as a result of revolutionary changes. In the light of these optimistic hopes they decide to have a second child, but while the Jew-tailor’s young wife is giving a birth to a baby, a pogrom starts. The family tries to hide from the stones flying into the window, but in the end the whole house is destroyed by the fire, and the whole family, including a new-born child, perishes.

The author, Stepan Vasyl’chenko (real name – Stepan Panasenko), a Ukrainian writer, put the story about the “little Jew Morchyk, the poor tailor” in a row of “bloody legends of our days”.¹⁵³ It is worth noting that there is nothing in the way Vasylchenko writes about the Jews that would indicate identification of the Jews with the Bolsheviks as well as no sign of a stereotypical Jewish depiction. In fact, one can see quite the opposite since the Jews are portrayed as poor and helpless, as distinctly separated even spatially, living in a separate quarter: “Out of twilight, there appeared a god-forsaken Jewish quarter,

¹⁵² *Ukraina*, 15, August 27, 1919, p. 4.

¹⁵³ *Ukraina*, 16, August 28, 1919, p. 2.

which seemed in the darkness hopelessly sad, destitute, and dirty”.¹⁵⁴ The story’s protagonist, Avrum Morchyk, is not an exploiter, as a stereotype holds it, but a hardworking Jew, with eyes red from daily tailoring. His tragedy is in the frustrated belief in the ability of the new times to bring freedom and brotherhood that would make him and his family equal to the people surrounding them: “From now on there will be freedom in the village, everyone will be at ease and full of joy”.¹⁵⁵ However, the realities of the changes that happened refuted Avrum Morchyk’s hopes, his mother pronouncing the verdict full of disappointment and bitterness: “Have you ever been recognized as a human being?.. You have been like a servant and your children will be foreigners’ slaves too!”¹⁵⁶

A simple and sympathetic portrayal of a Jew (already obvious in the affectionate diminutive *zhydok* as opposed to *zhyd*¹⁵⁷, *kravchyk* as opposed to *kravets*`) signifies the author’s sympathy toward Jews. Moreover, Vasylichenko seems to fully recognize the guilt of the crowd, the so-called “savages”, who attacked the Jewish quarter and set it on fire. Importantly, he does not specify or even hint at who that crowd consisted of – whether they were the Bolsheviks, Ukrainian nationalists, or the Whites – the point is that these were those, who failed to bring freedom and brotherhood to the Jewish quarter. One can only speculate how much this piece of fiction was meant to say about the pogroms that were perpetrated under the Directory’s rule (especially since a large scale pogrom wave took place earlier that year, in February-March 1919), but it can certainly be seen as criticism of the failure of the revolution to drastically improve position of the Jews with regard to safety. One may attempt to attribute the publication of such piece to the fact that *Ukraina* was a democratic publication, but one should keep in mind that these literary pieces occupied quite a large portion of the newspaper’s space and thus could not have been published

¹⁵⁴ *Ukraina*, 16, August 28, 1919, p. 2.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ *Zhydok* can also be (and was widely) used at that time as a derogatory form, but coupled with *kravchyk*, in this case it creates an affectionate impression.

without proper consideration. Since such a critique on the achievements of the revolution was not dismissed by the editorial team, it means that the Staff had probably approved of its content.¹⁵⁸

4.5. *Ukraina* and the pogroms

It is peculiar how the newspaper mentioned pogroms and anti-Jewish violence in the territory of Ukraine without employing the word ‘Antisemitism’. One of the rare instances in which the term appears is the news item of the section “Radio and Telegrams” of issue 7 specifically reading “Antisemitism in Hungary”. The case described involved the population’s protest against the Jewish presence in the institutions of higher education, when students of the technical school in Budapest “turned to the rector to demand the removal of all the Jewish students, because they could not sit in one room with the Jews”.¹⁵⁹ The use of the term for this specific case could be explained partly by the fact that this particular piece of news was imported from the other information source. The other reason is that antisemitism as based on racist theories or biological approach was not in fact potent in Ukraine. Instead, there were general anti-Jewish sentiments, more grounded in socio-economic conditions than ethnic conflict.¹⁶⁰

Moreover, in *Ukraina* Symon Petliura promulgated his condemnations of the pogroms taking place in the Ukrainian lands.¹⁶¹ In these statements against pogrom-makers, the leader of the Directory did not try to explicitly deny the presence of antisemitic attitudes

¹⁵⁸ There is an article, published in Kamianets Podilsky newspaper *Podolianyn*, in which the author, Oleg Budzei, claims that this story was written by Vasyl’chenko at an order of Petliura himself, with the purpose of combating pogroms in the Directory’s Army. However, *Podolianyn* is not an academic journal, so the author does not provide any specific references, though he indicates that this information comes from the memoirs of Borys Antonenko-Davydovych, who allegedly recorded what Vasyl’chenko himself told him (please see Budzei, Oleg, “Pro bidnoho ievreia zamovte slovo...” (“Say a Word for a Poor Jew...”), in *Podolianyn*, July 26, 2002, p. 5, <http://h.ua/story/75035/>).

¹⁵⁹ *Ukraina*, 7, August 16, 1919, p. 2.

¹⁶⁰ Pohrebinska, “Modern Methodological Approach,” 216-219; Samartsev, “Jews in Ukraine,” 28; Khrystiuk, *Notes and Materials*, 164; Kleiner, *From Nationalism to Universalism*, 20-21.

¹⁶¹ For more about Petliura’s stance against pogroms, consult Volodymyr Serhiichuk, *Symon Petliura i ievreistvo (Symon Petliura and Jewry)*, 2nd ed. (Kyiv: PP Serhiichuk M.I., 2006).

among the population, but the aim of his address was to deny Ukrainian national leaders' purposeful participation or approval of the pogroms. According to Petliura's statements and proclamations, it was true that Ukrainian troops engaged in the pogroms, but it was only the result of the Bolsheviks' provocations:

By provocation, for the sake of which they spare no effort, they want to divide us from within, bribing the criminal elements that incite our Cossacks to various calamities and pogroms directed at innocent Jewish population and wanting to use this to label our knights, bringing liberation to all peoples on the territory of Ukraine, as pogrom-makers.¹⁶²

Here the Chief Otaman of Ukrainian forces emphasizes that the pogroms were a valuable tool in the Bolsheviks' hands in discrediting Ukrainian nationalists.

The underlying slogan for a number of *Ukraina* issues is "Down with pogrom-makers", while the headline runs as follows: "Disgrace to Denikin's pogrom-makers!".¹⁶³ Importantly, when talking about Denikin and his pogroms, Ukrainians as victims are in some cases placed in one row with Jews: "[in Kyiv under Denikin] everything Ukrainian and Jewish is locked, closed, prohibited".¹⁶⁴ Both Denikin's armed forces and the Bolsheviks are identified as a threatening force for both Ukrainian national movement and Jews – as "chernosotentsi and chervonosotentsi" ("Black Hundreds and Red Hundreds").¹⁶⁵ Petliura's appeal to his troops in issue 21 (Army Order 131) deserves particular attention because it is located on the front page of the newspaper even preceding the usual Army reports, typed in larger characters, specifically accentuating the names of the Jewish socialist parties, including the Poalei Zion.

In the Directory's *Ukraina* one also finds the rhetoric of putting the blame for the pogroms on the legacy of the tsarist regime as well as its supporters in the face of the Bolshevik threat, the Whites: "Denikin's soldiers together with the local gangs of the Black

¹⁶² *Ukraina*, 19, September 2, 1919, p. 4.

¹⁶³ *Ukraina*, 64, October 29, 1919, p. 3.

¹⁶⁴ *Ukraina*, 64, October 29, 1919, p. 1.

¹⁶⁵ *Ukraina*, 21, September 4, 1919, p. 1.

Hundreds... organized the pogrom of the Jews in Kyiv in the way it used to be done under the rule of Nicholas II... On the whole, the attitude of Denikin and his authorities to Jews is inhuman”.¹⁶⁶ Building on the idea of continuity between the tsarist Russia and the White Army in their treatment of Jews, this news item contrasts their treatment of Jews with the stance taken by the Directory. An attempt to dissociate Ukrainian national authorities from the instances of the mass anti-Jewish violence is also made in the article on the pogrom in Fastiv on September 22, 1919, which states that “the pogrom *was perpetrated* by some separate units”¹⁶⁷, without mentioning nationality or political affiliation of the perpetrators.

This use of passive voice in cases when the pogroms were supposedly carried out by the forces affiliated with the Directory (“outrages, which *are* in some places *perpetrated* by some detachments of our troops”¹⁶⁸) and the use of active voice when Denikin’s and the Red Army’s anti-Jewish atrocities (“Jewish pogroms, which the Red Army soldiers *organize*”¹⁶⁹, “Volunteers’ [Denikin’s] Army *carried out* a monstrous Jewish pogrom in Nizhyn”¹⁷⁰) are reported are indicative of an attempt to obscure the problematic side of the Directory’s rule and its inability to control all of its military subjects.

There was an instance of the outburst of anti-Jewish feeling even in the newspaper itself, which involved the common identification of Jews with the Bolsheviks (featuring as “Moscovite-Jewish democracy”¹⁷¹) in the article on the front page of issue 34 of *Ukraina*. However, this case did not seem to go unpunished because, as claimed by Khrystiuk, this was the reason why the daily was “brought to criminal liability”.¹⁷² Thus, anti-Jewish sentiments were fought with by the officials.

¹⁶⁶ *Ukraina*, 23, September 6, 1919, p. 2.

¹⁶⁷ *Ukraina*, 48, October 9, 1919, p. 3.

¹⁶⁸ *Ukraina*, 12, August 23, 1919, p. 3.

¹⁶⁹ *Ukraina*, 17, August 30, 1919, p. 4.

¹⁷⁰ *Ukraina*, 36, September 24, 1919, p. 2.

¹⁷¹ *Ukraina*, 34, September 21, 1919, p. 1.

¹⁷² Khrystiuk, *Notes and Materials*, 165; there is no additional information available for this case, details are yet to be investigated.

To conclude, judging from the fact that Army Staff's *Ukraina* featured a large quantity of published items dealing with various aspects of Jewish life, the underlying idea is that Petliura's government and official authorities were favorable to Jews and Jewish communities – ready and willing to ally with the Jews, supporting their initiatives, concentrating more on common points than on disagreements. Even though we certainly cannot take information from *Ukraina* for granted and the articles on Jews were not always written in an exclusively positive tone (it is enough to recollect Cherkasenko's response to Zolotarenko), the mere fact of such a wide representation and presence of everything Jewish in the periodical edited and published by the Army Staff of the leader of Ukrainian national government in the then capital of the Ukrainian People's Republic loudly pronounces for the government's support and approval of the Jews and their participation in the life of a new-born Ukrainian national state.

One can try to argue that it was largely due to the Jews' active participation in the cultural life that they were so well represented in the newspaper, but the example of *Nash Shliakh* points out to the weakness of this argument. Though there were many Jews at the National University and there was even an attempt of establishing the chair of Jewish literature and history,¹⁷³ the newspaper reflecting the milestones of the academic life of the National University featured much less Jewish content than would have been expected.

Therefore, the role of Petliura's editorial staff in popularizing Jewish topics in the environment of Ukrainian revolution should not be underestimated. Though the separateness of the column "From the Life of the Jewry" pointed out to the borderline between Jews as "other" and Ukrainians as "us", the mental models created by the articles themselves were mostly oriented at producing the image of a Jew as an ally (the image evoking trust) and a victim suffering unjustly (the image exciting sympathy). In the long run, such mental

¹⁷³ Zavalniuk, "Jewish community," 33-34.

models could have had a positive effect on the general perceptions of the Jews by Ukrainians. However, most probably the readership of the newspaper was quite limited and the period of its publication was too short, so these sympathetic to Jews views could not have been successfully instilled.

CONCLUSIONS

The task that I have taken on was not to whitewash Symon Petliura and the period of the Directory, which was indeed extremely controversial and tragic for both Jews and Ukrainians, but, based on the documents that have not been looked at in detail, to reconsider the stereotypic view of the Ukrainian national leaders as “by-and-large ferociously anti-Semitic”¹⁷⁴, the statement, still made at the beginning of the twenty-first century after so many studies have already been completed to prove the debatability of guilt, if not innocence of the Ukrainian national leaders with regard to state-orchestrated antisemitism.

The Jews-related content published in *Ukraina* throughout 1919 and partially in 1920 presents illuminating evidence of the effort that the government of the Ukrainian People`s Republic put into improving the attitudes towards the Jews. Taken in their entirety, articles and news items on Jewish topics, as well as the mere fact of their continuous presence on the pages of an official publication of the Army, testify to the officials` sympathetic stance with regard to the Jewish population and their intention to instill such views into the readers of the newspaper.

Abramson`s statement that Petliura`s declarations and proclamations against pogroms were “intended for foreign consumption”¹⁷⁵ with the purpose of winning sympathies of the West does not seem potent, because Petliura`s and the Directory`s statements against pogroms were issued not only in August, but many of them came out in the spring, before *Ukraina* was published. Moreover, anti-pogrom appeals were not the only items with Jewish content that *Ukraina* featured, even though it was only intended for the Ukrainian-speaking audience. If Petliura`s and the Directory`s stance were anti-Semitic, the newspaper would at the least be silent on Jewish issues. This, however, was not the case,

¹⁷⁴ Chapin and Weinstock, *The Road From Letichev*, vol. 1, 4.

¹⁷⁵ Henry Abramson, “Jewish Representation,” 549.

since not only was it not neutral, but, judging from its content, it was almost openly favorable, even though it was not intended for the eyes of a Western (European or American) reader. Thus, *Ukraina* as a source helps to go beyond what is traditionally known about Petliura and the Directory (official proclamations and statements) and see them in a different light. It is not surprising that Abramson could suggest that anti-pogrom statements were only made for the purpose of impressing an outsider since these were usually the main materials examined by the scholars since the period of Schwartzbard's trial, when all the focus was on the pogroms. *Ukraina* allows to see different aspects of both governmental policies and Jewish life in this period from the side of the reader of the official Directory's press.

The relatively peaceful period of the Directory's stay in Kamianets Podilsky (June-end of October 1919) and "a progressive Jewish-Ukrainian *rapprochement*"¹⁷⁶ (as opposed to the "progressive alienation") demonstrated that under the relatively peaceful conditions relations between Ukrainians and Jews could have been rebuilt in the direction of cooperation and mutual understanding.¹⁷⁷ Goldelman, who contributed to the Army Staff's *Ukraina* during Kamianets period of the Directory, highlights that the government and troops of the UNR were at first met with suspicion and fear by the local Jewish population, but their attitude shifted to the positive side of the spectrum as a consequence of the Directory's policies and treatment of the Jewish Question.¹⁷⁸ Throughout 1919 *Ukraina* persistently emphasized instances of growing Ukrainian-Jewish cooperation.

The position of the Directory and of Petliura himself seemed to be more than favorable to the Jews of Ukraine as exemplified by the Directory's active cooperation with the Jewish community of Kamianets Podilsky and by the obvious philosemitic stance that the official Army Staff's newspaper took on the Jewish Question, emphasizing the need for

¹⁷⁶ Hunczak, "A Reappraisal of Symon Petliura," 180.

¹⁷⁷ Khrystiuk, *Notes and Materials*, 170.

¹⁷⁸ Goldelman, *Jewish National Autonomy*, 128-133.

Ukrainian-Jewish cooperation and the work done by the Directory and its state institutions with the purpose of combating the anti-Jewish violence. It is noteworthy that a special column dedicated to news from the life of the Jewry was created in *Ukraina* only for the Jewish community and there were no such newspaper entries for Russian or Polish minorities. Thus, only Jewish topics were covered in such detail and with such attention that deserves particular consideration.

Coming back to the media discourse analysis and using Tudor Parfitt's terms, in *Ukraina* Jewish-Ukrainian representations are more about "symbiosis" and "dialogue" (or at least an attempt of a dialogue) than "antagonism"¹⁷⁹, which in a way confirms Petrovsky-Shtern's argument about the existence of a Ukrainian-Jewish identity. Interestingly, in the case of *Ukraina* the place of the "other" is allocated to Russians and Poles, while the representation of the Jew seems often to have an ambiguous character, which means that though the Jew is portrayed as separate and distinct from the Ukrainian, there is no categorical antagonism implied between them.

Since editing and publishing *Ukraina* as an official periodical of the Army Staff were in hands of the elite, and the intelligentsia in particular, the newspaper expressed the so-called elite line and position, which was not necessarily supported by the wide masses of population. While the pogroms were condemned by the representatives of the political elite active in the Ukrainian Revolution, the masses often opted for a different path. As emphasized for the case of Ukraine by Andrew Lamis, "although the intelligentsia and the peasants held the same hopes for social liberty and for a free Ukraine, they always pursued their goals not together, but separately".¹⁸⁰ Curious in this regard is the case of Cherkasenko, who being the representative of the intellectual elite, was most probably the

¹⁷⁹ Parfitt, "Introduction," 5.

¹⁸⁰ Andrew P. Lamis, "Some Observations on the Ukrainian National Movement and the Ukrainian Revolution, 1917-1921," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2, 4 (Dec., 1978): 530, accessed May 20, 2013, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41035807>.

spokesman for the larger masses of Ukrainian people when he expressed his distrust towards the Jews. Belonging to the intelligentsia, Cherkasenko opposed himself to the political elite, as one who could reflect on the actions taken. This opposition that Cherkasenko himself stresses is important for understanding the kind of relations that existed between the political elite of the Ukrainian Republic and the people, which can also contribute to comprehending how such devastating pogroms could happen at the same time and in the most shocking proximity to the government that pursued one of the most philosemitic policies.

To understand how this could happen, it is necessary to stress once again that an important peculiarity of the Directory was its inability to control a fixed territory for a somewhat definite period of time. This created administrative problems, with only relative stability in cities and towns, but almost total anarchy in the countryside, best “characterized as a Ukrainian civil war, for ethnic Ukrainians serving in the Directory’s, Bolshevik, and White armies were killing each other for the victory of their respective vision of “Ukraine”.¹⁸¹ As articulated by Lozovyi, because of the constant relocation and changes of authority, the peasantry often found itself in the “information vacuum”,¹⁸² i.e. without sufficient information on the state-building processes going on in the territory of Ukraine. *Ukraina*, which could have been called for to combat such a lack of information, was distributed on the limited territory – the fact that diminished its impact as well.

A similar gap in mutual understanding and agreement can also be found within the body of Ukrainian Jewry, which is largely dwelt upon by Henry Abramson, who emphasized the breach existing not only between the Jews and the Ukrainians, but within the Jewish camp as well. A notorious example of the tragic results of this breach leading to the lack of cooperation was the inability of the Jewish parties to effectively respond to the

¹⁸¹ Yekelchuk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation*, 79.

¹⁸² Lozovyi, “Documents,” 152.

Ukrainian government's suggestion of creating self-defense units for preventing the pogroms, the idea supported by Petliura as the Commander of the Military but rejected by the Jewish parties, particularly the Bund,¹⁸³ who after the promulgation of the Fourth Universal tried to stay aloof from the Ukrainian government's politics. This, as pointed out by Abramson, was the manifestation of "the gulf between the highly westernized, secularized, and acculturated Jews active in political life and the average *shtetl* dwellers who were the opposite of these things".¹⁸⁴ Thus, even between the Jewish political forces themselves there was no unity and no agreement not only as to the specific program and social and political orientation of the Jewish people, but even with regard to such a basic issue as the language of the national education. The choice between Yiddish and Hebrew became the stumbling block in the process of building the system of Jewish education at the time of the Ukrainian Revolution. In other words, both Ukrainian and Jewish people were far from their elites in understanding many issues pertaining to the pogroms and their organizers.

It is important to mention that not only Jews suffered from the Army and *otamans*, but Ukrainian peasants as well. Some of *Ukraïna* articles point to this similarity of the destinies of two peoples, caught in the storm of the Civil War. Not only Jews, but, as illustrated by Lozovyi, Ukrainian peasants also expressed dissatisfaction with the Directory because of its troops participating in requisitions of property and products, while peasants had expected *petliurivtsi* to be better than the Bolsheviks.¹⁸⁵ In other words, in the anarchic state of events, looting and robbing was not only directed at Jews. This made peasants yearn for the strong authority, which could guarantee an end to the war and defend their lives and property. Similar reasoning might have led the Jews to the Bolshevik camp.

¹⁸³ Abramson, *A Prayer for the Government*, 83.

¹⁸⁴ Abramson, "Jewish Representation," 546.

¹⁸⁵ Lozovyi, "Documents," 154.

Ironically, the newspaper's use of the 'glorious pages' of Ukrainian national history and historical emblems and symbols for the purpose of fostering Ukrainian national identity with the goal of promoting Ukrainian national consciousness and thus defending an independent national state contributed to the anti-Jewish sentiments, already shared as well as easily disseminated among the population. For example, the use of the image of the Cossack, so often invoked by Petliura even in his anti-pogrom proclamations, had, unfortunately, anti-Jewish implications, bringing back the memories of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi's Uprising and Jewish massacres of the seventeenth century. Therefore, on the one hand, this contributed to the Ukrainian cause, awakening national memories and pride, but, on the other hand, added to harmful sentiments that continued to divide Jews and Ukrainians. Moreover, such Jew-hatred is still a significant part of the image of a Ukrainian Cossack in Jewish historiography.

In conclusion, this is how in the whirl of the revolutionary events and under the conditions of the Civil War this Ukrainian-Jewish *rapprochement* and symbiosis on the political level came to an end together with an attempt to build a Ukrainian independent republic, the task which was fulfilled only later, by the end of the twentieth century. This end was sealed by the events that followed and further polarized Ukrainian-Jewish relations, with the attempts to foster symbiosis and cooperation being buried by the history of mutual blames, yet to be re-discovered and unearthed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Periodicals

Ukraïna (Kamianets Podilsky, 1919-1920)

Robitnycha Hazeta (Kyiv, Vinnytsia, Rivne, Kamianets Podilsky, 1919-1920)

Nash Shliakh (Kamianets Podilsky, 1919-1920)

Published Documents and Memoirs

Goldelman, Solomon. *Zhydivs`ka natsional`na avtonomiia na Ukraïni (1917-1920) (Jewish National Autonomy in Ukraine (1917-1920))*. Munich: Dniprowa Chwyla, 1967.

Khrystiuk, Pavlo. *Zamitky i materialy do istorii Ukraïns`koï revoliutsii 1917-1920 (Notes and Materials concerning the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1920)*. Vol. 4. Vienna, 1922.

Mazepa, Isaak. *Ukraïna v ohni i buri revoliutsii (Ukraine in blaze and storm of the revolution)*, 3 vols. Prometei Publishers, 1950.

Pigido, Fiodor, ed. *Material Concerning Ukrainian-Jewish Relations during the Years of Revolution (1917-1921)*. Munich: Ukrainian Information Bureau, 1956.

Verstyuk et al., ed. *Dyrektoriia, Rada Narodnykh Ministriv Ukraïns`koï Narodnoi Respubliky 1918-1920. Materialy i dokumenty u 2 tomakh (Directory, Council of National Ministers of the Ukrainian National Republic 1918-1920. Documents and Materials in 2 volumes)*. Kyiv: Olena Teliha Publishers, 2006.

Secondary Sources

Abramson, Henry. "Historiography on the Jews and the Ukrainian Revolution." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 15, 2 (Winter 1990): 33-46.

———. "Jewish Representation in the Independent Ukrainian Governments of 1917-1920." *Slavic Review* 50, 3 (Autumn, 1991): 542-550. Accessed May 20, 2013. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2499851>.

———. *A Prayer for the Government: Jews and Ukrainians in Revolutionary Times, 1917-1920*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha. "The Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic." In *The Ukraine, 1917-1921: A Study in Revolution*, edited by Taras Hunczak, 82-103. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977.

- Borys, Jurij. "Political Parties in the Ukraine." In *The Ukraine, 1917-1921: A Study in Revolution*, edited by Taras Hunczak, 128-158. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- Bykovsky, Lev. *Solomon I. Goldelman: A Portrait of a Politician and Educator (1885-1974): A Chapter in Ukrainian-Jewish relations*. Edited by Lubomyr R. Wynar. New York, Toronto, Muenchen: Ukrainian Historical Association, 1980.
- Chapin, David A., and Ben Weinstock. *The Road from Letichev: The History and Culture of a Forgotten Jewish Community in Eastern Europe*, 2 vols. iUniverse, 2000.
- Dijk, Teun A. van. "Discourse and Racism." In *The Blackwell Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, edited by David Goldberg and John Solomos, 145-159. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- . "Elite Discourse and the Reproduction of Racism." In *Hate Speech*, edited by R. K. Slayden and D. Slayden, 1-27. Newbury Park: Sage, 1995.
- . "Structures of News in the Press." In *Discourse and Communication*, edited by Teun A. van Dijk, 69-93. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1985.
- Frankel, Jonathan. "The Dilemmas of Jewish National Autonomism: the Case of Ukraine 1917-1920." In *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, edited by Howard Aster and Peter J. Potichnyj, 263-279. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1990.
- Gitelman, Zvi. *A Century of Ambivalence: the Jews of Russia and the Soviet Union, 1881 to the Present*. New York: Schocken Books, 1988.
- Goldman, Guido G. *Zionism under Soviet Rule, 1917-1928*. New York: Herzl Press, 1960.
- Hall, Stuart. "Introduction." In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, edited by Stuart Hall, 1-11. London: Sage Publications, 1997.
- Honigsman, Y.S., and A.Y. Naiman. "Evrei Ukrainy" ("Jews of Ukraine"). In *Kratkii ocherk istorii (A Short Overview of History)*, edited by F.Y. Gorovskii, vol.1. Kyiv: NMK VO, 1993.
- Hryhorchuk, P.S., and V.P. Volovyk. "Kam'ianets`ka doba Ukraïns`koï revolutsii" ("The Kamianets period of the Ukrainian Revolution"). In *Materialy X-oï Podil`s`koï istoryko-kraieznavchoï konferentsii (Materials of the Tenth Conference on History and Regional Studies of Podillia)*, edited by I.S. Vynokur et al., 372-384. Kamianets Podilsky, 2000.
- Huba, P.I. "Presia iak dzherelo vyvchennia istorii natsional`no-demokratychnoï revoliutsii v Ukraïni (1917-1920)" ("Press as a Source for Researching History of the National Democratic Revolution in Ukraine (1917-1920)"). *Ukraïns`kyi istorychnyi zhurnal (Ukrainian Historical Journal)* 4 (1999): 29-40.
- Hunczak, Taras. "A Reappraisal of Symon Petliura and Ukrainian-Jewish Relations, 1917-1921." *Jewish Social Studies* 31, 3 (Jul., 1969): 163-183. Accessed January 12, 2013. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4466501>.

- . *Symon Petliura and the Jews: A Reappraisal*. Ukrainian Historical Association, 2008.
- Kleiner, Israel. *From Nationalism to Universalism: Vladimir (Ze'ev) Zhabotinsky and the Ukrainian Question*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1999.
- Kohut, Zenon E. "The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the Image of Jews, and the Shaping of Ukrainian Historical Memory." *Gezeirot Ta'h: Jews. Cossacks, Poles and Peasants in 1648 Ukraine* 17, 2 (2003): 141-163.
- Kryskov, A. "Uryad UNR na zakhysti ievreiv" ("The Government of the Ukrainian People's Republic in Defense of Jews"). In *Materialy IX-oï Podil's'koï istoryko-kraieznavchoï konferentsii (Materials of the Ninth Conference on History and Regional Studies of Podillia)*, edited by I.S. Vynokur et al., 271-275. Kamianets Podilsky, 1995.
- Kukh, O.M. "Vykladannia iudaïky ta oriientalistyky u Kam'ianets'-Podil's'komu Derzhavnomu Ukraïns'komu Universyteti (1918-1921)" ("Teaching Jewish and Oriental Studies at Kamianets Podilsky State Ukrainian University (1918-1921)"). In *Osvita, nauka i kul'tura na Podilli. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' (Education, Science, and Culture. A Collection of Scholarly Articles)*, edited by O.M. Zavalniuk, vol. 11, 32-36. Kamianets Podilsky, 2008.
- Lamis, Andrew P. "Some Observations on the Ukrainian National Movement and the Ukrainian Revolution, 1917-1921." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2, 4 (Dec., 1978): 525-531. Accessed May 20, 2013. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41035807>.
- Lozovyi, Vitalii. "Dokumenty Tsentral'noho Derzhavnoho Arkhivu Vyshchych Orhaniv Vlady ta Upravlinnia Ukraïny iak dzherelo do vyvchennia stavlennia selianstva do vlady Dyrektorii UNR u period ii perebuvannia na Podilli (1919-1920)" ("Documents of the Central State Archive of Supreme Bodies of Government and Administration of Ukraine as a source for understanding the attitudes of peasantry towards the Directory during its Podillia period (1919-1920)"). In *Osvita, nauka i kul'tura na Podilli. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' (Education, Science, and Culture. A Collection of Scholarly Articles)*, edited by O.M. Zavalniuk, vol. 10, 150-159. Kamianets Podilsky, 2007.
- . *Vnutrishnia ta zovnishnia polityka Dyrektorii Ukraïns'koï Narodnoï Respubliky (Kam'ianets'ka doba) (Domestic and Foreign Policies of the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic (Kam'ianets' Period))*. Kamianets Podilsky: Aksioma, 2005.
- Mark, Rudolf A. "Social Questions and National Revolution: The Ukrainian National Republic in 1919-1920." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14, 1/2 (Jun., 1990): 113-131. Accessed February 11, 2013. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036358>.
- Minc, Mattiyahu. "Kiev Zionists and the Ukrainian National Movement." In *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, edited by Howard Aster and Peter J. Potichnyj, 247-261. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1990.
- Nesterenko, V.A. "Pol's'ka ta ievreis'ka natsional'na osvita na Podilli v period Ukraïns'koï national'no-demokratychnoi revoliutsii 1917-1920 rokiv" ("Polish and Jewish National Education in the region of Podillia at the period of Ukrainian national-

- democratic revolution of 1917-1920"). In *Osvita, nauka i kul'tura na Podilli. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats` (Education, Science, and Culture. A Collection of Scholarly Articles)*, edited by O.M. Zavalniuk, vol. 9, 190-202. Kamianets Podilsky, 2007.
- Parfitt, Tudor. "Introduction." In *Jews, Muslims, and Mass Media: Mediating the 'Other'*, edited by Tudor Parfitt and Yulia Egorova, 1-11. London, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005.
- Petrovsky-Shtern, Yohanan. *The Anti-Imperial Choice: The Making of the Ukrainian Jew*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Pohrebinska, Irina. "Modern Methodological Approach to the Issues of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations (Late 19th and Early 20th Century)." In *Jews in Ukraine: History, Culture, Traditions*, edited by I.F. Kuras, 209-226. Kiev, 1997.
- Rabinovitch, Simon. "Russian Jewry goes to the Polls: an Analysis of Jewish Voting in the All-Russian Constituent Assembly Elections of 1917." *East European Jewish Affairs* 39, 2 (2009): 205-225. Accessed January 12, 2013. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13501670903016316>
- Rudyi, Hryhoriy. "Periodyka Ukraïny iak ob'ïekt dzhhereloznavchoho doslidzhennia ukraïns`koï kul'tury (1917-1920)" ("Ukrainian periodicals as an object of source-study of Ukrainian culture (1917-1920)"). (Manuscript of PhD diss.), Kyiv: The Institute of Ukrainian archeography and source-study named by Grushevsky, NSA (National Science Academy), 2004.
- Samartsev, Igor. "Ievreï v Ukraïni na pochatok XX st." ("Jews in Ukraine at the Beginning of the 20th Century"). *Ukraïns`kyi istorychnyi zhurnal (Ukrainian Historical Journal)* 4 (1994): 19-29.
- Serhiichuk, Volodymyr. *Symon Petliura i ievreïstvo (Symon Petliura and Jewry)*. 2nd ed. Kyiv: PP Serhiichuk M.I., 2006.
- Soldatenko, V.F. "Ukraïns`ka revoliutsiia doby Tsentral`noi Rady: analiz dosvidu periodyzatsii" ("Ukrainian Revolution of the Central Council Period: Analysis of Periodization Experience"). *Ukraïns`kyi istorychnyi zhurnal (Ukrainian Historical Journal)* 3 (1997): 3-25.
- Stanislawski, Michael. *Zionism and the Fin de Siècle: Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism from Nordau to Jabotinsky*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Suchkova, Olena. "Istoriia ievreïv Ukraïny v 1920-30-i roky u vitchyznianiï istoriografii" ("History of the Jews of Ukraine in 1920-30s in Ukrainian Historiography"). In *Problemy Kholokosta v Ukraine (Problems of the Holocaust in Ukraine)*, vol. 1, 13-14. Zaporozh'e: Premier, 2002.
- Szajkowski, Zosa. "'A Reappraisal of Symon Petliura and Ukrainian-Jewish Relations, 1917-1921': A Rebuttal". *Jewish Social Studies* 31, 3 (Jul., 1969): 184-213. Accessed May 20, 2013. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4466502>.
- Teliachyi, I. V. "Ukraïns`ki uriady i rozbudova kul'turno-osvitn`oi sfery na Podilli za Dyrektorii UNR (1919-1920)" ("Ukrainian governments and the development of the

cultural-educational sphere in Podillia during the Directory period (1919-1920)"). In *Osvita, nauka i kul'tura na Podilli. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats` (Education, Science, and Culture. A Collection of Scholarly Articles)*, edited by O.M. Zavalniuk, vol. 10, 135-142. Kamianets Podilsky, 2007.

Yekelchuk, Serhii. *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Zavalniuk, O.M. "Ievreis'ka hromada i Kam`ianets'-Podil's'kyi derzhavnyi universytet" ("Jewish community and the Kamianets Podilsky State University"). In *Naukovi pratsi KPDPU, istorychni nauky (Scholarly Works of Kamianets Podilsky State Pedagogical University, History)*, vol. 5 (7), 338-344. Kamianets Podilsky, 2001.