

**JEWS IN RUSSIA
AND
IN THE USSR**

Contents

Bibliography	2
Preface	3
The Jews	21
Jews in the Land of Kiev Russia and the Moscow State	25
The First Jews in Russia	45
The Further Growth Rate of the Jews in Russia	49
Politics of the Russian Government With Regard to the Jewish Question.....	51
How Jewish Capital Was Created in Russia	91
The Social Structure of Russian Jewry	93
Jewish Participation and Their Role in the Cultural Life of Russia	97
Jews in Russian Literature and Criticism	117
Jews — Russian Lawyers	121
Russian Jewry at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century	127
The Bailis Affair	141
The Jewish Question from February to October 1917.....	149
Jews in USSR	175
Personal-National Autonomy (State within a State).....	239
Organization of Land Use (Jewish national districts and regions.).....	253
Thirty-Year Total.....	263
The War Years.....	275
The Post-War Period (1946-1966).....	287
The State of Israel and the Problem of Double Citizenship	297
Supplement I.....	311
Supplement II	313
Epilogue.....	331

Bibliography

No bibliography is featured because of the extensive excerpts in the text; authorship, publication dates, and locations for the various books, journals, and articles with precise data make a bibliography far too long.

There is no point in enumerating hundreds of sources; the volume of this book would be greatly increased, yet without creating any substantial changes.

Preface

As the title of this sketch implies, it is limited by time and territory. By limited times, I mean by those three periods when the Jewish ethnic group lived within the territory of the Russian State. The first period was Kiev Russia era; the second period, when Western and Southwestern Russia was under the power of Poland; the third, during the Russian Empire, renamed the USSR. It is limited by territory by the lands held by the Russian people, and created by the State of Russia as it existed then. Any other era or occurrences beyond aforementioned boundaries are of no significance to this sketch.

During the two thousand years of their sojourn, many different Jewish groups were dispersed throughout different countries, different nationalities, and different eras. Inevitably, wherever these sects resided, conflicts arose between the Jews and the different local populations. Ultimately the “Jewish Question” or “Judaophobia” developed, which from the middle of the Nineteenth Century came to be known as “anti-Semitism”. “Anti-Semitism” is not an entirely correct usage, as Semites include not only people of the Jewish faith; but today the word is used specifically in reference to anti-Jewish feeling, replacing the more exact terminology of “Judaophobia” which was used for centuries prior to the emergence of the former word. “Judaophobia” has a more precise meaning than “anti-Semitism”, designating negative, unfriendly feelings solely towards the Jewish people. “Judaophilia”, on the other hand, would indicate a proclivity and friendliness towards the Jews.

The causes of “Judaophobia” that existed in pre-Christian times, and which still exist now, are beyond the framework of this historical sketch, and therefore will not be the subject of examination here. Moreover, the existing opinions of different researchers concerning the cause of the well-known mutual repulsion of the Jews by non-Jews are diametrically opposed. Some claim the problem lies within the nations where Jewish people have resided and still do reside. Others look for the causes of “Judaophobia” within the Jews themselves. Spinoza aptly phrased it when he said, “They carry it with themselves”.

Throughout the centuries much has been written on the subject of “Judaophobia”, and its reaction towards the Jews. Much less, however,

has been written on the causes of “Judaephobia” despite the fact it is well-known that “Nothing occurs without cause”, (“Nihil sine causa” — N. S. C.). The volume and character of this sketch does not permit elaboration on the causes of these conflicts, however, bypass them silently is also impossible. It is therefore suggested that the reader become acquainted with the analysis of this question, dealt with in the second part of this book. The title of this analysis is, “Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World”, by Professor Solomon Lourie. In this discussion the author deals with the causes which used to promote and still do promote “Judaephobia” both before and after the death of Christ.

In the course of this account there is some indirect mention of the causes of discord in the Russian-Jewish relationship that can neither be denied nor ignored. This discord, or mutual distrust, and the subsequent repulsion of both parties by each other, began with the first appearance of the Jews in Russia. All three major branches of the Russian people, the Great Russians, the Malorussian-Ukrainians and the Byelorussians are implicated in this “Judaephobia”, but not without cause. This discord in its broadest sense existed not only between the Russians and the Jewish ethnic group but also between the entire population of the USSR and the Jews, throughout the country.

This discord and mutual mistrust and the subsequent repulsion of the Jews by the entire population of the USSR is labeled “anti-Semitism”. The initiative in this discrimination is cast upon the whole non-Jewish population of Russia, the Jewish people falling heir by default to the sole of the silent and abused sufferers. Everyone else is to blame, but the Jews themselves are always assumed to be in the right.

No serious researcher can agree with stereotyped suffering on the part of the Jews, with no one to blame but the various native populations with which they became associated. Yet there is scarcely anyone who would try to establish the causes for this, as had been done by Solomon Lourie in his research. The majority chooses to remain silent about the true causes of these conflicts, preferring to let the quilt lie with the non-Jews, and therefore, examines only the consequences, the outward manifestation which is labeled “anti-Semitism”.

“The timid and double-faced” Jews and non-Jews recommend that the causes be ignored, for fear that these talks of discrimination and

defamation on the grounds of race and color only strengthen the spread of mutual prejudice, and therefore, do nothing to clarify the true historical issues.

This statement was made by the former secretary of the All Russian Constituent Assembly, Mark Vishniak, in his essay, "International Convention Against Anti-Semitism", published in the anthology entitled "Jewish World", (p. 98, New York 1939).

Vishniak himself was the initiator of this convention; however, he does not specify in any part of his work, how to understand this "anti-Semitism" in proper perspective. It is possible that he is incapable of understanding that there exists a basic difference between Jewish and non-Jewish races which goes far beyond race and color of the skin, and can be defined as "something else"?

This basic difference had been formulated thirty years before Mark Vishniak raised this question on an international scale, by Professor Solomon Lourie who said the "inner aspect" is that which distinguishes all Jews from non-Jews, regardless of skin color, hair color or any other trait related to their origin. It is this "something else", this "inner aspect" that explains the present conflict between the Jews, the Semites, and the Arabs (a fact that cannot be explained if one accepts Mark Vishniak's theories on the subject). Everyone knows that these races are of basically the same origin. In what then do they differ? Is it not in this "inner aspect"? It is this very thing that alerts the Jews and non-Jews, including the Russians, to a state of mutual distrust. Full frankness does not exist between the Russians and Jews, and this was aptly phrased by Solomon Schwartz, a noted author, when he said in his book "Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union" on p. 41, "that what a Russian would say to a Russian, he would not say to a Jew". This is very true, but alternatively, so is its converse: "what a Jew would say to a Jew he would not say to a Russian". He did not attempt to explain, however, the cause of this phenomenon. He felt the cause of this distrust needed no explanation.

The statements of the three Jewish writers quoted previously, who received their education in Russian universities and occupied notable positions in Russian cultural and political life, deserve special attention. Their statements are evidence themselves of this mutual distrust, a suspicion that

quite often overflowed into relations and created possible conditions for all kinds of conflicts.

This phenomenon is not specific to the Russian-Jewish interrelationship; in fact, the conflict between the Jews and the entire multiracial population of Russia-USSR existed for the whole period of time that the Jews resided upon Russian soil, or any other soil foreign to them.

Sometimes these mutually scornful and contemptuous relations between the Jews and the native population intensified and overflowed into pogroms, persecutions which had few limits in their intensity. Sometimes when a “thaw” in these pogroms occurred, the opportunity for material improvement and participation in political spheres of a country by the Jews arose. There were even times when the Jewish people ingratiated themselves with the rulers of these countries and conducted their own personal persecution upon the native peoples.

These persecutions were carried out upon the people who in the Jewish opinion were ill-disposed towards them. They carried out this extermination of the native people in the manner that is described in the Bible – “The Book of Esther”. History also testifies to incidents where the Jewish ethnic group exterminated even their own tribesmen whom they believed to be renegades, with the consent and co-operation of the ruler of the country involved. The Jews were able to convince the ruler that renegades who changed their Judaic beliefs for those of Roman gods did it for personal profit; therefore they could not be trusted, as they would just as easily betray the emperor (in this case Ptolemy) as they had betrayed Jehovah.

All these conflicts and hesitations in the interrelationship between the Jews and the native population were of local origin, without overstepping the boundaries of any one country. One country would expel them, another would let them in; one ruler would be kind to them, while others only “tolerated them”.

For this reason, the “Jewish Question” that arose in every country where the Jews resided had little importance in the life of a country or its people. They did not have great significance, since Jewish groups were scattered throughout different countries and never exceeded several hundred thousand in any country.

This, however, was not the case in Russia or the USSR. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the overwhelming majority of the world's Jewry lived within the boundaries of Russia-USSR, numbering more than 6 million. This huge sector of the world's Jewish population lived according to the law of their Judaic religion and isolated itself from the rest of the native population. This isolation was self-imposed, and not inflicted, compulsory ghetto living. It was a time however, when the Jewish people in Russia were striving through all possible channels to participate in all the spheres of the country's life, an endeavor in which they became quite successful.

At the beginning of the Twentieth Century, Russian Jewry was the centre of the Jewish religion, and its people's conscience. This centre, which gave direction to the life and the activities of the entire Jewish Diaspora, created purely Jewish ideological currents and political parties consisting solely of Jewish members, and produced from their ranks political personalities who became leaders of all Jewry.

In the late 1920s, Russian Jewry had turned from the insignificant four-percent minority limited in its rights into ruling class capturing most of the ruling positions in all spheres of Russian life. The occurrence was something unheard of throughout the whole history of mankind: an unequalled historical precedent.

The final point deserving special attention is the reaction of the whole free world, its press, and its public opinion, towards the change in the social conditions of the Jews in Russia, at the end of the second decade of the Twentieth Century. The reaction towards the change that occurred thirty years later after the Second World War must also be considered.

In less than one year, after the fall of the Czarist Regime in Russia, the Jewish ethnic minority of foreign origin had become the ruling majority, an incident unparalleled in human history. It was then that world public opinion, the greater part of its press, and even social and political leaders of that time, ignored this change and remained silent. They remained silent about the fact that four Jews concluded the Brest-Litovsk peace in the name of Russia, that all Russia's representatives on the League of Nations were also Jews, and that many of the leading political and social leaders of Russia were Jewish. Only a small number of uninfluential foreign press bodies saw and printed the truth about the exceptional change in the Jewish situation in Russia, and then only seldom and in a timid fashion.

The émigré press of the “Right” orientation wrote of the change but this was of little avail for few people listened to or read these articles. The reason for this was that these émigré newspapers were groundlessly labeled as anti-Semitic and reactionary. The émigré periodical issues of so-called “democratic” orientation were all in the hands of the Russian-Jewish immigrants who wrote about anything but the Jewish domination in Russian political spheres. Only the individual representatives within the “democratic” camp of the Russian immigrants, who were watching the events in Russia, dared to touch upon the “Jewish Question” as it existed in the USSR. The well-known political activist, Mrs. E. Kuskova, and the equally famous leader and creator of the “Russian Peasant Party”, S. Maslov, expressed their opinion about this “ticklish question”, and pointed to the inversely proportional Jewish participation in the ruling class of Russia. These two outspoken activists claimed that this inversely proportional Jewish rule would create preconditions for Judaeophobia throughout the native population of Russia.

Other well-known activists, Mrs. A. Tyrkova-Williams, noted this change, and A. Stolypin, one of the leaders of the solidarists (N. T.S.), reported about the Jewish majority composition of the Russian delegation of the League of Nations in his book “Counterrevolution”, published in July 1937.

Their voice was heard by no one, and no one upheld their findings. The “ticklish question” dared not to be raised or discussed on the pages of the “democratic” émigré press.

There was an attempt on the part of a group of Jewish immigrants to raise the question on the pages of the press and at public meetings. At the beginning of the second decade of the Twentieth Century, an organization called “Patriotic Union of Russian Jews in Foreign Countries”, centered in Berlin, called for all Jews to disassociate themselves from the activities of their fellow tribesmen in the USSR, in view of the latter's excessive participation in the pursue of Red terror. This organization claimed, not without foundation, that the negative attitude of the Russian people towards the Jews was brought about by Jewish participation in Red terror, and that ultimately these anti-Semitic views would spread throughout the country and encompass all Jews in the USSR. But their voice was not taken into consideration. Instead, it was sharply criticized by the world's Jewry, and through the protest the “Patriotic Union of Russian Jews in Foreign Countries” was forced to break off its criticism. In essence these demands

for disassociation were quite limited. The Russian Jews and other Jews throughout the world were called upon to disassociate themselves only from those fellow tribesmen who actively took part in Red terror. But there was no mention of the numerous Jews who held many high ranking positions in Russian institutions. This infiltration could not have gone unnoticed. It is therefore necessary to assume that the authors of the appeal had no objection to the monopoly status of the Jews in all areas of Russian life except that of Red terror. But even this modest call provoked a burst of indignation in all immigrant Jews who felt that this question should not be raised in any form: it should be kept silent if it could neither be justified nor refuted.

The result of this was that the impenetrable curtain was drawn down for thirty years over the existence of Jewish domination in the USSR. This conspiracy, which no one dared to violate for fear of being labeled an “anti-Semite”, grew stronger. No one was prepared to accept the consequences of such a revelation.

After the Second World War everything changed radically. The “Jewish Question” in the USSR appeared on the pages of the world press and in the Russian émigré newspapers and journals, and then the expose began. But this expose preferred to ignore the truth and wrote of the oppression and persecution of the Russian Jews, much as had been done in 1917. The discrimination was underlined and the government of the USSR and its native population was openly accused of “cultural genocide” of a portion of its citizens, namely the Jews.

How serious and well-founded are these accusations? The reader will draw that conclusion for himself, after he has attentively read what is written in this sketch. These facts and events which are given are not disputed even by those who appear to be the accused. This is why here, in the preface, we will not preoccupy ourselves with the assertion of the real causes of the revival of the old pre-revolutionary accusations of Russia for its anti-Jewish politics.

The causes will be clearly ascertained by an attentive and objective examination of this “ticklish question”. These causes arise from Jewish dissatisfaction because of a gradual decline of the privileged position which they held for that thirty year period between the fall of Czarist Russia and the end of the Second World War.

In the atmosphere of the cold war, these accusations acquire special importance, overstepping the boundaries of one state and assuming an international character, thus creating the necessary preconditions for the hostile relations between Russia-USSR and the rest of the world. This hostile attitude is directed towards the country and people who supposedly committed overt “cultural genocide” and “discrimination” against the Jews.

In the last two decades (1947-1967), a great number of books and articles were written on this subject, and an endless number of meetings and protests took place emphasizing the “persecution of the Jews” in USSR.

Except for the rarest of cases, the Russian people and its present government are unconditionally condemned for this so-called “anti-Semitism”, the simplified label of repulsion and mistrust shown by any person towards an individual or group of individuals of Jewish origin. Many accept such condemnation without even considering the necessity of looking for its causes, or the feelings which promoted these occurrences. It is, however, well-known that nothing occurs without cause.

It would only be logical to expect that, having established the existence of these well-known feelings and occurrences and provoked by these very feelings, the accusers would also demand that the causes of this provocation be established. However, no one does this. The very thought that the cause of so-called “anti-Semitism”, should perhaps be sought within the Jews themselves and in their own distinction from all other nationalities and tribes, would be qualified as an anti-Semitic act against the very source of anti-Semitism. That is why this “ticklish” question remains unanswered.

As mentioned above, there were only few authors who attempted to touch upon this question, to justify or explain the age-old conflict between the Jews and the nations with whom they resided and still reside. One of the authors who dealt with this question is Professor Solomon Lourie, from whose work extensive excerpts are given in Part II of this book.

The second author who examined the question of the Jewish role in the life of those people among whom they lived is the well-known figure Jacob Klatskin, author of “Problems of Contemporary Jewry” published in Berlin in 1930. Examining the Jewish role in the cultural life of nations, participation in which is only possible on the basis of known assimilation,

that is, through language proficiency and ability to acquire the outer aspect of the environment, Jacob Klatskin writes the following:

"In the first stage of assimilation, they are harmful not only to their own Jewish people from whom they have not entirely become disassociated, but also to the people or nation of whom they want to be part in order to rule them. They often make quite dull the source of the culture that is alien to them, vulgarizing it, even though they may appear to penetrate its inner depths. In doing this they abuse the culture's foundation. For the most part, they remain only superficially a part of the culture or turn into malicious and destructive mockers. Their power lies in humiliation and irony. They indulge in self-glorification, self-loving philosophy, asserting themselves as know-it-alls, knowing about everything without deep penetration into the very essence..."

The Jewish assimilationists like to be considered cosmopolitan. They do not sense the mysterious power of the national genius, preferring to be intermediaries among versatile national cultures. They are bored with and despise organized society. They fail to comprehend ideas that are original and unique. They appear to know everything and are at home in any nation. They like to be considered radicals and the most forward of the forward thinkers. They like very well to play the rôle of nihilists, imitating those who would depreciate or destroy a society, possessing a type of bankruptcy of national possessions, unable to remain at peace, for they are merely torn-off pieces of the historical chain. Their idealism is thus easily made suspicious, for it is very easy for a people with no firm roots to be the apostles of freedom, and even to work against what is already free. Even their virtues carry a certain seal of evil. Despite this, if in a sense they are still connected with Jewry as a whole, then even then they do no good. They accommodate themselves, and find common ground among the alien elements. They are procurers of Jewry with the German culture, the French culture, and any other culture they seek to assimilate, and by this inflict damage to both sides and have a crippling rather than a healing effect on the nation concerned.

Thus the Jewish assimilationists become accountable not only to the Jewish people, but also to the people of the nation whose culture they seek to invade. They, in effect, sin before the national structure of the other's cultural entity, falsify its historical originality, its national soul, by means of the falsified Jewish apostasy. They are double falsifiers, for they erase the cultural boundaries, as all boundaries are erased in their souls.

Therefore the sacred duty of the people is to stand on guard for their national individuality.”

(p. 196-197 of the German edition)

Klatskin explains the above by saying that the Jews descended from the “spiritual elite”, highly developed intellectually, and rich in creative and destructive abilities, and that therefore they could not be assimilated like slaves, without a trace into another distinct culture.

His statements have something in common with those made by many authors, of both Jewish and non-Jewish nationality, who attempted to comprehend those quite exceptional Jewish abilities to preserve that integral quality of Jewishness under outward signs of complete assimilation.

This ability of preserving Judaic beliefs inevitably led to conflicts with the native populations. These conflicts became more perceptible as national feelings and the unity of the native people's conscience grew stronger.

In pre-revolutionary Russia, patriotism and feelings of national pride, due to the influence of liberal socialists and internationalist ideas, were in decline, especially among the intelligentsia and the youth: the older generation was losing its authority in the eyes of the young and more active generation.

Perhaps this account for the main reason why the Jewish ethnic group had actually become the ruling class in Russia with such ease by the end of the year 1917. It was this class that occupied the leading posts of all Russian institutions, and created the framework of the new power, without encountering proper opposition from the native population. The struggle with the new power had more an economic basis than a distinctly expressed unwillingness that foreigners be the rulers of their country. The Russian

people did not have strong national feelings at that time, and the new power began a ruthless struggle to eradicate any such feeling from the people's memory. They ordered the destruction of all the monuments of culture and all the things that make a people proud and are therefore carefully preserved. The Russian national elite were virtually destroyed, and what remained was intimidated and thus brought to silence.

As soon as this nationalism seemed to be destroyed, national pride and Russian patriotism grew from these roots and started their slow and sure movement towards the ultimate liquidation of the "inversely proportional" representation that was the ruling class from 1917 to the end of the Second World War.

This movement proceeded steadfastly without any excesses, pogroms, or violence whatsoever. To replace the destroyed cultural elite of pre-revolutionary Russia, a new young intelligentsia sprang up as the master of its own country and the lawful heir of its historical past, and laid its claim. No one dared to refuse this claim. This, however, meant loss of power, prestige, and that position which was monopolistically occupied by the Jewish group, a position they had occupied unopposed for a quarter of a century.

It would be no mistake if we state that this is precisely the cause of the campaign in the press throughout the world, which accuses the Russian people and its government of anti-Jewish activity. Until the end of the Forties, all was in order, and the world looked on silently as the Jews ruled Russia and represented it in all international affairs.

All those who studied the "Russian question" failed to mention that unique phenomenon of a country of two hundred million that was being monopolistically ruled by the representatives of the ethnic Jewish group consisting of only three million people. The rulers of Russia for this quarter century were a people alien to the native population in race, sense of justice and aspirations.

But, let us hope that this fact will not escape those, who, in the future, will devote themselves to the study of this question in a relaxed atmosphere, instead of a calculated cold war, in which the accusation of the Russian people of "Anti-Semitism" is used as one of the main trump in a propaganda war.

The task of those charged with this research will not be easy. Mountains of books, thousands of articles, and all other types of “evidence” about the “anti-Semitic” manifestations of the Russian people, and of the persecution of the Jews in Russia and the USSR, will be found by these researchers. They will find nothing or almost nothing that refutes these unfounded accusations. Few people have written refutations that objectively state the true nature and essence of the Russian-Jewish interrelationship, and the original causes that produced these accusations against the Russian people. Nothing will be found to elucidate the Russian position in this argument except in such works that explore this interrelationship from a religious or a mythical point of view. But even these religious texts obscure more than clarify the Russian-Jewish question.

Taking into consideration what has already been said, the conclusion is entrusted to what we, the contemporaries, ought to elucidate objectively in the interest of truth and historical justice. The truth about the Russian-Jewish interrelationship is systematically silenced, destroyed, or perverted.

The truth must be revealed not only to the future generation but also the present one. It is no secret what an enormous role the “Jewish Question” plays in the business of creating and sustaining anti-Russian feelings throughout the world. These anti-Russian feelings feed the cold war, creating a worldwide threat of eruption into a hot war which might end in worldwide catastrophe and the possible destruction of all mankind. This is why an objective elucidation of the Russian-Jewish interrelationship must be made.

Is it not the duty of us all, especially those who were born in Russia, regardless of race, religion, political convictions, or party affiliation, to elucidate this question? This is certainly the duty of all Russians as well as non-Russians, including the Russian Jews, who are better informed about what is taking place in USSR. But, alas, everyone remains silent, thus indirectly confirming the outrageous lies and propaganda that feeds anti-Russian feeling throughout the world.

There is one characteristic circumstance that deserves special attention in the analysis of this propaganda. The accused, in all these mortal sins against the Jews, is the Great Russian branch of the Russian people. Only this branch of the Russian population is accused of these “crimes”, excluding the Malorussian-Ukrainian branch, when it is well-known fact

that it was in the Ukraine that all the excesses took place which are the bases of the Judaeophobia. It must also be taken into consideration that, in the past as well as now, the Ukrainians occupied the highest positions in the country, and actively participated in conducting that type of politics which irresponsible propaganda labeled as "cultural genocide" in Warsaw of all relation to the Jews.

The absence of Ukrainians on the bench of the accused is not difficult to explain if the aim of those who accuse the Russian people of this "persecution" of the Jews is known. The aim is the liquidation of that united country created by the Russian people, now called the USSR. After this liquidation occurs, the aim is to create a whole range of sovereign states which includes the Ukraine.

The Ukrainian separatists strive towards this aim. They are allies of the forces that under the pretence of the struggle for freedom against Communism, seek to break up the alliance of the USSR. Their strongest plea to rest of the world is an appeal to save the Jews from a so-called "cultural genocide" being imposed by the USSR. The "cultural genocide" is nothing but a catchword, skillfully used in a propaganda campaign. The Russian people, the Russian Government, and Russian Communism are blamed for this "genocide", and always Russian as opposed to Jew is underlined and emphasized. This emphasis is deliberately and conscientiously employed as a literary-journalistic trick, in order to foster anti-Russian feeling throughout the world.

It is a point to remember, that little more than twenty years ago, the press of the world, especially that of the émigré Jews, wrote disapprovingly of the part the Ukrainians took in the destruction of the Jews by the Germans in the Second World War. Here is what we read in the "Jewish World", published in 1944, p. 235-236:

"A special rôle in their anti-Semitic campaign was reserved by the Germans for the Ukrainians. In the article devoted to the Ukrainian people, "Der Sturmer" has not only included the Ukrainians in the "North Dinarsk" racial type, but also made special effort to praise them for their anti-Semitic achievements of the past."

The newspaper mentioned with pleasure the destruction of four hundred thousand Jews during the Chmielnitsky uprising in 1648 and the seventy thousand Jews butchered by Petlura and other Ukrainian bands in 1918-1919. The article ended with the pronouncement of the “convinced hope that the Ukrainians would find themselves at their height, and therefore revenge themselves against the Jews.”

“All sixty newspapers published in the Ukrainian language, on Ukrainian territory occupied by the Germans, are conducting ruthless anti-Jewish persecution.”

On the eve of 1942, a meeting was held in Warsaw of all the former officers and soldiers, who fought in 1918-1919 in the ranks of the Petlura army. At this meeting, a vow was taken to help the Nazi Germans in the liquidation of the Soviet Power, and in the destruction of Jews. In May of 1966 in New York, the fraternization of the Zionists and the men of the Petlura occurred along an again with a joint vow to destroy “Russian Communism”, without referring to the Jews this time. The details of this fraternization were published in the Ukrainian weekly “Our Fatherland” in May 1966. The comparison of these two vows given by the Petlura men shows that they changed from Jewish destroyers into their allies in their common business of liquidating the united USSR, and therefore deserves special attention. While the Jews of the USSR occupied the ruling positions, the Jewry of the whole world upheld the unity of the USSR. When the Soviet Jewry ceased to be this, the union of these Jews with all kind of separatists striving to destroy the USSR's unit began. This took place because the Jewry of the entire world realized that they could never return to their ruling position in the USSR.

In the future, undoubtedly there will be some researchers, who will take up the question of this most stormy epoch. As for ourselves, the contemporaries of these events, we must draw attention to this most unusual phenomenon in every way possible.

* * *

I belong to the “departing” generation, that generation which received their “school-leaving certificate” before the First World War, and ripened during the years of completely exceptional economic and cultural uplift in Russia. This period between the first revolution of 1905 up to the fatal years of

1914, the beginning of the First World War, was a truly exceptional period. I am of that generation to whose lot it fell to be the witness and participant in the stormy events of the first half of the Twentieth Century. This generation not only heard or read about these events, but also saw and endured them. We saw the good and the bad, saw all that took place in reality, and not what is now presented by the many chroniclers, who hush up certain facts and expose others, and in so doing distort the historical truth.

I was born and grew up in the heart of the Malorussia-Ukraine, not too far from the former capital of Baturin. I received my education in Kiev, where, still in times of peace, I donned the cap with a blue band of a university student. After the First World War and during the subsequent years of “overturns and indignations”, I had a quite difficult time, but never ceased to observe events that took place.

As I spent all of my grown life in the Ukraine where more than half of the Russian Jews lived, my special attention was always attracted by the so-called “Jewish Question”, both before and after the revolution.

And now, after the Second World War, when this question ceased to be the internal problem of Russia, and became one of the basic factors of world politics with its innumerable perversions and distortions on the pages of the world press, I felt provoked into stating the truth as I know it. It became a matter of necessity that I give my modest contribution to truthful elucidation of the Russian-Jewish question. The distorted and perverted facts that the world press resented, provoked me into writing this far from complete but truthful sketch “Jews in Russia and in the USSR” which I humbly present to the reader’s attention.

This sketch is based on facts. In it are presented those facts which took place in the past. It is not propaganda which can be printed en masse in any language of the world, in relation to the “Jewish Question” in Russia and the USSR.

* * *

While I was working on this sketch, I read over hundreds of books, articles, essays, statements and investigations, made by many different authors in different languages. I read books written both by authors deemed “Judaephobes” or “anti-Semites” and those deemed “Judaephiles” who have diametrically opposed ideas, the latter being in greater abundance. I

read Jewish and non-Jewish texts, and I came to the conclusion that all attempts to solve or explain the “Jewish Question”, by all those who on the religious and mythical bases not only contribute to, but hinder the revelation of the truth to the whole world, make this truth almost impossible to find.

Neither the “Evil Forces” nor the “Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion”, invariably appearing in one author's work, or those recognized as the tribes destined for a special “paradise”, or as the “Chosen People”, in another author's work, help to clarify the nature and age-long mutual repulsions and conflicts. Moreover, both points of view ultimately lead to contradictions with Christian teachings on the one hand, and understanding of democracy in the broadest sense on the other.

A true believer in the Christian doctrine cannot refuse to recognize as an equal the Jew who has become a Christian. Although all the trappings of the Jew do not disappear immediately upon the acceptance of the Christian faith, namely, that inner aspect of a Jew that gives rise to the mutual repulsion between Jews and non-Jews, the true Christian accepts him unconditionally as his equal. In much the same way, the true democrat, proceeding from the viewpoint that all people are equal in all respect, cannot refuse to give equal political and cultural rights to the Jews. Nonetheless he sees that the Jews, enjoying all these rights, constantly preserve their originality, their Jewish point of view, and their sense of justice. It is these elements of separatism and preservation of their unique difference that do not always correspond with the surrounding environment, and this leads to mutual mistrust and repulsion. To eliminate these separatist ideas is to solve the “Jewish Question” which exists in spite of all the laws prohibiting discrimination, and all attempts to hush up the violations of such laws. How to achieve this end, how much time is required, and what measures must be taken undoubtedly cannot be solved by our generation, because the roots of the “Jewish Question” extend too deeply into our past.

Meanwhile we will be, as we were in the past, witnesses of the unsuccessful attempts to solve this painful and age-old question. The entire objection to so-called “anti-Semitism”, without concrete proposals to terminate this problem will come to nothing as they have in the past, and will in the future. Neither strict punishments of anti-Semites applied by the

government of the USSR, nor the constant silence of the free democratic world will help to solve this problem.

An objective study of this question will logically show three possible solutions:

- I. Total assimilation of the Jews with native people. This is only possible if the Jews reject their Hebrew religion and their racial and tribal distinction in favor of several generations of mixed marriages. However the very expression of such an idea is held as “anti-Semitic” and Jewry, believers and non-believers alike, rise up against such a solution.
- II. The creation of independent Jewish territorial units, sovereign and autonomous, within whose boundaries the Jewish nationality could live according to their own laws and develop their own culture. An example such as this, given by Birobidzhan, shows that the Jews looked upon such a solution as discrimination.
- III. The status of “foreigners” within a given state for the Jewish ethnic group. Such a status automatically deprives them of participation in the cultural life of the country in which they live, and of any possibility of political involvement and subsequent influence on its politics: a status totally unacceptable to the Jews, and they have failed to suggest a fourth possibility. The question remains unsolved, therefore, or to be more precise, hushed up.

We can hope that this question will be solved, once and for all, in the future, when time destroys the many biases age-old prejudices. Then hopefully after several generations of mixed marriage the “Jewish question” will disappear by itself. This will happen as soon as people realize that race and religion must not be inseparably linked.

* * *

In the vast literature dedicated to the “Jewish Question”, both from the “Judaephobian” and “Judaephilian” points of view, there appear invariably the indications of “Evil Forces”, “The Protocols of the Learned elders of Zion”, “Kabala”, “Satanism”, and other explanations of the Jewish question. As I do not have sufficient erudition to pass Judgment on this, I

therefore do not make any attempt to give an exhaustive answer, nor to expound it comprehensively and objectively in this sketch. I am limiting myself solely to the facts and events that took place.

If one proceeds from the viewpoint that external facts exert an enormous influence on the spiritual aspect of man, cultivating this or that virtue of his character, it seems to me that this question deserves serious thought, in an attempt to explain certain Jewish characteristics that hamper their amicable co-existence with other nationalities.

This question is scientifically developed in Solomon Lourie's book, "Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World", which answers many puzzling questions, and explains what at first sight seems mysterious and incomprehensible. An attentive and thoughtful reading of the excerpt from Lourie's book (which appears in the second part of this book) will explain and clarify much of what is attributed to "Evil Forces", "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion", "Kabala", "Satanism" and other such mythical explanations of this question.

All of what is found in the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion", a recipe for success in life in the environment of another nation, will be found by the reader in Solomon Lourie's book. In it the reader will also find an explanation of what motivates the Jews to this or that tactic in their struggle for success. This is characteristic of not only the individual Jew but also the entire Jewry.

With this I will end my somewhat protracted introduction, leaving it to the reader to make his own judgment on the verity and expediency of my account in this sketch.

The Jews

As stated in the Bible, which is the history of the Jewish people, the Jews are descendants of one family of semi-Asiatic, nomadic Semites who developed into a tribe of numerous nationalities, bound together by their unity of religion and origin.

Since they were scattered among other peoples for two thousand years, the Jews had no territory of their own. They used the language of those nations among whose people they lived, but nevertheless, they preserved their tribal unity by not mixing with other nationalities. They lived their own isolated life among these nations, adhering strictly to their religion, distinct from that of other nationalities, in that it is an inseparable part of their race and origin.

In addition, the Jewish religion teaches that the Jews are the "Chosen People", distinct from all other nationalities and tribes, and under the special protection of God. The Jews believe that they are the "Chosen People", a fact that elevates them in their own eyes, and contributes to their conscious awareness of their own superiority.

Owing to the peculiarities of their religion and the mode of life, the Jews always remained a foreign body in the countries in which they lived, in spite of the fact that they spoke its languages. They have forgotten the language of their ancestors, preserving it only in religious practices.

In whatever country or nation they lived, the Jews took an active part in its economic life. Their major sphere of activity was commerce, retail and wholesale trade, avoiding that part of the business activity which produced goods for consumption or supplied raw materials needed for such goods. Neither agriculture, nor cattle-breeding, nor pioneering in the development and cultivation of virgin lands attracted the Jews in the lands of dispersion.

The Jewish participation in cultural life of the people along whom they lived was quite insignificant up to the Eighteenth and Nineteenth centuries. The reason for this was the Christian and Jewish conflicts that arose from religious differences.

The Jews did not attempt to invite strangers to join their religion, because they could not accept them as equal members of their religious community.

In the exact point of the Jewish religion, one must be born a Jew; one cannot become a Jew simply by accepting the Jewish religion.

As its people were considered the "Chosen People", the Jews jealously guarded the purity of their race and strove towards self-isolation in their mode of life and their daily living, which naturally hindered their assimilation with the surrounding native population.

The character of the Jewish business activity predetermined the times of their appearances in different countries of the ancient world as well as in the countries formed after the decline of ancient civilizations. They appeared where known law and order and strong power existed, essentials without which trade and commerce is impossible.

It was during the epoch of Hellenic cultural supremacy that the Jews appeared in Ancient Greece. In the Roman Empire, they appeared also when the Romans conquered North Africa and Western Europe and established their law and order.

They came not with the legions, but after them, settling in what is now Spain, England, Germany and France. Almost immediately they began their trading and intermediary activities which were favorably welcomed by the great powers, giving the Jews the opportunity to live and enrich themselves.

The character of their business activities, and also the tribal and religious peculiarities of the Jews during the two thousand years in which they were dispersed, caused endless conflicts with the nationalities among which they lived in secluded detached communities. This was especially true after Christianity became the supreme religion in these countries. In addition to the motives and the causes of their domestic and economic rivalry a greater role began to be played by their religion.

As the results of these conflicts periodically sharpened on different grounds and by different causes, the whole history of the Jewish sojourn abounded in the description of different limitations, exploitations and pogroms, whose victims were the Jews of the Diaspora.

Analysis and meticulous studies of these conflicts and their causes do not enter into the order of this work, which is a limited study as the title indicates. The work covers only that historical period which extends from the time of the Jewish appearance within the borders of the Russian

Empire, when the Jewish ethnic group was either "the subjects of the Russian Judaic faith", until 1917 or "the citizens of USSR of the Jewish nationality", after 1917.

For those who are interested in this question, its causes and conflicts, I refer them to the book written by professor Solomon Lourie, "Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World", published in 1922 in Petrograd. Extensive excerpts from this book are featured in Part II of this work, as a separate supplement.

Jews in the Land of Kiev Russia and the Moscow State

Until the end of the Eighteenth Century, when numerous Jewish ethnic groups, as a result of certain historic events, became "subjects of the Russian Judaic faith", Russia did not have its so-called Jewish problem since there were no Jews. Before the Eighteenth Century Russian chroniclers scarcely referred to the Jews, or if they mentioned them, it was only casually in connection with other events, e. g., the pogrom in Kiev in the second half of the Eleventh Century that resulted in the murder of the duke, Andrey Bogolubsky in 1074, and was referred to as the "Judaizers" (Zhidovstvuyushchive).

In order to present a fuller account of these events, in this sketch, we pause for a short description.

Jews in Kiev

During the epoch in which Kiev Russia flourished and its might grew, a lively trade with the Byzantine Empire and the West was going on. Jews appeared as merchants and traders of Byzantine extraction from the Byzantine and Greek colonies of the Crimean Peninsula. They settled in Kiev, quickly got rich and resided in houses equal in richness and décor to the mansions of the wealthiest men, the boyars, who were in attendance on the Great Duke.

As the Great Dukes were frequently replaced, they did not show any hostility towards the Jews, and some even openly patronized them. An example of this was the Great Duke Yaropolk. This, at times, provoked displeasure among the rest of the population. The trading and enterprising activities of the Jews were profitable for the treasury of the Great Duke. The Jews did not interfere in any other sphere of life of either the people or the state, preferring to lead their own secluded religious communal life.

So they continued to live until the second half of the Eleventh Century, when the Jewish pogrom occurred in Kiev, in the year 1062. During this pogrom all the Jewish houses and the rich Jewish colony in Kiev were destroyed. Whether or not there were losses of Jewish lives is not mentioned in the chronicle.

According to the chronicler of these events, it was not only the Jewish but also non-Jewish homes of rich people which were destroyed and pillaged.

This gives reason to believe that the grounds for the pogrom were not religiously but economically oriented, a fact that historians seem to ignore. They prefer to imply that the causes were basically religious in source, an explanation usual of all other conflicts between the Jewish Diaspora and the native population throughout history. These conflicts often led to various limitations, persecutions, pogroms and expulsions of the Jews from many countries.

This conflict between the Jews and the native population that ended in the pogrom of Kiev was not limited to Kiev alone, but was typical phenomenon in other cities of other principalities that were members of the single unit called Kiev Russia at that time. The indirect proof of this may be found in one of the decisions of the princes at the conference in Luebeck, at the very beginning of the Twelfth Century. The conference decided not to allow Jews to reside on any land that was part of Kiev Russia.

Jews in the North-East

Much of the information concerning the Jewish sojourn in the North East, in Vladimirsk-Suzdalsk Russia, is quite scanty and fragmented even now in comparison to that of Kiev. In the chronicles there is an indication that the closest persons in attendance on the great Duke Bogolubsky were Jews who were also the organizers of the conspiracy on his life that ended in his murder in the village of Bogolubovo In 1074. It is believed that these Jews were from the Kingdom of Khazar in the lower Volga region. The ruling classes of this Kingdom had converted to the Jewish religion. The chronicler, of course, did not deal with an examination of the question as to whether these were real Jews or the Khozars who had converted to Judaism. As far as the populace was concerned, they were Jews, as the chronicler had labeled them.

The invasion of the Tartars in the first half of Thirteenth Century emptied and destroyed the whole Kiev Russia, resulting in the disappearance of any possibility of trading activity. And for more than three centuries no mention is found in the chronicles about the Jews on Russian land. It was only at the end of the Fifteenth Century that the word "Hebrew" appeared again in the chronicles. This time it was not in connection with any conflicts between the Jews and the native population, but with the phenomenon which is known in history as the "Judaizers", otherwise called "Judaizing heresy", appearing in the North-West, in the city of Novgorod.

The Judaizing Heresy

The well-known historian Soloviev writes of this heresy:

"In the middle of the Fifteenth Century, and perhaps earlier, a heresy appeared in Kiev, which was under the power of the Polish-Lithuanian state, which seemed to be a combination of Judaic and Christian rationalism. Its leader and one of the members of the society of these heretics was a Jew named Zakharias. He arrived in Novgorod and, as the chronicle says, "with the help of five accomplices who were also Jews planted the seeds of the Novgorod heresy".

As a result of clever propaganda, this heresy received great publicity, at first in Novgorod, and later in Moscow. Here it found quite a few adherents, mainly among the high clergy and the upper class of contemporary Moscow society, including the daughter-in-law of the Grand Duke. The daughter-in-law was the mother of the heiress to the throne, Princess Helen.

This expanding heresy became a menace to the Orthodox religion and its hierarchy, headed by the Father Superior Joseph Voloklamsky. The hierarchy started a violent fight with the "Judaizing heresy", which defended itself energetically, advocating its teaching rights in the ensuing disputes.

After a long struggle, the opponents of the "Judaizing heresy" won, and at the specially convened council to deal with this question in Moscow in 1504, the heretics were condemned. Some of them were executed, some escaped to Lithuania (Poland), and the Princess Helen was locked in a monastery.

The heresy died out and decayed, but memories of it lingered for a long time in the minds of the faithful Orthodox people. They considered it as an unsuccessful attempt by the Jews, by means of heresy, to ruin the unity of the Orthodox Church.

And about half a century later, in 1550, the following dialogue occurred between the Great Duke of Lithuania and the Great Duke of Moscow.

The Great Duke of Lithuania and King of Poland, through his ambassador Stanislav Edrovsky, said the following to the Great Duke of Moscow. "It bothers us and our subjects, especially the Jewish merchants of our state,

that in the time of our ancestors, all merchants, both Jews and Christians, were free to trade in Moscow and throughout your state. Now, however, you do not allow the Jewish merchants to trade in any part of the state which you control."

John, the Great Duke of Moscow, replied. "We wrote to you more than once about the evil deeds committed by the Jews, how they led our people away from Christianity, brought to us poisonous potions and did many unfair things to our people. It does not befit you, our brother, even to write in their defense, since you have heard of their evil deeds."

Before this dialogue occurred all the Jews from Brest, that had lived and traded in Moscow previously, were expelled and their merchandise was burned.

Later, in 1563, during the Livonian war, when Polotsk was 'occupied by the Russians, all the Jews of that city were drowned in the river by order of Ivan the Terrible. This occurred when the local inhabitants, the Russian Polotskites, complained about the Jewish oppression and their evil deeds to him. The complaints were also made against leaseholders of the Polish authorities and magnates.

For more than two centuries after these events occurred, until the end of Eighteenth Century, the Jews in general were not allowed, even temporarily in any territory held by Russia, as it was in the Kingdom of Moscow, or the Russian Empire.

* * *

It was a different matter altogether concerning the Jewish sojourn on the Russian lands, occupied by the Power of the Polish-Lithuanian State after the breakup of Kiev Russia.

Rich and fertile lands on both sides of the Middle Dnieper, as well as the lands further west, were depopulated for almost three centuries. But as soon as the danger from Tartars began to recede, these lands were quickly occupied by settlers. New life sprang up, law and order was established, and the prospects of economic activities became promising, without the constant fear of Tartar raids, its ravages, and it's capturing of people for slavery.

These lands, once settled, became the property of the state and the Polish-Lithuanian magnates, who were holders of vast (latifundiums), cities, towns, villages and farming settlements. The population was turned into lawless slave-serfs, called "Pospolites". Exploitation of these lands and the use of the forced labor of these slave-serfs "Pospolites" yielded enormous profits to the holders.

Industrious and energetic petty landowners, in the hope of free life which was promised to them in newly settled lands, rushed to the East, escaping from the oppression of serfdom which had become extremely heavy in Poland. But the serfdom followed close behind, and as soon as the newcomers settled and established themselves, again it reared its head. New settlers were forced to do all kinds of duties and to pay oppressive taxes, the intention of which was to turn them into slaves, whose possessions, labor and even lives became the property of the "owners", the Polish lords and magnates.

The conditions were made still worse by the presence of a whole army of intermediaries, between the owners and their "subjects". Usually the intermediaries were Jews who were used to farming out different articles of the owners' income such as, the running of taverns, tax collection in the cities ("Mito"), mills, fishing rights, rights of using bridges and collecting of tolls on them, and dykes, built by the serf's own labor, and even Orthodox churches, located within the confines of granted lands.

Often owners leased their whole estates with all the "articles of the income".

The intermediaries, (the middlemen) wanting to carve out from these "income articles" as much as possible, refined themselves in their duties, counting of course upon their own intermediary "earnings". In case of the slightest disobedience to their service, the whole police-administrative apparatus of the Polish Government would be set in motion.

Not having any direct relationship with their Polish "lords", the "Pospolites"-serfs dealt usually with the intermediary-Jews' and therefore their wrath, indignation, and dissatisfaction against all kinds of unbearably heavy extortions fell upon the Jews and provoked sharp anti-Semitic feeling.

The Ukrainian people created a whole cycle of "ballads", legends about the Jewish oppression, which the Ukrainian historian Grushevsky writes about

in detail. As a socialist (Ukrainian ESER) and as a Bolshevik collaborator, repenting in his chauvinistic-separatist errors and returning from emigration to serve them, he could not be suspected of anti-Semitism.

In the chapter "Anti-Semitic Motives in the Explanations of Chmielnichiny" (p. 123 "The Beginnings of the Chmielnichiny") Grushevsky writes as follows.

The Jews, the leaseholders, rented all the Cossack roads, and blocked them with their taverns. Within every mile they had about three taverns, obliging the Cossacks to buy vodka and honey from them, and at the same time forbidding them to make these drinks for their own consumption. Here is how the "ballad" speaks about.

"When a Ukrainian Cossack bypassed a tavern,
The Jew-inn keeper would run out,
grab the Cossack by his forelock,
Pound with both fists on the back of his head,
pushing him in the tavern:
Why do you walk by and bypass my inn... " .

The Jews leased all the Cossack market places and collected "to the last farthing" from pedestrians and horse travelers, for all kinds of cargo or loads. They even collected from beggars who were handed something. They took from one what was best, and as the "ballad" say:

"The Jewish leaseholders would not stop at that.
They have leased all the churches in the famous Ukraine.
So when God gave a child to a Cossack or a peasant, the
latter had to go to the Jewish leaseholder and pay him
first in order to get permission to open the church, to
baptize the child. "

Of the extortions from different trades the famous "ballad about the Jewish oppression of Cossacks" said the following.

"If any Cossack or peasant wanted to catch some fish to feed his family, he did not have to go to a priest for blessing but to the Jew-leaseholder for the permission. Before the Cossack was allowed to fish, he had to promise to give part of his catch to the Jew, and then he could feed his wife and children with the rest. "

From the same "ballad" Grushevsky gives a long description of how a Cossack took a musket and walking on a road, bypassed the tavern. The Jewish innkeeper saw the Cossack and ran after him. "The Jew ran out from the tavern grabbed the Cossack by his bushy hair", cursing about how he dared to "kill a duck". Then the Cossack was forced to beg and address the Jew as "gracious lord".

How accurate these ballads are in depicting historical truth is difficult to establish, but it is known that they represent reflections of national feelings of that time without doubt.

Specifically, the question about the leasing of Orthodox churches by the Jews is disputed by many on the basis that there are no preserved lease agreements concerning this.

Advocates of this opinion that the Jews indeed were leaseholders of such churches bring forward a preserved contract for the year 1596. According to this contract the village of Slucha was mortgaged to two leaseholders together, one of Polish gentry, called Miklazhevsky, the other a Jew called Pesakhu. In the numerous income articles are mentioned the "churches and its collected alms". Thus, collected alms are income from the churches: The well-known historian Kostomorov completely shares his opinion, that it is a fact the churches were leased by the Jews. Grushevsky tends to consider it as an unproven fact, but some authors, for example Galant in the journal "Jewish Antiquity" for the year 1909, disputes this opinion.

Since this question is transformed from a historical platitude into a political platitude, justifying anti-Semitism among the Ukrainians the question is by no means fully and properly clarified and requires further objective investigation.

On the other hand, this question of the roles and activity of the Jewish intermediaries in general, excluding the question of leasing the churches, and appraisal of this activity by contemporary writers had been illustrated quite fully in the documents of that time.

From the preserved letter, written by Colonel Krivonos to the Duke of Zaslavsky, it can be seen that Krivonos considers the Jewish activity as the main cause for the uprising. Colonel Krivonos was one of the principle associates of Chmielnitsky. He writes to Zaslavsky: "*The Jews, if I may,*

Your Grace, have to be turned back to the Vistula, because they are the cause of this war. It is they who are the cause of your grief".

The Muscovite merchant, Kunakov, driving through the Ukraine in the winter 1648-49, that is, immediately after the beginning of the uprising, stated the following examining its causes: "The Jews robbed and humiliated the Cherkass, that's the Ukrainians. As soon as some Cherkass distills vodka or makes beer without telling a Jew about it, or does not take his cap off before a Jew, the Jews seize upon this chance to rob, to destroy the product, to confiscate his possessions, and forcefully to take away his wife and children for hard labor.

Usefovich, the priest from city of Lvov, writes: "Polish domination has reached such an unbearable squeeze, that they even use to hand the power over the churches to the Jews. A Cossack priest, simply called "Pop", could not conduct confessions, wedding ceremonies or other services in his own church if he did not pay the Jew for the keys in advance. Moreover, the priest was obliged to return the keys after each service. You, Poland, deserve the misfortune you are enduring now". So writes the Pole, who was a Catholic priest and a contemporary of the events.

In the preserved letters of Chmielnitsky it is stated, as proof of the extreme oppression of the people that he himself had to endure all kinds of falsehoods from the Jews.

We find the same in the memoirs of the events, written by the contemporary Poles, Kokhovsky and Grondsky. The latter, writing in detail about all kinds of heavy duties, says that these duties "grew from day to day, mainly because they were farmed out by the Jews, who not only invented various incomes that were highly dishonest to peasants, but also dominated and appropriated the law-courts dealing with peasants".

A Jew from the province of Yolyn, Natan Hannover, writes in his memoirs about the serfs, stating that they "worked their corvée for magnates and gentry, who burdened them with heavy work in the house and in the field. The gentry demanded from the peasants and serfs heavy duties, and some of the gentry, using horrible methods, forced the serfs to accept the religion of the ruling class. The Russian-Ukrainian people were humiliated to such a degree, that even the most humiliated people of all the peoples — the Jews dominated them as well".

From all these excerpts, from the authentic historical documents it is obvious under what unbearably hard conditions the broad national masses of the Ukraine and Russia existed at that time.

It is also obvious what the causes were that gave birth to the hatred of the Jews, causes that were characteristic for the mood of the masses of that time. Whether this is the fault of the Jews or the Polish Government, behind who's back stood the Jesuits, does not change the matter. The fact remains that on the Ukrainian-Russian territory, occupied by Poland at that time, such conditions were created where Jews, in order to exist, had to exploit the people.

* * *

Clearance of the Left Bank

The biggest magnate of the left bank of the Dnieper River, Vishnevetsky, learning about the uprising led by Chmielnitsky, collected a large army in order to help Pototsky to suppress the uprising. But, upon arriving at the river Dnieper, Vishnevetsky found all the river ferries destroyed and, as he was unwilling to detain his army by a slow crossing, moved towards the north to the province of Chernigov. Just a little north of Luebeck, Vishnevetsky was lucky enough to cross the river and move his army towards the province of Volyn, where he arrived already after the defeat of Pototsky near the Zholtve Vody and Korsoon. Vishnevetsky's residence, Lubny, was captured by the insurgents, who had massacred all Catholics and Jews that were unable to retreat in time with Vishnevetsky.

During the retreat from the Left Bank, where he was cut off by the river Dnieper from Poland, Vishnevetsky felt "as in a cage", according to the memoirs of his contemporary. From the many preserved documents it is obvious that this was not only an army retreat, but an evacuation of the whole Left Bank. All the people that were connected one way or the other with Poland and its social system were running away from the insurgents and retreated with Vishnevetsky. This included the gentry, the Jewish leaseholders, the Catholics and the Uniats. These people knew that if they fell into the hands of the insurgents, they would not be spared.

The contemporary Rabbi Hannover writes in highly accurate and colorful biblical style about this "exodus" of the Jews from the Left Bank along with

the Poles, who treated the Jews well, gave them protection and defended them with special care, so that they would not fall into Cossack hands.

Hannover writes concerning the fate of those who had no time to join the retreating Vishnevetsky: "many communities which were located behind the Dnieper, near the places of war, such as Perreiaslav, Baryshevka, Piriatin, Lubny and Lkhovitz, had no time to run away and thus were destroyed. The people of these communities perished in the upheaval, amidst bitter and horrible torments.

Of some captured Jews the insurgents stripped their skin off threw the bodies to the dogs. From others they chopped hands and legs off and threw the bodies on the road where carts and horses crushed them... The same treatment was given the captured Polish gentry and the priests. Behind the Dnieper thousands of Jewish souls were killed..."

Information given by Hannover fully coincides with the descriptions of the events by other contemporaries, who even give the number that perished. Grushevsky in his book "Chmielnichina in its Bloom" speaks about two thousand Jews killed in the Chernigov, eight hundred in Gomel, several hundred in Sosnitsa, Baturin, and Nosovka and in other towns and settlements. The description given by Grushevsky about how these pogroms were carried out was also preserved. "Some were chopped up, others were ordered to dig ditches where wives and children were thrown and buried alive under the earth, and still other Jews were given muskets and ordered to shoot at one another ..."

As a result of this spontaneous pogrom on the Left Bank during a few weeks of the summer of 1648, all the Poles, Jews, Jesuits and Catholics disappeared, as well as the few orthodox gentry, which sympathetically collaborated with them.

During this time people composed the song which is still known:

*"There is nowhere as nice as our Ukraine
There is no Polish gentry, no Polish nobles, no Jews
And no cursed Unia..."*

These events refer only to the Left Bank of the Ukraine-Malorussia. (Before the revolution the Poltava and the Chernigov provinces belonged to the territory which was called Malorussia and now Ukraine). According to the

"Everlasting Peace" of 1686 with Poland, a large part of Malorussia still remained under the Power of Poland. The river Dnieper was the borderline. The whole Right Bank, except the city of Kiev, again became the composed part of the Rechy Pospolite of Poland, with the same social and political system which provoked the uprising led by Chmielnitsky. The bloody struggle with the Poles, ending with their expulsion, has cleared only the Left Bank of the Ukraine-Russia.

In the years to come, right up to the fall of Poland and the reunion with Russia of the former territories of Kiev Russia that had been under Polish occupation for several centuries, the permanent sojourn of the Jews on Russian territory was not permitted.

But temporary stays for business reasons were not prohibited. When the Hetman Daniel Apostol requested during the years 1727-1734 that Jews be prohibited from entering the country, even for temporary stays in Malorussia, St. Petersburg answered him: "Jews are allowed to trade in

Malorussia on trade fairs, but only wholesale and are not permitted to take away gold, silver and copper, but are allowed for this money to purchase goods. Permanent residence for them in Malorussia is prohibited".

Jewish trading activity was profitable for the treasury of the Russian Empire, which is exactly what was said in the representations to the Empress Elisabeth about the admittance of the Jews into Russia. Elisabeth answered briefly and categorically: "From the enemies of my Lord Jesus Christ I desire no gain".

After this, the question of the Jewish admittance in Russia was not raised until the time when the large Jewish ethnic group automatically found itself in the territory of Russia and became subject of the Russian Empire. This occurred at the very end of the Eighteenth Century, after the so-called "Tripartite Division of Poland". After this "division" the former Russian territories were reunited with the main body of Russia. However, on these territories now were found numerous communities with dense Jewish populations which had not been there before the territorial seizure by the Lithuania-Polish state.

Jews of the Rechy Pospolite of Poland up to the time that they became subjects of Russia lived their own isolated life in Poland, not mixing with the native population, and represented themselves as a state within a state.

They lived according to their Jewish laws, recognized by Poland. Poland did not interfere with their laws and their particular mode of life. It even sanctioned these laws by a whole range of acts, giving them a royal assented status.

A brief sketch of the lawful standing of Jews in Poland was provided with a highly favorable preface by the head rabbi of the British Empire. Doctor Hertz issued in London in 1942 in a separate pamphlet during the Second World War. The publisher of this pamphlet was the "Polish Ministry of Information", as Poland at that time was occupied by the Germans and its government had escaped and was residing in London. The headline of the pamphlet was the "Legal Status of Jews in Poland".

In the first part of this pamphlet he systematically stated all the forms of privileges, defining the rights and responsibilities' of the individual Jews and of their communities, called "Kahals", during the time of their life on the territories subjected to Poland, and after its "division" and entry into Russian Empire.

Therefore, to clarify the complexity of the problem arising before the Russian State, when if unexpectedly received, along with the reunited territories of the former Kiev Russia, a most one million Jews, it is necessary to familiarize the reader, even in the most brief outlines, with the particular mode of life of the Jews, up to the time when they became "Russian subjects of the Judaic faith".

Sections of the pamphlet, describing the life and rights of the Jews in those territories of Poland that went to Germany (Prussia) and Austria do not belong to the content of this book, and therefore they are not discussed here. The section entitled "Equality in Independent Poland" (1918-1939) is also not dealt with here. The pamphlet, painting everything pink, depicts the Polish-Jewish interrelations, omitting and hushing up very many facts that took place in "Democratic Poland", facts that contradict the depiction.

In order not to go without proof of one sort or another, it suffices to recall the unwillingness of the students in the high institutions of Poland to sit on the same benches with Jews, or of the prohibition of Jewish students dissecting non-Jewish dead bodies. It was for the "national dead bodies" that violent fights occurred. In its own time, the Polish press wrote quite a

bit about these events, but in the pamphlet these characteristic facts are not mentioned at all.

The Soviet press also wrote about these fights. For example, a pamphlet written by D. Zaslavsky "Jews in USSR", published in Moscow by "Der Emes" in 1932, says that in Poland "in medical institutes and policlinics the fight goes on for national bodies" (p. 44).

But, because, this "war for the national dead bodies" took place outside of USSR limits, we will not deal with it, but will make only casual mention of it, to draw the attention of the reader to the fact that nothing like this ever occurred, either in pre-revolutionary Russia or in the USSR, in spite of the fact that the whole world accuses them of "anti-Semitism".

* * *

The biggest mass of Jews came to Poland from the West. The cause of the Jewish emigration was the persecution practiced in other countries. In Poland, owing to its tolerance, they found refuge. Because of this refuge Poland was given the Latin name "asilum haereticorum", in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, and was also called "asylum Iudeorum".

Besides the persecutions, according to the Jewish historians, there were other motives to immigrate to Poland. The main motive was prosperity in more favorable economic conditions that were in Poland in the Eleventh and in the following centuries. But the initial cause was the brutal persecution of the Jews in German territories during the period of the Crusades and later, in the time of the "Black Death".

The process of Jewish penetration from the west was very slow. But at times when the cruelty of the western persecutions mounted, the flow would become more spontaneous and a huge number of refugees would come to Poland. In all, there were four such waves of mass emigration to Poland. One was in 1096, resulting from the Crusader's persecution of the Jews. The second was when disorders sprung up in Germany, in connection with the Crusaders' campaign in the Thirteenth Century. The third, and the biggest wave of them all, was during the years 1348-49, at the time of the "Black Death" in Western Europe, during the reign of King Casimir the Great. The last wave of Jewish immigration from the west was at the end of the Fifteenth Century, in the days of the Inquisition in Germany, France and Spain.

Jewish newcomers pursued mainly financial operations. They farmed out tax collections from the population and minted coins, and also engaged in trade. Polish coins are preserved from the time of Mieszko the First, some of which have Jewish writings on them, others with Polish writings in the Jewish alphabet.

* * *

At the beginning there was no need to introduce special laws for the Jews in Poland, because there were not many of them, and they enjoyed the full freedom of the Polish State. But with time, when, on the one side, the number of Jews in Poland increased, and on the other, tendencies of intolerance had penetrated into Poland from Western Europe, it became necessary to establish special norms regulating the life of the Jews in Poland.

In the year 1264, Boleslaw Nabozhny granted the Jews in communities of Poznan and Kalisz privileges known under the title of "Kalisz Statute". With the annexation of other regions the "Kalisz Statute" became compulsory for the whole country. In 1334, according to the "Statute Visilitsy", King Casimir the Great confirmed the use of the "Kalisz Statute" in the whole country, and later, in 1364, also in the "Chervona Hossia", (Russia), which by that time was annexed to Poland. After this the "Kalisz Statute" received confirmation from almost all successors of Casimir, and was widely known as "General Privileges" or as "Jewish Statute — Statuta Judeoru", in distinction from special privileges, granted by the various kings or by the rulers to the separate Jewish communities. The last king who confirmed the Jewish Statute was the King of Poland, Stanislaw Poniatowski, in the year 1765. With time the "Kalisz Statute" became part of the Volumina Legum, the official collection of the Polish Common Law.

By the Kalisz Statute, a Jew was considered as a "servus" or a civil servant of the crown, that is actually in the service of the king himself. The Jews were obliged to pay into the treasury tax, and the king was obliged to defend them and to judge them, directly or through a person especially appointed for the task. Trial of Jews had to be done in a synagogue. Differences among the Jews were within the jurisdiction of the Jewish community itself.

For the murder of a Jew, according to these rights, the murderer could be executed and his possessions confiscated. The Kalisz Statute also contained a prohibition against accusing Jews in ritual murders, and these accusations were severely punished.

In the realm of economic activity the Jews were guaranteed complete freedom of trade, and were also allowed to lend money by promissory notes as well as by the use of personal possessions as collateral.

As we have said, the "Kalisz Statute" becomes the basis of legal existence for the Jews during the whole period of Polish independence up to 1792, with the exception of the short periods, when anti-Jewish elements had an upper hand. But the established limits, by these anti-Jewish elements, did not remain in force, and the "General Privileges" were confirmed again. So, for example, during the reign of Casimir Jagellon, in 1453, the Jews obtained the king's signature under the rights of their privileges. In that very same year the famous "lash of God", Yan Kapistrano, arrived in Krakow, and in its trading square pronounced inflammatory sermons against the Jews. But the efforts of Kapistrano and his Polish sponsor, the Cardinal Zbignev Olesnitsky, remained without results, because the king categorically refused to withdraw his signature.

However, Olesnitsky got the support from the Polish nobles and under the influence of this movement, the king was forced to grant the nobles the "Nieshavsky Statute" in 1454, which widened and multiplied the privileges of the nobles. At the same time, under the demand of Olesnitsky and upheld by the gentry, the king repealed the privileges granted to the Jews. But the king did not allow any persecution of Jews; when the pogroms of the Jews occurred in Krakow and Poznan, in 1463-64, the king took the Jewish side and imposed heavy fines on these cities, ordering compensation for all Jewish losses. In the year 1507, the successor to Casimir Jagellon, Cigizmund the First, again confirmed the "Kalisz Statute", from that point on it remained inviolable. In the year 1539 by way of the "Piotrovsky Statute" the king declined the right of jurisdiction over the Jews living in private villages and cities, and handed it over to the tutelage of those owners to whom these cities and villages belonged. From that time, the Jews in Poland were divided into new groups: the "crown Jews", that is, the ones living in the cities and ruled by the Magdeburg's law, and the "private Jews", living in towns and villages and belonging to the aristocracy or gentry.

The "General Privileges" granted considerable autonomy to the Jewish communities, called Jewish "Kahals". Within the sphere of activities of these communities were mainly the questions of religion, jurisdictions, charities, organizations, taxation of its own community, and, finally the budget of the community.

The wide autonomy that was received by the Jewish communities, led to the creation of ruling bodies that dealt with fiscal and religious questions. These bodies were called "zemstvo" or "provincial councils". At the moment of their appearance, in the Sixteenth Century, there were four such "zemstvos". But later their number increased and at the beginning of the Eighteenth Century there were more than twelve of them. More important "zemstvos" of the country were the "East-Polish" with big communities in Poznan and Kalisz, "Krakow-Sandomiersk", "Rutenskoe" which was the Russian territory of Galicia, and the "Lublin". Matters concerning the "zemstvos" were dealt with by the "Zemstvo Congress" which appointed its own administration and elected the "rabbi of the zemstvo", who at the same time was the judge of all the "zemstvos".

Besides the internal questions of each "zemstvo", there were also the questions common to all of them. One of these common questions was the necessity to levy taxes. It therefore became necessary to create a central apparatus, which, acting in the name of all the Jewish communities, would take upon itself the responsibility of collecting all the Jewish taxes throughout the republic. In addition came the necessity to 'institute a tribunal, which could act as the court of appeal for all the "zemstvos" courts, and as the superior court for the initial examination of especially important cases. With completion of this organization in the year 1591, the body of representatives of the Polish Jews, known under the name of "Council of the Four Lands", or the "Jewish Seim under Crown" came into existence. This representative body, which existed right up to 1764, had two central institutions: the Seim and the Tribunal.

The Seim convened, either annually or semi-annually in Lublin or in Yaroslaw, and consisted of the delegates of the "zemstvos" and the free cities. The Seim used to elect from amongst its delegates, a chairman, who bore the title, "Marshal of the Jews under the Crown"; one or more treasurers; and one or more secretaries. The "Marshal of the Jews under the Crown" was usually a member of the community with a layman's title; the secretary, however, had to be a rabbi. The "Marshal of the Jews under

the Crown" was usually the most distinguished man amidst the Polish Jews, and was the Jewish spokesman before the King and the Seim of the Polish State.

Within the jurisdiction of the Jewish Seim came fiscal, administrative and educational matters, as well as the general upbringing of the Jews.

Fiscal matters

The Jewish Seim's task was to distribute assessments. It acted as an agent of the state on Jewish taxes, was wholly responsible for such, and distributed shares of taxation among the corresponding "zemstvos" and big communities. Under the Seim a special commission was created for the distribution of taxes whose members were called "Simplera". This commission held its meetings even when the Seim was not in session.

Economic matters

The Seim regulated a whole range of questions affecting industries and trade, issued regulations in granting credit among the Jews, decided the forms of bills of exchange and their usage, and in 1624 issued laws about bankruptcy, on the basis of which all the possessions of the debtor became the property of the creditor. Even the succession and the dowry must be included in the property of the debtor, if they were willed during the three months prior to the day bankruptcy was declared.

Administrative matters

The Seim carried out instructions dealing with elections in the "Kahals", defined the term of office of the heads of the "Kahals", issued prohibitions against youth marriages below the age of twenty without parental consent, and forbade giving out bills of exchange to minors.

Matters of upbringing and education

Upbringing was one of the main tasks of the Seim. It directed the openings and the maintenance of the ecclesiastical schools, the printing of the books, and issuance of the same.

Tribunal

The second task of the Jewish representatives was to establish the "Tribunal". The roots of the Seim's tribunals can be found in the commercial law courts. Beginning from the Fifteenth Century, there was a custom that big Jewish communities had to send their best judges to the big marketplace of Lublin to preside at the most important trials and to take part in the discussions about special legal problems. When the Seim was created these marketplace law courts became permanently sanctioned establishments' and became known as the "Seim's Tribunals". The Tribunal use to elect a marshal who usually was one of the known rabbis of the country.

The Tribunal was authorized to discuss questions handed over to it by Seim such as disputes between communities and their individual members, between communities and "zemstvos", or between two communities about their supremacy over one or the other. The Tribunal also dealt with questions of a theoretical nature, interpreting and explaining legal problems of contemporary life.

* * *

As can be seen from all that is stated above, the organization of Jews in Poland was a realization of the age-old aim of the Jews to be a "nation without a territory" and to live under their own rule, by their own laws, as a strictly centralized whole with a solid hierarchy inside and sharp isolation from the surrounding, non-Jewish masses of population. In addition, Jews did not have to perform military duties, substituting monetary payments for services rendered. From the beginning of the Eighteenth Century, owing to internecine wars in Poland and the decline of the authority of its government, the authority of the Jewish Seim also began to decline. In the year 1764, by the decision of the Polish Seim, the Jewish Seim was abolished. However, the whole organizational structure of Jewish communities or "Kahals" remained preserved and unchanged, and their authority and power over the individual Jews remained absolute.

In the same year the Polish Seim passed a resolution to tax all the Jews two zloty per person every year.

In connection with this tax, they appointed special officials who took a census of all the Jews living in the territory of the Rechy Pospolite of

Poland. It was established that all together there were 577,889 Jews, living at that time in Poland.

Soon after the census, the "division" of Poland began, and subsequently the "Dukedom of Warsaw" was created; and after the Congress of Vienna in 1815 the "Tsarstvo Polskoe" was included as part of the Russian Empire.

After 1815 the borders of the divided parts of Poland did not change for more than a hundred years, until the end of the First World War and the subsequent restoration of the Polish State.

The majority of the Polish Jews remained in the territories that were included in the component part of Russia, such as the ethnographical Poland, Byelorussia and Malorussia, all of which went to Russia according to the first "division" of Poland.

Let us recall very briefly the distinctions of these "divisions" of Poland.

Actually, according to all three "divisions", Russia did not receive an inch of the ethnographical Poland, but only was restored the territories of the Kiev Russia, that had remained under the power of Poland for a long time. Even in this division not all its former territories were restored to Russia. Galicia, Northern Bukovina and Transcarpathia, which are the former territories of Kiev Russia, were captured by Austria-Hungary. Ethnographical Poland was divided between Prussia and Austria. Russia received Byelorussia (Polesie, Volyn) and the Right Bank Ukraine-Malorussia.

Prussia captured the lion's share of ethnographic Poland. In Warsaw there was a Prussian Governor. The city of Belostok was also part of the Kingdom of Prussia.

Such was the situation up to Napoleonic War, when Napoleon created the "Dukedom of Warsaw" from the ethnographic Polish territories that existed until the fall of Napoleon, in the year 1814.

The Vienna Congress of 1815 re-carved the map of Europe, and the "Dukedom of Warsaw" with small territorial changes, turned in to the "Tsarstvo Polskoe". The Emperor Alexander I was proclaimed as the "Tsar of Poland".

In essence, this was a personal union of the Russian Empire and the Kingdom of Poland.

So, under the power of Russia, to be precise, after Congress of Vienna, the territories of the former land of the Rechy Pospolite of Poland inhabited by the Poles with a large percentage of Jews that had enjoyed the widest self-rule in Poland, now found themselves under the power of the Emperor of Russia, the Czar of Poland.

The "Tsarstvo Polskoe" had its own constitution, its own parliament, its own army, its own monetary system, and had customs border with Russia. From what has been said here of the Polish-Russian struggle, the reader himself can judge the differences between the Polish occupation of Ukrainian Russian territories, and the Russian occupation of Polish territories.

Only later, after the two Polish uprisings of 1830 and 1863, was all the territory of the "Tsarstvo Polskoe" called the "Privislensky Cry", also known as the Vistula Territory.

The First Jews in Russia

After many centuries of categorical prohibition to reside in Russia, Jews at last arrived legally in Russia. The last confirmation of such prohibition was made by the Empress Elizabeth. It was in the reign of Catherine II in 1764 that the first Jewish immigrants arrived in Russia to assume permanent residence.

Catherine II, shortly after ascending the throne, decided to open the door to colonists, especially in the southern provinces, and to revive trade, industry and agriculture. For this purpose by the nominal decree dated June 22, 1763, the "Conseliaria Opecunstva Inostrannykh" (Chancellery, for Guardianship of Foreigners) was created. At the head of this Chancellery the Empress placed the closest man to her, Gregory Orlov.

And, in defiance of all the existing prejudices, Catherine II decides to include in the number of these "foreigners" the Jews. However, knowing the backward culture that surrounded her, she was too apprehensive to state it openly. Owing to this, she officially permitted the Jews to settle in the newly created province of "Novorossiysk" — New Russia — only on November 1769 in the decree to the Governor General of Kiev, Voyeikov. Until this, the intention of the Empress to let Jews into Russia was expressed by her in a, so to say, conspiracy with persons in her attendance. This "conspiracy" was reflected in the correspondence with the Riga Governor, "General Braun. The correspondence in which the whole matter was treated secretly. In the letter, delivered to Braun by the Major Rtishchev, it was noted: "When some foreign merchants of Novorossiysk province will be recommended by the Chancellory of Guardianship, permission shall be granted for them to live in Riga for the execution of trade, as is allowed by the law of Riga to merchants of other Russian provinces. If, furthermore, these merchants would their salesmen, representatives, and workers to settle in New Russia, proper passports must be issued to them, **IRRESPECTIVE OF THEIR RELIGION** and escorts provided for their safe conduct. If, lastly, there come from Mitava three or four men, who might wish to go to Petersburg with their requirements to the treasury, passports must be issued to them **WITHOUT INDICATION OF THEIR NATIONALITY, AND WITHOUT INQUIRIES ABOUT THEIR RELIGION**. Only their names must be stated in their passports. For the identification of themselves these people would resent **A LETTER FROM THE PETERSBURG'S MERCHANT LEVIN WOOLF**".

In such a mysterious way the settlement of Jews in Russia was initiated. As is seen, the autocracy of Catherine II did not free her from the necessity to respect the opinions and tastes of persons surrounding her, as well as the great masses of Russian people for whom all "Jews" were "enemies of Christianity". This is why in this letter the word "Jew" is carefully avoided. However Braun, obviously, understood Catherine's wish, or perhaps Rtishchev explained it to him verbally. The latter was at once sent to Mitava to the Russian envoy at the Duke's court Fon Smolin with a secret message, and on the seventh of May 1764, came back from Smolin with seven Jews. The Jews, who settled in New Russia, were merchants from Mitava. The names of these merchants were David Levy, Moses Aron, Israel Lazar and the worker Jacob Marcus. The thoughtful Catherine did not fail to include also a rabbi, Israel Haym and his assistant Natan Abram from Birzen, and even a "moel" Lazar Israel, obviously with the intention of establishing the religious requirements of a future Jewish community.

On the ninth of May these Jews in company with Rtishchev were sent to Petersburg. The Governor-General had entrusted Rtishchev with the covering report, in which he stated that he "does not guarantee that in this matter it would be possible to keep this secret, because the Jews arrived in

Riga openly and their departure, as much as he knows this nation, also could hardly be kept secret".

If we recall, by the way, that at that time, and still much later, up to Forties of the Nineteenth Century, the German burghers of Riga, who were of European appearance, led a fight against the admission of Jewish settlers into Riga, and even against the permission for a Jewish temporary stay AT THE ONLY INN, THE MOSCOW FORSHAT. Thus it is possible to appreciate how far Catherine II had outstripped her time in breadth of views and humanism.

And the Jews of that time understood and appreciated this. In the year 1780, when Catherine visited Shclov, they welcomed her with a specially inscribed ode in the Jewish language with attached translations in Russian and German. The concluding verse of this ode says: "You permitted us to live in your country in peace and safety, under the canopy of your goodwill, and under the protection of your scepter, in agreement with native people. Like them, we admire your grandeur, and like them, we are happy that we are your subjects".

With the same ode, Catherine was welcomed also by the Jews of Mogilev and Polotsk. Later, in her honor, they organized a magnificent manifestation.

* * *

Now this event is forgotten, but, nevertheless, it deserves special attention, especially in our time, when, as the result of the prolonged and deliberate propaganda which created throughout the world an opinion that the Jews in Russia were always victimized, deprived of elementary civil rights and subjected to persecution.

Forgotten is the decree of Catherine II in the year 1791, equalizing the Jews in rights with merchants, artisans, and the lower middle class Russians of those towns and settlements in which they lived. At one time, when these towns and settlements were under the power of Poland or Lithuania, the Ukrainian-Russian peasants had no rights whatsoever, unlike the Jews.

The decree of the Emperor Alexander I is also forgotten. In the year 1804, he allowed free access for the Jews to education, stating: "All Jews can be accepted and educated, without distinction from other children, in all the Russian schools, high schools and universities".

Student allowances given to the Jewish boys studying in the secular high schools are also not mentioned, while such allowances were not given to non-Jewish boys.

But never are we allowed forgetting the limitations, whatever there was, upon the Jews, and constantly we are reminded of them by the mass media, creating a picture of Russia as the country of lawlessness and persecution with respect to the Jews.

This will be discussed in detail at a later stage of this work. As with the measures taken by the Russian Government to equalize the Jews with the rest of population, so also the numerous limitations imposed will be discussed, with specific reference to the cause that provoked the imposition of such limitations.

The Further Growth Rate of the Jews in Russia

Assisting and promoting the settlement of Jews in Russia, Catherine II scarcely surmised that soon the historical events themselves would bring under the citizenship of the Russian Emperors, not separate small groups of Jews, as it was in the 1760's, but hundreds of thousands of individuals.

As was mentioned before, owing to the territorial changes at the end of Eighteenth and at the very beginning of Nineteenth Centuries, Russia took back a big part of her lands, which had been part of the former Kiev Russia. On these lands were found not only a native Russian-Ukrainian and Byelorussian population, but also a Jewish population solidly established during the Polish domination.

So more than half a million-citizen Jews, who, up to that time as a rule, were not allowed, appeared in Russia.

The total number of Jews of Russian citizenship in 1815 (after the completion of all the territorial changes) reached 1,200,000. They all lived outside the limit of the Russian state up to 1772, before the first division of Poland. Since they were splendidly organized as a state within a state, the Jews had their extensive self-rule, submitting not to the law of the state, but to their own Jewish laws.

One hundred years later, in 1915, there were 5 500 000 Jews in Russia. Besides that, towards the end of Nineteenth Century, from the beginning of the Eighties, over 1,500,000 Jews had emigrated from Russia to America. That made a total Jewish population of 7,000,000.

This means that in a hundred years the number of Russian Jews increased six times. During the same period the total number of all other nationalities in Russia had increased only four times. In 1815 there were 48,000,000 people in Russia, and in 1915, 180,000,000.

It can be seen from these numbers that the growth of the Jewish population in Russia grew much faster than the rest of the population.

Without making any conclusions here, we can only note that this growth factor is very demonstrative and interesting in itself.

There is little doubt as to the accuracy of the numbers used here, since they were taken from the book of the well-known Jewish demographer J. Leshchinsky "Jewish People and Numbers", Berlin 1922. The numbers were checked and verified with the data of other demographers.

Politics of the Russian Government With Regard to the Jewish Question

After they received more than half a million subjects of the "Jewish faith" the "Jewish Question" as such arose before the eyes of the Russian Government. What politics to follow in relation to this ethnic group, alien to the great bulk of population not only in religion, but also in language, mode of life, and even dress, became a distinct problem?

Mass migration or eviction of numerous ethnic groups in those times was considered impossible. People hit upon this idea only a hundred fifty years later, during the Second World War.

And where could they be evicted or migrated to? There were more than a million people involved. Western Europe, where the Jews came from, hardly would agree to take them back, even if the Jews themselves wanted to go or were evicted forcefully. This question was not raised by Russia at that time.

It remained for the Russians to simply settle with the fait accompli and to search for ways for establishment of a modus Vivendi with the new subjects.

This was the way that outlined by the Empress Catherine II at the beginning of her reign. The ultimate aim of this outline was the destruction of that Jewish self-isolation which was so solidly established during their life in Poland, and jealously guarded by the Jews themselves, because the self-isolation conformed to the Jewish religious mode of understanding and views on coexistence with alien nationalities.

Understanding this, the Russian Government, in 1791, had already undertaken steps for the equalization of Jews with non-Jews in the re-annexed provinces.

In that epoch all Russian subjects belonging to the so-called "subjects of estate", that is, peasants and lower middle class artisans and merchants, did not have the right to settle just anywhere or have the right of movement in today's meaning of the word. Each one was "ascribed" to the local "society" and he occupied and conducted his matters only in a given location.

In accordance with this order, the Jews, finding themselves Russian subjects after the "division" of Poland, were ascribed to the lower middle class and merchant societies of those localities of the South-Western territories in which they lived at the time of the transfer of these provinces to Russia.

In the decree issued in 1791, Catherine II confirmed this order and even spread its application, stating that the rights for Jews to settle in the newly created vicegerency territories of Ecatherinoslavsk and Tavrichesk province would be guarded.

The known Russian historian Milukov notes and emphasizes that the main aim of the decree was nominally to reaffirm to the Jews their equal rights with the rest of population of the annexed territories.

Dealing with Milukov's opinion in his sketch "The Legal Status of Jews in Russia", published in New York, an expert of this question and himself a Jew, A. Goldenweiser, adds "but at the same time, by special petition, fearing the competition of Muscovite Jewish merchants, the same decree had stated that the Jews had no right to join the associations of merchants in the central Russian cities and ports".

With this addition to the decree the beginning of the "Jewish Pale", also known as the "Pale of Settlement", was laid, yet it was not an equalizing measure, but a limitation lasting right up the revolution of 1917.

True, this "Pale" was easy transgressed, because there were many methods of overstepping it without coming into conflict with the strict letter of law, but nevertheless it existed and provoked the dissatisfaction of all the Jews, along with a significant part of Russian society.

The limitations of the "Jewish Pale" did not apply to the following categories of Jews: Those of non-Judaic faith (not Orthodox only); merchants of the first guild (that is, the more well to do Jews); those with completed higher education such as dentists, doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, mechanics, distillers, brewers and, as was said in the decree, "all the specialists and artisans in general". Beside that the limitations of the "Jewish Pale" did not apply also to the "salesmen or sales agents", who worked for the Jewish merchants of the first guild.

Owing to the existence of these numerous exceptions and the skilful use of them by the Jews, there was not, at the beginning of the Twentieth Century, a single city in Russia that did not have a large Jewish colony. In these colonies, as is mown, there were not so many poor Jews, as was the case in the "Jewish Pale".

The presence of the richest Jewish colonies in Petersburg, Moscow and other large cities that built such splendid buildings like the Moscow synagogue serves as the best proof that the "Pale" was easy to overstep.

As the "Pale" remained without being abolished it had not so much a practical as a psychological significance, creating and feeding among the Jews certain anti-governmental feelings that found a lively response in the liberal Russian society as well as in the press of the whole world.

To all of what is said above it is necessary to add that more and more educated Jews started to behave indifferently to the question of religion. They looked at the change in religion as an unimportant formality, fulfillment of which freed them from all limitations, including, first of all, the limitations of the "Jewish Pale". And this is why there were Jews who easily changed their religion usually to some Christian, not necessarily Orthodox faith. In most cases they took to Protestant branches of the Christian faith.

More and more Jews penetrated even the most reserved officers' environment, simply by changing their religion for any of the Christian once. Denikin in his book "Journey of a Russian Officer", published in New York, states, that in the year 1914, in the Russian army there were not only officers of the low ranks, but also generals who were of pure Jewish origin. General M. Grulevof of the General Staff says the very same thing in his memoires. General Grulev was a Jew who had reached the highest rank, and was even a candidate in the War Ministry of the Russian Empire. There were also Jews among the students of privileged military institutions, for example, Kaufman, who graduated from the Pazharsky Corps.

* * *

Soon after the decree of the year 1791, which had an equalizing significance for the Jews but did not limit their affair, came the decree of the Emperor Alexander I, in 1804 that stated: "all Jews can be accepted and educated

without distinction from other children, in all Russian public schools, high schools and universities".

At that time, there did not exist in any other country of the world such a similar governmental order. In essence it is for that kind of equality or "desegregation", that even now, in the second half of the Twentieth Century, a desperate struggle is being waged, not only in backward countries, but also in the advanced ones, such as the USA, for example.

Moreover, the initiative came from the top, from the autocratic sovereign power.

By whose fault and for what reason was it then that, some eighty years later, the "percentage quota" was introduced in Russia which limited the number of Jews in higher institutions. This will be dealt with more fully in subsequent accounts.

It cannot be doubted that it was the wish and intention of the Russian Government to bring the whole Russian culture within the reach of the broad Jewish masses, without the rejection of their Judaism.

However, for some reason this "desegregation" that existed and was exercised for more than eighty years is so zealously hushed up. But the "percentage quota" which existed for only twenty seven years, from 1887 to 1916, is so overstressed and underlined that it has become a proof of "Governmental anti-Semitism" in Russia.

* * *

The life of the Jewish ethnic group within the borders of the Russian Empire lasted for almost a hundred and fifty years, from 1772 when the first "division" of Poland occurred, and the declaration of full equality for Jews made in 1917.

During this period the government and its individual representatives issued many "additions" and "explanations" which had the tendency and the character of limitations upon the Jews, distinct from the first two declarations of 1791 and 1804 that had an equalizing character or one of "desegregation".

An expert on this question, a lawyer, A. Goldenweizer, in his essay the "Legal Status of Jews in Russia", enumerates all the existing limitations upon Jews of the Judaic faith, excluding the Jews of Christian faith since the limitations did not affect the latter.

The limitations were in the following spheres:

- 1) The right of residence and the freedom of movement;
- 2) Admittance to the learning institutions;
- 3) Pursuit of trade and industry;
- 4) Entrance into the civil service and the participation in the organization of self-rule;
- 5) Order of serving in the army;
- 6) Acceptance of Jews in the legal profession.

Let us examine all these limitations in their order, pointing out at the same time their results.

1) The right of residence and freedom of movement. The Jewish Pale.

The "Jewish Pale" has already been mentioned above, and its repetition here would serve no purpose. We are interested in its practical results and in the ending of the noble intentions of the government, wishing to equalize the Jews with surrounding population. These results, we must admit, were negative. The numerous exceptions from the general rules opened such wide possibilities for bypassing the law that both the rich and the enterprising Jews were practically able to evade the law entirely. The sales agents employed by Jewish merchants, belonging to the guild, could live anywhere, and their numbers were not limited by the law. Distillers, mechanics, specialists of various trades and the artisans enjoyed the same rights. Only the poor Jews from the "Jewish Pale" suffered as they did not have the opportunity to use the various loopholes to evade the law.

Jewish magnates of the sugar industry, railway-construction, flour milling, lumber trade, steam-ships, banking, tea trade and gold mining enjoyed all the rights, without changing their religion. The limitations of the "Jewish Pale" did not apply to them in any way whatsoever. Not only that, but according to the letter of the law, they could have Jewish "sales agents" and "specialists of various trades", understandably, with their numerous

families. Messrs. Poliakov, Zlotopolsky and Vysotsky, in Moscow; Rubenstein and Ginzburg, in Petersburg; Brodsky, Margolin, Dobry, Ginsburg, Shirman and Zorokhovich in Kiev, lived in residences and palaces, even though according to their passports they were Russian subjects of the "Judaic faith".

At the same time, in the enterprises belonging to these wealthy Jews, Russian-Ukrainians worked in such unbearable conditions that they used to provoke great dissatisfaction and subsequent mutinies by these workers, which were brutally suppressed by the Russian Government. All of pre-revolutionary Russia was agitated and full of indignation at the news of the bloody suppression of the workers' strike on the Lena gold-fields in Siberia in 1912. The cause of this strike was the inhuman exploitation of the workers and the demand of the administration of the gold-fields that the workers buy their supplies from the food stores owned by the gold-fields. In these stores the quality and price of goods were fixed by random will of the administration. Private trading on the territory of the gold-fields was not allowed. When the workers, brought to despair, refused to buy from the stores owned by the gold-fields these goods of bad quality and at inflated prices, and when they also refused to receive part of their earnings not in cash but in bonuses and rotten goods from these very stores, the administration concluded that it was mutiny. The administration called in the army and suppressed the "mutiny", resulting in many killed and wounded workers who had resisted the army's suppression. Many policemen, soldiers and their officers were killed during this suppression of the "mutiny". In connection with this, a wave of demonstrations against the government's action swept throughout of Russia. This was especially so in the higher institutions of learning, where the "Lena events" were traditionally marked from year to year by meetings and strikes. But never and in no place was a single word said, condemning one of the main shareholders of the "Lena gold-fields", Ginzburg, who during the suppression of this "mutiny" was at his residence-palace in Petersburg, on Moscow Street, and upon whom depended the change those working conditions which had provoked the "mutiny".

This case in point is far from being unique. The Russian Government brutally suppressed the strikes of Russian workers working in the Jewish enterprises, where even Jewish "salesclerks" ran the business in the name of their owners.

The Government stood on the side of law and order, without inquiring into the question to find out what provoked the disorders and upon whom depended the creation of working conditions which would eliminate these disorders.

But Russian general opinion and the opinion of the world as well, always attributed the guilt to the Russian Government and exaggerated every case where the authorities were forced by circumstances to use weapons.

2) Admittance in the learning institutions. The percentage quota.

The liberal decree of 1804, concerning the admittance of the Jews into all Russian learning institutions, not only provoked enthusiasm among the Jewish masses, but also came across fierce opposition from the whole Jewish hierarchy.

This was not unfounded, as they feared that the secular education could distract the Jews from their religion and their Talmudic direction. The rabbis and the Jewish communities or "Kahals" severely condemned the very thought of allowing the orthodox Jews the opportunities granted by this permission to obtain the secular education. The rabbis and the "Kahals" considered it sinful, and acted in every way they could against Jewish enrolment in these secular institutions of learning.

The existing Jewish schools, "khederas", with their teachers, "melamedams", the assiduous readers of the Talmud, "and the schools of the highest degree, "eshibots" were quite sufficient for the rabbis and the "Kahals". As for the secular schools, even with instructions in the Jewish language, they were considered to be a destructive element of the established mode of living in the racial-religious communities, the "Kahals". The spiritual life of these "Kahals" was guided by the rabbis who understood how dangerous to their authority this enlightening novelty could be. Up to this time the Jews had lived in their strictly isolated communities, based on the unity not only of their religion, but also their race and their blood, and the rabbis and the communities could rest at peace, because they were sure that a Jew would remain faithful to the religion and the Talmud, and the word of the rabbi would remain the law.

At the beginning Jews answered the call of the Russian Government to join the Russian culture, not only with silence but also with passive opposition. To learn in the secular schools was not at all appealing to the Jews.

And not only studying in schools, but even learning the language of the state of which they were subjects, was considered sinful and profane.

Their reasoning followed this pattern. Each new word of a foreign language mastered by a Jew unavoidably must force out one Jewish word, because Jehovah estimated exactly the quantity of words a Jew must be able to know. In this way the adherents of the Jewish faith lectured to the Jewish masses.

The ancient Jewish language, the language of the Holy Scripture, was known by only a few people, those especially dedicated to it. In their daily life the Jewish masses used the language which now is called "Yiddish", and up to the beginning of the Twentieth Century it was called "jargon".

Here is what Isaac Beer Levinson, the cultural enlightener of the Jews in the first half of Nineteenth Century, wrote about this question. (Levinson was born in 1788 and died in 1860. His whole life he fought to bring culture within the reach of the broad Jewish masses by means of secular education). "Jargon is not a language, but a shameful mixture of mutilated, corrupted biblical, Russian, Polish, German and other words. This strange mixture of different dialects, owing its poorness and rudeness, is unsuitable for the expression of refined feelings and serious abstract thoughts. Why do we need such gibberish? Speak either the German or Russian language". Referring to the Talmud and to history, Levinson states that the Jews usually spoke the language of that nation in which they lived. He points to many great Jewish scholars, who not only studied foreign languages, but also wrote their compositions in them. The philosophers Philo, Josephus Flavius, Saadyah Gaon, Yahudi Halevi, Maimonides, Bakhian-Ebn-Pecuda, these pillars of Jewish theological literature, wrote their compositions, of both philosophical and religious thoughts, in Greek, Arabic, Spanish and Italian, depending on the country in which they lived.

The thoughts of Levinson, stated above, were written at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, when the Jews had just began to participate in the secular studies and culture of individual European nations. Now, after a

hundred and fifty years, the enumeration of the Jews who wrote and are writing their works in the languages of those nations among whom they lived would take many pages. Heine Marx Lassal Wassermann, Shnitsler. Einstein, Feuchtwanger and many others wrote in German. But this does not mean that they were Germans. Many Jews wrote their compositions in English also, starting from David Ricardo and ending with today's American playwright Arthur Miller. Bergson wrote in French; Jules Romain, Andre Moroa, Adolphe Cremieux and many others did so as well. Geor Brandes wrote in Swedish. Lamborozo wrote in Italian. Moshe Piade (Michail Porobich Wrote in Serbian, Anna Pauker in Romanian, Slansky in Czech and Rocoshi in Hungarian. But all of them were Jews. The majorities of the Jewish literary writers wrote and are writing in Russian, both under their own Jewish names and under the cover of Russian pen-names like Koltsov, Nikulin, Riazanov and Sedykh.

Mark Slonim, a Russian Jew, whom many consider to be an expert in Russian literature, and who writes and reads many lectures about Russian literature, writes the following lines in his sketch "Writers-Jews in Russian Literature", (The sketch was published in the "Jewish World". in 1944, Publication "Union of Russian Jews in New York".)

"There is no special 'Russian-Jewish' literature in the Soviet Union and there cannot be any, for the historian and the explorer of art can raise only one question: what influence did Russian Jewish writers exert on Russian literature?"

Depending upon this degree of influence and their contribution to the Russian literature with their Jewish theme and "spirit", Mark Slonim divides the Jews, who wrote in the Russian language, into three categories.

In the first category Slonim includes Jewish writers and poets who wrote their works in the Russian language; this was so much assimilated that M. Slonim does not sight any evidence in their writings of the "Jewish spirit", and in his sketch he quotes the words of the critic Lvov-Rogachevsky, who named this category "Jews only in their passports", and he agrees with this definition. "There is nothing specifically Jewish, either in the spirit or in the themes of their creative work", is the opinion of M. Slonim.

Some writers from this category "have disguised their real names under pen-names and do not even reveal in their autobiographies that they are Jews", says M. Slonim.

To this category Slonim attaches Pasternak, Mandelshtam, Vera Inber, Efrem Zozula, Nikulin, Lidina, Kirsanova, Lifshits, Marshak and many others.

The second category is formed by authors who, as Slonim say, "in spite of their quite obvious assimilation into the Russian element, sometimes write of Jewish themes and motives".

This category does not hide its Jewish origin, and sometimes thrusts it out and emphasizes it. Erenburg for example, begins his autobiography with the words: "I was born in 1891, a Jew".

Elizabeth Polonskaia in one of her poems says: "this blood of mine in your veins does sing, in a foreign language it speaks..." (An encounter of this poetess with an indigent Jewess who recognized her to be Jewess.)

To the second category, besides Erenburg and Polonskaia, Slonim also attaches Andrey Sobol and Lunts.

In the third category M. Slonim includes those Jewish authors who write on Jewish themes almost exclusively.

At the head of this category stands Isaac Babel, of whom Slonim writes that he, Babel, "was one of the Jewish types so frequently encountered in reality, a communist, fanatically believing in Lenin's teachings and in a strange combination of the precepts of the Bible or the Talmud with, the requirements and the doctrine of the communist church".

Besides Babel in this category may be included Kozakova, Broide, Bergelson, Hait and other Jewish writers, many of whom wrote not only in Russian, but also in the Jewish language.

U. Margolin, a journalist whose articles frequently appear in the periodicals of the Russian press in emigration, also treats the very same question, the question of the existence of a "Russian-Jewish" literature. In the newspaper

"Novoe Russkoe Slovo" of January 11, 1962, Margolin wrote the following:

“Babel was a Jewish writer of the crumbling era. He treats Russian literature like a ring with a precious stone on a finger. The ring can be taken off, put aside for twenty years and again put on. The ring is not part of the body. In the Jewish literature of his time Babel becomes a meaningful part of his whole pathetic and thematic authorship.”

Jewish literature is generally multilingual. The Greek language of Josephus Flavius, the Arabic of Maimonides, the Latin of Spinoza and the German of Heine are all offshoots of the same stem.

The Jewish literature mentioned above is treated by the Jews themselves as the product of their whole people. All that was written by the people of the Jewish race in various languages in different times and epochs belongs to the people. S. L. Zinberg, the well known historian of this literature, writes: "In the Jewish literature, individual personality was always subordinated to the collective thought of the whole and dissolved in it. All spiritual wealth created and collected by the people, belongs to the people. The personages bear only the name of its people, for they know only one creator. It is the people of the whole Jewry". ("Jewish World", 11th collec. 1944, New York.)

Jewish literature in the Russian language became apparent only when a considerable number of Jews learned the Russian language, when they received their education in the highest learning institutions. This occurred only in the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century. And at the turn of this century the number of the Jews joining the Russian literary and cultural life had increased considerably.

The joining was not a fusion, dissolution or an assimilation to the end, like that of a chemical formation of heterogeneous elements, but only a mechanical mixture or, by the more accurate definition of U. Margolin, "rings with precious stones" put on fingers of foreign-born bodies.

But the number of these "rings" was multiplying more and more, especially in the spheres of journalism, publicism, criticism and the legal profession.

This phenomenon did not remain unnoticed. And from the 1880's the Russian Government, which at the turn of the century opened the doors of its learning institutions so wide for its Jewish subjects, took the path of limitations. It is these limitations that became the focal point of discontent and criticism from Jewish intellectuals. And it is about these limitations

that so much is still written even now, notwithstanding the fact that for more than eighty years, 1804-1888, not only were there no limitations, but on the contrary, the Russian Government assisted the Jews in various ways, bringing them within the reach of the entire Russian culture by means of education.

The advantages of the secular education, with its resultant difficulties and its opening possibilities for material success, were so obvious and strong that a considerable part of the Jews, disregarding the displeasure of their rabbis, rushed into Russian institutions of learning.

The process of joining the Jews with those of the Russian subjects completing secondary and higher education grew swiftly and steadfastly. It was so fast that by the middle of the Eighties, one-third of all the students at the university of Kharkov and Odessa, graduating from the faculties of medicine and law, were Jews.

By these very means the Jews penetrated into the Russian intellectual environment as they received diplomas from high schools or universities. This was especially so in the free professions of medicine, law and journalism, and they began to influence more and more the whole cultural life of Russia. But this was not, as shown above, the assimilation towards which the Russian Government strived, assisted and encouraged Jewish education in the secular institutions of learning. In assisting and encouraging the Jews with the education, the Russian Government was hoping to fuse them with the Russian culture and "cook them altogether, Jews and Russians, in the All-Russian pot": this now exists in the USA with all the ethnic groups, the citizens of USA, where the "American nation" is created and "American patriotism" is emphasized. The creation of the "American nation and patriotism" is achieved not only by universal education based on the all English language, but also by mixed marriages, by one mode of living, and by common material and political interests.

Nothing of this sort took place in Russia. The Jew in Russia, in spite of everything, remained a Jew. The Jew, despite the completion of higher Russian education and the substitution of traditional "lapersdak" by ordinary clothing, cutting off his "paisas" and his abandonment of the secluded circle of the Jewish community, the "kahal", and his overstepping the "Jewish Pale", and even, in some cases, changing religion and receiving

all, without exception, equal rights with the rest of population, nevertheless remained, above all, a Jew.

From his Jewish point of view he appraised all events, above all having in mind their usefulness and gain for the body of Jewry as a whole, not only for the many Jews in Russia, but for the whole Jewry of the Diaspora.

This however does not mean that they were not loyal subjects of Russia. But to them it was an alien and incomprehensible feeling which is inherent and characteristic to those who with their roots in the far past of their nation, saw their future inseparably linked with the future of their nation, and the state created by their forefathers of Russia.

With Jews, their past and their future was tied up not with Russia and Russian people, but with the Jewry of the whole world, with its own people of the past and the future.

Russia to them was only a temporary stage of their millennial sojourn in exile, in the same way as once the Roman Empire, Spain and Western Europe all were. As they did not become Romans, Greeks, Spaniards, Germans, so they did not become Russians, in spite of the fact that they learned the Russian language and rushed to take a lively part in the social and political life of Russia. This aspiration had every kind of support among the cultural Russian people, especially among the foremost and liberal intelligentsia.

The Jews joined the Russian cultural life as equal and even desired members of all kind of societies, professional amalgamations and cultural undertakings.

But for all that, they preserved and piously guarded what professor Lourie calls the "inner aspect of a Jew", characteristic only to Jews in whatever epoch and in whatever country they lived and in whatever language they spoke.

This "inner aspect" distinguished Jews from all other nations, tribes and races. The Jews themselves did not notice or did not want to notice this nor to speak or write about it. And to the non-Jews, accepting Jews in their own environment, the very thought of the possibility of discussion and the presence of this "inner aspect" was considered a manifestation of "Judaophobia" or "anti-Semitism".

But the hidden and unsaid well-known conflict, brewing from as early as the Eighties of the last century, began to make itself felt between the Jews, who entered into the Russian cultural life, and the Russian intelligentsia with its roots deep in its national past.

This was "Judaophobia" or aggressive "anti-Semitism" in the masses of Russian intelligentsia, which the cultural strata did not recognize and did not approve of. However, this was an unsaid and unrestrained acknowledgement that the desegregationist and assimilationist politics were not crowned with success, regardless of the enormous percentage of Jews who outwardly became similar to non-Jews.

The Jews quickly began to fill the ranks of the free profession, not because the other professions were closed to them or hindered in any way, but because they purposely avoided the others because of their inborn antagonism to bureaucratic governmental officialdom. With themselves they carried into these professions their own Jewish specifications alien and little understood by the surrounding environment.

Slowly voices were raised, at first very timidly though, about the growing influence of the "Jewish spirit" in the free professions, first of all in the legal ones and then in journalism.

All these created the preconditions that forced the Russian Government to reconsider the political correctness and expediency in handling the Jewish question.

Starting from the 1880's, the Russian Government chose different kinds of limitations for persons of the Judaic faith. These limitations affected all spheres of Jewish life, from the economic to cultural activities, particularly the questions of education in the learning institutions, both state owned and private.

These limitations were received extremely negatively by Russian society except for a comparatively small part of the conservatively oriented Judaephobes. Within the camp of the Jews, these limitations in general gave birth to sharp anti-governmental feelings, and pushed them towards the oppositionist and revolutionary groupings and organizations.

So the period of "assimilation" ended in the history of the Russian Jews. This period was completely utilized by the Jews for the creation of

numerous intelligentsia of Jewish origin, inseparably linked with their religion and their own recognition of being the "Chosen People". The last two elements, the religion and the "Chosen People", were precisely the main obstacles that prevented the Jews from blending with the Russian people and its culture.

How numerous these Jewish specialists, belonging to the intelligentsia, were is easy to conclude from the given numbers of Jewish students that graduated from the universities and replenished the ranks of these specialists.

According to the "Books about Russian Jewry" (published in New York, 1960), 41.5% of the medical faculty of Kharkov University was Jews in 1886; and in Odessa university's medical faculty it was 30.7%; in the law faculty it was 41.2%.

Graduating from these universities the Jews poured into the ranks of Russian intelligentsia, carrying into it a lot of the specific Jewish peculiarities of this ancient race, the race that was able to preserve its purity during the millennial dispersion.

Observing its unsuccessful politics of assimilation, the Russian Government introduced in 1887 the so-called "percentage quota", despite the fact that the government considered it an undesirable step. The "percentage quota" stated that from then on, only a certain percentage of people belonging to the Judaic faith would be permitted in high schools and universities. In the "Jewish Pale" this was 10%, outside of the "Jewish Pale" 5%, and in Petersburg and Moscow, only 3%.

This provoked an explosion of indignation in the whole Jewry of Russia and finally pushed the Jews into the ranks opposing the regime. The Russian liberal community also reacted negatively and sharply.

However, the "percentage quota" did not bring about a substantial change in the percentage of Jews receiving high school and university education. They were changing their religion for the Lutheran and according to the letter of law ceased to count as Jews. Others went to complete their education in other countries and after their return to Russia began their professional practices. The third group passed its examinations by the "external" method, while the fourth group received their education in the institutions to which the "percentage quota" did not apply, such as schools

of commerce and the whole range of private high schools and colleges. According to the "Books about Russian Jewry", in 1912 in the Kiev Institute of Commerce, there were 1875 Jewish students, while in the Psycho-Neurological Institute in Petersburg this book states that among the students there were "thousands of Jews".

The end result, of the thirty years in which the "percentage quota" existed, 1887 to 1917, the percentage of the Jewish students, that is those that did not change their Jewish religion, changed very little. In 1887 the average percentage for all of Russia was 14.5%, and in 1917, twelve per cent. These figures are taken from the "Books about Russian Jewry" and there is no basis to doubt its accuracy at all.

In these figures there is only one correction necessary, namely that the number of student Jews by their tribal and racial indications, but not of the Judaic faith, was not mentioned. These kind of students in 1887 were considerably less in number than in 1917. There is no exact information about the number of these students, but it is generally known that there were many of them.

Taking into consideration this correction, without the fear of making an error, it is possible to say that the introduction of the "percentage quota" did not change the percentage of the Jewish students in the Russian learning institutions, but only froze it at the level of the year 1887.

The "percentage quota" made itself felt with special sharpness in the Ukraine, where until 1917 there lived about two and half million or 41% of all Russian Jews. Nevertheless, even here the Jews managed in various ways to bypass the "percentage quota", mainly by creating their own learning institutions with the help of extensive Jewish capital. Besides this, there were many purely Jewish private schools, operated by the Jewish communities. In these schools the Jewish youth was getting its education, especially those who were unable to get into the Russian learning institutions. The enormous activities of these kinds of learning institutions are reported in quite great detail in the "Books about Russian Jewry", with documentary proof of the same in a separate chapter.

In the same book, on p. 360, we find the following lines: "still in June, 1914, it was announced that the promulgation of private learning institutions which did not enjoy governmental rights was increasing. The law provided

nationalities with the freedom to choose the language of teaching. This opened wide possibilities for the development of the Jewish education in 'Yiddish' or in the ancient Hebrew Language".

* * *

Knowing the above, the unfounded assertion spread throughout the world that in pre-revolutionary Russia "access to education was closed to Jews" loses all the persuasiveness.

In spite of the "percentage quota" more than 12% of Jewish students attended the highest learning institutions, whereas the total Jewish population in Russia constituted less than 4%. In addition, based on the law stated above permitting various nationalities to open unlimited numbers of learning institutions in their own languages, including Jewish, the real situation of Jewish education in Russia at that time is irrefutably proven.

At this point it would not be without interest to notice that it is precisely this fact that explains why there are so many political figures in Israel today that have had a Russian education. In the newly created state of Israel the overwhelming majority of the intelligentsia, the ministers and political figures came from Russia where they received their education. This education they acquired in the same Russia where, they claim, "access to education was closed to Jews". Had it not been for all these universities of Poltava, Odessa and Kiev, these former student realists, Israel would have found itself in almost total absence of capable personnel for the creation of all the apparatus of power necessary in the new state.

* * *

Before the conclusion of the question dealing with Jewish education in Russia, it is necessary to state once more, without fear of repetition, that there were very wide possibilities open to the Jews to obtain any education they wished. This easily obtainable education offered the Jews the widest possibilities to penetrate the ranks of the Russian intelligentsia and to merge with it, especially when the attitude of this intelligentsia to Jews was quite friendly.

And the penetration into the deepest circles of all kinds of cultural levels in Russia went on continuously. But the process did not bring about total fusion with the Russian populace. This was not the fault of the Russian

intelligentsia and the cultural part of its society. For the cause of this it is necessary to look into the Jewish strife towards self-isolation from the nations among whom they had to live throughout their history.

It is necessary to assume that this is the result of thousands of years of religious education which inspired the Jews with the knowledge that they are the "Chosen People", dispersed only temporarily, until that hour when they would gather again in the "Promised Land". All the other countries where they are living are not their motherland, but only a place of temporary sojourn. Their real motherland is the "Promised Land".

From the faith and immovable conviction within their being the "Chosen People" logically and inescapably show their consciousness of superiority over other nations. This is why Jews do not want to fuse with other nations. The result of this unwillingness is self-restriction, which is characteristic of the Jews — even of those living among the nations which do not exact any limitations against this fusion with them. In pre-revolutionary Russia, especially in the Ukraine, these self-restrictionist Jewish tendencies used to manifest themselves with special distinction, and made them an alien body among the masses of the Ukrainian-Russian population.

3) Pursuits of trade and industry.

In Article 791, chapter IX of the Code of Law of the Russian Empire, Jewish artisans, merchants and lower middle classes, "have, in the place of permanent residence of their choice, all the rights and preferences granted to other Russian subjects of equal status, insofar as this does not contradict the special Jewish rights".

These "special rights" for the Jews, aside from those who belonged to First Guild, made it impossible to pursue trade and industry outside of the "Jewish Pale".

The one exception to this rule concerned the Jewish artisans, who were allowed to trade of the "Jewish Pale". They were only allowed to trade with "goods of their own making", however.

The presence of these two limitations deprived the numerous poor Jews of possibilities to participate in the middleman activities, outside of the "Jewish Pale".

The question about the rights of artisans to trade in objects of their own making was not sufficiently defined and was thus interpreted to meet the needs of expansion or limitation upon such trade, whichever proved more convenient. This loose definition made it possible for the local authorities to abuse the rights of the Jewish artisans.

In connection with this there were many "explanations" given by the Senate, often contradicting one another. An example of this can be found in the decision of the Senate to allow a Jewish watch trader who used foreign-made parts, but assembled them himself, to sell the watch as his merchandise. In another decision, concerning the trading of flour by a Jewish baker, it was considered that such activity was unlawful, because it contravened Article 1. 171 with all ensuing consequences outlined in the Code of Punishment of 1845, namely, the confiscation of all goods and immediate deportation.

All these limitations however, were easily circumvented in one way or another. It was quite easy to find loopholes and other means of avoiding them, sometimes by legal methods, but, in most cases, by only partially legal or completely illegal methods. This was due to the many possible interpretations' that allowed either expansion or limitation of Jewish trade, according to the whims of local authorities.

These limitations used to irritate the poor Jewish population of the "Jewish Pale", because the limitations deprived poor Jews of possibilities to make a living in the usual manner and prompted their affiliation with the forces of opposition to the régime.

Whether or not these limitations were expedient and corresponded with the interests of the whole state depends entirely upon your point of view, and there are several different existing opinions on this subject. Many ministers of finance, for example, Vitte and others were opponents of these limitations, believing that it was necessary to give these possibilities to all Jews, so that they could trade and provide a living for their families.

4) The civil service. The self-rule.

"The law states that people of different religious beliefs or tribes cannot be refused positions as civil servants, providing they meet the educational requirements of these positions. This meant that any Jew who held a Scholar's degree, which was the equivalent of a first degree diploma from a

university, could not be refused admittance into any department of the civil service, if he wished to be employed by them, on the basis of his religious affiliation. Jewish people who wished to enter the civil service had to be put under oath to assure their loyalty to the service. This was decreed in the bill that pertained to ecclesiastical matters".

This was the way the Russian laws read, which were written during the "assimilative" period, when the Russian Government strived to "fuse the Jews with the native population". This fusion was to be achieved by attracting the Jewish youth into Russian schools and at the same time trying to overcome the Jewish isolationist tendencies".

According to the text of laws, the Jews were allowed to have the widest opportunities... But at that time, right up to the Seventies of the last century, there were no Jews with the corresponding qualifications. Until the end of the 1850's and the beginning of the 1860's, there were not many Jews with university degrees. At that time Jews who had graduated from Russian universities could be counted one by one. The mass influx of Jews to universities began only at the end of the Sixties and the beginning of the Seventies, after the great reforms of the Emperor Alexander II.

But the realization soon came that because a Jew held a university diploma in no way meant that he was on his way towards assimilation with the native population, an end towards which the government strived. In his "inner aspect" he remained, above all, Jewish, in spite of the cloak of a government official, excellent knowledge of Russian grammar and all the subtleties of Russian legislation.

The Jews became an integral part of the Russian culture, but they were never assimilated entirely nor did they accrete.

The national interests of Russia, in the widest and deepest meaning of the word, were, to them, alien and incomprehensible.

Realizing this, the Russian Government, in dealing with the question of Jewish tenure in the civil service, especially in the judicial department where the Jews had been attracted by their juristical education, arrived at the following methods of coping with their aggressive onrush. From the end of the 1870's the government stopped appointing Jews to such positions, and the Jews who already occupied those positions were retained without promotion. This brought about disappointment with their civil service

occupations among the Jews and they themselves, of their own free will, openly switched over to the professions open to them, such as medicine, journalism, law, etc. Only a few Jewish individuals remained in the civil service, for example, the Real Councilor of State Teitel, and the Privy Councilor Halpern, who remained in these ranks until the Revolution of 1917.

The Jews had no desire to become a part of the other fields of the civil service with the exception of Jewish doctors, whose numbers in the military department were quite considerable. In the medical profession there was no limitation whatsoever, whether in private practice or in the military service.

The legal profession, although it was considered a public enterprise, was closely tied with the judicial department until 1889, and there were no limitations on the enrolment of Jews as barristers. Thus the number of Jewish lawyers swiftly grew. Into the intellectual environment the Jews took a lot of their specifically Jewish characteristics; this did not remain unnoticed, and provoked a familiar reaction among some circles of the Russian society, as well as in the government. From the fourth of November 1889, in order to attain the enrolment of a Jew as a barrister, the permission of the Minister of Justice was required in each individual case. This regulation affected only Jewish barristers, but did not apply to Jewish assistant barristers.

These permits were obtained only with great difficulty and by this action the number of Jewish barristers with full rights was considerably reduced.

From the year 1912 on, the limitations for barristers originating in 1889 were applied to the Jewish assistant barristers as well. In both cases the limitations applied only to the Judaic faith, and did not affect the Jews of non-Judaic faith.

In the same year it was decreed that in the introduction of local elective courts, Jews must not be elected to preside as Justices of Peace and District Judges. Jews were also not allowed to occupy teaching positions in high-schools.

Jews were allowed to be readers and heads of faculties in the highest learning institutions, but only in limited cases. For the Jews of non-Judaic faith, there were no limitations and no obstacles whatsoever. Thus, for example, even the chief of the Military-Surgical Academy in Petersburg at

the beginning of this century was a Jew by blood. This fact created difficulties when his son sought admission to the Pavlovsk Military School.

* * *

At this point it is appropriate to explain that the civil service was of two kinds: service in the positions that led to titles and pensions, and service in the employment, the latter being the same as employment in private offices and industry. In the majority of cases, Jews that were in the civil service belonged to the category of the service in the employment.

Jews were not appointed to the higher administrative positions, but again this was applied only to the Jews of Judaic faith.

Participation in self-rule

The Jews did not know the limitations during the whole "assimilation" period of Russian legislation concerning self-rule.

But at the end of the 1880's, soon after the introduction of the "percentage quota" the limitations were also applied to the participation of Jews in urban and rural self-rule.

The Jews were no longer allowed to participate in Zemstvo meetings and electoral conventions. These limitations did not apply to the rural services, particularly to doctors.

Participation in city self-rule was limited for Jews by the well known "percentage quota" for the city public Dumas: namely, that no more than one-third of the total voters could be Jewish, and that no Jew could be elected as mayor of a city.

But at the same time there were no limitations concerning the election of Jews into the membership of the State Duma, and the State Council. There were Jewish deputies in all four State Dumas; one Jew, Vainshtain, was even a member of the State Council, and participated in its sittings alongside the highest dignitaries of the Russian Empire.

Military duties

During their whole sojourn on the territory of Rechi Pospolite of Poland, the Jews did not have to perform military duties in peace or in war. Instead

of direct participation in the defense of the country, they paid a special tax, freeing them from military service.

After becoming Russian subjects, the Jews were not called for military service either. Military duty was compulsory for the "subjects of all the estate — the lower middle classes, artisans, merchants. The Jews were allowed to substitute for their service a special monetary collection, levied from Jewish communities, called "Kahals", where the Jews permanently resided.

But in 1827 this order was changed. By the nominal decree of the Emperor Nicholas I, new rules were introduced compelling the Jews to fulfill their military duties in person.

The decision as to who was to be sent as a recruit was given to the authorities of the Jewish communities. The government demanded only a definite number of adult men, physically healthy and older than 25 years of age.

Who was an adult was the decision of the rabbis. According to the Jewish law a man is considered adult as soon as he reaches 13 years of age, and the appropriate religious ceremony is performed for him. In addition the Jewish communities were given the right to turn in as recruits some other in place of the draftees: either mercenaries or wanderers – “their own coreligionists” – caught without passports, free of charge.

The absence of direct instructions, as to who should be considered adult, and the giving of the right to the communities to decide who should be turned in as a recruit, opened the widest possibilities for all kinds of abuses.

The entire burden of this recruitment used to fall on the poorest part of Jewry, which had neither connections and protections, nor the means to hire a substitute.

The government remained blind by choice to the matter of the feeble boy unfit to carry on heavy military service, yet considered by the Jewish community to be adult. The main thing was that the required numbers of recruits were delivered into the military service.

One might believe that this was done consciously, hoping that the Jewish boy, cut off from his environment would more easily "fuse with the native

population". This is what used to happen, in most cases, with these boys-soldiers, who survived various childhood diseases.

Those Jewish boy-soldiers who were unable to carry weapons, but had talents for music, were placed in musical detachments where they were taught the Russian language and then transplanted into the Orthodox religion without being asked for their consent. Sometimes they were placed in special schools where they were quickly "Russified" and then they carried the military service further without experiencing any limitations as a Jew. These limitations existed in Russia only with regard to religious inclination, and not to tribal or racial origin. These were so-called "kantonists", many of whom made a good career in the military and the civil service. They married Russians and became completely assimilated' and as a result were a complete loss for Jewry.

This cruel method of conducting assimilationist politics existed for more than a quarter of a century and was not abolished until 1856.

Furthermore, this method of assimilating the Jewish masses did not have any tangible results, because only a very small percentage of Jewish boys found themselves in the "kantonist" institutions.

With the introduction of conscription in Russia, all Jews reaching 21 years of age had to serve on a general basis and no kind of substitution was allowed.

On the other hand, during fulfillment of the military services more and more limitations were applied to Jews. They were not allowed promotions to officer status; they were prohibited from appointment to military clerks, to the commissariat, to sanitation units and to frontier services.

All these limitations only aggravated the already negative Jewish attitude to the military service and they were eager to free themselves from it in every possible way, even sometimes by going away to another country whenever the call for military duties arose.

The government responded to this by imposing fines on the families of dodgers. The Government not only failed to reach its aim by this method, but also provoked criticism from all Jewish circles as well as from the wide circles of Russian society.

The only way out of this situation, as some of the political personalities in pre-revolutionary Russia saw it, was the return to the times when the Jews were not obliged to serve in the military, but could pay special taxes instead. This question was heatedly debated in the corresponding circles in the period between the first revolution of 1905 and the eve of the First World War, but no decision was made. All the limitations for Jews in the military services remained in force.

When the First World War came, hundreds of thousands Jewish soldiers in the Russian army did not remain indifferent, knowing full well the conditions of their fellow tribesmen in the Austrian army. In situation like this, it was inevitable for these thoughts to occur and for them to compare the conditions of both warring armies, and to make their own conclusions which promote neither patriotism, nor a true fighting spirit. To deny this or to keep silent about it is to remain indifferent.

* * *

In addition to the previously enumerated measures of the Russian Government for assimilation and desegregation, one more decree of the Russian Government can be mentioned in conclusion. This is the decree which, when it was announced, agitated all "Russian subjects of the Judaic faith".

At the beginning of the Nineteenth Jewish men wore long skirts down to their heels called caftans or cloaks, which were some sort of national Jewish costume at that time. Emperor Nicholas I, who was a lover of uniformity and order, introduced measures for the Jews prescribing and exactly defining the length of the caftans or cloaks. Of course the order had to be fulfilled, and the Jews were forced to cut off the long skirts of their overcoats. Thus were created the Jewish overcoats which till the ear 1917 were called "lapersdak". But the "paisys" — long-curly sideburns which were popular in Jewish settlements — remained inviolable until the revolution of 1917. The sideburns were worn by the overwhelming majority of Jews in the "Jewish Pale". The exception was the insignificant number of Jews who broke off from the old Jewish custom.

The results and the conclusions of the assimilation and limitation politics

At the beginning of the Twentieth Century, in the years preceding the First World War, the results of the politics that were guided by the Russian Government in dealing with the Jewish question were clearly visible.

It may be said, in short, that neither the long period of striving to "fuse the Jews with the native population" by the measures of encouragement and desegregation, nor the considerably shorter period of various limitations, were of any great success and did not bring the desired results. The Jews did not become Russian patriots, in the full meaning of the word as it is understood throughout the world. They did not become patriots in the sense as Romans use to say "dulce et decorum est pro patria more" (sweet and honorable to die for motherland). There were of course, exceptions, but they were not numerous.

This is not surprising, due to the fact that the motherland for Jews of the whole world is not considered to be the country in which they were born, but the "Promised Land". That is the dream of their return, the dream that they cherish during the whole life of their sojourn in dispersion. They were taught this thought from infancy in their families, in "khederah", and in all modes of living in their Jewish communities. To reject this dream — for an orthodox Jew, especially in those times — was equal to rejection of the religion of his ancestors. This entails total personal contempt of the whole of Jewry. Anyone who changed religion was bemoaned as if dead. This scene was often seen in the "Jewish Pale", when a Jew or Jewess changed his or her religion. Crying and sobbing, powdering the head with ashes, moaning and lamenting were heard from that Jewish home overtaken by such a misfortune.

Besides the theory and dream about the "Promised Land", Jews were from their infancy implanted with the thought of being "God's Chosen People", superior in all respects to all other nations of the world. These inculcated ideas were and are the main themes of Jewish home education; the ideas in which no orthodox Jew doubts or ever doubted. This gave rise to and fed the complex of superiority and led to the self-isolation of Jews in their places of the dispersion.

If we take into consideration still another circumstance, namely that the Jewish religion is the only religion inseparably linked with race and blood – one has to be born but one cannot become one – and to that add another fact, that of the exactly determined geographic territory, the motherland of each Jew, it then becomes obvious why all the assimilative attempts of the Russian Government ended unsuccessfully.

Only the youthful "kantonists", turned away from their families and the influence of the rabbis, and later married non-Jewesses, produced offspring who completely fused with the native population. It is from among these assimilated Jews, it turned out later on, that quite a few notable personalities of the Russian Empire were developed.

A Portuguese Jew, Devrien, occupied one of the most responsible positions in the Empire during the reign of Peter the Great. Baron Shafirov brilliantly conducted finances under Peter the Great. Under Nicholas I, the Minister of Finance was Count Kankrin, the son of a Lithuanian rabbi. Kaufman Turcanstansky proved to be not only an excellent general but also an effective administrator General Grulev was worthy of great merit for his studies of the Far East and Manchuria, where, by his suggestion of location, the city of Harbin was built.

But all these people were few in numbers. The majority of Jews were never close to the fusion with the native population which the Russian Government sought.

Something quite different happened when the Jews received an education as a result of the assimilative politics of the state, and when they were deprived of the possibilities of occupying responsible administrative positions in the apparatus of the state as the result of the measures of limitations. They poured into the cultural and economic life of Russia. They rushed in to these spheres of Russian life by any channels available to them. It is in these spheres of the country's life that they were quite successful and by the beginning of the Twentieth Century they exerted their influence on the whole life of the country.

The legal practice, journalism, criticism, publishing, trade and industry, finance and newspapers made up the wide field of action where the Jews, not only were able to develop their activities, but were able to influence to a considerable degree all the spheres of the country's life, remaining at the

same time an alien body, not tied organically with the national interests of Russia.

With their considerable capital accumulated by the end of the nineteenth Century, the Jews were able to give considerable financial support to all kinds of beginnings, which according to their opinion, might be useful at a given time in the future to the Jewish ethnic group in Russia. The opposite was also true. They could also counteract the creations, developments and those successful beginnings, which could bring harm or material or moral damage.

The Jews rushed with special energy into the periodical press, which was developing and acquiring more and more influence, and, by the beginning of the First World War, the majority of the periodical Russian press was either in the Jewish hands, or under Jewish influence and control. With this they acquired a powerful means of influencing the feelings of the broad masses, and thus the politics of the country.

Professor Solomon Lourie, in his book published in 1922 ("Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World") dealing with the questions of Jewish interrelations with nations and countries in which they sojourned, writes:

1. *"The local law must be strictly observed, but only insofar as it does not contradict the attitudes of the still existing national Jewish sense of justice and insofar as its observance is not connected with any harm to the Jewish people. Thus the laws, directly or indirectly applied against the Jews, in any case should not be observed.*
2. *It is necessary to be strictly loyal with respect to the state which regards the Jews favorably. In the case of a struggle between two states or between two parties within a state, it is recommended to sympathize, and, as far as possible, to assist the side more sympathetic towards the Jews."* (p. 120)

In spite of these two rules, the instructions regarding the conduct and activities of the Jews in Russia never found any place in the Jewish press, or in the press under Jewish influence. These were not only unpublished but were also never orally discussed. Nevertheless, the broad Jewish masses which were Russian subjects, completely adhered to these rules.

Living among other nations through the centuries of Diaspora life, every Jew worked out his own peculiar and distinct approach and appraisal to all that took place outside of the closed circle of the Jewish tribes. That is what Professor Lourie formulated exactly in these two points given above.

Whatever happens and wherever it happens in any country at any point on this Earth, in any sphere of life, a Jew a ways, and invariably asks the question: "How about us?" Sometime he asks this question aloud sometime he asks only himself. Depending on the answer given, he determines his attitude to the actual events, to a state, to a people, to a political personality or party, or to other cultural manifestations of the life of the nation where he lives.

At the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, Russia received more than a million Jews who had no knowledge of the Russian language, no large capital, and did not want to join or become accustomed to the Russian culture which was generally the All-Russian culture of the time, yet alien to them. At that time Jews neither wanted to participate in the Russian life and culture nor wished to exert their influence on the politics of the country, because they did not yet possess that kind of knowledge and economic power that made itself a force to be reckoned with.

But in less than one hundred years everything changed. Extensive capital was accumulated in Jewish hands; professional Jewish personnel were created, and they graduated from high schools and universities fully fluent in Russian. With the help of their accumulated capital, the Jews penetrated into all the spheres of the economic and cultural life of the country.

To this we must add another factor, namely, that in Europe, beginning in the middle of the Nineteenth Century, Jewish capital sometimes had decisive importance not only in the internal, but also in the external politics of many countries. At that time Russia was experiencing an acute shortage of foreign capital for the development of its industries. Upon the Rothschilds of France, England, Austria; and upon the Mendelssohn's of Germany depended a lot of the decisions regarding various financial questions, which influenced the politics of these countries in their relationship with Russia.

The largest and the most influential newspapers and publishing houses of Europe, and the telegraph agencies, which created the “political atmosphere” belonged to the Jews or were under strong Jewish influence.

Understandably and naturally the wealthy European Jews paid special attention to the fate and wishes of their fellow tribesmen in Russia, and pushed the decisions of their governments in the direction of such wishes.

The question of loans and trade agreements frequently fell under the direct dependence of the politics of the Russian Government toward the "Jewish question".

From memoir literature we know that in the Berlin Congress, convened after the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-78, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, a Jew, Disraeli, and also Lord Palmerston, found it possible and appropriate to question Prince Gortchakov, the representative of Russia, about the "conditions of the Jews in Russia". We also know the answer given by Prince Gortchakov, which forced this self-confident "lord" to blush.

From the recollections of Vitte we know what kind of pressure the financial circles of France, with Rothschild at its head, tried to exert on Russian politics regarding the "Jewish Question" during the conclusion of Russian external loans.

It is well known that the largest amount of financial and propaganda help came from the American Jews and was connected with all the revolutionary beginnings in Russia.

In Russia itself, the question of the relationship with the Jews – "Judaeophobia" and "Judaeophilia" – became one of basic questions addressed to public figures, writers and journalists. Only those who unreservedly and without reason repeated and supported all pro-Jewish expressions and saw in Jews only the good side, closing their eyes to negative actions, relative to all nationalities and tribes including the Jewish tribes as well, were recognized and admired as "cultural", "honest" and "progressive".

Anyone who dared to say anything out of tune against the complaints of oppression, persecution, torment and suffering of the Jews, was repeatedly named, both orally and in the press, and was subsequently labeled a

“Judaephobe” or an “anti-Semite”. His mind, honor and decency were questioned' his popularity declined, and no one would listen to him nor even read his works.

Frequently even those were considered doubtful who steered clear and had nothing to do with the “ticklish question”. They were suspected as “hidden anti-Semites”. (As Mark Vishniak stated in one of his articles. A Russian Jew, Vishniak was secretary of the All-Russian Constituent Assembly.)

Jews were watching vigilantly the attitudes of individual political and cultural personalities of Russia towards the Jewish question, and they used to divide these people into two groups, the friends and the enemies of Jews.

At the beginning of this century, the publishing house “Pravda” in Warsaw systematically issued small pamphlets under the general name “Friends and Enemies of Jews”. The pamphlet was sold for 3-10 kopeks. In this pamphlet, as the title indicates, “portraits and characteristics of each individual were disclosed”.

Russia was flooded with similar pamphlets which sold for pennies, or given away for nothing.

The propaganda machine was working at full blast, provoking and arousing the broad masses of Russia to make them feel that their duty was to strive to help “the oppressed” Jewry.

This aspiration, in its own turn, gave rise to sharp antigovernment feelings. The propaganda was repeated again and again, such that the initiative of all possible “discrimination” originated with the government, and was inspired and supported by big landowners, clergy and other “Black-Hundreders”.

More than a few journalists and writers in pre-revolutionary Russia owe their popularity to a considerable degree to their statements relating to the “Jewish question”, irrespective of the quality of their work.

On the other hand, if the smallest doubt was raised regarding the virtues and talents, not necessarily of the Jewish people as a whole, but of its individual representatives, the end result might be the boycott of the whole progressive society and the press. This phenomenon was typical in the socio-cultural life of Russia around the turn of the last century.

Lest you think that this statement is unsubstantiated, here are two examples which will clarify how great a role "Judaephobia" and "Judaephilia" played in the cultural life of Russia.

Alexander Amfiteatrov, a journalist and author of many lashing satirical and pamphlets write in his two pamphlets "Jewry and Socialism" and "Jewry as a Spirit of Revolution", that: "the Jews were never satisfied with any government, under the power of which they were placed by historical fate. They cannot, and will not be satisfied because an ideal of the perfect democracy, put in their souls, has not been realized to this day..." As regarding the fact that there are quite a few Jewish capitalists who are not interested in real democracy, socialism or upheavals, Amfiteatrov explains in the following words. "A socialist by nature is a socialist to his bones. A Jew, for centuries, had been compelled by law for self-preservation to wrap himself so coarsely and cleverly in a coarse bourgeois shell that entire teachings, entire sociological theories concerning this inborn bourgeoisie appeared. The inborn bourgeoisie representing a typical racial symptom of Jewry..." Amfiteatrov writes further:

"But with the years the alien colors are shed as are its dilapidated scales, and in the voices of Lassal, Marx, and the revolutionary activities of the Russian-Jewish leaders of the liberating epoch, we hear the invariable howl of the old ebonites, the thunder of Isaiah, the crying of Jeremiah, the noble equalizing utopia of Galileo and Jesus... Yes, Jewry in the world is not only a nation, or a religious association, it also a social party..."

"Paul's Christianity" – continues Amfiteatrov – "came into the world to work out alliances, a theory and an ethic of the bourgeois system, while Jewry, with all its hereditary subdivisions in religion and philosophy, remained to live and be tormented in order that socialism in the world might be preserved".

After writings of this sort and especially after the appearance of his well known pamphlet "'Gentlemen Crooks", Amfiteatrov was exiled from Russia. But a long time before the year 1917, and even before the appearance of his pamphlet, a Jew, V. S. Mandel, said at one of the social gatherings:

"Be that as it may, but the Jewry should have replied to Mr. Amfiteatrov and the other apologists of his with the

quotation from the Russian writer, known even to those Jewish nationalists who are against allowing anyone to speak Russian at their own gatherings: "God deliver me from fools."

Professor Konstantin Arabazhin of Petersburg university, a brilliant orator and speaker, had a reputation for progressive thinking, and his articles were willingly published in journals and newspapers. The auditorium where he read his lectures was always full. His speeches at literary gatherings were events in the literary world. His opinions and appraisals of literary works were held in high regard, his erudition and knowledge of literature was acknowledged nationally.

According to the custom of the time, new literary works were discussed openly at these literary gatherings. Once, at such a gathering, there was a discussion of the literary works by Simon Ushkevich, a Jew belonging to the third grade of fiction writers. Ushkevich wrote in Russian, depicting Jewish life and the mode of living in small towns.

Speaking at the gathering, professor Arabazhin made a comment on the Ushkevich work, noting the author's weak points.

The author, being present at the gathering, immediately responded with the following words: "why do you poke your nose into something that you don't know and do not understand?"

Arabazhin, being hot-tempered, did not remain speechless, but retaliated at once: "And why do you creep into Russian literature, which you neither know nor understand?"

The words of Arabazhin were directed only at Ushkevich as a reply to his remarks.

Unfortunately, the word "you" in the plural form is synonymous in Russian with the singular form "thou" if a polite form of address is required, (as in contemporary English) and in spite of this, the word was interpreted as a reference not only to Simon Ushkevich but also to all the Jews writing their literary works in Russian.

As a result the star of Arabazhin not only lost its luster, but completely disappeared. His works were no longer published by the "foremost and

progressive" press; no longer was he invited to literary meetings and debates, his lectures lost their magnetic force to students and he was put on list of "reactionaries", "Black-Hundreders" and "Jew-baiters".

Later on, during the civil war, prof. Arabazhin took an active part, closely collaborating with the "North-Western Government" of General Yudenich.

Something similar also occurred with M. Artzybashev, the most popular writer in Russia of his time, already in emigration in Warsaw, after his article dealing with the "Jewish Question" appeared in the press.

With regard to the incident with prof. Arabazhin, I had an opportunity to hear of this from several people who were present at the meeting. Similarly at the congress of Russian writers and journalists in Yugoslavia I heard the same thing, and in a conversation with the writers Evgeni Chirikov and Boris Lazarevsky the facts relating to this incident were confirmed.

After several decades I heard the very same thing from former Menshevik-"Bundist" G. Y. Aronson, who was living in New York and contributing to several newspapers and journals that are published in both the Russian and Jewish languages.

* * *

Jewish influence in all spheres of the cultural life in Russia was felt distinctly by all, except by those who did not want to hear or see, nor moreover to speak about it out of the fear of being taken for "backward", or "Black-Hundreders", with all the consequences which ensued. There were, of course, stout-hearted idealist-dreamers, who traditionally took part of those who cried about their sufferings, without reasoning how justified such cries were, nor wanting to "hear the other side of the story". If they are crying and moaning, that means they are suffering, therefore, they have to be helped and saved from these sufferings. Furthermore those, against whom the criers and the moaners complain, the power and the government, must be condemned...

Jews themselves regard as inconceivable altogether the fact that they sometimes and in some instances could be wrong. Here is what I. M. Bickerman writes about this question in his sketch "Russia and Russian Jewry", Collection I "Russia and Jews", published in Berlin in 1924.

"A Jew answers to everything with his usual gesture and with his usual words: it is a well known fact that we are at fault in everything. Wherever misfortune happened, a search into the matter would be made, and a Jew would be found as scapegoat. Nine-tenths of what is written in the Jewish periodical issues about the Jews in Russia constitutes only a retelling of this stereotyped phrase. Since the Jews, of course, cannot be at fault always and in everything, a Jew makes a conclusion, quite flattering and convenient for us, that we are always right in everything. Still worse, he simply refuses to subject his conduct to his own judgment. He refuses to realize what he is doing and what he is not, but, perhaps, ought to be doing. It must be concluded that since pretensions, reproaches and accusations are thrown at us from every different side, the accusers must be at fault, mankind must be at fault, everything else must be at fault, but not us..."

In another place in the same collection we also find the following phrase. "A Jew does not recognize the judgment of history. He himself judges the history..."

Not only the history, it should be added, he also carries out his own judgment about the culture, existence and life, of other nationalities, without admitting the thought that somebody, in general, not belonging to the Jewish tribe, might have his own judgment about the Jews, their culture, literature, entity and racial-tribal peculiarities.

And at the same time in every possible way, Jews strove to participate in all the sectors of social, political and cultural life in Russia.

From the beginning of the Sixties and Seventies of the Nineteenth Century, many Jews themselves strove to link up with Russians. At that time they were timid and unsure of themselves, but were inspired with assimilationist's feelings. These two decades were characteristic in the respect that there were no limitations whatsoever for Jews within the Russian Government. This aroused some enthusiasm in many Jews, who received their highest education in the Russian institutions, "in order to become a Russian". But the full assimilation was hindered by religious differences, which in those times meant a great deal.

At that time Jewish political parties did not exist at all. Jews however enrolled in All-Russian political groups, without experiencing any obstacles

either from Russian society or from well-educated Jews who considered it normal and natural.

And in Seventies we already encountered the Jews in the All-Russian groupings, not only as ordinary members, but also as leaders. It is true that not as many Jews assumed the rôles of leaders as the native Russians, but nevertheless they were there and no one ever questioned the right of Jewish participation.

In the last quarter of the century, and at the turn of this century in the years preceding the revolution of 1905-6, the Jews were filling the ranks and groupings of the All-Russian parties and formed the ranks of these parties as well. The big majority of those Jews were in the ranks of "Left" parties and in those groupings, especially the militant-revolutionary once, in which we frequently see Jews holding the most responsible and exalted positions.

The Jews did not, as a rule, participate in the so-called "Right" parties and groupings, with national or nationalistic inclinations. Yet it must be acknowledged, that there were cases when rich Jews supported such parties financially.

But the whole Jewish mass of five million, who were subjects of Russia, were, except in rare cases, of one mind in their oppositionist feelings towards the government. These Jewish masses consisted of the embodiment, closely welded by their origin, of the citizens who stroved to change the political system and the social order of Russia. These masses were ready and waiting only for the moment to employ their force in the task of reconstructing the country in which they lived.

Some of these Jewish masses wanted to reconstruct the Russian system by evolutionary means, by the means of various reforms, but there were not many such people. The majority of the Jews, if they did not state their aspirations, nevertheless silently approved the idea of forceful change of the existing order by revolutionary means.

The influence of the Jewish ethnic group on the cultural life in Russia and the creation of numerous Jewish personnel with a Russian education made it easier for the Jews to penetrate so quickly into all sectors of the economic life of the country. Many Jews were getting rich quickly and strove to give their children the highest education possible. The Jews did not spare their money on those social and cultural All-Russian undertakings which could

be useful to them immediately or in the future. Special attention was directed to the periodical press, which was beginning to gain more and more influence throughout the whole world the internal and external politics of all countries.

It was necessary to have educated and able personnel for this, and also considerable direct or indirect financing.

How were the above mentioned personnel created? It is the result of assimilative politics of the Russian Government on one hand, and the assimilative attitude and striving of the Jews on the other.

How the Jews created the capital which they did not spare to use for various undertakings and for the support of those All-Russian cultural institutions which they desired will be summarized here only in a general way, because the volume of this work does not permit me to spare too much space in which to deal with this question.

* * *

Five and half million Russian Jews participated most actively in the economic life, not only in the "Jewish Pale", but also in Russia as a whole, and, in spite of existing limitations, had achieved remarkable success.

At the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, when they became subjects of Russia, all the Jews were exclusively merchants, diverse lease-holders, brokers, intermediaries (the middle-men) and operators of drinking establishments. Neither the big bourgeoisie nor the people with secular education were among them. Neither were there any Jews of agricultural occupation of those who owned land.

But in one century the picture radically changed. On the eve of the 1917 Revolution, almost all of the most important largest enterprises of trade and industry in the "Jewish Pale", and to a considerable degree in all of Russia as well, were either completely in Jewish hands or under their domination.

It is impossible to determine exactly the percentage of Jewish capital that participated in different sectors of the Russian economy, because a considerable part of the Jewish capital was camouflaged in order to evade some of the limitations which existed for Jewish enterprises. In order to

bypass the law, Jewish enterprises often were operated under the figurehead of a non-Jewish enterprise, and gave an appearance that the enterprise was not Jewish.

The government had a difficult struggle against the above said methods. And to be frank, the government in reality did not struggle that much against such methods. For example, in the pre-revolutionary years, it was not a secret that one of Russia's largest joint-stock companies – "Grain-Sugar" – that controlled many sugar refineries and had a large trade of grain actually belonged to the well known Muscovite Jew-Zionist, M. Zlotopolsky. But the president of this enterprise was a Count, a person of non-Jewish faith. Thus formally at least, everything was in order. This phenomenon was not unique, but typical, and not only in the sugar industry, but also in the other sectors of economic life as well. Such practices were widespread in flour-milling, the grain trade, the lumber trade, and especially in the financial sector. Such practices however were more common in the "Jewish Pale" than in other parts of Russia.

As previously mentioned, although it is impossible to determine the exact amount of Jewish capital that was operating in the Russian economy, nevertheless, a great deal of information on this subject can be obtained from the book "Jews in Economic Life of Russia" written by I. Dizhura, who did extensive research into this question. The book was published in New York in 1960.

According to I. Dizhura's data, of 518 sugar refineries in Russia, 182 belonged to the Jews, or 31.5% of the whole. The 182 figure represents only those Jewish refineries which did not camouflage their capital. But in almost all other refineries, to a lesser or greater degree, Jewish capital was involved under the above described camouflage.

In the flour-milling business 365 large steam mills were in Jewish hands; 22% of all the breweries were also in Jewish hands, and in the textile industry – 30%. The grain trade was almost exclusively in Jewish hands. Out of 1000 grain trading posts, 930 belonged to Jews. The lumber trade, according to I. Dizhura, was one of the major Jewish businesses. And the river navigation on Dnieper was 70% controlled by the Jew, Mr. Margolin.

In the banking business, which nowadays plays such an important role in the economy life of a country, only two banks in all of Russia did not have

Jews on its board of directors. Those were the Moscow Merchant Bank and the Volzhsko-Kamsky. All other banks were either completely or to a considerable degree under Jewish control, and had Jews on the board of directors.

From this brief review, made from Jewish sources, one can see how great the participation of Jewish capital was in the economic life of Russia.

Even the gold-fields in Russia were generally in Jewish hands. As was said before, the richest gold-fields of Lena were in Jewish hands, owned by Ginzburg. The same picture can be seen in the mining of platinum where Jewish capital had its liveliest participation. In gold and platinum mining in

Russia, Jewish capital closely collaborated with the "foreign" English or French capital, which in fact belonged to the Jews of these countries, and to be precise, this capital belonged to the largest European Jewish-controlled banks which were making investments in Russia.

The only exception where Jewish capital was not invested was large land holdings. Starting from the 1880's, Jews were prohibited from the acquisition of lands in rural areas. But those who bought land before the prohibition were allowed to keep their land and were permitted to do whatever they wished with it. The land in question was not used for individual cultivations (Jews did not strive towards such occupations), but for large-scale farming.

Owing to the purchase of large land-holdings by Jews before the prohibition, it was possible for some of them to operate large-scale farms. In the Ukraine there were Jewish land-owners who had hundreds of thousands of acres under cultivation. For instance, in the Konotopsk district of Chernigove province, near Hetman's capital of Baturin, around which were many estates of the Ukrainian nobles of Hetman's times, there were two Jewish wealthy land-owners, Messrs, Zorokhovich and Cherkinsky. Their country estates, which were well-cultivated and well-managed, had such an appearance that not only the peasants, serving on these estates, but also many other landowners residing in the vicinity, were made envious. In the neighboring district of Putilovsk in the Kursk province, which did not belong to the "Jewish Pale", there were also wealthy Jewish landowners. The sugar producer Shirman, before the First

World War, owned a large estate in Gruzinsk, which was for many centuries the ancestral land of the former Putilovsk voivod-boiars of Cherepovoy.

Still many other large estates were acquired not personally by Jews, but by the joint-stock companies, primarily of the sugar refineries, which were actually owned by the Jews.

How Jewish Capital Was Created in Russia

An exhaustive and documented answer as to how Jewish capital was created in Russia is given by the same Mr. Dizhura, an expert and investigator of this question.

"An accumulation of capital was the result of Jewish activity during the first half of the Nineteenth Century as tax-collectors, operators of wholesale liquor storehouses and tavern operators".

Besides this, many Jews used to lease distilleries from the big landowners.

In Kiev alone, there were several wholesale liquor storehouses and many taverns in Jewish hands. For example, Veinstein had a storehouse and seventy two taverns. In Mernery he also had a storehouse and ten taverns. In Cherkassy, Mr. Sklovsky had a storehouse and twenty three taverns. Generally speaking, the vodka trade in the "Jewish Pale" was almost without exception in Jewish hands.

As is known, at that time the activity of the tavern operators, who traded in vodka, was tied up and closely interwoven with the activity of loan-credit which was not subjected to any control whatsoever. Simply speaking; there were no control and no regulations over usury, the victims of which were not only peasants who used to mortgage their miserable possessions and bring the money away in the taverns, but also landlords who resorted to such loans. The banking business at that time was only in its initial stage, and this is why people who were in need of credit had to turn to private businessmen who had the money. Quite a few representatives of the administration, officials and officers, also resorted to loans operated by tavern-owners and tax-collectors. Being hooked by loan operators, these officials inevitably fell into dependence upon the loan operators, and the resulting circumstances hindered the government's struggle against dishonest usurers.

Thus having accumulated capital in this manner, at the beginning of the second half of the Nineteenth Century, Jews began to invest in the rapidly developing sugar industry, in railway transportation and in other sectors of the trade and industry of Russia, and especially in the banking business.

As a result of this before the revolution Russia had many dozens, if not hundreds, of Jewish millionaires and their influence and share in the economic life of the country grew quickly and steadfastly.

In a parallel manner, their influence grew not only in the economic life of the country, but also in the cultural, political and moral life of the whole of Russia.

The feeling of tribal solidarity, characteristic to all tribes and nationalities in general, was always, and still is, strongly developed in the Jews. This fact attracted the attention of Tacitus who, even at that time, said that the Jews had a special love for their tribes.

And, motivated and directed by such feelings, the Jews continually endeavored not only to help, but also to promote the interests of their tribesmen, by contributing to their success and counteracting the promotion and success of their potential competitors, the non-Jews.

Possessing the finances and being tightly bound by their race and religion, Jews were extremely successful in this direction.

The Social Structure of Russian Jewry

Owing to their money the Jews were able to join merchant guilds of the First Rank and receive the highest education, if not in Russian schools, then in the schools of foreign countries. These circumstances enabled the Russian Jewry to free itself from or to by-pass most limitations. In fact the social elite of Russian Jewry were not affected by the limitations and did not suffer from them.

But, besides the social elite, the Russian Jewish masses, which numbered more than five million, had within itself the middle class, the petty-bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The middle class and the petty-bourgeoisie were almost exclusively merchants and intermediaries (middle-men), beginning with those whose business enterprises were in the thousands of rubles and ending with those who owned small business establishments. This group also included numerous Jewish artisans, from those who had their own workshops with hired workers to those with the itinerant "tinsmiths", "watch-makers" and "glass-cutters".

Having inborn abilities for trade and intermediary activities' the Jews almost completely forced out the non-Jewish tradesmen and artisans from the cities and towns of the "Jewish Pale" and also to a great extent from other places outside of the "Jewish Pale". This was possible because the

Jewish artisans and various specialists were allowed to live anywhere in Russia.

In the years preceding the First World War, in many cities and towns in Russia, nothing could be bought in stores, from Friday evening to Saturday evening: all tradesmen were Jews, whose religion forbids trading on Saturday.

The Russian Government, which is blamed by so many for the oppression of the Jews, treated this situation tolerantly and did not force Jews to trade on Saturday.

The non-Jewish population adapted to this phenomenon and there were no conflicts over this situation.

Besides the cities and towns, where the majority of the Jewish population dwelled, usually two to three Jewish families also lived in each village of the "Jewish Pale". These families operated variety stores where they used to buy up peasant produce t like eggs, poultry, wool and bristle. These Jewish families lived quite isolated lives, strictly keeping with the Talmudic rituals, and not only did not mix with the native population, but also did not even associate with them, except in business deals.

Side by side with the big, middle and petty-bourgeoisie, artisans and the people of free professions, Russian Jewry also had large numbers of proletariat, living in the cities and towns of the "Jewish Pale".

This proletariat, or a considerable part of it, eked out a miserable existence, working in the various capitalist enterprises of light industry or making both ends meet in petty-brokerage and intermediary services.

In their mode of living this Jewish proletariat also lived an isolated life, like all the other Jews.

Only the representatives of the free profession, including doctors, lawyers and journalists, and the social elite went outside, to a considerable extent, of the secluded circle of the pure Jewish mode of living, and if did not mix, then they closely associated with the surrounding native population.

However the main bulk of the Jewish population within the "Jewish Pale" as well as outside of it, kept closely to the precepts of their antiquity. They had a rare unity and harmony which preserved and protected them.

Because of such harmony, the whole Jewry of Russia, regardless of their sharp social stratification that usually leads to class differences was one monolithic whole. In all non-Jewish questions, all Jews from millionaire to beggar reacted unanimously.

Right up to the Revolution of 1917 t all the Jews were dissatisfied that some limitations for their coreligionists still existed in Russia. That is why they all supported and even took an active part in the All-Russian political parties, striving to change the existing social and political order in the country. Some Jews were inclined to the evolutionary reform method of changing the order; others preferred the revolutionary method and with their entire ardor rushed into the revolutionary parties and quickly occupied commanding positions.

Afterwards, when the revolution came and underground activists, agitators and propagandists who were former exiles became rulers of Russia's destiny, this feeling of interconnection and the unity of the whole Jewry saved the life of the members of the Jewish big bourgeoisie. Their fellow tribesmen occupied many ruling positions in those bodies of power, which could, according to their own judgment, have a free hand with the lives of Soviet citizens.

There were virtually no cases of the extermination of the representatives of the biggest Jewish bourgeoisie and the persons of free professions. But the extermination of the non-Jewish bourgeoisie, in the years of terror, was the order of the day.

Of course, the revolution and the abolition of private property could not bypass the Jewish capitalists and proprietors. Their capital was nationalized equally with all the rest and they suffered materially as well. But these losses were compensated by the surpluses which Jewry, on the whole received from the revolution.

The revolution of 1917 brought to all the Jews of Russia not only equality, but also, in fact, a privileged position and many of them were elevated to the position of important personages on a country-wide scale. To deny this means to deny all the known facts, which are not disputed even by the Jews.

The facts are too striking and too obvious. With equality, and even privileged positions, new possibilities opened for Russian Jewry, possibilities that were fully utilized by them in the first thirty-five years of Soviet rule.

The participation by Jews in all the spheres of economic, political and cultural life of Russia, renamed the USSR, was inversely proportional to their number in the country.

Jewish Participation and Their Role in the Cultural Life of Russia

The Jews began to take part in the cultural life of Russia only in the second half of the Nineteenth Century. There was no opposition to their participation from the government, or from the Russian intelligentsia, or from the Russian society as a whole. They were admitted into the Russian environment: in literature, the legal profession, political groupings and various other popular organizations as "Russians of Judaic faith".

Their civil self-consciousness, in becoming accustomed to the Russian culture, and their peculiar realistic estimation of future possibilities, told them that the future of Russian Jewry was inseparably linked with the future of Russia. This consciousness pushed them in the direction of most active participation in the political life of the country. At that time the Russian Jews, or at least their most educated part, did not think in a serious manner about the "Promised Land", because they were directing their efforts into the betterment of the life of their fellow tribesmen in Russia, not only in the direction of their legal rights, but also in the sphere of the economic and other modes of living.

On the other hand, there were, however, still strong isolationist feelings. The consciousness of being "God's Chosen People", the unwillingness and even fear of fusing with other people by means of mixed marriages and becoming Russian, kept the Jews at a certain distance from the rest of Russia's masses.

Inwardly unexpressed, Jews, just the same, continued to consider themselves as the state within a state or, as Solomon Lourie defined it, "the nation without its language and territory, but with its own law".

Taking part in the All-Russian cultural, social and political life, the Jews brought in a lot of their own specific peculiarities, without even noticing and realizing it. Many of these peculiarities, of course, were of positive, not necessarily negative quality. Each nation, race and tribe has positive and negative qualities, if these qualities are regarded in a broader sense from the viewpoint of a state, nation or race.

Naturally and understandably so, the Jews, at the time of their choice, joined in with those social and political groupings, who had programs which were most advantageous to them.

And just at the time, when the Jews began to take part in All-Russian political organizations, as it is known, an outline of the conflict became apparent. The conflict was due to the divergence of opinions and judgments, appraisals of the known appearances expressed by the members of the same organization, Jewish as well as non-Jewish.

A striking example of this conflict is the attitude toward the Jewish pogroms, which resulted from the repercussions created at the beginning of the 1880's by the most active revolutionary groupings. These groups known as "People's Freedom" and the "Black Repartition" resorted to terror in their political struggle and organized the murder of Alexander II.

This conflict is so characteristic and so typical of how differently one and the same event may be appraised by members of a same organization or party, holding even the same views, education and social disposition, differing from one another only by their Jewish or non-Jewish origin, that it is worthwhile to pause and elaborate on them. Moreover, similar or analogous conflicts can very frequently be detected in our time as well.

After the murder of the Czar on March 1, 1881, it is known that in some cities of the Ukraine Jewish pogroms occurred with their accompanying violence, destruction of possessions and loss of life.

A sudden change ensued as a result of this among the radically oriented Jewish youth who were taking the most active part in the revolutionary-terrorist activities of the "People's Freedom" and the "Black Repartition". Now the victims of the same terrorist activities which they themselves preached and practiced became their own fellow tribesmen, the Jews... At this time, a sudden turn of events within the conflict occurred. As long as the extermination of the representatives of authority was going on, including the Czar himself, as long as the call of the "Black Repartitionists" was directed at the destruction of properties belonging to the native bourgeoisie, disregarding the violence and murder, and as long as the Jews with their properties were not touched, the hearts of the whole of Russian Jewry were not disturbed.

Thus the Jews and the non-Jews worked harmoniously on the realization of the terrorist program. And no one questioned to which tribe, religion or race a selected victim of the terror belonged; or whether the victim was a "bourgeois" or a representative of power.

Members of the "People's Freedom", whose call was violence and terror, naturally could not remain silent about the Jewish pogroms. In autumn 1881, the executive committee of the "People's Freedom" released a leaflet in connection with the pogroms, and after a while, in the sixth edition of the "People's Freedom" the following was published: "all the attention of the defending people is concentrated now on the merchants, tavern operators and usurers, in a word, on the Jews, of this local bourgeoisie who hastily and passionately, as never before, are fleecing the working people".

As mentioned before, the above leaflet along with the article in the sixth edition of the "People's Freedom" considered the pogroms to be the manifestation and expression of people's anger, directed against the exploiters and oppressors' regardless of whether they were Jews or non-Jews.

Two years later, in the "Supplement" to the "Leaflet of the People's Freedom" an article was published "regarding the Jewish disorders", in which these disorders were interpreted as the beginning of the all-national movement, "not against Jews as Jews, but against the "Zhidy"-Jews, the ones who were the exploiters of the people". The people well understood that the authorities supported them not because they were Jews, not because they were an oppressed people, but only because they were those from whom they took bribes and with whom they made dishonest deals and shared the profits, associating thus in suppressing the working people. The working faction of the "People's Freedom", issuing the leaflet in connection with the Ecatherinoslavsk pogrom of 1883, spoke not against Jews in general, but only against the wealthy Jews, the exploiters of the workers. The "People's Freedom" has nothing against the first, the Jewish workers, and treated them as they did all the rest of Russian workers, but was against the second, the wealthy Jews, and "from its labor point of view has a lot of reckoning to do..."

At the end of the article, the author reminded us that the Great French Revolution also began with an assault against the Jews an referred to Karl Marx" who once explained that the Jews create, like in mirror, (not in an ordinary, but in a prolonged way) all the vices of the surrounding environment and all the evils of the social order, so that when an anti-Jewish movement begins, one can be sure that in it there is a hidden protest against the whole order, and thus the deeper movement starts".

The above excerpt was taken from an article by D. Shub: "Jews in the Russian Revolution" published in the Collection "Jewish World", New York, 1944.

The author of the leaflet of the "People's Freedom" was a Jew, Saveli Zlotopolsky, a member of the executive committee of the "People's Freedom". Zlotopolsky somehow managed to remain free, after twenty members of the twenty eight member committee were arrested.

The author of the article, published in the sixth issue of the "People's Freedom", was a member of the executive committee named G. Romanenko, who was admitted to the committee after March 1, 1881.

The author of the article "Supplement" to the "Leaflet of the "People's Freedom", which was mentioned above, is unknown.

The authorship of S. Zlotopolsky, for over half a century, was not disputed by anyone, but after the year 1917, the authorship question again came up in connection with the recollections of Anna Korb, who was in 1881 a member of the executive committee of the "People's Freedom". Anna Korb reaffirms that the author of this leaflet was not Zlotopolsky, but Romanenko. An investigator of this question, David Shub, himself a Jew, accepts on faith in his sketch "Jews in Russian Revolution" the belated disclosure by Anna Korb, without explaining the causes why this revolutionary kept silent about it so long.)

But it was not the authorship – be it Jewish, Ukrainian or Russian – that agitated revolutionary circles of Russia so radically.

What was more important was not who wrote the article, but what was written. Furthermore, it was not individually written by anyone person, but in the name of the executive committee of the "People's Freedom" that counts. Because the participation in this revolutionary-terrorist organization was not based on race, religion, nationality and social disposition. The son of the Ukrainian magnate – Dmitri Lizogub, and the General's daughter Sophia Perovska, and the son of the priest Jacob Stephanovich, the offspring of the wealthy Jewish family Saveli and Gregory Zlotopolsky, and the Jewess-proletarian Gesia Gelfman were active members of the organization.

It was psychologically unthinkable, ethically inadmissible and personally deeply insulting for any of this people, that they should not risk their own lives for the sake of the attainment of that, which according to their thinking, ought to have brought a better future. These people probably did not question what results their actions would bring upon their close or distant relatives.

Why was it possible for them to call for pogroms against landlords and their country estates, as well as against other "bourgeois", but impossible to justify the "people's anger" if its victim happens to be a Jew?

The controversy which took place within the radical-revolutionary circles, at the beginning of the 1880's, in connection with statements made by the members of the "People's Freedom" and the subsequent "Jewish disorder" attracted the most noted radicals-revolutionaries and founders of the movement: Lev Tikhomirov, Jacob Stephanovich, P. Lavrov, Lev Deich and others.

Summarizing the controversy, David Shub, a Jew who studied it thoroughly many years later after all the passions had settled, wrote: "It cannot be denied, however, that the majority of the Russian revolutionaries at the beginning of Eighties openly evaded and disassociated themselves from the point of view of the Jewish question, expressed in the sixth issue of the "People's Freedom".

"The Jewish disorders", according to Jacob Stephanovich, who became a member of the executive committee of the "People's Freedom" after the first of March, 1881 "is a purely national movement and therefore, we have no right to behave in a negative or even indifferent manner... ". Lev Tikhomirov had also the same viewpoint. This is reaffirmed by Plekhanov who entered into a dispute with Tikhomirov in regard to this question in 1882, already in immigration.

The well known revolutionary P. P. Lavrov, whom D. Shub qualifies as the "doubtless friend of the Jewish people", in a letter he wrote on April 14, 1882 to P. B. Axelrod, who was a Jewish Russian revolutionary, states the following: "I must confess to you that the Jewish question is extremely complicated and practically impossible. For the party, having drawn nearer in our viewpoint with the people and making them rise against the government, it is extremely difficult to solve. To solve it theoretically on

paper is very easy, but owing to the presence of people's passions and owing to the necessity of having the people ON ONE'S OWN SIDE wherever possible, it is quite another matter to solve it in practice".

Lavrov's thoughts and understandings were shared as well by many other Jewish revolutionaries who gave up their religious-racial-tribal approach and their demands to various questions, an exception to the general rules and conditions for their fellow tribesmen (for which, even now, many Jews, occupying key political and cultural positions in the lives of different states and nations, are sorry.)

Here is what a Jew L. Deich wrote to the Jew P. Axelrod on this question: "The Jewish question, in practice, actually now is almost insoluble for the revolutionaries. Well, for example, what must they do now in the Baltic region, where the Jews are beaten up? If they should defend them, which means, as Reclu says, "to provoke hate against the revolutionaries who not only killed the Czar but also support the Jews", and thus they find themselves between two contradictions, this' is a simply impossible situation, in practice and in action, for the Jews as well as for the revolutionaries. Of course, the latter must try to obtain for the Jews their rights and permission for them to settle anywhere. But this is, so to speak, activity in the highest sphere. And for the party to conduct reconcilable agitation is very, very difficult at this point in time. Don't you think that this did not grieve or confuse me? Nevertheless, I remain always a member of the RUSSIAN revolutionary party and I will not start to depart from it for a single day, because these contradictions, as well as some other ones, were not created by the party..."

But Axelrod does not agree with Deich's reasoning. In his unpublished article "About the Task of the Jewish Socialist Intelligentsia", which he wrote in 1882, is stated the following: "The programs and, still to an even greater degree, the manifested "public opinion" of the Russian educated classes appeared for the Jews-socialists in Russia something like a revelation, the meaning of which they decided frankly to formulate in front of themselves and others only after a difficult internal struggle. Being accustomed to the thought that the Jews, as a special nation, actually do not exist, that being the part of nowadays Russian subjects, and afterwards becoming Russian citizens, Jews are considered, depending on their class and cultural subdivisions, an inseparable part of corresponding elements of the "native" population. But the Jewish socialist intelligentsia, all of a

sudden, saw that the great majority of Russian society and people consider Jews as a special nation, all the elements of which — whether it is a long-skirted Jew, the proletariat, a petty-bourgeois, a usurer, a Russified lawyer or whether he is a socialist getting ready for exile or penal servitude — it does not matter, are harmful; all are, without distinction, “Zhidy”-Jews. The Jews, who are undoubtedly harmful to Russia, must be gotten rid of by whatever means...”

The statements given above and the opinions of the two Jews, active participators in the socialist-revolutionary groupings of the Russian radical intelligentsia, deserve special attention. For, on the one hand, the stakes and created prerequisites for the mass emigration of the Jews from the boundaries of the Russian Empire were outlined; and on the other, prerequisites for the future Zionist movement, which had rapidly grown in less than twenty years, were created; finally, a great number of radically-oriented Jewish youth rushed into the revolutionary circles, endeavoring to restore the crushed and exhausted ideal of the “People's Freedom”.

Some of them, L. Shternberg and Bogoraz, distinguished themselves so much that they were entrusted to edit the last issues of the “People's Freedom” number 11-12, in October of 1885.

Others, for example, M. Gotz, M. Fundaminsky, O. Minor, S. Ginzburg, L. Zalkind and Bogoraz, after receiving experience in these circles, in the second half of the Eighties, later played major rôles in the revolutionary events at the beginning of this century, particularly in the creation of the

Socialist-revolutionary party which played an enormous rôle, in the years of the first revolution (1905), as well as in 1917.

The question raised at the beginning of the Eighties in the controversy between Deich and Axelrod was never raised again. Feelings at that time were such that anyone who dared to raise such a question would be unreservedly identified as one of the “Black Hundreders” and deleted once and for all from the membership of the “cultured and foremost people”, who at that time were synonymous with the “intelligentsia”. However, this circumstance in no way hampered the rapidly developed Zionist movement. It was precisely among Russian Jewry that Zionism found its most fertile grounds from 1890 to 1910. Moreover, Zionism enjoyed sympathy and support from the progressive and foremost society.

The very existence and success of the Zionist movement that as evidence and confirmation of the self isolationist tendencies in the Russian Jewry, was never spoken or written about.

But, meanwhile, far from the whole spectrum of its reflections, Zionism ultimately was aimed at creating, in Palestine, a separate and independent state by means of resettlement of all the Jews of the Diaspora, consequently solving the age-long Jewish question once and for all; solving the question, not only in Russia, but also in many other countries, where it existed and demanded its solution.

In 1901, the "Zionists-socialists-internationalists", issued their "Appeal to Jewish Youth" (in the Russian language, published in London), stating accurately and clearly their final goal: "Creation of the Jewish state on a socialist basis.", "in the territory of Palestine and its neighboring countries:

Cyprus, Sinai...", "without the rabbis-obscurantists and the bigoted cult of the Jewish religion..." Among the Russian Jewry there were still many other shades of Zionism, depending on class affiliation, and the degree of education of the Russian Zionists. There were Zionists, who were big capitalists, Zionists who were middle and petty bourgeoisie, Zionists-liberals, Zionists-Marxists and Zionists-orthodox, to whom the Talmud was the highest law and the rabbi was the undisputable authority. Some of them openly enrolled in the membership of Zionist and pro-Zionist organizations, others only promoted them, in various ways, and supported them morally and materially.

But among those who could openly oppose the idea of collecting all the sons of Israel into the "Promised Land", the call of the Zionists was nowhere to be found, and their voices were not heard.

There were no Jewish voices that could call for the liquidation of these self-isolationist Jewish feelings which led to the creation of a "state within the state" and to the complete and unconditional fusion with the people among whom they lived and in whose language they got their education.

We are not interested in the separate nuances of Zionist and pro-Zionist feelings, while examining the Jewish question as a whole, from the point of view of the people of Russia, where the majority of the world's Jewry lived and supported Zionism to various degrees. It is interesting and important to establish something else: did the Jews really and sincerely want to

abandon Russia and resettle in Palestine, or to remain in Russia under the condition of a state within a state, living "by their laws", in their isolated circle, without allowing anybody to interfere in solely Jewish matters. At the same time, however, they would take most active part in all the matters of the Russian people, on the same basis as did the native population.

Many public and political personalities of pre-revolutionary Russia began to realize this question with utmost precision and clarity. This question acquired special acuteness after when the Zionist movement took organizational shape at the end of the last century. In 1897, in Basel, Switzerland, on the initiative of Theodor Herzl, the First Zionist Congress was held. The participants were from all the countries in which Jews lived, including many from Russia. In that language which is called "Hebrew", only one delegate, M. Kahan from Gomel, Russia, could pronounce his speech. All the rest of the delegates spoke either in Russian or German, depending upon whether they came from Russia, or Austria and Germany.

Since the Zionist idea was in full conformity with the religious-mystical world outlook and the disposition of the whole of Jewry, it provoked the liveliest response among the Russian Jewry, who were the most numerous in the Diaspora.

The Zionist propaganda began to resound in all the places where even the smallest Jewish community existed. Collections were made for the "Jewish Colonial Fund", by means of selling corresponding shares. Furthermore, constant and regular communications began among the Russian Zionist organizations and those in the other countries.

This did not remain unnoticed by the Russian Government, and in 1903 the Ministry of Internal Affairs gave instructions to the provincial, city and police authorities to combat the Zionist movement within the Russian Jewry.

According to Gershon Svet, who is the present Israeli consul in New York, those measures taken were as follows: to forbid Zionist meetings and congresses; to prevent the conduct of Zionist propaganda in synagogues; to close all the Zionist organizations in Russia; to withdraw the privileges of Zionist activists travel to foreign countries for the purpose of participating in Zionist congresses and meetings; to forbid the sale and distribution of

"Jewish Colonial Fund" shares under the penalty of confiscation if discovered in one's possession.

This prescription sounded an alarm to T. Herzl and he decided to obtain an audience with the all-mighty Pleve, then the Minister of Internal Affairs. Herzl succeeded in seeing Pleve at the end of 1903.

In his memoirs Herzl speaks about his journey to Petersburg, his conversation with Pleve and the results of their conversation.

Pleve did not answer Herzl immediately, but rather a while later by letter, giving Herzl to understand that the thoughts and considerations stated in the letter were reported by him to the Emperor Nicholas II.

In the letter to Herzl, Pleve states: "as Zionism has as its aim the creation of an independent state in Palestine, which, in this case, will lead to the emigration of a certain number Jewish Russian subjects, the Russian Government could regard it favorably.

But, since that time, the Zionists have begun to deviate from their direct aim, and have started to spread propaganda of Jewish national unity in Russia itself. The Government cannot tolerate this course of action because it will lead to the appearance of a group of people in the country, alien and hostile to the patriotic feelings on which each state is founded.

If Zionism returns to its previous program, it can count' on the moral and material support of the Russian Government, especially from that day on, when some kind of practical undertaking will reduce the numbers of the Jewish population in Russia.

In such a case the Government is ready to support the Zionist aspirations, before those of Turkey, easing their activities and even granting subsidies to the emigrating societies".

During his stay in Petersburg Herzl obtained an audience with Vitte, who was known not only as an important dignitary, but also as a man with wide connections in the financial world of Europe, in which the Jews played a dominant rôle.

Vitte disappointed Herzl. In discussing the Jewish question in Russia, Vitte, as Herzl recalls, was rude and told Herzl directly that the government and

all Russian patriots cannot be indifferent to the fact that the Jews constitute only five per cent of the population of the Empire, and make up fifty per cent of all the revolutionaries.

Herzl, himself the most ardent advocate of Jewish resettlement in Palestine, departed from Russia quite disappointed. Nevertheless, he obtained some promises from Pleve, even though they contained the condition that the Zionists not interfere in the internal problems of Russia. It is difficult to disagree with the fact that Pleve was, to a considerable extent, right, although from tactical considerations Herzl never said anything about whether he considered Pleve was right or wrong, but limited himself to the reading of Pleve's letter, which is stated above, at the Sixth Zionist Congress.

The projected possibilities of channeling the Zionist movement' or at least part of it in the direction of resettlement and subsequent creation of a Jewish state in Palestine, were acceptable to the Russian Government, but everything was interrupted by the revolutionary events that took place in the years 1904 to 1907.

The Russian Government had no time to deal with the Zionists. The Zionists, seeing the dazzling possibilities of success in their revolutionary endeavor, forgot about Palestine. Among their own masses, they concentrated upon the business of supporting that struggle which was conducted in order to attain realization of all the Jewish longings.

These longings boiled down to the longing for complete and unconditional equality for Jews in Russia, and, above all, towards the possible creation on a legal basis of "a state within the state", and the resultant acknowledgement of Jewish rights to their "personal-national autonomy", despite their dispersion throughout Russia.

The essence of the "personal-national autonomy" was the requirement for the maintenance of pure Jewish social and cultural establishments and organizations, such as newspapers' theatres and learning institutions at the expense of the state, in any settlement of Soviet Union where a certain number of Jews might settle. Non-Jews would have no right whatsoever to influence or to interfere in the internal life of Jewish communities of the would-be "personal-national autonomy", even though the non-Jewish population of a given settlement might be the overwhelming majority.

Jewish enrolment in Russian political life began right after the appearance of the qualified Jewish personnel, who had received their middle and higher education in the Russian schools.

This occurred at the beginning of the Sixties, of the past century, when the first revolutionary-radical circles began to appear, out of which later developed the "People's Freedom", the "Black Hundreders", and at the turn of this century, the "Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries".

A notable rôle in these circles, during the Sixties, was played by a Jew named Utin, who was sentenced to death, but was able to escape to a foreign country in the West. There he became secretary of the Russian section of the First International. Utin was in close relation with Karl Marx and actively upheld him in his struggle with Bakunin. Utin ended his career in Russia as a rich merchant. He made an appeal for pardon, was forgiven, and after his return to Russia, reached notable success in the field of trade and finance.

In the next decade, by the end of Seventies, we began to encounter Jews in the radical-revolutionary movement more often, where many of them occupied leading positions in these circles and parties, such as we have already mentioned above, Deich, Natanson, Axelrod, Zundevich, and many others.

Furthermore, at the end of the past century and at the beginning of this one, the number of the Jewish revolutionaries had grown so big that Vitte having in his hands the statistical figures, could say to Herzl that 50% of the revolutionaries came from the Jewish population which made up 5% of the population of Russia. With this, Vitte had in mind only the revolutionaries, without adding to their number the "oppositionist", and the enemies of the régime. These "enemies of the régime" were made up, almost exclusively, of the Jewish intelligentsia of Russia.

All of what was said above refers to the radical-revolutionary trend of the "Narodism"-Russian populist orientations, which were unique in the Sixties and the Seventies of the last century.

In addition to them, beginning in Eighties, the Marxists started to spring up and develop in parallel form. The Marxists were fore-runners of the social-democratic party, which was the unified body which split, in 1903, into the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks.

The first Marxist or Social-Democratic current in Russia was organized in 1883, when the "Liberation of Labor" group was founded. The founders of this group were G. Plekhanov, a Russian, P. Axelrod, a Jew, and L. Deich, also a Jew.

The group grew quickly, and at the beginning of the Nineties, presented itself as numerous current of large membership, consisting of Russians and many Jews as well. Somewhat later, many Georgians also became members.

Among the pioneers of this new movement in Russia were many Jews, who later played important rôles in the All-Russian Marxist revolutionary movement. Some of these were Riazanov (D. Goldendakh), Steklov (U. Nakhamkes, Kozlov (D. Ginzburg), Martov (U. Zederbaum, Dan (F. Gurvich), Martinov (A. Picker), Greenevich (M. Kohan) and many others. The majority of them used pseudonyms, as seen in the list given above.

The growth of the revolutionary feelings at the beginning of the current century extremely strengthened the influx of the new revolutionary power, among whom a great number of Jews were quite apparent.

But, besides that, in a parallel bastion, the Jewish Marxists had created their own party, the Jewish Marxist (social-democratic) party or "Bund". A study of the aims and program of the "Bund" shows that it was in no way different: the same All-Russian social-democratic party, which grew from the group known as the "Liberation of Labor", but it was a separate organization, the members of which could be only Jews.

The true Marxist-internationalists noticed this, and strongly protested against the limitations which were practiced, in fact, within one party. Moreover, the "Bund" had encased within its structure the Jewish symptoms of race and religion, which was the main difference between the "Bund" Marxist and the Marxist-internationalists. These were precisely the differences that Marxist-internationalists aimed to wipe out and destroy within the ranks of the proletarian movement.

At that time the creation and formation of the social-democratic organizations was accomplished on the basis of territorial subdivision, uniting all those who accepted the Marxist ideology and the party's program, regardless of race, religion and nationality.

Upon the creation of the "Bund", fierce controversy flared up about the inadmissibility of division on the basis of race, religion and nationality within the united proletarian movement.

In the process of this controversy the members of the "Bund" even issued a leaflet, in Russian, in which they justified their position by giving the following reasons:

"Generally speaking, it would be a delusion to think that any socialist party can conduct the liberation struggle of the proletariat of an alien nationality to which the party itself does not belong. The proletariat of each nation has worked out its own history, psychology, its own traditions, habits, and finally, its own national tasks. All these conditions reflect themselves in the class struggle of the proletariat, determine its program, form of organization, and so forth. These conditions and peculiarities must be taken into consideration, and must be skillfully exploited. But this is possible only for a party that has grown from the given proletariat which is tied in with it by thousands of fibers, which penetrate by its ideals and understand its psychology. For the party of an alien people, this is impossible".

This leaflet was printed in London, in March of 1903, before the split of the social-democrats into the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks.

The controversy ended with the complete and unconditional victory of the "Bund", which not only continued to exist and develop, but also quite actively interfered in the life and activity of the other social-democratic organizations, the non-Jewish ones, specifically, in the activities of the "Russian Social-Democratic Party" both in the Menshevik and Bolshevik factions.

Not only the rank and file members of the "Bund", but also its leaders considered it possible and admissible for themselves most actively to participate in the All-Russian social-democratic organizations, not only as ordinary members, but also as the members of central committee, while at the same time, jealously guarding the "purity" of the Jewish "Bund". Even Jews, who changed their Judaism for Christianity, were not admitted to the membership of the "Bund". This phenomenon was not left unnoticed. But no one dared to raise this question. The psychological atmosphere in the

revolutionary circles of that time was such that raising the question itself, would have been qualified as resorting to the methods of the "Black Hundreders" or "obscurantism", which were inadmissible among the foremost and intelligent people. Everyone tolerated this phenomenon, which, during one of the meetings held in Kiev, was called "double social-democratic citizenship". Furthermore, it was said that it would be impossible even for Karl Marx himself, who changed from Judaism to Christianity, to become even an ordinary member of the "Bund".

The Jews from the "Bund" played distinguished roles in "Russian social-democratic movement", before the revolution, during the revolution and even continue to play these roles today in emigration. To be convinced of this, one should only look at several issues of the magazine "Socialist Vestnik", which has been published for many decades in emigration, or to be present at some meeting or lecture of the "Russian Social-Democratic Party".

The non-Jews in this party and in the composition of the so-called "Foreign Delegation" can be counted on the fingers. Furthermore, at the congress of the Second International', representing the "Russian Social-Democrats", it would be futile and hopeless to look for the non-Jewish delegates.

The "Bund" and the RSDP have been so closely interwoven, that it is impossible to establish where the "Bund" ends and the RSDP begins.

Besides the two main currents of the Russian pre-revolutionary social and political life, having the radical-revolutionary character that originated in the circles and groups from the second half of the last century, there also existed in Russia currents of an oppositionist nature, but not of the revolutionary one.

These were the "liberals" and the "democrats" of various shades. The thing that all of them had in common was an oppositionist stand against the internal politics of the government and an opposition to the revolutionary methods to change those politics. Those who actively collaborated with Alexander II were also called "liberals", when he carried out the reforms in the first twenty years of his reign. The emancipation of peasants, judicial reforms, and the introduction of zemstvo and conscription were the major reforms he made. Those who took the oppositionist stand against the measures of limitation introduced by the government during the reign of

Alexander II's successor were also called "liberals". Noblemen, city and rural dignitaries, and to a considerable degree, writers, publishers and professors filled the ranks of liberals at that time, before the Twentieth Century.

In the ranks of these "liberals" there were virtually no Jews, although sometimes there were exceptions.

Very soon, however, when these "liberals" took an organizational shape, by calling themselves the "Constitutional Democratic Party", in 1905, many Jews rushed in and in no time occupied leading positions, especially in the organs of the press belonging to or sympathizing with the party.

The founders of the "Constitutional Democratic Party", who were in abbreviated form called "Ca-De" or "Cadets", were liberal rural activists and included I. Petrunkevich, F. Rodichev, Duke Shakhovskoy, Duke Lvov, Duke Trubetskoy and all the big land-holders, as well as a number of distinguished professors, S. Muromzev, P. Milukov, Novgorodzev and others. The "Cadets" by full right were called the most cultured party of Russia.

The political ideal of the "Cadet" party was a constitutional monarchy of the English type, where the "king reigns, but does not rule", full equality of all subjects of the state, freedom of the press, and broad local administration. In a word, they wanted parliamentarism as was founded in England or France, with ministers responsible to the parliament, and with a strict division of legislative, judicial and executive power.

These political demands by the "Cadets", in essence, were encroachments on prerogatives of the monarch and urged the limitation of his power, and therefore, in ruling circles, the attitude to the "Cadets" was distinctly negative, in spite of the fact that in the ranks of the party, there were many people with titles, rich land-holders and professors with well-known names.

There was a negative, or at best, a watchfully distrustful attitude engendered and strengthened by the circumstance that the ranks of the "Cadets" were being quickly filled by Jews, especially in the editorial office of their party organ "Rech" and in the ideologically nearest daily newspaper the "Russkie Vedomosti", that was published in Moscow and had been considered a serious, "professor's newspaper".

From the inception of the "Constitutional Democratic Party" its most influential leaders were M. Vinaver, I. Gessen, G. Sliozberg, G. Iollos, M. Mandelshtam and M. Sheftel. The opinion of Vinaver and his fellow tribesmen, who were members of the party, not only was taken into consideration, but frequently obeyed.

Among the members of the editorial staff and permanent contributors to the party organ "Rech", Jewish names were the most predominant. The editor was I. Gessen, and one member of the editorial staff was M. Ganfman. Permanent contributors were A. Landa, N. Efros, L. Kliachko, V. Ashkenazi, A. Kulisher, and S. Poliakov-Litovzev.

In the "Russkie Vedomosti" the leading position in the editorial office was occupied by G. Iollas, and among the permanent contributors we see I. Levin, N. Efros, L. Slonimsky, G. Shreider, M. Lourie-Larin, U. Engel, P. Zvezdich, and also the well-known Zionist V. Jabotinsky, who was the foreign correspondent of this newspaper.

The analogous correlation of the Jews to non-Jews was in the provincial and regional newspapers, staffed with an overwhelming Jewish majority, serving the population of various provinces and other parts of Russia. Odessa, Kharkov, Rostov-on-Don, Kiev, Saratov and even remote Irkutsk and Tashkent had smart newspapers with a circulation of many thousands, which actually belonged to Jewish hands. The publishers or editors, as well as a considerable percentage of permanent contributors, were Jews. For example, in Tashkent the largest newspaper was run by a Jew, Smorguner, and in Saratov the newspaper was run by Averbach, a brother-in-law of the well known communist Sverdlov. The "Kievskaya Mysl" was in the hands of a Jew, Kugel, and collaborating with this newspaper were famous Bronstein, known as "Trotsky", D. Zaslavsky-"Gomunkulus", A. Ginzburg-"Naumov", M. Litvakov-"Livrov".

The secretary-editor of the most widely read pre-revolutionary newspaper in Russia "Russkoe Slovo", which the well-known Sytin used to publish, was A. Poliakov, who previously worked for the "Odesskie Novosti" and for the "Birezhye Vedomosti", the most popular newspaper in Petersburg.

* * *

The facts mentioned above are sufficient to support the point that the degree of Jewish participation in the Russian periodical press, regardless of

these Jews' various political affiliations, bound within its influence the public opinion and could bend this opinion in any direction it chose. It thus goes without saying how strong this periodical press was.

I scarcely need to say that the Jewish journalists and publishers approached and elucidated any occurrence and event in the first place from their own point of view: is it useful and necessary for Jews or, on the contrary, is it bad, harmful or dangerous? They reacted according to the worn out common phrase: "what is good for us", meaning by "us" their own fellow tribesmen.

As a result, a great deal about the life of the country and people elucidated in the press was one-sided and tendentious: one thing was over-emphasized, thrust out and underlined; the other questioned or completely suppressed.

The incident already been mentioned above is, in this respect, an illustration in point. The bloody suppression of the disorders that took place on the Lena gold-fields stirred the whole of Russia and awakened a loud response in the world press. In the press the killed, wounded and arrested workers were listed. Only casual mention was made of the fact that there were victims on the other side also, and that there were casualties among the police and soldiers as well. But generally, nothing was said about these casualties. It was futile to search in the newspapers of that time for a truthful explanation of the real causes that provoked these events. The workers were provoked to act the way they acted by the greediness and inhuman attitude to the just demands of workers who were shamefully exploited by the millionaire Ginzburg, the owner of the gold-fields. Standing on guard for law and order and defending private property the Russian Government had to resort to the extreme measures it took, and, in defending the interests of the Ginzburg, spilled a lot of Russian blood.

The newspapers of that time, which were not in the stream of the oppositionist-revolutionary feelings and were called "right", did not, for understandable reasons, go deeply into the examination of the question, in reporting these events, and did not show of what nationality was that Russian subject, whose property was defended at the expense of Russian blood. In this respect, all were equal before the law both the capitalist-Jew and capitalist non-Jew. Property rights were acknowledged by the law and

therefore were guaranteed and defended unconditionally, and those who disturbed these rights were punished.

As a result of this one-sided elucidation of the events, oppositionist or revolutionary feelings were created among those who did not read the "right" press. This stirred up and strengthened anti-governmental currents among those who were already sufficiently agitated and who distrustfully treated and criticized everything that proceeded not from the "left", but from the government or was printed in the "right" press.

It would be appropriate to mention here that, beginning in 1905, in Russia, there was no preliminary censorship of the newspapers and journals.

Newspapers and journals used to come to a censor after they were issued, and if they contained anything that was inadmissible from the government's point of view, then appropriate measures would be taken against the editor and these could include a fine, an arrest of the "editor-in-chief", a ban on publishing the newspaper or journal for a certain period of time, or even closing it completely.

Under such conditions it was possible to issue newspapers and journals that were not only sharply-oppositionist, but even of "socialist-revolutionary", "social-democratic" or of Menshevik and Bolshevik orientation. True, editors frequently were subjected to various punishments, fines or arrests or both. But in spite of these measures, the newspapers and journals were published. It was possible to bypass the arrest or the serving of a sentence by various methods. There was always someone to bail out the editor or to take his place as "editor-in-chief". Money was always found with ease to pay these fines.

In the pre-revolutionary years wide circles of Russian society took a lively interest in the debates of the State Duma, in which there were frequently uttered sharp speeches criticizing the activities of the organs of power. Stenographic accounts were too long to print them fully in newspapers, and therefore, usually excerpts were printed from speeches and statements, which were given in the presence of the journalists, correspondents and representatives of newspapers. The method of formulating and "presenting" the contents of such speeches to readers depended on the correspondents. Frequent conflicts arose because of this. Once, in 1908, one member of the State Duma, in response to a statement from the

opposition which demanded more freedom for the press, asserting that all the information, Russian and foreign went through censorship, stated: "Yes, but, regrettably, not through government censorship, but through the censorship of the "Jewish Pale". He then pointed with his hand to the journalist box where newspaper representatives, who had gained access to the box, sat with the cards which were issued by editorial offices and in which neither the given names nor the surnames of the representatives were stated.

As a result of this statement, not only the cards of the editors were checked right on the spot, but also the passports, in which at that time, the "nationality" of the holder was not shown, as it is now, but rather the given name, surname and religion of the holder.

It turned out during the check that the overwhelming majority of the people who sat in the journalist box as correspondents" of various Russian newspapers were Jews. Only a few men turned out to be non-Jewish. In this journalist box it turned out that twenty-five men were of the "Hebrew faith", and these men were the representatives of various Russian newspapers. Furthermore, even the director of the "press Bureau at the State Duma was a Jew, one by the name Zait-sev-Bershtain. (The full list of these Russian Journalists is attached in the supplement.) Such was the picture, in a most general outline, of Jewish participation in the Russian periodical press which played an enormous role in the propaganda business.

Jews in Russian Literature and Criticism

Jewish participation in Russian literature right up to the revolution was minimal, but not because the works of Jewish authors were not printed or that there were some special governmental restrictions in this respect, or that readers were negatively biased against Jewish authors; quite the contrary, attitudes were courteously lenient towards the works of the few Jewish authors writing in Russian, even though these were less than mediocre.

Neither among the Russian classics of the turn of the century nor among the second-rate writer (if it is possible to categorize them) do we see Jewish authors. Only among third rate writers, who left little trace in Russian literature, do we encounter a few Jews: for example, Simen Ushkevich, Sholom-Alaikhem, Blialika, Chernikhovsky, Rathousz, and Braitman.

The Russian element was alien and incomprehensible to them, thus they limited themselves almost exclusively to fiction and poetry on Jewish themes and the Jewish mode of life. But they were hardly able to bear the criticism that came from Russians, even though it was a mild and well-wishing one. They took such criticism almost as personal insults or as "anti-Semitism and black-hundredism", although they themselves strove to appear at Russian literary gatherings and on the pages of the Russian press.

The matter stood quite differently in the sphere of literary criticism, reviews and "press comments". Here, Jewish journalists a most completely formed the literary attitudes of a wide circle of readers. But these journalists, when rating works of Russian authors, could not give up their own specifically Jewish approach. Only such big connoisseurs of literature as Vengerov, Aikhenwald and Gershenzon (all three Jews) were above purely subjective Jewish emotions and with their literary-critical works brought a valuable contribution into this sphere of Russian cultural life.

This applied to the author's personality, as well as the theme of his work, and to his "purity of vestry", in a reactionary sense. But the overwhelming majority writing reviews, literary as well as theatrical, synchronized their reviews with the existing opinion in the circles of the "foremost society".

The question of who was writing or where his work was printed earlier not only influenced but also determined the success or failure of the literary work of an author.

Russian writers were quite conscious about this and used to take this into consideration when choosing themes and depicting individual characters.

This was the "invisible and secret preliminary censorship" which was difficult to ignore if someone wished his works to appeal to readers.

For an author to publish his works in one of these organs of the press that was considered "reactionary" would automatically close possibilities for him to publish in all the rest of the newspapers and journals throughout Russia which were reputed to be "democratic", "foremost" and "progressive". In Russia periodicals of this sort were considerably more in number than the ones belonging to the "right" press, and their circulation greatly outnumbered those belonging to the latter.

Perhaps, mainly in this, one ought to look for an explanation of the phenomenon that in Russian fiction of the quarter century immediately preceding the revolution of 1917, one seldom encounters "positive heroes" among the patriotically inclined (in the finest sense of the word) conservative persons. An irreproachably honest policeman or a state official nor an ideological struggle against anti-patriotic or anti-state currents will be encountered in Russian fiction of that time. However, in real life such persons existed! And there were many of them; quite a few of them paid with their lives for loyalty to their duty, and to the oath which they made...

For each profession, class post or social group there existed certain firmly established patterns which it was not advisable to circumvent or to disregard if an author wanted his works to be published.

Without getting too deeply into this question, and without expanding it, let us glance at how in Russian literature, as in any other verisimilitudinous literature, the "Jewish question" and individual Jewish characters are represented. From an immoral viewpoint, we would be looking in vain for a common, negative Jewish character of the Shylock type or even an ordinary swindler in the Russian fiction of that time. But such types did exist among the six million Jewish masses in Russia, needless to say. To see them, one only has to be serious and objective in investigating this question.

Was this not the result of that "invisible and secret censorship" which used to oppress Russian literature during the last quarter century before the revolution in Russia?

This "censorship" exerted its influence not only contemporarily, but also extended into the past; appraising the great Russian writers, long since dead, putting them on the list of "Judaeophobes" (the term "anti-Semitism" did not exist at that time). Gogol, Pisemsky, Dostoevsky, Leskov were not "in good repute" among those who passed judgment about Russian literature.

You see, Gogol gave a true character of Yankel (in "Taras Bulba") and an accurate description of the Jewish pogrom. Pisemsky gave in "Turbulent Sea" a striking image of the Jewish tax-collector, Galkin, ("who diligently and precisely used to cross himself") and his sons. Dostoevsky foresaw the role of Jews in Russia and with this provoked the hatred of all of Jewry. Leskov made the Russian clergy positive types.

Lev Tolstoy also gave image of the nouveau-rich Jew – the contractor in his novel "Anna Karenina" – the well-known Moscow millionaire contractor, Poliakov, naming him "Bolgarinov". A patron of art, in the finest sense of the word and a great landlord, Bolgarinov receives Stive Oblonsky with impeccable manners, who arrives asking for a position. The reader will not find the slightest negative trace in the "gentleman" Bolgarinov; however, to make up for this, scarcely anyone would consider Oblonsky and his conversation with Bolgarinov an attractive or rousing tribute to Russian ancestral nobility.

Jews — Russian Lawyers

The judicial reform of Emperor Alexander II instituted the Russian legal profession as a free profession.

A lawyer (barrister) was placed by the law in a position completely independent of the executive power. This gave him possibilities of action, of course within the framework of the law, to initiate legal procedural changes and to maintain the expedience, justice and mercy of Russian courts.

Speeches delivered in court by barristers were not subject, on the strength of the Royal Decree to the Governmental Senate, to any limitations of censorship, even during the existence of preliminary censorship. Owing to this, it was possible to print them fully in the periodical press, even in those cases, when there were thoughts and words in the speeches which could not have been printed had they not been pronounced in court. Having such an advantage, barristers with oppositionist tendencies often inserted elements critical of the existing order and social system into their speeches.

On the other hand, a lawyer himself would arrange his own fees with his client. Whereas the client had to choose his lawyer according to his own discretion, he chose the one whom he considered to be most adroit and able to defend his interests. However, the interests of people who used to turn to lawyers were not always in harmony with norms of law and morality.

The independent legal profession, newly created in Russia, opened wide opportunities for persons with the juristic education which was required in order to be admitted to the bar. Opportunities for success in life were in no way smaller, perhaps even greater, than in the civil service.

Young educated jurists, regardless of their religion, racial or national origin, rushed into the legal profession. In this respect, there were no limitations for anyone during the first decades of the existence of the legal profession.

In the Sixties and Seventies of the last century the idealistic youth made up the first membership of the Russian bar and laid the foundation of that high morality which was characteristic of the whole Russian court, the judges, the prosecutors and the lawyers.

The Jews were not an exception. Because these were the decades when assimilationist tendencies among the educated Jews prevailed, they did not

separate their future or the future of all Jewry from the future of Russia. The conflict of the beginning of the Eighties (in the last century) had not come yet.

The free profession of a lawyer, to a certain extent, is a profession of being an intermediary between two sides. And very frequently one or another court's decision depended on a clever and able intermediary. The very mediation of the two thousand years was the basic Jewish occupation, providing them with means of existence. It is in this sphere they reached perfection, feeling themselves in their own element. They rushed into the legal profession, preferring it to the civil service. At that time, there was no difficulty for Jews to enter legal professions.

A good example of this was when the prosecutor for the Odessa district court, a Jew, A. Passover, voluntarily refused a civil service position in favor of a legal profession. This incident took place in 1872, long before the appearance of real limitations for Jews in the civil service. Passover's case was not an exception. Many other Jews, upon entering the civil service, did the same thing.

Knowing this, it is impossible to believe the widely spread opinion that the Russian Government forced the Jewish jurists into the legal profession. It should be remembered that restrictive measures appeared only in the third decade after the reforms of 1864.

Besides these motives (they cannot be denied), there were also incentives of a different order, both idealistic and materialistic: a free lawyer was in a position to participate and influence political and social questions; also he was free to run his own life and to do better financially than in the civil service.

There were still two more motives, which did influence Jewish jurists, prompting them to prefer the legal profession to the civil service. Nothing was said or written about the motives, but their existence is undeniable. For a Jew, brought up in the private life of a Jewish environment, keeping up with all the numerous and complicated ceremonies of his religion, it was not easy psychologically to live in the Russian Orthodox environment, which was an environment of Russian officialdom. It was also not easy for an orthodox Jew to participate in the ceremonial parts of the Russian court, which was inseparably linked with Christianity.

Besides that, an overwhelming majority of them having grown up in the "Jewish Pale" and therefore well aware of the attitudes of the native populace towards the Jews, young Jewish jurists could not disregard these attitudes when choosing their careers. These Jews could not acquire, even in the cloak of the minister of justice, the due authority and respect at that time from the obscure masses of the semi-literate population, full of prejudices and bias against those, who, to their understanding, were "enemies of our Lord Jesus Christ". Subconsciously, they realized this and acted accordingly.

All this taken together pushed the Jews into the legal profession' which was continually filled with more Jews.

Entering into the legal profession, they understandably did not cease to be Jews, and therefore preserved that "inner aspect" which distinguishes them from all other nationalities. This did not remain unnoticed by their non-Jewish colleagues, although, as mentioned before, to raise this question in front of the jurists, was considered unethical and insulting to those of high principles, which were sacred for the Russian intelligentsia and which had been laid into the foundation of the Judicial Reform.

When in the Eighties the period of various limitations for Jews began, the majority of Russian jurists definitely disapproved of those measures which were introduced by the government, particularly those limiting the percentage quota for the Jewish lawyers. The same position was taken by an overwhelming majority of the Russian society and press.

Nevertheless the percentage quota of jurists was introduced: 15% for jurists of the Warsaw, Kiev and Odessa judicial districts; 10% for Petersburg and Moscow, and 5% for all the remaining districts of the Russian Empire.

These limitations were applied only to persons of the Judaic religion and did not extend to the Jews of Christian religion. This prompted quite a few Jews, who were indifferent to the religious question, to change to one of the Christian religions and to acquire immediately those rights from which they had been restricted while they remained in the Judaic religion.

The quota was introduced on the basis of the report by the Minister Manacein, approved by the Czar, and was considered "temporary", pending the conception and inauguration of the corresponding law.

The working-out of the permanent law concerning the Jews at the bar was entrusted to a special commission, comprising senators, judges, professors and representatives of lawyers.

This commission worked for several years (from 1894 to 1904), thoroughly studying and discussing this difficult question. The draft was presented only in 1904 to the State Council for approval, but was not approved owing to the situation on the eve of the first Russian revolution. The question of dealing with the Jewish percentage in the legal profession was until 1917 based on, as mentioned above, "temporary rights".

This question indeed was not easy. The opinions of individual members of the commission were quite divers. Some were against any sort of percentage quota; others were in favor of complete prohibition of Jews as barristers in Russian courts; and still others questioned the expediency and the logic in the established quota being guided exclusively by the Judaic faith.

To the latter faction belonged the well-known lawyer F. N. Plevko, who, when the commission passed the bill, reserved his opinion, which he stated in writing. "Limitations, based on religion", according to Plevko, "cannot be accepted as satisfactory, because morally unstable people can by-pass these limitations by means of baptism. Jews cannot possess the moral qualities inherent in Russian people, and therefore cannot be the bearers of Russian legal conscience. Acceptance into the ranks of barristers of certain categories must be based on nationality or belonging to a known people or tribe and not on religion. This is why, wrote Plevko, it is better to increase the Jewish percentage for the Jews of Judaic faith, up to 15 and even to 20%, but not to open the legal profession to the baptized Jews".

The opinion of Plevko was not approved by the majority of the commission. Thus right up to the Revolution of 1917 there existed in Russia some limitations for the Jews of Judaic faith, but these did not apply to the baptized Jews.

Such was, in general, the condition of the Jewish barristers in Russian law-courts.

But besides the "barristers" there existed also the institution of the "assistant barristers" — jurists working for any rightful and competent barristers. Their number was not restricted and a great many Jews

circumventing some of the limitations filled these ranks, which were actually the ranks of Russian lawyers.

The participation, the significance and the influence of Jews in the Russian legal profession was enormous and grew incessantly, in spite of all the limitations.

Russian Jewry at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century

Towards the beginning of this century Russian Jewry was a solidly united body of six million, in which, in spite of social stratification, all were unanimous concerning the question of mutual support in regard to the negative attitude towards the regime, which did not want to abolish the existing restrictions for people of the Judaic faith.

Making up less than four per cent of the population of Russia, and, in spite of the percentage quota, there were more than twelve per cent of Jews having higher education. This enabled them to take an active part in the cultural life of the country and to exert a considerable influence on the feelings of the broad masses, and in particular, on the attitudes of the intelligentsia and the youth.

The newspaper business, criticism, the legal profession and, to a considerable degree, literature were under strong Jewish influence and, as such, reflected the attitude of all of Jewry towards the regime.

And when, at the beginning of this century, the revolutionary and sharply oppositionist feelings towards the government started to grow and get stronger, the Jews treated them not only sympathetically but also took a most active part in them, coming at once to the surface in the crest of events.

For the government these feelings and the deliberate Jewish activity did not remain unnoticed and it started to show tendencies to further increasing the restrictive measures against the Jews. This reaction only aggravated in the Jews their negative feelings to the regime.

The Kishinev pogrom, the unsuccessful Japanese War, the ensuing terrorist activities (in which the Jews took more than a small part): all these taken together heated up passions and created preconditions for the big revolutionary events which came in the years 1904-1906.

Russian Jewry assisted in every possible way those who were struggling against the regime. Some openly and others covertly rendered moral and material support to the anti-government movement and in the proper way elucidated Russian and world events.

By this time more than a million Jews had emigrated from Russia to the USA. Many of these emigrants were taking an active part in the political life of America, particularly its periodical press, always maintaining the closest ties with their fellow tribesmen in Russia and, understandably, explaining many events from the point of view of those Jews who had remained in Russia.

Regular and lively connections were maintained, through the Jews living in border areas of Russia, with the European countries where a substantial number of revolutionaries from Russia resided as political émigrés (among whose ranks was a large percentage of Jews). Through these connections, people were skillfully led across the border into Europe, and illegal propaganda literature was passed from Europe into Russia.

The government struggled with this situation, but without particular success: the channels for these illegal links with foreign countries were too numerous and too diverse.

The persons engaged in these activities were almost exclusively Jews.

Furthermore, inside the country, in all the oppositionist and revolutionary groupings, circles, organizations and parties, Jews played an enormous role. They were enrolling in committees and central organs as organizers (seldom as executives) or as initiators of all kinds of political activity, even as far as terrorism.

The many years' activity of Evno Azef, the instigator of many big terrorist acts, is well known to all. Michail Gotz, Bronstein-Trotsky, Nakhmkes-Steklov, Gertsenstein, Gershuni, the three Tsederbaums and a great many other Jews staffed the "revolutionary headquarters" and directed the activities of the government's enemies, the oppositionists as well as the revolutionaries.

And thus it is not surprising that the broad masses of Russia, watching all this, very frequently identified the word "Zhid" — Jew — with "revolutionary" or "rebel". In the eyes of the uncivilized masses, the latter began to substitute the former. This engendered sharp anti-Jewish feelings and created preconditions for the "Jewish disorders", as they were earlier called by the "People's Freedom", and later as "pogroms".

In the profoundness of the nation, whose ancestors created Russia and defended it with incredible sacrifices, a protest began to grow subconsciously against those new-comers who so easily and freely became the masters of the fate of their motherland. These new-comers began to treat scornfully many of those things which had been sacred to the nation and which were inseparably linked with the very concept of "Russia-Fatherland-Motherland".

To deny the presence and the growth of these feelings is hardly possible, especially now after the year 1917. It was in the turbulent years of the revolution that these feelings poured out in the bloody pogroms, perpetrated by the units of the Red Army which were commanded by the Jew Bronstein-Trotsky, (Glokhov, Novgorod-Seversk in 1918 and also the pogroms created by the Petlura men, among whose members of the government was one Ukrainian minister — a Jew from Kiev, Margolin. Another of the closest collaborators in organizing the movement of Makhno was the Jew, Arshinov. And finally, the feelings appeared as a certain "anti-Semitism", about which many books were written by the Jews, both communists (Larin): and non-communists (Schwartz and others).

These feelings latently existed in the first years of this century and irresponsible elements took advantage of them. This resulted, in the years of the first Russian revolution and in the years immediately preceding it, in a number of Jewish pogroms. The most known pogrom took place in the city of Kishinev in 1903, during which there were human sacrifices (49 killed).

The Kishinev pogrom provoked a storm of indignation not only in Russia but also in the whole world and embittered the Jews still more who were convinced that the pogrom was organized on "order" from the government, an attitude that was taken up by the world press.

That the "order" to organize the pogrom in Kishinev really existed may be sincerely doubted. Nowhere and at no time were there any proofs found that any such or similar "order" was issued by the Minister Pleve, neither before the 1917 nor after it, when all the archives of the Ministry of

Internal Affairs ended up in the hands of the revolutionary leaders. Through an objective study of all that was printed in connection with the pogrom (and very much was printed!), it is really possible to blame the

government for its inability to put a stop to the pogrom with lightning speed by use of its police and army. The government was not able to stop the pogrom until after two days of strife, only after it made numerous arrests and dispersed the thugs. To call this delay an "order" means consciously to look for a reality.

No one accuses Kerens and Trotsky in pogroms, although during their command of the armed forces of Russia pogroms occurred which were incommensurably greater than in Kishinev. During these pogroms there were a great many victims and mass beatings of the Jews in Kalush and Tornopl in 1917 and in Glukhov and Novgorod-Seversk in 1918.

To organize a pogrom by means of an "order", without the presence of a corresponding feeling in the masses is not only difficult, but even impossible — it is scarcely necessary to prove this. In these cases it is appropriate to blame the authorities in using insufficient energy and speed to end the pogroms. And here Pleve, Kerensky, Trotsky and the Ukrainian minister Margolin would all be culpable; if it were proven that they could have stopped the pogroms immediately.

Two years later, in October of 1905, a pogrom occurred in Odessa, which resulted in many sacrifices. Among the victims were Jews, police and soldiers, who suppressed the pogrom instigators.

This time there was a good action by the Jewish fighting group created by the party "Poale-Zion", which, after the pogrom, sent its representative to Odessa to investigate the event. The account was published in 1906 in Paris in a pamphlet entitled "the Odessa Pogrom and Self-defense of Poale-Zion"

(94 pages) (Publisher — "The Western Central Committee of Self-defense of Poale-Zion").

The representative (whose name is not given), states, in giving the characteristics of Neigardt, the governor of the city of Odessa, the chief of police, General Val, and the public rabbi of Odessa, Kreps, in the following words:

"Neigardt — this is a Russian official, a Russian executioner, a provocateur, an official scoundrel, yet all in some European taste".

"The General Val — had a rough and sinister look, like to stamp with his feet, swear, growl bestially; in a word, he was a frank and unsophisticated executioner".

"The public rabbi — the well-known scoundrel Kreps reigned for a long time in the Odessa rabbinate contrary to the general wish".

Further in the pamphlet is a description of how the self-defense was created and armed: "a special committee of armament' which bought the weapons, was appointed; fifteen groups from the students were formed, where each group was identified by a number. Before the beginning of the pogrom, there were two hundred revolvers. But the next day, on Wednesday, one professor, a very brave man, got one hundred and fifty further revolvers". "On Wednesday a lot of weapons were distributed in one of the Zionist synagogues..."

On the previous page (51) of the same pamphlet, we read: "At the huge rallies in the university, the revolutionary organizations arranged money collections for the purchase of weapons, not only for defense but also for the possibility of an armed uprising..."

The acknowledgement, in the above pamphlet, by the representative of "Poale-Zion" himself that the aim of all the arming was not only self-defense but also "armed uprising" deserves special attention because it indicates that the activity of the Jewish self-defense went beyond the framework of the actual self-defense. It set itself a much wider task: the overthrow of the existing order by means of armed uprising. The distribution of weapons in one of the Zionist synagogues imparted to all the "disorders" or "pogroms" in Odessa a somewhat different character than normal and justified the self-defense of citizens, especially in those cases when local authorities were unable to establish order and to defend the lives and property of peaceful citizens.

Knowing all which is explained above, there is no need to be surprised that the Odessa pogrom far surpassed, in number of victims killed, 'the Kishinev pogrom.

There were three days of actual war in Odessa, not only with killed and wounded but also with numerous "prisoners". According to the newspaper reports of the time, there were 800-900 "captives" taken by the insurgents.

The "captives" were taken to the university headquarters of the insurgent "self-defenders". According to the findings of the "Poale-Zion" representative, the number of "captives" was actually one-tenth of the above figure and did not exceed 80-90 persons. Also there, at the university, the insurgents were checking for any provocateurs among the "captives" and, as the representative expresses, used to make "personal" identity.

The Jewish groups of "self-defense", not only did checking but also searching, even of those who "walked by" and especially of gentiles. Here is how the pamphlet describes this checking: "A man, dressed in a sheepskin coat with a bundle tied in a red kerchief, walks on a street: we start to untie the bundle and find in it a revolver, like that carried by city police. Who? Where from? Not a word in reply, he only flattens himself against the wall and moves his eyes in all directions. I will never forget the expression of these eyes. All of a sudden a man rushes up and says: 'He is a policeman.

He is from our station.' You are on watch there? Yes? No answer; his face is red. Ah! Provocateur! Changed your clothes, came to ruin ours! I shoot at him, wound him in stomach, but do not kill him. Then we start to finish him with sticks. I pushed him in some door: it is pitiful and ugly to watch how he is finished off. Behind the door he passes away".

About 500 human lives — such was the result of the Odessa pogrom. To establish this number with complete authenticity and to determine how many Jews and how many non-Jews were is hardly possible. According to Jewish sources, 302 Jews were killed; according to government sources, over 200 non-Jews were killed. Concerning the non-Jewish who were killed. The pamphlet states: "There were many ruffians killed. No one counted them and no one made an effort to find out their number; in any case, it is believed that there were at least a hundred".

The count and identification were also hampered by the fact that the corpses picked up were brought to places under the control of government authorities who did not bother themselves with the identification of the dead, or with who was Jewish or non-Jewish. It was for this reason there were arguments and accusations of the police later in the "theft of Jewish corpses" which should have been buried in the Jewish cemetery.

Without doubt, many Christians were among the killed "defenders" along with Jews — insurgents who took an active part in the struggle along with the Russians.

The "Poale-Zion" representative sees the cause of the pogrom in the "anti-Semitism of the masses", and explains this "anti-Semitism" in the mutually contemptuous relationship between the Jews and non-Jews wherever the two lived side by side. Christians, says the pamphlet, scare their children with the words: "a Jew will put you in a bag". And the Jews scare their children with: "goy will put you in a bag".

It is obvious that in the presence of such feelings the smallest spark can cause an explosion and turn tense relationship into an active pogrom.

What was the spark which provoked the pogrom in Odessa and in the other places during the stormy months of the first Russian revolution? An explanation of this as being the "order" or "command" of the Russian Government, as already mentioned above, cannot sustain serious criticism: since it lacked the corresponding feelings among the broad masses, it is hardly possible to rouse these masses with this "order".

Perhaps it was a provocation from the side of the authorities, as is frequently used to explain such pogroms? The representative of the "Poale-Zion" answers this question thus: "I travelled to Odessa precisely in order to find a purely provocative pogrom, but — alas! — did not find it..." And he continued: "The tales about hooligans (if this word is not to be understood ethically) had been invented by imbecile Jewish gossipers who were afraid to look at the truth, and by cunning liberals who wished to get rid of the frightful question with cheap solutions."

Besides the theories of "order" and "provocation" in the attempts to explain what may have served as a "spark" for the explosion there exists still one more version: the striking activity of the Jews in all kind of appearances and demonstrations directed against the government and the existing order; as rule, all these demonstrations were accompanied by shouts and slogans evidently of an insulting and blasphemous character against those, whom the broad masses, the national conscience, respected and esteemed. Heart-rending yells: "Down with Nicholashka! Down with priests!" at meetings and demonstrations, directed and inspired by "revolutionaries"

consisting of an excessively large percentage of Jews, provoked a reaction, the edge of which had been directed against all the Jews in general.

The assertion about the Jewish role in revolutionary events of that time, not infrequently provoking Jewish pogroms, is confirmed even by the membership of the "Coalition-Soviet" in Odessa. The "Coalition-Soviet", capturing the university building, directed the "defense" and collected means and weapons "in case of armed uprising".

"The Coalition-Soviet" was composed of eight members: two representatives from the social-democrats (one from each of the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks); one from the "Bund"; one from the "S-Z" (socialist-Zionists); one from the S-P; one Armenian; one from the Georgians and one from the Poles. Both the social-democrats and the S-P representatives were Jews. There was not a single Russian or Ukrainian. (The latter is disputed, but nowhere and at no time, as much as could be established was the names and nationality of these three members of the "Coalition-Soviet" stated.)

In Kiev, approximately at the same time, a crowd of demonstrators under the leadership of two Jews – lawyers Shlikhter and Ratner, seized the building of the City Duma, broke and tore up portraits of the Czar and the State Emblem, and started to organize the "People's Militia". Also on the spot, in the City Duma, a collection of means and weapons was made. Shlikhter arrived at the meeting on horseback, followed by a crowd with red banners and flags. From the crowd came continued shouts, full of insults directed against the Czar, the government, the army, the police and religion. (Afterwards, in 1928, Shlikhter was Commissar of Agriculture in the Ukraine.)

In St Petersburg at that time the "Soviet of Workers' Deputies" was organized. The chairman was a Russian-Ukrainian, Khrustalev-Nosar, and the vice-chairman a Jew, Bronstein-Trotsky. On the proposal of Trotsky, in the absence of the chairman Khrustalev, (who at that time was already arrested) the resolution of an armed uprising was adopted. A call to an armed uprising or a participation in it entailed the heaviest penalties, including death. Khrustalev was aware of this and, not wishing to expose participants of the Soviet Workers' Deputies to such risk, was against such a resolution. Trotsky also knew and understood this. But, in spite of this, taking the advantage of the chairman's absence, he put the resolution of an

armed uprising through, uprising that took the lives of those many who voted for the Trotsky's proposal.

(Afterwards, during the First World War, Khrustalev voluntarily appeared in Russia and expressed his wish to take part in the "defense of the Motherland"; whereas Trotsky spent this time in the USA, and left for Russia only after the overthrow of the Czar in 1917.)

* * *

A great many examples of similar Jewish activities in the Russian revolutionary movement can be given, but the above are sufficient in order to judge the cases and grounds for pogroms in Russia.

The fact that the opinion exists in the whole world about Russia and Russians as the people and the country of constant pogroms, systematic oppressions and persecutions of Jews necessitates at least a general clarification of the Jewish sojourn outside Russia and their interrelations with those nations on whose territories they lived in dispersion.

A work of this volume does not permit enumeration in detail all the conflicts between the Jews and the nations among which they were dispersed. Therefore, the list is given here contains only the pogroms registered by Jewish historians. The biggest pogrom, according to the number killed was in Alexandria, in the year 68 A. D. During this pogrom 56,000 Jews were killed. It occurred at a time when Christianity was only in its embryonic stage, and was not a predominant but a persecuted religion. The following pogroms took place:

Year	Place	1351	Konigsberg
387	Rome	1355	Toledo
516	Clermont	1380	Paris
1013	Cordoba	1391	Barcelona, Toledo
1096	Worms, Mainz	1407	Krakow
1108	Toledo	1411	Mass pogrom in Spain
1146	German cities	1421	Vienna
1171	Blua	1447	Colmar
1189	London	1449	Lisbon
1212	Toledo	1464	Krakow
1235	Fulda	1467	Toledo and Nuremberg
1236	Anjou, Poitu	1469	Poznan
1262	London	1486	Toledo (1,640 killed)
1265	Koblenz	1494	Naples
1283	Mainz	1506	Lisbon (2,000 killed)
1285	Munich	1592	Vilnius
1287	All the English Jews in jail	1614	Frankfurt
1292	Colmar	1658	Slaughter in Great Poland
1301	Magdeburg	1680	Madrid
1328	Navarro	1686	Budapest
1336	Rothenburg and other cities	1716	Poznan
1349	Cevio, Switzerland	1761	Yemen

The above listed are only pogroms. Besides them there are far more registered "expulsions", "evictions" and all kinds of prohibitions and restrictions, and also orders that the Jews had to wear on themselves a sign of distinction such as a special form of pointed cap.

All these took place not in Russia and came not from Russian people, but from Italians, Spanish, Germans, English, Poles, Hungarians, Arabs, French, etc.

Perhaps we should give here a conclusion which was made by Solomon Lourie, the professor of the highest learning institution of Russia. This conclusion he stated in his book, published in 1922 in Leningrad: "The cause of anti-Semitism ought to be looked for in the Jews themselves. This is clear to a majority of scholars. But because anti-Semitism up to now remains the evil of the day, the fighting question, and then naturally, such an explanation of the anti-Semitism receives an appraising smack. Scholars are not content to ascertain that the Jews in these or other respects differ from the rest of the ancient world, but still find it necessary to explain the anti-Semitism in the way that the Jews are either much worse or much better than their neighbors". (The above stated words of the professor Lourie pertain to the pre-Christian period. But if the one word "ancient" is stricken out from the whole quotation then all that is said can be attributed to the present.)

To explain the fact as simply incidental, that wherever Jews appear also appear manifestations of "Judaeophobia" or (as it is now not quite precisely called) "anti-Semitism", is hardly possible.

The Russian people, and the country they created, is no exception.

How to get rid of this more than two thousand years' old phenomenon is outside the scope of this work, which, as its title shows, is limited to the description of Jewish life in Russia and USSR.

Russia, if it is permissible to bring it once more to the reader's attention, was the first country in which the legislature on its own initiative proclaimed a complete desegregation in learning institutions (in 1804), hoping in this way painlessly to assimilate Jews with the native population. This hope was not realized. And after eighty-two years (in 1887) restrictive government measures appeared and the percentage quota was introduced into learning institutions, quota which was mentioned in the foregoing account.

Throughout the history of mankind runs the "mutual repulsion" between Jews and non-Jews, irrespective of their nationality, language and culture. Now getting stronger, now getting weaker, this "repulsion" engendered all the conflicts between the non-Jews and the Jews, conflicts that frequently turned into all kinds of discriminations and pogroms.

There exist different opinions about the real causes of this "repulsion". Some, for example prof. Lourie, see this cause in the "special spiritual aspect" of Jews, serving as an obstacle to the natural assimilative process in their long common life with other nationalities and tribes.

Others, for example M. Freedlender, see this cause in the envy of the non-Jews towards the morally perfect Jews and their material success in the economic sphere.

Thirdly, look for the root of all evil in the sphere of religious differences and the corresponding active propaganda of predominant Christian church. (This is the viewpoint of all Jewish and an overwhelming majority of non-Jewish investigators of this question.)

Without going into detailed examination, which point of view is closer to the truth — it is possible that a portion of the truth is in each one — here, in conclusion, is also interesting to note the statements on this question made by the well-known Jewish historian, Cicil Roth. The statements are given by S. Poliakov-Litovtsev in his "Agasphera Legenda", published in the ("Jewish World" Collec. II). "Records of our (Jewish) chroniclers, formerly quite truthful, are deprived of perspective, and therefore involuntarily distort historical objectivity describing these events. Quite often they are isolated from the conditions in which they have occurred and the circumstances from which they came. Thus our chroniclers invariably ascribe to anti-Semitism, the religious and racial hatreds, every act of mob violence, victims of which turned out to be Jews, even when these had other causes and were directed against not only the Jews alone. The Jewish martyrologists took little account of it and from this sorrow and misfortune common to all mankind acquired the character of a solely Jewish calamity in their records.

In the year 1278 in London, 267 Jews were hanged. They were accused of having cut off a fraction of the gold from coins. But at the same time, many Christian goldsmiths were executed with the Jews on the same charge".

Further, C. Roth gives the whole range of calamities and catastrophes in which the Jews also suffered; however the chroniclers were interested only in the Jewish victims. The result is a picture of calamities and pogroms affecting Jews only.

Besides that, as C. Roth correctly notices, during all mutinies and outrages it is much easier to ransack Jews for the simple reason that their possessions were moveable, while possessions of non-Jews often consisted of all kind chattel and real estate.

The corrective, introduced by C. Roth, merits special attention. If we consider the times during which various excesses occurred on the territory of Russia, then we will see that they always coincided with all kinds of other agitations and disturbances excited by the state of the national masses. In periods of peace there were no pogroms for decades.

The Bailis Affair

Most of the pogroms in Russia took place at the beginning of this century. The result of these pogroms was a still much greater solidarity of the Jewish ethnic group and strengthening of its conviction of the necessity of carrying on the struggle against the regime in every possible way. Besides the Jewish pogroms, there occurred still one more event that rocked not only all of Russian society but also the whole world. This was a trial in Kiev dealing with the accusation of Bailis in a ritual murder.

The possibility itself of such a trial in the enlightened Twentieth Century raised a storm of indignation and protests in the world press. The press did not spare any ink in describing everything that took place in connection with this trial, and, at the same time, making many uncomplimentary comments about Russia and its regime. The words "pogrom" and "trial of Bailis" were linked with Russia in the most uncomplimentary manner, raising ideas and feeding imaginations about the nation and the country as wild, uncultured and lawless. Accusations of Jews in ritual murders, with the aim of obtaining the blood of Christians for Jewish religious ceremonies are just as old as the history of the Jewish sojourn in dispersion. There is no country or nation (where Jews lived) in whose history there was not a case of accusations and trials in ritual murders.

Among the dark and unenlightened national masses of the Christian world, there existed throughout the centuries a conviction that the Jews do indeed commit the ritual murders, in spite of the fact that not a single religion can carry the responsibility for the deeds of its individual sects and that all kinds of religious cruelties are always condemned by religions.

It is not incidental and not without foundation that even in the Sixteenth Century (in 1564) in Poland it was most strictly forbidden by the decree of the King Sigismund-August to provoke accusations against the Jews of ritual murders. This decree was issued at the request of the Jews themselves. At that time they enjoyed great influence in Poland and had the widest "personal-national" autonomy.

And when in Kiev, in 1911, the body of a murdered boy was found, rumor ascribed the murder to the Jews; a judicial process, known as "The Bailis Affair", commenced.

The pages of the Russian and the world press were filled with reports of the trial, creating an unhealthy atmosphere, and, directly and indirectly, accusing the Russian Government of everything. And the government indirectly pointed an accusing finger not to any cruel faction or sect who may have committed the murder but to all Jews in general.

Here is what we read about this trial in the book by S. S. Oldenberg, "The Reign of Emperor Nicholas II", published in 1949 in Munich by the "Society for the Dissemination of Russian National and Patriotic Literature".

"From the 24th of September to the 28th of October in the court of Kiev, the examination of the trial – the famous Bailis Affair – took place, attracting hundreds of foreign correspondents and observers.

Even in March 1911, when a twelve year-old boy, Andrey Ushchinsky, was found killed in Kiev, whose body turned out to be bloodless and had 47 pricked wounds, the rumor was at once spread that the boy allegedly had been killed by the Jews, with the aim of using his blood in some kind of secret ceremony.

Some representatives of judicial power, in particular the public prosecutor of the Judicial Chamber, Chaplinsky, undertook the task of proving this version. The local police investigation, however, had indicated something completely different – there were findings indicating that the boy was killed by a gang of thieves. But the advocates of the "ritual" version stated that the police had been bribed by the Jews. In the Duma, the right-wingers even introduced an inquiry in connection with this (in May 1911).

Ignoring the criminal investigators who did not believe in the "ritual" version, the prosecutor, at last, found witnesses testifying that Ushchinsky had allegedly been kidnapped by an office employee of the brick factory, Mendel Bailis, and, along with other unidentified persons, killed him. In August 1911, Bailis was arrested. Contrary to Russian custom the investigation dragged on for over two years until finally, in the autumn of 1913, the affair was brought to court.

The Russian and foreign press showed their unusual interest in this affair. Notable Russian writers and publicists of left orientation protested against the "bloody calumny" on the Jews. The most distinguished lawyers of Russia gathered to defend Bailis. They were N. P. Karabchevsky, V.A. Maklakov, O. O. Gruzenberg and others.

From its side, the right-wing press, led by the "Novoe Vremia" was out to prove the ritual character of the murder. And in assistance to the prosecutor, G. G. Zamyslovsky, a member of the State Duma, and the well-known Moscow lawyer, A. S. Shmakov, author of several anti-Semitic investigations, were appearing as public plaintiffs.

From the very first days of the court, a weakness manifested itself in the validity of the accusation. An article, written by V. V. Shulgin in the old rightist organ, "Kievlianin", (on Sept. 27, 1913) provoked a big uproar. Shulgin wrote that he swore on the coffin of the deceased editor of the newspaper, D. I. Pikhno, to write only the truth. He recounted, from the words of police officials, how it was suggested to them from the top to find a "Jew" by all means: he cited the words of the investigator himself who said that it is not important whether Bailis is guilty or not — what is important is to prove the existence of the ritual murders.

"You yourself commit human sacrifices", Shulgin wrote. "You treated Bailis like a rabbit which is placed on a vivisection table." This issue of "Kievlianin" — for the first time in its existence — was confiscated. The nationalist action reproached Shulgin, though in a mild manner, which after this shifted to the group of center.

Police officials in their reports to St. Petersburg noted, day after day, weaknesses in the testimony of witnesses of the prosecution and conviction of experts of the defense. Among the experts of the prosecution were prominent professors of judicial medicine, but they could prove only that the body was intentionally exsanguinated — which was not an evidence that this was done with the "ritual" aim.

The composition of the jury was, as the saying goes, "gray"-peasants, lower middle class and one postal official. Leftist newspapers accused authorities beforehand of the wish to take advantage of the "people's darkness". V. G. Korolenko wrote that the decision of such a jury cannot be authoritative.

But these simple people treated their task seriously. "How can we judge Bailis when in the court no one talks about him?" — Thus spoke the jurors among themselves, as the police reported.

Speeches of the plaintiffs did not change this impression: a lot was said in them about ritual murders in general and that the "Jews will ruin Russia", and almost nothing about Bailis.

On October 28, the jury acquitted Bailis. They replied affirmatively to the question that the murder was committed in the brick factory, belonging to a Jew named Zaiatsev, and that the body was exsanguinated there. And although the "Novoe Vremia" attached great importance to this question, it itself stated after two days, in the article written by Menshikov, that "Russia suffered defeat".

The exultation of the leftist press in the failure of this trial is understandable. But the very possibility of such an outcome, in the first place, is a striking illustration of the freedom and independence of the Russian Court and jury, and refutes the rumors about power pressure on the court".

With such words, the monarchist Oldenberg describes the much discussed trial of Bailis. He himself acknowledged that in this case the proof and evidence in the accusation and proof of the "ritual" murder did not carry enough weight.

The majority of Russian periodicals and all the foreign press, reported the Bailis trial in much harsher terms, throwing the shadow on those who stood at the head of the Ministry of Justice; and the shadow extended to the whole regime and system of pre-revolutionary Russia.

Rightist and extreme rightist Russian circles unconditionally supported not only the version of the "ritual" murder, the guilt of Mendel Bailis, but also extended the accusation to all Jewry. They were dissatisfied and disappointed with the outcome of the trial. It was clear to all that the acknowledgement of the bloodless body did not mean yet that the body was exsanguinated for any "ritual" purpose, and less so, that all Jewry was guilty in this.

There were quite a few people among the Russian community who assumed on purely theoretical grounds the existence among Jews of some kind of cruel sect, as for example, Scoptsy in the Orthodox religion. However, it can by no means be concluded that for the activities of a cruel sect, all members of such a sect can be responsible. And the government was reproached that at the trial this circumstance was not sufficiently emphasized and co-religionists were not protected at once from spreading interpretations.

But the ignorant national masses perceived the court's decision in their own way: the acknowledgement of the bloodless body was interpreted as a

confirmation that the Jews indeed do commit ritual murder. And newspaper boys, after the announcement of the court's decision, shouted on the streets of Kiev: "Bailis acquitted, Jews are accused!"

In general the whole Bailis affair left a heavy feeling of resentment and contributed to discrediting the régime. Especially when it was discovered at the court that pressure was exerted from the side of Ministry of Justice on the conduct of the investigation. This provoked the disapproval and even indignation of those who considered themselves advocates of the regime, especially among the "rightists".

An immense interest in this affair was shown by ambassadors of foreign countries in St. Petersburg in their conversations with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sazonov. The minister assured them that "Bailis will be acquitted". This statement is confirmed by documents (in ambassadorial reports). It further obscures and complicates the already obscure and complicated affair that brought so much harm to Russia.

In conclusion it should be mentioned that the Bailis trial took place at a time when the Jewish pogroms and the Dreyfus Affair, which agitated the whole world for many years, were still fresh in people's memories. There had been also, comparatively recently, the Mutansky trial in Russia, where heathens were accused of making human sacrifices. The heathens were Chermis, later acquitted by the court.

The result of the trial was that all six and one half million Russian Jews, even the well-to-do and loyal classes, became united still more closely in their negative attitude towards the Russian régime, along with their numerous fellow tribesmen in the USA and in Europe.

* * *

A few months after the trial, World War I started and the feelings of Russian Jewry changed to a considerable degree. All understood that Russia's coming out in alliance with democratic countries against the monarchies of Germany and Austria-Hungary, would, in the case of the latter's defeat, inevitably lead Russia into the democratic camp and bring about the democratization of the Russian régime itself. This is why Jews in an overwhelming majority became, if not Russian patriots, in any case, the "defenders", hoping that a Russian victory would bring benefits also to Russian Jewry.

However, these "defending" feelings were characteristic only of the majority of those Jews, who, having received a Russian education, joined the ranks of the Russian intelligentsia and well understood questions of international relations, and therefore could consider what victory or defeat would bring to Russian Jewry. These "defending" feelings had a different meaning to the Russian Jewry than to the native population, and were far from those patriotic feelings, which embraced all of Russia at the beginning of the war.

In essence, the calculation was thus that in case of a successful defense, that is, victory over the Central Powers, a change would also occur inevitably in the internal politics of Russia, in the direction desired by Jews. The "defending" feelings, expressed in support of participation in the war, did not mean at all that the same feelings were expressed in support of the regime and its internal politics. All Jews, without exception, had a definitely negative attitude to the regime, and did not make a secret of this.

The main body among the many millions of Russian Jews was far from patriotic and "defending" feelings, even though it cannot be asserted that all Russian Jews, one and all, were "defeatists" and wished German or Austro-Hungarian victory.

But neither can it be forgotten that the condition of the Jews in Germany and Austria was well known to the Russian Jews, and, naturally, they could not refrain from wishing that in Russia also Jews might occupy the same positions in public and political life, as well as in the army, without changing their religion. This wish cannot be considered unfounded. Moreover, in the Russian army were many Jews who not only fulfilled their duties loyally but also showed bravery in the war and received decorations. But they had no hope whatsoever to be promoted to officer's position due to their Judaic faith.

Not much was said during the war about these contradictions, but they influenced the feelings of both all Russian Jewry and of those many thousands of Jews who served in the army. There is no need to doubt this; these contradictions could not generate special patriotic enthusiasm.

It would be appropriate to recall here, that in the pre-war years in Russia the question was seriously discussed of releasing all Jews from military duties. But no decision was made, although many articles were written and many speeches were made in dedication of this important question.

Statements were made by the opponents and by the advocates of the "exclusion of Jews from the army". Both sides gave their reasons and considerations in confirming correctness and justification of their viewpoint. Whole books were even dedicated to this question, such as, for example "War and the Jews", written by Gessen and published in 1912, in St. Petersburg. This book consisted of 300 pages with numerous statistical data and a detailed account of Jewish conditions in foreign armies.

The size of this work does not permit the elaboration of this question, but what is said in the concluding chapter deserves attention: "The Jewish rôle in future wars in general, and on Western theatre in particular".

As subsequent events have shown, this rôle was not small, both during the war up to February of 1917 and after February, particularly in the years of the civil war, when the Jew, Bronstein-Trotsky, was in command of the Red Army and the fleet, and the Jew, Gamarnik, managed and ruled the political part of the armed forces, to say nothing of countless other Jewish high commanders.

But besides the loyal Jews and the Jews valiantly fighting on the front, there were quite a few Jews incited with "defeatism", which kept their feelings to themselves and in no way manifested or spoke about them. These were the broad Jewish masses, lacking culture, which in their tradition were disposed negatively to that regime which, according to their conviction, "persecuted" them. They carried over their negative attitude to all activities and measures of the regime, including here also the defense of the country. In their opinion Russia was not their motherland, but only a temporary sojourn till that moment when they would return to their Promised Land. This is why there could not be in them a patriotic gust of passion and uplift, peculiar to those whose past, present and future was inseparably linked with Russia.

There was still one more group among Russian Jewry which was openly "defeatist". The group was not large, but quite active, educated, well grounded in politics and able to conduct propaganda. These were Jewish members of revolutionary and socialist currents, groups and parties. A considerable number of them were either in exile or in emigration and, up to the February overthrow, were not able to act openly. This, however, does not mean that the group did not have any influence on the feelings of some part of Russian Jewry which formally remained loyal during the war years.

This group had its influence not only on their fellow tribesmen but also on many Russian socialists and revolutionaries who believed that only in the event of losing the war could there be any hope for the overthrow of the regime.

Summarizing the foregoing, it is possible, without a fear of making a mistake, to assert that all six million Russian Jews, in the years of the First World War, were unanimous in their negative attitude towards the regime of the Russian Empire. And if the Jewry supported some of the regime's beginnings during the war, then this was only in so far as these beginnings could bring benefits to the Jewry sooner or later, always putting the interests of Jewry in first place.

These attitudes were not secrets to the Russian Government and the supreme command, and provided grounds for doubts of Jewish loyalty; an overwhelming majority of Jews lived in the Jewish Pale, where military actions were taking place.

Without the possibility, in the conditions of war time, of investigating each separate case and verifying the loyalty of the Jews living in the areas of military actions, the military command compelled them to move from this areas, directing them to central provinces of Russia, where, before the war, Jews had been forbidden to reside.

With these measures, the Jewish Pale was actually abolished. But on the other hand, the forcible eviction of tens of thousands, frequently in hard conditions, with insufficiently organized transport, feeding and medical services on the way, was regarded by the Jews as new form of "persecution". And the doubt in their loyalty was interpreted as an undeserved and unsubstantiated insult. Such interpretation was made not only by the evicted Jews but by the whole Russian Jewry: this only intensified anti-government feelings. Such, in general, were the conditions during the years of the war right up to the February Revolution.

The Jewish Question from February to October 1917

In the first month of its existence the Provisional Government abolished on March 21, 1917, all laws and orders restricting the Jews. They were treated equal in all respect with the rest of the citizens of Russia. Wide possibilities were opened to them for the most active participation in all branches of public and cultural life of the country, without exception, and to occupy any position in the government apparatus.

The Jews did not keep themselves waiting and rushed in to occupy ruling positions, inaccessible to them previously, in all sectors of the social and political life of Russia, as well as administrative posts.

Four Jews became senators: M. Vinaver, G. Blumenfeld, O. Gruzenberg and I. Gurevich. The Jew G. Shreider, became the mayor of St. Petersburg and the Jew O. Minor, that of Moscow. In Kiev in 1917 we see as deputy mayor, the Jew, Ginsburg.

In the year 1917 in the responsible post, managing the affairs of the Provisional Government, was the Jew, A. Galperi. High posts in the ministry were occupied by Jews: S. M. Schwartz, D. U. Dalin — (Levin), I. M. Liakhovsky — (Maisky), Y. S. Novakovsky — all Social-Democrats, Mensheviks and "Bundists".

Besides the above listed persons, many Jews (up to October period) occupied high posts in institutions of local government in the "February period" of revolution.

But the senators' chairs and high positions in the government services did not attract the Jews. The instability of the Provisional Government, determined from the first days of its existence, and its dependence on arbitrarily arisen or created organizations of a purely political-revolutionary character, predetermined the unreliability and instability of posts and positions in the government services.

Revolutionary careers were made not in ministries, but at meetings and conferences of Soviet Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, quickly appropriating to themselves legislative and executive powers. It is there that the Russian Jewry rushed with the energy, persistence and conviction, peculiar to them that they "know everything and can do anything".

At that time — in the first months of the Provisional Government — the following revolutionary parties have pursued the occupation of these political areas, competing with one another on the proscenium of political life:

- The Party of "Socialist-Revolutionaries" from which its left wing soon detached itself, calling themselves the "Left Socialist-Revolutionaries".
- The Party of "Socialist-Democrats — of Mensheviks", which stood on "defensive position".
- "Bund" — exclusively Jewish Mensheviks — the Marxists, who did not admit non-Jews in their environment, but themselves quite actively participated in activities of All-Russian Social-Democratic Party — of Mensheviks.
- "Anarchists" — followers of the teachings of Kropotkin and Bakunin — demanded the abolition of any power in general.

All the mentioned parties were considered "revolutionary", in contrast to a few "bourgeois" parties which acted timidly during the revolutionary events. Here may also be included the "Constitutional-Democratic Party" which changed its name to the "Party of National Freedom".

The middle position between the "revolutionary" and "bourgeois" parties had been occupied by the "National Socialists", a large party with little influence. For some, this party was not "revolutionary" enough, for others, who judged it by its name, it was deemed "socialist".

Patriotic groupings, parties and "rightist" currents were stunned by the revolution and remained in virtual non-existence.

It is not out of place to mention here how Russian Jewry as a whole regarded the parties. At the congress of all the Jewish organizations, a decision was reached that in the forthcoming elections (general, direct, just and secret) no votes would be cast for the parties that were further to the right than the "National Socialists". The congress was held in the first months of the revolution. In such a way the organized Russian Jewry refused to support the party of "National Freedom", which as well as the central party organs was composed of many Jews. These Jews were well-educated and cultured, but they did not share revolutionary ideas and did not support revolutionary methods in internal and external politics.

Jews made up the overwhelming majority (from 60 to 80% of the central committees of all the six revolutionary parties enumerated above, while in the "Bund" there was not a single non-Jew.

Lists of names of the members of the central committees of these six parties, given in the Part II of this work, show the nationality of each individual member.

Owing to numerous pseudonyms and to changes from one faction of a party to another (for instance, Bronstein-Trotsky and Nakhmkes-Steklov – Mensheviks turned Bolsheviks), and also to the impossibility of drawing a distinction between "Bundists" and Mensheviks, these listings cannot claim to be 100% exact; therefore, some mistakes are possible in them.

But they give a quite convincing general picture of the racial composition of leaders in the revolutionary parties of Russia in 1917.

Besides their Central Committees, all these parties had a wide network in the provinces and regions, in the army and among workers, and they participated most actively in the political life of the country. These parties deliberately participated in diverse "Soviet Deputies": of workers, of soldiers, of peasants and especially in the State Deputies of Soviet Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' which, from the first weeks of the revolution, became the second government, more authoritative than the Provisional Government which had in its composition during the first month only one socialist, Kerensky. And the Jews in this second government played a leading rôle, occupying key positions.

In the first weeks and months of the revolution, all the revolutionaries that were in exile or who had emigrated returned to Russia and began to "deepen and widen" the revolution. Among those who returned from abroad were an overwhelming majority of Jews; this can be seen from the listings' published in the spring of 1917 in Russian newspapers.

Up to the moment of the fall of the Czarist regime, the emigrant-revolutionaries were concentrated in United States of America and Switzerland.

In the USA, in New York, there were such well-known Jewish revolutionaries as Bronstein-Trotsky, Kohan-Volodarsky, Radomyslsky-Uritsky and many others. They successfully conducted propaganda against

the Russian Government, watched war events closely and were getting ready to participate in the imminent revolution in Russia. Still one year before the revolution, on the fourteenth of February, 1916, a conference of emigrant-revolutionaries took place in New York. Sixty-two persons participated in this conference, fifty of whom were "veterans of the 1905 revolution", and the remainders of them were newly-admitted members. Participants of the conference were people of intellectual professions or "professional revolutionaries". Among the delegates was an enormous percentage of Jews. The material support for this group was provided by the banker Jacob Schiff, as was repeatedly said to those who were present at the conference.

During a little more than a year, two ships with emigrants departed from USA. The emigrants were returning to Russia after the February overthrow. An overwhelming majority of the passengers on these ships consisted of Jews, who in their time run away from Russia. This was not difficult to establish, as the passenger lists showed at a glance. All were returning as "political emigrants", although many of them were simply deserters, who had run away from Russia, in order to escape conscription. The circumstances now made these deserters "victims of Czarism", and they, as victors, were returning to Russia to take part in the revolution.

Upon their arrival in Russia they spread throughout the country, from St. Petersburg to Vladivostok, and at once took a most active part in its events.

Among those returning from the USA there were 265 Jews who settled in Petrograd (some of whom were real political emigrants, and some who were simply deserters, accompanying their fellow tribesmen). This was reported to the USA Senate Commission by a Methodist priest, Dr. George A. Simons, who had been the Dean of the Methodist church in Petrograd for many years. In memorandums (protocols. of Testimonies) 439 and 469 of the sixty-fifth session of the US senate, the following is mentioned: "among the agitators were hundreds of Jews from downtown New York, and in 1918 the governing apparatus in Petrograd consisted of 16 true Russians and 371 Jews, of whom, moreover, 265 arrived from New York".

The return of emigrants from the second centre – Switzerland – happened as follows: traveling to Russia from Switzerland the usual way – through Austria or Germany – was impossible, because these countries were at war with Russia, and any Russians finding themselves on these territories were

at once interned. The route through France, and then by sea, was dangerous due to the activity of German submarines and warships. Besides that, France, knowing the attitude of those who wanted to go to Russia, did not wish to help these emigrants. France also knew that a considerable number of these emigrants were active "defeatists", who without a doubt would develop their propaganda in Russia, which was France's ally in this war.

The Germans came to the rescue. They transported 224 emigrant-revolutionaries through German territory in sealed railway cars to Sweden, whence they went through Finland to Russia. Of the passengers in the "sealed" cars, 170 were Jews, almost all of whom were "defeatists".

They were met in Petrograd with a grand welcome, although the Provincial Government was well informed as to their political aims and their method of entering Russia. Newspapers were full of welcoming articles. Lists were printed of those who arrived, from which it was easy to establish the national identity of the passengers in the sealed railway cars. There is no need to enumerate them here; this would only trouble the reader. Those, however, wishing to verify this, can do so by reading Petrograd newspapers of April, 1917. Moreover, possibly they would also be surprised to find included the names both of those who soon upon their arrival took part in creating the power of the Soviets, and of those emigrants who had for several decades been enemies of "Stalinism", e. g. the well-known Menshevik — R. Abramovich.

Having concentrated, as shown above, all their active forces, these Jewish revolutionaries very quickly occupied key positions in all the parties that were claiming and competing for power at that time in Russia. But they did not rush into the apparatus of the executive power. They preferred to play a rôle in influencing the destiny of Russia by staying outside of the government, in the positions of deputies, delegates and leaders in various soviets and committees, which, as was said above, at that time embodied the "second government" in Russia.

The only exception had been made was in the militia, which had replaced the police. Jews readily went there from the first days of the revolution; of course, not in leadership of the militia or its management, but more humbly, not aspiring leadership beyond their own quarter or town. They felt themselves to be, if not "power", then at least organs of power and guardians of the "revolutionary order". With a band on an arm and with a

saber on the side, and frequently with a revolver on a belt, they fussed around, rushing about the city and, in a solemn manner, investigated petty occurrences and conflicts on streets and markets, being guided by the "revolutionary conscience and revolutionary justice". Of course, they were not on the beat, as were previous policemen, but preferred to do what police officers and district officers did. This with the exception that the officers and district officers used to give "good scolding" and "reprimands" before, upholding order without much success, whereas the new replacements rather "persuaded", appealing to the "consciousness" of citizens. The result was quick demoralization of the country and extinction of that patriotic spirit with which Russia had been seized at the beginning of the war, spirit which always used to save Russia in its time of peril.

Calles to continue the war until victory did not find any response from the masses. All dreamed about termination of the war and returning home.

There was no one to appeal to the patriotism of the Russian people: neither the Provisional Government, consisting of people for whom the word "patriotism" was synonymous with reactionary and "counter-revolutionary" against what they feared most, nor – and here much less – the Soviet of

Deputies, which was composed of people to whom the word "Russian patriotism" was itself alien, incomprehensible and even hostile. Russia was not their motherland, but only a temporary place of sojourn and the territory on which they had an opportunity to conduct their international-socialist experiments, without any resistance from the native population: the same population whose forefathers had created and defended their country with heavy sacrifices in the past and whose future was inseparably linked with the future of their country, Russia.

Since they did not meet any rebuffs, the leaders of the various former political and revolutionary parties (a majority of whom were Jews) felt themselves to be masters of the situation and started to act accordingly, without consideration of anyone or anything.

At that time (in the summer of 1917) Bronstein-Trotsky and Nakhamkes-Steklov started to influence everything. Taking up leading positions in the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies of Petrograd, these two Marxist-Mensheviks, who by this time had already turned Bolsheviks, with their peculiar tribal energy, temperament and purposefulness got busy

destroying law and order and even a minimum lawfulness which the Provisional Government wanted to, but could not, preserve with all its efforts.

Trotsky had a reputation as the former vice-president of the Soviet Workers' Deputies in 1905. He was able then to implement the decision about an armed uprising, contrary to the wished of the president, Khrustalev-Nosar, who "suffered" for freedom. (He "suffered" by being in jail in New York right up to the revolution.)

Nakhamkes did not have any reputation and was unknown outside of the revolutionary circles. He was of great stature, heavy, bearded, with a thunder-like bassy voice, unpleasant, and untidy in appearance. From the very first days of the revolution Nakhamkes advanced to the front ranks of revolutionary figures and manifested exceptional impetuosity and impudence in his political activity.

The following episode expressively testifies how powerful Trotsky's reputation was and how powerless the Provisional Government was. In July, 1917, after the suppression of the Bolshevik uprising, Trotsky, along with other leaders of the uprising, was charged by the prosecutor of the Petrograd Chamber of Justice under Articles 51, 100 and 108 of the Criminal Code for the organization of an armed uprising and treason. The accusation was valid, legally irreproachable, and punishable in war time with death penalty.

Other leaders who were charged for the uprising disappeared in hideouts. But Trotsky did not run away and did not hide. Instead, he circulated ironical letters, asking when he would be arrested.

In the Soviet Deputies he knocked on the rostrum and shouted to them: "You accuse Bolsheviks of treason and of an uprising? Put them in jail? And I was with them, yet I am here! Why don't you arrest me?" Members of the Soviet Deputies kept quite. (They were opponents of the uprising, and the Bolsheviks at that time were still in the minority.)

News about the order to arrest Trotsky so agitated the Soviet Deputies that after a few hours, when the order was signed, several members of the military section of the Soviet met in the headquarters of the Petrograd Military District, where the following conversation took place between them and the Quartermaster-General:

“What? You wanted to arrest Trotsky?”, the members of the Soviet asked the Quartermaster-General this question, in which there was no reproach, yet a bit of compassion could be sensed, having the innuendo that he was not in his right mind.

“Yes! And I am still demanding!”

“You obviously forgot what happened three days ago, yet I well remember your pale faces and trembling chins, when we served our time together on the fourth of July.”

“Yes, but this is Trotsky: Do you understand – Trotsky!”

“They tried to explain their worship of him and as a visual demonstration raised their arms to the sky.” (The quotation is from the book by B. Nikitin, "The Fatal Years".)

(The representatives of Military Section of the Soviet were members of Socialist parties of the Soviet, but they were not Bolsheviks. The Provisional Government did not dare to arrest Trotsky. Judging from numerous memoirs written by participants of the events: Kerensky prevented them from arresting him.)

The episode above gives a clear picture of what sort of fellow Trotsky was at that time. He openly conducted propaganda, calling soldiers and seamen to disobedience, thereby undermining the fighting efficiency of the army.

Steklov-Nakhamkes went still further than Trotsky. He made a call to have those who supported the continuation of the war murdered. After the July uprising, he was, in the same way as Trotsky, charged under the same articles, and, also like Trotsky, was neither prosecuted nor even arrested. He was detained for a short period of time, consenting to the decision of the prosecutor's office, but, like Trotsky, he was released by the Provisional Government.

Ovshy Moiseevich Nakhamkes (Steklov), a Russian subject of military age was detained at the beginning of the war by the Germans, but was released soon and arrived in Russia. From the first days of the revolution he joined the Soviet Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and became an important figure there. On his initiative and with his direct participation the police organization was destroyed. He also decided not to withdraw the

brainwashed and demoralized garrison, where there was a large percentage of mobilized workers, from Petrograd.

In the first days of the revolution, the Soviet Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies was created. It at once occupied the position of a "second government". A commission was chosen from it; this commission consisted of five members whose task was to maintain contacts with the Provisional Government. It was named "Contacting Commission".

Nakhamkes took part in this commission and at once became one of its leaders. The task of this commission, by the definition of Nakhamkes himself, was "by means of constant organized pressure to force the Provisional Government to fulfill the demands of the Soviet".

From the first days of the Provisional Government's existence this pressure was permanent. The pressure was carried out by Nakhamkes roughly, directly and unceremoniously. He behaved as the strict master. This led to a situation where the Provisional Government could not and dared not undertake responsible decision without the consent and approval of the "Contact Commission". Nakhamkes spoke in the name of the commission and was not opposed by the other members.

Nakhamkes' activity was not limited to the committee. Almost every day he made speeches in the Soviet and to numerous meetings. He pounded on all those who wanted to continue the war, including the Provisional Government and the General Staff of the army.

At the beginning of June 1917, a joint conference of Bolsheviks and Anarchists was held behind closed doors in Lessner's factory. They discussed questions about co-ordination of their actions. The Bolsheviks suggested to the Anarchists to take upon themselves the task of terrorizing persons who supported the continuation of the war. They argued that to them it was improper now to commit themselves to extreme excesses, while excesses are part of the program of individual anarchist groups. However, the Anarchists were not too enthusiastic about the suggestion. The question was about to fail, if the situation had not been saved by Nakhamkes, who was present at the conference. He so passionately and resolutely called to terror, so inspired those who were present, eloquently rousing them to start murders at once, that after his speech the Bolsheviks passed their

resolution without difficulty and on the spot made up a list of designated victims, at the head of which was Kerensky.

This resolution soon became known in the Petrograd Military District and in the War Ministry. The Minister of War at that time was Kerensky, and his assistants: Colonels Yakubovsky, Tumanov and Baranovsky. The Deputy of the Commander-in-Chief (on political matters) of the Petrograd Military

District, the lawyer Kuzmin, was called from reserve. He was a socialist-revolutionary, blindly carrying out all directives of the central committee of his party, one of the parties actively participating in the Soviet.

When the Quartermaster-General informed Kuzmin of all that took place in Lessner's factory, adding that there was no doubt about the information because it came from quite reliable persons, Kuzmin answered: "This cannot be! What? Nakhamkes gone to the Bolsheviks? This will never happen!" No move was made in connection with this matter.

Then the Quartermaster-General went to the War Ministry, where together with the three assistants of Kerensky above mentioned, they reviewed the situation created by Nakhamkes' speech. They looked at the situation quite differently from Kuzmin, who simply would not believe that the

Menshevik Nakhamkes could betray his party.

Indeed, was that not enough to charge Nakhamkes of working for the Germans? The order to immediately murder the persons willing to continue the war did not enter into the program of the social-democratic party or even of its defeatist wing. On what instruction then did Nakhamkes proceed? At the German Headquarters, a better conclusion could not be reached. What would have happened in France with those who began to urge the murder of Clemenceau and the corps commanders?

Thus the speech of Nakhamkes was appraised by the military people, who were far from being "black hundreders" (who could not have occupied responsible positions under Kerensky), but who were not bound by the iron discipline of socialist parties, as was the case with Kuzmin.

After a comprehensive discussion it was decided to organize special personal protection for Kerensky. It was further decided to take measures against the uncontrolled manufacture of hand grenades in factories;

grenades that could be used in the activities recommended by Nakhamkes. Enlisted to organize preventive measures, the Chief of the General Artillery Administration, General Lekhachev, attempted to set up strict control of explosives. The manufacture of hand grenades was organized in such a way that percussion cups were kept separately and could be put into grenades only outside of the Capital. At this the matter rested.

No one dared to arrest and try Nakhamkes or even to question or request an explanation from him. Neither the whole provisional Government nor the military authorities took action, although Nakhamkes' speeches and recommendations were known to all. The question, however, was "ticklish"; it was quietly decided not to raise the question at all.

The heralded terrorist Nakhamkes provoked lots of trouble and much attention at that time. A guard was appointed, a commission was composed, and other preventive measures were worked out. But he thundered from a platform right up to the July uprising, continuing to exert "organized pressure on the Government".

After the failure of the Bolshevik uprising in July 1917, an order was issued to arrest leaders of this uprising, including Trotsky and Nakhamkes. (As is known, the majority of the leaders had gone into hiding and did not appear before October). However Trotsky and Nakhamkes did not hide. They did not even run away, but continued their activity, ignoring the law and the very existence of the Provisional Government, which ought to have suppressed their activity but did not dare.

The episode of Trotsky's arrest, given above, was identical with that of Nakhamkes. An attempt by lawful authorities to arrest Nakhamkes ended in failure.

On July 9, Nakhamkes was found in a cottage in Mustomiak and on the order of the Headquarters of the Petrograd Military District was, in spite of his protests" brought in to the premises of the Headquarters. Here he constantly shouted and protested, asking how they dared to arrest him, who was, in his words "a member of the Executive Committee of All-Russia" and demanded that the Chief of the Headquarters should come to him.

Upon entering, the Chief of the Headquarters found Nakhamkes sitting at the table in a sprawling position, with his back to the table and his elbows on the table. To the question of the Chief: "Do you wish to ask me

something?” – Nakhamkes, without getting up from the chair, answered: “but I asked you to come almost two hours ago!”

In the room were soldiers and officers. The Chief stands, but Nakhamkes sits, sprawling, his legs crossed. Unable to contain himself, the Chief of the Headquarters said, emphatically and loud: “If you wish to speak to me, take some pain to get up!” Nakhamkes jumped up, as if a spring. “Why did you arrest me, in spite of the government’s prohibition?”, he asked. The Chief replied: “I knew that under the old régime exceptions were made only for ministers and members of State Council; but under the new conditions, as it seems, all are equal. Why should I make an exception for you?”

“What? It means you are arresting also the member of the Constituent Assembly?”, Nakhamkes asked. “I do not understand what this has to do with the Constituent Assembly?”, the Chief of the Headquarters replied. “Yes, but I am a member of the Executive Committee of the Soviet Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies of All-Russia, a member of the Legislative Chamber. At least this is how we look at ourselves.”

This interesting dispute was interrupted by an urgent telephone call to the Chief, who was informed that on orders from the government, Nakhamkes must not be detained in the District Headquarters any longer.

At the same time, the chairman of the Soviet Department himself, Chkheidze, appeared with two members to rescue Nakhamkes. The chief of the Headquarters could do nothing but let Nakhamkes go peacefully, in spite of the latter's guilt that had been established beyond a doubt.

But this was Nakhamkes-Steklov, who then, like Bronstein-Trotsky, felt himself master of the situation and behaved as such, without consideration towards anyone or anything.

But to make up for it, they were held in high esteem by the Provisional Government, and even by the Soviet Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, in which the Bolsheviks at that time did not have a majority. In fact, however, the Soviet was led by these two bully characters, daring not to take measures against its defeatist propaganda, and at the same time making resolutions about the continuation of the war to a victorious end. The absurdity of such a situation was felt by many, but no one dared to say anything. Behind Nakhamkes and Bronstein stood not only the central Committee of their party, but also the Central Committees of all

“revolutionary” parties, which offered indirect support in the form of non-resistance. This was because parties that was on the political proscenium at that time consisted mainly of their fellow tribesmen for whom feeling of the Russian patriotism was alien, incomprehensible and hostile.

There was a "struggle" with the defeatist propaganda. But the struggle was conducted in such a way as not to be victorious. With outmost exactness this "struggle" was explained by one of the Menshevik leaders – the Georgian, Tsereteli – stating that the "struggle should be conducted in such a way as to give them the possibility of an honorable retreat. Otherwise a counter-revolution can triumph."

Thus it was in Petrograd, as in all Russian cities, in that short period of time when the power was held by the Provisional Government.

In Kiev, Rafes set the trend and "deepened the revolution". He was a Menshevik – a "Bundist" who afterwards joined the Bolsheviks. At the front, the whole legion of small provincial Nakhamkes and Bronsteins conducted anti-patriotic propaganda in countless Soviet Soldiers' Deputies. And they did not encounter any due hindrance from the side of their colleagues Mensheviks and socialist-revolutionaries, of whom the Soviets were composed at that time. But if there was a counteraction, then according to the methods of Tsereteli, it was equal to connivance, indulgence, assistance and promotion.

Of course, far from all "deepeners" of the revolution and orators of meetings, and even not in a majority but a relative minority, were Jews. Non-Jews who only imitated the Jewish methods of Nakhamkes and Bronstein predominated in number. They simply did this by observation of demagogic and total impunity for expressions and activities, generally intolerable, especially in war time.

What is characteristic is that in the stormy political life of the first days of the Russian Revolution Jews – members of the "Bund" – were taking a most active part. It was this very same "Bund" which not too long ago, in 1903, had stated that "generally, it would be a big delusion to think that whatever the socialist party may be, it can direct a liberation struggle of an alien nationality to which it does not itself belong".

For guidance of a political party of any nation, in the opinion of the "Bund", it is necessary to be of the origin of the given nation, to be linked with it by

a thousand strings, to be inspired by its ideas and to understand its psychology. For a party of an alien nation this is impossible – The Jews from "Bund" stated this categorically in 1903.

However, already during the first revolution, in 1905, numerous Jewish revolutionaries quite actively interfered in the "affairs" of an alien nation. They were not only participants but also instigators and leaders of revolutionary actions, as for instance, Ratner, Shlikhter and Sheftel in Kiev.

And the "Bundists" as well as those who were not members of the "Bund" – in equal measure and equal energy rushed into the revolutionary movement. They considered that it was possible and accessible to them not only to participate in political life and All-Russian parties ("alien" – for them) but also to penetrate into the leadership of the non-Jewish parties, while jealously barring non-Jews from their Jewish parties. Characteristically, even those people were unacceptable to the "Bund" who were of Jewish origin and race, whose mother tongue was Yiddish, and who were convinced Marxists, but who had changed their religion.

The penetration into the political organizations and parties went on in two lines at the same time. They "delegated" or "co-opted" themselves as representatives of the parties and organizations which were purely Jewish in composition, and as representatives of All-Russian revolutionary parties and organizations. In the latter, as already stated above, if not a majority, then at least a considerable part of the Central Committees consisted of Jews. Besides this, a considerable number of Jews penetrated into the forefront of parties and organizations in a "personal" way. They were chosen and elected by the broad masses (embraced by the revolutionary feelings); the halo of "oppression" under the old regime, and an inborn Jewish energy and bullishness contributed to this.

As a result, even after several months following the February Revolution, we see not only many Jews but also "Bundists" occupying responsible positions. They were chairmen of Soviet Deputies in provinces: and at the front they quite actively and authoritatively deciding questions of a purely military nature, as well as matters concerned with approval or disapproval of these or those measures of the Provisional Government.

The Chairman of the Soviet Deputies, a "Bundist", relates in his memoirs how far-reaching were the power and possibilities of Jews who found

themselves as chairmen of some kind of Soviet Deputy, and how even the Supreme command of the Russian army had to take into consideration the opinions of youth who were "Bundists".

"During the day on 31 August, the news came about the personal assumption of command by A. F. Kerensky as the Supreme Commander and about the appointment of General M. V. Alexseev as his Chief of Staff.

We, the provincial public figures, leaders of Workers' and Soldiers' of Soviets, were completely stunned, (this was in Vitebsk) because previously we were informed that Alexseev belonged to the group having identical ideas as Kornilov. Hence, the invitation for him meant "compromising" politics, reconciliation with Kornilov. But it may have been that personally

Alexseev stood aloof from the political struggle and, being in need of a "military specialist" and an authoritative general under Kerensky, who was a civilian man, they were forced to invite him.

Just the same, this step by the Provisional Government cannot be acknowledged as the right one. It may turn out to be fatal. Our duty is to state our opinion and to pressure the government and the Central Committee of Soviets.

In the evening, at the sitting of the Military Bureau of Workers' and Soldiers' of Soviets the text of the telegram was drafted protesting the appointment of Alexseev and the tendency of reconciliation with the Kornilov movement. After this decision the Bureau got absorbed in its local work. An aviation fleet strained for action and decided to choose a detachment with machine guns to be sent to Orsha, where, according to our reports, a "force had been concentrated", for the last assault on Mogilev. We discussed the question of who of the members of the Bureau would go with this detachment: everyone wanted to participate directly in this "affair", but no one could be released for the task.

At this time we received news that General Alexseev would shortly be passing through Vitebsk, and a whole range of new questions about tactics arose before the Military Bureau. We saw the situation as quite complicated. We have just sent the protest against Alexseev's appointment; but now upon his arrival Alexseev remains for us the representative of the Supreme Commander-in-Chief, the highest military power in the country. Consequently, in all the questions of troop movements, his decision is final.

But Alexseev would reconcile with Kornilov — this is obvious; yet we consider the politics of reconciliation a mistake, treason. Meanwhile Alexseev is acting in the name of the Provisional Government, which we have decided to support. Moreover, Alexseev can argue in the interest of the front, operational considerations which are shrouded by secrecy for us, the uninformed.

Such was the train of thought which worried the members of the Military Bureau of local Soviets. In the resulting exchange of views we decided:

1. To state to General Alexseev the views of the Vitebsk Soviets: that the conversation with Kornilov must be such as with a state criminal, that he must be arrested;
2. To report all mobilizations and troop movements carried out by us and to follow his instructions given in the capacity of Commander-in-Chief.

Afterwards the Military Bureau authorized A. Tarle and myself, as the chairman of Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets, to meet General Alexseev.

At one o'clock in the morning, standing near the direct wire at the station, we received a telegraph tape which again brought sudden changes. This tape had an order from Kerensky to Colonel Korotkov in Orsha. In this order Kerensky demanded the immediate organization of an offensive on Mogilev and to arrest Kornilov and other conspirators. For us, after reading the order, it became clear that our position justified itself, that the initially hesitating "factions" suddenly reconsidered and rejected the plan which not long before this was entrusted to Alexseev. It became clear to us further that Alexseev's mission not only was getting complicated but perhaps falling away as undesirable. What shall we, the members of the Military Bureau, do? Of course, it is necessary to acquaint Alexseev with the order from Kerensky. Maybe this will give us a chance to ruin the plan of a "rotten compromise". With deep emotion we began to await the arrival of

General Alexseev, having a presentiment, that the order of Kerensky must strongly reinforce the point of view of the Military Bureau on liquidation of the Kornilov mutiny.

At two o'clock in the morning we were informed that the train of General Alexseev had arrived. He was asleep in a saloon-car, and we were introduced to the escorts of the General, Vyurubov and Filonenko. Vyurubov

wanted to know what the matter was, but we, of course, wanted to talk with the general himself and requested them to take us to him. We were taken to the saloon-car, where we were met by the sleepy general. Alexseev was about 65 years of age, of medium height, his face was well shaven and deeply wrinkled, his moustache was gray and long, and he had an attentive and sharp-sighted look. He received us standing and probably somewhat puzzled concerning such a late visit. We explained some details of military activities carried on by us in the district; we explained the attitude of the Vitebsk Soviet and the necessity of arresting Kornilov. We also added that in Orsha an offensive was organized on Mogilev and that the troops were gathered there. Alexseev got upset and said:

All these, gentlemen, are the results of deep misunderstanding, a complicated matter of mutual incomprehension. Before departing from Petrograd we fully agreed with Alexander Fedorovich. We chose a peaceful way to reconcile the question. I am convinced that the conflict has been artificially exaggerated, and that it will resolve itself. What you are doing is not required by the situation because it demoralizes our army and undermines the authority of commanders. I accepted the appointment in full agreement with the Provisional Government and I hope to succeed in reaching an agreement with General Kornilov in a peaceful way'.

Then I handed the rolled tape to Alexseev: "Here is the order by Kerensky to advance on Mogilev!"

I remember General Alexseev unrolling the telegraph tape completely and reading for a long time what Kerensky had ordered Colonel Korotkov to do.

"Ah, Alexander Fedorovich!" he exclaimed several times, as he would have considered it impossible to tell his deep thoughts with regard to Kerensky's inconstancy."Ah, Alexander Fedorovich! It seems in Petrograd we agreed about everything. I knew that only under the conditions of a peaceful arrangement of the conflict could I accept this mission. I can go to the General Headquarters."

Very upset, Alexseev wanted to get a direct wire to Kerensky at once, but the wire at the station was constantly busy. We recalled that at the headquarters of the Dvinsk Military District there was a wire and went there by automobile. There, in a separate room, after preliminary checking and ascertaining to whom he was talking, Alexseev had a conversation with

General Lukomsky, clarifying the situation at the Headquarters and persuading Kornilov to give up.

We were sitting in the next room. With us was a third person. He was the Soviet Commissar of the district, Iakovlev, who was getting acquainted with the situation.

It was already five o'clock in the morning, when a disturbed Chief of the Military District, General Baiov, his aide-de-camp, Baron Kekhli and General Golubovsky ran into the headquarters and reproachfully turned to us: — “Why did you not inform us about the arrival of General Alexseev?” “We had enough trouble of our own”, we answered.

Alexseev spoke with the Headquarters for more than an hour and when he came out to us, he had a tired and senile look. After greetings with the representatives of the district, he requested them to excuse him for a private conversation with us. On our question of what to do with the troop movements in the area, he answered that he did not see the need of this. “However, do as you please — it's hopeless”, he added. On the question about the situation he said: “I am going to Orsha, and then we shall see. I will try my best to settle the conflict peacefully”. And at this point unexpectedly he uttered a passionate word:

“You and I, gentlemen, are different people and we will hardly understand one another. But, as an old man, I will tell you that Russia is ill and its army is deadly ill. Arbitrary organizations breed strife inside the army and it is decaying alive. We, the old people, dreamed that a powerful army would be created in free Russia; what we see is that a formidable enemy is bringing destruction upon the Motherland.

All the disturbances in the country, the separatism of the outlying districts — all this business is the work of a cunning and powerful enemy. German Headquarters has been allocating large sums since 1879 in a secret fund subsidizing the Ukrainian separatist movement. And here we still have Soldiers' Soviets, this felonious fraternization at the front.”

If at the beginning of the speech we had sensed a politician in this general taking to heart — in his own way — the interests of Russia, then his last words, said with bitterness, stirred us up to our response:

“The only things that organize the Russian army and save it from disintegration are Soldiers' Soviets and the committees. It is time to understand and to appreciate this”.

In front of us was an already weary old man, who waved with his hand and said: “You, gentlemen, are young. Listen to the opinions of old people who love Russia and the army.”

We drove Alexseev to the train in an automobile and saw him off. The rest is known". (From the book, written by Gregory Aronson, "Russia in Its Epoch of Revolution". New York, 1966.)

* * *

The didactically instructive words, "that it is time to understand and to appreciate the rôle of savior of the Soldiers' Soviets and the committees", were said by the twenty year-old Jew, the chairman of the Soviet Deputies, to the gray-haired general. Such occurrences were characteristic for that time.

It was scarcely possible, in the late summer of 1917, to find even one "Soviet", "committee", "bureau" or a meeting where there were no Jews in a capacity, if not of "leaders", than of influential members or orators. In all spheres of life, starting with purely military affairs, they took a most lively part and with rare self-confidence used to decide how military and civilian authorities of Russia ought to behave in these stormy war years. In such a way they dominated the governing bodies of the country, within the borders of which they had appeared only a hundred years previously as alien born – a fact they themselves emphasized in every possible way with their self-isolationist strivings, on the one hand, and the rapid growth of Zionist, that is, emigrationist, feelings on the other. The natural and warranted question of how to co-ordinate the activities of Russian Jewry in political matters without ambiguous expression, yet still wanting to emigrate from Russia, was raised neither by Jews nor by All-Russian parties and organizations of that time.

Russia's insignificant Jewish minority began to exert organized and constant pressure on the whole course of government life in Russia from the first days of the Provisional Government. The minority exerted this pressure through various revolutionary organizations, without yet entering

into the Provisional Government or in the highest commanding staff of the Russian army of many millions.

At the same time Russian Jewry as a whole, without preliminary permission, carried out the so-called "personal-national autonomy". In doing this it emphasized its isolation from the native population of the country in which they lived and from which they received full citizen's rights from the first days of the Provisional Government.

Splintered into many parties and groupings, purely Jewish ones, the Russian Jewry nonetheless acted in this question as a whole with rare unanimity. And not only in the question of status for Jewry living in Russia but also in the question of which of the All-Russian parties Jews were advised to vote for, "for the parties not further right than socialists". So an All-Jewish congress decided in the spring of 1917 (in Finland).

A separate examination of numerous Jewish parties and organizations that existed on the territory of Russia among the Russian Jewry of six million does not enter into our task. The Jewry examined here is as one whole, as they examine themselves in respect to the whole population of Russia previously and in the USSR now.

Nevertheless, it is appropriate here to say a few words about three main directions of Jewish ideological-theoretical thought existing at the beginning of this century throughout the Jewry of Diaspora in general, and in the Russian Jewry in particular.

- I. The point of view of the "World Jewish Union" was formulated by its founder Adolphe Cremieux, the former minister of the French Republic. Cremieux maintained that there cannot be Germans, Frenchmen or Englishmen of "Judaic faith", but that there was and is always only the Jew, with all the consequences attached to this. For a Jew, interests of the Jewry as a whole must always be in first place; regardless of what country he is subject. (The full text of Cremieux's appeal is given in Part II, as a separate supplement).
- II. The point of view of "Zionist-Socialists", uniting the ideas of Zionism, socialism and internationalism on the basis of racial and tribal unity, but by no means religious. They are making an attempt to co-ordinate all social contradictions and differences

under the banner of "Zionism, socialism and internationalism". (The full text of the appeal to the Jewish youth of these "Z-S" men is given in Part II, in the supplement).

- III. Third point of view — the view of Russia as their native land, their motherland, whose fate and future are inseparably linked with the fate and future of Russian Jewry. The "Patriotic Union of Russian Jews in Foreign Countries", created abroad at the beginning of the Twenties, formulated this point of view in its appeal, "To Jews of All Countries!", published in the collection of first issue "Russia and the Jews". (It was issued by the publishing house "Osнова" in Berlin, in 1924.) This was the first and the last issue, because the very thought of presenting objectively the rôle and the degree, of participation of the Russian Jews in the revolution, was given a hostile reception by all Jewry in general, and particularly by the Jewish emigrants from Russia, as a statement directed against Jewry.

The above appeal ended with the following words: "For Russia and against its destroyers! For Jewish people and against profaners of its name!" (The full text of the appeal is given in Part II, in the supplement.)

This last point of view did not have many advocates in pre-revolutionary Russia, and still fewer in the years of the revolution, and an entirely insignificant number among the Jewish emigrants. Traditional Jewish hushing-up of shortcomings and mistakes of their tribe turned out to be stronger than facts and objectivity. It is this traditional hushing-up that put a seal on the lips of those Jews who attempted to tell the truth in the collection "Russia and the Jews" and at numerous meetings of Jewish emigrants at the beginning of the Twenties in Berlin.

Nevertheless, Russian Jewry, numbering in the millions, gravitated either towards the first point of view, or the second. They took part in revolutionary events, but did not combine in their thoughts the future of Russian Jewry with the fate of Russia.

The Jewish bourgeoisie strove to consolidate the "February gains", bringing themselves unlimited possibilities for spreading their economic, political and cultural activities throughout Russia. The party of "People's Freedom" (the former "Constitutional-Democrats") was that party where the Jewish bourgeoisie rushed in after the February overthrow. Even before the

revolution there were many Jews in this party, not only as ordinary members but also in its leadership, while the party organ "Speech", was generally in the hands of Jewish journalists and publicists.

The Jewish intelligentsia did not identify itself with the bourgeoisie. And the Jewish workers (who were politically active) carried their political activities either in the ranks of the purely Jewish "Bund" or in All-Russian revolutionary parties: social-revolutionaries, social-democrats, Mensheviks, Bolsheviks and Anarchists.

On the other hand, however, considering the interests of all Jewry as a whole, all groups of Russian Jews started with increased speed to implement the "personal-national autonomy" in life. The essence of this autonomy was that any ethnic group, regardless of its historical national territory (or absence of it) could demand from the state not only permission for but also all conceivable moral and material support of all forms towards their national-cultural activity.

Theoretically the idea of "personal-national autonomy" was applicable to any ethnic group, but its practical significance was only for the Jews who, unlike the rest of Soviet nationalities and tribes, did not have their own national territory. Jews were dispersed in large and small groups throughout Russia, especially so at the beginning of the revolution, when, in connection with the war events, the Jewish Pale practically ceased to exist. Mainly, it was at that time that the Jewish refugees evicted from the front dispersed throughout Russia.

And when afterwards hundreds thousands of Jews moved to Moscow, schools, theatres and newspapers in the Yiddish language on the basis of the "personal-national autonomy" were opened for them at the expense of the state, rather than their own. No other ethnic group enjoyed such a privilege, although there were very many Ukrainians, Georgians and Armenians in that very same city of Moscow. But no newspapers in their own language, nor theatres, or schools were opened in Moscow at the expense of the state.

Within the former Jewish Pale, especially in the Ukraine, preceding from the very same "personal-national autonomy" numerous national-cultural establishments were created at once at the expense of the state. It is true

that such establishments existed before the revolution, but not as many, and they existed at the Jews' own expense, or as private enterprises.

* * *

Parallel with this, Jews, as already mentioned above, used to take a most active part in the All-Russian national cultural activity, and in the newly-created bodies of self-rule of separate provinces and national territories. Some of these provinces and territories proclaimed their secession from Russia. So, for example, from the very beginning of activity of the Ukrainian Central Rada, which soon turned into the Government of Independent Ukraine, Jews invariably participated in its work. They appeared in rôles either as representatives of the Jewish minority, or as members of the All-Russian parties.

But primarily and basically, it was the "Soviet Deputies" and the "revolutionary committees" which created prerequisites for the influence on overall politics and for pressure on the anemic Provisional Government. In the latter, Jews played leading rôles, personally participating in the work of these organizations at the time of the revolution. It was possible for them to do this also because the central committees of all revolutionary parties consisted mainly of Jews, and the central committees of all parties' directed the works of all "Soviet Deputies" and "revolutionary committees" in accordance with party discipline.

At that time, in the summer and autumn of 1917, in line and parallel with officially existing state departments, which successfully assumed the power from Czarist Government (with some personnel replacement), a far-flung network of power which arbitrarily created various "Soviet Deputies" and "Committees" also existed. These organizations were subordinate to no one, except to the Central All-Russian Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, whose headquarters was in Petrograd. It was in this organization that Nakhamkes and Bronstein-Trotsky, whose activity was mentioned above, pursued their occupation.

And even this submission was far from absolute and unconditional. The character of the activity of various small "Soviet Deputies" and "revolutionary committees" still depended on which of the revolutionary parties had majority in them because discipline purely on the party line was firmer and stronger in the "overall-revolutionary" discipline.

The only thing in which all "Soviet Deputies" and "revolutionary committees", from Petrograd to the regional "Soviet Deputies" and "revolutionary committees" down to a regiment and company, were in unanimous harmony was their attitude to legal power, both in the central (Provisional Government) and in its local representatives. All of them supported it or carried out its orders only to the extent that it was in correspondence with opinions, feelings and the "political line" of a Soviet Deputy or revolutionary committee.

This "to the extent that" literally paralyzed any activity of the whole state administrative apparatus of Russia, from the first day of the Provisional Government right to its inglorious end.

Ministers, Diplomatic Corps, generals and "governing commissars", who replaced governors by the order of Provisional Government, and militia, replacing previous police, and directors of factories and enterprises in formality still existed. But they could undertake nothing without the consent and approval of those who filled the Soviet Deputies and revolutionary committees which considered it their prerogative to interfere in all activities of legitimate authorities. They were allowed to carry out only those measures "to the extent that" these did not differ in view and opinions from the "revolutionary public"; that is, with all its far-flung network of Soviet Deputies and revolutionary committees.

The Soviet Deputies and revolutionary committees, as shown earlier, consisted exclusively of representatives of the revolutionary parties: social-democrats (Mensheviks and Bolsheviks) and socialist-revolutionaries. In the central committees of these parties, however, Jews were in the overwhelming majority, as is seen from the lists, given in Part II of this work.

By having a predominant influence on the Soviet Deputies and revolutionary committees, the Jews restricted themselves only so far as to render "constant pressure" on the government and its policies, without trying to occupy or secure important posts.

This was the situation right up to the October overthrow, when everything radically changed and the Jews formally came to power, which up to now they exercised only in an indirect way — "by means of pressure on the government".

Jews in USSR

Up to the moment of the downfall of the Provisional Government in October, 1917, Jews, as mentioned above, occupied almost all leading positions in Soviets, committees, revolutionary party organizations and in the central committees, whose authority among the broad masses of the populations surpassed that of the Provisional Government.

But they did not enter into the government, preferring to exert pressure on it without taking responsibility on themselves for its action and general political orientation. There was not a single Jew in the Provisional Government; likewise, not a single Jew was appointed as a diplomat right up to the October overthrow and proclamation of Soviet Power. And, at the same time, no single minister or all ministers together could be sure that their decisions or orders would be carried out if there was no consent for this from the all powerful Soviet Deputies and various revolutionary committees.

As a result, when the moment arrived for decisive actions to be taken to defend that law and order which the Provisional Government should have been on guard against, it turned out that the government had neither the necessary resolutions for this, nor the strength.

In a comparatively short time all the power in both capitals and in the army (in so far as it still existed as an organized power) fell into the hands of those who up to now had guided the Soviet Deputies and committees.

Armed resistance was put up only by small military units, during the days of the overthrow and many months later by the anti-communist armies of the White Russian movement. After a long stubborn struggle the White Russians, supported by the interventionists, were unable to win. Power remained in the hands of the All-Russian Soviet Deputies.

Who made up the Soviet Deputies and what rôle the Jews played in them is explained in the previous account in the Provisional Government's period.

After the proclamation of Soviet Power, the leaders of the Soviet Deputies and the members of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party became "People's Commissars", replacing former ministers, or occupying leading posts in all spheres of Russian life.

Jews made up an overwhelming majority, occupying leading positions in the apparatus of the new power. This can be seen in the lists, given in full in Part II of this work, supplement No. 13.

Robert Wilton, an English correspondent of the London "Times", lived in Russia for seventeen years and had an opportunity to observe all that took place there during the revolution; writes that of 556 persons who occupied leading positions in all branches of the administration, 447 were Jews.

In Petrograd itself, as already mentioned above, according to the account of the Methodist priest who lived there many years, right up to year 1919, the government apparatus consisted of 16 Russians and 371 Jews, of whom, moreover, 265 had arrived from New York.

A commercial attaché at the American embassy in Petrograd, serving there from July 1916 to September 1918, confirmed on his arrival back in the USA, that two-thirds of the Bolsheviks were Russian Jews. (Evidence given before the Overman Commission.)

The London "Times" in its 5 March 1919 issue reported that 75% of the Bolsheviks were Russian Jews. (The word "Bolshevik" is understood here to mean not a member of the Bolshevik Party, but a person occupying this or that position in the administrative apparatus.)

The information given above, as well as many other similar situations, is confirmed by Jewish investigators of these questions and also by Lenin himself, who undoubtedly had a good knowledge of the rôle Jews played in the creation of the Soviet Power.

Here is what Lenin said in conversation with Diamantstein, the commissar on Jewish matters, under the "Commissariat on Matters of Nationalities", headed by Stalin in the beginning of the Soviet Power.

"Of great importance for the revolution was the circumstance that during the war years a large number of the Jewish intelligentsia settled in Russian cities. They eliminated the general sabotage which we encountered after the October Revolution...

Jewish elements were mobilized against the sabotage and thus saved the revolution in a difficult hour. We were able to seize

the state apparatus owing exclusively to this reserve of intelligent and well-educated workers.

We have in the given case a clear example of an action of special sociological conformity with a law to which is subordinated changes in economic and social structure of ethnic minorities dispersed among other nations. This structure must always correspond to the requirements and necessities of the majority of people, to the requirements and aims of a state, to the politics of government, to the interests of ruling classes or groups".

The above stated opinion of Lenin was recorded in the book "Jewish Worker" p. 236, written by the Jewish communist Kirznits and published in Moscow, in 1926.

It was repeated by Solomon Goldenman in "Yiddishe Galutwirshaft", Prague, 1934-1935.

This was cited in the "Herald of the Institute of USSR Studies" No.4 p. 32, October-December 1959, Munich.

* * *

Even without Lenin's words, which at that time were read by few, the whole population of Russia saw how the change of the ruling class came about with lightning speed. The population saw how Jews turned into Soviet dignitaries, commissars and commanders, and how they took along their numerous relatives and fellow-tribesmen, filling all the government departments.

Here is what I. M. Bikerman, the well-known Russian-Jewish social and political figure writes on this question: "A Russian man never saw a Jew in power; he saw him neither as governor, nor as police officer, nor even as a postal official. There were, of course, better and worse times, but the Russian people lived, worked and got rich; the Russian name was great and menacing. Now the Jew is in every corner and on all levels of power. A Russian sees him at the head of the first capital, Moscow, and at the head of the Neva-Capital, and at the head of the Red Army, an absolutely self-destructive mechanism. He sees that avenue of St. Vladimir now bears the famous name of Nakhmkes; the historic Liteinyi Avenue has been renamed Avenue of Volodarsky, and the city Pavlovsk into Slutsk. A

Russian now sees Jews as judges and executioners. He encounters Jews who are not communists, and are also as unfortunate as he himself might be, but nevertheless being involved in Soviet Power: it is everywhere, and there is nowhere one could get away from it. This power is such, that had it risen from the very depths of hell, it could not have been more wicked, nor more shameless. It is not surprising that a Russian comparing the past with the present is convinced in his mind, that the present power is Jewish and that that is precisely why it is so rabid, and that the power exists for them, and that it is doing the Jewish things which are consolidated by the power". ("Russia and the Jews". First collection pp. 22-23, published by "Osnova", Berlin, 1924.)

Further, in the same book (pp. 11-12) Bikerman says: "A Russian repeats over and over again, "the Jews ruined Russia". In these four words resound tormenting moan, an anguishing howl and the gnashing of teeth". Take note that "waves of Judaeophobia now flood countries and nations, and ebb is not in sight yet. Precisely, Judaeophobia: fear of the Jews, as of destroyers.

How do the Jews respond to all this? Not only the Soviet Jews and those that emigrated from there but all Jews in general? Bikerman answers this with the following words: "A Jew answers to all this with the usual gesture and the usual words: it's a known fact that we are to blame in everything; wherever misfortune occurs, a search could be made and a Jew would be found. Nine times out of ten what is written in Jewish periodicals concerning the Jews in Russia, constitutes only a retelling of this stereotype phrase. Since always and in everything we, of course, cannot be guilty, then a Jew hence makes a quite flattering and, at first glance, a quite convenient worldly conclusion, that we are always right. Not only that — still worse, he simply refuses to subject himself to his own judgment of his own behavior, to give himself an account of what he is doing, what he is not doing, and what he perhaps ought to have done. And since pretensions are presented to us from all sides, reproaches and accusations are poured at us, then our accusers are guilty, the whole world is guilty — guilty are others, but not we ourselves."

The above statements of I. M. Bikerman do not represent only his personal opinion on this question, under which lies a conspiracy of silence but also of the whole group of Russian-Jewish emigrants who found in themselves

enough courage to tell the truth directly and openly on the pages of the press.

This group was not large, but consisted of highly cultured people who understood that there are questions which must not be suppressed. At the beginning of the Twenties, this group created an organization called the "Patriotic Society of Jews in Foreign Countries". It is this organization that published the book written by Bikerman, describing Jewish rôles and significance in creating that repulsion of the Jews from the whole Russian population which Bikerman defined so exactly as "Judaeophobia". The word "Judaeophobia" is replaced now by the word "anti-Semitism", which cannot be acknowledged as the right one, because it does not define exactly those feelings and attitudes of the whole population of Russia towards the Jewish ethnic group, feelings and attitudes that were provoked by the activities of this group. The negative and critical attitude of the Russian population does not exist towards all Semites, but only towards an insignificant tribal Semitic group, the Jews.

The most remarkable thing in this book is the "Appeal to Jews of All Countries" written at the beginning of the "First Collection" (and the last one), published by the above mentioned "Patriotic Society of Russian Jews in Foreign Countries".

In this appeal World Jewry (Jews of all countries) is called upon to dissociate from those Russian Jews who, with their activities, provoked the burning hatred of the whole population of the country, thereby creating psychological preconditions for active, anti-Jewish, pogromist feelings.

"And not only in Russia," — is stated further in the appeal — "all, positively all, countries and nations are flooded with waves of Judaeophobia, rushed by the storm, toppling over the Russian power. Never before have so many threatening clouds gathered over the heads of the Jewish people."

The address of the "Patriotic Society of Russian Jews" not only got no response in wide circles of Jewry but it was met with definite hostility: this question should not be touched at all: those who raised it are acting against Jewry and Jewish people.

And the voice of Jews who dared to "thrust the hand into the wound" and honestly and openly discuss this "sore question" fell silent and rose no more to the present day. The question arose neither in the USSR nor abroad, in

spite of the abundance in emigration of periodicals in the Russian language that were and are controlled by the Jews.

When the "percentage quota" existed in Russia (whether or not it was justified is not touched upon here), the press was full of discussions and criticism of it, condemning it without reservation. But when the "inversely proportional" relation came, that is, when the numerously insignificant Jewish ethnic group occupied positions, inversely proportional to its number in the cultural and political life of Russia, and actually turned into a privileged "ruling class", then silence reigned, and the question was "removed from the order of the day". No one among numerous journalists, publicists and writers-Jews playing an important rôle in the periodic press in the Russian language considered it his duty to raise and comprehensively discuss this question directly and openly.

And if someone among the non-Jews attempted to touch the question of an "inversely proportional" quota actually being established in the USSR from the beginning of Soviet power, he was accused of "secret or overt anti-Semitism".

Attempts to investigate the first thirty years of Soviet power will be in vain, because nothing will be found about this "inversely proportional" quota in the newspapers of large circulation published in Russia. No explanations will be found either in thick journals or in any articles about how and what happened that representatives of an ethnic group, which make up only 2% of the population in Russia, had occupied about 80% of all key positions in all the spheres of the country's life. Such an occurrence up to now is unknown in history.

Only in folklore did this mass penetration by Jews into leading posts find its reverberation in songs and chastooshkas which could be heard at that time: "Tea by Vysotsky, sugar by Brodsky; all of Russia belongs to Trotsky" (they were all Jews). In the Ukraine the folk-song was spread: Hey, hey asses! All the Jews are bosses!

But as soon as Soviet power was consolidated, the iron hand of Cheka put an end to all kinds of anti-Jewish expressions.

Still, on 27 July, 1918, the newspaper "Izvestia" published a special decision by the Soviet Government about the energetic struggle with "anti-Semitism". It must be assumed that the negative response to the Jews,

called "anti-Semitism" by many, took such dimensions that a special decision was needed, whereby enemies of Jews were declared "outlaws".

Guided by this decision, organs of Cheka, which had many Jews in leading posts, used to decide themselves who was a "pogromist" and ruthlessly did away with him, without an investigation and trial, and without waiting until a "pogromist" revealed something. Under the concept "pogromist" it was not too difficult to bring anyone disagreeable to the new power.

Besides that, in the very same year of 1918, a decree was issued about the "red terror", which opened wide possibilities for the physical extermination of persons disagreeable to the new regime. By the order of the "red terror" all those "who due to their social origin and standing, and also due to their previous political activity and profession, were able to join the ranks of its enemies in time of danger for the Soviet rule, were destined to extermination".

During the first years of Soviet rule, especially during the years of the civil war, ignorant and vengeful organs of the new power, using this decree as excuse, "liquidated" many of those whom they considered potential enemies of the new regime.

It would hardly be possible to establish some day the exact number of those "liquidated". But that this number is great and involved hundreds of thousands in the opinion of some, and even millions, according to others, is beyond any doubt. It is not disputed even by those who fully justify such methods of struggle with potential opponents and enemies.

The lists of those liquidated "by means of red terror" or as "hostages" (occasionally, but far from always) had been published in newspapers and contained hundreds of names. Jewish names were rarely, if at all, encountered in these lists; when they were, it was very noticeable! But, of course, no one dared to say a word about this. People have read, thought, remembered... And a thought would occur of who the executioners were and who the victims were...

In 1919, when Kiev was occupied for short time by the Volunteer Army of General Denikin, a "Special Investigative Commission of South Russia", comprising highly qualified jurists whose objectivity was indubitable, established that 75% of the Kiev Cheka were Jews. The commission also had established that among those whom the Cheka had executed there was

no Jewish person. (The list of Cheka members and the list of those who were shot is given in Part II of this work.)

On the list among those who was shot is also the name of the first Chairman of Soviet Workers' Deputies Khrustalev-Nosar, who was active during the revolution of 1905. Khrustalev-Nosar severely criticized the seizure of power by the Jews, and the "squandering of Russia" by the members of Central Committee of the Bolshevik party, a squandering that took place during the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk treaty.

When Uritsky was killed in Petrograd in August 1918, ten thousand people were shot "by the order of red terror". The lists of the ten thousand victims were attached to fences and walls of houses adjacent to No.2 Gorokhov Street, where the Cheka was. Whether they were fully published in newspapers is impossible to establish at the present time without access to the archives. But the fact that the typewritten lists, containing ten thousand names, as confirmed by witnesses, were posted is not disputed in various autobiographic literatures even now.

What struck readers about these lists was the complete absence of Jewish names although the city of Petrograd was overfilled with Jews. This without even mentioning those big capitalists and "bourgeois" Jews who had lived in the city permanently even before the revolution.

Here is what one of those who read the lists tells us about them: "I was a worker then at the Putilov plant. At that time I was an ardent advocate of Soviet rule, for which I was ready to cut the throat of anyone who spoke ill about it. After the murder of Uritsky, literally all of Petrograd was in a state of fear and uncertainty. Mass arrest ensued. No one was certain of tomorrow, or yet of the next hour, even those who were one hundred per cent proletarians and advocates of Soviet rule. Rumors about mass red terror, declared in revenge for Uritsky and to frighten all enemies of workers-peasants' power, circulated in the city.

Passing by Gorokhov Street my attention was drawn to some typed announcements posted on the front of house No.2, which was occupied by the Cheka. I stopped and started to read. As it turned out these were lists of those executed on the order of red terror for the murder of Uritsky. I stood for a long time reading these lists. Whose name was not listed: officers, landlords, proprietors, merchants, professors, scientists, priests and

students, even artisans and workers! But what struck me odd was that in these listings not a single Jewish name appeared. Yet all that had happened was that one Jew, Kenigisser, killed another Jew, Uritsky.

'Jews are quarreling among themselves and our people are the ones to get shot', I thought. And I myself got frightened, fearing that I might be saying this too loudly, because in those days, and even many years thereafter, you may be sure that they would stand you up against a wall, or at least throw the book at you' for such words.

Afterwards I completed the Workers' Faculty Institute, had quite a few promotions, and visited the whole immense Soviet Union. And everywhere, right up to the war, I saw the very same thing: 'they' run everything, 'they' execute, 'they' forgive, 'they' order, whereas 'ours' are slaves overexerting themselves, daring not to utter a word... Only silently, they would look distrustfully at some Frenkel, rushing by on the great trans-Siberian railroad in a brilliantly-lit saloon-car, checking the forced labor camps. The camps that were organized by the very same Frenkel did not, as a rule, have many of his tribesmen, but if there were any, they were in commanding positions. This was the situation before the war, as well as when the war broke out, and the Germans invaded and had to be expelled from Russia. There were not many Jews in the front lines. But to make up' for this; medical units and supply units were overfilled with them especially deep in the home-front, behind the Urals. They preferred 'to wage war' there. Of course, there were exceptions. But these exceptions were not many. The officers and soldiers of the Soviet army and the whole population of the country saw everything; and it is not surprising that critical thoughts began to grow and strengthen about the Jewish rôle in the life of the country. The new 'ruling class' did not prove itself worthy of the position it occupied.

That equality which they did not have under the Czar regime they got after the overthrow and no one voice was heard protesting against it. Scarcely a few years passed when these equals turned into the privileged. And how! Much more firmly than the previous princes and nobles... Previously it was possible to become a nobleman, even a count or a prince. How many there were, as Pushkin said, 'who leaped from Ukrainian peasantry to princehood.' But try to leap into being a Jew? This is impossible!

I and a few other former Soviet engineers found ourselves in one of the refugee camps in conquered Germany after the war and one evening we

were discussing this question. 'Yes, they behaved like Polish lords!', said one of the interlocutors, a Ukrainian from Poltava. 'Not like Polish lords, but like Gods', corrected his countryman from Kharkov... And when I, as a Great-Russian, asked what this meant, he explained to me that 'like Gods' meant to live like Gods...

'Then what to do? How to treat them, once the people will be free to decide for themselves how to organize life in their own country?', one of us asked. 'Destroy them all, young and old alike!', angrily growled our fourth interlocutor, a gloomy and silent Mordvinian, who once studied with us at the Workers' Faculty. All of us were shocked: 'How so? Like Germans? Why, we are not beasts!' 'But I was not alone; all spoke thus, when we saw them with belongings and families in rail cars and automobiles, whereas we, Leningraders, escaped from the encirclement on foot, leaving everything behind. If we would have got them at that time, we would have torn them to shreds... My whole family perished from hunger in Leningrad.'

We all lapsed into silence. We were recollecting our encounter with the new ruling class. I also recalled, perhaps for the hundredth time, the lists on Gorokhov Street.

At this moment one of the interlocutors pulled a Bible out from his knapsack. He had received the Bible not long ago from some Baptist, Bible which he studied diligently. He turned to us and said, 'Here, listen to this, which is very similar to our times and to what we all witnessed ourselves'. And slowly, with deep feeling, he read the 'Book of Esther'. We listened holding our breath. For us, who had grown up under the Soviet rule, not knowing either the Gospel or the Bible, this was a revelation... To wipe out 75,000 men with impunity in one day just because in the opinion of the Jews, they were thinking maliciously but not doing anything, is not this the very same red terror? And still to celebrate this day from year to year! It was simply unbelievable that something like this could be in the Holy Scripture.

For a long time we sat and shared our recollections and thoughts that began from the lists on Gorokhov Street and ended with Bible reading. To act as the Bible tells us or as Hitler has done in our time ought not to be allowed; but it also impossible to reconcile this with the fact that this new 'ruling class' will forever remain what it became after the October overthrow, while

we still further will continue to be in our own country citizens of second or third class."

* * *

The above narration deserves deep thought, because everything that was said is not an invention, not a malicious propaganda of those who are called "anti-Semites". These are not inventions but facts, names, a real picture of that which took place in Russia during the first three decades of the Soviet regime. This took place during the time when, as Bikerman said, "Russians see Jews as judges and executioners", when all the commanding positions and leading posts of the government, without exception, are in the hands of a foreign, alien, and insignificant minority.

To deny everything said is impossible because, in fact, it was so.

The broad people's masses saw all this, but were forced to keep quiet. They were intimidated by the severe measures of the new "ruling class" which ruthlessly suppressed all attempts of overt dissatisfaction. Not only mass demonstrations and crowds were suppressed but also any criticism or discussion of the abnormal situation created by the insignificant alien minority.

Here is what we read about this matter in the book "Russia and the Jews" (p. 63) written by I. Bikerman. "And the least of fall it (the new power) can tolerate are crowd attacks on the Jews, because it knows very well that after the destruction of the Jews there remains only one step to the destruction of the power, deeply hated and considered to be Jewish. A Jewish pogrom therefore was announced as counter-revolutionary, that is, directly against the Soviet Power". The fact these words were written by a Jew and published in a Jewish collection deserves special attention.

But whenever there was a moment when the new power was losing its strength somewhere, the feelings of the revolutionary masses and Red Guards used to pour out into severe anti-Jewish pogroms. Such an occurrence took place in Glukhov and Novgorod-Seversk in the year 1918. "These pogroms in number of victims, deliberate brutality and torture, surpassed the well-known pogrom of Kalusha in 1917, committed by the revolutionary soldiers. More than once Red troops tried to deal with the Jews, and in many cases they succeeded. Sometimes the pogroms were committed by civilians: Jews were ransacked by townspeople, by peasants

and by returning soldiers from the front. Not only did pogroms occur at that time (in 1919) but they went unpunished. Soviet authorities hushed up Glukhov's and Novgorod-Seversk slaughter: they did not find anyone guilty because they did not look for anyone." (p. 64 from the collection, "Russia and the Jews", Berlin, 1924).

That is how matters stood with Jewish pogroms, which were called "counter-revolutionary", during the first years of the new rule. The new ruling class could neither curb nor avert these pogroms in spite of doubtless revolutionary inspiration by the armed forces of the country which were subordinated to it and this in spite of the fact that at the head of these forces at that time was Bronstein-Trotsky, and a great number of propagandist Jews, the commissars. The feelings of the masses were such that, as said above, authorities did not dare to undertake investigations and punish those guilty "pogromists" who were "outlaws" and were liable to be shot on the spot.

Jewish pogroms accompanied the armed forces of the Ukrainian Nationalists — the "Petlura group", "Makhno group" and various other 'Chiefs during all the time of their activity in these stormy years. Moreover, pogroms were committed by the military units and were followed by incredible brutality.

The most noted of all pogroms was the one that took place in the town of Proskurov, and which was committed by regular troops of the Ukrainian People's Republic, whose government consisted of Social Democrat-Marxists and had in its membership a minister, a Jewish lawyer from Kiev, A. Margolin.

On March 4, 1919, a "Zoporozhie Brigade" encamped near the town of Proskurov. The twenty-two year old Semesenko, who was in command of the brigade, gave the order to destroy all the Jewish population of the town. In the order he stated that there will be no peace in the country as long as even one Jew remains alive.

On the 5th of March, the whole brigade split into three groups. With officers at the head, the brigade entered the town and started the extermination of the Jews. The troops used to burst into houses and slaughter whole families. During that whole day, from the morning to evening 3,000 Jews were slaughtered, including women and children.

(According to other sources 5,000 were slaughtered.) The killing was done only with side-arms — sabers and daggers. The only man who perished in Proskurov from a bullet was an Orthodox priest, who, with cross in hand, attempted to stop the "Zaporozhtsevites" and was shot by one of the officers. A few days later the "chief", Semesenko, gave the town of Proskurov a contribution of 500 thousand rubles and, after they received it, he thanked the "Ukrainian citizens of Proskurov" for their help rendered to the "Army of the Ukrainian People's Republic".

This slaughter took place literally under the nose of the Ukrainian Government, located at that time nearby in the city of Vinnitsa. This government did not take any measures against the pogromists, neither during nor after the pogrom. The Proskurov pogromists remained unpunished.

All the other pogroms committed by the "Petlura men" at that time, pogroms in 180 settlements on the territory of the Ukraine, also remained unpunished. During these pogroms tens of thousands of Jews were exterminated. Some claim that over 25,000 Jews were slaughtered; others raise this figure up to 100,000.

To enumerate all pogroms with their corresponding numbers of victims is difficult owing to the volume of this work and the absence of strictly verified data.

In general, all of them were similar to the Proskurov pogrom and differed only in numbers of victims and in degree of organization and direct participation by the members of the Ukrainian People's Republic Army.

Pogroms, committed during this time by various "chiefs" — Gregoriev, Sokolovsky, Zeleny, Angel and others not under the command of the Ukrainian Government — were also no less cruel in distinction.

The partisans of Makhno especially glorified themselves in this respect. They called themselves "anarchists" which in fact they were until the summer of 1918, when they turned all their fury towards the extermination of the Jews.

The Central Committee of the Anarchists, as is known, consisted almost exclusively of Jews. Some Jews, like Keretnik, Lemonsky, Shneider and others, were closest collaborators with Makhno.

After the February Revolution in the big commercial settlement of Gulai Pole (Ekaterinoslavskoy Province) and native village of Nestor Makhno, the anarchist-terrorist, the anarchists acquired special influence; local Soviet Deputies, as well as those in adjacent towns and villages consisted almost exclusively of anarchists.

Among them were many Jews against whom there were no hostile feelings from the rest of the anarchists: on the contrary, quite a few Jews were promoted to commanding positions. In the uneasy months before the German occupation of the Ukraine (at the beginning of 1918), the anarchists had even their own fighting units and separate companies for the struggle against the regime of the Ukrainian Central Rada and its allies, the Germans. Among these units was also a Jewish company, under the command of Taranovsky, whose closest collaborators were Lev Shneider and Lemonsky — people who according to Makhno, were "unstable and inclined to accommodate themselves".

When the combined Ukrainian-German forces approached the Gulai Pole, "free companies" of anarchists and communists were sent to meet them with an order to stop their advance and hurl them back, while in the Gulai Pole itself, the Jewish company was left to carry the duty of garrison. This company not only did not try to defend the Gulai Pole but at once went over to the side of the Ukrainian-German forces and took a most active part in the destruction of the Revolutionary Committee and the Soviet Deputies. The company also played a major rôle in arresting individual anarchist and their sympathizers, whom the Jews from the company, being local dwellers, knew well.

This action by the Jewish company made such enormous impression on the whole surrounding population and engendered (in the words of Makhno) in Gulai Pole a previously unknown "anti-Semitism" and ferocious hate towards the Jews in general. In his memoirs (published in Paris in 1937), Nestor Makhno speaks about his attempts to struggle with this anti-Jewish feelings of peasants and workers and about little success in his attempts. The masses were burning with hate towards the Jews. They did not believe them any longer and at the first opportunity committed reprisals against the Jews, no less bloody and brutal than were once done by the Ukrainian-Petlurists.

And the word "Makhnoists" also became synonymous with pogromists who exterminate Jews, in the same way as the word "Petlurists".

Of whom were these "Makhnoists" and "Petlurists" composed?

They were composed of the very same peasant and town proletariat which followed the new Soviet power and approved its politics wholeheartedly except for one thing, the Jewish question. In this question, whenever the power relented, the population used to manifest its anti-Jewish feelings.

The Jewish population of many millions in the Ukraine, where now the "Petlurists", now the "Makhnoists" were the masters, knew these feelings very well and could not expect anything good, neither from one nor from the other. The only authority on which Jews could count for personal safety was the Soviet power. And even here they were not always safe, for we have seen events that occurred in Glukhov and Novgorod-Seversk, which formerly were under the control of Soviet power, were bloody pogroms took place in spite of this.

It is not surprising then that the Jews, choosing the lesser of many evils, gave preference to the Soviet power, which did not exterminate them physically, but only brought them material losses. However, this material loss compensated itself with redundancy, owing to the fact that the new power consisted mainly of their fellow tribesmen who widely opened all kind of possibilities for Jews. These possibilities enabled Jews to occupy all kinds of materially rewarding and morally satisfying positions.

The population saw this and, not without foundation, considered that now came "their rule", the Jewish rule. And because this new power presented demands to the population, demands that the population considered to be unjust and unbearably difficult, all the dissatisfaction was pouring out in anti-Jewish feelings, the same feelings that were restrained only by fear of severe punishment.

Such was the situation in general in that part of Russia and Ukraine, where events ran high in the civil war, during which the ruling authority in many places repeatedly changed.

It was during these changes that Jewish sympathies were evident. As a rule, their sympathies were on the side of the Reds, even in those cases when their enemies were the ones bringing with them the re-establishment of

property rights and that social system under which many Jews enriched and prospered.

In 1919 Kiev was occupied by units of the Volunteer Army of General Denikin. These units fully re-established the previous social order, including the property rights of numerous Jews who lived in Kiev.

After a few months units of the Twelfth Red Army broke through into the suburbs of Kiev. The threat arose that the whole city might be occupied by the Reds. The Kievites, who had already undergone Red rule once before, rushed by the thousands over the bridge (on Dnieper) to the left shore, which was under the control of the Volunteer Army. There were many thousands of Kievites of all ages and all social positions who crossed the bridge at that time. But among them there was not a single Jew, although Kiev at that time was full of rich Jews who were quite far from being sympathetic with the communist-socialist undertakings proclaimed by the new power.

This absence of Jews among the refugees attracted general attention. And it came to mind that only two months ago the lists of those Kievites who were executed on the order of "red terror", as well as the listings of Cheka members who carried out these executions were made public. Among the former there was not a single Jew; among the latter, they were in overwhelming majority.

When in December of the same year (1919), "Whites" left Kiev "Reds" took over again, the Kiev Jews, even those that were "socially alien and hostile" quickly adapted to the new order and occupied many posts in departments and commissariats of the new power.

Episodes, analogous or similar to those described above in Gulai Pole and Kiev, were seen in different versions and degrees in many other places during changes of power, when, in the process of civil war, they were taken over by the Reds or their opponents.

With their conduct during all these changes, the Jews, who were numerous in these regions, showed clearly and unambiguously on whose side their sympathies were, or to be more precise, to which of the changing powers they behaved less negatively.

Here we have in mind the Jewish masses, and not politically active groups, both in the political and social life of Jews, and in All-Russian areas, in which Jews used to take a most active part.

Politically active Jewish groupings at once determined their attitude to the power of the "new ruling" class, in which their fellow tribesmen predominated.

The purely Jewish Marxist "Bund", where non-Jews were not admitted, always and invariably was on the side of the new power in the struggle with its opponents. It opposed the "White movement" of all shades; was against various Ukrainian nationalist-separatist movements and even against the Ukrainian Social-Democrat-Marxists, including the forces of the Ukrainian People's Republic.

All-Russian social-democratic and socialist-revolutionary parties, at the height of the civil war in 1919, passed a resolution to cease all struggle against Soviet power and to direct all their strength against the enemies of Soviets and towards disorganization and corruption of the rear organizations of the "White movement". In the ranks of these two parties were a lot of Jewish intelligentsia, and its central organs had a Jewish majority.

The resolution of these two parties, which received an absolute majority during the election in the Constituent Assembly, deserves special attention in examination of the rôle and the importance of Russian Jewry in the creation and preservation of Soviet power in Russia. The rôle, which was noted by Lenin in his conversation with Diamantstein, pointed out that the "Jews saved Soviet power."

That the decision of these two largest and best disciplined parties had played a significant rôle in gaining the victory by the "Reds" over the "Whites" is beyond any doubt. Party discipline pushed many undecided social-democrats and social-revolutionaries into the ranks of active defenders of this power and towards voluntarily joining the Red Army. The decision pushed not only the rank-and-file members of these parties but also those who were promoted by the parties to responsible posts still in the period of the Provisional Government.

Thus, for example, the Menshevik-"Bundist" Solomon Schwartz was appointed under the Provisional Government as director of the Ministry

Department. This post was in the "generalship" rank. The director of the department, according to his occupied position, was a "personage of IV class" — "His Excellency". But when, dispersed by the Bolsheviks, the Provisional Government scattered without resistance and began the civil war, Solomon Schwartz, obeying the call of his party, voluntarily joined the Red Army. Thus Schwartz fought until demobilization on the Soviet side which dispersed the Constituent Assembly and the Provisional Government, of which Schwartz was a member. Afterwards Schwartz left Russia and became one of the active members in the Menshevik party. And his wife — "Vera Alexandrova" — was a constant collaborator of the "Socialist Vestnik" and editor of "Czechoslovak Publishing" in New York.

Schwartz and many of his fellow tribesmen — social-democrats and social-revolutionaries saved the Soviet power in the years of civil war, not in words but in deeds: Lenin himself acknowledged this.

The rescue of Soviet power, as is known, was done with measures of brutal terror; this provoked corresponding feelings in the broad masses. And when, as Lenin said, "Jews saved Soviet power", they, the Jews, made up the framework of this power and thereby provided people with a reason to identify the Soviet power with the power of Jewry. What this led to is explained by S. Maslov, founder and leader of the new party. In 1917, S. Maslov created a new party called "Krestianskaia Rossia" — the Russian peasant party. Maslov had been a member of the social-revolutionary party, which during the elections received a majority in the Constituent Assembly.

“This is a fact, that in South Russian cities, which changed hands often during the civil war, the appearance of Soviet power used to provoke the greatest joy and the greatest show of feeling in Jewish quarters, and often only in their quarters alone...” ("Russia after Four Years of Revolution", by S. Maslov, published in 1922.)

In the same book S. Maslov writes the following lines: "Judaephobia is one of the sharpest traits on the face of contemporary Russia. Perhaps it is the sharpest. Judaephobia is everywhere in the north, in the south, in the east, in the west. One is not protected from it, neither by a degree of intellectual development, nor by membership in a party, nor by tribe or age ... I do not know whether one is protected from it even by the level of the general moral aspect of a contemporary Russian. Pogroms are in the air. Strained

hate cannot end by ignoring it in the transitional period between the fall of Soviet power and the strengthening of the power-successor..."

E. Kuskova writes more extensively in her article "Who Are They?" published in "Jewish Tribune", in the same year (1922) about the same anti-Jewish feelings throughout Russia. (The article as supplement is included in Part II of this work.) To suspect E. Kuskova, the well-known public activist and national socialist, of a negative partiality towards Jews is impossible. During her whole life she was a Judaeophile and collaborator of many Jewish periodicals. And not with malignant joy but with feelings of deep bitterness did she describe anti-Jewish attitudes in Soviet Russia, not delving, however, into examinations of causes which engendered these attitudes.

And a quarter of a century later, in the middle of the Fifties, we read the following lines in the article of David Burg: "In case of an overthrow of the Soviet regime there is the danger that in a period of unavoidable anarchy, the Jews, one and all, will be physically destroyed, as a result of the population's feelings".

A well-known investigator of the Jewish question Djude L. Teller says the very same thing in his book "Kremlin, Jews and the Middle East": "A Jew must think with trepidation about a moment which will come after overthrow of the communist power. This will be the blackest and bloodiest night in the life of Jewry..."

The above statements of four authors, of whom two were Russians of "Left" orientation and two others were Jews, writing 25 years later, speak about the very same thing about the presence and even growth of anti-Jewish feelings in USSR.

And what is peculiar is that these feelings have seized those circles of Russian intelligentsia to which they were always alien. E. Kuskova in her article, "Who Are They?" mentioned above, also points this out.

These feelings were alien to Russian students who, in the war years, almost completely replaced regular officers and from the start of the civil war formed the basic cadres of the White Russian movement. If not all, then an overwhelming majority of these "White Guards" were sons of the Russian intelligentsia.

However, in the year of the civil war the anti-Jewish feelings were characteristic among these youth and not infrequently poured out in inadmissible excesses, against which authorities were powerless to struggle.

These excesses engendered repulsion from the White Russian movement even among those Jews to whom the White Russian movement was bringing protection to their properties and law and order which had been disturbed by revolutionary events. And there were many such Jews among the Jewish bourgeoisie who were against socialistic experiments and breaking up of the social order by revolutionary methods. But they were not in the White Russian movement, neither in the ranks fighting at the front, nor among those who morally supported and justified this movement. "A Jew in the White Russian movement is just as rare as a white crow" a Jew, Pasmanik, said once with bitterness to his fellow-tribesmen. Yet this man D. Pasmanik entirely supported the armed struggle with Soviet power.

Anti-Jewish excesses in districts occupied by White Russian army took place and no one denies them. Even Denikin writes about them in his "Sketches of Russian Disturbances" (volume V, p. 145) and sharply condemns them. However, he does not give much attention to an analysis of the causes that gave rise to these excesses, although this is extremely important for a correct understanding of this question; that is, to give an explanation of anti-Jewish excesses within the White Russian movement (This does not mean justification). An explanation, establishing the causes of these excesses does not at all mean justification of the actions engendered by these causes.

Anti-Jewish attitudes among cultured and educated Russians' whose sons joined the White movement, did not appear at once, but grew gradually under the influence of events of the World War and the revolution.

At the start of the war patriotic feelings enveloped the whole of Russia, especially its youth. But these feelings were taken skeptically by Jewry as a whole, although, as mentioned in the previous account, it was generally an advocate of war against the German-Austrian monarchies in the hope that defeat of these empires would lead to a change in the internal politics of Russia, which was favorable to Jewry. Therefore Russian Jewry formally was loyal, but this does not mean at all that the Jews experienced patriotic enthusiasm.

Russia, in their understanding, was not their motherland, but only a country of temporary sojourn. Their motherland was Palestine, the "Promised Land", whither they expected from childhood to return.

If to this is added the presence of limitations for Jews in the Russian army, then striving to avoid, even by loyal Jews, joining the ranks of Russia's defenders will become understandable. And the Jews were not condemned for this; neither was anti-Jewish feeling engendered by such evasion.

Russian intellectual young people, being in the army, reacted quite differently to the defeatist propaganda in which the Jews played a notable rôle. For these young people Russia was their motherland, which they wanted to defend at the start of the war, and the defeatist propaganda, therefore, provoked in them feelings of deep indignation and resentment. Not only the young people had such feelings and attitudes but also people of older generations, regardless of their political orientation and party sympathies. Even those who were in emigration, revolutionaries — irreconcilable enemies of the Czarist Government, realized that the motherland was in danger and often came back voluntarily to Russia to declare it their duty to take part in the defense of the motherland. One of the many to have done this was Khrustalev-Nosar, the former chairman of the Soviet Workers' Deputies. For this revolutionary activities in 1905 he was sentenced to exile, but escaped to a foreign country. And now he came back, while his deputy chairman, Bronstein-Trotsky, remained in New York and conducted defeatist propaganda. The defeatist propaganda Trotsky conducted was useful only to the Germans; moreover, his numerous fellow tribesmen were helping him in spreading this propaganda. Many of these tribesmen afterwards arrived in Russia "to deepen and to widen the revolution": they were Uritsky, Volodarsky and many others.

A well-known revolutionary-terrorist, Vladimir Burtsev, did the same thing as Khrustalev-Nosar and many other emigrant-enemies of the Czarist regime. However, there were no Jews among them, neither "defeatists", which is understandable' nor Jewish "defenders". They preferred to "defend" by sitting out in emigration, undermining in all possible ways the authority of that government which led the fight to death (true, not quite successfully) against the German invaders.

And when, in the spring of 1917, all these "defenders" arrived in Russia (in sealed cars or in specially chartered ships at the expense of American Jews)

they could not find even a word to condemn the defeatist propaganda which was proclaimed by Nakhamkes. The extent of this propaganda at that time reached the point of a call to have all those who stood for defense — that is for continuation of the war — killed. Nakhamkes, who at that time was not a Bolshevik, but a Menshevik, remained unpunished, although accomplices in his party and his fellow tribesmen could without difficulty at that time put a limit to his treacherous activity. By putting an end to his defeatist propaganda, the lives of many thousands of young Russian patriots, fighting with the enemy at the front, could have been saved. A whole legion of small Nakhamkeses in all corners of huge Russia, and in the active army, and in its rear started to incite the dark masses of soldiers against all those who did not wish to see defeat of their country. Officers were hounded first, and then came their supporters. Of course, not all those who spread the defeatist propaganda and condemned officers to death were Jews. But it is hardly possible to dispute that there were very many among them and that with their propaganda they assisted in demoralizing the army.

What kind of feelings and attitudes provoked all this, not only among officers but also in the whole population of Russia, sending its sons for its defense requires no explanation.

And when the work on disorganizing the army was completed in the name of Russia, four Jews went to Brest-Litovsk to conclude a shameful and humiliating peace treaty. These Jews were Trotsky, Joffe, Karakhan and Kamenev. And no one of their fellow tribesmen, who made up the majority at that time of the Soviet Deputies, noticed the somewhat peculiar composition of the delegation.

But, to make up for it, all of Russia noticed it, and it is doubtful that this would ever be forgotten. Memories of Russian people are no worse than memories of Jewish people, who even to this day "recall" their enemy, Haman, every year, and glorify Mordecai and Esther. What do they glorify them for? Because Mordecai and Esther through their efforts were able to obtain the destruction in one day of 75,000 of those who, in the opinion of Jews, were their enemies.

The whole population of the great country of Russia thus felt deep national humiliation and insult, regardless of the political views or party adherence of each individual. Especially the young people, who had sacrificially defended their motherland, had to go through this acute and bitter

experience. Under the new power they became the object of mockery, humiliation, torments and mob laws of the inculcated masses, under not only the connivance but also the full approval of the new ruling class, which consisted of foreigners with an ideology and an understanding of sense of justice alien to Russian people.

It is not surprising then that all this gave rise to anti-Jewish feelings in places where they did not exist before, and demanded a revision of the attitudes of the Russian intelligentsia towards the Jews. Kuskova writes about this in detail in her article mentioned above.

Massacres committed "on the order of red terror" with countless victims shot without investigation or trial still further intensified and aggravated these anti-Jewish feelings. Because in these massacres Jews played too noticeable rôles, aggravated feelings, created conditions for an armed struggle, pouring out into the White movement.

The August days of 1918 when for the murder of one Jew by another Jew, 10,000 non-Jews were shot were firmly remembered by the whole population of Russia.

And when Steinberg, Uritsky, Volodarsky, and their like, escaped from bloody justice, the young people of Russia started to wage a struggle in the ranks of the White movement; frequently the activities of some reached excesses against which even the command was unable to do anything, because some of these young Russians were embittered by traces of reprisals encountered on their way, like that of Uritsky, and unconcealed sympathies of the Jewish population to those who committed these reprisals.

But these excesses were of somewhat different character than those committed by the Ukrainian armed forces and by the Makhnoists, who used to slaughter the complete population of individual Jewish settlements and towns. The excesses of the "Whites" were mainly intentional "requisitions", difficult to separate from ordinary robbery. Such excesses were accompanied by frequent killings of Jews, at whose places the "requisitions" were made. Besides that there were many cases of executions of collaborators of Cheka, political commissars and active communists newly discovered or designated by local dwellers. And since the above

categories of enemies of the "White" abounded with Jews, then naturally the majority of those executed were Jews.

But there were no cases in the "White" movement where a whole military unit, under the command of its officers, could have systematically destroyed Jews, including old men, women and children. This can be asserted with trustworthiness, for had there been, no doubt there would have been information about it in biographical literature and in the periodical press.

However, this does not confirm that the "Whites" were not among the ranks inclined definitely towards Judaeophobia and that anti-Jewish feelings were not apparent during encounters with the Jewish population on occupied territories.

Generally speaking, at that time (during the first three years of Soviet rule) anti-Jewish feelings were predominant. And such feelings dwelled in the Petlurists, the Makhnoists, the "Whites", the greens and even the Red Army, which was commanded by Trotsky. As soon as discipline in the Red Army weakened, Red Army soldiers would at once create pogroms which equaled those of the Petlurists or Makhnoists.

These feelings enveloped then all areas of Russia and all the strata of its population, from the dark peasants and working masses to highly cultured circles. There were frequently revealed cases of Judaeophobia even among the non-Jewish members of the communist party.

Slogans such as "Soviets without Jews!" or "Communes without Jews!" were at that time quite widespread and reflected the feelings of the broad masses.

But at the very same time the Jew Sverdlov was the all-powerful leader of all internal politics, the Jew Bronstein-Trotsky was at the head of all armed forces of the country, the Jew Steinberg was in charge of justice, the Jew Goldendakh-Riazanov formulated the ideological bases of the new system, the Jew Apfelbaum-Zinoviev actually was a director of Petrograd, the Jew Goubleman-Kohan-Yaroslavsky was in charge of the struggle against religion, and both deputies of the chairman of the Cheka, Dzerzhinsky, were Jews — Trilisser and Yagoda.

For the new ruling class, overfilled with Jews, these feelings, of course, were no secret, because already in the first year of Soviet rule the struggle had started against Judaeophobia, otherwise called "anti-Semitism". The struggle was waged by means of prohibition and fright, but not by studying the causes and their elimination. The very thought that one of the causes of Judaeophobia may have been the Jewish people themselves with their peculiarities was completely inconceivable and considered as "anti-Semitic". If in those times someone dared to state that "Jews carry anti-Semitism and Judaeophobia within themselves", as Spinoza once said and as Arnold Toynbee, the well-known historian repeated not long ago, he would be considered "pogromist", with all ensuing consequences. No one wanted to risk his own freedom or even life; this is why all kept silent...

The power of the new ruling class was very sensitive to the Jewish question and used to punish ruthlessly not only open manifestations of anti-Jewish feelings but even the slightest hint of them.

Saying aloud the word "Zhid" – Yid, could have entailed serious consequences, although in the Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Polish languages Jews are called "Zhid" and even Jews call themselves "Zhidy" in reference to their own nationality. This word can be found in the works of Russian writers, who published their works before the year 1917. The word can be found, for example, in the works of Turgenev, Tolstoy and others; however, no one called them "anti-Semites". But under the new power people were afraid to pronounce this word.

At that time the populace of the whole country still firmly remembered the decree proclaimed by the new power on July 27, 1918: "the Soviet People's Commissariat prescribes to all Soviet Deputies to take resolute measures to suppress anti-Semitic movements at their outset. Pogromists and those who conduct pogrom agitation will be considered outlaws..." The population also witnessed numerous bloody reprisals committed on the basis of this decree.

Thus "anti-Semitism" was brought to silence. But it was far from "suppressing at the outset": anti-Jewish feelings remained. They were only chased inside.

Authors of books about "anti-Semitism" in the Soviet Union (for instance S. Schwartz) maintain that the decree of 27 July, 1918 "soon lost any

meaning". As proof, they point at the absence in the criminal code of 1922 and in its following issues of special instructions on "anti-Semitism" and a change of qualification of this criminal offence by the general phrase: "agitation of national enmity". But this "argument" was not convincing to anyone, and everyone perfectly understood what the matter was. They understood, and this is why they kept silent.

It was this silence that gave Solomon Schwartz reason to maintain that at the beginning of the Twenties the "wave of anti-Semitism subsided".

It is quite difficult to agree with this assertion. And Schwartz himself, in the very same book, extensively writes about a "new wave of "anti-Semitism" in the Second part of the Twenties. But he writes nothing about the causes for the appearance of this wave.

Meanwhile, anti-Jewish feelings among the broad masses of the population, particularly among the workers, began to appear distinctly soon after the Jews filled the whole administrative apparatus in Russia.

In the April 28, 1918 issue of Izvestia, an extensive decision of the Executive Committee of the Moscow Soviet was published "on the question of anti-Semitic pogromist agitation in Moscow and in the Province of Moscow".

Paragraph No.2 of this decision states: "to acknowledge the necessity of not creating a special Jewish militant organizations". Special militant organizations began to spring up arbitrarily in Moscow, composed of Jews, in case of an armed struggle when, in their opinion, they would be threatened by "black hundreders". On these grounds, relations between Jews and non-Jewish workers and white-collar workers in institutions, factories and plants were strained to the extreme. Authorities had to intervene and quickly disband the Jewish militant squads in order to avert developing bloody clashes.

The question about these Jewish militant squads is now diligently hushed up. But the presence of the paragraph No.2 in the above given decision testifies that the question of these squads had been discussed; by that point they actually existed. Yet in the decision nothing is mentioned about the disbanding of already existing squads, but only about the "necessity not to create them", Muscovites knew very well that many Jewish militant squads had been created and were disbanded only after this decision.

Subsequent measures and decrees of Soviet power on the Jewish question, and also bloody reprisals of the Cheka against "enemies of the regime", to which were added all "anti-Semites", put such a fear of God into the population of Russia that, as S. Schwartz said, "The wave of anti-Semitism subsided".

However, after the introduction of the New Economic Plan and some general indulgence that came with NEP, the population got somewhat more daring and the wave of anti-Jewish feelings started to rise again. These anti-Jewish feelings were a certain reaction against the dominant position which Jews occupied under the new system (that system that made it possible for them to become a privileged ethnic group, which, in regard to the native population of Russia, behaved far from tactful).

During the lean years of the "militant communism", when the whole population was hungry or underfed, when American help had been distributed by the ARA organization, the population of the country saw only or almost exclusively Jews working with this organization as interpreters or as assistants. And the conviction in the population grew that the help, in the first place, goes to Jews — "to their own". Since the distribution of help to a considerable degree lay with government bodies or interpreters, in both of which the majority were Jews, corresponding feelings in regard to the latter were engendered in the population.

Besides that, in those years, Jewish charitable organizations in foreign countries developed activities to render assistance to the famished in Russia. Moreover, a quite considerable part of this assistance went only and exclusively to the Jews. The population saw this and on the basis of its observation came to a conclusion far from favorable towards the Jews although it was bound by fear and was silent.

The population of Moscow saw the irresponsible flow of Jews that rushed into Moscow as soon as the new power was established. The population also observed how, in overfilled Moscow during the acute housing shortage, houses and apartments were found for these new "Muscovites".

The new power also had the remarkable attitude that "religion is the opiate of the people", for both the Orthodox and the Jewish religions. The Jew, Goubleman-Yaroslavsky, quite zealously fought with Christians in general, and with Orthodox in particular, plundering ("confiscating") church

properties and organizing all kinds of blasphemous and mocking shows of "atheists". But the synagogues remained untouched and its properties were not "confiscated". Muscovites did not see also the blasphemous parodies, shown on the days of Jewish religious holidays.

Of course, not only the Jews alone made up the army of "militant atheists". The head of this group, Goubleman, also had many able and ardent collaborators and assistants from among the Russians. Some of them made for themselves a fairly good career of the "atheistic activity" and even became members of the Union of Soviet Writers.

The demand for blasphemous literature at that time was very great. Rewards and royalties for such literature attracted many prominent workers, who made their career on literary works, written in the spirit and style of chapter 39 in the novel "Resurrection" by L. N. Tolstoy. Before revolution this chapter was banned by the censors, but it was widely spread throughout Russia illegally.

Jewish students were placed in special privileged positions when (in 1923) mass expulsion of students took place throughout the country on the basis of social origin. Even those who were on their last semester were expelled, if it was established that their origin was not proletarian. Not only the sons of nobles, landowners, officers, merchants, industrialists and dignitaries of the Czarist time, but also those of free professions, priests, deacons and even sons of sextons had been expelled without the right to enroll in any other institutions of higher learning. In connection with these expulsions, the periodical press wrote about numerous cases of suicides. But the Jews were not expelled and there were no suicides among them on these grounds.

The new ruling class introduced a clause into the government instructions about "purges" on the basis of origin to the effect that the students, being representatives of "national minorities", were not subject to them, because they had been oppressed and persecuted under the old regime. This was applied to all Jewish students.

All this recounted above did not, of course, go unnoticed by the population of the country and consequently anti-Jewish feelings arose where there had been none before and where they were least expected: among workers,

among young people — students and Komsomol, even among members of the communist party and the new bureaucracy of non-Jewish origin.

This was not at all "anti-Semitism" or Judaeophobia in the old meaning of this word, that is, hostility and hatred on the basis of race and religion. This was a sense of enmity and repulsion towards the privileged class which had been identified with the Jewry. Undoubtedly the signing of the "obscene" and shameful Brest-Litovsk peace treaty with the Germans played a certain rôle, especially for the cultural part of the population. Because the treaty was signed in the name of the Russian people by four Jews who agreed to this peace with such ease. It was an insult to the national feelings of Russian people.

In the second part of the Twenties, when the "rise of the anti-Semitic wave" became noticeable, the press started to sound the alarm. Articles began to appear about the insufficiently energetic struggle with this phenomenon, about the appearance among the workers of "dangerous recidivists of nationalism".

At the beginning of May 1928, the Agitation Propaganda Board of the Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party discussed the question of anti-Semitism and outlined the following suggestions:

- 1) "To include the question about the struggle with anti-Semitism in the program of political education".
- 2) "To expose the class behind the scene of anti-Semitism, using for this purpose art, literature, theatre, cinema, radio and the daily press".
- 3) "The party must create an atmosphere of well-known contempt of anti-Semitism".

Besides these propositions of a general nature, a special commission of the Agitation Propaganda Board also worked out a number of concrete suggestions, subject to the approval of the Central Committee of the ACP.

- 1) "To train personnel especially for the struggle with anti-Semitism".
- 2) "To include a theme about the struggle with anti-Semitism in school textbooks, films, the periodical press and literature".
- 3) "To organize public debates and lectures about anti-Semitism".

But in spite of all these resolutions and recommendations, as the investigator of this question, Solomon Schwartz, pointed out, "for the actual struggle with anti-Semitism, the Communist party could not find in itself sufficient decisiveness". Another investigator and author of works on anti-Semitism, Lourie-Larin, writes the following about the causes of this "insufficient decisiveness": "The false shame to overemphasize the Jewish question (in order not to stimulate anti-Semitism still further) actually leads to softening of the struggle with bourgeois counter-revolutionary sabotage in this section of the ideological front".

Manifestations of anti-Jewish feelings, and also public debates on this question, were numerous at that time throughout the whole Soviet Union. Many anti-Jewish speeches and statements made at public gatherings are quoted by Solomon Schwartz in his book, "Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union".

Because it is impossible to produce in full all that has been written on this question by Mr. Schwartz, the facts given here are considerably abridged.

Here are a few cases of feelings manifested by the population:

- 1) "From different parts of the country reports are coming that among students in Soviet learning institutions it has become customary to speak about Jews using the word 'Zhid' — Yid".
- 2) "In Kharkov student communists are contaminated by anti-Semitism and frequently ask why the percentage quota is not introduced for Jews in institutes of higher learning".
- 3) "The meeting of student communists in Kiev has demanded the introduction of the percentage quota for Jews at the time of enrolment in the University. This demand received preliminary discussion at the sitting of the Komsomol bureau".

All the above reports were made in the years 1928 and 1929, that is, at the time when all students were of proletarian origin, sons of workers and peasants. This deserves special attention, because these attitudes are of those who afterwards occupied various positions in the administrative, cultural and economic life of the country.

Feelings among workers were similar to that of students. So, for example:

- 1) "In Leningrad at the 'Lit' plant, under the leadership of the foreman-instructor, shouts were raised in the direction of Jewish workers: 'Zhidy!' Then, this slogan was drawn on the walls: 'Beat the Jews, save Russia!' After that, inspired by impunity, they beat up comrades Miller and Elashevich and a number of other Jews, with bricks".
- 2) "Another case, also in Leningrad: at the plant named Marti, a member of a collective bureau of this plant threatened a Jew, a member of the Komsomol, who spoke against him at a gathering: 'If you, Jewish idiot, dare once more to speak against me, I'll straighten you out.'"
- 3) "In Kerch, at the canning factory 'Volia Truda', a group of workers, victimized a Jewish worker, Gootmanovitch, beating him on his back with wire. The anti-Semite, Nichugin, in the presence of the chairman of the factory committee and a crowd of workers, shouted: 'If this little Jew is not taken away from us, I will choke him.'"
- 4) "In Kharkov at the state distillery No.2, during a break for breakfast, an argument broke out between Jews and non-Jews. At this point one of the arguing workers, a member of the Komsomol, Dobrynin, shouted to a Jewish worker: 'You want to attend universities? This won't work!' Meanwhile, another member of the Komsomol, a candidate of the Communist party, student of the agricultural faculty, Anikeev, approached the arguing workers and began to shout: 'Look here, you Jewish punk, what do you want here? Come to take bread away from our brothers? We won't leave you, Jews, in peace. If this was 1920, I would settle accounts with you fast. You are all speculators. And still you come to work here'"
- 5) "The chairman of the local committee, Kuzmichev, a member of Communist party, said during the discussion (in one of Moscow stores) about the dismissal of a Russian worker who beat up a Jewish worker: 'We won't allow dismissals of Russians because of a Jew'".

(All the above cases of anti-Jewish manifestations among students and workers are taken from the book written by S. Schwartz, "Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union" pp. 21, 22, 28.)

In the same book S. Schwartz also quotes the speech made by M. Kalinin on the Jewish question in November, 1926. Here is what Kalinin said:

"Why is the Russian intelligentsia, perhaps, more anti-Semitic now than it was under Czarism? This is quite natural. During the first days of the revolution, intelligentsia and half-educated Jewish masses rushed into the channel of revolution. As an oppressed people, never being in administration, the Jews naturally rushed into the revolutionary construction, with which the task of administration is also linked. At the time when a considerable part of the Russian intelligentsia rushed-back, got frightened of the revolution, precisely at this moment, Jewish intelligentsia rushed into the channels of revolution, filled the positions of this channel with a much greater percentage in comparison to its population and started to work in administrative organs.

For the Jewish people, as nation, this phenomenon (that is, wide Jewish participation in "revolutionary organs") had immense importance, and, I must say, negative importance. When at one of the plants I was asked: 'Why are there so many Jews in Moscow?' I answered, 'If I was a rabbi, grieving about the Jewish nation, I would curse all Jews coming to Moscow in Soviet positions, because they are lost to their nation. In Moscow Jews mix their blood with Russian blood and in two or, at most, in three generation they are a loss to their nation. They turn into ordinary Russifiers. It, (pp.1617 of the above book.)

Almost coincident with Kalinin's statement, a meeting dedicated to the Jewish question was held on the second of December at the Conservatory in Moscow. At this meeting Professor U. V. Klyutchnikov said the following:

"The February Revolution of 1917 already established the equality of all citizens in Russia, including also the Jews. The October Revolution went further. The Russian nation showed self-denial. A definite disparity has been created between the quantitative composition of Jews in the USSR and in those places which Jews have occupied temporarily in cities.

You see how throughout Moscow small Jewish stalls with bread and sausages have sprung up. Here you have a primary source of this dissatisfaction. When Russians see how their women, old men and children freeze nine to eleven hours on a street and get wet in the rain at a stall in Moscow, and then they see these comparatively warm Jewish stalls with bread and sausages, a sensation of dissatisfaction rises up in them.

This phenomenon should not be ignored; it must be taken into consideration. A watchful feeling can occur in dwellers of big cities, since the proportionality is disturbed in state projection, in practical life and in other spheres, as well as between the numerical composition of the Jews and native population. We in Moscow have crisis: masses of people are cramped in lodgings where it is almost impossible to live; at the same time, you see how people come from other parts of the country and occupy living quarters. These newcomers are Jews.

The matter is not in anti-Semitism, but in the fact that national dissatisfaction, national watchfulness and watchfulness of other nationalities grow. We should not close our eyes to this. What a Russian would tell a Russian, he would not tell a Jew! The masses say that there are too many Jews in Moscow. Take this into consideration, but do not call it anti-Semitism..." (The above extract from the speech of Professor Klyutchnikov is taken from the shorthand record of Lourie-Larin, who was present at the meeting and recorded the professor's words. Eventually these words found their way to pp.124-126 in the book "Jews and Anti-Semitism in the USSR". State-publishing, 1929, Moscow-Leningrad.)

The question of constantly growing numbers of cases of sharp anti-Semitic manifestation of feelings troubled the power more and more; it threw all its forces into the struggle with this phenomenon, because it understood very well that the very existence of its power and its ruling class, consisting at that time mainly of the Jews, were threatened. Throughout the country explanatory work was started on this question. One aspect of this explanatory work was "consultation on anti-Semitism". Lourie-Larin reports, in the above book, "Jews and Anti-Semitism in the USSR", that these consultations were held in Moscow on August 23, 1928.

At the meeting ("consultation") were present a few dozen workers from various Moscow industrial enterprises. They were foremost people in the industry: "all party members", Komsomol members and a few "sympathizers", in a word, all that human material out of which are molded party members, Komsomol members and union activists.

At the "consultation", after the lecture, participants forwarded notes with questions, extremely characteristic for a definition of their feelings. In his book, Lourie-Larin gives a list of six questions in full. The questions are interesting and deserve to be presented word for word:

- 1) "Why do Jews not want laborious work?"
- 2) "Why do Jews get good positions?"
- 3) "Why are there so many Jews in universities: don't they forge documents?"
- 4) "In case of war won't the Jews betray and won't they evade military service?"
- 5) "Why was good land given to the Jews in Crimea, whereas the Russians received a much worse land?"
- 6) "Causes of anti-Semitism should be sought within the Jewish nation itself, in its moral and psychological education".

The remaining notes with questions were in about the same spirit. In none of these notes could racial-religious motives be detected, which mentioned that the Jews crucified Christ, motives that were characteristic of real anti-Semitism in the old classical understanding of pre-revolutionary antagonists of the Jews.

The economic aspect is predominant in all the questions of these notes, along with dissatisfaction with the privileged position the Jewish ethnic group occupied under the new regime.

From the speeches described above made by three notable communists — two Russians (Kalinin and Klyutchnikov) and one Jew (Lourie-Larin) — can be seen how serious and threatening the Jewish question at that time (at the end of the Twenties) was in the Soviet Union. And the authorities, not without reason, sounded the alarm.

Under the conditions of the communist regime, discussion of this question in the press was unthinkable. Only a one-sided dealing with this question was possible. It was possible to discuss from the point of view of the ruling class, which through its control of the news media, reduced the whole thing to press information, and even then it rarely took place, but when it did, the elucidation or the interpretation of this question was usually reduced to separate incidents of expressed dissatisfaction with the "inversely proportional percentage quota" which was established under the new

regime. Moreover, these incidents were called "recidivism of black hundreders", "tricks of pogromists" or "a sabotage of bourgeois capitalists". And no one then could dare to substantiate anti-Jewish feelings, to argue or to refute.

When at the very end of the Twenties and the beginning of the Thirties the Five-year Plans and collectivization began, which were accompanied by sharp government measures towards all those dissatisfied or sabotaging new measures, then apparently everything quietened down and open manifestations of anti-Jewish feelings became considerably less. (Which does not mean that anti-Jewish feelings disappeared,) This apparent calming down was taken by S. Schwartz as an "abatement of the anti-Semitic wave".

What the real feelings of the broad masses were, neither S. Schwartz, nor Lourie-Larin, nor various other Jews of the ruling class could have known, the reason being that "what a Russian would tell a Russian, he would not tell a Jew", as Schwartz wrote in his book, quoting Prof. Klutchnikov's speech. It is hardly possible to doubt that "what a Jew would tell a Jew, he would not tell a Russian". In this, perhaps, lies the cause of that watchfulness, and sometimes also of repulsion, which are characteristic in Russian-Jewish relations during the whole time of the Jewish sojourn within the borders of the Russian State. Of course, in these relations there were also exceptions, but exceptions, as is known, only confirm a general rule. It is unnecessary to judge whether this is good or bad. But to deny this phenomenon (good or bad) is also impossible. It exists.

Only in private life, in the conversations of persons undoubtedly trusting one another, could silence sometimes be broken and people would express, more or less frankly, their dissatisfaction. And sometimes, in a state of excitement careless phrases and words would escape their lips, words for which some paid dearly.

In the literature of that time, the literature which one would think should have reflected national feelings concerning the "Jewish Question", or to be more precise, concerning the question of dissatisfaction with the Jewish rôle in the country was "taboo" and this question was not touched. And if any Soviet writers of the time wrote something in scenes from daily life, endeavoring to be more realistic, which could have been interpreted as a manifestation of anti-Semitism, this could have entailed consequences

quite unpleasant for the author. In such cases an author had to justify himself on the pages of the press and express his "admiration for the Jewish people", as the writer Boris Pilniak had to do in 1931.

The history of this "repentance", in brief, is as follows: in his story "Floating Ice", written in 1924, Pilniak tells how a detachment of "rebels" occupied a small town in the Ukraine. A chief of the detachment is an anarchist, but its commissar is a communist. In the detachment, "Izvestia" is regularly received and read, and the detachment lives a life of Soviet insurgents. But they do hang Jews, and create Jewish pogroms in the town, which Boris Pilniak describes thus: "In the town the Jewish pogrom was started in the early morning. Such pogroms were always dreadful in that — gathering by the hundreds — Jews begin to howl more dreadfully than a hundred dogs howling at the moon, and perform the villainous traditional ceremony of Jewish feather-beds, covering the streets with down, under the wind... ". (Vol. 3, p. 81)

At that time, right up to the very end of the Twenties, the situation was such that, as Lourie-Larin said in the above account, there existed "the false shame to over-emphasize the Jewish question, in order not to stimulate anti-Semitism still further". It must be assumed that for this reason there were no protests or objections on the pages of the press in connection with the content of the story "Floating Ice". This story was even included in the collective works of B. Pilniak in 1929.

But he was not forgotten. He came to mind at the beginning of the Thirties, when, as the result of sharp government measures, the lips of the population had been sealed. As S. Schwartz says "there ensued an abatement of the anti-Semitic wave" and it was possible to forget about "the false shame to over-emphasize the Jewish question".

On June 24, 1931, in "Izvestia" in the article written by M. Gorky "About Anti-Semitism", Pilniak's story, "Floating Ice", was mentioned. In the article, it was stated that this story indicates a passive-tolerant attitude by the author to the extreme manifestation of "anti-Semitism". There existed at that time in Moscow the "Jewish Telegraph Agency" — JTA, which at once telegraphed this to New York and on the next day in the "New York Times" a corresponding article about Pilniak's attitude to "anti-Semitism" appeared. Boris Pilniak at that time was in the USA.

After ten days, on July 5, 1931, in the same "New York Times" a protest was published by B. Pilniak against the accusation of "anti-Semitism". In this protest, Pilniak expresses his "admiration of the Jewish people", and categorically rejects that he ever had hostile feelings towards Jews. He points out that his works were translated in "Yiddish", and reports that his grand-mother was a Jewess.

Anti-Jewish feelings of the broad people's masses arose as a result of the Jewish activities that turned them into the privileged "estate". So write many Jewish investigators of this question. These investigators write that anti-Jewish feelings were "active, massive and spontaneous". They call these feelings "anti-Semitism", although, as stated above, this has nothing in common with the real anti-Semitism.

And maybe, involuntarily and unconsciously, some talented writers and poets of that time, depicting negative characters that stir up fear and hatred, picture them as Jews, and give them Jewish names.

So, for example, the famous poet, Sergey Yesenin, wrote the following dialogue:

ZAMARASHKIN:

Listen, Chekistov!
Since when
Have you become a foreigner?
I know that you are a Jew,
Your name is Leibman,
And to hell with you,
that you lived abroad.
It makes no difference — in Mogilev is your home.

CHEKISTOV:

Ha – ha!
No, Zamarashkin!
I am a citizen from Weimar.
And arrived here not as a Jew,
But as one who possesses the gift
To tame fools and beasts;

I swear and will persistently
Curse you even for a thousand years.

For this work, Yesenin, as much as is known, did not have any unpleasantness and he did not have to write in the "New York Times" about his "admiration of Jews". On the contrary, the Russian Jews living in New York admired him and during his stay in New York made a feast in his honor in the Bronx, at a private house. Towards the end of supper, after heavy drinking, Yesenin began to behave not quite decently and started to "bring his fists into play". Wishing to pacify him, the hosts and the rest of the guests grabbed him by his arms and intended to tie him up. Yesenin fought back and would not yield... He ran up to an open window and in a heart-rending voice started to yell: "Rescue me! Jews cut my throat. Beat the Jews, save Russia! The incident was, of course, hushed up and no action was taken against Sergey Yesenin.

Another well-known Soviet poet, Edward Bogritsky (a Jew from Odessa), wrote "Thoughts about Opanas", where the following seditious lines are found:

I fled from the provisions detachment
From Kohan, the Jew.
In ravines and on slopes
Kohan growls like a wolf,
He pokes his nose in huts,
Which are cleaner.
He glances right, and glances left,
And puffs angrily:
Rake out from the ditch
Hidden corn!
Well, but if someone kicks up a row,
Don't make noise, little brother!
With moustache into the rubbish-heap,
Shoot him — that's how to put the lid on him.

"Thoughts about Opanas" did not provoke any response, although there is in it the word "Zhid" — Yid, which was considered at that time a manifestation of "anti-Semitism". But then the poet himself was a Jew.

All three recounted extracts from the works of Soviet writers and poets were written and published in the first decade of the new ruling class power, during the Twenties.

In the second decade nothing of the sort could be found on the pages of the USSR press. The start of the Five-Year Plans and collectivization were accompanied by government measures which tightly sealed the lips of all dissatisfied people. And the population of the country was afraid not only to speak but also to think about the "Jewish Question". Silence' which S. Schwartz called an "abatement of anti-Semitic wave", fell. People were silent. But this does not mean that they did not see and did not think... Once Shevchenko said: "the people are silent... because they prosper". And people became silent under the power of Koganoviches' dynasty..." Whether this silence was the result of "prosperity" or of fear, was revealed only at the end of the Forties and the beginning of Fifties, when, as David Burg says, the attitude of the Soviet population is such that, in case of an overthrow of Soviet power, all the Jews "will be simply slaughtered" in this moment of inevitable anarchy. And the Government of the USSR, after the victorious war, took these attitudes in considerations, and gradually started to replace members of the ruling class, by appointing and promoting representatives of the native population of the country to responsible positions. To call this "anti-Semitism" means to distort reality intentionally and consciously.

Ought not this cause to be considered in the "inverse proportionality" of the tribal composition of the ruling class, which consisted of less than 2% of the total population and occupied more than 80% of the leading positions? And ought not this cause to be considered also in the very own behavior of the Jews, who, after the year 1918, made up the privileged part of the Russian population?

But this question, as already mentioned above, is being diligently hushed up. The cause was very well understood by all Jews, both in the USSR and in the West, but this cause did not figure in explanations of that phenomenon called "anti-Semitism"... However, by attentive reading of articles and research, written by Jews in the Russian language in emigration in various periodical issues and separate books, one clearly perceives an almost panic terror creeping before the possibility of weakening or fall of power, which restrains "anti-Semitism" and does not allow pogroms or beating of Jews to occur.

Being unable to enumerate many similar and analogous statements made by authors, Russian Jews, we will limit ourselves therefore to a few extracts from the sketch "Jews and Soviet Dictatorship", published in the yearbook "Jewish World" (1939). The sketch was written by Simon Osipovich Portugaise who wrote under the Russian pen-name (nom-deplume) "Stepan Ivanovich". (In emigration Portugaise was editor of the Social-Democratic journals "Dawn" and "Notes of Social-Democrat" and other socialist organs of the press in the Russian language.)

Here is what "Stepan Ivanovich" writes: "In foreign countries many believe that there is no anti-Semitism in Russia, and for this are well disposed to Soviet rule. But in Russia people know that this is not true and, knowing such, set great hopes for the longevity of Soviet power, which, however, does not allow pogroms to occur, as is hoped, will never allow them to happen. In foreign countries, people are well-disposed to Soviet rule, because they believe in this advertisement: 'in the USSR there is no anti-Semitism'; in Russia they are well-disposed to Soviet power and are very frightened of its death, because they do not believe this advertisement, knowing that there is 'anti-Semitism' in USSR... but Stalin does not allow pogroms to occur and hopefully will not allow them to occur".

At another point in the same article "Stepan Ivanovich" writes the following lines: "The fall of Soviet power will be catastrophic for Jews, and any friend of the Jewish people must with horror cast away such view."

Although giving the above explanations about Jewish support of Soviet power in his article, "Stepan Ivanovich" personally did not share his opinion with them, but he gives them as "typical and quite widespread opinions among the Jews in the USSR, Jews in foreign countries and also among the friends of the Jewish people in the whole world".

"Stepan Ivanovich" had written his sketch after 20 years of stay of his fellow tribesmen in positions of the ruling class in the USSR, almost on the eve of the World War II, while the yearbook "Jewish World" was printed in the same year that Stalin concluded his treaty with Hitler. What is more, this treaty was approved also by the Comintern, in which Jews played far from small rôles. Jews then played a still bigger rôle (in the years preceding this treaty) in the external politics of the USSR. An overwhelming majority of the ambassadors were Jews, as well as being among the responsible workers in the People's Commissariat of External Affairs. And only a few

months before signing the treaty with Hitler, Stalin replaced the Commissar for External Affairs, the Jew, Finkelstein-Litvinov, by a Russian, Molotov (true, he was married to a Jewess who was very active politically). This was done to please Hitler, who could not agree to carry on negotiations with Finkelstein. What considerations prompted the Jews, who at that time ruled the political life in the USSR and the Comintern, to enter into agreement with Hitler has not been found out up to now. This question, it must be assumed, will occupy future historians, to whom archives and data connected with this treaty will be accessible. For us contemporaries it is difficult to understand. Opinions on this question are different and contrary. Some hold the opinion that the rulers of the USSR considered that conflict with Germany was inevitable. By concluding the treaty with Hitler, the rulers wanted to postpone the clash, and step forward only when Germany was weakened by the war in the West. It was believed that Hitler would go to war against the West only after he would secure himself with a treaty with the USSR (as actually happened).

True, calculations did not justify themselves. From September 1939 and up to June 1941, the West was unable to create a front which would have tied up Hitler's armies, thereby giving him possibilities to commit an attack on the USSR, entailing incalculable sacrifices both of human life and of material. Theoretically, however, it is possible to acknowledge this as a logical calculation, of course, in view of the inevitable clash between the two countries.

But there is also another opinion: that the leadership of the USSR did not consider a military conflict with Germany as inevitable, at least not in the near future. Taking into consideration the attitude of the broad masses, and also the tendencies of the new ally — Hitler — a sharp turn of the USSR politics in the Jewish question was possible: for the sake of preserving power, heads of the USSR would bring Jews to sacrifice, in spite of the fact it itself was composed almost entirely of Jews.

At first glance this opinion sounds paradoxical. But by attentive reading of statements expressed by Russian-Jewish emigrants in the period directly preceding the conclusion of the treaty with Hitler, we find many statements confirming this paradoxical opinion.

So, for example, in the above mentioned book "Jewish World" (1939, p.51), we read the following: "If the dictatorship, reverting now to some national

traditions of Moscow Russia and Imperial Russia, will consider it useful for itself and for its power over the minds and souls of its subjects to resort to this tradition of persecuting the Jews, should it need this "opiate of the people", then neither in the past nor, especially so, at present are there absolutely any obstacles for Soviet power. A right guaranteeing something, a right not to be persecuted, not to be given away in sacrifice to the "national indignation" — such a right the Russian Jews do not have right now, and indeed never had under the Bolsheviks. There was only a great opportunity for this, but there never was the right".

This was written at the end of the Thirties, that is, in the period of maximum occupation by Jews of all key positions of the cultural, economic and political life of the USSR, when the "dynasty of the Koganoviches" dominated the ruling head of the country.

What did the author (Portugaise-Ivanovich) perceive in the above "reverting to national traditions of Moscow Russia and Imperial Russia"? He does not explain, or he attempts to substantiate his apprehensions by the following words: "As is clear from materials collected and published by G. Aronson, the Soviet power had already become shy about Judaeophilia and Judaizing ascribed to it, and in a number of facts its active and consistent desire to hush up completely the existence of the Jews in USSR is being revealed. Jews are being systematically removed from the texts of such official documents as those in which dozens of the smallest nationalities and tribes are marked, the very name of which became known only recently. The Soviet power ceases to be, so to say, 'responsible for the Jews'. They became clearly an object of inconvenience for that course of 'love towards the motherland', of 'national pride' and of easy victorious 'patriotism', which is now being implemented foolishly and crudely in the USSR".

Taken in quotation marks, the meanings of "patriotism", "national pride" and "love towards the motherland" the authors of the above statements express, by the very act, the subjective Jewish attitudes to the feelings of love towards the motherland, to national pride and to patriotism of the Russian people, the same people who created the greatest state on earth, within the borders of which many Jews made enormous material fortunes up to 1917, received an education and, after the year 1917, became magnates of this great country and masters of its destiny.

As is known, each people, and especially the Jewish, cultivate its patriotism and are proud of it. Why then does not the patriotism of the Russian people find approval by Portugaise and Aronson? They do not explain this, but simply express a quite distinctly negative attitude towards it.

Professor Solomon Lourie in his book "Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World" scientifically explained and substantiated this invariably negative attitude of the Diaspora Jews towards patriotism and nationalism of any country and any people among whom they live, as a "nation without a language and territory". Extensive excerpts from this book are given in Part II of this work.

Ardently guarding their Jewish originality and purity of race, inseparably linked with religion, Jews do not admit strangers into their midst. But they themselves, Jews of Diaspora, strive to penetrate into all branches of the life of those foreign people among whom they live, and if there is an opportunity to occupy leading positions, they will do so. In countries and states with highly developed patriotic and national feelings and populations of homogeneous tribal composition, this is much more difficult to achieve and provokes a rebuff of the native population, which regards itself as a widened family of descendents of the same forefathers. It is much easier for them to achieve their ends in countries with a multitribal population, bound only by territorial unity and supreme power, or in states in which, for some reasons, patriotic feelings are suppressed and brought into latency.

In countries with a multitribal population unlimited possibilities are open for Jews to penetrate into the ruling class, without any opposition from the native population. The awakening of patriotism in a native population, naturally, is regarded by the Jews as a possibility that the question will be raised about their rôle in the country's life, about the possibility of occupying leading posts in the political and cultural life of the country in which they live at a given time and still maintain their own ideology and sense of justice, thus remaining alien to the native population.

All Jews in all countries of their sojourn understand this circumstance very well, and this is why they regard any manifestation of national pride and patriotism as a threat to themselves and to their position in a country.

Often this threat is felt even when it does not exist, as for example, in the USSR in the second part of the Thirties, when any manifestation of Russian patriotism was qualified as "great-power chauvinism" and was brutally persecuted. And, of course, there was no "reverting to national traditions of Moscow Russia and Imperial Russia" whatsoever at that time in the USSR.

But pre-conditions by the end of Thirties were already created for the awakening of national pride and patriotism of Russian people, whom aliens, turning into the privileged class, had ruled and for whom they had spoken for two decades. The discontent created by this privileged class was already floating in the air at that time; this could not have remained unnoticed by Jews, and they sounded the alarm in advance. They sounded the alarm because they anticipated events a whole decade in advance and, with subjectivity peculiar to them, exaggerated them as in the statements by Portugaize-Ivanovich and Aronson, the mouthpieces of Jewish attitudes and apprehensions in the USSR and without.

"The Soviet power already became shy about the Judaeophilia and Judaizing ascribed to it", we read in the "Jewish World" (1939). Non-Jews have not been noticing this "shyness", observing how, precisely in this period, the "inversely proportional" percentage of Jews in the highest positions and in diplomacy has reached its maximum.

Without exception, all ambassadors in the largest European countries in 1937 were Jews: in England there was Maisky; in France, Surits; in Germany, Yourinev (Ganfman); in Italy, Stein; in Belgium, Rubin.

There was not a single Russian in the USSR delegation in the League of Nations. The delegation consisted of eight members: Finkelstein-Litvinov, Rosenberg, Stein, Markus, Brenner, Girshfeld and Svanidze. The only non-Jew was the Georgian, Svanidze. At the head of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs was Finkelstein-Litvinov.

If in any country the ambassador of the USSR was not a Jew, then all the remaining personnel (counselors, secretaries, attaches) were Jews, as seen from the list below.

Approximately the same proportion of Jews was represented in numerous Trade Delegations of the USSR in foreign countries.

The personnel of the Diplomatic Courier Section of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs consisted almost exclusively of Jews.

Thus the matter stood with USSR representation in foreign countries; so it stood also in all other branches of USSR life in the second part of the Thirties, that is, in the years before the Second World War.

In order to give, as fully as possible, the picture of Jewish participation in the life of the USSR, a list is given below of the USSR personnel in various branches of the state apparatus (see supplement No.2).

This list, in general, did not undergo changes right up to the beginning of the Second World War. The ruling class in the USSR consisted chiefly of the Jews, occupying key positions in all branches of the country's life.

Trials and purges in the Thirties, as a result of which many Jews were not only dismissed from their positions but also shot or exiled (Apfelbaum-Zinoviev, Sobelson-Radek and others), did not change the correlation of Jews and non-Jews in the state apparatus of the USSR. They, as before, preserved after themselves and their relatives those positions which were occupied during the first years after October 1917.

Of course, in the new ruling class there were also non-Jews, who marked the beginning of this ruling class. But they all held the common spiritual view in their negative attitude to Russia as a national state. They were all "tied with the Germany of Marx as their spiritual motherland". And they did not limit their future activity to the borders of anyone state, but presented themselves on an international scale.

Professor Felatov writes about how views were formed of that group of people into whose hands fell the control of Russia in 1917 in "Present and Future Reflections about Russia and the Revolution".

"In the decade of reaction (1907-1917) in foreign countries, a rapprochement was taking place with the Bolshevik Headquarters and the leaders of the Left International. A lull in Russia and the compelled idleness of emigration attracted their attention to European affairs. Here solid ties were set up by Lenin, Zinoviev, Menshevik Trotsky, Rosa Luxemburg,

Radek and Rakovsky with Polish-Jewish-German radicals roaming from country to country, who were, however, tied to the Germany of Marx as their spiritual motherland.

During the war, at the time of the socialist betrayal of the revolutionary cause, the Third International was born in Zimmerwald-Kental, tying the expectations of a worldwide revolution to the World War. At this time Lenin, and especially Trotsky, felt themselves the least Russian revolutionaries. Like Radek and Rokovsky, these were spirits craving to incarnate themselves in any country: it could just as easily have been Austria or Germany, had Russia not collapsed first. The only Russian that Lenin felt at that time was an antithesis of patriotism – a special hate towards Russia as the most vicious of the so-called "imperialist countries".

However, the centre of his political interest (and of the Bolsheviks in general, up to 1918) was, of course, Germany, which impressed him spiritually by having in it two extremes: Marx and Ludendorff. France and the Latin countries they despised. A Russian revolution always appeared to them as a prelude, a provincial mutiny. Only in Germany could the construction of socialism have started".

Returning to Russia, Lenin carried away with him also the intellectual nucleus of the Third International. These leaders were, as is known, almost exclusively Jews, both Russian and German-Polish Jews.

This leadership had quickly expanded at the expense of Russian Jews, reinforcing its ranks and creating that ruling class which for almost thirty years humiliated and degraded everything that was national-Russian, even Russia itself, thereby provoking antipathy in the nation. And when at the end of the Forties, the words "a cosmopolitan without kith or kin" were pronounced, the broad masses felt that this was the beginning of the end of the ruling class. And the Jews, not only in the USSR but also in the whole world, perceived in this the beginning of "government anti-Semitism".

In his time, as is known, Lenin said: "What do I care about Russia!" And the leaders of the Third International, brought by him to Russia, took into its hands the education of the Russian people and wrote the following in the government organs of the press: "We do not have national power – we have international power. We do not defend the national interests of Russia, but the international interests of workers and deprived people of all countries"

("Izvestia", February 8, 1921). "Russia! Putrefied? Collapsed? Died? What then? May your memory live forever" ("Pravda", August 13, 1925). "Writers must throw overboard their literary mysticism, indecency, national point of view" ("Pravda", January 1, 1925). Between the national point of view and the indecency had been put the equal sign.

Thus the politics of Russia and the education of the people's masses were conducted in this spirit for thirty years, masses that found themselves under the rule of that "Third International nucleus" which was brought to Russia by Lenin. Moreover, this nucleus had swelled and expanded, absorbing in itself not only the dwellers of the USSR with an international attitude but also many natives of various western countries, related in spirit and tribe. The same natives who outside of the country already acted as representatives of the USSR, "the motherland of all proletarians".

In connection with this it would be of interest to mention an excerpt from the newspaper "Novoe Russkoe Slovo" (that of February 25, 1965) with a description of the personalities acting in Spain during its civil war in the years 1936-39.

Lazar Stern from Bukovina (according to his passport he was "Emil Kleber" from Canada, but had never been in Canada) was in command of International Brigades. Another, Stern-George, Division Commander in the Rea Army, was called "Grigorovich" in Spain. Jacob Smushkevich, Corps Commander in the Red Army was called "Douglas" in Spain. General Batkin was called "Fritz". The Hungarian Jew-communist M. Zalka worked in Spain under the pseudonym "General Lukatch". Abram Slutsky, who was in charge of the foreign section in the NKVD, travelled to Madrid under the name "Chernigovsky". The chief resident of the NKVD in Spain was "General Alexander Orlov" who had even "his own jail in the city of Alcalad, but in fact at Lubianka he was called "Nickolsky" or "Katznelson".

The ambassador of the USSR in Spain was Marcel Rosenberg. The assistant to the military attaché at the embassy was Lvovich, also acting under the pseudonym "Lotti". All the named representatives of the USSR were Jews. The only non-Jew was a Latvian named Ian Berzin, who for 15 years had been in charge of the Central Intelligence of the Red Army. In Spain he worked under the pseudonym "General Grishin".

All the foreign intelligence services, of course, knew very well of which nationality all these "Russians" were, "Russians" who were representing the USSR in Spain. But nothing was written about this in the world press. The fear of being suspected of "anti-Semitism" was stronger than the wish of reporting the biographical data about these "Russians" to readers.

Jews filled the ranks in embassies and trade delegations that represented the USSR in all other countries in approximately the same proportion.

In connection with this a characteristic joke was spread on the eve of the Second World War in Europe. It was agreed to have a conference of the USSR ambassadors and trade delegates in Geneva representing the USSR in all large European countries. Of course, the English Intelligence Service wanted to know what the conversation would be about at the conference. The Englishmen installed microphones, found two Russian emigrants who spoke good English and one Englishman who spoke good Russian, and were set to take down in shorthand the whole talk of the conference. But a big confusion occurred: none of the three could write down anything, because the "Russian Diplomats" conducted their whole conference in Yiddish.

But the matter did not go any further than the joke; even at that, it was passed around only orally. Neither the émigré nor the world press touched this "ticklish" question.

The Jewish press outside of the USSR also kept silent, press which wrote so frequently earlier about the percentage quota and all kinds of discrimination of Jews in Russia.

The very same phenomenon, in the sense of overfilling by the Jews of various departments, was seen not only in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs but also in all other ministries (People's Commissariats) of the USSR.

Here are impressions of foreigners who visited Moscow in 1935 and had an opportunity to convince themselves in this "proportionality" between the Jews and non-Jews in important state departments in the USSR.

These impressions and observations are related in the book "Fair of Insanity", which was written by the Englishman Douglas Reed, who was a journalist and spent several days with Anthony Eden in Moscow. On pages 194, 199 and 200 of this book he writes the following:

"Two big British establishments, represented by Anthony Eden and myself, have never sent their representatives into Soviet Russia up to now... Not one statesman has visited Moscow... My newspaper has never sent a correspondent to Moscow because of the censorship. Thus these two visits were big events, each in its own field.

The Soviet Government repeatedly complained that the Russian news (correspondence from Moscow) was transmitted from Riga, and asked why the newspaper would not send its representative to Moscow. The answer was always 'censorship'.

Thus my visit was long awaited and desirable. I stayed there no longer than five minutes, when representatives of the government began to argue with me about insignificant things. They said that I wrote (in my correspondence) that Eden was passing the street where a 'silent crowd in worn-out clothes stood in lines'. At once a small Jewish censor appeared and demanded that I must strike out this expression (from the transmitted correspondence). To this demand I answered: 'would you like me to write that the streets are filled by bourgeoisie in top-hats?' He remained unchanged. Such was the cultural level of the censors.

The Ministry of Censorship, which consisted of the whole control machine (muzzles) for representatives of the foreign press, was packed with Jews and this surprised me more than anything else in Moscow. They were the same Jews that were also in New York, Berlin, Vienna or Prague — well fed, well made up, with a touch of dandyism in clothing.

I was told earlier that the percentage of Jews in the government was not as great. But in this ministry, which I got to know very closely, they were monopolists". Further, in the very same book, Douglas Reed writes the following: "And where are the Russians? It must be assumed they are those silent, badly dressed crowds that are standing in lines..."

We find other evidence about Jews being in the government apparatus of the USSR in the book "From Freedom to Brest-Litovsk", published in 1919, in London. The author of this book is Tyrkova-Williams, wife of Harold Williams who for many years was a correspondent for the English newspaper "Manchester Guardian". A. Tyrkova-Williams was herself a journalist by profession. She took an active part in politics and participated

in the ranks of the "Constitutional Democratic Party" as a member of the Central Committee. Here is what we read in her book:

"Among Bolshevnik bosses there were very few Russians, that is, very few people of the profound Russian culture and who had an interest in the Russian people. None of them in any sphere had occupied notable positions in Russian life before the revolution.

Side by side with foreigners, Bolshevism attracted many followers who lived among the emigrants that were for many years in emigration in various foreign countries. Most of them were Jews. They spoke very poor Russian. Some of them had never been in Russia before.

The nation from which they seized power was alien to them. Besides, they conducted themselves as victors in a subjugated country.

Generally, during the whole revolution, and particularly during Bolshevism, Jews occupied very influential posts everywhere. This phenomenon is very complicated and strange, however, the fact remains... For example, there was the famous trio: Leiber, Gotz and Don who were elected in First and Second Soviets 1905-1917.

In the Soviet Republic all the committees and commissariats were filled by Jews. They frequently changed their names. But this masquerade deceived no one. Rather, quite the reverse, the pseudonyms of commissars emphasized the international and even foreign character of the Bolshevnik power.

Of course, among the Bolshevniks there were also Russians — workers, soldiers and peasants, and influential Bolshevniks such as Lenin, Lunacharsky, Banch-Bruevich, Kollontai and Chicherin, who were of Russian origin.

However the dominating class, which very quickly crystallized around the Bolshevniks, consisted primarily of aliens, people who were strange to Russia. This fact, perhaps, was useful to them in holding the masses in subordination, since the Bolshevnik autocracy was built on their absolute contempt and disregard for the people whom they were running. (pp. 207-299 of the book, "From Freedom to Brest-Litovsk").

* * *

What was the population of the Jewish ethnic group within the boundaries of the USSR in the second part of the Thirties, the years when the Jews were in the ruling majority in all branches of the country's life? It is impossible to give an absolute figure owing to various reasons, many Jews took typical Russian pseudonyms and acted under them; still many more quite officially changed their Jewish names and surnames. In the beginning of the Twenties whole pages of "Izvestia" were filled with reports about changes of names and surnames. This was allowed by law and did not entail an expense or red tape. Besides that, it must be taken into account "that during the general census of the population the heading "religion" did not exist at all, and to answer the question about "nationality" was left to the individual. Using this opportunity, many Jews, without changing their surnames, could state that they were "Ukrainians", "Byelorussians" etc., which in fact they did.

In statistical reports, under the heading "Jew", were listed, without any verification, all those who, during census, called themselves and their underage children "Jews". Naturally under such methods of conducting a census, a number of real Jews did not enter their names under the heading "Jew" and thereby had reduced the actual number of Jews residing in the USSR.

Perhaps purely Jewish organizations kept their own statistical records more precisely than did the official Soviet ones: however, there is no data about these in statistical research.

This assumption is not inconceivable. In 1965, in New York, an association of purely Jewish organizations accused administrations of fifty New York banks of not admitting Jews to leading executive and administrative positions, and when they did, the percentage ratio did not correspond to the percentage of Jews living in New York. The Jewish association insisted that Jews made up 25% of the New York residents, whereas in executive positions in banks Jewish representation equaled only from 2 to 3%. In this accusation it is further stated that 82% of New York banks did not have Jews in its administrative ranks.

All the figures given above are the result of four months of secret inquiry into the nationality of 1,250 of the highest executives and members of administrations in fifty New York banks.

The chairman of the association for New York banks, Osten S. Murphy, answered that banks do not know and do not take interest in who of its executives, directors and members of administrations are Jews, and who are not. In forms and personal records of executives there is no heading about racial origin, color of skin, religion. This should have been known by Jewish organizations. It is unknown how and on the basis of what data the Jewish organizations came up with the given figures and percentages. (Published in "Herald Tribune" October 21, 1965).

After this reply the association of Jewish organizations did not raise this question again in newspapers, although this does not mean, of course, that this question was finally taken off the line.

The incident above shows how Jews are watching attentively and in an organized manner the successes and failures of their fellow tribesmen in all countries of the world.

For example, a bulletin is regularly published in London called "Jews and the Jewish People", a collection of material from the Soviet press. The bulletin is published in the Russian and English languages. In this bulletin all data is given about appointments, promotions to higher ranks, rewards and medals received by Jewish citizens of the USSR, for the current period (usually three months). The data begins with generals and ends with cow-milkers and Jewish labor-heroines. The given data is commented upon and emphasized, if, in the opinion of Jews, their fellow tribesmen were not sufficiently rewarded or promoted in the USSR.

Thus, in order to establish the number of Jews living in the USSR one has to rely on official Soviet statistics and, taking into consideration the above, make adjustments for those Jews who proclaimed themselves as "Russians", "Ukrainians", "Byelorussians" or as representatives of any other nationality.

According to the information published in 1939 in the year-book "Jewish World" (article by S. Pozner), the number of Jews living in the USSR in 1935 was 2,900,000, equal to 1.8% of the whole population of the country. It must be assumed, however, that actually there were more, but how much more is unknown. Supposedly there were no less than 3,000,000.

It is these three million Jews who gave, from amidst their ranks, almost the whole ruling class of the Soviet State, numbering two hundred million

people. This is obvious with utmost clarity from the lists featured in this work, and also from the above statements and the evidence of foreign observers.

In the first period, in the period of the seizure of power in Russia, special knowledge, education, experience, qualifications to occupy responsible leading positions in all the spheres of the country's life were not required. To achieve this, it sufficed to be aggressive, self-assured, loyal to the party and, of course, to have a kindred and tribal closeness with those who made up the nucleus of the power.

But when the power was seized, the new ruling class encountered the necessity of having a corresponding education in order to occupy responsible posts. Lacking the required education, the various "activists" were trying with brave ignorance to solve all questions.

The pre-revolutionary intelligentsia and big specialists were ruthlessly exterminated, and those who survived were not trusted by new power. And if someone was admitted to the service, then he was assigned a "commissar", who, not having knowledge or understanding, only hindered the work.

It was necessary to create a new intelligentsia, cadres of educated people from those groups of the population in whose loyalty and trust the new power could not have been in doubt. These groups were almost the whole Soviet Jewry and those numerous activists who advanced themselves in the beginning of the revolution and were utterly devoted to the new power.

The first task of the new power, in the field of education, was to safeguard itself from the danger of infiltration by "socially alien" elements, the unreliable ones; that is, not to admit sons of former aristocratic and wealthy families in the higher learning institutions, except Jews who fell under the classification of "oppressed and persecuted" people under the old regime. When this was secured the power proceeded to create the new intelligentsia, the new elite of the country.

Theoretically it should have been created of the people "from a wooden plough and a machine-tool". It was for this purpose that the so-called "workers' faculties" were created to train these activists that they be able to go through courses in higher learning institutions.

What this turned out to be in practice is shown by the statistical information about the tribal composition of students in higher learning institutions of the USSR. According to the information given by Pozner in the "Jewish World", 1939, there were more than 20 percent (20.4%) of Jewish students in higher learning institutions", while the Jewish ethnic group consisted of less than 2 percent (1.8 %) in relation to the whole population of the USSR.

In considering students as a rate per thousand of population, we find the following comparison:

- Per one thousand Russians there were 2.8 Russian students.
- Per one thousand Ukrainians there were 2.0 Ukrainian students.
- Per one thousand Byelorussians there were 2.4 Byelorussian students.
- Per one thousand Jews there were 20.4 Jewish students.

The above records are for the year 1935. In the next decade the percentage of Jewish students steadfastly grew. There are no exact data about the percentage of Jewish students for this decade; there is only an indirect indication concerning this. Thus, for example, the former Moscow student David Burg, in his article "The Jewish Question in the USSR", which is included in the Part IT of this work, reports that, before the World War II in one of technical faculties of Moscow, the percentage of Jewish students was 40%. And according to numerous reports from various students of that time, the percentage of Jewish students was considerably higher.

This circumstance provoked corresponding attitudes among the remaining non-Jewish masses of students. The non-Jewish students, as well as the whole population of the country, understood very well that if the percentage growth of the Jewish students would continue at the same rate as before the war then in the not too distant future a non-Jewish student would become a rarity in the higher learning institutions of the country.

To this we must add another circumstance: during exams, some Jewish students, dissatisfied with ratings received for their knowledge, accused professors of "anti-Semitism", of negative partial treatment of Jewish students. Such accusations used to send chills under the professors' skins. Of course, this was not invariably so. But it did occur, and quite frequently. While passing examinations, a Jewish student reveals his lack of knowledge

and unpreparedness. An examiner expresses his opinion. In reply, the Jewish student says: "You are cutting me, because I am a Jew". The confused professor asks a few more "childish" questions, which were not too difficult to answer. Then the professor gives a satisfactory mark and the Jewish student, with an air of victory, returns to his place.

Former students of higher learning institutions of the USSR tell about similar methods of passing exams. After World War II, quite a few such students found themselves outside the USSR. Former professors also tell about this occurrence, but of course, not to foreigners (Jews), but to their own (Russians), to whom they would tell what they would not tell a Jew, as S. Schwartz writes in his book.

Knowing all the above, there is no reason for surprise about S. Schwartz's report that students demanded the introduction of the percentage quota for Jews, as was explained in more detail in the previous account.

It is also impossible not to take into account still one more circumstance. An overwhelming majority of Jewish students, in a material respect, were in a much better situation than the rest of the students, for the very simple reason that they were children or relatives of the ruling class people. These were well-off and could, if not support fully, then at least help their student children or relatives quite substantially.

All these circumstances have contributed to Jewish students so much that they were able to complete universities and institutions much easier and quicker, and, upon receiving their degree, get jobs wherever they wanted and with less difficulty than other students.

The new ruling class quickly prepared "replacements" for itself, which already filled up Soviet establishments, not on the basis of merits, but on the basis of university degrees. They filled up the establishments to such an extent that "even now" (in the middle of the Fifties, that is almost ten years after the Jews started to lose their monopolistic position in the USSR), as Furtseva said "there are ministries in which more than half of the personnel is Jewish". The minister of Public Education of the USSR, Cathrine Furtseva said this when she addressed a meeting of Moscow University students. It must be assumed that Furtseva spoke the truth, because her assertion was not refuted in the Jewish press, which published the content of her speech.

True, by that time, (that is, by the middle of the Fifties) under the pressure of the general feelings of the whole USSR population, after the Jewish-Arab war and the subsequent creation of Israel, and in the interest of state security, Jews were removed from leading posts and the previous confidence in them ceased to exist. But no one persecuted them. And the establishments, previously filled to capacity with Jews, only gradually started to get replacements from the representatives of the native population of Russia. How slowly this process went is evident from the unrefuted assertion of Furtseva.

After 30 years of ruling in Russia the Jews ceased to be the ruling class. But no one exterminated them, as they did in their time with the overthrown class of pre-revolutionary Russia, a class that was partially exterminated physically, and whose survivors were forced to deprivation.

We will see now what this ruling class did while holding its privileged position, and how it dealt with the enormous cultural heritage of the great nation within which it found itself.

* * *

Material valuables that ended up in the hands of the ruling class after its coming to power were enormous, innumerable.

"The whole 'crystallized labor' turned into capital, in all its kinds and forms. It is the fruit and the results of capitalist plunder of workers" — so various orators of all calibers and shades preached at meetings. They used to throw the fiery and rousing slogans to the dark masses: "plunder what was plundered!"

And the All-Russian plunder began: at that time it was called "socialization", "nationalization", "requisition"... Everyone plundered everything, starting from underwear, crosses worn around the neck, wedding rings and ending with treasures and priceless works of arts... You see, all these were "plundered", "all these belong to the people"...

It is impossible (and it is doubtful that it will ever be established) to calculate or to account for how much was looted.

It is only possible to judge where the loot went on the basis of indirect information and memoirs of active participants of this All-Russian plunder.

So, for example, in the newspaper, "Novoe Russkoe Slovo" of 1965-1966, there is an indication of who was in charge and how he managed the "socialized" treasures. Extensive excerpts from the memoirs of participants are given in the supplement of Part II of this work. ("Socialized Treasures and their Use".)

During the first post-revolutionary years, whole freight cars and trucks loaded with silver used to arrive in Teheran, silver that was sold by weight as "scrap". At that time in Persia there were silver "tumans" (markets specializing in silver trading). On one plate of weights would be placed the silver "scrap", and on the other, Persian silver coins weighing the same amount. Thus the "scrap" went kilogram for kilogram.

This silver "scrap" had been torn off from gospels, icons set in the framework and vestries, and it also included various other articles made of silver: glass-holders, silver dishes, icon-lamps. In this "scrap" there were also many articles made by the famous Russian jewelers: Khlebnikov, Ovchinnikov and Fabergé.

More valuable and more portable "scrap" went to the large antique stores of Europe and America and was sold, of course, not by weight.

Even now, after half a century, in various antique stores and at auctions from time to time, jewels, icons and art works of doubtless Russian origin appear. However, the ways and means by which all these ended up in salesmen's hands is unknown. One can only speculate.

The capitalist world, so zealously guarding private property and severely punishing violators, shut its eyes in this case to the origin of what was sold and readily bought that which was "deliberately stolen", bought without asking immodest questions.

Was this not an indirect justification of the All-Russian plunder and the recognition of the rights of those who stood in power then to dispose of the loot in accordance with their own orders?

It would be appropriate to recall here the case of policyholders from the Insurance Company "Rossia", which also had capital in the USA. A few emigrants, with policies in their hands, appealed to the American court with a request to settle payments due them from the capital of "Rossia" that was in USA banks. These policyholders had incontestable rights to receive

certain sums of money from the insurance company. The court made a decision in favor of the policyholders. But the USA Government intervened and "explained" that even in the year 1918, the Insurance Company "Rossia" was socialized by the decree of Soviet power and therefore the claims must be refused. This, however, did not prevent the frozen capital of the Insurance Company "Rossia" in USA to be used in satisfying claims analogous to those of Russian emigrants, but presented by persons, who had American citizenship at the time of the socialization decree.

* * *

Besides the treasures, precious stones, gold, silver and articles of art which were easy for the new ruling class to squander throughout the world, the innumerable national historic treasures and cultural monuments of the great nation fell into their hands. Under their charge was the culture that was created by whole generations during its thousand year history; monasteries, temples with priceless frescos, places and centers of art where Russian history and Russian culture were manifested. All these things which were cherished and were an integral part of the past were under their control.

For the new rulers of the country all this was not only strange and alien but also harmful and even dangerous. It reminded them of those times when Russia was ruled by Russians, when behind monastery walls Russians sat out from enemy raids, when in monastery cells chronicles were written, when the Russian national concept and sense of justice were forged.

This is why the new power, unable to sell or to squander this part of the All-Russian property, property of the whole Russian people, began, with exceptional ferocity, to destroy it. This task was entrusted to Goubleman, who took the pseudonym "Yaroslavsky". He occupied himself with the defamation and destruction of the temples, applying blasphemous, humiliating methods in his activity. Under his leadership, the "militant atheists" mocked and jeered everything that was sacred and dear to the people.

How many of the unique and irreplaceable monuments of Russian culture, inseparably linked with its Orthodoxy, were destroyed, sullied or profaned is impossible to account for or to enumerate. Perhaps this will be done by generations to come. We, however, not only should but must remember

this. We must also remember that emerging now among the young people of the USSR there is a heightened interest in the past of their people. This heightened interest demonstrates that it is not so easy to kill in a people their national spirit, their conscience.

* * *

Russian culture (literature, art, science) at the beginning of this century occupied, if not the first, then, undoubtedly, one of the first places in the world. At the turn of the Twentieth Century, the cultural elite in Russia was raised and educated in humane and liberal traditions, equally alien to the xenophobia of the French, as to the cold and haughty utilitarian attitude of the Anglo-Saxons, and to the self-conceited and pompous Germans. These elite bore within itself the germs of cosmopolitanism and this is why it has so easily and freely admitted representatives of all tribes, races and nationalities into its environment.

Russian nationalism was in a latent state and the "national repulsion", strikingly manifested in other nations, was almost absent among the Russian cultural elite.

Such circumstances, it must be assumed, explain why alien and foreign elements at first penetrated as equals into the ranks of the Russian cultural elite with unusual ease. And after the year 1917, they almost completely captured in their hands the leading positions in all spheres of the cultural life in Russia.

Somehow this capture occurred unnoticed. When the Russian elite realized itself nationally, it was already' too late. The new ruling class, with uncommon energy and determination, rushed in to struggle with the historical past of Russia, and well succeeded in capturing the power during the first quarter of the century. Even the very words "Russia" and "Russian" were under prohibition. If anyone was caught or simply was suspected of showing the least amount of discontent with this new course of Russian culture, he could easily end up in a not so distant place.

The teaching of Russian history and subjects connected with it, both in secondary and in high schools, became quite a dangerous profession. The history of Russia had been going through changes and adjustments to the new course. Changes in this subject occurred frequently and one had to be on the alert, in order not to end up in heresy. In the Soviet press, of course,

it was not mentioned. In the world press, if there was something written about it, then it had to be approved by the Jewry, because this was regarded as a struggle with Russian chauvinism and the eradication of the remnants of "red patriotism".

Only in 1966, in the book "Russia in the Years 1917-1964" written by Westwood, the American historian-investigator, can you read the following truthful lines: "communists struggled not so much with Whites, bourgeoisie, kulaks or Fascists, as they did with the historical past of Russia".

This is, perhaps, the first incident when the main aim of the ruling class was correctly noted and distinctly formulated. This aim consisted of eradicating any feelings of national belonging and converting the new generations into "Soviet people" with a psychology of "a cosmopolitan without kith or kin".

Immediately after coming to power, the new ruling class, understanding and taking into consideration the great importance of instilling their ideas in the masses: first, prohibited throughout the country all periodical issues of non-communist orientation; and secondly, at the head of all newspapers and magazines it placed its own people, who not only held the same political views but also were of the same tribal identity. (In order not to enumerate here all the editors of influential newspapers and magazines in the USSR during different periods of rule by the new class, it is recommended to look in the corresponding listings, placed at the end of this book.)

At once the new heads of the USSR press started to implement the general line of the Third International, which, with its headquarters, arriving from foreign countries and began an undeviating struggle with the historic past of Russia.

This struggle advanced on a wide front. Besides the press, which in every possible way tried to denigrate the past of the Russian people who created the great state, the literature of that time also undertook the same task. The huge state machinery of "public education" got into the same act as well, striving to educate the new generation completely ignorant of the past and its people and country...

The aim was to create the "new man", the international man, who would be unable to remember his kinship and would not know and understand what his motherland was.

Anything that could interfere with this new course of upbringing was subject to prohibition and extermination. Various stooges of buffoonery in the ruling class "were using brooms to sweep out Russian classics and other trash which cluttered the brains of the proletarians". Pushkin was under prohibition, to say nothing of Dostoevsky, Leskov and other leading figures of Russian literature. The dictator of literature was the nephew of Sverdlov, Leonid (Laiba) Averbakh, whose activity is described in the separate supplement in Part II of this work (see "Lenka and Henrikh of Iron").

The whole legion of the new Jewish "Soviet writers and journalists" appeared on the proscenium of literary life. These Jews were in addition to those who even earlier had congested the pages of Russian newspapers and magazines, for example, Bagritsky, Silvinsky, Babel, Kataev, Petrov, Sklovsky, German, Ilf, Kaverin, Lidin, Goldberg, Nickulin, Kirshon and many others.

As a result, in the second part of the Thirties it was just as difficult to find a Russian among "Russian" (Soviet) journalists and writers as among numerous "Russian" (Soviet) diplomats, trade delegates and the rest of the personnel in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The very same picture had been observed in the spheres of art, music, theatre and cinematography. The volume of this work restricts the enumeration of all the names; furthermore many Jews acted under Russian pseudonyms.

The population of Russia was silently observing everything that took place. However it was unthinkable to condemn the situation as it stood then, when the numerically insignificant minority, alien to the Russian people in their ideology and sense of justice, had captured almost all the leading positions in the country. Concerning protests, people were afraid even to think about them because this would have been deemed "anti-Semitism" and would have entailed severe punishment.

Solomon Schwartz, the investigator of "anti-Semitism in the USSR", calls this silence "subsiding of the anti-Semitic wave". A. S. Pozner reports in "Jewish World" (for the year 1939) that the "Jewish foreign press was

carefully watching for any rise of anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia, and it must be stated, that it was able to note only an insignificant number of incidents. The last such incidents took place during 1935-1936. The Jewish Telegraph Agency detected two incidents in 1935, and in 1936 only one. Court actions were taken in all three incidents against the ones guilty of anti-Semitism, and they paid for it with jail terms, ranging from two to five years.

"A generation grown up during the Soviet rule, in all probability, was free of anti-Semitic feelings, because it was brought up without the influence of racial and religious ideologies." Yet on the very page S. Pozner wrote: "At the Eighth All-Russian congress of Soviets, Molotov spoke; it was possible to conclude from his words the presence of anti-Semitic feelings in the country and in the administration. He threatened to consider manifestations of such feelings as a capital crime in the name of the government".

An explanation of that phenomenon which S. Schwartz calls "subsiding of the anti-Semitic wave" should be found perhaps in this last threat of the death penalty, stated on behalf of the government, and perhaps also in the insignificant number of court cases dealing with "anti-Semitism". Was it not the fear of the death penalty that closed the lips of the population so tightly and so reliably that even such experts on "anti-Semitism" as Solomon Schwartz could not discern these feelings?

The death penalty for the show of feelings is an unheard punishment, not only in peace time but even in a war situation or an occupation.

It is no wonder that the population of Russia kept silent and did not protest the new ruling class and all the experiments this new ruling class tried on the Russia which it had seized.

At that time — during the second part of, the Thirties this new ruling class seized the power in the USSR widely and all-embracing.

The closest collaborator of Stalin (married to a Jewess) was his brother-in-law, Lazar Kaganovich. The other brother-in-law, Moishe Kaganovich, was at the head of all heavy industry in the country. The People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs (NKVD) was in the hands of Hershel-Yagoda and his deputy and assistant Agranov-Sorenzon. The criminal investigation department was in the hands of Lev Belenky. Concentration camps were

run by Mendel Berman, whose closest associates were Jacob Rapoport, Lazar Kohen and Simon Firin. All the jails in the country were run by Khaym Apeter. Political administration of the Red Army was in the hands of Yankel Gamarnik and Moses Vladimirsky. Internal trade was managed by I. Veizer and co-operatives by I. Zelensky. Lev Mariazin was in charge of the State Bank and all the treasuries of the country. Light industry was in the hands of I. Lubimov (Kozlevsky). Moses Kalmanovich was in charge of all food products in the country. Transport and all modes of communication were under the authority of Stalin's brother-in-law, Lazar Kaganovich, under whom Sigal occupied the position of Chief Procurator of Transport. Samuel Ginzburg was the head of all construction materials in USSR. All the metallurgy of the country was in the hands of A. Gurevich. The head of the trust, "Ore of the USSR", was Trakhter; at the head of the trust, "Potassium of the USSR", was Tsifrinovich and the head of the trust "Leather of the USSR" was Margulis.

All the main articles for export from the USSR were also in the hands of Jews: "Export-grain" — Abram Kusin; "Export-wood" — Boris Kraevsky.

Saul Bron was chairman of the Chamber of Trade of the USSR. His closest collaborators were also Jews. The whole external trade was in the hands of Aron Rosenberg.

The struggle with religion was led, as already mentioned, by Goubleman, and atheistic literature was in the hands of L. Averbakh.

Sobelsohn-Radek managed the periodic press; he spoke poor Russian, yet gave orders to editors of newspapers and magazines.

The Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union (TASS) was in the hands of the Jews Vaisberg, Ginsburg (Koltsov), Shatsky, Tsekhar, Heifets and others.

The names of those enumerated above are also in the more detailed listings, placed in this book as "supplement". Here they are given, without fear of repeating them, clearly to demonstrate who at that time ran all the resources of the USSR as well as its cultural life.

But at the same time this ruling class zealously guarded "national-cultural" life of its fellow tribesmen who created a certain state within a state. They named this state "personal-national autonomy", without letting anyone

interfere (except Jews) in the internal affairs of this state within a state, which possessed neither its own territory nor language.

Personal-National Autonomy (State within a State)

Before giving an account of the main points as to what is meant by "personal-national autonomy" and the results of putting it into practice, it is necessary to define more precisely the concept of "nation", "nationality".

The word "nation", as the very name indicates, comes from the Latin word "natio", which originates from the word "natus" — born, ("nasci" — be born). So, quite rightly, in the Russian language there existed and exists the equivalent word "nationality", which might also be called "tribal belonging".

The word "citizenship" also existed and exists in Russian, side by side with "nationality" or "tribal belonging".

In countries with a homogeneous tribal language and cultural population the meanings "nationality", "tribal belonging", "citizenship" may be substituted one for the other, without the precise definition being affected.

But not all countries have, in a sense, a monolithic tribal population. In such countries it is necessary to differentiate strictly the nation, "citizenship" from "nationality" and "tribal belonging".

A subject of Russia or a citizen of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not mean that the given person is a Russian or even a Slav...

A citizen of France is not necessarily a Frenchman by nationality, nor is a citizen of the State of Israel necessarily a Jew. There are also Arabs. In the USA there are blacks, red, yellow and white "Americans", or, as is frequently said, "people of American nationality".

Pre-revolutionary Russia was multi-tribal. The USSR is also a multi-tribal (multi-national) state. All tribes or nationalities that make up the population of the USSR have their territories, which are now accepted as "national territories". Only one nationality, or ethnic group, did not have its territory at the time of the creation of the USSR. These were the Jews, consisting of less than 2% of the whole population and dispersed throughout the country.

Before the revolution all the nationalities and tribes of Russia were considered Russian subjects. They were equal and did not experience any limitations. The only restrictions in respect to the Jews existed in rights, not

on the basis of tribal restrictions but on the basis of religion. Jews who broke off with Judaism automatically received all rights, and were equal with other subjects of the Russian Empire.

After the year 1917, the previously centralized Russian State underwent administrative reorganization into separate federal territories, populated by different nationalities. For each nationality the right for self-determination up to separation was recognized.

And all nationalities, to a certain extent, have realized their rights of self-determination by the creation of "national republics" or "autonomous regions". Of course, they were created on the instructions of and under the leadership of the Communist Party as "national in form but socialist in content".

Only the Jews were unable to do that for the simple reason that they did not have territory and were not a "nation", but only "ethnic group".

In special demographic literature, there are quite a few definitions of the word "nation" with enumerated indications required for an ethnic group to be recognized as a "nation".

The most concise definition is the one given by the well-known English historian, Carlyle, who states that "nations consist of land and ancestors".

The Italian scholar Mancini (middle of the 19th century) gives this definition: "A nation is a natural society of people, attached to a united territory, origin, language and adapted to living intercourse and social consciousness".

A similar definition is also found in the works of communist authors, both before the revolution and after it. It goes thus: "A nation is a historically formed stable community of people that came into being on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological qualities, being manifested in common specific peculiarities of the national culture".

This last definition was published for the first time in 1913, repeated in 1929 and once more repeated in 1960; therefore, there is every reason to consider it the dogma of Marxist-communists.

It is quite obvious that the Jewish ethnic group cannot come under any of the above definition of a nation because of the absence of territory. Nevertheless, it possessed an exceptionally and distinctively expressed "stability" and "peculiarities of psychological mould" (according to the definition of Prof. Solomon Lourie that the Jews possess "spiritual aspect" that distinguishes them from all the rest of the people of the world).

Jews, however, being in dispersion and even conversing in different languages, "considered themselves as a nation, a state with their own laws, but without their own territory". (Professor Lourie's definition.)

At one time, in Poland, this situation was regulated by the "Kalisz Statute", according to which Jews who lived in Poland could abide by "their laws", in the content of which Poland did not interfere with. (See p. of this book.)

The "personal-national autonomy" was something similar to the Kalisz Statute, except that it had considerable changes in favor of the Jewish ethnic group. The idea was put forward by the Russian Jews even in the years of first revolution (1905), but it was realized only after the second revolution, in 1917.

These changes consisted in that the Jews (as distinct from the situation in Poland) acquired all civil rights, equal with the rest of population (which they did not have in Poland), but at the same time preserved the sequestered character of the Jewish ethnic group. So much so, that in the sphere of Jewish "national-cultural religious life" and in daily life they had the possibility of living according to their Jewish laws. They were even allowed to have separate cemeteries, something which was not permitted any other nationality of the USSR.

The satisfaction of cultural needs such as theatres, newspapers and schools in the "national" republics and regions was provided out of the budgets of the corresponding republics and regions. The expenses of "national-cultural" services for Jewish groups, residing on territories of various republics and regions, also fell on the budgets of these regions.

And if a considerable number of Jews arrived and settled permanently in any city, purely Jewish cultural institutions also had to be created — theatres, newspapers, if the Jews so desired, and schools in the Jewish language. All this was done at the expense of the city or the corresponding national republic or region.

In order that all this be strictly put into practice, the "Evsection" — the Jewish section of the Communist party, — watched and took care of it. There was, however, no separate communist party, as, for example with the Ukrainian communists, who formed one at the beginning of Soviet rule.

Stalin was resolutely against this, considering that the Jews were not a "nation", and therefore could not create the Jewish "national" communist party. Its absence was compensated by the presence of "Evsection", which in fact managed all the Jewish affairs in the USSR. This was similar to what once existed in Poland, where such affairs were managed by the "Jewish Seim". Of course, it was not allowed to judge and to pass sentences in synagogues. But all "affairs" and "conflicts" in planning the "personal-national-cultural" autonomy were handled and resolved by the "Evsection" in the spirit and sense of the laws of the people of Israel.

All possible assistance and contribution to the "Evsection" were secured by the government. And the personalities of this "Evsection" were old party comrades through the "Bund", with many Soviet dignitaries.

The first measure of the "Evsection" was the establishment of the "Jewish Telegraph Agency" in Moscow, abbreviated JTA.

By-passing the official agency, "TASS", the JTA used to send its reports abroad to those agencies of the press which it wanted, for instance, the "New York Times". No one other national group had such an agency and possibilities to report directly abroad, although many Ukrainians, Georgians and Armenians had permanent residence in Moscow where their fellow-tribesmen were at the top of the party and the government. Only Jews had this privilege and used it to keep in touch constantly and regularly with the rest of Jewry dispersed throughout the world.

Dealing with questions that took place in the USSR, the JTA' from its Jewish point of view, undoubtedly exerted a considerable influence on the attitudes of broad circles of the world community. The influence was directed at the non-Jewish community, who, however, read newspapers controlled by Jews. And it is impossible not to acknowledge that the rôle of the JTA was enormous in the matter of forming world opinion about the USSR and everything that took place there.

But at the same time, the responsibility in presenting one-sided and partial reporting (which used to occur frequently) — was also enormous. The

politics of many states concerning the so-called "Russian question" were and are directly dependent on these opinions about the situation of the Jews in the USSR and the government's attitude towards them.

During the first thirty years of Soviet rule the main informant to the whole world about Jewish conditions in the USSR was the JTA. Afterwards, after the closing of the JTA and facilitated possibilities of visiting the USSR, and correspondence with relatives and friends, the numerous "specialists on the Russian question" became the informants. They were almost exclusively Russian Jews, who filled various institutions in different countries.

Besides the links that were maintained with the rest of Jewry of Diaspora by means of the JTA, the "Evsection" developed its activity also in other directions. First of all, it took charge and care to develop a prospering Jewish national culture within the limits of the USSR. It also facilitated to a maximum the lot of its Judaic religion by giving it an easy time in the conditions of the communist regime while holding to the general course of atheism and militant godlessness.

It must be taken into account that among the active figures of the "Evsection" there were a lot of former Jewish "socialist-Zionists" and "Bundists". A considerable number of these, if not all, were, according to M. Slonim, "frequently found to be, in reality, types of Jew-communists, fanatically believing in Lenin's teaching and in strangely combined precepts of the Bible or Talmud with the doctrine and requirements of the communist church".

Knowing this, it will become clear that over almost twenty years, after the start of godless activity by Goubleman-Yaroslavsky, it was possible to observe occurrences in Moscow of Jewish religious life-scenes which did not confirm at all the official course of eradicating religion from daily life.

In the collection "Jewish World" for the year 1939 one can read the following: "In Moscow three synagogues are open: the Bolshaia, the former Poliakovskaia and the one in Marinoy grove. In Drogomilov the special Jewish cemetery which is managed by "khevre-kaddish" at the Bolshaia synagogue also remained intact. At the synagogue there is also "beh-hamidrash", where, behind volumes of the Talmud, one can see elders, gray with age, and a few youths, dreaming of going to Palestine.

As in the good old days, a struggle goes on between the parties in the administration of synagogues. Election campaigns are being conducted, and sometimes its whole business ends up in slanders between opponents, so much so, that even authorities have to intervene. So, in Moscow, not long ago, the "opposition" of the administration in Bolshaia synagogue turned to the Moscow Soviet with a complaint about the method of baking matzos, pointing to irregularities of their bosses. The result was that the Moscow Soviet got interested in the matter and decided that the baking of matzos was quite a profitable business and took to banking the matzos itself.

There is no need to doubt the accuracy of the above description. To a non-Jewish reader, however, a question naturally occurs: "but what happened to the Easter Cakes during the same years in Moscow?"

As is well-known to all, in those years (at the end of the Thirties) not only did the Moscow Soviet not engage in the production of Easter Cakes but even separate families in Moscow and throughout the whole USSR did not dare to engage in this.

In the bulletin issued by the JTA on September 9, 1938, one can read: "On the eve of the last Jewish holidays of 1938, the newspaper 'Der Emes', (published in Moscow in Jewish) complained on its front page that 'the Jewish clericals' exert a big influence on the religious life of the population. They pay special attention to the accurate observance of religious instructions and holiday customs. "Rabbis and their followers", wrote the communist organ, "spare no efforts agitating for circumcision of newborns, observance of the Sabbath and kosher food. They do good deeds with their obsequial brotherhoods. These brotherhoods, not being recognized by law, do exist in many cities and are harmful to Soviet citizens. Attempts to organize 'khederas' and 'eshibots' were mentioned by the press many times".

In "Jewish World", for the year 1939, this can also be read: "Der Emes" wrote that, in some places, things go so far that on Jewish holidays Jewish children do not go to school, and are not persecuted for it. For example, in the Stalingrad region, Jews freely perform ceremony of circumcision. The first such example was given by Radun, the shock worker on the collective farm of "Ozet", and after him followed the shock worker of "Trudovik", and after him followed others. At Easter time, Jews everywhere bake matzos.

What is more, in the said region, an example of that was given by the First Secretary of Communist Party comrade Rabinovich".

The above excerpts from Jewish sources testify that there was not much pressure on the Jews from Soviet authorities. What pressure was there if, at the end of the Thirties, they had their own separate cemeteries, which the rest of the USSR citizens were not allowed to have, if they could keep their children at home on Jewish holidays with impunity, if they could perform circumcision, bake matzos, have special obsequial brotherhoods and do good deeds which have not been recognized by law?

Neither were there any obstacles from new rulers to the most intensive development of the Jewish culture in all its manifestations: literature, theatre, periodical press in Jewish language. On the contrary, all these were supported and encouraged. As a result, a whole number of writers, poets, journalists appeared who wrote and published their works in the Jewish spoken language — "Yiddish".

In 1939, Pozner, the investigator of this question, gives the following facts in the collection "Jewish World": "Of the Jewish writers in former times, only Mendel, Mokher, Sforim and Sholom Alaikhem enjoy indisputable acknowledgement and respect as classics, and their works are being published with comments and revisions... In the years of the Soviet regime there appeared many new writers in the Jewish language, among whom were some very gifted people. Some of these were Peretz Markish, David Hofstein, Itzik Fefer, Kvitko, Noakh Lourie, Ezru Fininberg, M. Taitza, S. Godiner and S. Khalkin".

Besides the Jewish authors, writing in "Yiddish", works of world literature: Shakespeare, Goethe, Byron, Balzac, Hugo, Dickens, Anatole France and even Homer were also translated and published into the same language at the state expense.

The above facts, obviously, testify to the utmost encouragements given by the Government of the USSR in the development of Jewish culture, and not at all to its suppression or discrimination as is frequently written by unconscientious investigators of Jewish conditions in the USSR.

Never, during the whole time of its dispersion, in no one country did any government render such assistance and encouragement to the development of Jewish culture as did the USSR during the first thirty years of Soviet rule.

The circumstance that, spending people's money on translations and publications in "Yiddish" of the works of Homer and Shakespeare and other foreign writers" the government did not support "khederas" and "eshibots", in which the Talmud was studied, has no relation to the Jewish culture whatsoever. Yet Jews, even up to now, do not agree with this and do not separate their, the Jewish, culture from the Hebrew religion.

The Hebrew religion, as all other religions, was proclaimed "opiate of people" and a struggle was waged against it, but with much softer and delicate measures than were once used against other religions.

The USSR ruling class, which mainly consisted of Jews, did not spare state funds on the development of education in "Yiddish", as well as on all kinds of scientific institutions functioning in this language. Beginning from the school network (including secondary schools) and ending with the "Jewish departments" at the Academy of Science (in Byelorussia and the Ukraine), the teaching was conducted in the "Yiddish" language.

But, as the Jews themselves state, "cares about preserving and developing the national culture are alien to the Jewish intelligentsia of Soviet Russia. It is little grieved by the fact that the Jewish masses do not have the necessary trust in the Jewish school and in many cases prefer to send their children to Russian, Byelorussian and Ukrainian schools: therefore the Jewish school has been developing slowly". (Jewish World, 1939).

In 1939, Mr. Shulman, a contributor to the Jewish newspaper "Der Tog", visited the USSR in order to be convinced of how the Jewish culture had developed in that country. In Minsk he became interested in the work of the Jewish department at the Byelorussian Academy of Science. In all the other departments life was in full swing, but in the Jewish, a deadly silence astonished Shulman. A secretary of the Academy explained to him that the Jewish department was having a very poor success, owing to the absence of those who might have wished to work in it. "Jewish scientists prefer to work in Russian or Byelorussian scientific departments".

In Kiev, where there was an extensively planned Jewish institution of higher learning, the "Institute of Jewish Proletarian Culture", things were no better. In 1936, the institute had been closed "for reorganization" and had not been open for a long time. Part of its library was sent over to

Birobidzhan. So, besides the building, Shulman could not see anything else there.

And when, upon his arrival in Moscow, he expressed his astonishment to Litakov, the editor of the Moscow newspaper "Der Emes", published in "Yiddish", about the poor interest in the development of Jewish national culture and the absence of corresponding propaganda, Litakov answered: "So do you think that the Jewish school is just as important a matter as building socialism?"

Neither did the Soviet Jews show any interest in the history of the Jewish people, as it was in the years of pre-revolutionary Russia. In spite of enormous material possibilities, made available by the state for the people of science, scientific works in "Yiddish" are almost non-existent. "It is necessary to state", writes a Jewish observer, "that in Soviet Russia very few people devote themselves to study of Judaism – Jewish history, philosophy, philology, ethnography, economy".

What is the reason they are so few? All the possibilities are present, but those wishing to become students of Judaism are not, in spite of the fact that the government assisted and encouraged its study.

The answer to this natural question was given affirmatively by a Jewish journalist, who stated that "cares about preserving and developing the national culture are alien to the Jewish intelligentsia of Soviet Russia", and that "the masses have lost their trust in the Jewish school."

Hence a logical and psychological conclusion: a striving to join the Russian culture. This indeed takes place, engendering and nourishing assimilationist attitudes. The process of assimilation goes on regardless of counteraction to these attitudes from rabbis as well as from numerous representatives of the Jewish intelligentsia, intelligentsia which did not free itself from the Zionist-Socialist aims of the previous Jewish parties, the "Bund", "Poale-Zion" and the "socialist-Zionist-internationalists", to which belonged the majority of the Jewish intelligentsia in Russia before the revolution.

An atavistic fear of disturbing the purity of race by means of mixed marriages was stronger than all international and socialist programs. The programs of which Jews were its followers and propagandists.

It was not less difficult for non-Jews to rid themselves of the purely irrational feelings of the well-known "repulsion" against Jews. This was especially so for inhabitants of those Russian territories which were once part of the "Jewish Pale", where the native population had many contacts with Jews, for instance, in the Ukraine.

It was this repulsion that hindered the process of quick assimilation. If it was not for this repulsion the "Jewish question" would have been eliminated within the borders of the USSR by intermarriages.

Here are demonstrative statistical facts about the percentage of mixed marriages in different parts of Russia. These statistics deal with marriages after the revolution when all obstacles of religious nature no longer existed for such marriages and when the institution of civil marriage was introduced in the USSR.

The data for the years 1924-26 show that in the regions of the former "Jewish Pale" in the Ukraine and Byelorussia where a large percentage of the Jewish population lived, there were registered only 3.6% mixed marriages (Jews with non-Jews whereas deep in the country the percentage of such marriages was 16.8%.)

Giving these figures in the "Jewish World" for 1939, the author makes no attempt to investigate the cause of this disparity, but briefly states that "this is understandable". Actually it is not quite so understandable, that where the percentage of Jews was larger the percentage of mixed marriages was smaller, and the vice versa. This disparity becomes understandable only when we take into account that deep in the interior of Russia its native population had almost no contact with Jews before the revolution and did not know them. In the "Jewish Pale", however, the native population was constantly in touch with Jews, knew them very well, and had "repulsion" in regard to them. Besides that, undoubtedly, the Jewish social structure within the "Jewish Pale" and outside of it also played a big rôle. The Jews who lived deeper inside Russia belonged mainly to the Jewish intelligentsia or bourgeoisie and in their daily lives did not adhere much to the old, strict Jewish customs and eagerly associated with Russian families.

However cases of mixed marriages were rare exceptions not only among the Jewish bourgeoisie and intelligentsia but even among Jewish revolutionaries. All of them, as a rule, married Jewesses, except Trotsky,

who was married to a Russian woman. The exceptions occurred among revolutionary leaders — Russians, such as Avksentiev, Sukhomlin, Kerensky, who married Jewesses (Kerensky got married in emigration).

Jews in general, not only in Russia, view mixed marriages as the beginning of the end for the Jews and oppose them in every possible way.

In connection with this, one incident that took place in 1960 in the USA deserves attention. In Philadelphia, at the big meeting dedicated to the struggle against anti-Semitism, there appeared a well-known English historian Arnold Toynbee, invited by the Jewish organizations to make a speech. Toynbee recommended an end to anti-Semitism by means of intermarriage.

Toynbee's advice provoked burst of indignations by the numerous Jews gathered there, who were offended by the suggestion as a wish to destroy Jewry. Eight hundred rabbis wrote in the press, protesting such methods of eradicating anti-Semitism in USA.

In the USSR, as already mentioned above, the struggle against anti-Semitic sentiments was conducted by other methods — prohibition and severe punishments.

The question of mixed marriages did not interest the Soviet Government, although a great many Jews were in it. On the contrary, mixed marriages were viewed with approval and important Soviet personages themselves led the way: Stalin, Molotov and Voroshilov, the diplomats Krestinsky, Troianovs and many others were married to Jewesses.

Life goes on. The secluded Jewish life, destroyed by the revolution, was already impossible to re-establish even by the means of "personal-national autonomy". To an old man's horror, Jewish young people started to eat all food, including pork, and to ride in streetcars on Saturdays, stopped attending synagogues and began to associate with "goyim". The post-revolutionary Jewish generation was irretrievably departing from Jewry and was rushing to join the All-Russian culture.

And no efforts of the "Evsection" could prevent this process. Every interest was lost to study the Jewish language, one that was more and more ceasing to be the spoken language of the Jews in the USSR. According to data

provided by the last census, 80% of Jews in the USSR do not know how to read and write "Yiddish", to say nothing of the ancient Hebrew language.

The Jewish "national culture" in pre-revolutionary Russia, in spite of all "limitations" (or owing to it) reached a golden age which it never had in any other country during the whole Jewish sojourn in their dispersion. With great knowledge of this question I. Zisman writes in detail about this in his review of the "Book about Russian Jewry". (This review is given in full in Part II of this work as a "supplement").

However, as life has shown, this golden age was possible only under the conditions of Jewish self-isolation, in their distinctive voluntary ghetto, which the Jewish culture of Russian Jews was up to the year 1917. The culture was inseparably linked with the Hebrew religion and impregnated with racial mysticism and scholastic points. In its time, this culture gave rise to a whole number of political figures who created Jewish parties — "Bund" and "Zionist-socialists", combining in themselves positivism and Marxist materialism with elements of Judaic racial mysticism.

And when, with the advent of communist power, all political parties were prohibited, including the Jewish, former members of "Bund", "Z-S" and also partially of "Poale-Zion" rushed to join the "Evsection" of All-Russian Communist Party. It was through the official channels offered by the Evsection that they started to put into practice the "personal-national-cultural autonomy" across Russia. They did it, sparing neither the material resources of the whole country nor considering the wishes and feelings of the native Russians.

"A Jewish Department of the Proletarian University" is being created in Moscow. And Maria Livshits-Frumkina, a former member of the "Bund", is being appointed its president. In Kiev a huge building is set aside for the "Institute of Jewish Proletarian Culture" (which as mentioned above, was closed in 1936, because Jewish students did not want to study in it). In Minsk, the Jewish department of the Byelorussian Academy of Science is standing empty, although it was opened and is maintained at the state's expense. Schools (including secondary schools) teaching in the Jewish language, are being opened and maintained in cities and towns with a considerable Jewish population. The Jewish language is being recognized by the state on an equal basis with all other languages of the country and

legal procedures are conducted in settlements with a considerable percentage of Jews, for example, in Byelorussia.

In the national republics, not only is the creation of separate Jewish professional organizations being permitted but it is even encouraged. Members of these organizations could only be Jews who at the same time are members of parallel professional organizations of all-state or republican formations. Thus, for instance, in Kiev, side by side and parallel with the "Union of Ukrainian Writers", there also existed the "Ukrainian Union of Jewish Writers".

A great many similar examples of this "dualism" could be cited.

The "Evsecs" — members of the Jewish section of All-Russian Communist Party — used to show unusual activity in the matter of introducing and putting into practice the Jewish "personal-national-cultural autonomy" wherever an opportunity presented itself. This ranged from legal procedures in "Yiddish" in Byelorussia to issues of newspapers in the distant Birobidzhan or in the Jewish theatres of the Crimea.

However, "Evsecs" were getting old, their ardor was petering out, yet there were no replacements for the simple reason that the new Jewish generation had lost interest in their culture because of gravitation towards joining the cultural life of All-Russia.

Furthermore, they started to quarrel among themselves and to display unattractive traits — internal squabble, intrigues informing.

A bulletin issued by the JTA on June 19, and August 7, 1938, reports: "the Kharkov newspaper "Der Stern" attacked the most prominent Evsecs of Moscow. And the Moscow "Der Emes" replied by attacking the "Ukrainian Union of Jewish Writers". The general meeting of the Gezerd in Moscow, in December, 1939, showed a shameful picture of the public informing on prominent Jewish communists, who had the misfortune of once having been members of the "Bund", "Poale-Zion", "Zionist-socialist", etc. "In Kiev and in Kharkov, as a consequence of similar intrigues, many prominent Jewish writers were "cleaned out" — expelled. These were Marx Eric, Mikhail Levitan, Haim Gilden and others".

Summing up the conditions of the Jewish culture in the USSR, the observers (Jewish emigrants) stated that "we are witnessing not the

strengthening and development of Jewish culture in Soviet Russia but the extermination of some of the few bearers of it who still remain" (S. Pozner). And the well-known Jewish historian, Dubnov, writes: "There is a generation growing which does not know its origin and its century-old past".

It is not proper, of course, to dispute the opinions of experts on this question. They are quite right, giving such a pessimistic picture of the success of the Jewish culture after twenty years of its propagation in the USSR.

Later on, this deviation from the Jewish culture by Jewry itself still further gained strength at the expense of quite voluntary assimilationist sentiments.

Those specific peculiarities called "Jewish culture" were the main and basic causes of the deviation: Jewish culture is the only culture in the world organically and inseparably linked with religion. "Evseks", the communists, generally did not recognize religion and used to reproach displays of Jewish religious feelings, or at best, only tolerated them.

And it is not surprising that the whole expensive venture of spreading the Jewish culture in the communist state ended in complete failure.

The religious life of Jews in the USSR withers away, and along with it withers the Jewish culture.

Organization of Land Use (Jewish national districts and regions.)

During their century-old sojourn in dispersion, the Jews had never and nowhere engaged in agricultural labor. This used to provoke a critical attitude towards them by the native population.

Still in the Eighteenth Century, before the Jews became Russian subjects, an attempt was made in Poland to work out a law enabling the Jews to engage in agricultural labor; however, nothing concrete was done in this regard.

In Russia, in the first part of the Nineteenth Century, the government itself started to organize Jewish agricultural settlements on the fertile, rich and at that time only partially settled lands of South Russia. The new settlers were promised various favorable terms, and corresponding sums of money were allocated to build houses and other farm buildings. Supervision for all these was entrusted to the "New Russian Guardianship (migrating) Bureau". Eight hundred and ten thousand acres of land were placed at the disposal of this Bureau.

Here it should be noted, that the migrants were directed to the new lands only when houses had already been built for them. (The houses were built not by Jewish hands, but by hired workers). Monetary grants were also given to the new settlers for the organization of farms in these new places.

As a result of this arrangement, 8 Jewish agricultural colonies which accounted for 600 families with 3,640 persons were created in the province of Kherson by the year 1810. The government spent 145,000 rubles, which at that time this was a huge sum of money, on the construction of these colonies.

Later on the migrating activity was curtailed, owing to poor results produced by these migrant agriculturalists, and consequently the credits were also curtailed.

But arbitrary sporadic migration of small Jewish groups still continued. Under trying material conditions in resettled small Jewish towns of the Western region and Volhyn, and hoping to receive various favorable terms including exemption from military duties (decree of 1827), Jews embarked on this arbitrary migration.

But, of course, the results of the whole migratory movement and the government attempts to "attract Jews to agriculture" turned out to be insignificant. And up to the moment of the 1917 revolution Jewish farmers comprised a "microscopic" section. Owing to such numbers these Jewish farmers had no importance in the whole body of the Jewish masses of six million and played no rôle in the "Jewish question" of Russia.

The volume of this work makes it impossible to allot sufficient space and to describe in more detail this attempt to create Jewish farmers.

Jewish agricultural settlements — "colonies" — did exist in a few places before the revolution. Such settlements presented a sad and dismal picture: sloppily cultivated fields, and pitiful farm buildings.

Moreover, these settlements were scattered about and nowhere occupied any considerable part of the territory which could have been proclaimed as Jewish "national territory", if not as a region, at least as a district.

It is for this reason that during the first post-revolutionary years the question of the creation of any territorial Jewish unit was not raised. Jews limited themselves with the "personal-national autonomy" and by spreading Jewish cultural institutions throughout all Russia to serve Jews wishing to settle anywhere.

Only in 1924, when the civil war had ended and calm ensued, was a special committee created for the exploitation of land by Jewish workers (COMZET). The COMZET was created by a decision of the presidium of the Central Committee of the USSR and placed under the jurisdiction of Soviet Nationalities. A special organization for the dissemination among Jews of the idea of turning to agricultural works also came into being. This organization was called the "society of OZET" and it united hundreds of thousands of members.

COMZET and OZET attracted not only citizens of the USSR but also Jewish organizations outside of the USSR. For example, in the USA the Jewish charitable organization "Agrojoint" collected and directed to the USSR large sums of money for the help of land exploitation by COMZET and OZET.

The Soviet Government allotted large areas of prime land for the settling of Jewish farmers. The biggest part of the land was in the Crimea — over 342,000 hectares; 175, 000 hectares in the Ukraine; 28,000 hectares in

Byelorussia. Besides that the creation of a separate Jewish "national region", Birobidzhan, was formed in the Far East. For this purpose a whole province of 4,000,000 hectares of land was allotted. The territory borders on China and has a moderate climate, and enormous natural resources. There are huge deposits of iron (Hingan), magnesium and coal, to say nothing of the great extents of valuable forest.

The creation of the Jewish national region of Birobidzhan was planned in 1933, whereas the organization of agricultural settlements and separate Jewish districts in the European part of the USSR had already started in the second part of the Twenties.

The Jewish press in the USSR as well as abroad regarded these measures by the USSR Government not only with approval but even with delight. D. Zaslavsky treats this subject more thoroughly and in detail in his book, "Jews in the USSR", published in Russia in 1932 by the Jewish publishing house "Der Emes" in Moscow.

S. Pozner also writes about this in the collection "Jewish World", published in Paris in 1939: "In the interest of the Jewish population, six autonomous Jewish districts have been organized, in which all administrative institutions, courts and learning institutions have "Yiddish" as their official language. All Jewish public and pedagogical institutions are maintained at the expense of the state. Here is some data about these districts:

Districts	Area (hectares)	Jewish population (persons)
Kalinodorfsky	75,000	16,000
Novo-Zlotopol	45,000	14,000
Stalinodorfsky	100,000	35,000
Freidorfsky	100,000	20,000
Larindorfsky	100,000	20,000
Birobidzhan	4,000 000	20,000

The Jewish autonomous districts have existed for ten years. During this time, as L. Zinger points out (in his "Die Soziale Aufrichtung"), in these districts 17 collective farms had been created, 8 machine-tractor stations had been built, and 113 schools had been established, of which 42 were high schools and 4 technical schools. Two daily newspapers and one monthly magazine are published there. There is also one musical-ballet school, two theatres, a library, a movie theatre, etc."

Mark Slonim, well-known in Russian-Jewish émigré circles' also writes as enthusiastically about the activity of COMZET and its results. In his sketch "Jewish Writers in Soviet Literature", published in the collection II "Jewish

World" (New York), Slonim writes:

"In some cases Jews recognized themselves as a national minority, having the right to cultural autonomy. In literature, little is said about the life of the Birobidzhan Republic, in which, as in some collective farms of the Ukraine, the official language is Jewish (school instructions are also conducted in it). In these districts before the war a kind of special form of existence and daily living had been created for those who, by force of organic gravity or conscious decision, did not want to submit to assimilation and desired to preserve their national peculiarities. With a special love Jewish writers depicted Birobidzhan, where young people, overcoming all difficulties and struggling with severe natural conditions, are building the "Jewish-Soviet home" with enthusiasm. The poet, N. Fefer, ardently believes in a bright future for this endeavor:

I walk on marble boulders,
Whisper in Jewish forgetfully,
While mountain brook, slowing down
Its run makes a noise in amazement...
A future city is shining for me,
Structures of marble appear to me...
And upon the marble slabs I read
There is a wonderful time coming...

From the very beginning of COMZET activities the Jewish attitude to the creation of their "national territories" was invariably positive. It was so positive that it used to turn all Jews frequently into exaltation, both the Soviet ones, as well as Jewish emigrants, and even those who had no links with the history of the history of Russia whatsoever. All approved and supported it, and foreign Jews generously sacrificed for this affair.

The creation of the "Jewish Republic of Birobidzhan" provoked special enthusiasm. Because there the Jews were complete masters and could create life according to their own discretion. In the widely distributed "Illustrated History of Jewish People", written by Natan Auzubell, a separate chapter has been dedicated to Birobidzhan, giving many

illustrations. The book has sustained nine editions. From the illustrations in the book, the reader can see that towns and settlements with good houses and roads and even established bus communications were built for the settlers.

The persistent and relentless propaganda of OZET was conducted not only within the limits of the USSR — both in Yiddish and in other languages of USSR — but also abroad, and especially in the USA, where it had great success. Through AGROJOINT large sums of money were collected. Furthermore about one thousand Jews from USA went to Birobidzhan to take part in the creation of the Jewish national region.

In the Soviet Union special propaganda films were screened, with the aim of attracting settlers to Birobidzhan. For instance, the film "Way to Happiness" pictured the journey to Birobidzhan and success of the Jewish settlers there. At that time, the most popular song in the USSR was from this film: "Wind blows, rain pours... Pinia carries gold..."

(Due to overdoing and exaggeration of characters portrayed in the film, it was soon banned as a bearer of "anti-Semitic after-taste"). But the propaganda activity of OZET was not stopped.

However, the results of this whole campaign were less than modest. The prospect of turning into farmers or pioneers in the Far East little tempted the Jews. Now that they had become citizens of the USSR, with equal and full rights, they have reached their main objective, which is to be part of that body which made up the ruling class of the USSR. There was hardly any increase in the Jewish population of Birobidzhan.

At the First Zionist Congress in Basel in 1897, the founder of Zionism, Theodor Herzl, said: "We do not want to turn Jews into peasants... ". He foresaw and understood that the future of Jewry lies not in transforming Jews to peasants. His followers in the USSR who created OZET did not understand this; this is why they did not meet with success, in spite of enormous means and energy spent on "turning Jews into peasants", and what is more, not in the "Promised Land", but in dispersion.

The exact figures as to what the total cost was to the State of the USSR and to donors are unknown. The total expenses of this "fancy" of creating Jewish national districts and the region of Birobidzhan cannot be given

because they were not published, in spite of the love of communist rulers for all kinds of statistics, figures and plans.

Nevertheless, one can get some idea about the whole venture on the basis of indirect data that was published.

First of all, a start can be made with the quantity of hectares of fertile land allotted the Jewish settlers. Excluding Birobidzhan, 420,000 hectares of land were allotted to 105,000 Jewish settlers, in the five agricultural national districts, named above. This amounts to more than 4 hectares of land per person. And if we take an average family as consisting of 5 persons, then it comes to 20 hectares of land per family. The overwhelming majority of peasant-farmers did not have such a quantity of land in those districts which bordered on the newly-created Jewish districts. All the necessary elements to make these agricultural settlements prosper were present. But in reality, not only was there no prosperity but after a period everything was neglected. And by the beginning of the war the "Blooming Jewish agricultural settlements and districts" existed only in the imaginations of those who themselves never saw them, but only wished them to be "blooming".

How this happened is described in detail by one agronomist who, on orders from the government, took part in the organization of these districts and was witness to the results (see the supplement in the Part II of this work).

The description refers only to the Freidorfsky district, but same thing happened in all the other districts.

As for Birobidzhan, well, the conditions there were quite different. The vast territory was only sparsely settled by Jews in spite of all the propaganda and material help. And, although this was the Jewish national region, in which everything was in Yiddish, there were not many Jews. The majority of the population of the Jewish Birobidzhan was not Jewish, but consisted of the Great-Russians, Ukrainians and others. True, there were newspapers published in Yiddish, books printed in Yiddish, learning institutions created, buildings erected (by non-Jewish labor), radio programs broadcasted in Yiddish... But it is impossible to understand, for whom this all was, because the proportion of non-Jewish population there was considerably higher than of Jewish.

The unsuccessful attempt to create for the Jews their own Jewish national republic, with every possible assistance from the state apparatus of the country, merits lengthier consideration.

After the revolution, Soviet power guaranteed "national autonomy" to ethnic minorities. This guarantee, however, had the condition that the group claiming national autonomy had to be in the majority on that territory on which a national autonomous district, region or a republic was to be created.

The Jews of the USSR were dispersed throughout the country and in no place did they have a sufficient amount of territory (other than some settlements and small towns) on which they could make up a majority of the population. It was decided, therefore, to create such a territory by means of migration. The choice of such territory fell on Birobidzhan, in Far East.

This vast almost unpopulated territory of about four million hectares borders on China, across the river Amur. The territory with enormous natural resources, a moderate climate, an abundance of forests and rivers plentiful with fish, was projected to be, at first, the Jewish national region, and then a republic.

Initiators of this venture estimated that in a very short time there would be a Jewish population of at least half a million in Birobidzhan. This would create the prerequisite to proclaim Birobidzhan as the "Jewish Soviet Socialist Republic". For a while, however, in 1928, Birobidzhan was declared as only a Jewish National Region, and 6 years later, in 1934, it was renamed a province.

In consideration of half a million population and more, all the necessary facilities for the new settlers were planned and created. The capital of Birobidzhan was built with comfortable houses, installed electricity and good newly-built roads. A theatre was built and named "Kaganovich", a library was built and named "Sholom Alaichem", with 110,000 books in the Yiddish and Russian languages. Besides that, 44 library reading halls were built throughout the Birobidzhan. Throughout the region, 132 schools were opened, with instructions mainly in Yiddish, including four secondary schools, pedagogical and medical technicums, a railway school, and a music

school. Also opened were the museum of Regional Studies, and the museum of Jewish Culture.

All the institutions of self-governing were organized to work in Yiddish, as well as the courts, the daily newspapers and many other periodical issues.

No resources were spared for all this, neither the government ones nor those that were coming from the USA through AGROJOINT.

The new settlers, for whom all this was created, were arriving very slowly and in small parties. Because they did not have qualifications as building workers and in general were people not used to physical labor. It was necessary to use non-Jewish labor for the realization of the plan. And, in fact, all that was envisaged in the plan of creating the "Jewish Republic" was built by non-Jewish hands.

Jewish pioneers who might have wished to build their own "Jewish home" with their own hands were nowhere or almost nowhere to be found. Neither were many of the pioneers found who wished to go to Birobidzhan to settle in houses already built for them. They preferred to go to Moscow, where, at the end of the Thirties, according to the "Jewish World" numbers steadily increasing.

According to the very same "Jewish World" (p. 381), there was only a total of 20,000 Jews altogether in Birobidzhan at the end of the thirties. Any further influx had ceased, in spite of all the propaganda and the great possibilities for development of national-cultural activity.

The failure of the undertaking was obvious. In 1938, the Government of the USSR decided to liquidate COMZET, and at the same time informed AGROJOINT of the USA that there was no further need of their money for the Jewish farmers of the USSR.

According to data given in the "Illustrated History of Jewish People" (by Nathan Auzubell, New York, 1960), in 1941 the whole population of Birobidzhan was 113,930 among whom less than one-third were Jews. But nothing is said about how much less. The only mention is that "a tendency has been detected in the reduction of the number of settlers in Birobidzhan".

In reality, however, the problem was not only in reduction of the number of new arrivals but in Jews leaving the Birobidzhan altogether. This is supported by the official statistics data, published in 1965, in the reference book, "Population of the Globe" (p. 59).

The following is given about Birobidzhan: "Jewish autonomous region (part of Khabarovsk territory). Area – 36 thousand square kilometers. Population, according to the 1959 census, is 162.9 thousand. (At the beginning of 1965 it was 172 thousand.) The main nationalities (in thousands) were: Russian – 127.3; Ukrainian – 4.4; Jewish – 4.3".

As these figures show, the Jews in the Jewish Birobidzhan at the present time make up not only "less than one-third" but an altogether insignificant minority.

What this Jewish minority of four thousand is doing in the specially created "Jewish National Region" cannot be said precisely. There is a conviction, in wide circles of the USSR that those Jews who remain in Birobidzhan are all in commanding posts, but not at all in labor positions.

How much of this is true is impossible to verify at the present time. The official statistics of the USSR, as well as Jewish emigrants who watch the life of their fellow tribesmen in the USSR from day to day, maintain silence about this.

Thirty-Year Total

During their whole sojourn of two thousand years in dispersion, the Jews have always provoked a well-known repulsion in all the nations in which they lived, considering themselves to be "the state without territory, but with its own laws". This repulsion frequently manifested itself in direct limitations and hampered opportunities the Jews had for advancement in most of the diverse spheres of the life of the state or people among whom they lived.

To overcome these limitations and difficulties, the Jews had to spend a lot of strength and energy, much more than would the native population of a country. The Jews however did not have fewer aspirations to occupy the well-known positions in a country, but much more than the native population, because from infancy they had been brought up with the consciousness that Jews are "God's Chosen People".

There were times when the Jews were forced by circumstances to restrain and not to reveal these aspirations. Enormous reserves of potential energy would be accumulated, but because of the prevailing situation of Judaeophobia they could not find an outlet for its use. Judaeophobia was characteristic to most countries in which the Jewish groups lived.

But whenever Judaeophobic feelings were relaxed in a country and a favorable regard for Jews began to appear, those aspirations for power which were previously restrained and concealed would wildly manifest themselves and the Jews quickly occupied leading positions in a country.

According to Professor Solomon Lourie, the author of the book "Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World", "then the Jews had so much of that free energy left which they previously spent on a struggle with special anti-Semitic obstacles that frequently the inertia gained from their previous efforts in the continuing struggle caused them to go beyond the point that they themselves, perhaps, anticipated. So when, for a short period of time in Egypt, a party that renounced its traditional politics of Judaeophobia came to power, the most prominent positions were occupied by Jews. (Here he has in mind the Ptolemaic Dynasty in the First Century A.D. For a detailed account, see Part II of this work.)

Something like this happened in Russia in the year 1917, when previously existing limitations for Jews were abolished. The Jews immediately rushed

to occupy those positions in the country's life which were previously inaccessible to them. Only this time they succeeded much more than they did in Egypt under Ptolemy IV. Hardly a year had passed before they had practically turned themselves into the ruling class, occupying an overwhelming majority of the key positions in all the branches of the country's life and the state apparatus.

They preserved this privileged position of theirs right up to the beginning of the Second World War.

We will try now to sum up what heights the Russian Jewry, on the whole, reached in this period, lasting thirty years from 1917-1947, and what damage it suffered as an isolated ethnic group (for this they were) during their whole sojourn on Russian territory, right up to 1917.

Their achievements were enormous, far beyond that which the Jews had ever before achieved.

As indicated above, they became the ruling, privileged class, with all the ensuing consequences. It can be said without exaggeration that their influence on the entire life of the country and its population and on the internal and external politics of the state was decisive.

In previous times, in other countries and among other nations the attainment of power was an opportunity for the Jews to accumulate material wealth, which they handed down to their descendants or relatives. The inheritors, thus, were provided with secure positions in a social and political system of the future.

Such opportunity did not exist in the Socialist Soviet Union, where private property was abolished. Under the new system the basic prerequisite for success in life was education. It was education plus relative and tribal connections with the ruling class that ensured corresponding positions and a life-long career for the descendants of this class.

Understanding this, the Russian Jewry poured in a great stream into the highest learning institutions and filled them in a proportion that in no way corresponded with the proportion that the Jews constituted of the total population. During their first thirty years in power as a ruling class, the Jews were able to give the highest education to so many of their fellow tribesmen that even now the percentage of Jews who are citizens of USSR

with a higher education outnumbers the non-Jewish percentage many times.

The achievements in this sphere were enormous and impossible to ignore. The ruling class, however, ignored the opinions and feelings of the native population.

The achievements mentioned entailed many consequences, however, which caused great harm to Jewry and its daily life and unity, and it is doubtful whether they can be remedied.

This damage, first of all, manifested itself in the deviation of all the Jewry of the USSR, and its young people in particular, from the Hebrew religion, religion which was and still is inseparably linked with the Jewish origin and peculiarities of their daily life. The religion, which served throughout centuries as a reliable faithful safeguard against the dissolution of Jews in the surrounding environment, was being deserted. It is this dissolution that the Jews of the world fear the most, and against which they carry on a fierce struggle.

Life turned out to be stronger than the decaying scholastic-mystic lines. As a result all the attempts of the Jewish political parties, such as the "Bund", the "Pale-Zion" and the "Zionist-Socialists", to combine the faithfulness of the Hebrew religion with the faithfulness of atheistic Marxism-communism, came to nothing.

The attempts by the "Evsecs" to establish the Jewish national region, learning institutions, as well as the Jewish "personal-national" autonomy with the cultural establishments, turned out to be a very expensive venture for the whole population of the USSR. The venture, which was explained above, suffered complete failure. Furthermore, the cause of this failure was by no means a counteraction by the native population, but by the Jews themselves.

The numerous Jews at the beginning of the revolution who combined faithfulness to the Talmud with the faithfulness to the communist dogmas (for instance, Isaac Babel) quickly began to vanish. The "Evsecs" and their followers were leaving the scene without being able to create replacements for themselves from among their own young generation.

The assimilationist attitudes of the Jewry inseparably linked with the deviation from the Talmud and the secluded daily life began to grow and to get stronger. Mixed marriages, substitution of the spoken "Yiddish" language by Russian in daily life, indeed a reluctance to even study "Yiddish" in which, according to the last census (1959) only twenty per cent of the Jews, citizens of USSR, could read or write, all these are signs without a doubt of the assimilation process, which was quite voluntary.

The process, however, did not work too quickly, owing to the presence of the irrational repulsion, preserved even now in Jews, of those whom their ancestors called "goyim". It is this repulsion that hinders mixed marriages and full assimilation into a culture with a surrounded environment. Subconsciously, the Jews themselves, not realizing this, continue to divide all people into "ours" and "not ours". The continuation of this division goes on at a much slower pace, than the deviation from the religion and language. When this situation will be overcome is impossible to predict.

The damage to Russian Jewry, as a result of its turning into the ruling class, was not limited to the sphere of the religious and cultural life of Jews in USSR. The attitude of the whole population of the USSR towards Jewry as a whole had sharply changed. It had changed not only among the broad national masses but also among the Russian intelligentsia, which traditionally was inclined to be friendly towards the Jews. During the introduction of measures by the new power, the excessive, very striking Jewish activity engendered a sharply negative attitude among the population. The measures and those who affected them radically changed the attitude of the population towards the Jews, even those individuals who were always Judaeophiles. This came to light as early as the first years of Soviet power. It is about this that E. Kuskova wrote in her article entitled "Who are they?" published in the Jewish émigré newspaper. This article is given in Part II of this work. Later on, the causes which engendered negative feeling towards the Jews grew. The causes were: the enormous percentage of Jews in the organs of Cheka, their atheistic activities, the humiliation of the national feelings of people and of the monuments of its culture, the eradication of the very word "Russian" and all the activities of the power directed towards the destruction of much of what for the people was sacred.

At the same time, the very striking relative Jewish material well-being contrasted against the background of general famine and the shortage of all

necessities, from which the whole population of the country suffered, could not, of course, contribute to favorable feelings toward the Jews. Thus the consolidated anti-Jewish feelings had brought forth their fruits: feelings which revealed themselves only in the face of fear of severe punishment.

These anti-Jewish feelings had nothing in common with that feeling which is called "anti-Semitism". Its causes were not at all in the religio-racial sphere, but were solely and exclusively in the material sphere, resulting from the discontent of the hungry and the poor, in observing the life of the well-nourished and the rich, who moreover were strangers. These strangers disregarded and scorned the national past and the national culture of the people among whom they lived and whom they ruled.

The people were aware and noticed all these occurrences. The ruling class alone did not notice these occurrences and treated them as "counter-revolutionary" activities and "remnants of the past".

However, Russian Jewry as a whole suffered such moral damage as a result that restoration would be virtually impossible. Jewry, if not forever, then for a long time, lost hope in the possibility of good relations with that people, in whose land they lived and are still living.

The ruling class caused further damage to themselves and to the Russian people. This damage resulted from their very existence and from their unpunished destructive work wrought on the historical past of the great nation. By doing this the new ruling class gave Hitler and his followers an enticing example of how an insignificant alien minority can control and rule a huge country, disregarding everyone and everything.

This argument was often used by the German National Socialists in their propaganda. "Replace three million Jews, who are rulers of Russia, by three million Germans, and everything will be in order". Such thoughts were not once expressed by German propagandists in their psychological preparation to master Russia. These thoughts, of course, were addressed to Germans.

The propaganda that poured from Germany into the USSR tirelessly repeated again and again that the "Jews rule Russia", and gave a great many names and facts. It is impossible not to acknowledge that this propaganda found attentive listeners in the USSR and had a definite influence on the attitudes of the national masses.

The ruling class of the USSR, however, in its propaganda, operated more with proletarian, international slogans, which quite sufficiently set people's teeth on edge during the last quarter century and did not have much effect on the masses. This is exactly what came to light during the first months of the war.

The "war for the proletariat" and the "Third International" did not inspire anyone, and bragging of the ruling class about the "complete military readiness" of the USSR was not convincing.

Moreover, what should not be lost sight of is that fresh memories were still alive and harbored within the people about those periods, when the whole population was starving and experiencing acute need in everything, while at the same time the Jews were receiving help from their fellow tribesmen abroad, and were in an immeasurably better situation than all the non-Jews. If the people did not protest and did not commit mutiny, it does not mean that they did not see, or did not understand, or did not take notice of what was happening.

Millions of those who were "repressed" and dispossessed as kulaks were still alive while members of their families, relatives, and even friends, were interned in camps, which, as was well known to all, were managed almost exclusively by the Jews.

True, these "unreliable" elements, from a political point of view, were not in the regular units of the Red Army, but in case of war and general mobilization it was impossible to prevent their penetration into the ranks of the army. This without any doubt could well have affected the spirit and moral of the army in the case of a big war.

It must be assumed that, taking this into account, the USSR tried in every possible way to avoid a clash with Germany or even to postpone it as long as possible.

The agreement with Germany in the summer of 1939 was accepted by all the ruling class of USSR without protest and objection, even though this agreement was with the most wicked enemy of Jewry, with German anti-Semites, although the ruling class of USSR was entirely under the influence of Jews who comprised its most sizeable and influential part. This agreement was also approved by the Comintern, also consisting mainly of Jews.

Huge trains, loaded with raw materials needed to conduct the war, started to roll from USSR into Germany. The ruling class was buying time with this from the aggressive German Nazism, if not finally, at least for the time being. This calculation, it must be acknowledged, was right, if the Germans had stuck in the West. But an unforeseen and unprovided for event occurred. The bloodless German victory over all its enemies in Europe freed the powerful German war machine, and it rushed on Russia and the Second World War began.

Still, before it began, for almost two years the Germans were in command in Poland. There, the Germans showed with the utmost clarity what sort of treatment the Jewish citizens of the USSR could expect in case of war with Germany and occupation by its army, even temporarily, of the Soviet territory where the Jews lived.

The Government of USSR and its whole ruling class knew this very well, and nevertheless, when the war started, it turned out that no necessary measures were taken in time to save the Jews. At that time, if they so desired, the Jews could have taken the necessary measures in advance. It is, therefore, not the fault of the Russian people that a certain number of Jews, citizens of the USSR, were destroyed by the Germans. The blame for this lies on that ruling class that is the Jews, who did not take the necessary measures in time.

It is difficult to understand the indifference that Soviet diplomats showed toward Jewish destiny in Poland during the conclusion of the agreement with the Germans in August 1939, when the destiny of the Polish Jews was actually predetermined. Yet, had the Soviet diplomats shown during the talks even the slightest desire to accept, as immigrants into USSR, all the Jews from that part of Poland occupied by the Germans, the Germans would not have protested against it, but would have welcomed it in every possible way. It is also logical, because the three million Polish Jews were neither needed nor useful to the Germans, but were considered only unnecessary ballast.

During the talks, before signing the agreement, repatriation of the Ukrainians and the Byelorussians was discussed. The question was solved by mutual agreement, allowing those who would wish to repatriate themselves on the Soviet side to cross the USSR-German demarcation line. The Germans were not against this repatriation, if they so desired, of

insignificant Ukrainian and Byelorussian groups from the territories falling under their administration.

After the question dealing with Ukrainians and Byelorussians was settled, Ribbentrop proposed to Molotov: "Would you like to take three million Jews?" In reply there was dead silence from the Soviet delegation. The question about the Jews was "isolated" for discussion afterwards, but was never discussed. Neither the Germans, who stood by their proposal, nor the Soviet Government raised this question again.

After the capitulation of Germany, when numerous diplomatic documents became publicly known, it was impossible to find a trace or indication anywhere that this question was discussed at all or that the Germans had proposed to the USSR to accept all the Jews from Poland.

The fact that such an important question was not entered anywhere into protocols is unlikely. It would be nearer to the truth to assume that this German proposal, and the USSR's reaction to it, was omitted when details of the agreement between Hitler and Stalin were announced. Perhaps this was done in order not to give a basis to the accusations that the USSR, albeit indirectly, contributed to the destruction of the Polish Jews.

To clear up this question will be a matter for future historians and investigators of this epoch. It is impossible for us, as contemporaries, to do this. A great deal is still inaccessible for study and impossible to publish. Nevertheless, to remain true to historical facts that took place, we not only can but must indicate what subjects should be studied in the future.

We must ensure that not only the still inaccessible documents should be left for future research, and facts pointed out, but also opinions expressed, suppositions and hypotheses stated, which although were not printed anywhere, nevertheless existed, were discussed and talked about. Because these can easily fall out from a field of observation of future historians.

During the war I had an opportunity to hear about Ribbentrop's proposal from different well-informed Germans, close to the ruling circles of that time, and also from prominent members of the Soviet Communist Party. The latter were in Moscow at the time of the German-Soviet talks, and according to them, they heard about this from people occupying high posts in the Ministry.

For example, Zhelenkov, who was chairman of the Moscow Soviet (Mayor of Moscow) in 1939 and, later, in 1944, chief editor of the newspaper "Volia Noroda" (organ of the Vlasov Movement), told about Ribbentrop's proposal, and about how Stalin reacted to it. When Molotov reported the proposal to Stalin, Stalin said: "we must think it over", but he did not give any immediate answer. Only on the next day, upon summoning Molotov, he told him briefly: "the proposal of Ribbentrop is not suitable... It is not worth it... Don't say a word about it..." and the question of three million Polish Jews during the talks was not raised again.

With the Stalin's brief phrase: "it is not worth it" the destiny of Polish Jews was decided.

Stalin, without a doubt, was well-informed about the anti-Jewish feelings of the broad national masses of USSR. He took into account that an appearance of three million Jews, accustomed to the Polish conditions of life, quite different from those of the USSR, inevitably would lead to many conflicts, which would not bring any benefits either to the country or to the regime. On the other hand, leaving them in the grace or disgrace of the Germans (at that time the shooting and burning had not yet taken place) more than probably would provoke intensification of anti-German sentiments in the USA, which in fact did happen. This was due to the fact that there was hardly any Jew in Poland that did not have relatives in USA. It is impossible to deny that Stalin was capable of grasping the situation. Indeed, for him personally, and for the whole Government of USSR "it was not worth it" to show humanity and to save the Polish Jews. Regardless of this fact, already indicated above, at that time the Jews in the USSR occupied leading positions in all the spheres of life, and especially in diplomatic circles. But in this case they were compelled to subordinate their pro-Jewish sympathies to the pitiless dogma of the Communist International and silently follow Stalin's instructions in this matter without question.

Being unwilling to turn the USSR into a refuge for Jews fleeing from Hitler Stalin did not limit his refusal to Ribbentrop's proposal about the three million Jews. They were not "admitted into the USSR" even when they attempted one by one or by small groups to cross the border of the USSR after the liquidation of Poland and establishment of the demarcation line between the USSR and Germany.

In his book "Jews in the Soviet Union" (New York, 1966), Solomon Schwartz describes in detail numerous incidents when the Soviet frontier authorities not only did not allow the Jews to pass into Soviet territory but also forcefully returned them to the Germans. At that time there was a flood of Jews who tried to get into the Soviet Union without visas or similar documents.

No one disputes the fact that this was actually so. Everyone knows that these events took place in October of 1939, immediately after the Polish capitulation and the establishment of the frontier line between the USSR and Germany, as a result of the "friendship" agreement signed a couple of weeks before. It is natural and normal that the countries, having agreed to friendly relations, must observe the existing worldwide rules about the entrance into a country by subjects of another country, even if they are from a friendly country. It is to these rules that Soviet authorities adhered, preventing the penetration into its territory of anyone without corresponding permission. Therefore, no exceptions were made for the Jews.

This circumstance, that there were no exceptions made for the Jews, makes Mr. Schwartz indignant. Mr. Schwartz, who as a lawyer by education, should have known that no country in the world makes exceptions for anyone, including the Jews. He also should know the other circumstance that, according to the law, a permit to cross the border is necessary' whoever it may be, even a Jew, and the severest punishment, immeasurably more severe than in non-socialist countries, existed for the violation of this law.

Enumeration of all the cases of non-admission without a permit into the USSR only testifies to the vigilance of the Red Army, which was entrusted by the government to guard the borders. Mr. Schwartz ought to know this and, with his indignation, should not demonstrate his utter lack of comprehension of elementary norms of law.

There is no doubt that had there been corresponding instructions from the government, all the Jews would have been admitted without hindrance to the territory of the USSR, without any kind of visa or permit. Moreover, in the past there were cases when the Russian Government used to admit thousands of people whose lives were threatened in the country of which they were subjects without any visas. These cases are well-known to all

Armenians and Balkan Christians, who, escaping from the Turkish slaughter, were admitted to Russia in unlimited numbers. But in October of 1939 nobody slaughtered and shot the Jews, simply because they were Jews. This began much later, in 1941.

Why the ruling class of the USSR did not obtain instructions about the passing of the Jews into the USSR is a special question. The Jews of the USSR undoubtedly wished to help their own fellow tribesmen. What held them back from pressing for an easy admission of the Jews into USSR?

We find the answer to this question in one of the articles in the "Socialist Herald" which gave the account of Krushchov's purported statement made at the beginning of 1944, in Kiev, after its liberation by the Soviet Army: "They (the Jews) were unwilling to help, because the population would identify Soviet power with the Jews". One Jewess, Ruzha Godes, who succeeded in camouflaging herself under the Russian nationality and survived the occupation in Kiev, complained to Krushchov that she was refused employment in a government department just because she was Jewess. To this Krushchov said the following: "I understand that you, as a Jewess, look at this question from a subjective point of view, but we are objective. Jews in the past have committed many sins against the Ukrainian people. The people hate them for this. In our Ukraine we do not need the Jews. And, I think that for the Ukrainian Jews who survived Hitler's attempts to destroy them, it would be better if they did not try to return here. It would be better for them to go to the Birobidzhan. You see, here we are in the Ukraine. Do you understand? This is the Ukraine. And we are not interested that the Ukrainian people would interpret the return of Soviet power as the return of the Jews". He stated this with the utmost clarity and precision. (See the article in Part II of L this work.)

And without any doubt, what Krushchov said in 1944, Stalin knew perfectly well in 1939, when he turned down the German suggestion that the USSR take all the Polish Jews. Although he was a dictator, he could not ignore the feeling of the population, and if to the three million Soviet Jews were added three million Polish Jews, this could provoke consequences undesirable not only to Stalin himself but also to the Jewish ruling class as well. This probably was the cause of the indifferent attitude to the fate of the Polish Jews.

A few years before 1939, this possibility was foreseen by the writers Aronson and Portugaise, as is mentioned in the previous account. They, as we recall, regarded it possible and probable that, for those in whose hands was the power of the USSR, it would be advantageous not only to disavow themselves from any kind of defense of the Jews but also even to become their persecutors. This will be carried out, they prophesized.

As the subsequent events have shown, the pessimistic predictions of Aronson and Portugaise partly, but to a significant degree, came true.

True, no "persecution" against the Jews had ever occurred in the USSR, but the feeling of the population was taken into account and to avoid the possibility of the occurrence of great disturbances and dissatisfaction, that were especially dangerous in view of possible war, the Jews were thus "quietly" removed from the most obvious and responsible positions and replaced with representatives of the other nationalities of the country.

This was done without loud trials or the noise of newspapers, but it was firmly and steadfastly achieved nonetheless.

The population, of course, noticed this. And it is impossible not to acknowledge that these measures of the ruling power did not provoke dissatisfaction.

So it went during the war, especially when the dissatisfaction of the population with the Jewish privileged position in the USSR became so clear.

The War Years

Was the war with Germany unexpected for the ruling class of the USSR or was it foreseen and expected? Up to now it is still not established with certainty.

Several well-informed investigators of this question and authors of memoirs hold the opinion that Stalin expected either to avoid the war completely or to enter into it at a moment most suitable to him.

In support of the latter supposition we find the circumstance that, as the events have shown, the armed forces of the USSR, of course, could not have happened, if Stalin had anticipated the possibility of sudden German attack.

The war put the question pointblank before the Russian Jewry, subjects of the USSR, regarding their total physical extermination if the Germans were not defeated or repulsed.

For the ruling class, in which the Jews played such an enormous rôle, the war was a verification and examination of the attitude of the whole Soviet population toward the Jews. This attitude was to take definite and predetermined form by the end of the war.

Participation in a war, it is known, is not limited only to immediate participation in battles and fights and a show of personal bravery, sacrifice and talents of military leadership. The home front, in its broadest meaning, is an organization of whole country's resources and corresponding propaganda. As it is in the country so it is outside, the home front plays an enormous rôle, and on a well organized home front also depends the final victory.

Understanding this, the Jews of the USSR had shown from the very beginning of the war their feverish activity, aiming at the ultimate victory over the Germans, while underlining Jewish active participation in the war activities at the front. For example, at the first Jewish meeting in Moscow, as the sole non-Jewish speaker, a Red Army soldier named Kuznetsov spoke, praising "the sons of the Jewish people" for their heroic deeds at the front. Several months after the beginning of the war, Soviet Jews held a congress in Moscow. The congress published an appeal to the "whole of Jewry", calling for support of the USSR, in every possible way, in the war

with Germany. In Moscow the "Jewish anti-Fascist Committee" was created to develop propaganda activity, and this consisted almost exclusively of Jews.

The world press, outside of Germany, was full of reports about active Jewish participation in the war and their military bravery and sacrifices.

True to character the atheistic Soviet power permitted what would have been unthinkable earlier in conducting the propaganda. So, for example, in the "Jewish World" (the Collection 11 of 1944, New York) we read the following: "During the big Jewish holidays in 1941, the synagogues of Moscow, Leningrad and Kharkov were filled with the praying, not only with people of the old generation but also with the young Jewish soldiers fighting in the ranks of the Red Army. During Easter Week of 1942, for the first time since the October Revolution, big public Seders were arranged" (p. 237).

What impression this report could have made on the conservative Jewish circles, which had a well known "repulsion" for the USSR and the cause of official atheism proclaimed there, hardly merits comment.

And on the 20th December, 1941, the Moscow radio station, broadcasted in Polish, and repeated on the next day five times in German, "comparing the successful Russian winter offensive with the miracle of Maccabeus. The Germans were reminded that the 134th Nuremberg Division, named after that city in which the racial legislation came into being, was annihilated exactly in Hanukkah Week when the Jews celebrate the victory over the oppressors of the Jewish people" (quot. from the book "Jewish World", p. 238).

Side by side with this in the foreign press the courage of individual Jews at the front was regularly reported, as well as reports of the number of rewards received by Jews for brave deeds. So, for example, only in the first fifteen months of the war, five thousand one hundred and sixty three Jews received decorations for bravery. The Soviet Army had one hundred generals who were Jews, and besides that, it was possible to find in each new list records of decorations and promotions of many Jewish generals...

E. Stalinsky, a Jewish emigrant, in his article "Jews in the Red Army", published in 1944 in the USA, enumerates a great number of Jews distinguished in the war, and also those with the Gold Star on their chests

— Hero of the Soviet Union (the highest award). He ends his enumeration with the words: "their list is too long to include in the frame of this small article".

Neither will we enumerate them. We can add only one comment that, to establish who among the generals or the heroes is Jewish and who is not does not appear possible, for when promotions and decorations are made neither tribal nor national origin is mentioned. How Jews establish this is unknown. Moreover, many Jews have pure Russian names and surnames, such as General Karponosov, Barinov and Zlatotzvetov, for example.

No one disputes the presence of the Jews in the Red Army in different ranks, up to and including the rank of general. It is true, that, at the beginning of the revolution, a Jew, Bronstein, known as Trotsky, commanded the whole armed forces of the country, and the political part was also in the hands of the Jew named Gamarnik, but this was not during the Second World War, Neither were there Jews among the commanders of the fronts nor army groups, individual armies or even corps commanders. The Jewish generals were more in the home front departments, military technical units and military medical units, to name only few. But there were Jews, of course, in combat units, some of whom were also killed and wounded. There were even generals in the engineer-technical service, for example, General Naftaly Aronovich Frenkel, or General Iakov Danilovich Rapoport, who were preoccupied with concentration camps and maintaining order in them.

But all of them, on the front as well as behind, on the home front, made every effort not to fall into German hands, which was for them certain death.

For a Jew, regardless of his rank, if he fell prisoner, there was no possibility of surviving and ending the war alive. That kind of possibility existed and was used by the Jews in the First World War, but not in the Second World War. Owing to this, Jews who were in the ranks of the Red Army did not display any defeatist feelings and fought for conscience and for fear, if they could not obtain their release from the front. (This was a reserved warrant against the military draft, given to those whose profession was deemed necessary to the war industry).

A great number of the Soviet Jews had such reserved warrants. This was noticed by the whole country and provoked feelings far from friendly toward the Jews.

The reserved warrants were given to executives in the different sectors of important industries and, at the time of evacuation, these specialists were evacuated first, of course, with their families and possessions. And because an overwhelming majority of these executives were Jews, who during the evacuation saved also their families, it appeared that only the Jews were evacuating, occupying rail and auto transport.

The Government of the USSR, taking into consideration the danger for the Jews of falling into German hands, endeavored on its own part to evacuate the Jews first.

This last circumstance, of every possible assistance by the Government of the USSR in undertaking to save the Jews in the face of the German offensive, is hushed up by the world Jewry or even denied altogether by some Jewish investigators of this question. To acknowledge this means to acknowledge also something positive done for the Jews by the Government of the USSR, Government which from the end of Forties is in great disgrace in the eyes of the world Jewry, who accuse it of "anti-Semitism" and "persecution" of Jews.

But during the war years, the Jews used to speak of the Soviet Union quite differently. Mark Vishniak, one of the initiators in the creation of the central organ for the struggle with anti-Semitism, at the meeting of the Jewish Federation in Cleveland in 1943, in published article in the collection "Jewish World" in 1944, is writing the following (p. 98): "The most convinced enemies of the USSR cannot say that the USSR is cultivating anti-Semitism..." Mark Vishniak, the former Secretary of the All-Russian Constituent Assembly and for many years editor of the Tolstoy émigré journal in the Russian language is a highly informed man.

In another place, in the same "Jewish World", we read the confession that "the Soviet Government delivered the necessary transport to save the Jews, even to detriment of the conduct of the war efforts".

An evacuation of the Jews in the face of the attacking Germans went not only by railroad, trucks and automobiles, overloaded by the Jews and their moveable possessions, (frequently including furniture and even pianos) but

also on horses harnessed to carriages and carts. The Germans bombed railway lines and big highways, but it was comparatively safe to travel on the country roads. This is why many Jews preferred this method of evacuation: although it was slow, it was safe. The Jews, when evacuating, received written directions from city councils to the chairmen of collective farms and state farms, and upon presentation of the directions, they got a pair of horses with a buggy and required fodder. With such directions the Soviet Jews travelled during their evacuation by the country roads changing their horses and replenishing fodder on the way until they could reach a railway station safe from German bombers, to embark on trains to go on further to the land behind the Ural Mountains. At such railway stations the escaping Jews left their horses and buggies to the mercy of fate.

The German army, during its offensive, discovered, a few miles from the provincial city of Sumy, not far from Kharkov, many thousands of abandoned horses with wrung withers and hurt shoulders that were therefore unfit to be harnessed. These horses had been abandoned by the evacuating Jews who were lucky enough to escape further east. The authorities of Sumy, shortly before the Germans came, organized a veterinary hospital, with the aim of giving the horses treatment and making them suitable for harnessing.

So, by all ways and means possible, a wave of Jewish evacuees was moving toward the east ahead of the advancing Germans.

According to a statement made by the Soviet Jewish writer Bergelson, 80% of the Jews who resided in the regions occupied by the Germans were evacuated. Only in the cities, like Kiev, for example, where there was no time to evacuate all the Jews, the Germans, because of their quick advance, were able to trap and destroy certain number of them.

The exact number of Jews destroyed by the Germans in the occupied regions of the USSR has not been established for certain even today, in 1966. For example, even the figure concerning the largest mass destruction of Jews in Kiev (Baby Yar — 1941) cannot be considered absolutely exact. At different times, different authors and investigators quote different numbers. At first it was said that seventy or eighty thousand were destroyed; now this number has fallen to thirty four thousand. To establish the exact number is the task of future objective investigators of this question, if it is at all feasible. It is necessary to take into consideration that

the Germans used to destroy not only the Jews, by mass shooting, as it was at the Baby Yar. They also destroyed many other nationalities by mass starvation in the prisoner of war camps, as happened in the Darnitz, only a few kilometers from the Baby Yar. In the prisoner of war camps at Darnitz tens of thousands of those six hundred and sixty five thousand Soviet soldiers and officers who were trapped in the Kiev encirclement in September of 1941 perished from starvation and deprivation. The exact number of these prisoners who perished is also unknown; however, it is beyond doubt that their number was definitely not less than, but larger than the number of Jews shot at the Baby Yar.

Generally speaking, each objective investigator of the question concerning the evacuation of the Jews at the time of the German advance cannot fail to recognize that those in those hands the power of the USSR at that time was did everything possible to save the Jews. They often did it to the detriment of even native population, toward whom there was immeasurably less concern (or none whatsoever) than to the representatives of the Jewish ethnic group. The people saw this, but, chained by fear, they kept silent, not daring to raise their voice in protest.

Only rarely, in a moment of panic, these feelings broke through and it was possible to hear from a crowd "of second class citizens", that is, the non-Jews, words of indignation and threats, but the representatives of the ruling class, who were in charge of the evacuation, put forward the appearance that they did not hear it or attempted affectionately to persuade and reassure the protestors.

In the war years, and also in the first years after the end of the war, the fact that the Soviet power helped to save the Jews in all possible ways was considered beyond any doubt. Much of this was written in the periodical press, both Jewish and non-Jewish, outside of the USSR.

Thus Eugene M. Kulisher in the bulletin "Khaiasa" wrote in 1946: "No doubt can be raised that the Soviet authorities undertook special measures for the evacuation of the Jewish population or to alleviate their spontaneous flight. Side by side with government personnel and industrial workers and executives, the priority was given to all the Jews during the evacuation. The Soviet authorities offered thousands of trains especially for the evacuation of the Jews, recognizing that they were the most threatened part of the population".

Later in his extensive work about the migration of the Jewish population, published in 1948 by Columbia University, Kulisher writes: "The whole factory equipment were taken out and, together with trained personnel and other skilled workers' removed from the urban centers. In addition the government employees and broad masses of the Jews were evacuated".

Moshe Kaganovich, the former partisan, published two books of memoirs (one in 1948 in Italy, the other in 1956 in Argentina), in which he categorically confirms that according to the instructions of the Soviet authorities all the available means of transportation were given for the evacuation of the Jews; furthermore, an order was given to evacuate the Jews first.

In the winter of 1946-47, in order to verify everything on the spot, the New York correspondent of the Jewish newspaper "Der Tog" B. Z. Goldberg visited the USSR, and in particular Kiev, and wrote about his impressions and investigations in his article "How Soviet Russia Evacuated the Jews During the War" ("Der Tog" — February 21, 1947).

The author, as he writes, set for himself the task to clear up: "what kind of Soviet policy was used in dealing with the Jewish evacuation". He questioned many about this, both Jews and Christians, military men and those who had been evacuated' and all answered that "the policy of the Soviet authorities was to give priority to the Jews during the evacuation, and to their utmost to pull out as many of them as possible so that the Nazis would not be able to destroy them". Among the persons Goldberg talked to, he also names the Kiev's Rabbi Shekhtman.

The statements given above of several Jewish emigrants completely coincide with numerous eye-witness accounts of those USSR citizens who themselves were in the midst of the events when the evacuation of the Jews was taking place.

And up to the year 1948, when the sharp turnabout came in Jewish relations with the USSR, no one raised this question again. But as soon as it became known that the Jews in the USSR had begun to lose their monopolistic right in ruling the country, everything sharply changed and became subject to reappraisal. Everything was studied, including the question of whether the Soviet Government helped to save the Jews during the war or was indifferent to their fate.

In 1966, a book was written by S. Schwartz entitled "Jews in the USSR from the Beginning of the Second World War", published in New York. In this book the author refutes all the previous statements of different people regarding the Soviet help given in saving the Jews from the Germans and their' timely evacuation. S. Schwartz doubts all that was previously stated and printed about this question, even the evidence of Rabbi Shekhtman, for the simple reason that nowhere in the Soviet press and the Government orders could he find written confirmations that the Jews had to be evacuated in the first place, or that priority had to be given to them. "And if it is not found to documented, it means such a thing did not take place", concludes Solomon Schwartz, forgetting that in this world many events and actions of different governments take place without written orders or confirmations. Nevertheless they in fact did and do take place every day. Nowhere, for example, was the overcrowding by the Jews of the Russian revolutionary parties and its central committees printed, of overcrowding of all kinds Soviet departments, diplomatic and trade missions in foreign countries, of overcrowding of the organs of Cheka and departments of propaganda in the first quarter of this century after the October Revolution. But all this took place and Solomon Schwartz himself cannot even deny this. Nowhere, for example, was it printed that a diplomatic representative of the State of Israel cannot be a person of a non-Jewish tribe or non-Judaic faith. But this rule, though printed nowhere is implemented and strictly carried out in real life in the democratic State of Israel, whose population is more than ten per cent non-Jewish.

That, which S. Schwartz was looking for in the Soviet press and could not find, was not printed for a reason obvious to each objective investigator. This reason was the unwillingness to aggravate the sharply negative attitude of the whole population of the country on account of the privileged position which the Jews occupied in the USSR up to the moment when the war began. To print something akin to which S. Schwartz was looking for and could not find would have been a provocation toward the whole population of the country and could have easily escalated to a consequence undesirable for the whole ruling class. The feelings of the broad masses of the USSR were very well known to those who, at that time, guided the politics and the propaganda of the country. Therefore, nothing was printed, in the interest of the Jews themselves.

But to make up for it, those undertakings were strictly carried out and due to this fact hundreds of thousands of Jews were able to escape German

massacre and were able to safely and happily sit out the war behind the Ural Mountains. The Soviet power can be reproached for other things, but not for its unwillingness to save the Jews.

One does not have to possess a great imagination in order to have an idea of what would have happened, for example in Kiev, during the month of August of 1941 if an order was printed and proclaimed by the authorities concerning the giving of means of transportation for the evacuation of the Jews "to be sent before others". How would the non-Jewish Kievites have reacted to this edict once it was proclaimed? Would they not have had grounds for a mutiny, the reason for which they had already been ripening for two decades?

“Why was it not printed? Why was it not underlined? Why was it not mentioned? Why was it not noted? Why did they not erect a monument for the Jews at the Baby Yar?” S. Schwartz repeats these questions in all manners in his bulky book of four hundred and twenty five pages entitled "Jews in the Soviet Union from the Beginning of the Second World War". The whole population of the USSR, and any investigator who is able to be objective without examining everything from the exclusively subjective Jewish point of view, can give the answer at once to all these questions.

There can be only one answer: "in order not to provoke the irritation and the indignation of the whole population of the country by making out the Jews as the only ones who suffered from Germans, while at the same time immeasurably more non-Jews perished than Jews. In order not to arouse memories of the many million non-Jews who perished in the years of terror and artificial famine, when the country was ruled by the Jews. In order not to resurrect in the people memories of that time when the Jews were ruling Russia, and humiliated its historic past by abolishing and destroying the monuments of its past."

If that is not clear to Mr. Schwartz, who throws the accusation at the whole population of the USSR that they are lacking respect for the perished Jews, it is quite clear to those who now hold the power of the USSR. It is clear and understandable to them and this is why they do not erect SPECIAL monuments for the Jews.

The demand to erect such monuments, which is presented not solely by Mr. Schwartz, only provokes the reverse reaction throughout the whole of the USSR.

This reaction might easily pour out into a demand for the exact calculation of how many lives it cost the whole population of the USSR during the thirty years of oppression when the Jewish class ruled the USSR. This calculation will hardly be profitable for the Jews.

If the Jews are constantly occupied in calculating and recalculating the number of Jews that perished at the hands of the Germans, then it is quite possible that some day the Russian people will take to calculation also. The living memories of the millions who perished from the artificially created famine, when Kaganovich ruled everything in the Ukraine, and the millions who perished in the concentration camps will never disappear from the memories of the nation!

Considering the conditions and the national feelings, it is possible to state with conviction that the return of the Jewish ethnic group to the position of the ruling class in Russia or in the USSR, as long as this name chooses to remain, is impossible.

These feelings by the end of the war were such that they could easily have ended in an outburst, during which even the government probably would not have survived. Only by taking measures at the proper time and by the gradual removal, without any commotion or newspaper publicity, of the Jews from the ruling posts was this explosion averted.

Outbreaks of the people's indignation pouring out in pogroms were characteristic of the mood of the first post-war years and were far from unique, although the Soviet press did not print anything about this. One such outbreak took place in Kiev, and is described in the "socialist Herald": One Jew killed a Ukrainian. "The crowd rushed to the house, in which this Jew lived. They dragged his wife and child into the street and killed them on the spot; then they rushed to raid further, and the agitation very quickly **TOOK A SHARP ANTI-SOVIET CHARACTER**" (this incident is given in detail in Part II of this work). Characteristically, the author of the article, the editor of the "Socialist Herald" Mr. Abramovich, had labeled this not "anti-Semitic" but "anti-Soviet" character, thereby confirming that in the mind of the masses Soviet power was identified with Jewish power.

All these separate outbreaks could easily have fused together into one vast riot, during which the Soviet power itself would have had difficulty surviving. The government took this situation into account and took corresponding measures, unwilling to risk irritating the population.

"The descent on the breaks" and quiet liquidation of the most important status of the Jews in the USSR during the first post-war years continued in this manner. These "purgings" were not widely announced to the population, but were carried out quietly, without unnecessary publicity and public discussion.

So it was until 1947, the year of the creation of the State of Israel. This was the state to which the Soviet Jews, subjects of the USSR, had shown special interest and had revealed their feelings. This event placed their loyalty as citizens of the Soviet Union under question.

The Post-War Period (1946-1966)

If it were possible to describe the period of pre-war years and the war years with sufficient objectivity, even though it may not be an exhaustive description owing to the unavailability of many sources for research, which are inaccessible to us, the contemporaries of the events, the description of the events that occurred in the post-war years are still far more difficult to achieve for a number of reasons.

The first and basic reason involves the circumstance that all, or almost all, information and data about the condition of the Jewish ethnic group in the USSR were given in the light of the Cold War. This information, of course, left much to be desired in the sense of its objectivity.

The Soviet press endeavored not to touch the Jewish question in its whole extent, limiting itself only to rare indirect indications that some people committed improper acts, or inflicted harm on the USSR. The meaning "some people", of course, refers to the Jews. The phrase "indirect indications" is the precise description of the method used by which surnames, names and patronymics of such people were printed such that it was clear to the reader that the people in question were Jews.

The foreign press interpreted this as setting the masses against the Jews and diligently registered all such cases, calculating, of course, the percentage of the offended cases against the Jews perpetrated by the Soviet authorities.

The free exchange of opinions on this question in the pages of the press with the aim of establishing knowledge of the true conditions was impossible both in the Soviet Union and in the West, due to the atmosphere of the Cold War. It was during the stirring up of the Cold War that the question of the "persecution" and of "discrimination" against the Jews in the USSR became one of the main trumps in the propaganda against the USSR. This was called "anti-communist" propaganda, but in fact, was considerably more anti-Russian than "anti-communist".

Taking into consideration the situation, perhaps it would be safer and better not to touch this period at all and to end my sketch with the year that the war ended.

But, on the other hand, it is precisely during this twenty-year post-war period that the Jewish question in the USSR underwent such changes that not to mention them, even though in a brief condensed form, is impossible.

Therefore we will make an attempt, in the most general outlines to describe the events of this post-war period.

* * *

Since the war the feelings of the broad Soviet masses have changed. Many revelations which had been seen during the war years were endured silently by the masses, as they endured the Jewish dominance before in their own country. The broad masses were no longer inclined to accept what was revealed more than twice in the war years, and especially after the end of the war. The government took these feelings into consideration and, as said above, more and more non-Jews gradually began to appear in the leading administrative positions. These positions were occupied now by the representatives of the native population of the country: the Great-Russians, the Byelorussians, the Ukrainians and the representatives of the other national minorities, who had their own national territories. The same occurrence was also observed among the Soviet Ambassadorial and Trade Delegation positions, which in the pre-war years were almost completely filled by the Jews.

In these years, the first post-war years, the question in its broadest sense of the meaning arose before the country and before its political leaders, in particular about the actual Jewish "double citizenship". These Jewish subjects of the USSR divided their sympathies and loyalties between the USSR and the State of Israel, which was created in 1947. The creation was preceded by an endless and tireless propaganda throughout the whole world in the first days after the war. This propaganda ended with the decision of the United Nations to create the sovereign Jewish State of Israel.

The psychology of this "double citizenship", peculiar to each Jew of the Diaspora, is thoroughly discussed in the research of Professor Solomon Lourie, printed in Part II of this work. The essence of this psychology lies in the fact that at the time of the decision of any question, a Jew, regardless of the country he resided in and to which he owed his citizenship, must, first of all, explain to himself whether this or that decision or measure of a

government in power, or of a political party, whether in power or in opposition, is useful or harmful to Jewry as a whole. Only then is the decision made to support those which are useful to Jewry as a whole, regardless of whether they coincided with the interest of the country or the nation in which a Jew at that time may be residing.

That which Professor Solomon Lourie so distinctly formulated in his book, published in 1922 in Petersburg, began to make itself felt in the USSR during the post-war period. The political direction of the country ceased to coincide with the interests and longings of all the Jewry of the Diaspora, as it was before, during the thirty-year period. In the USSR itself the Jewish ethnic group started gradually to lose its privileged position and to get equal rights and opportunities with the rest of the population. This was interpreted by the Jewry of whole Diaspora as "discrimination". The awakening of the national self-consciousness of the Russian people and, if not the cessation then the considerable curtailment of the ridiculing of its historic past, was interpreted by the Jewry as a revival of, if not "anti-Semitism" and "blackhundredism", then, in any case, of "Russian patriotism". This occurrence from the point of view of Jewry was undesirable and dangerous. And the larger part of the world's Jewry changed from advocates of the USSR to its opponents. The striving of all the Jewry, including those who were the citizens of USSR, in every possible way to support the demands concerning the creation of the State of Israel, regardless of whether these demands met the requirements and the interests of the State of the USSR, brought internal conflict between the Jews and the non-Jews of the Soviet Union. This conflict raised, not without reason, the question of their loyalty to the country, in which for thirty years they had occupied privileged positions.

In the critical months of the war the USSR propaganda machinery, which was almost entirely in Jewish hands, served to raise the army's spirit, an army on which international slogans and appeals used at that time did not have much effect. This propaganda machinery turned then to Russia's past. The medals of Alexander Nevsky, Suvorov and Kutuzov were instituted, and, soon after, titles that were known in pre-revolutionary Russia and golden shoulder straps which were so much hated by those who created the USSR, were also introduced.

The spirit of the past, against which various Goublemans, Apfelbaums, Suritzmans and their fellow tribesmen had fought to their utmost to

eradicate it from the memory of the nation during quarter of a century and to deprecate it in every possible way, was let out from the bottle. As soon as this spirit got loose it found such response among those who had staunchly, with their blood, defended their Motherland, the land and the heritage of their ancestors, it was impossible to drive it back.

The international-cosmopolitan mist had disappeared and in its place life had returned to the seemingly dead patriotism of the Russian people and the patriotism of the whole population of the USSR, people who realized their own strength and their right to rule their own country.

From the self-consciousness, naturally, emerged the question of in whose hands the leadership of the whole cultural life of the country should rest. To be more precise, could this leadership be in the hands of the one ethnic group whose concept and sense of justice was alien to the spirit of the nation they sought to control? This is not a theoretically abstract question but one of the very existence of a national culture, of its essence, its manifestation.

This question is not new. It already hovered in the air for a long time, but was not voiced and, moreover, was not discussed in the press, because this inevitably would have been interpreted as "anti-Semitism", the accusation or even suspicion of which could have cost the people their social or literary careers.

This question hovered not only in the air of the USSR or of pre-revolutionary Russia. The question existed and was of concern to the elite of many nations, but remained unvoiced. Perhaps only in diaries, where concealed thoughts are expressed, and then only in some, did they venture to touch this "ticklish question" and place it under examination to the full extent of its implications.

Mark Vishniak, the former Secretary of the All-Russian Constituent Assembly, on his arrival in the USA devoted himself to the struggle with anti-Semitism throughout the world.

Dealing with this question, he made an interesting discovery which was published in the "Jewish World", New York, 1944. The discovery was widely received among all those who were interested in this question.

Here is what we read on pp. 95-97 of Collection II of this issue:

"The most extreme radicalism does not insure one against anti-Semitism, just as a revolution either in the past or in the present by no means guarantees that the discrimination and defamation of minorities' religion, race and skin color will not be finally and irrevocably swept away.

It is possible to give much evidence to the fact of how the outstanding and foremost minds found themselves at the mercy of anti-Semitism. Let us limit ourselves to one little known illustration taken from practical activity of the new time.

André Gide, in all fairness, was considered one of the leading figures in French fiction of the Twentieth century, one of its luminaries. You foreigners, take for instance the recently published biography of Gide, written by Claus Mann, the son of Thomas Mann. In this biography Gide is called 'the most prominent contemporary author', the 'moralist with the artistic genius', 'whose immortality is assured'. Gide was known for his extreme radicalism in many spheres of life and politically was connected with 'all the extreme Left' which developed in France only in the Twentieth Century. At one time he even became an adherent and follower of Bolshevism. He was on friendly terms with Leon Blum an frequently, from his younger years right up to the French catastrophe, visited Blum's house, was his confidant, and at one time was co-editor.

At the beginning of 1940, Gide published his diary, covering forty years, a huge volume of over a thousand pages. Here Gide turns out to have not only a personal hate for Blum, but also to be a 'cultural anti-Semite. He denies the Jewish writers who immigrated to France the right to consider themselves French writers, Porto-Riche, Blum and other authors who made their way in French literature, criticism and theatre, by writing in no other language but French, are, in the opinion of Gide, not French writers and cannot claim to be such. 'It is of no significance to me that the literature of my country enriches, if this enrichment will be detrimental to the importance of the literature. It is better to disappear, when a Frenchman cannot find strength to create, than to offer an ignoramus the opportunity to play the rôle of a Frenchman in his place and in his name'" — (Gide's record of January 24, 1914 p. 237).

It is necessary to remember the importance of Gide to France and its literature as he was the ruler of men's minds and souls for two generations

in France, in order to estimate the true worth of the tragic demonstration of this "case". This is an individual case, but not an insignificant one.

So writes Mark Vishniak who in the same book writes the following words on the next page: "even the most convinced enemy of the USSR, cannot say that anti-Semitism is cultivated by the government".

At that time, we suppose, the prosaic eye of Mr. Vishniak had not yet discovered the beginning of the equalization of Jewish rights, equalization which is now called "anti-Semitism".

And a few lines later in the same book and on the same page M. Vishniak writes: " The timid and double faced Jews and non-Jews, having an apprehension that discussions about discrimination and defamation on grounds of religion, race, or skin color only aggravate and promote defamation and discrimination by themselves, recommend avoiding such discussions of the subject".

Vishniak himself, however, not only speaks but also writes, addresses the public and organizes the struggle against anti-Semites on a world scale, struggle, which in his opinion, must be conducted " beginning with the information about the hotbeds of the infection and ending it with direct warning and suppression ... "

Addressing the general meeting of the Jewish Federation in Cleveland, in January of 1943, and rejecting the presence of even a hint of "anti-Semitism" in the USSR Government, Vishniak hardly could have supposed that in only three years the very same Government of the USSR would approve and support the statement made by Zhdanov, who raised the problem of "cosmopolitan without kith or kin" and started the struggle against their dominance in the cultural life of the country.

It is impossible to establish whether Zhdanov hit upon this idea himself or whether M. Vishniak helped him with his wide notification of the concealed thoughts of Andre Gide, who had written them in his diary. It is unimportant and insignificant. What is important is how it was welcomed by the men of culture in the USSR and that it was the beginning of the new policy of the government in dealing with the Jewish question, policy that was directed to the actual equalization, in word and deed, of the Jews with the rest of the population. This equalization inevitably led to the loss by the Jews of that privileged position which they had in the USSR for thirty years.

It is not surprising then that this new political course of the government was interpreted by the whole Jewry of Diaspora as 'anti-Semitic'. It invariably averted a favorable Jewish attitude to everything which took place in the USSR and put Jewry on the way toward the active support of the powers and movements hostile not only to the system but also to the social order of the USSR. This course also put the Jewry on the side of those who aimed to liquidate, by means of dismemberment, the united country that was previously called Russia, and renamed the USSR during the rule of the Jewish ethnic group.

It is precisely in this change in the politics of the USSR Government, it is to be supposed, that one must look for the causes of the special sympathies shown by the Jewish Diaspora towards all kinds of separatist groupings of the individual nationalities of the USSR, which were not noticeable in the pre-war years.

The new course in the Jewish question, however, was interpreted quite differently by those cultural personalities who were not Jewish. Nothing was written about this in the newspapers, nor was it discussed at gatherings and meetings, but it definitely was felt that this new course showed the approval and gave hope to Russians that they actually would get equal rights and opportunities with Jews who up to that time had the monopoly in the sphere of culture in the USSR in general, and in propaganda in particular.

Zhdanov's statement and its support by the government did not result in an immediate removal of Jews from literary and propaganda activities. Very many, even disproportionately many Jews remained at their posts in literature, art, critics and propaganda and no one displaced or removed them. Erenburg, Zaslavsky, Vera Inber, Pasternak, Marshak and a great many others remained on the literary Olympus. Their number has not declined even now in the year 1967. Jews, for example Nickulin, Kozakov and many others, belong to the Union of Writers of the USSR. To speak about the complete dismissal of the Jews from participation in the cultural life of the USSR, of course, is impossible.

The fact that they had lost their previous monopolistic position and the leading rôle is obvious. It is precisely this circumstance that irritates the world Jewry.

Characteristic and deserving of special attention are the words that were said by Zhdanov, who laid the foundation of the recognition that the culture must be national in its own very essence and that its roots must be firmly implanted in the far past of the nation. And when Zhdanov, the communist and follower of the Third International, said, "Cosmopolitans without kith or kin", no one, besides the foreign Jews, protested against these words.

Is this not a proof of the realization by the people of the full value and depth of its national culture? And at the same time, is this not a proof of the unvoiced protest to those who speak and act in the name of the people whose national culture is alien, incomprehensible and hostile to them?

What Andre Gide wrote in his diary before the First World War, was repeated by Zhdanov after the Second World War in different words.

"Culture is a heritage of fathers and grandfathers and it must be handed down to their descendants". Thus teach the spiritual leaders and the elite of each nation. In the USSR this heritage of fathers and grandfathers was under prohibition for thirty years and if there was any mention at all, it was painted in black colors.

And when the words "cosmopolitans without kith or kin" were pronounced, people interpreted them as the recognition by the power itself that the loyalty of those who spoke and acted in their name was taken under doubt. This corresponded exactly to what people thought and wanted, and whose national feelings after the victorious war were aggravated in the light of all of what they had seen and had suffered during the war.

Stalin, who was well-informed about these feelings, took this circumstance into consideration and in every possible way always underlined the sacrifices and merits of the "Russian" people during the war, recalling nowhere either the Jewish people or its sacrifices and merits, the presence of which were doubted by the population of the whole country.

All the population of the country still well remembered the millions of sacrifices during the collectivization, famine and camps in which no Jews were seen. Moreover, these sacrifices were not the result of brutality inflicted by some invading enemy, but were inflicted by the ruling class which consisted mainly of the Jewish ethnic group.

In such a psychological circumstance, in circles of the "Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee", and among Jews in general, a thought occurred to turn the whole Crimea, which had been devastated during the war, into a Jewish national province or republic.

This venture, the so-called "Crimean Affair", entailed serious consequences. The "Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee" was disbanded and its organizers, the numerous Soviet personalities of Jewish origin, were repressed, among them Solomon Lozovsky (Drizdo), who was the head of the committee.

The population of the country knew nothing of this plan, and it was not discussed anywhere, neither in the press nor at gatherings. But the Central Committee of the party intercepted and suppressed the plan because it realized the potential of it.

The details of the "Crimean Affair" are still awaiting the objective investigator, because the time has not yet come for such historical investigation. There is still too much that is dark and unknown about this "Affair". But the Soviet Government's lightning reaction to the plan shows what importance was attached to it.

Turning the whole Crimea, with its natural wealth, harbors and sea fortress, Sevastopol, into a Jewish province or even a republic, would have been a "military risk" for the Soviet Union, in the opinion of the Government of the USSR. Krushchov was also in agreement with this government's opinion, as he confirmed in August 1956, calling this thought "monstrous". This was reported by P. Abramovich in the "Socialist Herald", in May 1957.

We will not judge how "monstrous" the thought is. But if we can conceive really how the realization of the "Crimean Plan" would have ended, then it is not so incredible that there was apprehension of the "military risk", expressed by Stalin and repeated by Krushchov.

In the atmosphere of the Cold War, with whole of Jewry on side of the Soviet enemies, the presence of a "Jewish state" in Crimea was indeed a "military risk".

And if this military risk was envisaged and prevented in the proper time, then from the point of view of the Soviet State it is difficult not to approve of the fact that such an "Affair" did not come about.

Even if P. Abramovich and his fellow tribesmen do not approve of this, the whole population of Russia-USSR adheres to the contrary opinion to make up for it. There can be no doubt whatsoever about this. It is also doubtful that the whole population of the USSR would be in grief if every last representative of the Jewish ethnic group abandoned the country forever. That is my opinion; there was no debate about that.

Furthermore, one more fact must also be taken into consideration that at that time, when the plan concerning the creation of the Jewish national republic in Crimea was in its fostering stage, there already existed in the Constitution of the USSR the provision for the Union and the autonomous republics of the Soviet Union to "enter into direct relationship with foreign countries, concluding with them agreements and exchanging with them diplomatic and consular representatives...", "to have its own republic military formations". And "for each union republic the right is reserved to leave the USSR freely", (Articles 18, 18-a, and 18-b).

And if the plan of creating the Jewish republic in the Crimea was realized, what guarantee was there that, with help and support from the whole Jewish Diaspora, the Crimea would not have seceded? It is also unknown whether this state would have been friendly or hostile to the USSR. And how would the rest of the two hundred million people of the USSR have regarded this venture?

It must be assumed that what has been stated above was well considered and taken into account when the attempt of actual separation of the Crimea from the rest of the country was averted, Crimea for which so much Russian blood was spilled.

The State of Israel and the Problem of Double Citizenship

Soon after the painless liquidation of the "Crimean republic" (if the execution of several men is not counted), there occurred one more event in the life of the Jewish ethnic group in the USSR. This event placed the loyalty to the State of the USSR of all Soviet Jews under doubt.

In the first two post-war years (1945-1947), a strenuous and intense propaganda for the creation of the separate sovereign State of "Israel" went on in the whole camp of victors in the Second World War. The creation of Israel was to take place in Palestine, where the majority of the population was Arab. The fact that in territory contemplated for the creation of the Jewish State, Jews were only a minority was not taken into consideration, and without voting or plebiscite, part of Palestine was given to the Jews, who at the beginning of 1948 proclaimed the creation of the "State of Israel".

The Jewish ethnic group of the USSR was entirely on the side of those Zionists who conducted propaganda in the whole world for the creation of "Israel". The Zionists based their claim for the "Promised Land" on the "promise given to Jews on the Mount of Zion" (The words of the Israeli Premier Ben-Gurion, November 1956, during the "Suez Crisis").

The Government of the USSR also did not protest the creation of the new state in this manner. The representative of the USSR at the United Nations voted for the creation of this state as well as for its admission to the United Nations.

What considerations and motives the USSR had for taking such a position is, for us contemporaries, difficult to judge because too much is still in the archives, inaccessible to researchers. At present, however, it is possible to raise only two questions for consideration in the future. In the first place, is it compatible with the principles of democracy prescribed in the fundamentals of the UN to create a state by such an obviously undemocratic way? Secondly, how could the USSR, standing on the position of atheism, recognize the mystical-religious Jewish "rights" to Palestine?

These two questions, up to now, have not been persuasively or convincingly answered, nor any one attempted to answer them. The political

personalities of the whole world prefer to keep silent and generally do not touch these questions.

It is hardly possible to explain the USSR's position in this question as "pressure of public opinion" or as pressure of the Jewish ethnic group in the USSR. Public opinion, or to be precise, the unexpressed feelings of the whole population of the USSR were not on the side of the Zionists. And the Jewish influence on the external politics of the USSR was diminishing quickly and sharply, owing to their dubious loyalty. There is only one possible explanation to the obscure stand of the USSR in this question. How precise it may be is difficult to say. The essence of this explanation is as follows. The position of the Government of the USSR in the Jewish question was the result of the far-reaching plan to bring about "confusion" in Eastern Affairs, by which the USSR would stand to gain in any event. In case the pro-communist elements had won in Israel, it would have automatically become the champion of the USSR's politics in the Middle East, the former stronghold of the still powerful colonial Empires of Britain and France at that time. In case, however, of Israel taking a pro-Western position, as indeed happened, the USSR would get the strongest propaganda means for the inclusion of the whole Arab world in its orbit, by offering them help against Israel. In such a way the hundred million people of the Arab world would be broken off from the influence of the West.

It may be that all that has been said are the idle thoughts of journalists and commentators; nevertheless, they deserve the attention of the future investigators.

Besides the above explanations, there is one more thing, namely, the wish of the Government of the USSR to verify the loyalty of its citizens, the Jews, on the basis of their reaction to the recognition of Israel. This was precisely what happened in 1948, several months after the proclamation of the sovereign state of Israel and its admission to the UN.

In October 1948 Golda Myrson (now Golda Meir) arrived in Moscow as the appointed ambassador of Israel to the USSR.

At that time more than half a million Jews lived in Moscow. Upon her arrival in Moscow, the Israeli Ambassador went to the synagogue where she was enthusiastically welcomed, and at once many thousands of Muscovite Jews applied to emigrate to Israel.

Iossif Vissarionovitch Stalin and the government drew a conclusion from this. After the welcoming demonstration of the Jews given to Golda Myrson there immediately followed a whole range of limitations ordered by the government, concerning the "personal-national" cultural activity of the Jewish ethnic group dispersed throughout the country. The Jewish newspaper "Der Emes" in Moscow was closed, as well as the Jewish theatres. Also in Moscow the teachings of 'Yiddish' were stopped. Quite a few of Jewish activists in the sphere of their national culture were forced to leave Moscow, and some were even arrested. All the "Muscovites" that applied to leave the USSR and settle in Israel were deported into far-off provinces of the USSR.

"The government sensed the unreliability of the Jews" writes the Muscovite, David Burg, who left USSR in 1956, and published an extensive article, "The Jewish Question in Soviet in the German language in the Magazine "Anti communist" (No. 12, 1957). (The article is given in full in Part II of this work.)

This sensation of the "unreliability of the Jews" corresponded to the same sensation of the whole population of the country, which, in general, looked at Jews as an element "newly arrived, strange and alien".

However, it must be acknowledged that there were no mass dismissals from work nor were other repressive measures taken against the Jews just because they were Jews. They held their positions, which were neither the best nor the worst, and were not dismissed or deprived of the possibilities of work.

But the previous confidence they held disappeared. The previous positions of the mighty ruling class were shaken, and possibilities of attaining the leading roles in all spheres of life were considerably shortened and hampered. This especially pertained to those positions and professions in which complete reliance in loyalty was required, such as diplomatic affairs, external politics and the defense of the country.

Although the word "Jew" was never written and mentioned in these new measures the whole population of the USSR, and the Jews above all, distinctly sensed the new course of the government in the Jewish question.

The population met this new course with their full approval, however silent, because in the USSR the Government does not tolerate either approvals or disapprovals.

All the same, the Jewry in the USSR, as well as in other countries, saw in this new course "discrimination and persecution" toward Jews in the USSR, and the whole force of their indignation and resentment was directed in the first place at the dictator Stalin. Of course, there were many Soviet Jews who were aware of many valid reasons for the government to doubt Jewish reliability in the case of conflict with Israel, or its protectors and allies. But the fear of being accused of acting "against Jewry" in breaking the thousand-year tradition of racial-religious solidarity forced them to be silent. It forced even the staunch advocates of the communist theory and of Stalin's tactics and practice to keep silent.

Among the Jews, dispersed throughout a huge country, dissatisfaction with the new course in the Jewish question grew. The main culprit was considered to be Stalin who without noise and publicity steadfastly implemented his line.

The feelings of the Jewish ethnic group in the USSR were shared by the Jewry of the whole world and were reflected in the hostile attitude not only to Stalin and his regime but also to the entire Russian populace, considering them to be the culprits in the "persecution" of the Jews.

So it went on until the second half of 1952 when a group of doctors were accused of an attempt to poison Stalin by means of improper treatment. The doctors, closest to the Kremlin heads, were, in the majority, Jews. How and why the care of Stalin and his collaborators was entrusted to the Jews scarcely requires explanation. They had remained there from those times when the Jews high and low occupied responsible positions. And they were not replaced by anyone, even after the sudden change in the year 1948.

The accusation brought forward against the Jews, and the corresponding campaign in the Soviet press was interpreted in a widely spread way by the population, especially the Jewish section, as sympathy to those who were confronted with the accusation, Moscow was full of rumors about approaching repressions against the Jews and about their exile to the Far East.

"They started to pack suitcases, to sell furniture cheaply and went to bed with thoughts that probably at night they will be arrested..." In this manner David Burg, in his article mentioned above, described the feeling of the Moscow Jews.

From October 1952 until the death of Stalin, the feeling of more than half a million Moscow Jews was characterized by panic. No one was in doubt that, as at the beginning of the war whole nationalities were exiled from the Crimea, Caucasus and Volga region, so too the Jews would be exiled, and not only from Moscow but also from the rest of the places where they lived.

Stalin's sudden death changed everything. The "doctors' plot" was declared to be a forgery. A calm ensued among the Jews.

However, there was no use even considering the return of the Jewish ethnic group to its previous position as the ruling class.

The politics of the USSR Government in the Jewish question progressed steadfastly toward the bringing about, on a percentage basis, the number of the intellectual professions and the responsible positions occupied by the Jews to the corresponding number of such professions and positions occupied by the representatives of the rest of the population. These policies were carried out without haste and without noise and shocks, arousing the approval of the whole population of the USSR and the resentment and indignation of its Jewish minority which consisted of one percent, minority which labeled this as discrimination.

Not even the whole Jewish minority can be included in the one per cent figure. In the USSR there are quite a few Jews who consciously chose the way of free assimilation and became unconditionally loyal to the USSR. They chose not only full entry and inclusion into the Russian culture and mode of living but also their assimilation. Such disappearance considerably facilitated their departure from the Jewish religion which jealously guards the purity of race, race which is inseparably linked with its religion. The mixed marriages, about which rabbis speak with terror, considerably contributed to this process. The loss by the Jews of their spoken language, "Yiddish", and its substitution by the Russian language contributed to this process also. More than 80% of the Jews in the USSR cannot read or write in "Yiddish" today.

The Jewish ethnic group in the USSR experienced the same occurrence which happened to the Jews in Western Europe during the middle ages. They forgot their language in their everyday life and accepted without any compulsion the German language in its place, naming it "Yiddish".

At that time only the presence of the "ghetto" helped Jewry to preserve its tribal peculiarities and religion, and to prevent its full disappearance in the sea of Germany. Now, however, there is neither "ghetto" nor absolute subordination to the authority of rabbis. Therefore the process of assimilation, in spite of all kinds of protests and the existence of the Israeli State, goes on unflinchingly. It is impossible not to take this into consideration, but to prevent it is also impossible.

This inevitable and unavoidable process of assimilation on one hand, and the loss of the privileged position by the Jews on the other, engenders and nourishes anti-Russian feelings in the whole Jewry of the Diaspora. These feelings are also widespread among a considerable, probably overwhelming, majority of the USSR Jewry, unabling them to reconcile with the loss of their privileged position.

Julius Margolin also writes about these anti-Russian feelings which are interwoven with anti-Soviet feelings, as mentioned by David Burg in his article above. Margolin substantiates and justifies these feelings.

In his article "Tel-Aviv Note-book" which was featured on November 15, 1960 in the newspaper "Russkaia Mysl" No. 1604, published in Russian in Paris, Julius Margolin writes:

"In the special position, under the sceptre of Nikita, Jewish people are the only ones who are condemned to the loss of their nationality and the gradual liquidation of their historical and cultural individuality. Of course, Nikita is kind and humane; he is far from Hitler's cannibalism; the question is not physical extermination once and for all but it is the "EVTANAZIA": painless, as far as possible, suffocation and spiritual dying of the whole people from whom the right to decide its own fate is taken away. The right is also taken away from the other people of the Soviet Empire, but to these people, at least, within the next few centuries, there is no threat of danger of denationalization. Russians will remain

Russians, Ukrainians will remain Ukrainians and Georgians remain Georgians. Only the Jews are "atomized" and subjected under "special regime". And as a consequence, those who hail national suicide, they show an exceptional zeal... but others hate this regime with unparalleled strength, because only in this hate can their national identity assert itself. I dare to affirm that even the most "irreconcilable" emigrants, peacefully living the rest of their days in different corners of the West, do not have the imagination about the depth and the quality of this bottomless hate".

Margolin's acknowledgement that the Jews hate the regime which they created themselves in their own time, it seems, should have engendered the urgency to overthrow this regime, as was Czarism.

However, Margolin does not mention this urgency to the USSR Jewry...

To make up for it, David Burg speaks about it in great detail and quite convincingly. He was born and grew up in Moscow where he received his higher education and after this he emigrated to the West in 1956. Burg, of course, knows much better than Margolin the Jewish feelings in the USSR in general, and that of many thousands of Muscovite Jews in particular, and therefore he writes distinctly about these Jewish feelings, aspirations and apprehensions in the USSR.

In his article, which was mentioned above, Burg uses the "anti-Soviet" and "anti-Russian" as synonyms. Of course, this is not accidental, because the Jews, dissatisfied with the new political course of the government in the Jewish question, themselves interlace these two meanings, as their fellow tribesmen outside of the USSR are doing. Here is what David Burg writes on this question.

"The discrimination (He calls equalization discrimination) strengthens Jewish nationalism and the Jews' aspiration for Israel. At the time, when the generation of the Thirties had an indifferent attitude to the question of its identity, the overwhelming majority of the young Jews at present feel quite nationalistic. However, this nationalism is not in the least conditioned by the religion. In the majority, especially among the young Jews, this nationalism, resulting from the hostile politics of the government toward the Jews, combines with the sharp anti-Soviet line. However, this is

not always so. To some the danger of the anti-Semitism "from below" seems greater than the danger of the anti-Semitism "from above". The reasoning is as follows: although the government puts pressure on us, it nevertheless allows us to exist. If, however, a revolutionary change comes, then during the inevitable anarchy of the transitional period we will simply be slaughtered. Therefore, it is better to hold on with the government, however badly it may be treating us. Among the people of these lines the anti-Russian feelings and striving toward Israel are especially strong".

The two statements of the Jewish authors given above deserve special attention. This is because they are of the latter years (of 1957 and 1960), and also because the two authors write frequently about the "Jewish question" in Russian in the periodical press. The two authors are unanimous in their appraisal and understanding of the Jewish feelings in the USSR, and of the attitudes of the whole population to its fellow citizens, the Jews.

At the same time, these two authors hush up the real cause that provoked these feelings and extensively speak about the "limitations" and about "discrimination", when in fact, as is seen from their own account, the conversation is about the equalization in rights and opportunities of non-Jewish population with the Jews, who for thirty years occupied privileged positions in the USSR.

Neither Margolin nor Burg writes anything regarding the time when discrimination actually was practiced with respect to the native population, when one per cent of Jewish minority used to make up 80% and even 90% of the diplomats and other Soviet dignitaries. Yet, they as Jews, ought to write about, try to explain, and, if possible, justify the "inverse proportionality" of the Jews who occupied the leading positions in the country in which they appeared a little less than a hundred and fifty years ago, and made up little more than one per cent of the population they controlled.

Both authors speak about the Jewish attitude in the USSR. Margolin did not live in the USSR as a free man, but as a Polish war prisoner who lived there from 1939 and associated in camps only with his fellow tribesmen who were primarily from Poland. He speaks about the "bottomless hate" they had toward the regime. However, he does not write about the feelings of the non-Jewish population toward the Jews.

To make up for it, David Burg speaks about it unambiguously: "if a revolutionary change comes, then during the inevitable anarchy of the transitional period WE WILL SIMPLY BE SLAUGHTERED". It is said quite clear. It is to be supposed that Burg knows well the feelings of the population of the USSR, although, it is hardly possible to agree with his assertion that all the Jews in the USSR WOULD BE SLAUGHTERED. But in the case of anarchy there will undoubtedly be quite a few anti-Jewish excesses.

Absence of any certain information about the attitudes of the population of the USSR with respect to Jews permits us neither to confirm nor to refute the gloomy forecasting of Burg. Therefore, we have to limit ourselves to citing only these statements in our short account of the twenty-year post-war period.

In telling about "bottomless hate" the Jews have for the REGIME, Margolin silently bypasses the attitude of the rest of the population of the USSR toward the regime, as well as toward the Jews. But Margolin does not touch upon the question of whether this Jewish hate goes so far as to wish the overthrow of the hated regime or is limited only to hatred without a possibility of manifesting itself, nor does he mention the question of whether this hate spreads to all Russian people.

Burg, on the other hand, speaks about the attitude, not only of the Russian people but also of the rest of the population of the USSR, not toward the REGIME, but toward the Jews. He reports that the Jews, regardless of their negative attitude to the regime, are apprehensive of its overthrow, and therefore support it.

The press of the whole world writes often and much about the hostile attitudes of the government of the USSR and its whole population toward the Jews. As a rule the government is identified for some reason mainly with the Russian people (meaning the Great-Russians), without including the other nationalities of the country, for example, even the Ukrainians who have an age-old account to settle with Jewry. Frequently reporting about the anti-Jewish feelings of the population, the foreign Jewish press explains that all incidents and excesses result from government initiatives, and hushes up the feelings of the population itself with respect to the Jews.

For example, in the journal "Socialist Herald" (an organ of the Jewish "Bund" and the "Russian Mensheviks"), published in Russian in the issue of December 1959 (p. 241), we read the following. "Upon entering stores and shops of the "Second Jerusalem" (Malakhovka — Moscow suburb), you can see their (Jewish) tallow and arrogant ugly faces everywhere, disdainfully looking at the Russian. And where is this? In our Russian land the Judaic stock, risen so high, throws dirt at the Russian people, calls them "fools" and "Ivans", and we tolerate everything... How long is this going to last? We saved them from the Germans, who are more rational concerning this nation, and sheltered them. But they so quickly became impudent; they do not even understand the Russian people. Who is in whose land anyway? The people are grumbling (theoretically), but they are not too far from practice either. To speak frankly, the Bolsheviks for no reason made haste to equalize this nation. This nation can be sent down to the lower classes, but it will come out like couch-grass, chocking up the pure and kind souls of the Russian people. So it happened. Our people are not the same now. From the Jews they became infected with bureaucracy, greed, the desire for personal gain and inhospitality. There is not an open sincere Russian soul except those which exist in villages".

The above quoted was supposed to be a leaflet which was signed thusly: "B. J. S. R. and L. R. P. ", which the "Socialist Herald" deciphers as: "Beat the Jews, Save Russia" and "Liberation for the Russian People".

The leaflet was circulated in the Malakhovka, a Moscow suburb, where before the revolution Jews were not allowed to settle, but there are now many Jews, even with two synagogues. The editor of the "Socialist Herald", P. Abramovich, published this leaflet in full in his journal, adding that, in his opinion, it was fabricated by the USSR Government itself, at the head of which at that time was N. Krushchov. It is unknown how precise this assertion is. Abramovich gives nothing in support of this claim, not even indirectly.

In the opinion of the former Soviet citizens who are non-Jews, now in emigration, the content of the leaflet (without considering style) corresponds in general with the opinion of the whole population in the country about the Jews and their rôle in the USSR. Under the restraints of Soviet censorship this opinion cannot be expressed publicly, yet it exists without doubt. Burg's statement about the threat of annihilation of all Jews

not by the government, but by the population, confirms the presence of the corresponding feelings in the whole population.

One more thing is noteworthy in this leaflet: it is the absence of any indications of the religio-racial causes of the negative attitudes to Jews, that is, to what precisely causes "anti-Semitism". The causes given here are quite different and are purely of a materialistic character, namely, dissatisfaction and resentment against the privileged position of the Jewish ethnic group due to their capture of all the best positions in the country, and against the scornful and contemptuous attitude of this new ruling class to the native population.

The unsubstantiated assertion by the "Socialist Herald", that the leaflet was fabricated by the government itself, cannot be accepted seriously.

At one time the Jews used to repeat, and the press of the whole world echoed it, that the pogroms in pre-revolutionary Russia were the result of government orders. After the revolution, when all the police archives became accessible to the Jews who came into power, not one of such or even similar orders were discovered. The practice of resorting to unsubstantiated assertions or accusations, or even expressions such as, "it is commonly known" or "as it is known" does not give credit to those who resort to their use, unable to confirm their accusation with facts or documents. One case, well known to the "accusers" of Russia and its Governments in the organization of Jewish pogroms, is worth mentioning here. After the biggest pogrom, in terms of number of victims, which took place in Odessa in 1905 (see p. 122 of this book), the Jewish party "Poale-Zion" sent to Odessa its representative, who, after a thorough study of all the circumstances of the affair, wrote as follows: "I went to Odessa to find a purely provocative pogrom, but, alas!, I did not find it".

* * *

On this note ends the description of the last twenty-year post-war period, which as stated above, does not pretend that it includes documented proof and all the thoroughly elucidated events of this period.

The reason is the absence of the necessary facts and the impossibility of verifying opinions and statements of various people. A lot more has to be verified in the future, which, I hope, will be done by those who will engage in this question.

Here also ends the whole sketch "Jews in Russia and in USSR", which, as its name implies, is limited in time and territory: it is limited in time only by those comparatively short periods when the Jewish ethnic group lived in the Russian land, the territory of the State of Russia, now renamed the USSR.

The questions connected with the Jewish sojourn outside of this territory and its mutual relationship with those nations among whom they lived or live during their dispersion, we have not touched, because this is outside of the framework presented here.

* * *

In conclusion, we have the opportunity to show statistical data, giving a clear picture of the degree of the Jewish participation in the cultural life of the Soviet Union, where they make up 1.1% of the population.

According to the 1959 census the population of the USSR was 208,828,000; of these, 2,268,000 were Jews, which equals approximately to 1.1%.

The percentage of Jews in individual intellectual professions is as follows: doctors — 14.7%; scientific workers — 11%; jurists — 10%; writers and journalists — 8.5%; art workers — 7%.

Knowing all these facts, the accuracy of which is not disputed by anyone, one can only wonder at the assertions of "discrimination" and "persecution" about which so much has been spoken and written in all the languages of the world.

On the question of persecution of the Judaic religion in the USSR, the State, where every religion is proclaimed to be "opium for the people", and against which a struggle is carried on, it can be asserted that the Judaic religion is in better condition than any other religion. As already has been mentioned in a previous account, even the Moscow city council was engaged in baking matzos in the prewar years, while at the same time the city council not only disengaged itself in making Kulitch and Paskhas (Easter Cakes) for Orthodox Christians but it even forbade all bake and pastry shops to make such things. In the USSR such enterprises are state owned. Jews in Moscow have their own separate Jewish cemeteries, which is not permitted to any other faith.

On the days of the big Jewish holidays the celebrations are unhindered in Moscow, even under the watchful eyes of the militia, and many thousands of Jews conduct their religious demonstrations accompanied by songs and dances.

The most-circulated American newspapers, the "Daily News" of October 18, 1965, and the "New York Times" of October 19 of the same year, reported details of these festivities. The "Daily News" writes: "half a million Moscow Jews were drinking and dancing on the streets adjacent to the synagogue", and reports that this demonstration lasted from six o'clock in the evening until midnight.

The "New York Times" writes about this at greater length, but speaks not about "half a million" but about "tens of thousands young and old Jews" who took part in these festivities, and the whole block of streets adjacent to the synagogue were closed to traffic. Arkhipov by-street, on which a big hospital is located, was filled by the dancing and singing Jews who kept on merry-making until midnight. And the militia did not prevent them.

The facts above, whose reliability is beyond doubt, testify silently to how much the Judaic religion is "oppressed" in Moscow.

And at the same time, it is unthinkable for Christians to have religious processions in Moscow where tens of thousands could take part, even under the watchful eye of the militia.

In view of the above, it is difficult to agree with all those who in most newspapers of the world write about religious persecutions of the Jews in the USSR, forgetting that all the other religions in the USSR, with regard to the freedom to perform their religious holidays and ceremonies, are constrained immeasurably more.

* * *

An impartial history, having at its disposal strictly verified facts, which to us contemporaries is still inaccessible, cannot fail to recognize that in no one country, in no one nation during the whole of its two thousand year sojourn in dispersion, did the Jews have such opportunities. Never have they reached such a position as in Russia or the USSR, especially in the thirty-year period from 1917 to 1947, when they actually were the ruling class of the country.

If they were unable to hold this position and lost it irretrievably, then it is not the Russian people and not the population of the State of two-hundred million that bears the guilt for it. The guilt must be placed upon the peculiarities of the Jewish people themselves, who brought the negative attitude upon themselves. With their activities the Jews created against themselves that negative attitude, which used to be called "Judaeophobia" and is now called "anti-Semitism". This is confirmed by many Jews themselves, from Spinoza to Professor Solomon Lourie. Professor Solomon Lourie expressed this opinion in 1922 in his well-researched book, "Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World".

But this question, first, is too controversial, and, secondly, is outside the framework of this sketch; therefore, it is not subject to our examination.

The task of this work is limited — to tell the truth about the Jewish life and conditions only and exclusively during their sojourn on the territory of Russia and the USSR. How this has been accomplished is for the reader to decide.

Supplement I

V. N. Tatishchev "History of Russia" Vol. II

Edited by the USSR Academy of Sciences

Moscow-Leningrad 1963

(Years 6621 = 1113)

"The Great Duke VLADIMIR MONOMAKH,

Vsevolod II, the son of Vsevolod I".

(Chapter 13, p. 129)

"...The Kievites, not wanting Sviatoslaviches, became indignant and ransacked the houses of those who supported the Sviatoslaviches. The house of the military chief (Tysiatsky), Putiaty, was ransacked first. Then many Jews were beaten; their houses were ransacked because these people did a lot of harm to Christians in the matters of trade. A great number of them gathered in the synagogue and erected a barrier; they defended themselves as best they could, asking respite until Vladimir's arrival. The dignitaries of Kiev, seeing such great disarray and fearing worse to come, were hardly able to persuade the people to calm down. They sent for Vladimir a second time with a request to him to come immediately to appease the rebellious people, warning him that 'if you hasten not your advent, your daughter-in-law, the Great Duchess, boyars, churches and monasteries will be ransacked. And if that happens then you and you alone must answer before God'. Hearing this, Vladimir was greatly horrified, and soon sent 'to announce' to inform Sviatoslaviches about everything; he himself left for Kiev. And when, on Sunday, April 20, Vladimir approached Kiev, he was met by a great number of people outside the city. Then he was met by the boyars at the gates of the citadel. The Metropolitan Nikofor, with bishops and clergy of the parish, met him with honors and great joy and led him to the Duke's house.

Thus Vladimir accepted the throne, to the pleasure of all the people and the mutiny ceased. However, he was asked publicly to bring the Jews to justice because they took away all the Christian trade. Under Sviatopolk, the Jews had great freedom and power, because of which many merchants and

artisans were ruined; they enticed many to their law and took up residence in houses among Christians, a thing that had not been done before. This is why the people wanted to beat them and to ransack their houses. But Vladimir replied: 'Many of them (the Jews) came and settled everywhere in different principalities because they were admitted by the previous Dukes. It is not now proper for me, without a council of Dukes, to stand contrary to lawfulness and to allow killing and ransacking where many innocent could perish. For this reason I will call the Dukes to a council meeting at once'.

And soon Vladimir called them all to Kiev. When the 6 Dukes gathered for the council meeting in Vydobytych they established the following law after a long discussion: 'From this day on, from all the lands of Russia, all Jews with their possessions shall be deported, and hence they shall not be readmitted; if they secretly re-enter, it is permissible to ransack and to kill them'. And the orders were sent to all cities, according to which they were deported. Yet many in the cities and on the way out were beaten and ransacked. From that time on, there are no Jews in Russia, and whenever some of them come, the people ransack and kill them..."

(Source: "Chronicle of Nestor".)

Supplement II

THE RULING CLASS OF USSR BEFORE WORLD WAR II

(Years: 1936-1939)

SECRETARIATE OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE CPSU (b)

I. V. Stalin	—	L. M. Kaganovich	Jew
--------------	---	------------------	-----

ORGANIZATION BUREAU OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE CPSU (b)

I. V. Stalin	—	Y. B. Gamarnik	Jew
N. I. Ezhov	—	M. M. Kaganovich	Jew
N. M. Shvernik	—		

COMMISSARIAT OF FINANCE

COMMISSAR:		G. F. Grinko	—
------------	--	--------------	---

HIS DEPUTIES:		E. B. Genkin (Rosental)	Jew
R. Y. Levin	Jew	Y. A. Teumin	Jew

Keeper of valuables and manager of external trade department:			
O. I. Kahan	Jew		

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD:		L. Shanin	Jew
Malakhovsky	Jew	A. A. Pekis	—
Naifeld	Jew	A. Y. Khatskevich	Jew
Tamarkin	Jew	I. V. Blink	Jew

Chairman of Central Committee of Finance and Bank Employees:			
D. Zaslavsky	Jew		

STATE BANK

CHAIRMAN:		L. E. Mariazin	Jew
Deputy:		G. M. Arkus	Jew

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF CPSU (b)

V. A. Balitsky	—	I. S.	Unshlikht	—
K. Y. Bauman	Jew	A. S.	Bulin	?
I. M. Varaikis	—	M. I.	Kalmanovich	—
Y. B. Gamarnik	Jew	D. S.	Baika	Jew
N. I. Ezhov	—		Zifrinovich	Jew
I. A. Zelensky	—		Trakhter	Jew
I. D. Kabakov (Rosenfeld)	Jew	F. P.	Griadinsky	Jew
Y.A. Iakovlev (Epshtein)	Jew	G. N.	Kaminsky	Jew
Bitner	Jew	L. M.	Kaganovich	Jew
G. Kaner	Jew	M. M.	Kaganovich	Jew
V. G. Knorin	Jew	L.	Krishman	Jew
I. E. Yakir	Jew	A.K.	Lepa	Jew
S. S. Lobov	—	S.A.	Lozovsky(Dridzov)	Jew
I. E. Lubimov (Kozlevsky)	Jew	B. P.	Pozern	—
D. Z. Manuilsky	—	T.D.	Deribas	Jew
I. P. Nosov	—	V.V.	Osinsky	Jew
U. L. Piatakov	—	K. K.	Strievsky	—
I. A. Piatnitsky (Blumberg)	Jew	N. N.	Popov	—
M.O. Razumov (Sagovich)	Jew	S.	Schwarts	Jew
A. I. Ougarov	—	E. I.	Veger	Jew
G. I. Blagonravov	—	M. L.	Rukhimovich	Jew
A.P. Rosenholts	Jew	L.Z.	Mekhlis	Jew
A. P. Serebrovsky	Jew	K.V.	Ryndin	—
A.M. Shteinhart	Jew	I. V.	Stalin	—
I. P. Pavlunovsky	Jew	M. M.	Khataevich	Jew
G. Y. Sokolnikov (Brilliant)	Jew	M.S.	Chudov (Askov)	Jew
G. I. Broido	Jew	A. M.	Shvernik	—
V. I. Polonsky	Jew	R. I.	Aikhe	Jew
G.D. Vainberg	Jew	G.G.	Yagoda	Jew
M.M. Litvinov (Finkelshtein)	Jew			

NOTE: Jewish nationality is written.
Non-Jewish nationality is indicated by hyphens.

REMARK: Possible inaccuracy in names is explained in the second part of this work.

REMARK: 59 members in all, of which 40 were Jews.

CENTRAL INSPECTION COMMITTEE UNDER THE CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF CPSU (b)

M. F. Vladimirovsky	—	E. S. Kohan	Jew
I. S. Shelekhes	Jew	Y. A. Popok	Jew
V. V. Adoratsky	?	P. M. Pevzniak	Jew
Y. S. Agranov (Sorenzov)	Jew	S. F. Redens	Jew
Y.G. Soifer	Jew	L. N. Aronshtam	Jew
N. M. Yanson	?		

SOVIET CONTROL COMMISSION UNDER THE SOVIET PEOPLE'S
COMMISSARS OF USSR

Z. M. Belenky	Jew	K. B. Gay	Jew
N. M. Antselovich	Jew	U.M. Gladshstein	Jew
A. I. Gaister	Jew	L.E. Goldich	Jew
I. S. Zemliachka	Jew	M.A. Daich	Jew
I. M. Moskvich	—	N.I. Ilin	—
B. A. Roizenman	Jew	A. I. Karlik	Jew
Y. Y. Bauer (Baier)	Jew	R. Y. Kissis	Jew
L.P. Bogat	Jew	K. L. Soms	Jew
E.I. Vainbaum	Jew	S. Y. Manfred	?
P. S. Vengerova	Jew	G. Melamed	Jew
M. I. Gemmervert	Jew	A.N. Gussev (Fridkin)	Jew
Y. I. Gindin	Jew	A.P. Rosit	Jew
V.G. Faigin	Jew		

PARTY CONTROL COMMISSION UNDER THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF CPSU (b)

L.M. Kaganovich	Jew	L. A. Papparde	Jew
N. I. Ezhove	—	A. N. Petrovsky (Birkman)	Jew
E. Yaroslavsky	Jew	D.A. Bulatov	Jew
E. I. Yurevich	Jew	I. M. Bekker	Jew
N.S. Berezin	—	R.G. Rubinov	Jew
S.K. Brikke	?	M. I. Rubinshtein	Jew
E. B. Genkin (Rosental)	Jew	V. P. Stavsky	Jew
M. L. Sorokin	—	M. L. Granovsky	Jew
M. M. Temkin	Jew	V. Y. Grosman	Jew
A.A. Frenkel	Jew	P. E. Davidson	Jew
S. T. Khavkin	Jew	B. A. Dvinsky	Jew

V. F. Sharangovich	Jew	A.A. Levin	Jew
A. I. Yakovlev (Epshtein)	Jew	Z. I. Meerzon	Jew
N. N. Rabichev (Zaidenshner)	Jew		

COMMISSARIAT OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

COMMISSAR:		G. K. Ordzhonikidze	—
HIS DEPUTIES:		A. I. Gurevich	Jew
M. M. Kaganovich	Jew	A. P. Serebrovsky	—
G. L. Piatakov	—	A. M. Pittersky	—
M. L. Rukhimovich	Jew	A. V. Vinter	—
MEMBERS OF THE BOARD:		Birman	Jew
V. Grosman	Jew	Shtern	Jew
Y. Gugel	Jew	Y. B. Shumiatsky	Jew
Erman	Jew	P. I. Andraunas	Jew
Israilovich	Jew	A. A. Sokolenko	Jew
Figatner	Jew	S. Ginsburg	Jew
Shtein	Jew	A. I. Dubrovitsky	Jew

COMMISSARIAT OF LIGHT INDUSTRY

COMMISSAR:		I. E. Lubimov (Kozlevsky)	Jew
HIS DEPUTIES:			
A. M. Fushman	Jew	A. B. Genkin (Rozental)	Jew
V. A. Levin	Jew	Shvartsman	Jew
M.A. Daich	Jew	Margulis	Jew

COMMISSARIAT OF FOREST INDUSTRY

COMMISSAR:		S. S. Lobov	—
HIS DEPUTIES:		Kazatsky	Jew
A. K. Albert	Jew	A. G. Rozin	Jew
K. Y. Rosental	Jew	I. A. Vladek	Jew
Greenshtain	Jew	M. A. Sovetnikov	—

COMMISSARIAT OF GRAIN AND LIVE-STOCK OF SOVIET
AGRICULTURE

COMMISSAR:	M. I. Kalmanovich	Jew
HIS DEPUTIES:	K.P. Soms	—
G. L. Ostrovsky	Jew	M. G. Gerchikov
T. A. Yurkin (Vainberg)	Jew	V. L. Paverman
L.A. Grushevsky	Jew	A. L. Lvov

COMMISSARIAT OF AGRICULTURE

COMMISSAR:	M. A. Chernov	—
HIS DEPUTIES:	I. I. Raingold	Jew
A. A. Levin	Jew	Podgaets
MEMBERS OF THE BOARD:		
S. B. Uritsky	Jew	L. L. Paperni
Kahan	Jew	L. Shtok

COMMISSARIATE OF EXTERNAL TRADE

COMMISSAR:	A. P. Rosenholts	Jew
HIS DEPUTIES:	I. Y. Veinzer	Jew
M. I. Frumkin	Jew	A. B. Ozersky
MEMBERS OF THE BOARD:		
S. A. Mesing	?	B. S. Belenky
B. I. Plavnik	Jew	S. G. Bron
F. Y. Rabinovich	Jew	M. G. Bronsky
N.N. Romm	—	S. M. Dvoilatsky
Y. A. Sokolin	Jew	L.H. Fridrikhson
M. L. Sorokin	Jew	M. G. Gurevich
A.M. Tamarin	Jew	Y. D. Yanson
S. B. Zhukovsky	Jew	M. A. Kattel
I. I. Flior	Jew	F. F. Kilevets
I. M. Katsnelson	Jew	A.A. Kisin
		B. I. Kraevsky

COMMISSARIAT OF SUPPLY

COMMISSAR:		A. I. Mikoian	—
HIS DEPUTIES:		M. N. Belenky	Jew
M. F. Levitan	Jew	Y.K. Yaglom	Jew
M. N. Belsky	Jew	S. Y. Grossman	Jew
MEMBERS OF THE BOARD:			
B. Giber	Jew	P. Y. Rosenta	Jew
Golman	Jew	R. P. Rozit	Jew
G. I. Dukor	Jew	N. G. Gurevich	Jew
Indenbaum	Jew	A. N. Kliazet	?
S. Ginzburg	Jew	L. S. Nikolaevsky	Jew

CENTRAL UNION OF CONSUMER SOCIETIES

COMMISSAR:		I.A. Zelensky	—
HIS DEPUTIES:		A.S. Kishak	Jew
B.L. Krichevsky	Jew	M.S. Epstein	Jew
Chairman of All-Union Co-Operative Bank:		M. Vul	Jew

MAIN ARBITRATION

CHIEF ARBITRATOR:		F. I. Goloshchenko	Jew
His deputy:		I.K. Hamburg	?
ARBITRATORS:			
A.I. Vainshtein	Jew	A. P. Schneider	Jew

PROCURATOR'S OFFICE

GENERAL PROCURATOR		I. A. Akulov	—
Assistant Procurators:			
A. A. Solts	Jew	Shirving	Jew
DEPUTIES:			
Leplevsky	Jew	Sigal	Jew
		A. Y. Vyshinsky	—

COMMISARIAT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

COMMISSAR:	M. M. Litvinov (Finkelsthain)	Jew
HIS DEPUTIES:	G. Y. Sokolnikov-Brilliant	Jew
N. N. Krestinsky	—	L. M. Karakhan Jew
Secretary of People's Commissariat:	P. P. Otlichin	—
Secretaries:		
B. I. Shmokh-Bronskaia	Jew	S. B. Epshtein Jew
M. S. Morshtiner	Jew	V. I. Dyment Jew
PROTOCOL DEPARTMENT:		
Chief:	Y. A. Rothstein	Jew
Secretary:	B. G. Burstein	Jew
POLITICAL ARCHIVES:		
Chief:	I. S. Yakubovich	Jew
DEPARTMENT OF DIPLOMATIC COURIERS:		
Chief:	F. K. Grikman	Jew
1 st WESTERN DEPARTMENT: (Poland, Scandinavia, Baltic.)		
Chief:	L. E. Berezov	Jew
Assistant:	L. Y. Gaidis	Jew
Referent on Poland:	E. L. Kontis	Jew
2 nd WESTERN DEPARTMENT: (Central Europe, Balkans.)		
Chief:	D. G. Shtern	Jew
Assistant:	F. V. Linde	Jew
Referent on Czechs and Balkans:	M. S. Shapiro	Jew
Referent on Germany, Switzerland & Holland:	V. L. Levin	Jew
Referents on Austria & Hungary:	M. I. Rossovsky	Jew
	S. P. Kanter	Jew
3 rd WESTERN DEPARTMENT: (Anglo-Roman countries.)		
Chief:	E. V. Rubinin	Jew
Assistant:	H. S. Veinberg	Jew
Referent on USA:	S. L. Stoler	Jew
Referent on England:	K. Y. Lelians	—

1 st EASTERN DEPARTMENT:	(Middle Eastern countries.)	
Chief:	V. M. Zukerman	Jew
Press Director:	E. L. Galperin	Jew

2 nd EASTERN DEPARTMENT:	(Far Eastern countries.)	
Chief:	B. I. Kozlovsky	?
Referent on China:	M. S. Smirnov-Bregovsky	Jew
Referent on Japan:	E. G. Eizenshtadt	Jew

LEGAL DEPARTMENT:		
Chief:	A. V. Sabanin	—
Assistant:	M. A. Plotkin	Jew
Juristcounsellors:	V. G. Blumfeld	Jew
Referents:	V. O. Braun	Jew
	I. S. Duvan	Jew
	N. E. Rivlina	Jew
	A. B. Rafalovskai	Jew

ECONOMIC SECTION:		
Chief:	B. D. Rosenblum	Jew
Assistant:	R. M. Fligelbaum	Jew

CONSULAR DEPARTMENT:		
Chief:	A. V. Zaslavsky	Jew
Referents:	A. A. Poliak	Jew
	V. N. Krivitskaia	—
	V. N. Serebriannyi	Jew
	E. A. Shmulevich	Jew

PRESS AND INFORMATION DEPARTMENT:		
Chief:	K. A. Umansky	Jew
Assistants:	Y. B. Podolsky	Jew
	S. S. Belsky	Jew
	B. M. Mirnov	Jew

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AND PERSONELL DEPARTMENT:		
Chief:	Y. M. Martizon	Jew
Assistant:	L. A. Gashkel	Jew

COMMISARIAT DELEGATES UNDER THE UNION REPUBLICS:		
Under the Russian SFSR:	A. A. Rozé	Jew
	G. I. Melamed	Jew
	G. I. Vainshtein	Jew
Under the Ukrainian SSR:	G. B. Gelyunovsky	Jew
	A. M. Petrovsky-Schwartzman	Jew

Under the Byelorussian SSR:	I. A. Kartashev	Jew
Under the Transcaucasian SSR:	Y. S. Ilyinsky	Jew
	R. M. Naimark	Jew
	A. G. Itkin	Jew
Under the Uzbek SSR:	Y. A. Einkhor	Jew
	G. A. Apresov	?
Under the Turkmen SSR:	S. L. Borisov	Jew
	B. B. Shargorodsky	Jew
Under the Tajik SSR:	I. S. Veinberg	Jew

COMMISSARIAT REPRESENTATIVES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES:

FRANCE:

Ambassador:	V. P. Potemkin	—
Counselors:	M. I. Rosenberg	Jew
	E. B. Girshfeld	Jew
Trade representative:	S. M. Dvoilatsky	Jew
Military attaché:	S. I. Ventsov (Kranets)	Jew

GERMANY:

Ambassador:	Y. Z. Surits	Jew
Secretary:	A. V. Girshfeld	Jew
Vice-Consul:	L. S. Kaplan	Jew
Attaché:	B. M. Gordon	Jew
Trade representatives:	D. V. Kandelaki	?
	L. H. Fridrikhzon	Jew
	A. S. Fainshtein	Jew
	M. Y. Volynsky	Jew
Military attaché:	L. A. Schnitman	Jew

ENGLAND:

Ambassador:	I. M. Maisky (Liakhovsky)	Jew
Counselor:	C. B. Kahan	Jew
Attaché:	A. F. Volchov (Berkman)	Jew
Trade representative:	A. V. Ozersky (Friedman)	Jew

ITALY:

Ambassador:	B. E. Shtein	Jew
Consul:	P. M. Dneprov (Goldshtein)	Jew
Counselor:	P. S. Fridgood	Jew
Secretary:	L. B. Gelfand	Jew
Trade representatives:	B. C. Belkeny	Jew
	B. P. Shapiro	Jew

POLAND:		
Ambassador:	Y. H. Davtian	—
Counselor:	B. G. Podolsky	Jew
Trade representative:	A. M. Tamrin	Jew

TURKEY:		
Ambassador:	L. M. Karakhan	Jew
Counselor:	H. A. Zalkind	Jew
Trade representative:	S. I. Akivis	—

AMERICA:		
Ambassador:	A. A. Troianovsky	—
Counselor:	B. E. Svirsky	Jew
Secretaries:	A. F. Naiman	?
Attachés:	G. I. Hokhman	Jew
	B. K. Lipko	?
	G. M. Grigoriev	Jew

AUSTRIA:		
Ambassador:	A. M. Petrovsky	Jew
Counselor:	Lorents	Jew
Secretary:	P. K. Nekunde	—
Consul:	G. E. Shainin	Jew

GREECE:		
Ambassador:	M. V. Kobetsky	Jew
Secretary:	G. Y. Bezhanov	Jew
Trade representative:	N. S. Angarsky	Jew
His assistant:	V. A. Adamson	—

JAPAN:		
Ambassador:	K. K. Yurenev (Ganfman)	Jew
Counselor:	N. Y. Reivid	Jew
Secretaries:	A. B. Ascov	Jew
	B. A. Gintse	Jew

LATVIA:		
Ambassador:	S. I. Brodovsky (Brightman)	Jew
Secretary:	I. M. Morshutin	Jew

LITHUANIA:		
Ambassador:	M. A. Karsky (Bekman)	Jew
Secretary:	S. M. Kofman	Jew
Trade representative:	A. M. Samarin (Markovich)	Jew

MONGOLIA:		
Ambassador:	S. E. Chutskaev	—
Counselor:	I. Y. Zlatkin	Jew
Secretary:	Y. G. Gorsky	Jew
Trade representative:	A. I. Beerkinhof	Jew

NORWAY:		
Ambassador:	I. S. Yakubovich	Jew
Trade representative:	P. I. Kushner	Jew

ROUMANIA:		
Ambassador:	M. S. Ostrovsky	Jew

SWEDEN:		
Ambassador:	A. M. Kallantoi	Jew

URUGUAY:		
Ambassador:	A. E. Minkin	Jew
Secretary:	A. A. Ostrin	—

FINLAND:		
Ambassador:	E. A. Asmus	—
Trade representative:	L. L. Nepomniashchy	Jew

STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

CHAIRMAN:	V. I. Mezhlauk	—
-----------	----------------	---

HIS DEPUTIES:	I. S. Unshlikht	—
E. I. Kuring	—	A. I. Gaister
		Jew

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION:		Khvesin	Jew
S. S. Dikansky	Jew	N. E. Volynsky	Jew
B. L. Markus	Jew	S. B. Karp	Jew
E. Z. Goldenberg	Jew	G. B. Lauer	Jew
Mandelson	Jew	M. I. Rubinshtien	Jew
S. L. Goldberg	Jew	S. Guberman	Jew

ALL-RUSSIAN CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SECRETARY to M. I. Kalinin: Miagky Jew

PRESIDIUM SECRETARIAT:

Chief:	M. F. Verbitsky	—
Deputies:	Z. S. Ostrovsky	Jew
	A. A. Simanovsky	Jew

GENERAL SECRETARIAT:

Chief:	I. Yashtain	Jew
--------	-------------	-----

PROTOCOL DEPARTMENT:

Chief:	Resh	Jew
--------	------	-----

PUBLISHING DEPARTMENT:

Chief:	Maximovsky	Jew
--------	------------	-----

PERSONELL DEPARTMENT:

Chief:	A. V. Shotman	Jew
Deputy:	G. S. Gurievich	Jew

AMNESTY COMMISSION:

Chairman:	A. S. Munik	Jew
Secretary:	S. P. Milicin	Jew

JEWISH LAND EXPLOITATION COMMITTEE:

Chairman:	S. Dimanshtein	Jew
Deputy:	B. I. Trotsky	Jew
Engineer-agronomist:	A. R. Temkin	Jew
Chief Administrator:	E. M. Kohan	Jew

MUNICIPALIZATION AND DEMUNICIPALIZATION COMMISSION:

Chairman:	A. V. Shotman	Jew
Secretary:	M. I. Mashintseva	—

CORRESPONDENCE BUREAU:

Chief:	M. V. Ottenberg	?
--------	-----------------	---

SOVIET CULTURAL CONSTRUCTION:

Chief:	D. M. Naridotsky	?
--------	------------------	---

FINANCE DEPARTMENT:

Chief:	Mant	Jew
--------	------	-----

“LENIN” FUND COMMISSION:

Chairman:	A. A. Simanovsky	Jew
-----------	------------------	-----

COMMISSARIAT OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS (NKVD)

COMMISSAR:	G. G. Yagoda (Gershel Yagoda)	Jew
Assistant:	Y. S. Aranov (Sorenzon)	Jew
Chief of Main Administration of Militia:	L. N. Belsky	Jew
Chief of Main Administration of Camps and Settlements:	M. D. Bergman	Jew
Chief of Belomor Camps:	L. I. Kohan	Jew
Chief of Belomoro-Baltic Camps:	S. G. Firin	Jew
Chief of Main Administration of Prisons:	Apeter	Jew

NKVD COMMISSIONERS

North Caucasian Territory:	Fridberg	Jew
Central Asia:	Piller	Jew
Tajikistan:	Solonitsyn	—
Uzbekistan:	Krukovsky	?
Azerbaijan:	Purnis	?
Stalinsk Territory:	Rappoport	Jew
Vinitsk Province:	Sokolinsky	Jew
Kharkov Province:	Karlson	?
Far Eastern Territory:	T. D. Deribass	Jew
Kazakhstan:	Zolin	Jew
Smolensk Province:	Nelke	?
Western Province:	Blat	Jew
Moscow Province:	Redens	?
Leningrad Province:	Zakovsky	Jew
Orenburg Province:	Risky	Jew
Kiev Province:	V. A. Balitsky	—

PROMINENT EMPLOYEES OF NKVD

M. A. Trilisser	Jew	S. A. Rosenberg	Jew
L. A. Zalin	Jew	A. G. Minkin	Jew
L. A. Mayer	Jew	G. P. Kladovsky	?
Z. B. Katsnelso	Jew	F. M. Kats	Jew

F. M.	Kurmin	Jew	A. L.	Shapiro	Jew
L. D.	Wool	Jew	L. I.	Shpiegelman	Jew
A. I.	Rybkin	—	M. L.	Pater	Jew
G. V.	Grodiss	—	N. A.	Frenkel	Jew
A. P.	Formeister	?	A. R.	Dorfman	Jew
F. I.	Sotnikov	?	B. V.	Ginzburg	Jew
I. I.	Ivanov	Jew	V. S.	Baumgart	Jew
I. F.	Yucis	—	E. G.	Johanson	?
E. I.	Senkevich	—	E. A.	Vodarsky	Jew
S. A.	Gindin	Jew	A. A.	Abramovich	Jew
M. D.	Bergman	Jew	A. M.	Vienshtien	Jew
V. Y.	Ziedman	Jew	L. M.	Kudrik	Jew
D. Y.	Ziedman	Jew	M. I.	Lebel	Jew
Y. F.	Volzfon	Jew	I. V.	Putilik	Jew
Y. M.	Dyment	Jew	K. A.	Goldshhtien	Jew
G. Y.	Abrampolsky	Jew	M. F.	Goskin	Jew
I. G.	Vaitsman	Jew	M. S.	Kurin	Jew
M. M.	Vaitsman	Jew	M. S.	Iezuitov	Jew

POLITICAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE RED ARMY

CHIEF:	Y. B.	Gamarnik	Jew
His assistants:		Ozol	Jew
	A. S.	Bulin	Jew
Chiefs of Sectors:		Roset	Jew
		Rudzit	—
Inspectors:			
Berlin	Jew	Politman	Jew
Raskin	Jew	I. Greenberg	Jew
Reichman	Jew	A. Katnelson	Jew
Chiefs of Political Administration:			
Far Easter Army:	L. N.	Aronshtam	Jew
Ukrainian Military District:		Amelin	Jew
Far Eastern Fleet:		Bulyshkin	—
Black Sea Fleet:		Gugin	Jew
Transcaucasian Aviation:	N. N.	Gents	Jew
The Volga Aviation:	A. V.	Veltner	Jew
Baltic Fleet:		Rabinovich	Jew
The Volga Military District:		Mezis	Jew
North Caucasian Military District:		Shifres	Jew

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF MILITANT ATHEIST UNION

CHAIRMAN:	Y.	Yaroslavsky (Goublemann)	Jew
His deputy:	A.	Lukachevsky	?
Personnel Training Department:			
Chief:	D.	Mikhnevich	?
Agitation of Masses and Anti-Religious Work Department:			
Chief:		Kefala	Jew
Department of Anti-Religious Studies in Schools:			
Chief:	M.	Iskinsky	Jew

DEPARTMENT OF ANTI-RELIGIOUS LITERATURE

CHAIRMAN:	M.	Yakoviev (Ephstein)	Jew
Department of International Upbringing:			
Chief:	I.	Intsertov	Jew
Department of Anti-Religious Work in the Army:			
Chief:	G.	Strukov (Blokh)	Jew
Department of Scientific Research:			
Chief:	L.	Lukachevsky	Jew
Museum of Anti-Religious Struggle:			
Chief:	U.	Kohan	Jew

MOST PROMINENT MEMBERS OF THE ATHEIST UNION

G. Ailderman	Jew	M. M. Sheinman	Jew
F. Saifi	Jew	V. Dorfman	Jew
A. Minkin	Jew	U. M. Vermel	Jew
S. Mitin	Jew	M. Altshuler	Jew
Raltsevich	Jew	K. Berkovsky	Jew
V. Kozlinsky	Jew	M. Percits	Jew
A. Ranovich	Jew	S. Volfzon	Jew
A. Kozlovsky	Jew	D. I. Zilberberg	Jew
U. Ganf	Jew	I. Greenberg	Jew
Klitch	Jew	A. Shliter	Jew

CULTURE AND EDUCATION

CHIEF OF CINEMATOGRAPHIC INDUSTRY:

	B. Z. Shumiatsky	Jew
--	------------------	-----

Scientific worker:	Y. G. Tager	Jew
--------------------	-------------	-----

Prominent workers:

L. Z. Trauberg	Jew	G. Y. Roshel	Jew
V. S. Iosilevich	Jew	M. Kaufman	Jew
L. G. Katsnelson	Jew	M. P. Schneiderman	Jew
Y. N. Blekh	Jew	A. P. Shternberg	Jew
S. M. Eizenstein	Jew	A. G. Greenberg	Jew

PRESS

EDITORS:

“Economicheskaiia Zhisn”		Veisberg	Jew
“Pravda”	M.	Saveliv	Jew
“Za Industrializatsiyu”		Tall	Jew
“Krestianskaia Gazeta”	S. B.	Uritsky	Jew
“Ogoniok”	M.	Koltsov (Ginzburg)	Jew
“Komsomolskaia Ukraina”	M.	Minain	Jew
“Tikhookeanskaia Zvezda”	I.	Shatsky	Jew
“Vodnyl Transport”	M.	Tsekhar	Jew
“Krasnaia Zvezda”	M.M.	Landa	Jew
“Komsomolskaia Pravda”	V. M.	Bubeken	Jew
“Bakinsky Rabochyi”	N. K.	Belyi	Jew
“Worker’s Way”	S.	Sheidlin	Jew
“Worker”	L.	Khafets	Jew

EDUCATION

An overwhelming number of Soviet professors, teachers and even head of universities were of Jewish nationality. They are not listed here for lack of space. It would take too many pages to list them all. Instead, their number is given on percentage basis for the country as a whole on the following page under the heading "statistics" listed as "scientific workers".

The special communist universities, schools, etc., as a rule, were filled with Jewish teachers. For example, the Western Communist University of National Minorities, which trained propagandists specializing in foreign politics, was headed by Rector Frumkin; Rector I. G. Raiter was the head of Communist University of Eastern Workers.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

COMMISSAR:	V. Kaminsky	Jew
Chief Administrator of the Kremlin Hospital:	Y. Levinson	Jew
Head Doctor of the Kremlin Hospital:	M. Kroll	Jew
His deputy:	B. Kohan	Jew
Doctor:	L. Levin	Jew

STATISTICS

According to the 1959 census the population of the USSR was 208.828.000. Of this 2.268.000 were Jews.

In USSR the Jews make up 11 per cent of all scientific workers; 10,4 per cent jurists (procurators, judges, lawyers); 14,7 per cent of all Soviet doctors; 8,5 per cent writers and journalists; 7 per cent art workers (actors, artists, musicians, sculptors).

Jewish population of the USSR constitutes 1,1 per cent of the country's population. Is it possible to speak of discrimination against the Jews under such circumstances?

SUMMARY

	Central Committee of ACP (b)	
Jews 61	Non-Jews 17	Unknown 7
	Council of People's Commissars	
Jews 115	Non-Jews 18	Unknown 3
	Central Union of Consumer Societies	
Jews 7	Non-Jews 1	Unknown 4
	Procurator's Office	
Jews 4	Non-Jews 2	Unknown —
	Commissariats: Foreign Affairs and Trade	
Jews 106	Non-Jews 17	Unknown 8
	State Planning Commission	
Jews 12	Non-Jews 3	Unknown —
	All-Russian Central Executive Committee	
Jews 17	Non-Jews 3	Unknown 2
	Commissariat of Internal Affairs (NKVD)	
Jews 53	Non-Jews 6	Unknown 8
	Political Administration of the Red Army	
Jews 20	Non-Jews 1	Unknown 1
	Culture, Education and Union of Militant Atheists	
Jews 40	Non-Jews —	Unknown 1
	Press: Editors of newspapers	
Jews 12	Non-Jews —	Unknown —

Epilogue

The age old conflict between the native population of various countries and states and the Jewish ethnic groups finding themselves in the territories of these nations is well known.

Until the middle of the Nineteenth Century, this conflict was called "Judaophobia" (now "anti-Semitism"), which hindered and is still hindering a peaceful and fruitful co-existence between Jews and non-Jews. This conflict used to manifest itself with special distinction in the countries and states where a considerable Jewish population resided — nations in which Jews were considered "subjects".

At the beginning of the Twentieth Century, Russia had within its borders six million Jews whose views and values, sense of justice and their concept were alien to the native population. The Jewish group lived its own secluded life, unwilling to assimilate with the surrounding population in spite of any possibilities created by the Russian Government to achieve this end, as stated in this sketch.

It is this isolationist Jewish tendency, interwoven with their "spiritual aspect" that has given the impetus to this conflict. The entire blame for this is placed successfully upon the Russian people and all its governments and regimes, accusing them of "anti-Semitism". How valid these accusations are is explained to a sufficient degree in this sketch.

This, however, does not prevent the spread of the calumny of oppression and persecution of the Jews in Russia-USSR. This in turn, stirs up sharp negative attitudes toward the Russian people in the rest of the world, creating and feeding anti-Russian feelings in international relations.

Calumny bears its fruits. It is believed without proven evidence or even an effort to verify them, how just and valid these accusations are. Without proof or trial, the entire Russian population is blamed and condemned. Not only the Russians but also other nationalities and tribes native to that country are accused of this "oppression and persecution" of the Jews. Few took the trouble to listen to the accused, a practice elementary to any court of law, even in the most oppressed societies.

How did the accused respond to this condemnation without trial? The accused is the entire population of Russia — USSR, represented at present by the party and the Government of the USSR, as well as the "Foreign Russians" with numerous national and patriotic church organizations leaders. Did the accused respond in any way? No! It remained silent.

There is no secret why this silence exists in response to e calumny.

The USSR does not involve itself in this question, because such involvement inevitably would lead to the resounding revelation of the rôle the Jewish people played in creating the framework of Soviet Power which liquidated the cultural elite of pre-revolutionary Russia; the conclusion of the shameful Brest-Litovsk Treaty; the organization of concentration camps and "Red Terror", and subsequent Jewish dominance in all spheres of life for thirty-five years.

Even the Russian emigrants do not involve themselves with, or even broach this subject, fearing to be accused of "anti-Semitism". This is an all-consuming dread that almost every Russian emigrant fears.

As a result, the calumny, without being counteracted, feeds and grows strong.

The silence of those who should refute this injustice gives food to all the enemies of multinational Russia. Their silence is acknowledged as an admission of guilt and confirmation of these accusations.

To break the silence, "to rub salt into the wound", and truthfully elucidate the ticklish question of the Jewish condition and their rôle in Russia and in USSR, is the purpose of this sketch. To answer the distortions of truth made and the perversions indulged in by one party and contributed to by the blatant silence of the other is my aim.

As a son of the Triune Russian people, Ukrainian-Malorussian by origin, representative of that generation which had the destiny to participate in these events, these upheavals, and to witness the indignation suffered by all silent partners to this injustice, I consider it my duty and obligation to the future to reveal the truth, as I have done in this book.

I firmly believe that the time will come when impartial researchers, free from fear of being accused of "anti-Semitism", will be able to give a much more complete and detailed account of the life of the Jewish ethnic group in Russia, and the USSR, and of its influence on all spheres of life of that great power created by the Russian people. When this occurs, I hope my modest, far from complete sketch, will prove useful.

* * *

In conclusion, I offer my thanks to all those Russian emigrants who responded to my article, "Calumny About Our People", published in 1964 in the several émigré organs of the press, and who sent me valuable advice,

suggestions, documents and data, and upheld me morally and materially in my endeavors.

In the event a second edition of this book is published, which, at present, due to lack of means is printed in limited numbers, and also in the event of the translation of this work, in full or in part, in any foreign language, I appeal to the readers to send me their opinions on the content and validity of my account, as well as any suggestions for additions, omissions, or more precise elucidation, on any aspect of this effort.

Andrey Diky

For more information, please visit <http://iamthewitness.com>