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Abstract
Historians have already shown how the Jewish minority contributed to the rebirth of the Lithuanian state in 1918. The beginning of the experiment to integrate the Jewish minority into the reemergent Lithuanian state, however, has often been told from the perspective of failure only. The article challenges this view, by describing how Zionism, the Jewish national movement, supported the emergence of the Lithuanian state. The author analyses how the Jews supported the newly created Lithuanian government by voting to send representatives to it, and by producing a document that improved the international position of the Lithuanian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference, and which was helpful for the international recognition of the young state.


Anotacija
Istorikai jau yra parodę, kad žydų mažuma prisidėjo prie Lietuvos valstybės atkūrimo 1918 m. Tačiau eksperimento integruoti žydų mažumą į atsikuriančią Lietuvos valstybę pradžia dažnai nušviečiama kaip nesėkmė. Straipsnyje šiam požiūriui metamas iššūkis aprašant, kaip sionizmas, žydų tautinis judėjimas, rėmė Lietuvos valstybės atsiradimą. Autorė nagrinėja, kaip žydai parėmė naują suformuotą Lietuvos vyrūsybę, nusprendami pasiūsti į ją savo atstovus ir sukurdamı dokumentą, kuris pagerino lietuvių delegacijos Paryžiaus taikos konferencijoje tarptautines pozicijas ir šitaip padėjo pasiekti jaunai valstybei tarptautinį pripažinimą.
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Introduction

It is well known that the Jewish minority contributed to the rebirth of the Lithuanian state in 1918, but little is known of the protagonists and processes of this participation. Lithuanian historians such as Tomas Balkelis,1 Eglė Bendikaitė,2 Vladas Sirutavičius,3 Darius Staliūnas4 and Vygaunts Vareikis5 have worked on it. The works of Oscar Janowsky,6 Mark Levene,7 Klaus Richter8 and Theodore Weeks9 also contain references to these events, even though they often take a more general and external view of the question of the Jews. The focus in this text is above all on the year 1919, on the period after the actual world war, and I would like to use my description to show how, in the very place of Paris, which was then seen by the whole world, the Lithuanian Jewish (further Litvaks) and Lithuanian politicians entered into a ‘pragmatic alliance’, which was planned as a win-win situation, and also proved to be such at that moment. So I am referring above all to a presentation of selected events of 1919 outside Lithuania.

In the following, I will try to give an insight into the Jewish perspective on the events of that year, taking into account a brief prehistory, starting with a few remarks on the politicisation of Lithuanian Jews before 1918. Afterwards, I will trace various snapshots of the turn of 1919, before devoting myself to the main plot that shows Lithuanians and Jews at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919.

The politicisation of Lithuanian Jews before 1918

The question of how the Litvaks behaved towards the emerging Lithuanian national movement has not yet been discussed in detail, says Motti Zalkin.10 There are indica-

tions that Litvaks had selectively supported the efforts of the Lithuanians in the first Duma election in 1905. But Jewish public debates and writings before 1918 did not deal with the question of Lithuanians’ quest for independence.

Around the turn of the century, the Jewish national movement, Zionism, developed as a mass movement in the whole Pale of Settlement. The Jewish workers’ movement, the Bund, was important too. Theodor Herzl also noticed this when he visited Vilnius in 1903. Already at the time, St Petersburg sent around a circular warning local authorities to keep a vigilant eye on Zionist activities, which were viewed as being ‘in contradiction with the principle of the Russian state idea’. The outcome of the revolution of 1905 and the preparation of the first Duma elections precipitated the formation of parties: hence, also of Jewish parties. Jews and Lithuanians cooperated in the preparation of the first and second Duma elections, whereby Jewish voters decided to support the call for Lithuanian autonomy, one of the main political goals of the Lithuanians.

Zionists were elected in all the regions of the Russian Empire, including Shimshon Rosenbaum of the Minsk governorate, who would later go on to play an important role during the first years of the Lithuanian government. Darius Staliūnas explains that this first cooperation between Jews and Lithuanians made it possible for the groups to get to know one another better, and to learn about their respective arguments.

We will not be going into the situation of the Litvaks in the First World War here. On the eve of independence, the Lithuanians had their own opinion about the Jews, but obviously without speaking directly to them. Joachim Tauber mentions in his study about the Lithuanian Taryba minority and the national minorities that the Jews had a ‘complete disinterest in Lithuanian independence and an affinity with Russia’.

In September 1918, the Zionist Central Committee was founded in Vilnius under the leadership of the poet Leib Jaffe and the teacher Dr Joseph Berger. The Zionist Congress, which was organised by this committee, took place in Vilnius from 5 to 8 December 1918. At the congress, the decision was taken to support the Lithuanians in
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the founding of their state, on condition that Jews were granted national auton-
omy.19 Eglė Bendikaitė writes:

The first Zionist conference in Vilnius ended more than a yearlong process of Lithuanian-
Jewish discussions and negotiations and produced a practical result: three Jewish represen-
tatives agreed to be coopted into the Lithuanian council, though without officially rep-
resenting any Jewish organisation and without claiming to represent the entire Lithuanian
Jewish community.20

This decision and its consequences represented a clear victory for the Zionists.
Three people were chosen to represent the Jewish minority in Lithuania’s newly cre-
ated provisional government.21

The three were Dr Shimshon Rozenbaum, who was named deputy foreign minister,
Dr Nachman Rachmilevich, who was given the position of deputy minister for com-
merce and industry, and Dr Jacob Wigodski, who became minister for Jewish affairs.
The government’s 12 December declaration on general policy, which soon followed,
already contained the signatures of these three Jewish ministers. The first edition of
the official bulletin of the government, Vyriausybės Žinios, appeared on 29 December
1918, and a Yiddish edition was also printed.22 Contemporary sources report that the
Taryba member Antanas Smetona, who would shortly thereafter become Lithuania’s
president, could not conceal his joy about this.23 On 14 December 1918, Smetona de-
clared that in the unclear situation in Eastern Europe following the German defeat,
the young, multi-ethnic state could not do without the inclusion of the other ethnic
groups living there.24 Moreover, according to Smetona, the Jewish representatives
hoped ‘that what happened to them in Poland, Lviv and elsewhere will not happen
to them here, and they will not be disappointed, but rather, working together, we
will reach the goal to which we are marching, a free independent Lithuania’.25 In this
way, the Zionists in Lithuania, in particular, had already provided support for the
founding of the state. Gringauz stated that ‘at the time of the establishment of the
Lithuanian state all the Jewish political groupings had already accepted the demand
for autonomy.’26 Additional support was to follow on the international stage.
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On 11 November 1918, the first Lithuanian government under Augustinas Voldemaras came into being. The process of state formation was thus under way. Just two months later, on 18 January 1919, negotiations began at the peace conference in Paris. Thirty-two states took part, but Lithuania was not invited. Nonetheless, it sent a delegation to Paris, which had observer status and was supposed to represent the interests of the new state. In the eyes of the Entente powers, Lithuania was a state that had been established by the Germans. The Lithuanian delegation was at most consulted during some commission meetings. The delegation, which consisted of two groups, attempted to be active behind the scenes, to compose memoranda, to publish articles in the local papers, and to write up petitions.

The delegation was led by Augustinas Voldemaras, with Oskaras Milašius serving as his secretary, and it consisted of Lithuanians resident in the country and Lithuanians living abroad. Martynas Yčas, Tomas Naruševičius, Petras Klimas and Alfredas Jonas Tiškevičius belonged to the first group, but so too did Shimshon Rozenbaum, Max Soloveičikas and other people. The representatives of Lithuanians living abroad included Jonas Žilius, Bronius Kazys Balutis and Juozas Dobužinskis. The main objectives of the Lithuanian delegation in Paris were recognition of Lithuanian statehood, territorial expansion, independence from Poland, and Baltic unity. As Aldona Gaigalaitė has discussed, the Lithuanian government prohibited the delegation from undertaking negotiations about a Polish or Russian annexation of Lithuania. The situation was complicated, moreover, since the new Polish state was seeking to re-establish itself within Poland’s historical borders. Thus, in April 1919, Vilnius was occupied by Polish troops.

These facts reinforced the legitimating strategy of an independent Lithuania as a haven of democracy and a model state with respect to the protection of minorities. Klaus Richter underscores that this occurred in sharp contrast to Poland, ‘whose push into ethnically non-Polish areas, against the background of anti-Jewish pogroms in Lviv, Pinsk and Vilnius, was increasingly viewed internationally as chauvinistic’. So much for the Lithuanian delegation. Now, what role did Jews play overall at the 1919 Paris Peace Conference?

Thanks to Woodrow Wilson’s ‘Fourteen Points’ plan and the proclaimed right to self-determination of peoples, the Jewish question was also exceedingly present at the Paris peace negotiations. Moreover, no one could predict how the newly founded states would deal with their Jewish minorities. The Paris Peace Conference was really
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the very first occasion when the Jews as a national group could raise their voice in
the international arena.

Joanna Żyndul has correctly noted that the politicians of the Ukraine and Lithuania
were dependent on their minorities. The ‘Committee of Jewish Delegations to the Paris
Peace Conference’ (Comité des délégations Juives) was confronted with this problem.
The delegations included Zionists, Folkists, religious and patriotic Jews, but also West-
ern liberal Jews: the whole spectrum was represented.29 They were led by the Zion-
ists: the American Jewish Congress (AJC), but also representatives of the Joint Foreign
Committee of British Jews (JFC) and representatives of the Alliance Israélite Universelle
(AIU). How the composition of the Jewish delegation came into being, as well as the
battles over political direction they fought out among themselves, played only a very
subordinate role. The international arena in which they appeared, on the other hand,
was of great importance. What was at stake in Paris was thus ‘context not content’.30

At the Paris Peace Conference, it became clear that there was a need for a frame-
work of protective rules for Jews and other ethnic minorities in the newly emer-
gent states, in order to be able to implement the overall construct of the negotiated
peace agreements. To this extent, a window of opportunity opened here for the Jew-
ish delegations to act. But this also meant that the dialogue between the Jews and
the representatives of the new states was intensified.

What happened now in practice? The British diplomatic historian Harold Temperley,
who was a member of the British delegation, has given a precise description of the
atmosphere of those months in his diaries:

At meals, and when off duty, there was no convention to forbid discussion of the business
in hand. A unique opportunity was thus given to every specialist of grasping the relation
of his own particular question to all the others involved, and of seeing its place in the vast
problem of reconstruction before the Congress. So great a diversity of minds has seldom
been associated on a single task under one roof. Men who never imagined they had any-
thing in common began to discover how much in common they really had. In friendly infor-
mal intercourse they came to see how they differed, and also to appreciate the sincerity of
views which were not theirs.31

The atmosphere was thus extremely positive and allowed for many discussions,
even though it was not easy precisely for the Lithuanian delegation, since many
participants in the conference had long avoided even using the name of Lithuania.
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There were also tensions between the Polish and Lithuanian representatives. The Polish delegation tried to defame the new Lithuanian state, which had not yet been recognised, as hostile to Jews. The ‘Paris Declaration’ of 5 August 1919 represented a breakthrough.

The document ‘On the Situation of the Jews in Lithuania’ was drafted by Shimshon Rosenbaum for the Lithuanian delegation led by Antanas Voldemaras. It was addressed to the Comité des délégations Juives, and relied on the principle of quid pro quo. In it, Lithuanian Jews were promised broad rights to autonomy, which were to be anchored in the constitution and laws. In return, the Jewish Committee promised to support the position of the Lithuanian delegation during the peace conference. The historian of law Samuel Gringauz enumerates what the Lithuanian Jews were promised:

(1) Proportional representation in parliament, administration, and the judiciary. The establishment of a Jewish ministry to deal with Jewish affairs. (2) Full rights as citizens for the Jews together with the right to use the Yiddish language in public life and in governmental institutions. (3) Autonomy in all internal matters, such as religion, social services, education, and cultural affairs. The Kehillot and the National Council were to constitute the operating agencies of Jewish autonomy. They were to be governmental bodies patterned after the example of territorial autonomy with the right to issue ordinances which would be obligatory both for the Jews and the government agencies.

With the support of their Jewish colleagues, the Lithuanian politicians used democratic means to achieve recognition of their independence. Klaus Richter notes that this was ‘above all [about] a strategy of legitimation for foreign policy purposes’. By virtue of it, the Lithuanians and the other Baltic republics were able to distinguish themselves from the Poles. On 24 September 1919, Great Britain granted Lithuania de facto recognition, and the delegation was finally taken into consideration at the peace conference. Gringauz summed up in retrospect: ‘Among the new states Lithuania was the only one where Jewish autonomy attained strong and visible expression.’ Here I can also underline once again that the affiliation of the city of Vilnius was a major bone of contention between Poland and Lithuania. Jews represented a large group of inhabitants at that time (43.5%). Interestingly, Lithuanian representatives played the Jewish card to the Polish delegation. They did it because
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the constellations were favourable during the peace conference in Paris, where the Jewish question was discussed openly for the first time. The Lithuanian delegation also had a representative who was able to formulate this argument professionally. In the long term, however, the Lithuanian state lost Vilnius, and thus a large percentage of its Jewish minority, making the Jewish card meaningless after a few years.

Conclusions

How can we sum up? Let us turn here again to Samuel Gringauz, the historian of law and future judge from Memel (Klaipėda). He summarised this phase of Lithuanian-Jewish cooperation as follows:

Thus, the years 1918 to 1920 witnessed a confluence of factors that favored autonomy. The desire of the Jewish community for national self-government which stemmed in turn from the national autonomist and Zionist trends, coincided with the political tradition of Lithuania’s leaders and with the country’s political needs. Out of this combination of factors evolved the socio-political experiment of ‘Jewish national autonomy’.38

The later failure of this experiment already belongs to another historical chapter. Much too often, the beginning of the experiment is only recounted from the perspective of this failure. Let it here be noted: at two relevant points, Zionism, the Jewish national movement, supported the emergence of a Lithuanian state. First, by the vote to dispatch its representatives to the newly created government, and, second, by producing a document that improved the international position of the Lithuanian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference and was thus helpful to gaining recognition for the new state. In conclusion, an ancillary factor should also be mentioned. Interestingly, the processes involved in the striving for autonomy in the countries was linked with the fact that Jews in these countries ‘[were] fixed more firmly and explicitly in the nationality of the lands of their birth [than] they had ever been before’.39 The Jewish activist Lucien Wolf, who spent time as a political observer at the peace conference, already described this phenomenon in 1920. It would apply for many Lithuanian Jews. This is an important observation. But this phenomenon as well can only be described in a separate chapter.
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ŽYDŲ INDĖLIS Į LIETUVOS NEPRIKLASOMYBĘ 1918–1919 METAIS
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Santrauka

Faktas, kad žydų mažuma prisidėjo prie Lietuvos valstybės atsiradimo 1918 m., yra plačiai žinomas. Mažiau yra žinoma apie sprendimo dalyvauti kuriant valstybė pirmieji ir su šiuo dalyvavimu susijusius procesus. Straipsnyje gilinamas pirmiausia 1919 m. ir bandoma parodyti, kaip konkrečiai Paryžiaus taikos konferencijos scena buvo išnaudota Lietuvos žydų ir lietuvių politikams perėmiant į „pragmatinės sąjungos“ būvių, į kurį žiūrėta kaip į galimybę be pralaimėjimo ir kuris iš tiesų pasirodė tokis besąs. Straipsnio dalis glaustai atskleidžiamas žydų požiūris į Lietuvą 1918–1919 m., atkreipiant dėmesį į šio požiūrio formavimosi priešistorę, pradedant Lietuvos žydų politizacija prieš 1918 m. Antroji straipsnio dalis per keletas momentines 1918–1919 m. įvykių nuotraukas pereina prie pagrindinio siužeto – lietuvių ir žydų santykių 1919 m. Paryžiaus taikos konferencijoje.


