

An offprint from

POLIN

STUDIES IN POLISH JEWRY

VOLUME TWENTY-FIVE

*Jews in the Former Grand Duchy of
Lithuania since 1772*

Edited by

ŠARŪNAS LIEKIS, ANTONY POLONSKY

and

CHAERAN FREEZE

Published for

The Institute for Polish–Jewish Studies

and

The American Association for Polish–Jewish Studies

This material is copyright-protected and may not be reproduced in any form without the express written permission of the author of the article, the editor of the volume in which it was originally published, and the publisher of the volume.

Any requests for permission to use this material in whole or in part should be addressed in the first instance to the Littman Library at <info@littman.co.uk>, and all such requests should include details of the precise use intended.

Oxford · Portland, Oregon

The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization

2013

The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization

Chief Executive Officer: Ludo Craddock

Managing Editor: Connie Webber

PO Box 645, Oxford OX2 0UJ, UK

www.littman.co.uk

Published in the United States and Canada by

The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization

c/o ISBS, 920 NE 58th Avenue, Suite 300

Portland, Oregon 97213-3786

© Institute for Polish-Jewish Studies 2013

All rights reserved.

*No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by
any means, without the prior permission in writing of
The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization*

*The paperback edition of this book is sold subject to the condition
that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out
or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any
form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published
and without a similar condition including this condition
being imposed on the subsequent purchaser*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data applied for

ISSN 0268 1056

ISBN 978-1-904113-93-5

ISBN 978-1-904113-94-2 (pbk)

Publishing co-ordinator: Janet Moth

Production: John Saunders

Copy-editing: George Tulloch

Proof-reading: Bonnie Blackburn and Joyce Rappoport

Index: Bonnie Blackburn

Design: Pete Russell, Faringdon, Oxon.

Typeset by: John Saunders Design & Production, Eastbourne

Printed in Great Britain on acid-free paper by

TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

Articles appearing in this publication are abstracted and indexed in
Historical Abstracts and *America: History and Life*

Lithuanian Antisemitism in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

DARIUS STALIŪNAS

LITHUANIAN antisemitism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries has received significant scholarly attention.¹ While some studies have taken the form of narratives that are valuable in their own right, there are also analytical papers (most notably by Vladas Sirutavičius and Nerijus Ūdrėnas, amongst others) that reveal the differences between the image of Jews in the mid-nineteenth century in the fiction of Bishop Motiejus Valančius of Telšiai in Samogitia and the antisemitic portrayals of the latter part of the century, propagated by certain Lithuanian nationalist leaders and imbued with racial undertones. The research shows how the objective of modernizing Lithuanian society encouraged opposition to Jews, and indicates which factors promoted this stance, by contrast with those that subdued anti-Jewish sentiments. My own findings are based on this historiography; however, my analysis of primary sources aims particularly to present the main elements of Lithuanian antisemitism and to show the significance of different aspects of it in the ideologies of the main Lithuanian political movements, as well as to reveal the dynamics of Lithuanian antisemitism. Antisemitism will be analysed in close relation to Lithuanian nationalism.

¹ V. Berenis, 'XIX a. nacionalinis judėjimas: Lietuviai ir žydai', *Metai*, 1997, no. 6, pp. 99–106; id., 'Bažnyčia ir Lietuvos žydai — sugyvenimo, priešiško ir supratimo istoriniai aspektai', *Lietuvių katalikų mokslo akademijos metraštis*, 14 (1999), 61–8; L. Truska, *Lietuviai ir žydai nuo XIX a. pabaigos iki 1941 m. birželio: Antisemitizmo Lietuvoje raida* (Vilnius, 2005); L. Truska and V. Vareikis, *Holokausto prielaidos: Antisemitizmas Lietuvoje XIX a. antroji pusė–1941 m. birželis* (Vilnius, 2004); V. Vareikis, 'Tarp Valančiaus ir Kudirkos: Žydų ir lietuvių santykiai katalikiškos kultūros kontekste', *Lietuvių katalikų mokslo akademijos metraštis*, 14 (1999), 79–96; L. Venclauskas, 'Moderniojo lietuviško antisemitizmo genėzė ir raida (1883–1940 m.)', Ph.D. diss. (Vytautas Magnus Univ., Kaunas, 2008); V. Sirutavičius, 'Lietuvos žydų bendruomenės integracijos problemos XIX–XX a.', *Kultūros barai*, 1992, no. 2, pp. 83–7; id., 'Katalikų Bažnyčia ir modernaus lietuvių antisemitizmo genėzė', *Lietuvių katalikų mokslo akademijos metraštis*, 14 (1999), 69–77; id., 'Kościół katolicki a geneza nowożytnego antysemityzmu litewskiego', in K. Jasiewicz (ed.), *Świat Niepożegnany: Żydzi na dawnych ziemiach wschodnich Rzeczypospolitej w XVIII–XX wieku / A World We Bade No Farewell: Jews in the Eastern Territories of the Polish Republic from 18th to 20th Century* (Warsaw and London, 2004), 614–20; N. Ūdrėnas, 'Book, Bread, Cross, and Whip: the Construction of Lithuanian Identity in Imperial Russia', Ph.D. diss. (Brandeis University, 2000).

Antisemitism in this chapter is understood in two ways. First, it is a political movement with a clear ideology that holds Jews responsible for the downfall of nations or races. In this view, Jewish characteristics cannot be altered through education or other means, and are considered harmful to anyone exposed to Jews within any field (in the political, economic, or cultural spheres). The aim of such antisemitism is to minimize or completely eliminate the influence of Jews in public (state) life. Second, the less articulated forms of opposition to Jews—those forms that lack a substantial ideological structure and are not organized in political movements—function rather as a certain latent ‘cultural code’,² but can also be articulated in public discourse.

Several elements dominated the Lithuanian antisemitic narrative: the religious (and moral), the economic, the cultural, and the political. Though these were closely and often directly interrelated (for example, the explanation for the allegedly detrimental economic activities of Jews singled out their religious beliefs), by revealing the range of ‘reproaches’ levelled at Jews, we can arrive at a better understanding of the structure of Lithuanian antisemitism. It is precisely the content and popularity of these elements within separate Lithuanian socio-political ideological streams that will be discussed here.

ANTI-JUDAISM

Of all the themes I have mentioned, religious Judaeophobia is the oldest in the Lithuanian discourse, as is the case elsewhere too. Jews had been persecuted since medieval times for having rejected the ‘true’ faith, and were collectively blamed for the murder of Christ.³ As much in the period of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as in the nineteenth century, Jews were accused of using the blood of Christians for ritual purposes.⁴ These and similar anti-Judaic beliefs were quite popular among the masses, and even penetrated the more educated layers of society, sometimes provoking pogroms.⁵

Probably the most radical and undoubtedly the best-known figure behind Lithuanian religious Judaeophobia is Justinas Bonaventūra Pranaitis, whose book *Christianus in Talmude Iudaeorum; sive, Rabbinicae doctrinae de christianis secreta*

² R. S. Wistrich, *Between Redemption and Perdition: Modern Anti-Semitism and Jewish Identity* (London and New York, 1990), 31.

³ It is likely that children were introduced to such images in preparation for their confirmation: V. Vareikis, ‘Antisemitizmas Lietuvoje (XIX a. antroji pusė–XX a. pirmoji pusė)’, in Truska and Vareikis, *Holokausto prielaidos*, 27.

⁴ J. Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, *Žydai Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės visuomenėje: Sambūvio aspektai* (Vilnius, 2009), 246–69.

⁵ See Ūdrėnas, ‘Book, Bread, Cross, and Whip’, 351; V. Žaltauskaitė, ‘Smurtas prieš žydus Šiaurės Lietuvoje 1900 metais: Įvykiai ir interpretacijos’, in V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas (eds.), *Kai ksenofobija virsta prievarta: Lietuvių ir žydų santykių dinamika XIX a.–XX a. pirmojoje pusėje* (Vilnius, 2005), 79–88.

(‘The Christian in the Talmud of the Jews; or, The Secrets of the Rabbinical Teaching Concerning Christians’) was first published in Latin in 1892 and later translated into other languages, including German, Russian, Italian, and Polish, as well as Lithuanian.⁶ Pranaitis believed that the Talmud was the source of Jewish wrongdoing and that from it Jews derived their contempt for Christianity. The Talmud was held to allow Jews to kill Christians. However, texts such as his, with such radical anti-Judaic content, were rarely published in Lithuanian. In addition, it is important to note that Pranaitis wrote his book in Latin. This circumstance suggests that he most likely considered his book an academic work with no direct links to specific social situations. Equally significant is the fact that this work did not appear in Lithuanian until twenty years after its first publication, another factor that suggests that there was no special ‘need’ for such books in Lithuanian society at that point. Sometimes works of an anti-Jewish nature were simply translations from other languages.⁷ Thus, while it may be felt that Pranaitis’s treatise and similar texts were not suited to the newspaper format by reason of their content and alleged academic nature, it appears that there were other important reasons why texts similar to his were not printed in Lithuanian periodicals. Although Pranaitis’s book was well received even in the liberal press,⁸ it is likely that the editorial boards of Lithuanian newspapers, even those of a clerical bent, did not find radical religious Judaeophobia acceptable. This hypothesis seems to be borne out by the fact that it was rather in the Polish antisemitic newspaper *Rola* that Pranaitis published his writings.⁹

One particular situation that arose towards the end of the Romanov dynasty highlights the diverse attitudes of the Lithuanian periodical press towards antisemitism.

⁶ J. B. Pranaitis, *Krikščionis žydu talmude; arba, Slaptinas rabinų mokslas apie krikščionybę* (Seiniai, 1912). Pranaitis himself alleged that this publication provoked great dissatisfaction amongst Jews. It is true that some of them believed the author to be Professor Pranciškus Karevičius of the St Petersburg Catholic Academy: J. B. Pranaitis, letter to A. Dambrauskas, 25 Mar. 1894: Vilnius University Library, Manuscript Section, F1 D309, letter no. 3. Incidentally, in this letter Pranaitis also makes negative comments about Jews, referring to them as ‘stinkers’.

⁷ e.g. V. Grušeckis, *Talmudas žydu*, pt. 1 (Riga, 1905), translated from Polish.

⁸ Kelmelis [?], ‘Ko galime tikėtis nuo naujojo caro Mikalojaus II?’, *Ūkininkas*, 1895, no. 14. Here and below, pseudonyms whose bearers have not been identified are indicated with ‘[?]’.

⁹ In these writings Pranaitis devoted much attention to discussing the Polish-language newspaper *Izraelita*, which spoke out in favour of Jewish integration into Polish society. When defending his book’s depiction of Christians in the Talmud, Pranaitis continued to emphasize most of all his claim that the Talmud encouraged intolerance of Christians by Jews: Ks. J. B. Pranaitis [Pranaitis], ‘Z tajemnic talmudycznych (Odpowiedź na odpowiedź)’, *Rola*, 1892, no. 12, pp. 177–9; id., ‘Wyjaśnienie artykułu “Izraelity” p. t. “W formie książki”’, *Rola*, 1893, no. 3, pp. 39–40; no. 4, pp. 55–6; no. 5, pp. 71–2; no. 6, pp. 87–8; id., ‘Judaica: Ciekawa historia “spalonego obrazka”, czyli szlachetny cel i szlachetne środki’, *Rola*, 1894, no. 17, pp. 275–6, and continued in nos. 18, 19, 20, 25, and 26; id., ‘W sprawie rewelacyj ex-masońskich’, *Rola*, 1896, no. 48, pp. 770–2; no. 82, pp. 851–3. The publisher of *Rola*, Jan Jeleński, was one of the main proponents of Polish clerical antisemitism: T. R. Weeks, *From Assimilation to Antisemitism: The ‘Jewish Question’ in Poland, 1850–1914* (DeKalb, Ill., 2006), 68–70; W. Benz (ed.), *Handbuch des Antisemitismus: Judenfeindschaft in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ii/1: *Personen* (Berlin, 2009), entry on J. Jeleński by M. Moszyński, 407–8.

In 1911 Menahem Mendel Beilis was accused in Kiev of murdering Andrey Yushchinsky. The prosecutors alleged that the crime was carried out for religious purposes: they believed that Beilis needed Christian blood to conduct his religious rituals. The trial, held in 1913, was covered in detail in the many languages of the empire's periodicals, and was closely followed in the main Lithuanian publications, where it drew particularly great interest because Pranaitis was one of the prosecution's expert witnesses. In this role, Pranaitis asserted that Jewish religious literature did in fact condone the use of Christian blood for religious purposes. The liberal Lithuanian press (*Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 'The Lithuanian Farmer', and *Lietuvos žinios*, 'Lithuanian News') condemned the trial, which in their view was contrived by the authorities, and denounced Pranaitis for spreading medieval prejudices.¹⁰ At the same time, though the nationalist *Viltis* ('Hope') failed to articulate its position, the clerical press stood up to defend Pranaitis, and, indirectly, welcomed the accusation and used the reports on the trial to strengthen the claim that Jews controlled the international press.¹¹

Lithuanian periodicals rarely employed sophisticated reasoning to discuss the possible religious roots of 'evil' Jewish behaviour. Correspondents often publicized stories that attempted to illustrate Jewish disrespect for Christianity. This type of story most often referred to Jews' 'inappropriate behaviour' in the vicinity of Catholic churches: in Višakio Rūda, 'during the blessing in the church, those Jewish bastards would always loiter around the square, always peering in through the entrance with their greasy noses while waiting for people to begin leaving the church', at which point the Jews would immediately start to peddle their wares;¹² in Tryškiai, a Jew was said to have started trading near the church; Jews showed no respect for Catholic processions, and 'he relieved himself right there, as is usually the case with Jews';¹³ while in Šakiai, Jews allegedly set up near the church an outdoor toilet which emitted the most terrible odour;¹⁴ and so on. The volume of such descriptions of everyday behaviour in a sense served to give credence to the claims of educated antisemites about Jews' disrespect for Christianity.

As stated, the accusation that Jews corrupted the morals of their neighbours, primarily the peasantry, was a feature of anti-Judaism. In the late nineteenth century, periodicals of all ideological streams (e.g. *Aušra*, 'Dawn', *Ūkininkas*, 'The Farmer', and *Tėvynės sargas*, 'Watchman of the Fatherland')—and after the revolution in

¹⁰ J. Bkp. [J. Šaulys?], 'Kun. Pranaitis ir jo kvalifikacijos eksperto rolė', *Lietuvos žinios*, 1913, no. 118; P. Leonas, 'Žydo Beilio byla ir kunigo Pranaičio niektikėjimas', *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1913, no. 45, pp. 462–3; id., 'Kunigo Pranaičio niektikėjimas', *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1913, no. 46, pp. 474–6.

¹¹ 'Žydo Beilio byla', *Aušra*, 1913, no. 22, pp. 344–5; 'Garsiai bylai pasibaigus', *Rygos garsas*, 1913, no. 84; Plunksnius [?], 'Žydų galybė', *Šaltinis*, 1913, no. 42, pp. 641–2; 'Bylos atbalsiai', *Šaltinis*, 1913, no. 42; Pr. Dovydaitis, 'Keli žodžiai apie kun. Pranaitį, žydiją ir "pirmėviją"', *Šaltinis*, 1913, no. 47, pp. 740–2.

¹² Jau ženotas isz Skriaudžių [?], 'Viszakio-Ruda', *Ūkininkas*, 1893, no. 12, pp. 94–5.

¹³ Kurmis isz K. sodos [?], 'Isz Tryszkių', *Tėvynės sargas*, 1899, no. 10.

¹⁴ Cilvakas [?], 'Šakiai', *Vilniaus žinios*, 1905, no. 100.

1905 the clerical press too (e.g. *Šaltinis*, ‘The Fountainhead’)—often contained articles that claimed to report actual events illustrating how Jews sought to corrupt the peasantry: ‘Wherever a Jew appears, there immediately follows a decline in faith, goodness, and national consciousness; in other words, demoralization grows.’¹⁵ This ‘aim’ of Jews to spread depravity was sometimes directly attributed to the Talmud.¹⁶ In addition, Jews were accused of caring only about profit and were said to encourage peasants to become drunk or to steal, so that they would be more likely to spend money—naturally—in inns.¹⁷ Thus, both in Motiejus Valančius’s fiction and in the illegal Lithuanian press of the late nineteenth century,¹⁸ the peasantry was often warned to be cautious in the presence of Jews, not only because Jews would trick them, but also because Jews aimed to corrupt the morals of those around them.

ECONOMIC COMPETITION

Major economic and social changes took place in Lithuania in the second half of the nineteenth century. With the abolition of serfdom in 1861 and the growth of favourable market conditions, spurred on by rich grain harvests in Lithuania and an increase in demand from western Europe, the agrarian sector experienced rapid development in the 1870s. This was accompanied by the rise of a number of peasants with additional capital who were inclined to invest in other ventures. However, an agricultural crisis began in the 1880s, which was worsened by differential tariffs that boosted grain export from the provinces of Russia’s interior but did not apply to Lithuania.¹⁹ All these circumstances caused some Lithuanians to see Jews no longer as intermediaries but as competitors.

As noted above, Jews were accused of corrupting the morals of the peasantry for personal profit. And it is precisely economic arguments that are most often mentioned in antisemitic texts. The palette of economic antisemitism categorized Jews as exploiters of Lithuanians and as dishonest traders. Lithuanians were urged to engage in trade and crafts themselves, to boycott Jewish stores, and to buy only from ‘their own kind’. The significance and frequency of such arguments varied in Lithuanian press publications representing the different ideological streams.

¹⁵ Mokytojas G. Taučius, ‘Izraeliaus valdžioje’, *Šaltinis*, 1912, no. 47.

¹⁶ S. L. Kušeliauskas, *Talmudas žydu* (Tilžė, 1906).

¹⁷ Eketis [J. Jazbutis?], ‘Mauszos aimana’, *Tėvynės sargas*, 1898, no. 8, pp. 8–10; v.k. [V. Kudirka], ‘Žinios isz Lietuvos’, *Ūkininkas*, 1890, no. 2, pp. 29–30; An. St. [A. Staugaitis], ‘Prie žydu klausimo’, *Lietuvių laikraštis*, 1905, nos. 44–5.

¹⁸ The ban on printing Lithuanian in the Latin alphabet was introduced in the Russian empire in 1865 and lasted until 1904, so during that period Lithuanian newspapers were published in East Prussia and smuggled into the empire from there.

¹⁹ S. Matulaitis, *Atsiminimai ir kiti kūriniai* (Vilnius, 1957), 30; V. Sirutavičius, ‘Notes on the Origin and Development of Modern Lithuanian Antisemitism in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century and at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century’, in A. Nikžentaitis, S. Schreiner, and D. Staliūnas (eds.), *The Vanished World of Lithuanian Jews* (Amsterdam, 2004), 61–72.

The Jew as Exploiter

This theme appeared both in Lithuanian publications of the mid-nineteenth century²⁰ and in the first illegal Lithuanian newspaper, *Aušra* (1883–6).²¹ Later, at the very end of the century, the topic was discussed in both the clerical and the liberal press, and after the 1905 revolution it was prevalent in the clerical publication *Šaltinis*.²² The image of the Jew as a trader, a moneylender, or an innkeeper exploiting the peasantry was easily accepted in a peasant-oriented agrarian society where a farmer's work was highly valued, whilst profits earned from trade, lending, or similar activities were viewed with less favour, as they did not involve physical labour. Epithets commonly used to describe Jews—bloodsuckers, leeches, fleas, ticks, spiders waiting to trap flies (i.e. peasants) in their webs—arose precisely from this attitude towards the honest, but hard, work of a farmer and the seemingly devious, easy activities of a middleman. It was also sometimes stated that the Jews were a wealthy people.²³

The Jew as Swindler

Even though Lithuanian publications sometimes printed stories in which a Lithuanian outsmarted a Jew, the opposite trend was obviously more dominant.²⁴ In his *Paaugusių žmonių knygelė* ('Little Book for Adults'), Motiejus Valančius warned the peasantry that Jews did their work dismissively, without care for quality and only for profit, and that in any co-operative undertaking or even in a friendship, 'in the end the Jew always cheats the other man'.²⁵ Jews were often accused of tampering with products, for example by mixing quality goods with 'seconds'; wrapping cheap goods in packaging materials taken from expensive products; selling factory rejects as quality goods; and cheating in measurement (usually when weighing).²⁶ It was stated that

the adulteration of various products has become so widespread today that you can't tell what you're eating, or drinking, or sowing, or what fertilizer you're using on the fields. You buy

²⁰ Vareikis, 'Antisemitizmas Lietuvoje', 23.

²¹ We must admittedly agree with Linas Venclauskas that little attention was given to this Jewish topic in *Aušra*, because according to the vision of its publishers, Lithuania was first and foremost a 'cultural and linguistic phenomenon': Venclauskas, 'Moderniojo lietuviško antisemitizmo genezė ir raida', 24. In other words, the publishers of the first illegal newspaper were primarily oriented towards the cultural needs of the modern Lithuanian nation, and in this context the Jewish factor was unimportant.

²² -j-a- [J. Adomaitis], 'Mokintis reikia', *Ūkininkas*, 1891, no. 6, pp. 242–7; Pašeimėnis [Br. Prapuolenis], 'Iš jų vaisių pažįsti juos', *Šaltinis*, 1906, no. 18, pp. 274–5.

²³ A. Domeika, 'Savęs gailėkimės', *Šaltinis*, 1906, no. 36, pp. 562–4.

²⁴ 'Žmogus su geldomis ir žydelka', *Szvieša*, 1900, no. 5.

²⁵ M. Valančius, *Paaugusių žmonių knygelė* (1868), in his *Raštai*, vol. i (Vilnius, 2001), 183. In nineteenth-century Lithuanian texts, the implication of *žmogus* ('man', 'person') could be specifically 'peasant'.

²⁶ -v-k- [V. Kudirka], 'Nuo Zapyszko', *Ūkininkas*, 1890, no. 9, pp. 137–9; V.K. [V. Kudirka], 'Apie pardavinychias', *Ūkininkas*, 1895, no. 2, pp. 9–11; Eketis [J. Jazbutis?], 'Mauszos aimana', *Tėvynės sargas*, 1898, no. 8, pp. 8–10; Driskius [?], 'Vartotojų Draugijų reikalingumas', *Šaltinis*, 1908, no. 3, pp. 37–8.

wine and get water mixed with who knows what; you buy bread, and the Jews have calculated what to mix in so that it weighs more but needs less flour; you buy fertilizer and get some kind of dirt; you buy medicine, and even here the Jew has concocted something.²⁷

The publication of such stories in the Lithuanian press aimed to discourage peasants from buying from Jewish stores. However, the number of Christian-run trading places was small, so the next step was to encourage peasants to start their own businesses.

The Encouragement of Entrepreneurship and National Solidarity among Lithuanians in Business

As Vygantas Vareikis has noted, the author of the first history of Lithuania, Simonas Daukantas, urged Lithuanians to oppose Jewish domination in business and to take up trading themselves.²⁸ The Lithuanian press, primarily *Ūkininkas* in the late nineteenth century, and mostly *Šaltinis* after the 1905 revolution, found many reasons to encourage peasants to open up shops: the claim, noted above, that Jews had a penchant for cheating; the profits that it was allegedly easy to make in trade; the opportunity to shop on Saturdays; and so on. Encouragement not only took the form of urgent exhortations to Lithuanians to open their own shops, but also was provided by the presentation of successful examples from other countries.²⁹

The Lithuanian press did not limit itself to advancing the establishment of enterprises. According to the correspondents of the Lithuanian newspapers, since Jews operated among themselves, especially in the economic sphere, and always tried to compromise competing businesses owned by other ethnic groups, Lithuanians too had to maintain solidarity and support ‘their own’ traders by boycotting Jewish stores.³⁰ This would also be beneficial to Lithuanians because emigration would

²⁷ X.X. [?], ‘Žydai ir mes’, *Šaltinis*, 1914, no. 29, pp. 433–4.

²⁸ Vareikis, ‘Antisemitizmas Lietuvoje’, 23.

²⁹ J. Mažulis, ‘Lietuvių prekyba’, *Šaltinis*, 1908, no. 23, pp. 370–1; Kun. P. P. Bulvičius, ‘Rupinkimės daugiau prekyba!’, *Šaltinis*, 1911, no. 13, pp. 146–7; Stud. [?], ‘Ūkio prekybos klausimas Lietuvoje’, *Šaltinis*, 1914, no. 6, pp. 81–2.

³⁰ [J. Kriaučiūnas], ‘Kam Maskoliai Žydus guja išz kaimų’, *Ūkininkas*, 1893, no. 6, pp. 41–2; X.X. [?], ‘Žydai ir mes’, *Šaltinis*, 1914, no. 29, pp. 433–4. We have little information about the collective efforts made by the Jews to oppose Lithuanian attempts to start trading, but it may be assumed that such efforts were made. One such incident, concerning what was probably the first Lithuanian-owned shop in the Suwałki province (in Pilviškiai), is recounted in the memoirs of the Lithuanian social democrat Stasys Matulaitis: ‘The local Jews were strongly against this new development. When Kačergis rented the premises for a shop from Joškus, whose house stood near the central town square, usually known as the *rinka*, the shop was in an advantageous location, [and so] the Jewish community called a *kehilah* meeting in the synagogue and insistently demanded that Joškus should break his rental agreement with Kačergis. And when he refused to comply with the *kehilah*’s demand, the crowd in the synagogue gave Joškus a pretty good beating-up. But poor Joškus still refused to break his agreement with Kačergis. The shop opened and was successful. This obstinate attempt by Jewish traders to prevent Lithuanians from opening a shop, to eliminate Lithuanian trade, and in this way to avoid competition from other nationalities, failed’: Matulaitis, *Atsiminimai ir kiti kūriniai*, 94. Note that Lithuanian social democrats were not typically antisemitic, which makes this account seemingly trustworthy.

decrease, as many would be able to find work in Lithuania, while Jews would be forced out into other countries.³¹ Many publications dealt with this theme in the late nineteenth century, and new impetus was gained with the boycott of Jewish traders in the Kingdom of Poland, starting in 1912, when the Polish National Democratic candidate Roman Dmowski was defeated in the election to the Fourth Duma in the city of Warsaw by the socialist Eugeniusz Jagiełło, whom the Jews had supported.³² When writing about the Polish boycott, the Lithuanian clerical press urged—either directly or indirectly—that similar action be taken in Lithuania.³³

The strongest expression of economic nationalism was in the Lithuanian newspapers of a politically liberal orientation in the last years of the nineteenth century, and in the clerical press, both at the end of the century and after the 1905 revolution.³⁴ The clergy's objections to the Jews were summarized by the priest Antanas Maliauskas (Maliauskis) in his book *Žydai: Ekonomijos ir visuomenės žvilgsniu* ('Jews: An Economic and Social Sketch'), which professed to be an academic treatise, as the author based his arguments on the works of many western European authors.³⁵ In Maliauskas's opinion, Jews were by nature inclined to cheat, and their primary goal was to profit at any cost. They were a parasitic element of society as they chose only the easiest jobs, exploited others, and—if that were not enough—vitiated the morals of the society in which they lived.³⁶

Within liberal political circles, certain changes became visible. Antisemitic texts in *Varpas* ('The Bell') and *Ūkininkas*, which were directed more towards the masses, became more varied. *Varpas* usually presented a generalized image of the Jew as an

³¹ Musiszkius [?], 'Kaž sako ukinikas savo broliams', *Ūkininkas*, 1890, no. 2, pp. 17–19.

³² Weeks, *From Assimilation to Antisemitism*, 163–9. For more on Polish antisemitism, see B. Porter, *When Nationalism Began to Hate: Imagining Modern Politics in Nineteenth-Century Poland* (New York, 2000).

³³ Ant. Šaltunas, 'Kaip lenkai sumanė nusikrapštyti žydų', *Vienybė*, 1913, no. 10, pp. 148–9; no. 12, pp. 178–80.

³⁴ Researchers have noted that, in the publications of the Samogitian bishop Motiejus Valančius, criticism of Jews was of a secular, not a religious, nature: V. Vareikis, 'Tolerancija ir atskyrimas: Žemaičių vyskupas Motiejus Valančius, Lietuvos katalikų bažnyčia ir žydai', *Lietuvių katalikų mokslo akademijos metraštis*, 20 (2002), 91–103.

³⁵ A. Maliauskas, *Žydai: Ekonomijos ir visuomenės žvilgsniu* (Kaunas, 1914).

³⁶ He maintained, incidentally, that in all other spheres (science, art, culture, politics) Jews could not lay claim to any achievements either; on the contrary, they appeared to have spread harmful ideas: 'In Jewish literature and science, it is first of all subjectivity and egoism that break through': Maliauskas, *Žydai*, 36; 'Thanks go to the Jewish theatre managers, who very often transform real art into something that is superficial and shameless . . . Jews are very likely to mock and defame that which others, especially Christians, hold dear, but they do not allow any mention of their faults in literature, or newspapers, or the theatre': *ibid.* 46; in politics, he added, they spread liberalism and socialism. Maliauskas also claimed that Jewish assimilation was impossible and unwanted: 'The mixing of the "Aryan" nationalities with Jews would bring them to intellectual, physical, and moral degradation. Jewish integration into Christian public life has already had much to do with people's retreat from Christian moral duties. And that attack on morality would be even greater if Jews integrated with Christians, not so much because of their convictions as because of their political persuasions. Then they would bring even more elements of the Jewish world view into our lives': *ibid.* 58.

exploiter of peasants, based on antisemitic theories popular in western Europe, while *Ūkininkas* would more often present descriptions of everyday events from actual places in Lithuania to illustrate the typical negative characteristics attributed to Jews. In other words, *Ūkininkas* oriented itself to its readers and spread antisemitic ideas not so much through theoretical deliberation as by basing its arguments on actual examples. Virtually no new antisemitic texts were printed in *Varpas* from the mid-1890s onwards,³⁷ whilst such pieces stopped appearing in *Ūkininkas* at about the turn of the century. In *Varpas* especially, this development was most likely related to changes in the management of the publication, which in the mid-1890s was staffed by left-wing activists (Stasys Matulaitis, Juozas Bagdonas, and Kazys Grinius). These administrators co-operated closely with the social democrats.³⁸ Later, texts that could be described as antisemitic or close to antisemitic would sometimes appear in the pages of Lithuania's liberal press. Thus, in 1912 an article appeared in *Lietuvos žinios* about a Lithuanian who tried to start trading in flax, but refused to continue with this enterprise once he had had an encounter with the Jews.³⁹ That article conveyed a message about the suffering of Lithuanians and about Jewish traders who profited from their labour. *Lietuvos žinios* also featured articles supporting the Lithuanians' aim to take businesses and trade into their own hands, and to become established in the cities—that is, to become the dominant group.⁴⁰ It is clear that, in striving to achieve these aims, they saw the Jews as competitors.⁴¹ Yet the classification of Jews as competitors, and the invitation to Lithuanians to operate in solidarity in order to become more established in business, might not be fairly labelled as antisemitism.⁴² It is difficult to distinguish between the protection of a nation's own interests and antisemitism; that line should be drawn less on the basis of actual quotations than on the general orientation of a given publication. In the Lithuanian liberal press, periodicals which could unreservedly be termed hostile towards Jews were indeed rare after the 1905 revolution.⁴³

³⁷ Mykolas Römeris drew attention to this change as early as 1908: M. Römeris, *Lietuva: Studija apie lietuvių tautos atgimimą* (1908; Vilnius, 2006).

³⁸ R. Miknys, *Lietuvos demokratų partija 1902–1915 metais*, Lietuvių Atgimimo istorijos studijos 10 (Vilnius, 1995), 106.

³⁹ Ad. [?], 'Imkime linų pirklybą savo rankosna', *Lietuvos žinios*, 1912, no. 26, p. 24.

⁴⁰ K. Arpietis, 'Rupinkimės pirklyba ir pramone', *Lietuvos žinios*, 1914, no. 111.

⁴¹ K. Gr. [K. Grinius?], '1913 met. II. Santykiai su kitataučiais', *Lietuvos žinios*, 1914, no. 16. Similar texts were published in *Lietuvos ūkininkas*: P.R. [?], 'Mums reikia praturtėti', *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1914, no. 5.

⁴² Unless antisemitism is understood very broadly, that is, as any type of antipathy to Jews or competition with them.

⁴³ This was acknowledged also in the Jewish press, which admittedly had cause to reproach *Lietuvos žinios*. The Yiddish newspaper *Di vokh* ('The Week'), for example, suggested that *Lietuvos žinios* should refrain from nationalistic speculation and desist from its opinion that other ethnic groups in Lithuania had to adapt to Lithuanian standards, that is, to recognize their culture and learn their language. The recognition process had to be reciprocal. In addition, *Di vokh* recommended that 'suggestive publications' be avoided: 'Unzer entf', *Di vokh*, 1915, nos. 17–18, pp. 16–20. By 'suggestive publications' the

The social democratic press, represented, for example, by *Naujoji gadynė* ('The New Era'), followed not so much national as class ideology. If it featured articles on this topic at all, it emphasized that not all Jews were exploiters—just the Jewish bourgeoisie.⁴⁴ In the nationalist strand of ideology there was no clearly expressed anti-Jewish economic nationalism. The newspaper *Viltis*, from its inception in 1907 until September 1913, when the chief editor was changed and it fell into the hands of Catholic-oriented editors,⁴⁵ had almost no antisemitic content. This does not mean, of course, that all reports about Jews in this newspaper were positive. The paper's ideologue Antanas Smetona, for example, urged Lithuanians to co-operate with each other, as only through practising solidarity could they hope to prevail in the face of Jewish competition. According to the future president of Lithuania, not only was it unjust that Jews as middlemen profited at the cost of Lithuanians and did not add to the country's (read—Lithuanians') welfare: 'Meanwhile no one realizes that it is certain Lithuanians that add to the Jews' wealth, and that in turn those Jews do not return one penny towards Lithuanian affairs.' In addition to that, their 'dishonest' methods were inherently wrong: 'having such a monopoly on trade, Jewish middlemen can put any price they like on agricultural products and their wares. When the farmer tries to match them and asks a higher price for his grain than is offered, he really regrets it later, as the traders negotiate a price and in the end force the farmer to sell his grain for next to nothing.'⁴⁶ Later, when the newspaper had been taken over by the clergy, a new regular section appeared, titled 'Jewish Relations', along with features describing how Jews interfered with Lithuanians engaging in trade, and further urging Lithuanians not to buy from Jewish stores, and so on—that is, the complete economic antisemitic repertoire that has already been discussed.⁴⁷

THE CULTURAL THREAT

In 1908 Mykolas Römeris, in his famous study of the Lithuanian national movement, observed that 'Jews themselves did not pose a threat to Lithuanian national culture. In the sphere of national culture, the question of Lithuanian–Russian and

Yiddish newspaper had in mind several minor announcements that appeared in *Lietuvos žinios* implying the notion of Jewish amicability with the Germans: S. [?], Pušalotas, 'Panev. apskr.', *Lietuvos žinios*, 1914, no. 180; 'Šiauliai', *Lietuvos žinios*, 1914, no. 182. At the time, the First World War was already under way and such material may have been understood as informing on the Jews to the Russian leadership.

⁴⁴ P. Siūlelis [P. Paršaitis?], 'Kas tas "vidurinis priešas"?', *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907, no. 3, pp. 35–6; M. [P. Avižonis?], 'Apie žydus', *Naujoji gadynė*, 1906, no. 10, pp. 148–9.

⁴⁵ G. Varvuolis, 'Viltis ir "viltininkai"': Lithuanian Institute of History, Vilnius, Manuscript Room, F4-385, fos. 153–64.

⁴⁶ A. Smetona, 'Kooperacijos kelias', *Viltis*, 1911, no. 15.

⁴⁷ P. Kuzma, 'Mūsų prekybos reikalais', *Viltis*, 1913, no. 136; Ylaketis [?], 'Ar gi pigiau parduoda?', *Viltis*, 1914, no. 62; J.P. [?], 'Merkinė', *Viltis*, 1914, no. 104.

Lithuanian–Polish relations was a hundred times livelier and more acute than that between Lithuanians and Jews.⁴⁸ There were similar assessments in the Lithuanian press.⁴⁹ In truth, the leaders of Lithuanian nationalism perceived a greater cultural threat from Poles, Russians, and, in some degree, Germans. The historically determined Polish-speaking cultural domination in Lithuania was understood by some leaders of the Lithuanian national movement, primarily on the right, as the greatest threat to Lithuanian ethnic culture. The so-called Russification policies which began in 1863, seeking Lithuanian assimilation in the Vilna and Kaunas provinces in the future, and acculturation in the Suwałki province, were also seen as a major problem. These factors were real threats to the spread of Lithuanian ethnic culture.⁵⁰ Meanwhile, in the German empire there was rather rapid acculturation and assimilation of Lithuanians into the dominant German culture. In this context, Jewish culture, which neither the imperial leadership nor the country's social elite considered worthy of respect, did not pose any threat to Lithuanians. Indeed, when sometimes Jews did happen to spread a 'foreign culture and language' in Lithuania, it was not Jewish but Russian, for which they were condemned in the pages of the Lithuanian press.⁵¹ Lithuanian nationalist activists, like the political leaders of some other 'rural' nations, held ethnically conscious Jews in much higher regard than those who blindly adopted the beliefs and behaviours of the dominant culture, whether Polish, Russian, or other.⁵²

The 'opposite' process, that is, Jews becoming 'Lithuanians of Mosaic faith', had not really begun and was rarely a topic for discussion. It was sometimes stated that the situation was different from that in France and Germany, where Jews 'became' French or German. In Lithuania, Jews did not become Lithuanians,⁵³ and Lithuanian nationalists fostered little hope for the incorporation in the Lithuanian nation of the Jews.⁵⁴ One publicist who did broach the subject was Vincas Kudirka,

⁴⁸ Römeris, *Lietuva*, 66.

⁴⁹ J. Bur. [J. Burba], 'Męs ir žydai', *Vilniaus žinios*, 1905, no. 207.

⁵⁰ D. Staliūnas, *Making Russians: Meaning and Practice of Russification in Lithuania and Belarus after 1863* (Amsterdam and New York, 2007).

⁵¹ J.B. [J. Vileišis], 'Iš savo pastogės. IV', *Varpas*, 1900, no. 3. In 1917 the famous Lithuanian public figure Matas Šalčius wrote about the situation before the war: 'In the end, Jews, as expected, turned out to be opponents of the Lithuanian language as well. Lithuanian teachers who had Jewish pupils at their schools were not allowed to teach the Lithuanian language, as Jews asked that their children be taught Russian, and made complaints to the government about these Lithuanian teachers elsewhere, in Eržvilkas, Seda, and at other places. The Kaunas Jews shouted at the Lithuanians who came into town to the markets and shops for speaking "litauckai, chamckai" ['in Lithuanian, coarsely']': M. Šalčius, *Dešimt metų tautiniai-kultūrinio darbo Lietuvoje (1905–1915)* (Chicago, 1917), 44.

⁵² Precisely such attitudes were typical of the Ruthenian political leaders from Galicia: J. Shanes and Y. Petrovsky Shtern, 'An Unlikely Alliance: The 1907 Ukrainian–Jewish Electoral Coalition', *Nations and Nationalism*, 15 (2009), 483–505.

⁵³ Q.D. and K. [V. Kudirka], 'Tevyniški Varpai', *Varpas*, 1890, no. 10.

⁵⁴ An article published in *Varpas* in 1892 giving a positive response to mixed marriages between Lithuanians and Jews was most likely the only example of such a publication: 'Iš Lietuvos', *Varpas*, 1892, no. 2.

who based some of his arguments, including racist elements, on the ideas of the French antisemite Édouard Adolphe Drumont. Because Kudirka considered that Jews were inherently evil, and that it was impossible to transform ‘them’, he cautioned non-Jews to beware of them and to struggle against them.⁵⁵

POLITICAL ENEMIES?

Publications of a Catholic orientation made use of another argument typical of the antisemitic discourse then popular in Europe: that Jews aimed to control the world, indeed practically already did so. Serafinas Kušeliauskas saw the roots of this idea in the teachings of the Talmud.⁵⁶ The clerical periodicals by now had no doubt that Jews controlled the world through banks, other financial institutions, trade, and the press.⁵⁷ If truth be told, there were not many publications articulating this stance; more articles highlighted Jewish solidarity in a specific location or region. Of course, there was only one step between such discussions and claims of a world controlled by Jews.

Another reproach directed at Jews was that they did not support the Lithuanian national movement and ‘showed no concern for national issues’ (as understood by Lithuanians).⁵⁸ From the perspective of Lithuanian nationalism, the dominant political aims on the ‘Jewish street’ were in fact opposed to the Lithuanian political programme, as the majority of Jewish political groupings in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries sought to reform the Russian empire, transforming it into a democratic state that would grant its ethnic groups national–personal autonomy. The Lithuanian aim of gaining territorial autonomy within the ethnically Lithuanian boundaries objectively went against the Jewish political programme.⁵⁹ There were

⁵⁵ Several memoirs mention that, in the first essay that Kudirka wrote in Lithuanian (his earlier work had been in Polish), he devoted a passage to ‘Why Jews do not eat pork’: K. Grinius, ‘Prie V. Kudirkos gyvenimo’: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, New York, RG 1400 (Bund Archives), ME 1, folder 319; letter of Fr. T. Žilinskas, most probably addressed to J. Gabrys, 1909: *ibid.*; Fr. T. Žilinskas, ‘Pora brūkšnių prie Dro Vinco Kudirkos biografijos’: *ibid.*, ME 21, folder 2. Kudirka’s essay, somewhat edited, was later printed in *Aušra*, 1885, no. 6, pp. 160–1. For more about the racial elements in Kudirka’s antisemitism, see Vareikis, ‘Antisemitizmas Lietuvoje’, 38–9, and Sirutavičius, ‘Notes on the Origin and Development of Modern Lithuanian Antisemitism’, 66.

⁵⁶ Kušeliauskas, *Talmudas žydų*, 7.

⁵⁷ Plunksnius [?], ‘Žydų galybė’, *Šaltinis*, 1913, no. 42, pp. 641–2; K. [?], ‘Kokie tad svetimi laikraščiai skaitytini? (Dėl kun. J. Tumo straipsnio. II. Laikraštija ir žydija)’, *Viltis*, 1913, no. 161; 1914, no. 2.

⁵⁸ ‘Iš Lietuvos’, *Varpas*, 1892, no. 2, pp. 29–30; Jon. Kas. [J. Kriaučiūnas], ‘Apie žydus sionistus’, *Vilniaus žinios*, 1905, no. 219; X.X. [?], ‘Žydai ir mes’, *Šaltinis*, 1914, no. 29, pp. 433–4. Matas Šalčius wrote: ‘Jews, reaping their bounty from the Lithuanian land and hoarding its wealth, have never made any contributions to that land’s cultural affairs or exerted themselves to that end, but have put a lot of their funds into those “Zionist languages” and Jewish national and industrial affairs’: Šalčius, *Dešimt metų tautiniai-kultūrinio darbo Lietuvoje*, 44.

⁵⁹ Pilyps [?], ‘Naujai apsišiekusių žydų tarpe dvasia’, *Vilniaus žinios*, 1906, no. 94; V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas (eds.), *A Pragmatic Alliance: Jewish–Lithuanian Political Cooperation at the Beginning of the 20th Century* (Budapest and New York, 2011).

instances in which the illegal Lithuanian periodical press blamed Jews for pandering to the government, or even seeking to harm Lithuanian interests.⁶⁰

However, as in many other European countries, the most common criticism of the Jews levelled by the right wing of the Lithuanian national movement was related to the active participation of Jews in leftist parties and movements. This topic became especially heated during the 1912 elections to the Fourth Russian Duma in the Suwałki province, when the representatives of the Lithuanian left wing under Leonas Bulota united in one bloc with the Jews and confronted the Lithuanian clerics. The Lithuanian clerical press, and primarily *Šaltinis*, accused the Jews of seeking to spread ‘progressive’—leftist—ideas, whilst Bulota’s greatest sin was his collaboration with the Jews.

IN PLACE OF A CONCLUSION

There was ultimately no shortage of antisemitic articles in the Lithuanian press, and one might classify *Varpas* and *Ūkininkas* in the late nineteenth century, as well as *Šaltinis* after the 1905 revolution, as antisemitic publications; anti-Jewish sentiments were prevalent especially in the clerical press.⁶¹ Nevertheless, antisemitism did not develop into an organized political movement in Lithuania and its ideology did not constitute an important part of Lithuanian nationalism. Racial ideas did not catch on and there were only a few assertions of the irredeemable nature of Jews. In this respect, alongside Vincas Kudirka the priest Antanas Maliauskas should also be mentioned.

One of the most important reasons for the relatively modest scale of Lithuanian antisemitism, as has already been noted in the historiography, was the slow pace of social and economic modernization in Lithuania. Despite some changes, Lithuania continued to be an agrarian country, and the ethnic division of labour that had been formed long ago, in which Lithuanians farmed the land and Jews carried out various mediatory functions, remained essentially the same. Even though Lithuanians did aim to establish themselves in trade or other businesses, they did not significantly alter the status quo or generate harsh conflicts. Compared with neighbouring countries that had large Jewish communities, Lithuania had relatively few pogroms⁶² and the damage done was marginal; just one fatality was recorded, during a pogrom in 1905 in Dusetos.⁶³ But even though this socio-economic interpretation is important, it cannot by itself suffice, if only because it does not explain why antisemitism was

⁶⁰ ‘Iš Lietuvos’, *Varpas*, 1892, no. 2, pp. 29–30; ‘Bukite atsargūs!’, *Tėvynės sargas*, 1900, no. 8.

⁶¹ Indeed, there were several appeals made for increased antisemitism: An. St. [A. Staugaitis], ‘Prie žydų klausimo’, *Lietuvių laikraštis*, 1905, nos. 44–5; J.V. [?], ‘Žydų politika’, *Šaltinis*, 1912, no. 44.

⁶² Sirutavičius and Staliūnas (eds.), *Kai ksenofobija virsta prievarta*; D. Staliūnas, ‘Litauen’, in W. Benz (ed.), *Handbuch des Antisemitismus: Judenfeindschaft in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, i: *Länder und Regionen* (Berlin and New York, 2008), 217–21.

⁶³ D. Staliūnas, ‘Dusetos, Easter 1905: The Story of One Pogrom’, *Journal of Baltic Studies*, forthcoming.

strong in both the clerical and the liberal press in the late nineteenth century, but subsequently weakened, remaining only in publications edited and financed by priests. It is hard to reconcile this with the fact that it was precisely in the 1880s and 1890s that antisemitism was strong in the rest of Europe, and that there too it later also abated.⁶⁴ Events that took place in Lithuania and the tsarist empire truly had more impact on Lithuanian nationalism than did the influence of one or another ideology beyond the state's borders. A significant, but non-determining, condition was the death of probably the most vocal proponent of Lithuanian antisemitism, Vincas Kudirka, in 1899.

The relatively weak expression of antisemitism in the Lithuanian press of the early twentieth century is also linked to a political conjuncture.⁶⁵ Lithuanian nationalism had a clear anti-imperial character. Those Jews who were among the politically active section of society were mostly of a leftist or liberal persuasion, and hence were allies in this struggle. Thus, when Lithuanian leftist parties had the greatest influence among Lithuanian voters during elections to the State Duma, they would easily form voting blocs with Jews. According to *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 'Though Jews are not Catholics and not Lithuanians, and though they accept Russian culture and maintain that culture in our cities, there is one good aspect to them—they are progressives, fighters for freedom and for a better organization of the state.'⁶⁶ Poles were important opponents (if not the most important ones) for both Lithuanian social democrats and nationalists: for the former as class (and partly cultural) enemies, and for the latter as cultural and political foes. As was noted by one of the leaders of the liberal wing of Lithuanian nationalism, Kazys Grinius, those who had thrown their weight behind *Varpas* in the late nineteenth century believed that 'Lithuanians still had too few resources to stage a war on several fronts, and did not advocate open antisemitism'.⁶⁷ Thus, in the 'hierarchy of enemies' in Lithuanian nationalism, except perhaps for clerics, Jews were not a prioritized problem; rather the opposite—they were potential allies in the battle with the most important opponents: the Poles and the Russians/Russia.

This need for a political alliance with Jews minimized antisemitism in the Lithuanian press; however, it can be assumed that the genuine or circumstantial benevolence of some Lithuanian nationalist leaders towards Jews was not transmitted to the masses. As a result, during the elections to the First State Duma in the Kaunas province, despite the attempts of Jonas Basanavičius, one of the leading figures in the Lithuanian national revival, to form a common bloc with the Jews, antisemitic comments surfaced quite frequently among the peasantry, while Kazimieras Samajauckas, a member of the National Lithuanian Democratic Party,

⁶⁴ W. I. Brustein, *Roots of Hate: Anti-Semitism in Europe before the Holocaust* (Cambridge, 2003).

⁶⁵ Here I shall not discuss further the attitudes of the Lithuanian leftist activists, for some of whom antisemitism was on principle unacceptable as it went against the general tenets of democracy and social justice.

⁶⁶ Juozas [?], 'Ka daryti?', *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907, no. 2, p. 18.

⁶⁷ K. Grinius, *Atsiminimai ir mintys*, 2 vols. (Tübingen, 1947–62), i. 176.

made the following forthright observation: ‘A bloc made with the Jews will discredit Lithuanian voters in the “eyes of the people”.’⁶⁸ During the elections to the Second State Duma, Lithuanian voters were at first afraid of negotiating with Jews as ‘having returned [home], they would be skinned for selling out to the Jews’.⁶⁹ Similar trends can be seen in the elections to the Fourth Duma. According to the priest Juozas Šnapšis (Šnapšys–Margalis), the activity of Lithuanian social activists in Telšiai was greatly complicated by agitators from Kaunas, who revealed that an agreement had been reached with the Jews to co-operate in the provincial election curia. This information was said to have encouraged some of the ‘sold-out’ Lithuanian voters to exclaim: ‘Hey, listen, they’re selling out to the Jews and Calvinists.’⁷⁰ Equally telling was another episode related to the Beilis case. The critical articles by Petras Leonas in *Lietuvos ūkininkas* about the alleged Jewish use of Christian blood for religious rituals and Fr. Pranaitis’s critique provoked great dissatisfaction among some readers. The editorial board hastened to reassure them that, while the superstition itself deserved criticism, it in no way wished to defend those Jews who ‘harmed and exploited’ Lithuanians.⁷¹ However, the editorial board’s defence of itself was probably ineffective, as in the following year, 1914, according to one of the newspaper’s publishers (Felicija Bortkevičienė) the number of subscriptions to *Lietuvos ūkininkas* fell precisely because of the contributions by Leonas.⁷² These examples show that latent forms of antisemitism remained alive even in the section of the peasantry that sympathized with Lithuanian leftist and liberal political streams—those who were not typically antisemitic.

Translated from the Lithuanian by Albina Strunga

⁶⁸ D. Staliūnas, ‘Collaboration of Lithuanians and Jews during the Elections to the First and the Second Dumas’, in Sirutavičius and Staliūnas (eds.), *Pragmatic Alliance*, 50.

⁶⁹ J. [?], ‘Rinkimai atstovų Dūmon Kaune’, *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1907, no. 6.

⁷⁰ Fr. J. Šnapšis, letter to A. Dambrauskas, 4 Oct. 1912: Vilnius University Library, Manuscript Section, F1 E94, fo. 8. One of the most active agitators, Martynas Yčas, was an Evangelical reformist, not a Catholic, as were most other Lithuanians.

⁷¹ ‘Nuo Redakcijos’, *Lietuvos ūkininkas*, 1913, no. 46, pp. 475–6.

⁷² P. Leonas, ‘Mano pergyvenimai ir prisiminimai. V–ji dalis (1906–1914 m. m.)’: Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, Vrublevskis Library, Vilnius, Manuscript Section, F117-1078, fo. 125.

