The pogrom that broke out in Skvira, a large town at a railroad junction southwest of Kiev and home to the Chernobyl Hasidic court, in December 1919, was the eighth since October 1917. For two weeks, the Denikin army troops had terrorized the Jews of Skvira: at least sixty people had been killed, over three hundred were wounded, and a “huge” number of women were raped, with almost twenty of them subsequently requiring medical help. The Jewish women of Skvira had been repeatedly raped by various pogrom perpetrators throughout 1919, but the rapes were seldom voluntarily reported, because of the humiliation and shame associated with them. However, as the pogroms intensified, and mass rape of Jewish women overwhelmed Jewish communities, people started to narrate their experiences. As one Roitbok, a victim of the fifth pogrom in Skvira in August 1919 by the Zolotonoshsky unit of Petliura’s army, described his dreadful experience minute by minute, he painstakingly focused on some seemingly insignificant details but apparently left some obvious gaps in his witness account.

A group of twenty-four Jews had congregated in one house waiting for the pogrom that was about to break out; however, they had been caught off guard, and had not managed to escape to a hideout across the street. The “bandits,” as Roitbok called the assailants, had dragged all the Jews out and divided the men and women in two groups, but had kept them in the same space. Petliura’s soldiers intended to rape the Jewish women, and wanted it to hurt the most, so they had arranged the scene in a way that would augment the upcoming
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violence. The violent rites of the pogrom had unfolded according to social gender codes, and pogrom perpetrators deliberately and strategically utilized them. After separating men and women, the pogromschiki had tortured and tormented their victims in an effort to extort as much money and jewelry as they could, and had robbed the apartments. Once the initial loot had been acquired, the bandits proceeded to a macabre entertainment: torture and rape. One girl had been selected and raped in turns by a group of soldiers on the spot, in front of the gathered Jews. The other three attackers had beaten the witness’s cousin until she fell on the floor, where one of the men proceeded to punch her chest and abdomen. The victim managed to run out of the house. She had been crying on the porch, apparently unable to move because of the shock and pain, when another group of pogromschiki came by, dragged her inside the house, raped her in turns, and shot her dead afterward. Her sister had been separated from her mother, dragged by the soldiers into the next room, and raped. Her aunt had been murdered by the youngest bandit, who had been left behind to guard her but got bored with his task. One of the bandits began to abuse Roitbok’s eleven-year-old sister. He then told Roitbok to kiss the girl goodbye and shot her on the spot. After that, he dragged the crying Roitbok to the apothecary across the street, where they forced him to produce some money to pay for the bullets and the wear and tear on the whip that the bandit had used to beat him. After the bandit left, Roitbok, shaken and exhausted by the pogrom experience, sat on the chair in the deserted apothecary and fell asleep for two hours, as if his whole being could not cope with the trauma.

Most of the female members of the Roitbok household were subjected to brutal rape, carried out in front of witnesses and by the group of pogrom perpetrators. This single narrative of one episode of one of the pogroms is illustrative of the mass rape of Jewish women, as the rape scenario was repeated over and over throughout 1919 with striking similarity. Even this particularly violent episode should be considered within the larger perspective, as it was one of many that happened in the course of the fifth pogrom, which means that Jews of Skvira had already been victims of pogrom violence, or at least had witnessed it, four times, and would yet suffer similar experiences thrice in the course of a few months.3

3 The first pogrom at the end of 1917 by local peasants and the third pogrom in March 1919 by Red Army troops produced no casualties, but looting, beating, and abuse did take place. The second pogrom by Petliura’s retreating platoons in February 1919 and the third by Tyutyunik and Zheleznyak gangs in June 1919 brought devastation and left behind casualties. Roitbok and his family had been already exposed to the pogrom violence before, and survivors had yet to live through another Petliura’s pogrom in September, a pogrom by the Makhno gang that terrorized Skvira through October and November 1919, and a pogrom by Denikin’s army in December.
The pogrom script, as it evolved during the Ukrainian Civil War, focused on intentionally horrific violence against Jews with the intent of not only killing the Jews but also of destroying Jewish life first and foremost. The objective of the genocidal violence was to destroy the very basis of Jewish existence, to demolish all sacred values of Jewish life, and to inflict maximum suffering onto Jews through both violence and the exposure of violence. The Jews were destined to become witnesses to their own disgrace.

In the context of a violent conflict like wars or riots, there is a type of violence other than murderous that does not aim to achieve death of an enemy as its primary target, but aims to destroy the very core of the human being—the able self—while keeping the body alive. Slavery, torture, and rape rob the victim of the ability to control his or her actions and his or her body, and aim to inflict suffering that is continuous. Often, slavery, torture, and rape are interwoven, and employed at once, and the distinction between the three can become blurred. Theoretically, torture and slavery are not gender-based, and can have practical goals, such as extraction of labor or of information, although that is not a requirement. Rape, regardless of a victim’s identity, is always a gender crime, which does not and cannot have purposeful goals, but can inflict maximum suffering on the victims, the gazing crowd, and the larger community.

The mass rape of Jewish women became a prominent feature of the violent pogroms all over Ukraine. Tcherikower in his notes seems to have exhausted his vocabulary trying to give a name to the massive occurrences of rape during the Civil War pogroms that he refers to as an “epidemic.” Though rape had been a feature of anti-Jewish violence throughout Jewish history, and in the history of pogrom violence in particular, it was not a significant part of the pogroms in 1917–18. In 1919, however, the number of rapes of Jewish women surged tremendously. Mass rape of Jewish women affected, according to very conservative estimates, no less than half of Jewish women in the places where pogroms occurred. It is very difficult to assemble the exact rape statistics because rape generally was seldom reported, as it was unanimously understood as shameful for the victim, but at the same time recognized by the Jewish population of Ukraine as an integral part of the traditional pogrom script. As a result, nobody, neither pogrom survivors nor persons who assessed pogroms and interpreted the data, wanted to discuss rape publicly, but they shared the understanding that rape had taken place in the course of pogroms. However, as pogroms unfolded, more and more reports would account for the mass rape.
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of Jewish women. Very cautious at first for “obvious reasons,” the reports of the growing number of rapes became more explicit and precise as mass rape of Jewish women ruptured Jewish communities beyond repair.

Mass rape should be regarded within the context of genocidal violence, and specifically of how this brand of violence strategically targeted the interiority of every victim, every witness, and every victimized community. The concept of genocidal rape has been developed by a number of feminist scholars, particularly Claudia Card, and is increasingly recognized by the international community. The purpose of genocidal rape, according to these thinkers, is to assert the power and superiority of the perpetrators, destroy publicly the dignity of women, and, in doing so, victimize the whole community through humiliation. The shame and disgrace of rape endures long after the execution of the crime, and is transmitted from generation to generation. The traumatic experience dramatically impacts the victimized community. Mass rape thus aims to promote the social death of the community which, along with its physical destruction, is the ultimate objective of genocide.

Integral to the strategic goals of gender violence utilized by most of the belligerent armies involved was the creation of a public spectacle of mass rape, which augmented the humiliation and impacted more observers. Almost without exception, rape was perpetrated collectively and in the presence of witnesses. The public rape performance fit into what we have termed an evolving pogrom script. The street theater aspect played out through carnivalesque rituals in a way immediately recognized by Jewish communities from their historical and more recent experiences. In 1919, however, the level of anti-Jewish violence spun out of proportion and manifested itself in both an unprecedented death toll, excess of humiliating torture, and brutal, visceral rape. The mass rape had evolved within this archaic scenario, and often became its culmination.

THE PUBLIC SPECTACLE OF RAPE

Spectacle makes mass rape genocidal. During the pogrom in Rossava that has been discussed at length, the public rape of a Jewish girl emerged as the central performance in the theater of violence, a focal point of the pogrom,
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and its culmination.\textsuperscript{7} Here, Cossacks brutally raped every other Jewish woman and girl in the town on the first evening, leaving them naked on the streets to bleed to death. The \textit{pogromschiki} did not differentiate by age or physical condition: they raped a seventy-year-old woman before her husband’s eyes, the twelve-year-old daughter of a local distiller, and a new mother who had just given birth. According to eyewitnesses, the parents were hacked to pieces as they tried to cover the naked bodies of their daughters. The mass rape continued into the second day of the pogrom. On the third day of the pogrom, the White officers summoned Rossava’s entire population to the central square. Roza Kozlova, who had been raped by a group of Cossacks on the previous day, arrived at the gathering with her parents. It is clear that the previous rape had happened in public, since the anonymous witness, and probably everyone else, knew about it. The Cossacks shot Roza’s father on the spot. After that, her mother “was picked up on the sabers,” forcing her daughter to observe the killing of her parents, while the whole scene was exposed to the public. Then the Cossacks dragged Roza to the shed in the square, gang raped her again, and after that pushed her outside into the crowd. Apparently this horrible display of rape was the essential communication from the Cossacks and their command to the crowd of peasants, and to the Jews, regardless of what the official reason for the summoning was. This dramatized rape performance unfolded at the peak point of the pogrom, after the looting, general torture and beatings, and mass rape of Jewish women had already taken place in public spaces. The spectacle of Kozlova’s rape was an intentional and significant statement of power and ultimate domination, the culmination of the grand performance of the pogrom.

A common pattern emerges in the theater of pogrom violence: every rape and every act of violence is executed as a spectacle, which together coalesces into one big performance that often culminates in a grand finale. A meticulously staged spectacle concluded the November pogrom in the small shtetl of Bobrovitsy, located to the east of Kiev and a long distance away from Rossava. The pogrom unfolded according to the same common script: the Cossacks first announced a “tribute” to be paid by the Jewish community, then went around the houses, tortured the Jews, and collected the loot; and the Jewish women were raped at homes in front of their families or in the streets by groups of Cossacks, who also specifically targeted unmarried teenage girls to be brutally raped in public. After the pogrom was over, the Jewish population of Bobrovitsy assembled at the cemetery to bury the pogrom victims. At the exact time when

\textsuperscript{7} YIVO Archive, file 209, 18770–71.
all the Jews gathered at the cemetery, a large group of Cossacks rode back into the shtetl, forced their way into the cemetery, and raped the fifteen-year-old shammes’s (a sexton in a synagogue) daughter right there in front of everyone present. In Bobrovitsy, the spectacle of rape was orchestrated to achieve maximum dramatic effect to punish and disgrace Jews: it brutally deprived the Jewish community of the appropriate mourning for their dead, symbolically vandalized the sacred space, and humiliated Jews further by public destruction of female dignity and honor.

The street theater of pogrom violence, ritualized and exposed, appealed to the most bestial and primal emotions of perpetrators, victims, and bystanders. For pogromschiki, this macabre circus became a source of satisfaction and entertainment, which derived primarily not from physical gratification, or sadistic pleasure, but from the mortification and suffering of the punished victims. The rapists acted as a group with a collective purpose, and the rape of Jewish women in Rossava or Bobrovitsy, and all the other shtetls and towns, had been performed as a public statement.

Claudia Card argued that “one set of fundamental functions of rape, civilian or martial, is to display, communicate, and produce or maintain dominance.” The spectacle of rape delivers the message of dominance to the vulnerable community, and transforms an individual act of sexual violence into a calculated assault on the community in general. In other words, public exposure and ritualized performance of rape is a strategy aimed to remove the act of rape from a private domain, to strip it of the emotional and intimate aspect of sexuality, to absolve a perpetrator from responsibility, and to validate rape as an act of punishment in the public domain.

No discussion of public punishment is possible without referencing the classic work by Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish.* Foucault described the practice of public torture and execution, and its demise in modern history. The purpose of public scaffolding in premodern history was to establish and emphasize absolute monarchical power over subjects. The public execution that appeared “to exceed . . . in savagery the crime itself” appealed to the most bestial feelings of the crowd, and established a potent image of absolute power as the body of the condemned was subjected to elaborate torture. As society, challenged by modernity, changed its values and objectives, Foucault argues,
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the spectacle of public scaffolding has been substituted with the public trial that focuses on the prosecution of justice, while the actual punishment is carried out away from the public view and is based on discipline—an inverted version of spectacle, when the condemned are subjected to constant scrutiny.

Foucault described how the public spectacle of violence disappeared in the nineteenth century. In the twentieth century, it made a comeback as a strategic weapon of war and genocide. Bergoffen has analyzed the politics of gender in modern warfare through the public rape of women to further genocidal objectives:

The public rape strategy exploits the ways that the rape spectacles create images of horror that inflame feelings of shame and disgust either by staging a Sadean challenge to the incest taboo, manipulating fantasy of masculine sovereignty or disrupting (if not destroying) the gender identities of men and women.12

Bergoffen argues that in peacetime rape reinforces gender identities indigent to the patriarchal society: rape serves as a punishment for the woman who placed herself in harm’s way by leaving the protection of her family.13 Wartime and genocidal rape aim to destroy publicly the traditional gender identities of the community, feminizing men and instrumentalizing women. The spectacle of rape targets not just women whose bodies are violated and degraded, but “their men” as well, who are degraded and humiliated in the eyes of the enemy, of the onlookers, of their peers, of their tortured women, and in their own eyes.

Roitbok’s narrative14 of his experience of the Skvira pogrom illustrates how he, in his designated role of observer, was involved in gender violence. He and other Jewish men were forced to watch the rape of women they knew and were related to. The shame and humiliation of the spectacle were acutely experienced by Roitbok, and he omitted all the descriptions of the actual act of rape, while going into a lot of minor details about other actions of the pogrom perpetrators. The logic of the narrative suggests that Roitbok15 intentionally did not mention all the instances of gender violence inflicted on his close relatives and possibly on his little sister. Roitbok is closely involved in the unraveling

12 Bergoffen, *Contesting the Politics of Genocidal Rape*, 50.
13 In reality, Bergoffen remarks, domestic rape defies this narrative, because in this case rape is perpetrated by men charged with protection of women. Ibid., 51.
14 Miljakova, *Kniga Pogromov*, 227–28.
15 For the reasons to be discussed at length in the following chapters.
visceral performance—the bandits address him when they are deciding what to do with his little sister and suggest that he “kiss her goodbye” after she was murdered. The crying Roitbok was humiliated further by the suggestion that he pay for the tear and wear of the whip he was beaten with. Roitbok was physically exhausted by his role of observer and fell asleep after he was left alone, which appears to be a sign of an adaptive response to his extremely traumatic experience.

Gender and sexual politics establish how the spectacle of rape impacts the most visceral and bestial human emotions, and causes the most damage to human interiority. The pogroms in Ukraine were not carried out as an ethnic cleansing campaign or a religious war, or rather were never described as such, and lacked the single ideological set of violence narrative. The pogrom genocide was narrated and rationalized in strictly political terms and utilized the infamous Judeo-Bolshevik canard, which by no means reflected the real motivations of the groups of perpetrators. Considering that pogroms were perpetrated by a number of armed forces, who fought for absolutely different reasons and goals, the messages that they communicated through anti-Jewish violence were poles apart. To some groups of pogrom perpetrators, the rape spectacle proved to be more instrumental than to others. Specifically, the White Army did utilize Foucauldian public punishment on several different levels, as a genocidal strategy and simultaneously in the form of a narrative of monarchial power, reenacted by both assailants and their victims.

The reenactment of the monarchial narrative as Foucault’s “spectacle of the scaffold” perfectly served the White Army’s faux representation of the Tsarist regime. For the White Army, with its unclear goals and objectives, anti-Jewish violence became a technique to define themselves and their enemy. The reenactment of monarchial ceremonies, as discussed in the previous chapter, was reinforced by the public display of cruel punishment. The original mechanism of public punishment, as described by Foucault, focused not on the original crime that caused the retribution, but on the monarchial rite to exact this punishment. Only a certain kind of power exerts itself directly on bodies and is exalted and strengthened by its visible manifestations. Such power, or a simulacrum of power in the case of White Army vis-à-vis the Jewish community, best asserts itself through militarized order, treats real or imaginary breach of rules or laws as a betrayal that requires vengeance, and retaliates
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against disobedience as if against an act of hostility. The crusade unleashed by the White Army against the Jews was grounded in popular prejudice, which was at the same time deeply rooted in ages of animosity. The White Army represented not a real authority that could enforce its laws, but an imaginary one that fed off demonstration of force against its enemies, and, in Foucault’s own words, “in the absence of continual supervision, sought a renewal of its effect in the spectacle of its individual manifestations; of a power that was recharged in the ritual display of its reality as ‘super-power.’”

The publicized violence strengthened the White Army’s image as a monarchical absolute power and ensured and furthered genocidal objectives. Foucault did not and could not discuss rape as a form of public punishment as exercised by monarchical power. However, it was in a form of publicly exposed rape that “spectacle of the scaffold” made a comeback during the pogroms and became the focal point, the culmination of the spectacle of violence practiced by all pogrom perpetrators. Genocidal rape, as was discussed earlier, emerges as an extremely versatile form of weapon, which inflicts maximum damage on the victimized community. This heinous strategy works best when communicated through ugly spectacle, fitting perfectly into pogrom script, which is also based on publicly executed violent rites. The rituals of mass rape are almost identical in most pogroms; however, the secondary details specific to each pogrom demonstrate how the meaning of rape was emphasized.

The shtetl of Borzna, located northwest of Kiev, was of no specific significance, as it was rather far away from the two closest railway stations, but nevertheless lay directly on the line between Kiev and Moscow. The Jewish population of Borzna numbered approximately three hundred and fifty families. From the end of August to the beginning of September 1919, White Army regiments forced the Bolshevik troops out of Borzna, but the Reds managed to recapture the town. Borzna changed hands up to nine times, although the evidence is conflicting, some anti-Jewish violence took place every time regardless of which troops took over. Finally on September 15 (old style) the White cavalry regiment known to the local Jewish population as the Blue Cuirassiers or the Hussars of Death came into town. The pogrom broke out immediately: “they came in at four o’clock in the afternoon, but already in half an hour the piercing female screams were heard from everywhere,” recalled Rivka Raskovskai,
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sister of the leader of the Borzna Jewish community. Raskovskaia’s evidence is very restrained compared to other accounts of Borzna pogrom, but she also singled out mass rape as the most defining aspect of pogrom violence. Almost all Borzna pogrom narratives focus on the horrible and exceedingly brutal rape of Jewish women, and particularly young girls. The death toll of the Borzna pogrom was relatively low, compared to many other shtetls—twenty-four Jews died, and many were tortured by partial hanging, pulling out of beards, etc. Murders, torture, and beatings of Jewish men are mentioned as a background to the spectacle of rape: large groups of Cossacks undressed young Jewish girls in front of their families and other people, flogged them, and then brutally raped them. Raskovskaia mentions one thirteen-year-old Jewish girl raped in her house in front of the girl’s father and grandfather; other reports name one more victim, Yoffe, a fourteen-year-old girl; and although only one case of rape was registered officially for “obvious reasons,” all respondents talk about the epidemic of syphilis, and a lot of pregnancies that resulted from the pogrom.  

The pogrom perpetrators in Borzna deliberately built up tension and fear by gradually approaching the culmination of the performance: undressing, then flogging, and after that—the greatest punishment—rape. In this case, the “punishment” aspect of rape was stressed through the public flogging—a basic form of punishment that would be understood as such by a spectator of any age and social status. Forced undressing aimed to cause more shame for the victims and their families, and to stress the subservient position of the Jews. The elaborate and malevolent choreography of the Borzna pogrom illustrates how rape culminates in a public spectacle as a focal point of the pogrom. But the Foucauldian “art of torture” would be pointless if there were no one to observe it. The spectacle of rape required an audience, and in Borzna, like in other pogrom-stricken towns, the audience was carefully selected.

With the established function of the public mass rape of Jewish women as a strategic weapon, the role of the spectator becomes a crucial one. The humiliating aspect of the torture is validated only when witnessed and comprehended as such. Without witnesses, the sadistic act remains an individual performance of assault and torture, but once the event gains spectators the rape becomes an act of public punishment, an act of war, which requires no vindication or justification. Foucault wrote: “In the ceremonies of the public execution, the main character was the people, whose real and immediate presence was required for the performance.”
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The main function of the audience is to observe, to look. The practice of looking or observing, unlike simply seeing, is one of the basic ways to interpret the world, like writing or speaking, Sturken and Cartwright argue in “Practices of Looking.”  

Looking is irreversible, as an image once seen cannot be wiped out from consciousness without a trace. The practice of looking involves the relationship of power: images communicate a message and cause a spectrum of emotions from pleasure to horror; through looking people can influence and be influenced. The complicated process of looking that establishes the relationship between the image and the observer is described in psychoanalysis as the gaze. The Lacanian concept of the gaze, usually applied to film and fine arts, fundamentally describes the pleasure and desire experienced by the spectator in a particular set of social circumstances. Feminist scholarship argued early on that visual culture is traditionally structured around the “male gaze” that disempowers woman by making them objects of voyeurism. Sturken and Cartwright proceed to argue that the concept of gaze is not restricted to subjectivity and the spectator, and, according to Foucault’s theory, there are institutional gazes that establish the relationship of power between individuals within its realm. The images can exert power and act as its instruments. All the meanings and functions of gaze were simultaneously employed in the context of mass rape of Jewish women during pogroms, inflicting maximum suffering on the maximum number of people.

The audience of pogrom rape consisted of three groups of people: large groups of pogrom perpetrators, the local non-Jewish population, and the Jews. The local non-Jewish population identified with the perpetrators during the UNA pogroms, and was not necessarily present during Denikin’s pogroms. Whenever the non-Jewish crowd was present to witness the spectacle of rape, it provided yet another gaze to intensify the suffering of the victims. Whether mass rape took place in front of a large crowd, like in Rossava, where all the population was forced to assemble in the central square, or inside the houses, like in Skvira as described by Roitbok, the assailants endeavored to perform
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the rape in front of the family members of the victims. The composite audience provided the gaze, which, to Sturken and Cartwright “is the process in which the object functions to make the subject look, making the subjects appear to himself or herself as lacking.” The transitional function of the gaze turned the Jewish audience into victims and perpetrators at the same time: by actively witnessing the spectacle, the Jewish audience added to the suffering of the women being raped, and inflicted further suffering onto themselves by both watching the execution of their own and by recognizing themselves as doing so.

The pogrom perpetrators recognized the power of the gaze and sought to intensify it by involving close relations of the victim: parents, children, and other family members were very often forced to witness the rape of their daughters, sisters, and mothers. During the pogrom in Cherkassy, the father of two teenage girls being raped in front of his eyes began pulling out his own hair and crying, and the Cossacks murdered him. For the father the pain of association with the perpetrators on top of the pain of witnessing his own daughters’ suffering was unbearable, so he tortured himself to punish himself further, and to compensate for the horrible spectacle that devastated him. The Cossacks did murder the girls’ father in the end; however, it is probable that it was done to harm his daughters more than the father himself, for whom the death could be a redemption. As violence of the pogroms in general and rape in particular intensified, the murder of the Jews provided less gratification for the perpetrators than the elaborate spectacle of their suffering.

The sexual component of the gaze, described in psychoanalysis, was most definitely present in the spectacle of rape. Jewish women were undressed and raped in front of Jewish men’s eyes, forced Jewish men to join in the gaze, which “carries the negative connotation of the powerful, if not sadistic, position within the game.” By forcing Jewish men to desire women who were being raped, perpetrators made Jewish men, however briefly and unconsciously, rapists of their own women, inflicting on them further shame and suffering. One particularly horrific episode illustrates this: during a pogrom in Smela, a husband was forced to be the thirteenth to rape his own wife, and the Cossacks made sure that he “was not faking it.”
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victim and her husband, and to ruin them emotionally as well as physically, as this forced act of rape would inevitably impact, if not completely ruin, this particular Jewish family.

There is no evidence about rape during pogroms provided by rape perpetrators and their leaders, so the scholars have to evaluate circumstantial evidence to establish how the rape strategy fitted into the agenda of rape perpetrators. The following case study is focused on a single well-planned raid, which was glorified by the White Army as a victory, and was committed by one of the most famous of its commanders, known not for their viciousness, but for their honor and dignity. The story of the pogroms committed outside the former Pale of Settlement during this infamous episode illustrates that mass rape was evidently and casually recognized as an integral part of the pogrom script, and that mass rape was understood, at least by the high command of the White Army, as a just and adequate punishment of the Jews.

General Mamantov was a well-known charismatic leader of the Cossack army who commanded the Don Cossack Host before and after the Revolution. Unlike the infamous general Shkuro, who elicited dread even among his comrades-in-arms with his ruthless and vicious violence, General Mamantov was widely regarded as a wise and thoughtful leader, mild-mannered, kind, an exemplary officer, and a very refined, well-educated, ascetic person, who shunned strong drink and detested cigarette smoke. From the end of August until the middle of September 1919, General Mamantov led his very best battalions on a cavalry raid in the rear guard of the Red Army in Central Russia. The official goal of the raid was to distract the Bolshevik command from a counteroffensive, and to instigate a peasant uprising against the Soviets; however, it turned out that there was another motive for the raid, probably no less important. In less than a month, Mamantov’s Cossacks broke through the Red Army front line, conquered several Russian towns, violently yet meticulously perpetrated pogroms, and ravaged small Jewish communities in those cities. The White Army command did not approve of the raid, although among Cossack armies it was treated as a glorious victory, especially when the enormous convoy laden with loot crossed back into Ukraine, and Mamantov sent a victorious greeting over the White Army radio channels. The peasants in the territories raided by Mamantov’s troops did not rise
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against the Bolsheviks, and the Jewish communities in towns such as Kozlov and Yelets were utterly devastated.

The pogrom in Yelets lasted six days, although the Jews of Kozlov were told that the Cossacks were entitled to at least twenty-four to forty-eight hours of plunder,37 and were carried out with frightening precision, as described by the Bolshevik officials who were sent to investigate, but obviously had no previous experience with pogroms and could not fully comprehend and describe the disaster.38 The Cossacks were not interested in finding and punishing the “real” Bolsheviks at all; they went into the town in large groups, entered Jewish homes, assembled Jewish families in their apartments, raped Jewish women in front of their families, looted anything that could be found, and then took the surviving Jews outside of town, where they were undressed, tortured, the Jewish women were raped again and again, and then the surviving victims were killed. Everything happened very fast, with military precision, but followed the same script as all the pogroms perpetrated by the White Army.

The military raid into the Russian interior turned into a punitive expedition against Jews, and all the atrocities were committed with the full knowledge and approval of the command. When General Mamantov was approached by the representatives of the local Russian intelligentsia, who were astounded and shocked by the rape, torture, and murders, he said that Jews in fact should be shot not in small groups but in the hundreds.39 This general, known for his impeccable personality, who was rumored to have forced his Cossacks to destroy all the alcohol in one of the towns to preserve morale,40 considered the rape, torture, and murder of Jews to be right and just.41 Mamantov undoubtedly knew about rape and torture and approved of it, as the discipline in his regiments was always perfect.

Mamantov, like most officers in the White Army, was a very well-educated man, born and raised as a member of the privileged class, who was exposed to modernity and enjoyed its benefits for most of his life; and still he considered barbaric punishment by public rape an adequate means of retaliation.

37 Miljakova, Kniga Pogromov, 784.
38 YIVO Archive, file 206, 18463–64.
39 Miljakova, Kniga Pogromov, 785.
40 Grishchenko and Lazarev, “Konstantin Konstantinovich Mamantov.”
41 Similarly, twenty-five years later the Russian high command, including Stalin himself, considered wartime rape to be a reasonable response to the German invasion. See also Giles MacDonogh, After the Reich: The Brutal History of the Allied Occupation (New York: Basic Books, 2009).
Rape statistics of the pogroms during the Civil War suggest that not only the visceral cruelty of mass rape was intentional, but also that it was understood by at least some pogrom perpetrators and their leaders as the way to maximize suffering among the victims, also exposed to education and secularism, who would be able to comprehend the ugly barbarity of their punishment. The gaze as a practice, according to Foucault and Sturken and Cartwright, belongs to modernity. The complex relationship between the spectator and the spectacle, and between the observer and the observed, gains crucial importance in the modern image-permeated society, and, according to Foucault, would serve as its major regulatory force. The return of public punishment during pogroms in many respects relied on the modernized gaze of the audience. The return of violent spectacle in a form of genocidal rape was directed at the inhomogeneous Jewish community of Ukraine that had been partially exposed to secularism and modernity. Likewise, the perpetrators of the genocidal rape constituted an inhomogeneous multitude of groups of people, who sought to achieve different goals and communicate different messages through the mass rape of Jewish women.

---

42 A. Freidberg, *The Mobilized and Virtual Gaze in Modernity*, with introductions by N. Mirzoeff (London: Routledge, 1998).