

UDC 94:341.485(=411.16)(477.81/.82):930.2(44)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.35.332681

Roman MYKHALCHUK

PhD (History), Professor of the Department of World History, Rivne State Humanities University, 12 Stepan Bandera Street, Rivne, Ukraine, postal code 33000 (r.mykhalchuk@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0001-9313-4830

ResearcherID: AAD-6148-2020

Роман МИХАЛЬЧУК

кандидат історичних наук, професор кафедри всесвітньої історії, Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет, вул. Степана Бандери, 12, м. Рівне, Україна, індекс 33000 (r.mykhalchuk@ukr.net)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Mykhalchuk, R. (2025). Segregation of the Jews in the ghetto of “Volyn-Podillia” General District according to the materials of Yahad-In Unum Organization (Paris, France). *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 35, 88–99. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.35.332681

**SEGREGATION OF THE JEWS IN THE GHETTO OF “VOLYN-PODILLIA”
GENERAL DISTRICT ACCORDING TO THE MATERIALS
OF YAHAD-IN UNUM ORGANIZATION (PARIS, FRANCE)**

Abstract. Purpose: based on the analysis of the Yahad-In Unum sources, to do the research on the segregation of the Jews in the ghetto of “Volyn-Podillia” General District. **The research methodology** is based on the principles of scientificity, historicism, problem-historical, search methods, as well as the methods of analysis and systematization. The method of oral history, orevidence is a leading one in the research. **Scientific Novelty.** For the first time in historiography, a separate research focuses on the analysis of the Holocaust oral history sources, orevidences of “Yahad-In Unum” scientific institution regarding the situation of the Jews in the ghetto of “Volyn-Podillia” General District. The life of the Jews in the ghetto has been analyzed from the perspective of non-Jewish testimonies. For the first time, a large number of unpublished oral sources have been introduced into scientific circulation. **Conclusions.** The analysis of the Yahad-In Unum oral sources, orevidences made it possible to reconstruct the history of the ghetto establishment and functioning in “Volyn-Podillia” General District during the Holocaust from the perspective of non-Jewish testimonies. These sources are valuable because they contain details of the Jewish life in the ghetto and information not found in other official documentary sources. In the study the features of the ghetto establishment, resettlement, everyday life, labour, robbery, physical and moral abuse of ghetto prisoners have been elucidated. The Jews used various methods to survive, interacting with representatives of the occupation administration and civilian residents. Despite the fact that the ghetto functioning has been researched on the example of “Volyn-Podillia” General District, certainly, the research results have a much broader significance for understanding the Nazis’ plans “to solve the Jewish issue”, in particular the segregation of the Jews in ghettos on the territories occupied by Germany.

Key words: Yahad-In Unum, the Holocaust, video testimony, oral history, orevidence, ghetto, Patrick Debois, “Volyn-Podillia” General District.

СЕГРЕГАЦІЯ ЄВРЕЇВ В ГЕТТО ГЕНЕРАЛЬНОЇ ОКРУГИ “ВОЛИНЬ-ПОДІЛЛЯ” ЗА МАТЕРІАЛАМИ ЯХАД-ІН УНУМ (м. ПАРИЖ, ФРАНЦІЯ)

Анотація. *Мета статті* – проаналізувати становище євреїв в гетто генеральної округи “Волинь-Поділля” під час Голокосту на основі джерел усно-історичної колекції “Яхад-Ін Унум” (м. Париж, Франція). **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах науковості, історизму, проблемно-історичного, пошукового методів, а також методах аналізу і систематизації. Провідним у дослідженні став метод усної історії. **Наукова новизна.** Вперше в історіографії окрему розвідку присвячено аналізу джерел усної історії Голокосту наукової інституції “Яхад-Ін Унум” щодо становища євреїв в гетто генеральної округи “Волинь-Поділля”. Проаналізовано життя євреїв в гетто з перспективи неєврейських свідчень. Уперше до наукового обігу введено велику кількість неопублікованих усних джерел. **Висновки.** Аналіз усних джерел “Яхад-Ін Унум” дав можливість відтворити історію створення та функціонування гетто генеральної округи “Волинь-Поділля” під час Голокосту з перспективи неєврейських свідчень. Ці джерела цінні тим, що містять подробиці життя євреїв в гетто та інформацію, яка не зустрічається в інших офіційних документальних джерелах. У дослідженні розкрито особливості створення гетто, переселення, побутове життя, працю, грабіж, фізичну, моральну наругу над бранцями. Євреї використовували різні методи щоб вижити, взаємодіючи із представниками окупаційної адміністрації та цивільними жителями. Незважаючи на те, що функціонування гетто розглянуто на прикладі генерального округу “Волинь-Поділля”, результати дослідження, безумовно, мають набагато ширше значення для розуміння планів нацистів у “вирішенні єврейського питання”, зокрема сегрегації Німеччиною євреїв у гетто на всіх окупованих теренах.

Ключові слова: Яхад-Ін Унум, Голокост, відеосвідчення, усна історія, гетто, Патрік Дебуа, генеральна округа “Волинь-Поділля”.

Problem Statement. Oral history is an important area of research into the events of the 20th century, including World War II and the Holocaust. As Tetiana Boriak notes, the role of oral history, orevidence as a method and historical source is valuable when it comes to totalitarian regimes, as generally genocidaires do not leave behind documents about their intentions for future mass murders (Boriak, 2024, p. 9). Eyewitness testimonies enable us to supplement the traditional research base and “humanize history”.

The scientific institution Yahad-In Unum (Paris, France), founded in 2004 by Father Patrick Desbois, stands out among large-scale oral history, orevidence collections. This organization searches for mass grave sites using eyewitness accounts of the murders of the Jews during World War II. As of May 1, 2024, Yahad-In Unum’s video collection contained 7,982 testimonies in 12 countries. The organization carries out the largest scientific research work in Ukraine, where 3,065 witnesses were interviewed, 3,308 video testimonies were recorded, and 1,298 sites of mass executions were identified (Mykhalchuk, 2024, p. 104).

The memories of non-Jewish residents about the Holocaust are important because they contain details not recorded in other official documents. In particular, they contain valuable information about the segregation of the Jews in the ghetto. Owing to the extensive source base of Yahad-In Unum, this study made it possible to highlight the stay/mistreatment of the Jews in the ghetto (on the example of “Volyn-Podillia” General District, which during the Nazi occupation was part of Reichskommissariat Ukraine).

Review of Sources and Historiography. The historiography is based on the research of Yahad-In Unum founder Patrick Desbois and scholars who used the organization’s sources. In particular, P. Debois’s studies highlight a close relationship between the Holocaust

witnesses and the Jews, who were often neighbours of the Jews (Desbois, 2011; Desbois, 2013; Desbois, 2018). P. Debois mentions the involvement of local residents in the “solution of the Jewish issue” by the Nazis, by forcing them to do a “dirty” job (“small death jobs”) – digging/burying graves, searching corpses, sorting the clothes of the murdered, etc. (Desbois, 2011).

Over the past 5 years, the Ukrainian scholars have significantly intensified their research using the Yahad-In Unum source database. Roman Shliakhtych analysed over 100 oral testimonies stored in Yahad-In Unum archive about the Holocaust in rural areas of Dnipropetrovsk region (Shliakhtych, 2019) and using oral sources analysed the functioning of Jewish forced labour camps located on the Kryvyi Rih – Dnipro (Dnipropetrovsk) route (Shliakhtych, 2024). Volodymyr Zilinskyi, based on the Yahad-In Unum sources, managed to clarify the reaction of witnesses, murderers, and victims in Lviv region during the Holocaust (Zilinskyi, 2019). In his studies Andriy Khoptiar writes about 82 actions of murder of the Jewish population, in which about 115 thousand people died in the territory of Kamianets-Podilskyi region (Khoptiar, 2020). Yuriy Kaparulin not only did the research on the Holocaust in Kalinindorf district, but also highlighted the commemorative practices of the Jewish community at the sites of mass shootings (Kaparulin, 2020). Roman Mykhalchuk, based on the Yahad-In Unum sources, highlighted the role of civilians in the Nazi plans of the Holocaust in the territory of “Volyn-Podillia” General District (Mykhalchuk, 2020); analysed the role of the Jewish property in the dynamics of the Holocaust focusing on the local non-Jewish population of “Volyn-Podillia” General District (Mykhalchuk, 2021); described the situation of the Jews in Mizoch ghetto (Mykhalchuk, 2022a) and Rivne ghetto (Mykhalchuk, 2022b). The study by Roman Mykhalchuk and Volodymyr Zilinskyi focuses on oral history, orevidence in the Holocaust research using the Yahad-In Unum sources as an example (Mykhalchuk, & Zilinskyi, 2025).

Orevidences require a critical approach and comparison with other sources (cross-analysis). In this aspect, studies in the oral historical context of research are important (Bodnar, 2021; Hrinchenko, & Rebrova, & Romanova, 2012; Mykhalchuk, 2021, 2023; Boriak, 2024). We share Halyna Bodnar’s opinion, who notes that it is important for an oral historian to go beyond the text – to capture what the text does not convey (Bodnar, 2021, p. 38).

The research sources were video evidences from the Yahad-In Unum archive, which concern the territories of “Volyn-Podillia” General District. The choice for the analysis of this administrative entity is actualized by its importance in the plans of the occupiers. In particular, the main institutions of Reichskommissariat Ukraine were located there: the headquarters of the main quartermaster’s office and the economic administration of Army Group “South”, the Central Bank of Ukraine, the German Supreme Court, and the headquarters of the chief of the Wehrmacht’s rear units in Ukraine. The city of Rivne was the centre of Reichskommissariat Ukraine. In 1941, the two largest executions of the Jews (the first one – in Babyn Yar) were carried out in these areas, in Kamianets-Podilskyi and Rivne.

Purpose: based on the analysis of the Yahad-In Unum sources, to do the research on the segregation of the Jews in the ghetto of “Volyn-Podillia” General District.

Research Results. The segregation of the Jews in ghettos during the Holocaust was an important element in the “solution of the Jewish issue”. The number of ghettos in the German-occupied territories varied. In Ukraine, the number of at least 442 ghettos was confirmed (Altman, Y. et al, ed., 2011, p. 210). According to the data of the American

encyclopedia publication on ghettos and camps, there were 134 of them in the region under analysis – "Volyn-Podillia" General District (Encyclopedia of Camps and Ghettos, 2012, pp. 1322–1508). However, comparing this data with other sources, it can be argued that their number could have been about 150 (Mykhalchuk, 2017, p. 275).

The functioning of the majority of ghettos in "Volyn-Podillia" General District is associated with the establishment of a civil administration in the region on September 1, 1941. However, there were several ghettos established under military administration during the first 10 weeks of the occupation. For example, such ghettos were in Balyn, Domachevo, Kupel, etc. (Encyclopedia of Camps and Ghettos, 2012, p. 1316).

In settlements where there were fewer than 200 Jews, according to Erich Koch's instructions, ghettos were not established (Lauer, 2010, p. 114; Mykhalchuk, 2017, p. 275). Therefore, the Jews from other settlements, primarily villages, were resettled in large ghettos. There are many testimonies about ghettos where the Jews from other settlements were relocated, – in Mlyniv (YIU, Testimony 1377UK. Mlyniv), Stolyn (YIU, Testimony 195B. Stolyn), etc. The practice of relocating the Jews and concentrating them in one place was quite common before the murder. For example, it is known that shortly before the liquidation of the Mizoch ghetto, the Jews from the neighbouring village of Derman were resettled there (Memorial Book of Mizocz, p. 194; Mykhalchuk, 2023, p. 31).

According to witness testimony, the Jews from Ostropol, Iziaslav, and other towns were in Starokostiantyniv ghetto (YIU, Testimony 867UK. Starokostiantyniv). Another witness noted that the Jews from Polonny, Ostropol, Hrytsiv, Liabun were kept in this ghetto as well (YIU, Testimony 865UK. Starokostiantyniv). A researcher Oleksandr Kruhlov confirms the presence of the Jews from neighbouring districts in Starokostiantyniv ghetto, because during its liquidation in May of 1942, among those shot there were the Jews from neighbouring villages of Ostropol, Hrytsiv, and Starosyniavka districts. In particular, among 11,000 Jews killed in Starokostiantyniv, Oleksandr Kruhlov mentions about 581 Jews from Ostropol (Altman, Y. et al, ed., 2011, p. 945).

In rare cases, some Jews were allowed to live outside the ghetto. Exceptions were made for the Jewish specialists, members of the Judenrats and the Jewish police, who could live outside the ghetto or in special quarters within the ghetto. In Luninets, a witness noted that all Jews who were not doctors, welders, or specialists were sent to the ghetto (YIU, Testimony 190B. Luninets). In Stolyn, one doctor did not live in the ghetto (YIU, Testimony 195B. Stolyn). Similar cases were observed in Stepan, Kostopil (Mykhalchuk, 2017, p. 275). For a long time, about 20 Jews lived outside the ghetto in Rivne (Mykhalchuk, 2022b, p. 78). The Jews, qualified specialists, in the ghetto, as an exception, could have other identifying marks. For example, in Starokostiantyniv ghetto, according to a witness, the Jews had a patch on the left chest and right shoulder, while the Jews qualified specialists wore a black patch with a yellow stripe (YIU, Testimony 865UK. Starokostiantyniv).

The most neglected neighbourhoods were usually chosen for ghetto housing. The heads of the Jewish councils (Judenrats) were usually informed of orders on relocation. The relocation process was often supervised. For example, during the relocation of the Jews from the village of Leploka to Domachevo ghetto (Beresteisky Gebiet), the process of transporting belongings was monitored and accompanied by police officers (YIU, Testimony 136B. Leploka (Domachevo)).

The resettlement time depended on the local administration (in Rivne this process dragged on for several months) (Mykhalchuk, 2022b, p. 77). However, sometimes the resettlement

time was one day, or even several hours. Such a time limit deprived the Jew of getting ready for resettlement. Therefore, the Jews entered the ghetto practically robbed, because they could not take all their belongings with them. In Boremel, when moving to the ghetto, according to eyewitness testimony, they were only allowed to take food, and no furniture (YIU, Testimony 1343UK. Boremel). In Luninets, they were not allowed to take many things with them, only the most necessary things (for example, bedding) (YIU, Testimony 191B. Luninets). In Olyka, when the Jews tried to take some things with them, they were not allowed, but were kicked away (YIU, Testimony 1773UK. Olyka). The houses left behind during the resettlement became the object of looting by local non-Jewish residents. For example, during the resettlement to the ghetto of Velyki Mezhyrichi, as soon as the Jews left their homes, the houses were immediately looted. As a non-Jewish witness recalled: no one guarded the houses, so “then terrible things happened, pillows, feathers were everywhere, and everything was scattered” (YIU, Testimony 1422UK. Velyki Mezhyrichi).

The ghettos established were of a closed and open type. There were also mixed ones. In the open type ghetto there was no fence. Examples of such settlements were the ghettos in Dubrovysia, Korets, Horodnia, Kolkakh, Katerburg, Kivertsi, Ratne, Yarmolyntsi, etc. (Mykhalchuk, 2017, p. 275). Rivne ghetto was considered to be an open type (Altman, Y. et al, ed., 2011, p. 858), where the Jews had the opportunity to go out to work (Barats, 1993, p. 56). A witness recalled that there was no fence around the ghetto and the Jews could leave the ghetto: “they went out everywhere, wherever they wanted – they went there” (YIU, Testimony 1416UK. Rivne). Other evidence of the absence of fences refers to the ghetto in Radyvyliv (YIU, Testimony 1782UK. Radyvyliv), Olyka (YIU, Testimony 1774UK. Olyka), etc. Sometimes the type of ghetto (open/closed) changed over time depending on the plans of the occupiers. For example, in August of 1941 an open type ghetto was established in Kupel, and in April of 1942 it became a closed type (Mykhalchuk, 2017, p. 275).

The construction of the ghetto fence fell on the shoulders of local residents, as well as ghetto prisoners. Confirmation of the fence construction by the Jews is found in the testimonies about Tuchyn ghetto (YIU, Testimony 1389UK. Tuchyn), Varkovychi ghetto (YIU, Testimony 1396UK. Varkovychi), Lanivtsi ghetto (YIU, Testimony 818-819UK. Lanivtsi), Mlyniv ghetto (YIU, Testimony 1377UK. Mlyniv), Stolyn ghetto (YIU, Testimony 195B. Stolyn), Brest ghetto (YIU, Testimony 156B. Brest).

Other memoirs state that local residents were forced to do such work according to the order of local authorities or police. This fact was recorded in the ghetto in Kozhan-Horodok (YIU, Testimony 185B. Kozhan-Horodok), Lakhva (YIU, Testimony 181B. Lakhva) and the others. In Ozeriany the fence and the gate were built by 12 local residents according to the orders of the local mayor (YIU, Testimony 1463UK. Ozeriany).

Many testimonies detail the height of the ghetto fence. For example, in Varkovychi, a witness stated that the fence height was taller than a man (YIU, Testimony 1396UK. Varkovychi). But usually, the figures of 2 – 3 meters were mentioned. Thus, in Tuchyn (YIU, Testimony 1389UK. Tuchyn), Mlyniv (YIU, Testimony 1377UK. Mlyniv), Domachevo (YIU, Testimony 136B. Leploka (Domachevo)) the height of the fence was 2 m.; in Ozeriany (YIU, Testimony 1463UK. Ozeriany), Shepetivka (YIU, Testimony 1788UK. Shepetivka), Shumsk (YIU, Testimony 1790UK. Shumsk) – 3 m. The fence in Brest ghetto was 1,5 m. (YIU, Testimony 156B. Brest).

Various sources (both Jewish and non-Jewish accounts in particular) report numerous facts about the presence of wire on the ghetto fence. Some accounts describe the wire as

barbed, and sometimes as being connected to electricity. For example, a fence with wire is recorded in memories in Ozeriany (YIU, Testimony 1463UK. Ozeriany), Dubno (there were several rows of wire (YIU, Testimony 1379UK. Dubno)), Luninets (YIU, Testimony 193B. Luninets (Brest)), Domachevo (YIU, Testimony 136B. Leploka (Domachevo)). In Lanivtsi it is mentioned that the fence was connected to electricity (YIU, Testimony 818-819UK. Lanivtsi). According to the testimonies the barbed wire was in Varkovychi ghetto (YIU, Testimony 1396UK. Varkovychi), Boremel (YIU, Testimony 1343UK. Boremel), Mlyniv (YIU, Testimony 1377UK. Mlyniv), Shumsk (YIU, Testimony 1790UK. Shumsk). In Radyvyliv, there were 2 rows of barbed wire (YIU, Testimony 1783UK. Radyvyliv), in Stolyn – 5 – 6 rows (YIU, Testimony 196B. Stolyn).

The entry into the ghetto was guarded. If the ghetto was large, there could be several entrances (gates). For example, there was one entry into Domachevo ghetto (YIU, Testimony 136B. Leploka (Domachevo)). In Dubrovysia, it was noted that there was a gate to the ghetto that was open, so at first it was allowed to leave the ghetto, but then it was closed (YIU, Testimony 1807UK. Dubrovysia). In Ostroh, a witness reported that there were two gates (YIU, Testimony 86UK. Ostrog). In Stolyn, three gates were documented on three different streets (people were taken to work through Kliushchenkova Street (YIU, Testimony 195B. Stolyn)). There were also several gates in Brest ghetto (YIU, Testimony 156B. Brest). Information about Boremel ghetto differs in non-Jewish accounts. In one case, a witness mentioned one entry into the ghetto (YIU, Testimony 1337UK. Boremel), and another eyewitness indicated that there was more than one entry (YIU, Testimony 1343UK. Boremel). This example illustrates the importance of critically analyzing and verifying eyewitness testimonies. Determining the credibility of testimony is done by using cross-analysis (Hrinenko, & Rebrova, & Romanova, 2012, p. 180).

A characteristic feature of all ghettos without exception was overpopulation and an excessive crowding of their inhabitants in a limited space. Often the ghetto area covered several streets. In Shumsk, the ghetto was located on two or three streets (YIU, Testimony 1790UK. Shumsk). In Kozhan-Horodok, all the ghetto prisoners could not fit in the premises, that is why, there were double storey beds there (YIU, Testimony 189B. Kozhan-Horodok). There were 20–25 houses in Boremel ghetto (YIU, Testimony 1343UK. Boremel), which an eyewitness described as “small, as if they were dug in the ground” (YIU, Testimony 1337UK. Boremel). Sometimes, due to a lack of space, the Jews were forced to stay in cellars or spend the night out-of-doors. For example, in Kozhan-Horodok ghetto, the Jews slept out-of-doors (YIU, Testimony 185B. Kozhan-Horodok). Describing a large crowd in Hoshcha ghetto, the witness noted that the Jews slept on the floor “like piglets” (YIU, Testimony 1431UK. Hoshcha).

Labour became an integral part of an everyday life in the ghetto. The occupiers tried to exploit the political economy of genocide to their advantage. The Jews worked inside the ghetto and outside it on the “Aryan” side. Some Jews believed that their employment could save their lives, as they were useful for the occupiers. Varvara Barats recalled that labour was unpaid in Rivne ghetto (Barats, 1993, p. 39). The reward was the very fact of working for the Germans. Linen, hosiery, tailoring, and shoemaking workshops operated in the ghetto (Mykhalchuk, 2022b, p. 79). In Kozhan-Horodok ghetto the Jews sewed clothes (YIU, Testimony 188B. Kozhan-Horodok), in Dubno they made harnesses for horses (YIU, Testimony 1379UK. Dubno), and etc.

Labour outside the ghetto was often related to construction. In Luninets ghetto the Jews dug trenches for defense (YIU, Testimony 191B. Luninets). In Smordva ghetto the Jews were

taken out to work in the fields every day (mostly men) (YIU, Testimony 1371UK. Smordva). The Jewish men and women were taken out of Lanivtsi ghetto to work every morning. Young women (30–40 people) worked in the gendarmerie, where they cleaned and beat out carpets (YIU, Testimony 822UK. Lanivtsi). In Zinkiv ghetto the Jews cleared snow and worked on roads in winter (YIU, Testimony 690UK. Zinkiv). In Volochysk Jewish men carried stones and paved the road (YIU, Testimony 855UK. Volochysk). Often, humiliating anti-Semitic measures were taken to the Jewish workers. The Jews from Luninets ghetto worked all day until evening. When going to and from work, they were forbidden to walk on the sidewalks, but only along the road (YIU, Testimony 190B. Luninets).

When the Jews worked, supervisors/guards were almost always present. An exception was recorded in Stolyn ghetto. There, the Jews (women and men) after receiving orders from the Judenrat went to work wherever they were needed without any guards. In the evening, they also returned to the ghetto on their own (YIU, Testimony 195B. Stolyn).

It was also important that during the escort and work, the Jews did not only make the attempt to escape, but also did not come into contact with the local non-Jewish residents. The Jews could obtain food, hear the latest news, etc. However, attempts at contact were made by both Jews and non-Jews. Thus, in Stolyn the Jews worked outside the ghetto, where they could get food from non-Jewish residents (YIU, Testimony 195B. Stolyn). In Lanivtsi ghetto the Jews were taken out to work every morning: “Well, somewhere there, someone gave them beets, someone – potatoes, someone – bread. And they carried it all to the ghetto in the evening” (YIU, Testimony 822UK. Lanivtsi). When the Jews from Shumsk ghetto went to work (they built sidewalks), local residents would come up to them and bring them something (food). Also, during breaks at work, the Jews could exchange their own things (YIU, Testimony 1792UK. Shumsk). At the same time, the Schutzmanns, the policemen who escorted the Jews from Shumsk ghetto, made sure that they could not make such contacts (YIU, Testimony 1790UK. Shumsk).

In the ghetto, the Jews were a constant target for robbery. As soon as the Jews were herded into Luninets ghetto, they were told that if they wanted to save their lives, they had to give up gold. Two weeks later, this demand was repeated (YIU, Testimony 191B. Luninets). In Brest ghetto the Jews gave gold at the demand of the occupiers (YIU, Testimony 156B. Brest). During constant searches in the ghetto by the Ukrainian and Jewish police, food and other items were taken away from the Jews, and blackmail was used. In Lanivtsi the Ukrainian policemen took away carrots and potatoes during searches because the Jews did not give gold. On the day they demanded gold, the Jews were taken out on foot to do forced labour (50–100 people at a time), and were told to hand over the gold, “because if you don’t give it, we will take revenge on you” (YIU, Testimony 822UK. Lanivtsi).

An artificial shortage of food and belongings was created in the ghetto. During the resettlement, the Jews were limited in their ability to take a sufficient amount of belongings with them. It was not possible to take many products with them and they quickly ran out, which became one of the most acute problems.

In this way, an artificial famine was provoked in the ghetto. In Luninets ghetto a witness recalled hungry children who were not fed because there was not enough food. (YIU, Testimony 191B. Luninets). When there was a shortage of food, the Jews tried to use it economically. In Lanivtsi ghetto the Jews carefully sorted “barabolia” (potatoes – author), because there was nothing else to eat. According to the witness’s description: “The Jews ate half-rotten barabolia” (YIU, Testimony 820UK. Lanivtsi). In the same ghetto, the Jews

suffered not only from a lack of food, but also from a lack of water, because the well had “broken down” (YIU, Testimony 822UK. Lanivtsi). In such cases, the presence of water bodies could have improved the situation. Thus, in Olyka the Jews lived not far from a pond, where they could not only wash themselves, but also apparently satisfy their need for water (YIU, Testimony 1773UK. Olyka)

Attempts to find food outside the ghetto were illegal. A witness from Velyki Mezhyrichi noted that there was a warning (announcement) that if there was any contact between the Jews and the non-Jewish population, “we will burn the whole house and kill everyone” (YIU, Testimony 1421UK. Velyki Mezhyrichi). However, both sides engaged in smuggling, exchanging goods and services. A researcher Shmuel Spector noted in this regard that “hungry Jews were good trading partners” for peasants (Spector, 1990, p. 133).

Sometimes non-Jewish residents brought food to the ghetto free of charge on an altruistic basis, but often they did so for a material reward. Such facts are found in almost every ghetto. Non-Jewish witnesses who spoke about their experience of such cooperation with the Jews often only mentioned the facts of providing food without explaining the reasons (free of charge or for reward). For example, in Boremel, the witness noted that he threw bread, potatoes, carrots, and pears over the fence (YIU, Testimony 1337UK. Boremel). In Kozhan-Horodok, the witness’s mother gave potatoes, bread, and beans to the Jews in the ghetto (YIU, Testimony 189B. Kozhan-Horodok). In Brest, non-Jews were allowed to enter the ghetto for a time to draw water from a well located on the ghetto grounds. This allowed them to contact the Jews and provide them with food (YIU, Testimony 156B. Brest).

There are also facts indicating the circulation of goods between the Jews and non-Jews for exchange or material reward. For example, in Lanivtsi the Jews displayed goods behind the ghetto fence. If any of the local residents were interested in the goods, an exchange could take place (YIU, Testimony 822UK. Lanivtsi). A witness from Stolyn said that food was thrown over the fence into the ghetto for exchange “junk” (YIU, Testimony 194B. Stolyn; Mykhalchuk, 2021, p. 69).

In Brest some non-Jewish residents put on yellow circles, climbed over the fence and went into the ghetto to the Jews. According to the participant, he and his brother (boys 10-12 years old) often did this. The braver brother went into the ghetto 8 – 10 times, and the witness – 3 – 4 times. When the locals brought them milk, the Jews gave them fabric for sewing clothes. They also ordered shoes to be sewn by the Jews. Often these were acquaintances, such as the Jew Leiba, whom they knew well (YIU, Testimony 156B. Brest).

Given the desperate situation of the Jews, the exchange was often uneven and resembled robbery. For example, a witness from Tomashivka recounted exchanging a watch for 10 kg of flour in the ghetto, claiming that at that time the Jews “needed help” (YIU, Testimony 127B. Tomashivka). In Ozeriany, when the Jews asked for bread, the witness replied: “Give me the watch – I will give you bread” (YIU, Testimony 1463UK. Ozeriany). According to the witness, he paid for the watch with a slice of bread and gave a little lard. In addition, he asked the Jews for “cigarettes”, for which he gave them nothing, because “they did not ask for anything anymore” (YIU, Testimony 1463UK. Ozeriany; Mykhalchuk, 2021, p. 74). Thus, in the ghetto he exchanged food many times and each time asked for a watch, because he had clothes. He considered this practice normal, even being acquainted with prisoners. In his study Father Patrick Desbois mentions a similar case with a watch and bread in Rokytne (Desbois, 2018, p. 34).

In these cases, the police officers’ task was to monitor the situation to prevent such contacts. However, as witnesses note, corruption was observed, and it was possible to bribe

the right people. In Boremel, it was officially not possible to hand over food, but if the police officers were acquaintances, then it was possible to make a deal with them (YIU, Testimony 1343UK. Boremel). In Varkovychi, people would come to the ghetto gate and hand over food, sometimes by agreement with the police: "Give something to the policeman there and he will hand it over" (YIU, Testimony 1398UK. Varkovychi). According to the recollections of a witness in Shumsk, some policemen pretended not to see people handing over food to the local ghetto (YIU, Testimony 1792UK. Shumsk).

The Jews suffered not only from officials who demanded a "ransom", but also from the arbitrariness of the police, who used unjustified violence against them. The Jews could not protect themselves, because there was impunity for the police (Ukrainian and Jewish). According to eyewitness accounts, in Lanivtsi ghetto the Jews could be shot or killed just like that – if they did not like it, or did not go well, "who will be responsible there"? (YIU, Testimony 821UK. Lanivtsi). In Stara Syniava, a policeman (police chief) said about the Jews: "today I shot one parasite, I shot him whenever I wanted to" (YIU, Testimony 861UK. Stara Syniava). In Lanivtsi, in the ghetto it was forbidden to leave the houses, and anyone who did was shot. One Jewish woman, Dvoira, who was insane, went out and was shot (YIU, Testimony 822UK. Lanivtsi). The murder of the Jews also occurred during the ghetto liquidation, when they hid because they did not want to be shot. For example, in Starokostiantyniv ghetto, a Jew was found hiding in a house with double doors and was shot (YIU, Testimony 865UK. Starokostiantyniv). According to a non-Jewish witness about the situation of the Jews in Lokachi ghetto: "later on, things became so bad that it's even impossible to describe them" (YIU, Testimony 1481UK. Lokachi).

In addition to physical violence, which often ended in death, the Jews were subjected to moral and psychological abuse. In Smordva, as the Jews were being expelled from the ghetto, the Schutzmanns forced them to march and sing songs (YIU, Testimony 1371UK. Smordva). In Kostopil ghetto, the German commandant forced the Jews to dance. In one case, about 50 people were dancing (YIU, Testimony 1787UK. Kostopil). In Brest, the Germans entered the ghetto at night and did whatever they liked, including sexual violence. A witness recalled such facts: "there was rape, there was everything. They did whatever they wanted there" (YIU, Testimony 161B. Brest).

In addition to violence inflicted by the occupiers, the ghetto residents suffered from violence at the hands of the Jewish police. Many testimonies indicate that their behaviour was worse than that of the Ukrainian police. As a witness in Olyka noted: "The Jews beat their own people even more than the Ukrainians... the Jews beat their own people, without any hesitation" (YIU, Testimony 1773UK. Olyka). In total, there were about 30 members of the Jewish police in Olyka (YIU, Testimony 1774UK. Olyka). In Boremel, 12 Jews were in the police under the leadership of the Germans. They beat the Jews who did not want to go to work with sticks. However, they were also later shot separately from other Jews (YIU, Testimony 1337UK. Boremel).

Summarizing the testimonies of non-Jewish residents, it should be noted that almost all of their memories are full of empathy and feelings for the Jews (although there were some exceptions). The Jews were acquaintances, neighbours, friends with whom they made friends during the interwar period. In Hoshcha, recalling how the Jews exchanged clothes for food, taking off their clothes, the witness noted: "They were the Jews, they all knew each other, they went to school together, they played together, they went to the meadow there, they were such good guys... so how to take something away from him, if he came – he wanted

to eat” (YIU, Testimony 1431UK. Hoshcha). When the Jews were taken out of the ghetto in Lanivtsi to work, the witness observed them and recalled later: “But there, among the Jews, there were my students who studied with me – boys and girls. I recall that and cry because of that” (YIU, Testimony 822UK. Lanivtsi). In Kostopil, the witness said: “that is a terrible judgment,” and he repeated these words several times during the interview (YIU, Testimony 1787UK. Kostopil).

Conclusions. Thus, the oral history sources, orevidences of Yahad-In Unum provide an opportunity to analyse the history of the Holocaust from the perspective of non-Jewish testimonies. Together with the Jewish memories and other documentary sources, they provide an objective analysis of the stated issues. The analysed orevidences contain exclusive information that is not found in other official documents. The research shows that genocidal intentions regarding the Jews were implemented, in particular, through the segregation of the Jews in ghettos. The analysed orevidences reveal the history of the ghetto establishment and functioning in “Volyn-Podillia” General District of Reichskommissariat Ukraine. There are common and distinctive features of the stay/detention of the Jews in the ghetto, but the ultimate goal of this process was the same. To survive, the Jews used various methods, interacting with representatives of the occupation administration and civilian residents. In the ghetto labour was considered as a ghostly chance for salvation. Bullying in the ghetto (physical, material, moral, sexual, etc.) became widespread. It is also important that the sources provide an opportunity to trace the reaction of non-Jews to the Holocaust. Depending on different circumstances, it was not unambiguous, and their roles could change.

Acknowledgement. We express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for publishing.

Funding. These grants, funded by the European Union (through EURIZON H2020 project, grant agreement 871072) are intended to enable Ukrainian research teams to continue their scientific work, remotely, by carrying on research projects in collaboration with partners from European research institutes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altman, Y. et al (Eds.) (2011). *Kholokost na terrytoriyi SSSR: entsyklopedyia* [The Holocaust on the territory of the USSR: encyclopedia], 2 ed. Moskva: Ros. polit. entsyklopedyia (ROSSPIeN): Nauchno-prosvetitelnyi tsentr “Kholokost”. [in Russian].

Archive of Yahad-In Unum (YIU), Testimony.

Barats, V. (1993). *Behstvo ot sudby. Vospomynanie o genotside evreev na Ukraine vo vremia Vtoroi mirovoi voyny* [Flight from Fate: Memoirs of the Genocide of the Jews in Ukraine during World War II]. M.: Art-Byznes-Tsentr. [in Russian].

Bodnar, H. (2021). “Sohodni istoriia tvorytsia v Ukraini”. *Usna istoriia i dosvidy nezavershenykh revoliutsii na viiny: mirkuvannia pro dyskusiine i (ne)ochevydne* [“Today’s history is being made in Ukraine”. Known history and the evidence of unfinished revolutions in the war: a reflection on the debate and (un)obvious things] In H. Hrinchenko (Ed.), *Slukhaty, chuty, rozumity: Usna istoriia Ukraïny XX–XXI stolit’*, TOV “Art-knyha”, 31–57. [in Ukrainian].

Boriak, T. (2024). *Usna istoriia u dzherelnii bazi studii Holodomoru: istoriia formuvannia ta informatsiinyi potentsial korpusu svidchen* [Oral History in the Source Base Studies of the Holodomor: the history of formation and information potential of testimonies] / Ed. Oleksandr Danylenko. Kyiv: TOV “Yurka Liubchenka”. [in Ukrainian].

Dean, M. et al (Eds.) (2012). *Encyclopedia of Camps and Ghettos, 1933 – 1945. Volume II: Ghettos in German-Occupied Eastern Europe*, (pp. 1322–1508). Washington: The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum; Indiana University Press, [in English].

Desbois, P. (2011). *Khranytel spohadiv. Kryvavy my slidamy Holokostu* [The keeper of memories. Bloody Footprints of the Holocaust]. Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. [in Ukrainian].

Desbois, P. (2013). The witnesses of Ukraine orevidence from the ground: the research of Yahad-In Unum. *The Holocaust in Ukraine: New Sources and Perspectives (Conference Presentations)*, (pp. 91–99). Washington: Center for advanced Holocaust studies US Holocaust memorial museum. [in English].

Desbois, P. (2018). *In Broad Daylight: The Secret Procedures behind the Holocaust by Bullets*. New York: Arcade Publishing. [in English].

Hrinchenko, H., & Rebrova, I., & Romanova I. (2012). Usna istoriia v post radianskykh doslidnytskykh praktykakh (naprykladi suchasnykh Bilorusii Rosii ta Ukrainy) [Oral History in Post-Soviet Research Practices (on the example of modern Belarus, Russia and Ukraine)]. *Ukrainskyi Istorychnyi Zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 4, 172–187. [in Ukrainian].

Kaparulin, Y. (2020). Te Holocaust in Southern Ukraine: Te response of survived Jews of Kalinindorf district afer the German occupation. *Colloquia Humanistica*, 9, 153–180. DOI: 10.11649/ch.2020.011 [in English]

Khoptiar, A. (2020). Holokost v Kamianets-Podilskii oblasti: khronolohiia, mekhanizmy, metody vynyshchennia yevreiskoho naselennia (lypen 1941 – sichen 1943 rr) [The Holocaust in Kamianets-Podilskii region: chronology, mechanisms, methods of extermination of the Jewish population (July 1941 – January 1943)]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 3, 90–102. DOI: 10.15407/uhj2020.03.090 [in Ukrainian].

Lauer, V. (2010). *Tvorennia natsyistsoi imperii ta Holokost v Ukraini* [The Creation of the Nazi Empire and the Holocaust in Ukraine]. Kyiv: Zovnishtorhvydav Ukrainy; Ukr. tsentr vyvchennia ist. Holokostu [in Ukrainian].

Memorial Book of Mizocz. (p. 194). URL.: <https://www.jewishgen.org/Yizkor/Mizoch/miz179.html#Page193> [in English]

Mykhalchuk, R. (2017). Stanovyshche yevreiv v hetto heneralnoi okruhy “Volyn-Podillia”. *Nauka, osvita, suspilstvo ochyma molodykh: materialy X Mizhnarodnoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii studentiv ta molodykh naukovtsiv*, (pp. 275–276). Rivne: RVV RDHU. [in Ukrainian].

Mykhalchuk, R. (2020). “Small death jobs”: the role of forced civilian persons in the Nazi plans of the Holocaust in the General District of Volyn-Podillia (on the materials of Yahad-In Unum). *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 15, 157–165. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.15.205144 [in English].

Mykhalchuk, R. (2021). Rol yevreiskoi vlasnosti v dynamitsi Holokostu v heneralnii okruzi “Volyn-Podillia”: fokus mistsevoho neievreiskoho naselennia [The role of Jewish property in the dynamics of the Holocaust in Volyn-Podillia general district: the focus of the local non-Jewish population]. *Problemy istorii Holokostu: ukrainskyi vymir*, 13, 38–85. DOI: 10.33124/hsuf.2021.13.02 [in Ukrainian].

Mykhalchuk, R. (2022a). Stanovyshche yevreiv v Mizotskomu hetto [The position of Jews in the Mizoch ghetto]. *Zaporizhzhia Historical Review*, 6(58), 209–219. DOI: 10.26661/zhv-2022-6-58-21 [in Ukrainian].

Mykhalchuk, R. (2022b). Stvorennia ta funktsionuvannia Rivnenskoho hetto [The creation and functioning of the Rivne ghetto]. *Intermarum: istoriia, polityka, kultura*, 10, 73–91. DOI: 10.35433/history.112031 [in Ukrainian].

Mykhalchuk, R. (2023). Holocaust oral history sources in the Yahad-In Unum archive collection (based on general district Volhynia-Podolia materials). *Colloquia Humanistica*, 12, 1–19. DOI: 10.11649/ch.2908 [in English].

Mykhalchuk, R. (2024). Potensial usnykh svidchen Yahad-In Unum v doslidzhenni zlochyniv pro yevreiv ta neievreiskoho naselennia pid chas Holokostu [The Potential of Oral Testimony in Yahad-In Unum in Investigating Crimes against the Jews and Non-Jewish Populations during the Holocaust]. *Nauka, osvita, suspilstvo ochyma molodykh: materialy XVII mizhnarodnoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii здобувачів вищої освіти та молодих учених*, (pp. 104–105). Rivne: RVV RDHU. [in Ukrainian].

Mykhalchuk, R. (2025). *Mizoch: zhyttia ta zahybel yevreiskoi hromady* [Mizoch: the life and death of the Jewish community]. Kyiv: Ukrainskyi tsentr vyvchennia istorii Holokostu; Rivne: Volynski oberehy. [in Ukrainian].

Mykhalchuk, R., & Zilinskyi, V. (2025). Usna istoriia v doslidzhenniakh Holokostu na prykladi dzherel Yakhad-In Unum [Oral history in Holocaust studies using Yahad-In Unum sources as an example]. *Visnyk nauky ta osvity – Bulletin of Science and Education*, 2 (32), 1701–1711. [in Ukrainian].

Shliakhtych, R. (2019). Holokost u sil'skii mistsevoli Dnipropetrovs'koï oblasti (za materialamy svidchen' ochevydtsiv z arkhivu Yahad-In Unum) [The Holocaust in the countryside of the Dnipropetrovsk region (based on evidence from the Yahad-In Unum archive)]. *Roxolania Historica*, 2 (17), 188–198. DOI: 10.15421/30190212 [in Ukrainian].

Shliakhtych, R. (2024). Yevreiski tabory prymusovoi pratsi na trasi Kryvyi Rih – Dnipro (Dnipropetrovsk) (za materialamy usnoistorychnykh dzherel) [Jewish forced-labor camps along the road Kryvyi Rih – Dnipro (Dnipropetrovsk) (based on oral history sources)]. *Eminak*, 3 (47), 411–427. DOI: 10.33782/eminak2024.3(47).747 [in Ukrainian]

Spector, S. (1990). *The Holocaust of Volhynian Jews, 1941 – 1944*. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem. [in English].

Zilinskyi, V. (2019). They were killed on the spot: The destruction of Jews during the nazi occupation in the territory of Lviv region. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu – Lviv University Bulletin, Special issue*, 340–360. [in English].

*The article was received November 06, 2024.
Article recommended for publishing 30/05/2025.*