

## CONTENTS

### STUDIES AND ARTICLES

- Alexander V. Cheremisin, *MUNICIPAL INTEGRATION OF SOUTHERN UKRAINE JEWS AT THE END OF THE XVIII – THE BEGINNING OF THE XX CENTURIES: SETTLEMENT, MODERNIZATION AND PARTICIPATION IN SELF-GOVERNMENT*.....7
- Mihaela Ilie, *KING CAROL II'S NATIONAL RECONCILIATION POLICY AND THE "CONCENTRATION GOVERNMENT" LED BY GHEORGHE TĂTĂRESCU (NOVEMBER 1939 – MAY 1940)*.....19
- Haxhi Ademi, *THE CASE OF THE "DISPLACEMENT" OF SERBS FROM KOSOVO DURING WORLD WAR TWO*.....31
- Andrii Smyrnov, *THE UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX AUTOCEPHALOUS MOVEMENT DURING THE YEARS OF GERMAN OCCUPATION*.....43
- Fátima Gil Gascón, Manuel Gómez Segarra, *WITH VIGILANT CONCERN: THE DEBATE ARISING FROM THE SPANISH FILM CENSORSHIP LAW OF 1963 IN THE WRITTEN PRESS* .....55
- Adi Horațiu Schwarz, *THE CONFERENCE IN MALTA (2-3 DECEMBER 1989) AND THE END OF THE "COLD WAR" – PERCEPTIONS IN EASTERN EUROPE*.....67
- Kanat A. Yensenov, Gani M. Karasayev, Seitkali Z. Dyusen, Bekmurat R. Naimanbayev, Marat K. Islamov, *THE MODEL OF INTERETHNIC ACCORD IN THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN (1991-2018): HISTORICAL RESEARCH ASPECT*.....79
- Fidel Rodríguez Legendre, Cristina Ruiz-Alberdi, *THE "BOLIVARIAN REVOLUTION" OF VENEZUELA WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF POST-COMMUNISM AND POST-DEMOCRACY (1998-2019)* .....93
- Akmaral Dalelbekkyzy, Zeinol-Gabden Bisengali, Aknur Toleubayeva, Aimukhambet Zhanat, Karlygash M. Baitanasova, *NATIONAL CODE: METAPHYSICS AND UNITY OF HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS*.....105
- Hanse Gilbert Mbeng Dang, *GEOPOLITICAL USES OF THE SPEECH IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: ELEMENTS OF ANALYSIS OF COOPERATION BRIC AFRICA* .....119
- Florian Olteanu, *ALBURNUS MAIOR/ ROSLA MONTANA – A HISTORIOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS*.....129

### IN MEMORIAM

- In Memoriam – Ștefan Ștefănescu (May 24, 1929 – December 29, 2018) (*Dinică Ciobotea*).....139
- In Memoriam – Titu Georgescu (23 February 1929 – 28 July 2004). 90 years from birth (*Constanțiu Dinulescu*) .....142



## STUDIES AND ARTICLES

### MUNICIPAL INTEGRATION OF SOUTHERN UKRAINE JEWS AT THE END OF THE XVIII – THE BEGINNING OF THE XX CENTURIES: SETTLEMENT, MODERNIZATION AND PARTICIPATION IN SELF-GOVERNMENT

*Alexander V. Cheremisin\**

#### **Abstract**

The article is dedicated to the research of Jewish population conditions in southern towns of Ukraine during the end of the XVIII – beginning of the XX centuries. Jewish population constituted a substantial part of southern towns' population during the studied period. That is why the participation of the Jews in cultural, national and municipal life of southern Ukrainian towns is analyzed. Employment of the Jews in towns is characterized, too. The South of Ukraine from a legal point of view of the Russian Empire was marked as a limit for Jewish settlement, so the details of their participation in self-government are analyzed. The problem of the Jews' participation in urbanization and modernization of the Southern Ukraine region is studied taken separately. Demographic changes in a part of Jewish population and in regard to their correlation in municipal councils are also characterized. The conclusions are made concerning the role of the Jews in urbanization of the Southern Ukraine region and their activity in municipal self-government.

**Key words:** *The South of Ukraine, Jewish population, municipal self-government, local government, the limits of settlement*

#### **Introduction**

In the second half of the XVIII century serious geopolitical changes took place which were related directly to the incorporation of the northern Black Sea region into the Russian Empire, making its borderline alongside the Black Sea coast, founding new towns and establishing new trading relationships: both international and home. After the above incorporation of the Southern Ukraine region into the Russian Empire previous or former military settlements became bases for a plenty of Southern Ukraine towns. Eventually they were regarded as “cities”, at the time the power was transferred from military command to civil administrations, which completed towns' formation and their obtaining civil power.

The building of military fortresses and new towns became a stimulus for economic, industrial and trading development of the region (Atanelishvili and Silagadze, 2018). Soon in the Southern Ukraine new towns were built on a basis of old Cossacks' and Crimean tartars' fortresses and settlements. Towns in the region were founded, first of all, as military-administrative centers, on which following primary

---

\* Professor, PhD, Department of Philosophy and Social and Humanitarian Disciplines, Kherson State Agricultural University, 23 Sritenska Str., Kherson, Ukraine, Phone: +380669830422, Email: al.cheremisin@gmail.com

tasks were put: to hold a territory, to populate it, to form administrations and only in due course to develop economically.

International relationships became more tolerant, old conflicts were forgotten and stereotypes were changed. Those who were enemies in their homelands, here in the South of Ukraine got married. At the crossroads of Jewish, Russian and Ukrainian languages a specific “Odessa’s language” was borne. The South of Ukraine became the most tolerant region among others both in Ukraine and Russia in social, national, religious and cultural aspects. Thus, “new life” in the Southern Ukraine changed and modernized all social groups and nationalities, having produced new thinking and behavioural stereotypes as being Liberal-European and civilized. The above mentioned had an impact on social and political life which was more intensive here in comparison with neighbour regions of the Empire (Kozyrev, 2016).

The most characteristic feature of the Southern Ukraine was that from the very beginning it was an area of intensive international process. An active part in the process was taken by representatives of numerous ethnic groups, substantially different from each other by customs, national character, level of national self-conscience, economic and cultural development. According to the report of Kherson Gubernator from 1852: “No province represented such a plenty of nationalities as Kherson one. Here apart from merchants of different nationalities, who constituted a substantial number, permanently there lived the Malorusians, the Great Russians, the Belarusians, the Serbians, the Bulgarians, the Moldavians, the Greeks, the Armenians, the Germans, the Karaims and the Jews” (Russian State Historical Archive, 2018). Further in the documents the following nationalities are mentioned: the Polish, the Swedes, the Gipsy, the Lithuanians, the Georgians, the Crimean Tatars, the Nogajans, the Kazakhs, the Italians, the French and the Mordovians; 22 nationalities in total. Each of these nationalities left a distinctive feature on the region’s variegated cultural life as well as on its economic activity.

### **Defining the status of representatives of different nationalities in the Southern Ukraine**

The re-settlement of representatives of different nationalities onto the territory of the Southern Ukraine put a problem of defining their status (Bondaletov, 2015). The author shares V. Kolisnyk’s thought that on a basis of the colonization process in the South of Ukraine the Russian Government developed a classification system of state subjects who were divided into three groups (national-ethnic factor was taken as a criterion). The first group consisted of natural subjects among whom nobility, clergy, townspeople and countrymen were distinguished. The second group according to official terminology consisted of heterogeneous population. The third group, the separated one, consisted of Finnish population. Depending on belonging to this or that subject category, the legislation varied substantially in relation to legal status of a person (Kolisnyk, 2001: 70-77).

In fact, the attitude of the Russian Government to colonists of various nationalities was different, which was reflected on the legislation level. In particular:

- Jewish population was separated into a group for which on the territory of the South of Ukraine a limit of settlement was ordered.

- Jews were obliged to carry out military obligations paying in kind, even more than other groups of population;
- Jews were prohibited to take part in local self-government until 1870.

After the colonization of the region, its national formation was basically completed. The Ukrainians, the Russians and the Jews constituted a majority of population in the region (Kabuzan, 1976: 136-149).

According to the researches of O. Donik (2011) and O. Danylchenko (2009), the Russians were the most numerous population group in the Southern Ukraine towns. To the greater extent, they represented military officers, officials, nobility, tradesmen, townspeople, clergy and others. Their number increased substantially at the expense of natural migration from inner regions. The characteristic feature of the colonization of the South of Ukraine was that the Ukrainians settled in the countryside working on farms, whereas the Russians lived in towns. There are a lot of Crimean Tatars who lived in the countryside on the territory of the Crimean Peninsula. The Jews constituted a competitive number for the Russians in towns, which corresponded to military-administrative and commercial specifics of southern towns. Foreign colonists settled mostly in the countryside forming their own communities. In towns, they settled in small groups. For example, the Germans lived compactly in Sudak, Feodosija and other towns. The Greeks lived in Kherson, Mariupol, in the Crimean peninsular towns. The Jews constituted the most compact municipal communities in all towns of the South, especially in Odessa, Mykolaiv, Kherson, Kerch, Elisavetgrad, as the territory marked the limit of settlement. The Moldavians lived in all towns of the south, but the most populous group lived in Odessa. Communities of the Ukrainians, the Bulgarians, the Polish, the Greeks, the Swedes, the French, the Czechs, the Serbians, the Estonians, the Italians, the Lithuanians, the Belarusians, the Georgians, the Armenians and others were not populous in the Southern Ukraine towns.

The documents testified that on the territory of the Southern Ukraine all nationalities became modernized. It was indicated that the Russians learnt a lot of Ukrainian words, idiomatic expressions, sayings and other peculiarities of Ukrainian language. The Moldovan population, although having preserved its native language, knew Ukrainian well. The Serbs nearly merged with Ukrainian population. Besides, it was indicated that the Ukrainians of the Southern Ukraine differed from those living on other territories. The former was more mobile, and unlike the Ukrainians from the Left or the Right bank Ukraine, they did not suffer from serfdom's influence. They could go to the Crimea freely or to Moldova in order to earn money in towns, or to work on fields of other farmers or just to run away. Sometimes runaway Ukrainian serfs formed criminal groups who fought against Russian landlords and the Jews, which reflected old memory of Hydamacks movement. In general, there is a widespread opinion that the Ukrainians worked on farms mostly. So it was. Apart from that town Ukrainian residents worked in fishing co-operatives, salt enterprises or worked as cabmen (especially in port towns), when free from working on farms or as shepherds – feeding cattle (Maykov, 1868).

Representatives of the *Russian nationality* – the nobility and the merchantry – took official posts in the state, they were also engaged in commerce and industries.

Although Russian peasants settled in villages, they did not stay permanently there but went to towns the way they did in Russia. The *Belarusians* were not numerous, usually they were busy with farming and transportation. The *Polish* were divided into two categories. The first one took part in the colonization process of the end of the XVIII century. Representatives of this category belonged to higher social strata and served in the state or private service. Representatives of the second category – re-settled by the government in 1847 – were busy with cattle and agriculture farming. The *Bulgarians*, the *Moldavians* and the *Greeks* were busy mostly with cattle and agriculture farming and commerce. The *Germans* worked as teachers in towns, engaged in commerce, they were also industrialists, artisans and officials. The *Swedes* lived in colonies preserving their mother tongue and customs and regarded themselves as subjects of Russia; they studied Russian language in towns (Maykov, 1868).

The *Armenians* lived in towns forming small groups. They were busy with commerce and various trades. But the rich were not numerous, as the Jews were competitive with them in commerce. The *Jews* constituted one of the most numerous population groups in the Southern Ukraine towns. Their main activities were commerce and trading. There were also artisans, but rarely. They possessed main capitals of the region. They found it more profitable to deal with the Ukrainians or foreigners. Among Russian population they were known as renters or buyers of bankrupted estates, where they grew wheat or flax on fields and then sold crops abroad. In commerce they were not competitive only with the Russians (Maykov, 1868).

It is known that the Jews re-settling to modernized Southern Ukraine from Podolje and Volyn provinces, where their relatives still lived in traditional towns-ghettoes, forgot their traditional lifestyle very quickly. As a result, they began to get ready 2-3 months before visiting relatives looking for old-fashioned suits, yarmulkes and other articles of traditional Jewish cloth; they also grew paces to look themselves their parents wanted them to (Turchenko and Turchenko, 2003).

#### **Analysis of statistical data of representatives of different nationalities of the Southern Ukraine**

Statistical data of Tavria province from 1865 indicated that the Russians (the Great Russians, the Malorusians) lived in towns in the quantity of 58 900 people (10.2% total population of the province). Their quantity was nearly the same on the Crimean peninsular. The Crimean Tatars were 4.7% (lived exceptionally on the Crimean peninsular). The Jews were 2.2%, the Greeks were 1.9%, and other nationalities were less than 1%. In total, townspeople constituted 20.3% in the province (Ravesskiy, 1865).

According to statistics of Katherinoslav province, the Great Russians constituted a majority of population in the south-east part (80 thousand people), whereas the Malorusians – in the north-west part. It was also indicated that the Serbs adopted completely traditions, customs and language of the Ukrainians and nearly merged into one nationality. The Jews (23 thousand people) lived in all towns of the province, were busy with commerce, the Greeks lived compactly in Mariupol district. The Armenians

(up to 20 thousand people) were mostly merchants or townspeople and were engaged in commerce in different towns of the south (Vilson, 1863).

According to the census of population from 1987, town's population were 28.87% of the total in the province. The most populated towns were Odessa, Mykolaiv, Kherson and Elisavetgrad. In the column "mother-tongue" it was indicated that the Ukrainians were 1 462 039 people, whereas the Russians were 545 375 in the province; there were no distribution data for towns. It was indicated, as a result, that the Russians prevailed in the western districts of the province, the Jews and the other nationalities prevailed in the east. In Odessa lived 55.6% Jews of all towns in the province. According to group distribution middle-classes constituted the most numerous group – 62%, peasants – 25%, merchants – 1.26%, foreigners – 2.88%, other groups – 8%. According to occupations of townspeople it was indicated that the Jews prevailed in commerce, whereas the Russians and the Ukrainians were engaged mostly in various industries (Troynitskiy, 1904).

In Tavria province according to the census of population from 1897 townspeople constituted 20% of the total. In the column "the Russians" there were subdivisions for nationalities: The Great Russians (49.1%), the Malorusians (10.4%) and the Belarusians (0.2%). As for other nationalities, there were following percentages: The Crimean Tatars in towns were 14.2%, the Jews – 11%, the Karaims – 3%, the Greeks – 3.6%, other nationalities – less than 1%. In the countryside the Ukrainians constituted a majority in comparison with towns (42.2%). In total, the Crimean Tatars in the province were about 34%, whereas the Russians – 28% (Troynitskiy, 1904).

According to the census of population from 1897, in Katherinoslav province townspeople were represented by their nationalities as following. In total in the province:

- the Ukrainians constituted a majority – 68.9%;
- the Russians – 17.27%;
- the Jews – 4.69%;
- the Germans – 3.83%;
- the Greeks – 2.31%;
- the Crimean Tatars – 0.82%;
- the others nationalities (the Poles, the Belarusians, the Moldavians, the Turks, the Gypsies, the French) – less than 1%.

In towns representatives of the abovementioned nationalities were distributed as following: in Katherinoslav the Russians constituted a majority (41.78%), the Jews – 35.43%, whereas the Ukrainians – only 15.76%. In Lugansk the Russians prevailed – 68.16%. Mariupol was populated mostly by the Russians (63.22%), the Jews were 15.14%, the Ukrainians – 10.4%. Other nationalities constituted the absolute minority. In particular, the Ukrainians were 19.2%, the Jews – 7.1%, other nationalities – less than 1%. Nearly a half the Russians (51.47%) and the Ukrainians (42.99%) lived in Slovjanoserbsk. In Pavlograd the Ukrainians were 33.43%, whereas the Russians – 34.36%, the Jews – 27%. In Oleksandrovsk (42.98%), Novomoskovsk (77%), Verchnedniprovsk (56%), Bachmut (61.78%) the Ukrainian population prevailed. The Russians and the Jews constituted a minority there (Table 1).

Table 1: National representation in municipal self-government of the Southern Ukraine (Troynitskiy, 1904)

Town	Russians	Ukrainians	Jews	Poles	Romanians	Greeks	Crimean Tatars
Kherson	75,4	15	1,5	8,4			
Berislav	10	83,3					
Mykolaiv	90,4	3,6	0,6	7,4			
Olexandria	35	58,8					
Novogeorgievsk	63,3	36,4					
Ananjiv	41,6	35		15,6	6,5		
Elisavetgrad	59,8	28,4	2,9	7,8			
Bobrinetz	28,6	61,9		4,8	4,8		
Voznesensk	42,8	38,1		9,5			
Novomirgorod	95,6	4,4					
Olviopol	44,4	55,6					
Odessa	72,8	7,6	6,4	8,7			
Majaki	44,4	55,6					
Ovidiopol	63,3	27,2		9			
Ochakiv	44,4	55,6					
Katerinoslav	63	25	13				
Oleksandrivsk	37,7	58	3,8				
Bachmut	22,2	68,9	4,4				
Verchnedniprovsk	39	60,7					
Mariupol	67,8	7,1				14,3	
Novomoskovsk	38	53	3				
Pavlograd	64,6	29,2	6,3				
Slovjanoserbsk	50	50					
Lugansk	83,3	13,3					
Simferopol	71,6	9,2	2,6				5,5
Bachtchisarai	11,8	5,8					40,5
Karasubazar	42,1	5,2	10,5				31,5
Berdjansk	67,9	21,5					
Nogaïsk	85,7	14,3					
Orchiv	18,2	81,8					
Oleshki	91,3	6,5					
Eupatoria	63	6,5					15,2
Melitopol	76,9	13,5					
Perekop	77,8	3,7					11,1
Jalta	82,7	6,8					
Feodosia	69,2	5,7					5,7
Staryi Krym	80						
Kertch	84,3	4,7	4,7				1,5

According to the calculations of O. Danylchenko (2009), the national formation situation in towns at the beginning of the XX century had certain characteristic features. During the first decade, the percentage of towns' population surpassed that in other regions of Ukraine. In the South of Ukraine, it constituted 21.7%, whereas on an average for Ukraine it was 18.3%. Towns of the south remained multinational with



the prevalence of the Russians – 43%, the Jews – 26%, the Ukrainians – 24% and 7% for other nationalities.

The above mentioned period may be considered as the first in urbanization of the South of Ukraine. The most populous national groups were the Russians, the Ukrainians and the Jews, which was a result of solving military-administrative and trading-commercial tasks. At the beginning of the XX century, the national formation situation changed, but not substantially: the Russians, the Ukrainians and the Jews constituted a majority of population of southern Ukrainian towns. So the towns can be reasonably called *Ukrainian-Russian-Jewish*.

For example, V. Zhabotinskiy, a famous Jewish public figure from Odessa of the beginning of the XX century, wrote in his memoirs: “Even though it (Odessa) was in Russia and at my time it was russified linguistically, Odessa was not a Russian town in fact. It was not a Jewish either, although the Jews were a prevalent ethnic group, especially, if we consider that the so-called Russians were the Ukrainians indeed, that is to say the people who differed from the Russians like the Americans differ from the English or the English from the Irish” (Gerligi, 1999).

The Emperor Alexander I regarded the book of Englishman Robert Lyall “Travels in Russia, the Crimea, the Caucasus, and Georgia” (1825) as hostile for the Russian Empire. In the traveler’s works around Kherson, Katherinoslav and Tavria Provinces the Russians looked corrupted, the Jews – swindles. He calls the South of Ukraine a separate country, whose population consisted of the Russians, the Ukrainians, the Jews and foreigners. Robert Lyall describes the region’s history in detail; he also characterizes the activity of Peter I and his dreams of a civilizing mission on the Black Sea’s coasts. Then he analyses the reasons why it failed and the region was civilized by representatives of the Western Europe instead. His attention is drawn onto the fact that southern Ukrainian towns developed very quickly. It was difficult do recognize them within 5 years. He considered the Government’s activity concerning economical development as insufficient; he also criticized commercial activity with West Europe in particular. He drew a conclusion that Odessa should be one of the best ports of the world and that the Government blocked its quick development (Gutri, 2012).

It should be mentioned that Jewish language had a great impact on the southern Ukrainian inhabitants and served as a basis for creating a special “Odessa’s language”. For example, V. Shyshkov noted: “«Odessa’s language» was not a collection of random irregularities of Russian language; it had deep roots and lasting traditions, its «norms» and «rules»... Russian language of middle classes was influenced greatly by Ukrainian and Jewish language elements” (Shyshov, 1998). Russian was spoken in towns of the South of Ukraine indeed, but according to statistic data of the beginning of the XX century the Russians were not considered as erudites of Russian language, whereas the Jews (51%) knew Russian.

Cultural influence of the Jewish population was distinctive in periodicals. For example, the most popular newspapers and magazines were published in French, German and English. Even the periodical “Vestnik of Southern Russia” (1820) was firstly published in French. The attempts to publish “Vestnik” in Russian for merchnts ended in downfall of its popularity. When the editorial board addressed to

police asking for help in widespreading the newspaper, they could find even with the above help only 5 people wishing to buy the newspaper in Russian. In reply to it local merchants said they could learn better and fresher news from the Jews, notwithstanding the fact that Russian merchants outnumbered Jewish thrice (Skalkovskiy, 1894).

These examples could be regarded as signs of the region's renewal and modernity, which proves that in the South of Ukraine the modernization was going on quickly, whereas traditionalism did not keep pace with "new" rhythms of life. New social, national, cultural, commercial-industrial conditions created faster tempos of modernization in comparison with other regions.

Local self-government of Southern Ukraine provinces was multinational in its formation. According to ethnical representation, the Poles, the Romanians, the French, the Greeks, the Armenians, the Crimean Tatars, the Jews, the re-baptized Jews, the Germans were represented in public establishments, though the Russians and Ukrainians constituted the most substantial part.

Despite the fact that the Jewish population in Southern Ukraine towns constituted one of the most populous ethnic groups, the Jews were not numerous in municipal self-government. Only Odessa could be proud of Jews' most numerous representation – 6.4%, and the least – in Mykolaiv – 0.6%. In Kherson 1.5% were elected to public establishments, in Elisavetgrad – 2.9%. The Romanians were elected mostly in 2 towns – Ananjev (6.5%) and Bobrinets (4.8%). The Jews were in the absolute minority in all self-government structures of Katherinoslav province. The representatives from the Jewish ethnos were also in the minority in all towns of Tavria province. From 2% to 10% of the Jews were elected in different towns. The deputies from the Armenians, the Greeks, the Germans and others had from 2% to 4% (Troynitskiy, 1904).

The Jews were permitted to be elected to bodies of public government only after 1870, before that they could be elected to municipal self-government only through re-baptizing. After 1870, the Jews were elected to municipal councils, though their number was substantial only in Odessa. They were in a minority in other Southern Ukraine towns: from 2-3 to 10 persons depending on a town's status. They were absent in some towns of the region.

For example, in self-government of Kherson city there were few who supported deputies from the Jews, even their colleague deputies did not like their presence in the city council and they spread ideas among their electorate that it would make no good, because the Jewish deputies were not responsible before them (Khaustova, 2018). Thus, in a majority of municipal councils of the South of Ukraine the representatives of the Russian nationality prevailed. In self-government bodies representatives from the Ukrainians, the Jews, the Armenians, the Greeks and others were not numerous.

At the same time, in spite of their inconsiderable presence in city councils, the Jewish contribution to the development of municipal self-government was rather significant. For example, one of the most notable figures of Odessa city council was a Jew O. Pergament (he had university education and was a honored citizen of Odessa), who was elected the president of the Odessa republic during eventful revolutionary years of 1905-1907, and after its end he was elected a deputy of the State Duma.

It is worth to mention that the leader of Kherson city council was Jews-millionaire Rabinovich. In 1908 Kherson deputies defended their views concerning development of the sea port. The then civil gubernator did not consider the activity of deputies as professional, as they were representatives of different professions (dentists, lawyers and others). He regarded himself as an expert, so his ideas of the port's development (orientation onto inner markets – Olexandrivskiy and Donetskii) were quite rational, because it was possible to trade cheap char coals. In future the port would be competitive with Mykolaiv's (Kostruba, 2018). According to the deputies' plan it was necessary to build a rail-way from the station to the port. The gubernator's plan was postponed after almost a year of long debates. He was extremely annoyed that dentist Rjabkov was against the head of the province and the others took millionaire Rabinovich's advice. The leaders of the city council turned the public to their side and received a support from the Ministry of Trade. The Council of Ministers stood aside in this matter, but it ordered the deputies to co-ordinate their activity with the Gubernator, not addressing directly to the ministries, which caused misunderstandings (The report from the Senate's case...: 30-60).

Thanks to the *Jews* the case of bribery both in municipal self-government ranks and in the structures of Kherson provincial administration was revealed to the public in 1820-1830. During the investigation a public questioning was carried out concerning bribery in the province. In all towns local inhabitants proved that the provincial officials were "great bribe-takers who were very harmful and put the fear into a majority of the community with their unlawful deeds". During the trial in a court session the gubernator did not evidence any relation to it and even looked like a weak person not able to control his own officials who made advantage of it. However, a suspicion arose that the gubernator was defended and protected and, as a matter of fact, he was not found guilty. At the time there were no direct evidences of the gubernator's guilt. Everything happened, when the gubernator went on business trips. All the guilty persons were sentenced to different terms, except for the ober-prosecutor of the Senate, the guilt of whose was not ever proved. The top rank person to be sentenced was the vice-gubernator of Kherson province A. Rewl. In fact, the case started with beating a baptized Jew who had been forced to enter the army and did not want to give a bribe of 500 rubles. The prosecutor Shulzenko and A. Rula extorted the biggest fixed bribe from a Jew Fanung (8 000 rubles) for closing a criminal case against him, in which the latter was supposedly guilty of protecting some runaways (The case of accusation of bribery and abuse...: 21-45).

Not taking into consideration rather special relationships the Jews had with self-government bodies of the South of Ukraine, they did not manage to work out a programme aimed at further development of municipalities. They were more interested in problems of their own self-determination.

The parties of national minorities were engaged in problems of political future of their own nationalities. In particular, Jewish social-democratic workers' party "Poaley-Scion" (the first organization in Ukraine was founded in Katherinoslav in 1900-1901, and later – in other towns) tried to combine socialistic ideas with Zionism. The party defended a priority of territorial solution of the Jewish problem by the way of establishing a centre in Palestine. The party also set a task of liquidating capitalism'

system and breaking dominance of the bourgeoisie over proletariat. In 1904 in Odessa a part of the representatives broke off and eliminated the issues concerning Palestine, they began to call oneself Zionistic-socialistic workers' party. Its members considered a national autonomy as insufficient for solving the Jewish problem and broadened their demands including national equality. In 1905, another part of the party founded Jewish social-democratic party and proclaimed establishing national autonomy on a basis of self-governed communities. Nothing was mentioned in the programme documents concerning development of self-government in Ukraine or in the south, as the most actual problem for the party was solving the national issue (Fomin, 1996).

### **Conclusions**

Thus, we can draw a conclusion that the Jews took an active part in the colonization and urbanization processes of the South of Ukraine at the end XVIII of the XX century, turning themselves into one of the numerous population groups of the region. For the greater part the Jews actively integrated in cities' life of the region, quickly self-modernized and got an access to patterns of "new life" of the region, that is why towns of the South of Ukraine may be considered as Ukrainian-Russian-Jewish. The Jews quickly created necessary images of towns' population: merchants, traders, bankers, shipbuilders and others. They had a great influence on social-economic development of the region. At the same time the Jews' integration into self-government bodies was not so active. They always approached tolerantly to administrative structures either in the province or in the centre. No documents have been found to evidence their criticism of local self-government or provincial administration. They could take part in municipal councils until 1870 by the only way – re-baptizing. After 1870 they were allowed to be elected to municipal structures. At the time the Jewish population almost did not make use of this right. Notwithstanding the fact that the Jewish population constituted one of the largest inhabitant groups of the region, they were few in municipal self-government bodies. However, they were among the most influential figures in towns of Kherson province. At the same time, their political views did not go far beyond the borders of national self-determination.

### **References**

- Atanelishvili, T., Silagadze, A. (2018). Formation of economic views in the ancient era. *Bulletin of the Georgian National Academy of Sciences*, 2(1), 191-196.
- Bondaletov, A.A. (2015). Evolution of self-organization ideas. *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*, 3, 132-139.
- Bondaletov, V.V. (2015). Some problems of management and controllability of public self-organization. *Materials of the Afanasiev Readings*, 1(13), 15-19.
- Danylchenko, O.P. (2009). *Ethnic Development and International Relationships of the South of Ukraine (the end of XVIII – the first quarter of XX c.)*. Vladivostok.
- Donik, O.M. (2011). *Ukraine: In the two Emperies (the last quarter of XVIII – the first of XIX centuries)*. Kyiv.
- Fomin, V.M. (1996). *The Programme Documents of National Political Parties and Organizations of Russia (the end of XIX century – 1917 year)*. Moscow.
- Gerligi, P. (1999). *Odessa. City's History: 1794-1914*. Kyiv.
- Gutri, M. (2012). *Odessa through the Eyes of the British*. Odessa.

Kabuzan, V.M. (1976). The size of the Population and National Formation of Novorossia in the 60-80s of the XVIII Century. *Ukrainian Historical-Geographic Collection*, 1, 136-149.

Khaustova, M.G. (2018). Legal Integration: The Theoretical Aspect. *Journal of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine*, 25(1), 192-203.

Kolisnyk, V.P. (2001). National-Ethnic Factor in the Legal Regulation of Social Relationships in XVII-XIX century. *Bulletin of the Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine*, 2, 70-77.

Kostruba, A.V. (2018). Aspects of Civil Rights and Their Integration into International Social and Environmental Legislation. *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism*, 9(5), 995-1002.

Kozyrev, M.S. (2016). The procedure for the adoption and execution of administrative regulations for the provision of public services by federal executive bodies. *Materials of the Afanasiev Readings*, 4(17), 32-35.

Maykov, L. (1868). *The Lists of Towns and Villages of the Russian Empire. Kherson Province in 1859*. Saint Petersburg.

Ravesskiy, M. (1865). *The Lists of Towns and Villages of the Russian Empire. Tavria Province in 1859*. Saint Petersburg.

Russian State Historical Archive. (2018). *Report of the Governor of the Kherson Province from 1852*. Retrieved August 20 2018, from <http://www.fgurgja.ru/object/34621372>

Shyshov, V. (1998). *All Odessa. 1794-1994. Anthology. Dictionary*. Moscow.

Skalkovskiy, A. (1894). *From the Past of Odessa*. Odessa.

The case of accusation of bribery and abuse of power against Kherson Vice-Gubernator, the prosecutor and officials. DAHO. F. 14. Op. 1. D. 1242.

The report from the Senate's case, correspondence of the Ministry of Justice with the Senate concerning the case of Kherson Vice-Gubernator Rula accused of bribery. DAHO. F. 14. Op. 1. D. 1402.

Troynitskiy, N.A. (1904). *The First General Sensus of Population of the Russian Empire*. Saint Petersburg.

Turchenko, F.G., Turchenko, G.F. (2003). *The Southern Ukraine: Modernization, World War, Revolution (the end of XIX century – 1921 year)*. Kyiv.

Vilson, I. (1863). *The Lists of Towns and Villages of the Russian Empire. Katherinoslav province in 1859*. Saint Petersburg.