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Abstract

The thesis deals with history of the Russian right-wing monarchist parties in Odessa (the Russian empire) during 1905-1907. It presents their activities not as a haphazard collection of acts, but as a coherent system rooted into the ways they perceived a situation around. Thus, the thesis offers an analysis of Russian right-wing monarchist ideologists’ in Odessa ideas on a general situation in which the Russian Empire found itself at the early 20th century. That situation, they thought, brought into life the Russian right-wing monarchist parties themselves thereby determining their strategy. I understand by the latter a set of general basic principles to guide oneself in order to achieve broader goals. The thesis also provides an analysis of the Russian right-wing monarchist parties’ activities in Odessa through the prism of their understanding of the immediate circumstances in which they had to act. One of the most important characteristics of the latter was activities of the monarchists’ rivals, who appeared on the political scene of the city much earlier. The thesis shows that a considerable part of the monarchists’ actions was a reaction towards the revolutionaries’ activities and that the monarchists drew upon their rivals’ successful experience of working among the masses. Under the auspices of the local authorities’ they managed to achieve unprecedented successes in that field by using the same methods as the revolutionaries.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

The thesis deals with history of the Russian right-wing monarchist parties in Odessa (the Russian empire) during 1905-1907. It presents their activities not as a haphazard collection of acts, but as a coherent system rooted into the ways they perceived a situation around. Thus, the thesis offers an analysis of Russian right-wing monarchist ideologists’ in Odessa ideas on a general situation in which the Russian Empire found itself at the early 20th century. That situation, they thought, brought into life the Russian right-wing monarchist parties themselves thereby determining their strategy. I understand by the latter a set of general basic principles to guide oneself in order to achieve broader goals. The thesis also provides an analysis of the Russian right-wing monarchist parties’ activities in Odessa through the prism of their understanding of the immediate circumstances in which they had to act. One of the most important characteristics of the latter was activities of the monarchists’ rivals, who appeared on the political scene of the city much earlier. The thesis shows that a considerable part of the monarchists’ actions was a reaction towards the revolutionaries’ activities and that the monarchists drew upon their rivals’ successful experience of working among the masses. Under the auspices of the local authorities’ they managed to achieve unprecedented successes in that field by using the same methods as the revolutionaries.

Before proceeding to the main part of my work I think it is necessary to provide a general overview of the Black Hundred movement in the Russian empire and with an analysis of historiography of the Black Hundred, which explains my choice of the research problems. As activities of the Russian right-wing monarchist parties under consideration took place mostly in Odessa, I devoted a separate section for general overview of history of the city and situation in the city at the beginning of the 20th century.
General historical background

In the very peak of the Russian revolution of 1905, on the 17th of October Tsar Nicolas II issued the “October manifesto”. It proclaimed establishment of the parliament and granted the population with a number of democratic freedoms, such as freedom of press, gatherings, religion, political parties and trade unions. From this moment on the political organizations acquired a legal status in the Russian empire. This fact was especially important for the right-wing monarchist part of the society. As loyal law-abiding citizens its representatives did not have their own political organizations and were deprived of the legal opportunity to create those hitherto. The manifesto gave them that opportunity, and the first right-wing monarchist organizations emerged. The four main groups of political parties in the Russian empire can be distinguished at that period. The first one could be referred to as a revolutionary one, which stood for the continuation of the revolution and overthrow of the autocracy. It included such parties as social-revolutionaries, social-democrats and other. The liberal parties accepted the manifesto, but advocated the strengthening of the constitutional reforms. Constitutional-democrats’ party was the most prominent representative of this camp. The Octobrists’ parties represented by the Octobrist, Trade-Industrial and other parties fully accepted the manifesto and the new political regime. Finally, the right-wing parties until the end of the revolution rejected to acknowledge the parliament as an independent legislative body and stood for unlimited autocracy and other traditional, monarchist values.

Taken together all of the right-wing parties are called “the Black Hundred” or “the Black Hundred movement”. However, it should be noted that there is a big terminological mess in the Black Hundred studies in this respect. The scholars do not distinguish between the plural “The Black Hundred” and the singular “The Black Hundred” and use them interchangeably. Those terms could be used to designate both the movement in general and individual
organizations in particular. Additionally, the terms “the Black Hundred” (and in plural), “party”, “organization”, “union”, “movement”, “monarchists”, “right-wing”, “far-right”, “extreme right”, “radical right”, “conservatives” are usually used as synonyms by the researchers. Additionally, the “Black Hundred” in both plural and singular could be used as a synonym of the Union of Russian People (URP), the largest and the most prominent organization within the movement. Although, the borders of the Black Hundred as a whole and of the URP are very similar, they are still not the same. I’ll use the terms “organization”, “party”, “union” with epithets “the Black Hundred” and “right-wing” to refer to particular Black Hundred organizations. I will use the same terms in plural with addition of the terms “movement”, “conservatives”, “monarchists” in order to refer to these organizations in plural or to the Black Hundred in general. I will not use the terms “far-right”, “extreme right”, “radical right”, because I do not see the necessity to study the far-right and moderate right separately in this work.

The Black Hundred was a strong important political movement covering huge territories of the Russian empire, it had a lot of members, belonging to all of social strata of the society and it was aimed at the suppression of the revolution to protect the Autocracy, Orthodoxy and Russian people. When the right-wing parties came into being they put forward the slogan of the restoration of the order shaken by the revolution and thus acquired a huge popularity. A huge number of those grassroots parties emerged throughout the country after the October manifesto was issued. One of the central aims of the Black Hundred was the struggle against the Jews whom they believed to be the sole begetters of the troubles of the Russian empire. The central and local authorities of the state believed that during the years 1905-1907 the Black Hundred were quite successful in the achievement of their goals. Through its leadership and especially through the organization called the Russian Assembly (RA) the Black Hundred was related to
the highest echelons of the Russian empire power network and the tsar himself, which shows the importance of the movement. The RA was a small but mighty monarchist organization emerged at the turn of the 20th century. It included members of the dynasty, the highest state bureaucrats, big landowners and intellectuals. It was an aristocratic type of organization with a restricted membership with a considerable backstage influence. Before the First Russian Revolution it engaged predominantly in the cultural activities. Then it became engaged in the political activities and acted like a Think Tank for the monarchist movement. In 1905-1907 a number of members of the Black Hundred grew up to 400000. This made the Black Hundred the largest political group of the time. For example, the largest revolutionary party Bund had only 34000 members. In geographical respect most of the Black Hundred unions and members were located on territory of the contemporary Ukraine with a number of significant branches in the other European parts of the Russian empire. As for social composition of the movement, it included representatives of all the strata of the Russian society. At the same time, one can see that various Black Hundred organizations and branches differed significantly from each other in this respect. For instance, the branches of the URP in Volyn’ region consisted predominantly of peasants and priests, while most of the members of the Odessa branch of the same organization were the port workers.

From the very inception the Black Hundred profoundly engaged in a wide range of different activities on political, social, economic, cultural scenes. They also participated in street fighting against their political enemies and violence against representatives of ‘hostile’ ethnic groups. The Black Hundred were especially fruitful in their publishing and educational efforts. Thus, in 1906 their unions published eighty-nine newspapers and journals and a significant number of pamphlets and leaflets. A number of the Black Hundred organizations run schools and gymnasiums. Ideology of the Black Hundred rested upon Uvarov’s triad
“Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality” and stood for traditional monarchist and religious values such as unlimited power autocracy of the tsar, privileged position of the Orthodox Church and of the Russian people. Antisemitism was one of the central elements of their ideology.

The Black Hundred movement reached its peak in the period of 1905-1907. It was time when they had a lot of members, influence, were especially active and relatively united. After these years historians speak about a gradual decline of the Black Hundred movement until its final collapse in 1917. However, this periodization is far from being perfect: on the contrary a number of the branches experienced their heyday in years following the revolution. Moreover, after the revolution the tendency towards the reduction of numbers of members was common to most of political parties in the country. With a number around 70000 members on the eve of February 1917 the Black Hundred were still among the biggest parties in the Russian empire.

The organizational question was one of the weak points of both the Black Hundred movement in general and its main representative the URP in particular. The intensive unification efforts conducted during the 1905-1907 proved to be unsuccessful: the URP remained an amorphous, decentralized, poorly administrated organization. After the revolution a number of schisms within the organizations occurred on the central and local levels. The schisms on the central level led to a big organizational mess. The central branches started to fight against each other for the loyalty of the local ones; the local branches prescribed themselves to several rival central branches simultaneously, dynamically changed their loyalty and proclaimed independence.

Problems of Historiography of the Black Hundred and My Research Goals

Until recently a considerable part of historiography, especially those produced in the Soviet Union, dealing with the Black Hundred used to reproduce a number of myths and
misconceptions concerning various aspects of the history of movement. One of the most persistent among them pertains to its number of members, social composition and activities. The Black Hundred’s membership was characterized as very small and composed of representatives of only two social strata – nobility and lumpen-proletariat, and the Black Hundred’s activity was reduced to organization of pogroms only. A tradition to talk about the Black Hundred in that way dates back to pre-revolutionary liberal and socialist publicists who aimed at discrimination of the movement. However, it was the works by Lenin that imposed this perspective upon the subsequent Soviet historiography, which did not dare to go against his opinion.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union a number of scholarly works on the topic published since the early 90s was bigger than a number of the works published during the entire period of the Soviet rule. Thematically these studies could be divided into three groups at least. The first one embraces the comprehensive works which try to study the Black Hundred in the Russian empire in general. These works discuss a huge range of topics concerning different Black Hundred organizations throughout the Russian empire, their diverse activities, social composition, ideology etc. The second group of works discusses the same issues, but on the regional level. To the third type belong problem-oriented works which deal only with some specific problems of the history of the Black Hundred. These are mostly the scholar articles.

3 Sergey Stepanov, Chernaya sotnia (Moscow: Eksmo, Yauza, 2005).
5 Igor Omel’yanchuk, Chernosotennoe dvizhenie v Rossii (Kiev: MAUP, 2006).
However, in the recent years the monographs started to appear as well. These are the books by Razmolodin⁴ and Karpuhin⁵. The work by Bogoyavlensky⁶ could be placed within this category as well.

The post-Soviet students of the Black Hundred started to reevaluate the legacy of the Soviet historiography. Igor Omel'yanchuk was among the first who successfully challenged a number of Soviet myths about the Black Hundred. In his works⁸ the author thoroughly and persuasively argued that both the number of members, social composition and activities of the Black Hundred were much more complex and different from those suggested by the previous historiography. Thus, he found that total membership of the Black Hundred was over 400 000 persons (which is 4 times higher than the most optimistic Soviet calculation), that its members belonged to all of the social strata of the Russian society and that pogroms and violence played very insignificant role in the activities of the Black Hundred unions if any. However, some of the works produced in the 90s⁹ were still not free from the Soviet stereotypes.

The Black Hundred unions in Odessa have never been a subject of a special investigation, although they have been often mentioned in general works on the history of the movement. Therefore, neither Omel'yanchuk’s nor Soviet historians’ conclusions on such issues as a number of the members, social composition of the unions and their pogrom and violent activities have, with a few exemptions and qualifications, been tested on the case of

⁵ Maksim Razmolodin, O konservativnoy sushnosti chornoy sotni (Jaroslav': N'uans, 2009).
⁸ Omel’yanchuk, “Social'nii sostav.”
Odessa. It is exactly this issue which I will address in the chapter dealing with the Black Hundred activities in the city.

Additionally, I am going to cover another gap in the historiography of the Black Hundred. While talking about the activities of the movement, the general studies on the history of the Black Hundred, which have the entire Russian empire in scope, always slip into pure haphazard descriptivism with very little of explanatory potential. The authors simply put together accounts of various activities of a number of the Black Hundred unions located throughout the empire and then relying on some implicit criteria organize these activities into broader categories. In the end they have chapters on the activities with subsections like “Terror and violence”, “Forms of propaganda”, “Publishing activities”, “Educational activities”, “Elections to the State Duma”, “Economical activities”, “Struggle against strike movement”\(^{10}\) and others that introduce us detailed accounts of endless cases. Although this strategy indeed has its advantages, it does not help us to understand the exact reasons which motivated the Black Hundred activists to do what they did. I think, to some extent this could be explained by the fact that the Black Hundred unions gathered by these researchers under one umbrella are too different from each another to allow any reasonable generalizations. If to assume that local conditions produced a decisive impact on the activities of the Black Hundred unions, (and we know that these conditions were very different in different parts of the empire) than it is clear that the activities of the Black Hundred unions, or at least motivations which stood behind them, should have also been very different. I suppose that one of the most decisive of these conditions should have been the other local political actors against whom the Black Hundred unions had to compete for the electorate’s sympathies. I think that this perspective will allow us to perceive different activities of the Black Hundred unions not as a list of some occasional activities.

\(^{10}\) Omel’yanchuk, *Chernosotennoe dvizhenie v Rosskiyskoy imperii.*
items, but as an organic whole rooted into the way the activists perceived the situation around them. In formulating my research problem in that way I guide myself with situational approach elaborated by Alexei Miller. It implies, that “the focus shifts from the actors as such to the process of their interaction and to unveiling the logic, including the subjective logic, of their own behavior and the reactions to the contexts and activities of other actors”\(^\text{11}\). Therefore, in the Chapter 2 I am going to describe the way the Black Hundred of Odessa generally perceived the reality in which it had to act. In other words it will deal with the local Black Hundred’s strategy, if to understand by the latter a general plan, basic principles etc. to guide oneself in order to achieve a main goal. In this respect Chapter 3 dealing with issues of the Black Hundred activities mostly will also cover the movement’s tactics, if to understand by the latter specific considerations related to achievement of specific sub-goals that support the defined mission. In chronological respect I am going to cover years 1905-1907, a period of the Revolution of 1905. It was time when the Black Hundred emerged in Odessa, organized itself and achieved its first big political successes. After 1907 another major schism within the Union of Russian People led to establishment of a new right-wing monarchist party, a branch of Mikhail Arkhangel Union. This made a situation within the Black Hundred in Odessa different and more complicated. Initially, I planned to study a period of rule of Prime Minister Stolypin (1906-1911). His figure caused a considerable impact on the entire Black Hundred movement and the situation changed for the latter after his death in 1911. However, an amount of sources which had to be studied in order to cover that time frame appeared to be unbearable for the MA thesis and I had to confine myself to the shorter chronological period.

\(^{11}\)Alexei Miller, *The Romanov Empire and Nationalism. Essays in the Methodology of Historical Research.* (Budapest: Central European Press, 2008), 18.
Odessa in early 20th century

Odessa was founded in 1794 on the order of the Russian Empress Catherine II on a place of a small Tatar village adjacent to a Tatar fortress. It was located in a newly acquired due to the Second Turkish War (1787-1792) land taken from the Ottoman Empire. The city had a strategic importance as it was a warm port accessible through the sea even in winters. Odessa became the first important port for import and export of agricultural and manufactured products, in particular grain. Nearly all the wheat and more than fifty percent of other grains were exported from Russia through Odessa. By the early 20th century Odessa transformed into a huge fast growing metropolis, an important economic, cultural and administrative center with ethnically heterogeneous population.

Economy

Alexander’s I decree of 1817 granting Odessa a free-port status played a crucial role in the city’s development. From 1819 to 1829 the city had a special status of a place where goods transitioning to countries other than Russia were allowed to enter and leave Odessa duty-free12. These promoted the city’s commerce and prompted domestic and foreign enterprises to set their branches here. By the end of the second quarter of the 19th century Odessa firmly established itself as a center of international commerce and became a major cultural, administrative and commercial center of New Russia. After the Emancipation of serfs in 1861 commercial significance of Odessa increased even further as an expanded railway network linked the city to various interior markets of the empire. From 1860s till 1894 grain exports from Odessa increased in around 4 to 6 times constituting 160 million poods a year. Opening of Suez Canal in 1869 also improved Odessa’s position as from now Asiatic goods were shipped to the

Russian empire not through the Baltic Sea ports, but through Odessa. In 1870s the city’s economy started to decline because of falling grain prices and competition from American grain traders. However, the city remained the most important urban center on the Russian empire’s Black Sea coast.

Commercial strength of Odessa lied not only in grain trade. Only ten percent of persons engaged in trade (30 thousands) dealt with moving of grain products. The rest were traders in other agricultural goods, middlemen, or involved in small retail. Odessa was also strong in heavy industry which rapidly developed. The number of factories between 1883 and 1898 increased in 250 percent. “One notable feature of factory production in Odessa was the smallness of enterprises in terms of work force and output…”¹³ Typical Odessa factory employed around 50 workers. Most of Odessa factories produced goods valued around 100 thousands rubles. The largest branch of industry was processing of foodstuffs. The second largest factory sector in terms of production measured in rubles was metal processing. Thus, although in the early 20th century grain trade still dominated the economy of the city the manufacturing became also very important.

In the early 20th century Odessa experienced a harsh economic decline which caused its impact upon the city life. The city found itself in a growing competition with other Black Sea ports of the Russian empire, which were located closer to new centers of grain production, had broader, deeper and better equipped harbors, which could handle a bigger amount of grain. Additionally, the cost of shipping of grain to Odessa became higher than to other ports. In 1900 Odessa suffered from nation-wide recession, in 1904 it faced challenge of bad harvest and outbreak of war between Russia and Japan (1904-1906). The war disrupted economic connections between Odessa and the Far East, depriving the former from markets, which forced

¹³ Ibid., 6.
many factories to reduce production and even to close down. Additionally, chaos of the Revolution of 1905 contributed to the city’s economy decline. All of these resulted in growth of unemployment rates especially in construction sector. In the end, “war and recession combined with structural weaknesses in the local economy to exacerbate the growing pains of Odessa”14

Population

The land around Odessa initially was poorly populated. The emperors encouraged immigration there by promising free lands, tax exemptions, state loans etc. Through the course of the 19th century Odessa along with other cities of the Russian empire and the world experienced a remarkable population growth. If in 1795 it had only around 2,5 thousands residents, by 1904 it already had around 500 thousands residents15. It became the fourth largest city of the empire after St. Petersburg, Moscow and Warsaw. 58 percent of the population was literate. Half of the population belonged to working class including 16 thousands semi-employed day laborers and around 6 thousands dockworkers16. Odessa was a city of migrants. From its very inception the city acquired a pronounced cosmopolitan character17. In 1819 only one-quarter of the population was Russian and Italian was the main commercial language of the city. In the end of the 19th century only around 44 of its residents were born in the city. Around 5% of Odessa residents (nearly 20 thousand persons) were subjects of foreign states18. Residents of Odessa spoke 55 languages and came here from over 30 countries. A lot of foreign merchants resettled to Odessa encouraged by the government. The migrants belonged to a variety of nationalities such as Great Russians, Poles, Ukrainians, Armenians and Greeks. Most

14 Ibid., 20-23.
15 Ibid., 7.
17 Herlihy, Odessa, 7.
18 Weinberg, The Revolution, 12.
of the migrants were workers who tended to segregate at special workers’ districts. Apart from permanent dwellers there were a number of people coming to the city in search for temporal employment at the harbor or at the constructions. Additionally, every spring and summer a lot of peasants in search for employment visited an agricultural labor market which met near Odessa. Unlike in other Russian towns the influence of peasant culture upon Odessa was quite small despite a constant inflow of peasants, who comprised around 30 percent of the city’s population. A lot of persons were attracted to Odessa by its image of an Eldorado, a “…California, another frontier territory where jobs abounded and settlers could give life another try.” The presence of a large foreign community gave Odessa a cosmopolitan flavor which other cities of the empire, with the exception of St. Petersburg and few Baltic seaports, did not possess. The cultural influence of those residents of Odessa who came from Europe permeated the city. A number of private and public schools, theaters, libraries, reading rooms, museums, a circus, an opera and a university made Odessa a huge center of culture. Broad streets, boulevards, parks and beautiful buildings designed in neoclassical style reminded of Western Europe and delighted the city visitors. Although at the turn of the century Odessa experienced an economic decline its image of a kind of El Dorado persisted. The city did not have enough work for arriving people who had to face perspectives of unemployment, hunger and poverty. However, even in years of recession many migrants decided not to leave the city for their native villages, towns or shtetls.

**Ethnicity**

The largest ethnic group was Russians (Great Russians, Belarusians and Malorussians). Together with other Slavs they constituted around 60 percent of the city’s population. Those

---

19 Ibid., 14.
20 Ibid., 9.
21 Ibid., 13.
who reported Russian Orthodoxy as their religion were 56 percent which is around 225
thousands persons. Jews constituted approximately 35 percent of the population and were the
second largest ethnic group. Other ethnic groups comprised around 6 percent of Odessa’s population.

The Russians predominated at the bottom and top of the society and the Jews stood
somewhere in the middle of social ladder. Of course, this division is quite rough as there were a
lot of lower strata members both among Russian and Jews. Among all of the ethnicities of the
city Jews deserves for a special attention as the Odessa Black Hundred made struggle against
Jews one of the central elements of its ideology.

Jews

The Jewish population of the city grew up from 17 thousands in 1854 to around 52
thousands in 1873 and to around 150 thousands in the early 20th century. Jews from Pale of
Settlement were especially attracted to Odessa. The shtetls experienced problems of
impoverishment, overpopulation etc. and Odessa was the next after the United States and
Western Europe destination for increasing Jewish migration. Comparing to other cities of the
Russian empire Odessa was appealing to them as it was located within the Pale of Settlement
and the Jews did not require any special permission to resettle there and were exempted from
part of discriminatory anti-Jewish legislation of the empire. The Jews believed Odessa to be a
place to make money, a place where one could rise from penury to wealth. This hope was a
strong force in popular imagination. In addition to economic reasons Odessa was also attractive
to Jews for its psychological and intellectual atmosphere. A new Jewish community in Odessa
was less influenced by traditional values and norms of Jewish society and culture. “Odessa,
therefore, provided Jews with a setting in which they could engage in new and different
intellectual, cultural, and economic pursuits more freely than in areas of traditional Jewish settlement"^{22}. In the 19th century Odessa rose as one of major centers of Jewish Enlightenment (Haskalah). It became a center of Hebrew and Jewish literature with a number of outstanding figures. The Jews also actively participated in the city’s economy and politics, establishing various enterprises and working in local municipality.

Odessa Jews were engaged in commerce and acted as middlemen in various trades. In the middle of the 19th century the Jews started to dominate the city’s commerce and took the grain trade into their hands. Greeks controlled the grain trade in Odessa until the Crimean War (1853-1856) which turned European markets to import grain not from the Russian empire but from America. Some of the Greek traders bankrupted, others closed their enterprises which did not bring them high profit anymore and pursued other ventures promising greater profits. This niche was filled in by Jewish traders who were accustomed to operate at smaller profit margins. By the late 1870s Jewish entrepreneurs controlled slightly more than half of the export trade in grain^{23}, around 60 percent of the city’s commercial firms and owned around half of Odessa’s stores. By 1910 they owned around 90 percent of the export trade in grain products^{24}. At the early 20th century they also controlled around 40 percent of enterprises under factory inspection, most of the banks operating in Odessa and constituted over half members of merchant guilds of the city. However, wealthy Jews did not have a direct influence upon local politics as the 1892 statute deprived them of the right to elect deputies to the City Duma^{25}. Despite the prominence of Jews in local economy more than half of them lived in poverty.

^{23} Ibid., 16.
^{24} Ibid., 17.
Ethnic segregation and animosity

For many years a degree of inter-ethnic animosity was relatively small in Odessa. The government’s policy encouraged migration of non-Russians into the city. The first governors of Odessa were themselves subjects of France whose policies in the spirit of the Enlightenment actively contributed to development of Odessa as a cosmopolitan center. However, the official policies clashed with popular xenophobia supplemented with resentment and envy caused by economic success of Jews most often took form of Antisemitism among many gentiles of the city. For several times during the 19th century it resulted in violent clashes and anti-Jewish pogroms. Additionally, clashes between Jewish and Russian youth were not rare.

Chaos of the Revolution of 1905 contributed to gentiles’ animosity towards Jews. The revolutionary events led to economic decline, cutting of workplaces and other accompanying hardships which also contributed to gentiles’ anxiety against Jews. This was due to the fact that Jews encouraged by the governments’ policies were quite numerous in revolutionaries’ ranks. From the second half of the 19th century the government took an increasingly hostile stand towards Jews. Beginning in 1870 the government adopted a set of laws restricting Jewish representation in municipal dumas. In spring 1881 an anti-Jewish pogrom went through the Russian empire including Odessa as a response to Emperor’s Alexander II assassination. The government passed the May Laws which restricted Jews’ economic activities and movement through the empire. In 1886 the government established quotas on Jewish representation in universities. This was especially painful for Odessa Jews as they comprised around one-third of

27 Weinberg. The Revolution, 15.
all students in Novorossiysky university in Odessa. These policies resulted in a rapid growth of Jews’ participation in the revolutionary movement.\(^{28}\)

Patterns of residential and labor segregation of the population of Odessa also encouraged interethnic hostility by reducing contacts between members of different ethnic groups. Jews and Russians were rarely working at the same enterprise simultaneously. They also tended to work in different branches of industry. Jews preferred to work at small workshops and as salesclerks, while Russians at the factories.\(^{29}\) Moreover, quite often Jewish shopkeeper and tavern keepers were perceived as exploiters by the workers.\(^ {30}\) At the enterprises were Jews and Russians worked together the reciprocal hostility was stirred up by job competition.\(^ {31}\) For example, such a situation was in Odessa Port, where Jewish dockers constituted half of the workforce.\(^ {32}\) Another reason for ethnic animosity, according to Weinberg, was rooted into the migrant character of Russian workers. They arrived to Odessa mostly form villages, where they almost did not encounter Jews, and brought to the city popular anti-Semitism. At the city they joined *zemlyachestvo* which limited their contacts with outsiders to a minimum, thus preventing from development of contacts with Jews, that could stimulate the destruction of their anti-Semitism.\(^ {33}\) There are indeed exist accounts that the workers felt themselves in Russian cities as strangers and outsiders.\(^ {34}\)

Residential patterns played their role in the growing of the distance between Jewish and Russian workers. The city was divided into five distinctive areas: Port, the outskirts – Slobodka and Peresyp, Moldavanka and the Central part of the city. The Port district was inhibited by

---

\(^{28}\) Langer, “Corruption,” 178.  
\(^{31}\) Kuromiya. *Freedom and Terror in the Donbas*, 47.  
\(^{33}\) Ibid., 53.  
\(^{34}\) Ibid., 48.
mostly young unmarried man for who did not born in Odessa. Most of them came from the central parts of Russia. Most of them were unskilled day laborers. Their living and working conditions were very poor. They lived in poor dirty and diseased flophouses, were they slept on the floor close to each other. They always were hungry and drunk. Their wages were very low and there were not enough jobs for them in the port. There were not enough facilities for workers. The main place where they spent their free time was taverns. The contemporary journalist depicted workers of the port as “unpleasant looking”, “ragged”, “sick” and aggressive with “broken noses”\textsuperscript{35}. In popular press they were always associated with criminal activity, especially thievety and smuggling.

Peresyp and Slobodka were industrial districts with a lot of different enterprises. Former Russian and Ukrainian peasants lived there. There were more places like cinemas and auditorium. However the living conditions there were not much better. The rooms, as in the case of the port, were dark, diseased and cold. The smoke from the factories made the air poisonous. The journalists often saw the relations between poor living conditions and moral qualities. In press reports Slobodka and Peresyp often figured as the areas were lower-class workers “beat, knifed, or shot each other” for some petty reasons or rape women. Thus, the residents of Slobodka and Peresyp were always portrayed in the press as more violent than people in the city.

The character of Moldavanka was quite different\textsuperscript{36}. In the popular mind Moldavanka was associated with crime much more than other neighborhoods. The crime in Moldavanka according to the journalist was perceived there as not a crime itself but as a business or

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 50.
profession and was widespread among the population of the neighborhood \(^{37}\). Moldavanka was populated mostly by Jews. It was manufacturing district of pre-industrial character with a lot of artisan workshops and a small number of big industrial enterprises. The living conditions there due to the presence of some well-equipped houses were a little better than at Slobodka and Peresyp. However, most of the residents of the neighborhood lived almost in the same conditions as residents of the two previous neighborhoods. The apartments there were depicted by the journalists in the same terms: as small, overpopulated dirty and diseased \(^{38}\). As well as residents of other non-central districts of the city, residents of Moldavanka were portrayed by the journalists as hostile, aggressive, dirty and morally defective. Violence was perceived by the journalists as banal and commonplace in the neighborhood and young “workers” was presented as its main exercisers \(^{39}\).

The central part of the city included Bul’varniy, Khersonsky and Alexandrovsky districts and was populated mostly by the middle- and higher-class persons. Living conditions there were much higher than at the outskirts and a lot of facilities were located there, the streets and apartments were clean, bright and comfortable. The richest district was Bul’varniy, than goes Khersonsky with its significant student population and the less prestigious district was Alexandrovsky populated with lower middle class persons \(^{40}\). Alexandrovsky district was also portrayed as the most criminal part of the central city, especially Alexandrovskaya street and the area near Old Bazaar \(^{41}\).

Thus, the Jewish and gentile population tended to live in isolation from each other. Each neighborhood tended to be populated by the representatives of one of the ethno-confessional
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groups\textsuperscript{42}. However, for example, in such a traditionally called “Russian” neighborhood as Peresyp there were near twenty percent of Jewish residents\textsuperscript{43}. One of the important features of the city’s geography was the fact that the outskirts and the Port district were purely connected by the transport both to the central city and to each other. Moskvich wrote about them “not even Odessa anymore”\textsuperscript{44}. It should be added that the workers of the city tended to work near the place where they lived and tried hard not to change this places even under the bad circumstances\textsuperscript{45}. So, there were large, quite separated, although located not far away from each other, more or less ethnically homogenous areas which inhabitants almost did not interfere in the life of inhabitants of other quite separated and more or less ethnically homogenous areas. It can be assumed that this fact contributed to perception of other parts of the city and their residents as “Others” and thus encouraged reciprocal hostility towards the population of different parts of the city, especially that of the different ethnic and religious group.

Thus, at the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century Odessa was a huge economic, cultural, and administrative center with ethnically heterogeneous population. The lower class members of the two main ethnic groups of the city (Russians and Jews) in general tended to segregate from each other both in labor and residence which contributed to growth of level of reciprocal animosity. On the other hand both of the ethnicities were more or less equally represented among workers of the city port, an enterprise providing a huge number of workplaces. Economic decline experienced by Odessa in early 20\textsuperscript{th} century led to cut down of a number of workplaces at the port which strengthened economic competition between Russian and Jewish port workers. The Jews also occupied the middle of social ladder in Odessa working as
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physicians, lawyers, doctors etc. This fact could contribute to few educated Russian professionals’ animosity towards Jews who, they thought, occupied the workplaces which should have belonged to Russians. The animosity towards Jews appeared a fruitful source for the Black Hundred propaganda which blaming of Jews for all misfortunes of the Russian state found a wide appeal to Russian population of the city. The Black Hundred also made use of the fact that the Jews were also particularly visible among the revolutionaries who terrorized the city in period of the Revolution of 1905. The Black Hundred represented this fact as evidence of Jews’ hostility towards Russian state and Russians.
Chapter 2. Russkaya Rech’s monarchist worldview

In this chapter I am going to address an issue of how the right-wing monarchists (the Black Hundred) in Odessa in early 20th century Russian empire constructed the reality in which they had to act. I think that there lies one of the keys to understanding the Odessa Black Hundred’s activities, as I assume that the Black Hundred’s actions stemmed from the way they perceived reality around. Later on I shall make a few remarks concerning Russkaya Rech’, my main source, and then I will proceed to an issue of a general situation in the Russian empire in years 1905-1907. Then I will look at the way they constructed the situation in Odessa in order to understand what local agenda the Black Hundred had. After I am done with those so to say historical and geographical contexts I will address the way Black Hundred perceived other important actors. I think that will end up in a comprehensive account on how the Black Hundred perceived themselves and the situation around them in historical, geographical and political contexts. I shall quote the sources a lot, because most of them are translated into English and introduced into scholarly literature for the first time.

Russkaya Rech’

Russkaya Rech’ s program was described in detail in an article devoted to an important newspaper’s shareholders meeting dealing with providing the newspaper with further funds. “A program of our editorship corresponds to that one of people’s monarchist parties, though the former does not equal the exact programs of any individual monarchist party. Therefore, Russkaya Rech’ could call itself a non-party daily”. The newspaper stood for

the unity of the Empire governed by unlimited autocrat only… We perceived that single and unlimited power blessed by the church not as a restriction of people and not as people’s enslavement… but as a firm and reliable bulwark of political independence and people’s freedom. We have been always perceiving Russian autocracy as the best form
of reign allowing various improvements and capable of development without transforming into any other form of statehood... That is why devotedness to monarchy had never prevented us from various real, not illusionary improvements of the state system of Russia. In the area of internal politics we stood for a priority of Russian nation, which is an elder sister of a great, but not always unanimous enough Slavic family, without violating natural rights of other nations populating... the Russian empire with the only reservation that those nations should not be enemies of Russian statehood... We singled out the Jewish question arguing that it is impossible to live with the Jews peacefully because of their hatred towards Christians, and that it is better for both us and them to separate from each other, then to live together in a constant animosity. In our foreign policy we stood for Russian state interests on both East and West aspiring to unite where it was possible with the Slavdom, and on the other hand we wanted to achieve a greater unity between monarchists and Christians from different countries to struggle against representatives of destructive teachings... Russkaya Rech’ decided to be a school of that harmonious and logically-complete system of ideas which could be called “monarchist worldview”.

What is important in the above-mentioned account is that Russkaya Rech’ pretended to represent a monarchist worldview in general without inclination to any particular party’s ideology. I will take that words for granted and treat Russkaya Rech’ in the same way as it represented itself, namely as “a representative of a monarchist worldview” but with only one qualification “in Odessa”.

**The Present Historical Moment**

One of the first things the newspaper wanted to deal with is to present its readers with an explanation of what it called “an essence of the present historical moment” as its authors felt that there are some deep transformations going on in the Russian state. In their view in 1905 the historical moment was the following. Dark inorodtsy forces of Russia joined together with scoundrel professors, Russian by birth, and bankrupt landing gentry who served at zemstvo and state institutions and were hungry for money and power. They havoc among the Russian nation and conspired to kill it with its own hands what manifested itself in the “October slaughter”. The Russian state managed to survive at that moment only due to the fact that deceived Russian
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Nation discovered the lies produced by “liberators” talks and followed its true leaders. The madness was not nation-wide, it caught only youth from intelligentsia and the so-called “conscious” elements of peasants and workers. The other part of the nation instinctively felt that “liberators” were enemies and managed to prevent the Russian state from having been destroyed. By July 1907 the situation of the Russian nation, according to Ivan Leydensky, was different. Its essence lied in a fact that it was a turning point in economic life of the nation. The nation was in the middle of transition from ancient agricultural culture to more complicated agricultural techniques, and from extractive industry to manufacturing one. “We should go along the road of the West” - Ivan Leydensky wrote, “we should develop an intensive agriculture and factory industry and only after that we should come at international trade scene and open our markets at the Far East”. Therefore, he continued, Russian nation should have learnt various mechanical arts, developed modern agricultural techniques and bought only that staff which it had produced by itself\textsuperscript{47}.

Under strong strikes of devoted to the tsar army the revolution has been defeated; its leaders surrendered, they are searching for new occasions to revolt, but the army is ready… The revolution calmed down but did not fall, it is still alive in minds and hearts of monsters who are called enemies of the statehood… Revolutionaries wage war against economic good of the state: they systematically destroy reserves of grain… A revolutionary takes his energy from terrorist acts which happen every day and kill tens and hundreds of the devoted servants of the Motherland… Somebody’s invisible hand directs events of the revolution and it wants to light a fire of revolution again… However, what have happened will never happen again as the nation’s psychic has transformed and nobody will greet bloody events anymore…The revolution has lost almost everything it won previously, it is left with a small group of blind, fanatic and useless people, who still admire it and lead the terror. Who is the main band-master of the revolution?... It is the Jews. They led other nations to the good of the revolution, and they lead us to the same point\textsuperscript{48}. “In Vilna juridical district the Jews constitutes around 15% of the whole population, in Odessa juridical district – 13,5 %, in Kiev – 12%. If we take into account that 1. Jewish population concentrates in towns and cities 2. All urban population of Russia constitutes around 25% of the entire population 3. In towns and cities live not only Jews but also other inorodtsy, then it will appear that in that juridical

\textsuperscript{47} Russkaya Rech’, July 31, 1907.
\textsuperscript{48} Russkaya Rech’, December 14, 1907.
districts, which encompass around 20 gubernias, 2/3 of urban dwellers are Jews and inorodtsy and only 1/3 are Russians. The fact that Jews dominate the towns of Western and Southern Russia shows that interests of Russian urban population... are not in Russian hands... In 1901-04 Jews took much more active part in revolutionary movement than Russians... 64.9% political criminals are Jews. Therefore, the years 1905-07 for the Black Hundred was the times of rise and fall of the revolution conducted by the Jews against the Russian people.

The Revolution of 1905-1907

Russkaya Rech’s publicists tried hard to explain the reasons for and contents of the revolution in Russia. One of the ways to do so was to compare it to the revolutions in Western Europe. According to Russkaya Rech’, the main factor in Western European revolutions was people who had grown rich. However, that people, together with the rural population and aristocracy belonged to the same nation. Therefore, the author concluded, bourgeois revolution was a national revolution. The things were different in Russia. As in the Western Europe, the author continued, the revolution in Russia was done by urban population, with only difference that in the West bourgeois came from peasants and belonged to the same nation as the latter, while Russian city dwellers were to a large extend inorodtsy who did not create Russia and did not fight against its enemies, but similarly to Egyptian Hyksos came to Russia from nowhere. The revolution done by alien city dwellers, according to the author was not a democratization of Russia, but a legitimization of Jewish-inorodtsy city dwellers’ domination over Russian peasantry, over Russian national interests.

Aristocratic-bureaucratic Western Europe transformed due to revolutions into a constitutional-democratic one, but everywhere the power remained in the hands of the same nation. Aristocratic-bureaucratic Russia, due to the revolution, gradually transforms into a Jewish-bourgeois one. In our case, it is not the middle class who wants to take a position of a higher class, as it was in the West, it is an inorodets-town dweller who wants to replace a Russian. As a result of revolution Russia tends to be a Russian
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one by its rural, governed and taxpaying public and Jewish and *inorodcheskiy* ones by its governing and consuming public*. “When comparing our recent events to similar European ones, at least one thing becomes clear that everything goes wrong only because we lack strong, enlightened and conscious *meschanstwo*\(^{50}\).

Therefore, according to Russkaya Rech’, the main peculiarity of the Russian revolution was that it was done not by the Russian nation, but by inorodtsy and that it would have not lead to any progress but to a subordination of one nation by another.

According to Russkaya Rech’, the Jews’ desire to wage a revolution in Russia manifested itself in the Kadets’ (Constitutional-Democrats) parties activities. Thus, the newspaper continued, to the left from centrist October 17 party stood not Kadets but republican parties. As the Russian Assembly was an “academic” party for the right-wing parties, the republican parties had, according to Russkaya Rech’, their own “academics” in the form of the Party of Democratic Reforms (PDR). The newspaper defined its basic principles as fraternity, equality and freedom and its main task as to elaborate a way for a republican transformation of Russia “through plebiscite”. The party acknowledged private property, the author proceed, and generally had a bourgeois character. As a purely academic party which dealt mostly with theoretical questions concerning state system it had a small membership and like the Russian Assembly it participated in politics and the State Duma elections only indirectly.

It is other parties who, according to Russkaya Rech’, tried to implement theories elaborated by the PDR. Some of them tried to do this peacefully, others – “violently”\(^{51}\). Thereby, the former constituted the right wing of the republicans while others constituted the left one. The Party of Peaceful Renovation (the PPR, Kadets), according to Russkaya Rech’, stood at the right wing. “As a heritage of Mason theories it trails a Jew after itself”\(^{52}\). All

\(^{50}\) Russkaya Rech’, September 3, 1906.

\(^{51}\) Most probably the author meant “by means of terror and strikes”.

\(^{52}\) Тащит еврея за собой.
people, according to that party, are equal and should have equal political rights. According to Russkaya Rech’ the members of that party were “metaphysics theoreticians”\textsuperscript{53} and they did not want to look at life which had shown that a Jew as a spice could be equaled to other spices but as a religious sect, which is based on “humanity-hating”\textsuperscript{54} Talmud, it is very dangerous for humanity. In other respects, the newspaper proceeded, the PPR party program was purely bourgeois and its foundation was the preservation of capitalism and private property. Russkaya Rech’ wrote that although some of its points indeed promised to grant peasants with lands and to give plants to workers, everybody understood that it was there just “for appearance”\textsuperscript{55}. Be it as it may, Russkaya Rech’ concluded, the PPR wanted to reform Russia in a peaceful and legal manner and from this perspective this party should have been permitted. The PPR, according to Russkaya Rech’, had around 20 branches around Russia but most of them were in the biggest university centers. From Russkaya Rech’ perspective, that party served as a front organization for another party which was not legalized, namely the Republican Party, and which had to resort to the legal rights of another party.

The Republican Party formerly called itself the Constitutional-Democratic Party (the Kadets), but it threw off the mask soon, because it did not want to preserve the monarchy and that mask had already helped it to confront with the monarchy and to show it its teeth. Now it calls itself with its true name: “Masonic organization under the name of the “Party of People’s Freedom” (PPF). After it has successfully defeated religion in France it moved into another country which suddenly became weak. The first attempts of Masons to enslave Russia began at the beginning of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. However, because of opposition from the supreme authority of the state they were not successful. Now it started to act openly. Revolution is the only way
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for Masons to reach their aims. That is why the PPF occupies the left wing of the Republicans by aiming at realization of all the reforms it need in a revolutionary manner, without waiting. Its tactics is the same as it was in the 18th century France, namely to gain control over movement it wish, to direct the masses to violently fight for improvement of their material life. It is backed by a huge capitals produced by enslaved by them French nation. “Divide and rule” is its principle. By destroying strength of peasants’ commune it will make it possible for capital to enslave every individual. It entices the people by illusionary personal freedom and draconian laws of civil relationship and through this it subordinates the Christian nation to Jews. The Jews give a lot of money to the PPF. The Jews demand from Russian leaders of the party to instigate the masses to violent actions for illusionary ideals. The Russians in that party are threatened with death by the Jews. The Bund activists are ready any moment to murder any of the leaders of the PPF, preventing the latter from changing their political behavior. The PPF had its branches in every place where at least a single Jew lived. Therefore, according to Russkaya Rech’ Kadets’ parties were controlled by the Jews, were extremely popular among the Jews, were financed by the Jews, but they also included a small number of Russians who were controlled by the Jews.

A perceived nature of that support which the Kadets’ parties and other left-wing parties had from the part of the Jews made the monarchists optimistic, as they believed that they could have successfully retook hearts and minds of those Russians who had got into the left-wing camp by occasion. According to Russkaya Rech’, at the beginning of the revolution the society consisted of two not equal parts. One of them, a lager one, treated the political events indifferently without either sympathy or opposition. The second of them, a small one, sympathized with the revolution. After the government used force against the revolution the

---

56 Russkaya Rech’, February 2, 1907.
masses remained indifferent but the intelligentsia became more radicalized. The government realized that the implementation of force made the situation worse, therefore it decided to grant the society with freedom so that the latter would be able realize “a true nature of the revolution”. In a while, after the revolution turned into anarchy the indifferent part of society started to produce individuals and organizations which aimed at fight against anarchy. At the same time those who initially sympathized with the anarchy realized that it was not as good as it used to appear. From that moment on more and more people openly opposed the anarchy, but their number was still not larger than that of those who continued to sympathize with it, and there still remained a lot of indifferent people. Russkaya Rech’ believed that once the government realized that society did not sympathize with the revolution anymore it would suppress the anarchy fast. Russkaya Rech’ believed that most of the Russians were monarchists by their worldview, however they were not active, they were still sleeping in political respect. The monarchists should have awakened. By inviting people into their organizations, Russkaya Rech’ preceded, the monarchists made the organizations stronger and after they became strong enough they should have shown this strength to everyone. Russian society organized in that way would have communicated its will to the government through numerous petitions. In 1906, according to Russkaya Rech’, when monarchists were still organizing Russian society time to show their strength had already come. Russkaya Rech’ suggested that they should have followed revolutionary parties’ example. That parties had been organizing and agitating for decades and were quite experienced in that respect. However, unlike the revolutionaries, Russkaya Rech’ warned, the monarchists should have not resorted to violence. In following the revolutionaries the monarchists should have united like-minded people into organizations. Then they should have introduced discipline within their organizations. Then a common plan of further activity for all of the organizations throughout Russia should have been elaborated. And
only afterwards they would have been able to start to influence Russian life, Russkaya Rech’ concluded. Therefore one can see, that general Black Hundred’s program was tightly related to the ways it perceived the revolution and its main actors.

**Odessa**

In late August of 1906 there happened an incident in one of the city’s gymnasiu...
resulted not from the drunkenness, but from the lack of free places were Russian workers could work. “All of the ways /for Russian workers to improve their life – OD/ are blocked by the Jews… and there are Jewish traps everywhere on the Russian ways”[^64]. In an article “What is going to be next” the author wrote that there were 500 thousands inhabitants in Odessa. According to the author, despite the fact that most of them were the Russians, one could not have seen the Russian people almost anywhere. The shops belonged to the Jews and other peoples, half of the houses were not Russian, and “nothing goes in the Russian ways”. Most of the employees of the city hospital were the Jews. There would be no places for Russian physicians, jurists and journalists in Odessa soon, he wrote. “Odessa has already been conquered by the Jews”, the author concluded[^65]. Thus, the newspaper represented the city as being economically dominated by the Jews.

* 

Therefore, one can see that the Black Hundred in Odessa was born as response to the revolution which, according to its deep persuasion was done by the Jews and other “inorodtsy” in order to dominate Russian people. According to the Black Hundred, it was done by hands of Kadet parties whose leaders were Russians controlled by the Jews. The Kadets, according to the Black Hundred, did not win the sympathies of the Russians and were able to have such a huge impact upon life of the state due only to the passivity of most of the Russians. This passivity made them either not to oppose Kadets or to express fake sympathy towards the latter while actually sharing traditional monarchist values. This made the Black Hundred to believe that they had huge and bright perspectives in awakening the Russians’ consciousness which could

[^64]: Russkaya Rech’, September 24, 1906.
have made them more important in the political life of the state. The Odessa Black Hundred believed that the city had been conquered by the Jews and that they had to retake it.
Chapter 3. The Black Hundred activities

In the course of the Revolution of 1905 a new actor – the Black Hundred parties – appeared on political scene of Odessa which had been dominated by socialist organizations and liberal activists for around 30 years. It is to a large extent revolutionary activity of the latter which gave rise to the Black Hundred. The local socialists and liberals became the main opponents of the Black Hundred. Therefore, before proceeding to analysis of the Black Hundred parties it is necessary to give a general overview of a situation within the Black Hundreds’ enemies’ camp. In doing so I will rely on Weinberg’s work, which basing itself upon a profound amount of sources provides quite detailed, extensive and original account of history of the socialists and revolutionary activities of liberal activists in Odessa.

Rivals of the Black Hundred

The Socialist Organizations

At the beginning of the 20th century Odessa was one of the major centers of revolutionary activities in the Russian empire with a number of active socialist underground organizations struggling for minds and hearts of the city workers and intelligentsia. The history of Odessa revolutionary movement dates back to mid-1870s when the first workers’ political organization in the Russian empire, South Russian Workers’ Union, emerged in the city. With Zaslavskii and Lavrov at the head, the Union aimed to organize artisans and factory workers in the South of Russia. In the late 1875 after it managed to organize around 100 workers the Union was closed by the police. Although its life was short, the enterprises which fell under its influence remained “hotbeds for radical opposition and labor strife for the next several
decades. In 1870-1890s a number of revolutionaries attempted to revive the workers’ movement throughout the Southern Russia. In 1890 the first Marxist circle was established by David Goldendakh in Odessa. Among members of the circle there were a number of workers. Goldendakh led discussions concerning the workers’ movement in Western Europe and gave lectures and popularized Marxist ideas among the members of the circle. In 1891 after establishing a few other circles and setting up a well-stocked socialist library, Goldendakh was arrested. His line was continued by students Yurii Sterklov and Grigorii Tsyperovich, who reestablished a network of circles among artisans and factory workers. They and other leaders were arrested in 1894. In 1895 a new South Russian Workers’ Union with around 200 members was set up by Boris Okol’skii, Anton Boreish and Ivan Iukhtonskii. The union aimed at condemning exploitative practices of subcontractors dealing with construction workers. The union focused on achieving political freedoms and economic reforms. The narodovol’tsy acting in the city in the 1890s had a similar program. The circles of this period, according to Weinberg, achieved only “modest success”. Attendance at meetings was irregular and membership was fluid. In the late 1890s Jewish Marxist and labor activists from Vilna arrived in Odessa. They acted mostly in the Jewish milieu and helped Jewish workers to organize labor unrest and to establish strike funds. Unlike the previous revolutionaries who aimed not at recruitment of as many members as possible, but at training of individuals demonstrating special leadership qualities as agitators and organizers, the Vilna Social Democrats (SD) concentrated on enlistment of new members and wide propaganda of their ideas. Comparing to their predecessors the efforts of the Vilna SD’s were fruitful. A number of strike funds were
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established among workers of different professions and a number of libraries opened. However, the Vilna SD failed to unite all of the strike funds and workers’ circles in the city into a single organization. Although the Vilna activists strongly gravitated towards Jewish workers they did not want either to create an independent Jewish movement or stir up Jewish national feelings. Be it as it may, “Jewish workers soon formed the backbone of the SD movement in Odessa,” most of whom were workshop employees. The SD’s leadership in revolutionary movement in Odessa was challenged by a number of other socialist groups. In 1903 a branch of Bund was established in Odessa. In 1904 it claimed a membership of 400. In 1901 a branch of the SR movement was established in Odessa. In the mid-1902 they got some prominence among workers of several enterprises. In late 1903 a group of anarchists advocating terror and general strike as an appropriate revolutionary tactics split of the local SR organization. It was especially appealing to local students and began to play a major role in political and social unrest in late 1905. Thus, on the eve of 1905 workers of Odessa were exposed to a variety of revolutionary organizations and activists. Although, only small part of the workers was directly involved in the political activities, the other part of the workers was undoubtedly bombarded with news on the political activities of the former and was acquainted with their views and ideas.

Moreover, a number of leaders of the strike movement in Odessa had “socialist background.” In the course of the Revolution of 1905-1907 the striking workers started to assume some of political demands which were on the SD’s agenda. However, as Weinberg
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notes, despite the devoted activities of individual SD agitators, who made speeches and distributed leaflets\textsuperscript{79}, “they did not direct the workers’ movement. As participants but not initiators or leaders of the unrest, they exerted a secondary influence in generating work stoppages”\textsuperscript{80}. Neither the socialist parties had a considerable formal ties to emerging in 1905 workers’ trade unions. However, like in the case with the strike movement, a number of the trade unions leaders were members of the Social Democrat parties\textsuperscript{81}. The same pattern could be observed in the Soviet of Workers’ Deputies. It was created in November 1905 on the initiative of local SD’s\textsuperscript{82} and most of its deputies were members of different revolutionary parties. According to Weinberg, “The Soviet, even more than trade unions, bore the indelible imprint of the SD’s, particularly the Mensheviks, in its outlook, program, and actions”\textsuperscript{83}. However, despite all of these the Soviet proclaimed formal political neutrality\textsuperscript{84}.

Thus, by the time the Black Hundred unions in Odessa came to the fore, a developed network of various Social Democrats organizations had already been functioning for around 35 years in the workers’ milieu disseminating Socialist ideas and assisting in workers’ struggle for better working conditions. Although the SD’s parties did not attract any considerable number of workers, the workers acknowledged the SD activists’ superior organizational skills and eagerly elected them to lead the workers’ own organizations, whose activities thereby acquired remarkable socialist hue. Since 1870s that time the socialists tested various forms of organizational activities among the city workers such as establishing of tea-houses, libraries, mutual loan societies etc. Thereby the Black Hundred was provided with an opportunity to
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draw upon the socialists’ experience of working in the workers milieu and, as I will show later, they did take that opportunity.

The Kadets

The only work which focuses on the Kadets in Odessa as the main subject is Stanislav Koval’chuk’s dissertation. However, his narrative is too haphazard and unsystematic. The author simply describes his occasional press and archival findings. Therefore, this only work on the Kadets in Odessa does not provide us with all of the information we need. At the same time, this study is a groundbreaking one; it exposes scholarly community to new source evidence which makes it unfair to underestimate its value. According to the author, a branch of the Kadets party was set up in Odessa on December 11 1905 on an initiative of professors of Novorossiyskiy University with E.M. Shepkin at the head. By 1906 it had around 600 members among whom were “groups of Jews, Poles and Ukrainians.” Most of the members belonged to nobility and “meshane” estates. The party was established “on the basis of a wide network of educational institutions of the city and was composed mostly of professors, high school teachers and students.” The major issue the party devoted its efforts to from the inception were the State Duma elections and pre-elections agitation. In late January 1906 the Kadets lead a number of pre-election meetings for general public in order to explain the Electoral Law. The party published articles in local newspapers complaining about lack of funds.
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Weinberg provides us with a more valuable insight into the direct precursors’ of the Kadets party revolutionary activists. In autumn 1905 the University reemerged as a center for the protest movement of the citizenry of Odessa. Professors, university students, secondary school students, revolutionaries and workers “used its building to hold mass rallies, plan demonstrations, and organize and direct self-defense groups”. The students’ assemblies held in the university building became a forum for various political parties such as Kadets, SD’s and other. At the meetings issues concerning struggle against the autocracy were discussed and ideas on the necessity of a comprehensive political reform promoted. Huge mass rallies with 7000-10 000 persons participating took place at the University auditorium on October 15. At this rally professors, students and members of revolutionary organizations planned a general strike for October 17. On October 16 the revolution broke out. The students and workers built barricades and fought against the army. However, by the evening they were dispersed.

Thus, the individuals directly involved into the functioning of educational institutions in city, namely, the professors, the secondary school teachers and students and the university students stood in the open opposition to autocracy and played a significant role in dissemination of revolutionary ideas among the local population and in organization of the pressure upon the government through mass rallies, demonstrations and even violent confrontation with the troops. The university, both as a building and as professors and students, became an important center of the revolutionary movement in the city.
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The Black Hundred in the city

The Russian Assembly (RA)

The Russian Assembly (Russkoe Sobranie) became the first Black Hundred organization in the city. It was established on February 26 1905. Although some circumstantial evidence indicates that its role in the Black Hundred movement at the city could not be underestimated, there is not a lot of information left pertaining to its history. The most extensive piece of information on the RA is Russkaya Rech’s report on the party’s anniversary meeting at 1906. There Pelikan said that the first year of existence was very hard for the organization. Especially hard, the speaker recalled, were September and October when a number of people left the RA ranks and only a small nucleus of faithful and reliable people remained. According to Pelican, it was generally assumed that the RA did nothing, but it is not like that. He said that the organization was unable to do a lot since it encountered numerous obstacles. However, Pelikan proceeded, the RA could be proud of being involved in Russkaya Rech’ establishing, as the current publisher of the newspaper was colonel Mikulin, was the former head of the RA. The second achievement of the RA, according to Pelikan, was setting up of the URP?. At another place Pelikan stressed that the RA should be also regarded as progenitor of all of the subsequent monarchist organizations in Odessa. Rodzeivch’s speech on the same meeting provides a more detailed insight into the RA activities. According to him, the RA held a number of meetings where various lectures concerning “the most important present-day” issues were delivered. The organization participated in a farewell ceremony pertaining to warships’ departure to Far East. The RA participated in a ceremony of reception of general’s Kondratenko’s body, “a Port Arthur” hero. The party medically assisted to Russian people, who were wounded by a Jewish crowd during the Jewish pogrom of 1905. The RA also

94 Omel’yanchuk, Chernoosotennoe dvizhenie na territorii Ukrainy, 17.
took part in The Russian Assembly All-Russian Rally. The RA published a number of free of charge pamphlets and leaflets for people in order to oppose revolutionary propaganda. During the elections to the First State Duma the RA published proclamations, the RA’s electoral program and a guide for voters, which instructed them on the details of the electoral process. At the same meeting where the speeches by Pelikan and Rodzevich were delivered one of the members of the RA announced that he endows the RA and the URP with a piece of land at which the first one will be able to build a school and the second one – to build a tea-house and a library. In the end of March the RA organized two commissions responsible for building of the school, an economic one, responsible for purely financial aspect and another one pedagogical, responsible for elaboration of educational profile of the school.

Although we do not have any direct evidence, I think, it is possible to assume that the local RA branch for the Black Hundred in Odessa was the same as the RA was for the Black Hundred in the Russian empire in general. Namely, it was a kind of a brain of the Black Hundred movement, its ideological and intellectual center which also provided other unions with its organizational support and leaders. The last point is especially true for Odessa where most of the leaders of the local Black Hundred parties indeed also belonged to the RA. Social composition of the Odessa branch of the RA also corresponded to social composition of branches of the RA elsewhere – a small membership belonging to the highest strata of society. In 1905 there were 278 members in the Odessa RA most of whom were local aristocrats,
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civil servants and the military\textsuperscript{102}. It is hard to say anything precise concerning the aims of the organization, but from the piece cited above one may conclude that it tried to combine a work with the lower strata with a work on an educational front. Later, the members of the RA established separate parties each concentrating on only one of that fields of activity. Therefore, I think, it is possible to say that generally the history of the Odessa Black Hundred is the history of growth, expansion and development of the RA.

The Party of the Legal Order (PLO)

The Party of the Legal Order (Partiya Pravovogo Poryadka) was established in early December 1905, soon after the Electoral Law concerning the State Duma elections was announced. It became the first mass right-wing party in the city. Most of the visitors of the general meetings belonged to middle class and working class\textsuperscript{103}. The PLO represents an interesting case from the perspective of classification of the political forces of that time. While having an Octobrist political program it used openly Black Hundred rhetoric and surrounded its meetings and actions with symbols and rites characteristic for the Black Hundred parties. The RA accused the PLO leadership of fooling its members, who, as the RA firmly believed, should have been in the Black Hundred ranks. It seems that the RA critique was to some extent justified as under its pressure the PLO members indeed gradually transfused into Odessa branch of the Union of Russian People and the PLO ceased to exist. The case of the PLO also suggests that the party formed a different center of right-wing politics in Odessa which, I hypothesize, gave birth to branches of the Union of October 17 and the Trade-Industrial party which emerged later.

\textsuperscript{102} Russkaya Rech’, March 26, 1906.

\textsuperscript{103} Russkaya Rech, December 13, 1905.
The RA treated establishment of the PLO with suspicion. One of the RA meetings was deliberately devoted to the situation around the PLO. The RA speakers at that meeting argued that a number of members the PLO got into this party because of a kind of misunderstanding. Most of the party members, according to the RA leaders, should be members of the RA. The RA members argued that although leaders of the PLO stood for a constitution, speakers of the party do not speak about the constitution at all. This fact, the RA speaker concluded, makes members of the party think that the party stays for autocracy. The members of the PLO who were present at the RA meeting where these questions were discussed confirmed that they had not known anything about “constitutional aspirations” of the PLO. They have just left the PLO and became members of the RA.\(^\text{104}\)

The PLO program was published in early December at Russkaya Rech’. According to the document the October manifesto invited Russian people in person of its representatives to rule the state in harmony\(^\text{105}\) with tsar. The authors of the program wrote that it is time for everybody to join parties which they like and that a collective reason of people can work usefully in a sphere of state affairs only if the latter are covered from different angles by competing parties. “Our party is based on constitutional monarchy. The convocation of the State Duma is the main aspiration of our party. We should do our best to elect representatives to the State Duma. The State Duma will bring peace and order…”\(^\text{106}\). According to the authors the following measures are crucial for protection of a legal order in the state: 1. Unity and indivisibility of the Russian state 2. Settlement on peasant question. 3. Settlement on workers’ question 4. People’s education 5. Improvement of the Russian military forces\(^\text{106}\). Thus, as the program fully accepted the newly established political regime it could be regarded as a party of
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\(^{105}\) В согласии.

\(^{106}\) Russkaya Rech’, December 14, 1905.
an Octobrist part of the political spectrum. Moreover, some points of the program closely resembled that one of the Union of October 17\textsuperscript{107}.

In around a month after the PLO opening ceremony the RA opened a public polemic with PLO at Russkaya Rech’s correspondence column in order to ascertain its political credo. On January 29 a letter by the PLO council to Russkaya Rech’ was published in the correspondence column. The council wrote that there were articles published in different newspapers which argued that the PLO goes against the autocratic tsar. The council continued that contrary to that information the PLO stood for autocracy “but it did not wish to touch an issue of Manifestos of the 6\textsuperscript{th} of August and of the 17\textsuperscript{th} of October”. “The party keeps to October the 17\textsuperscript{th} Manifesto and through this fulfils the will of the tsar” he wrote\textsuperscript{108}. The RA welcomed that the PLO confirmed that it stood for the autocracy. Than the RA asked the PLO to confirm that it had abandoned its previous program “designed in a constitutional spirit” and to confirm that their leaders believed that Russia should remain under unlimited tsar’s rule\textsuperscript{109}. The PLO responded that it has never expressed any aspiration for the restriction of the monarch’s autocratic will. On the contrary, it has always protected the autocratic rule against both left-wing parties which struggle for its restriction and right-wing parties which want to preserve pre-reform bureaucratic regime\textsuperscript{110}. The RA Council replied that it started the argument with the PLO in order to find out if the ideology of the latter provides any space for establishment of an alliance between the parties. The previous program of the PLO was, according to the Council, too obscure. It could be interpreted that the PLO stood for a constitution. At the same time, the Council continued, the content of the speeches delivered at
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the PLO party meetings could be interpreted as evidence that the party stood for the autocracy without aspiring to restrict the latter... However, the Council continued, the PLO’s responds to the RA points did not clarify the issue. The party, according to the RA Council, again spoke of some “Russian constitution which does not restrict tsar’s autocracy”. However, the Council continued, it was not correct to play with the words which had well-known meaning. The essence of constitution, it wrote, is when people after struggle against monarch take his power of him and delegates it to its representatives. The best representative of the Russian people, it wrote, was tsar. The deputies elected to the State Duma, the RA Council continued, would not govern the people, they would not struggle against the tsar, but they would support the tsar against his and Fatherland’s enemies. From this perspective, the Council continued, the October Manifesto cannot be regarded as “the beginning of the Russian constitution”\textsuperscript{111}. The PLO did not respond. However, at one of the party meetings one of speakers explained the party’s position on that issues in a bit more detail. P. D’Arman claimed that in the Russian state the power should belong to the Russian people. The Russian people delegate their power to tsar. That is why limitation of the power of tsar would result in limitation of the power of the people. The Russian people did not want for its power to be lawlessly delegated to bureaucracy, because the specifics of bureaucracy as such could not guarantee that bureaucracy would not misuse the power. Manifesto restricts the tyranny of the bureaucracy in legislative field and delegates the legislative power back to the people in person of their representatives of the State Duma. Constitution means “a law concerning a state’s establishment with the country’s deputies’ involvement into legislative activity”. That is, the word “constitution” is not necessarily related to a notion of a restriction of a monarch’s will. In that sense the act of October 17\textsuperscript{th} is a constitutional act. An elections procedure as such cannot guarantee that the

\textsuperscript{111} Russkaya Rech’, February 22, 1906.
deputies sent by the Russian people would be their true representatives that is why the monarch’s power should not be restricted. If it is nevertheless restricted, the Russian people could lose their privileged position within its own state. Additionally, since Russian tsar got his autocratic power from the Russian people, he could not either resign or restrict the power in favor of political aspirations of radical parties by his own will\textsuperscript{112}. Thus, both of the parties agreed on the fact that the October Manifesto had not restricted tsar’s authority and the argument basically went about the very word “constitution”, which the RA did not want to acknowledge.

From the very inception the party focused on working in the workers’ milieu. On February 19 factories’ and plants’ workers organized by the PLO presented temporary general-governor of Odessa with an orthodox icon and apologized “for what they have done”\textsuperscript{113}. On March 9 a project of a statute of an educational-economic society of workers and servants at plants, factories and trade enterprises of Odessa was elaborated by members of the PLO\textsuperscript{114}. The party also planned to open consumers’ shops and storehouses\textsuperscript{115}. It seems that by end of spring 1906 the PLO continued to expand its influence among the workers of the city. An article in the correspondence column tells us about an accident that took place on one of the electoral meetings pertaining to the First State Duma elections. At that meeting 150 Gen factory workers refused to listen to speakers who slandered the PLO and the state and provoked the workers to participate in strikes. The workers responded the speakers with singing the hymn of the Russian empire and started to disseminate leaflets of the PLO afterwards\textsuperscript{116}. In another article “it is reported” that a lot of artisans and workers from factories and plants want to become members
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\textsuperscript{116} Russkaya Rech’, April 1, 1906.
of the organization\textsuperscript{117}. On April 25 the Council of the educational-economical society run by the PLO was elected\textsuperscript{118}. According to Smirnov the second workers’ strike on the eve of Easter was stopped only due to the impact of the party’s proclamations disseminated among the workers. The PLO run its own tea-house and library for the workers\textsuperscript{119}. However, it seems that something started to go wrong in late spring–summer 1906. In an article “To the right-wing ones” an author wrote that the PLO did not have enough funds for functioning. He wrote that the party had to rent rooms for its offices, for meetings of ruling bodies of the party, for general meetings of party members, the party had to publish “useful leaflets”, to pay salaries to the office workers, to pay for mailing, heating and lightening of the rooms\textsuperscript{120}. I think it is an interesting insight into how the party leaders’ routine looked like. In July 1906 a few letters complaining that there is a mess going on in the party and insisting that the party should join the OURP appeared in the correspondence column\textsuperscript{121}. One of the authors claimed that the party administration got to inefficient and unreliable hands, that there is no intelligent, skillful and unselshif persons among leaders of the party\textsuperscript{122}. On a general meeting on July 22 the PLO council announced that the party is ready to unite with the OURP. On July 27 a letter signed by Gen factory workers appeared in “Odesskie Novosti”. In this letter the workers announced that although previously they actively participated in activities of the PLO they do not want to deal with the Black Hundred anymore\textsuperscript{123}. Thus, in late July the PLO lost some of the influence it had acquired in the workers’ milieu before. On December 3 the ceremony of the unification of the
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local branches of the URP and PLO took place. The PLO ceased to exist\textsuperscript{124}. Thus, it is clear that
the PLO resorted to the same forms of activities in the workers’ milieu as the socialists with
exception of establishing the strike funds and other acts related to organization of revolution.

**The Union of Russian People (URP)**

In the mid-1900s the Union of Russian People (Soyuz Russkogo Naroda) became the
most prominent, large, strong and successful organization not only in Odessa, but in the entire
Russian empire. However, in the late 1900s, according to D. Langer, due to its leader’s
corruption, it started to decline fast and by the World War I it was in a state of total decay. The
Odessa branch of the Union of Russian People was opened in the late January 1906 on the
initiative of the local RA which wanted to expand its activities upon the city masses. The party
acted along two main lines. The first one was a work with members of a working class milieu,
whom it wanted to transform into loyal subjects of the tsar and conscious Russian nationalists.
The second one was a violent fight against revolutionaries who continued to terrorize local
entrepreneurs and bureaucracy. The second aim was deeply connected with the first one as it
was workers’ milieu which provided the URP’s paramilitary detachments with recruits. Thus,
the URP concentrated on work in workers’ milieu, which as I have shown previously, was
especially revolutionized. The URP’s large workers’ organizations and strong paramilitary
detachments brought it a statewide fame and were highly valued by local officials.

In an announcement about upcoming opening ceremony of the URP branch in Odessa it
is said that the party will work for good of the Fatherland. “The good of the motherland lies in
firm preservation of Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nation, in convocation of the State Duma and
establishment of a legal order\textsuperscript{125}. The job of the URP, according to the announcement was to

\textsuperscript{124} Russkaya Rech’, December 5, 1906.
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attract Russian people through “words, deeds, press, proclamations, pamphlets and our persuading propagating”. At the opening ceremony the head of the URP count Konovnitsin claimed that the most important event now were the State Duma elections, because if the enemies would the elections, Russia would perish. However, as we will see the URP did not manage to prepare to the Elections properly. Initially there were around 500 party members in the URP. In twenty days this number grew up to 1000. By January 20 1907 it had around 20 thousands members.

In dealing with the workers the URP resorted to the same kind of activities which effectiveness was proved by an experience of the monarchists’ rivals from the revolutionaries’ camp, namely, it was establishment of tea-houses, libraries and various economic organizations for workers. The URP set up an especially large number of the tea-houses which became the most important centers of its activities. Therefore, I will pay a special attention to that issue. According to Konovnicin, the first aim of a tea-house was to unite members of the URP on the basis of discussions and team-readings. The second aim of the tea-house was to attract new members through discussions with guests. At one of Russkaya Rech’s announcements it was said that in a URP tea-house “every Russian poor man will be able to have a tea with bread and to read a Russian newspaper and useful books”. Konovnicin also outlined the way the future tea-houses should look like. The place where the tea-house would be located, he wrote, should have one big hall for a tea-house and a few smaller rooms, the first one for the library, the second one for plates and dishes storage, the third one for a kitchen director and the fourth one
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for the meetings and tea-house documents\(^\text{131}\). After the first tea-house would be established in the city center, the party planned to establish further tea-houses at the peripheries\(^\text{132}\). On the 26\(^{\text{th}}\) of February Sedov donated the URP a place in the city center where a tea-house could be built. On the 27\(^{\text{th}}\) of February Charnavsky donated a place for a tea-house at Moldavanka part of the city (Gradonachalnicheskaya 42 street)\(^\text{133}\). On the 23\(^{\text{d}}\) of April the URP opened the first tea-house in the city center at Torgovaya 33 street. On October 9 the URP set up another tea-house at Torgovaya 1 street in a building donated by Sinitsin\(^\text{134}\). The URP presented its tea-houses as substitutes for taverns in which the city workers degraded and listened to revolutionary agitation. “In the URP and the tea-house, we, Russian workers can spend our free time by reading Russian newspapers and journals instead of listening to agitator’s incendiary speeches. We could peacefully talk to each other… I am pretty sure that in a free time our workers would not go to taverns where the ‘dark characters’ and gangs constantly hold their meetings… - a Worker” \(^\text{135}\). In the tea-houses theatrical performances also took place\(^\text{136}\) and movies were screened\(^\text{137}\).

The tea-houses statute is an especially interesting document as it provides the most insightful information on the nature of that institution. The membership criteria according to the statute were the following: 1. Devotion to the tsar 2. Christian faith. Nationality does not matter. 3. Teetotal way of life. 4. Prohibition to disseminate any publications except of a). those one which have religious and moral character b). those one which are published by the URP and its branches and by the Russian Assembly, and other publications permitted by the Council
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of the Odessa URP branch c). newspapers “Drug”, “Svet”, “Russkaya Rech’”, “Den’”, “Kievlyanin”, “Moskovskie Vedomosti”, “Pahar’”, “Narodniy golos”, “Zarya” d). a duty to expel from the tea-house anyone who would attempt to propagate revolutionary ideas in the tea-house. 5. Prohibition of any kind of violence and incitements to pogroms and crimes. 6. There will not be fixed prices in the tea-house. Every visitor could pay as much as he wants, because, according to the statute, the tea-house is not a commercial organization, but a place where the URP members could gather\textsuperscript{138}. However, the URP abandoned the point 6 soon. On the 25\textsuperscript{th} of March the weekly gathering of the URP decided to introduce 25 kopecks of obligatory fee which the members should pay for the organization to be able to continue to maintain the tea-houses\textsuperscript{139}.

On December 16 in the correspondence column Konovnicin announced that the URP is going to set up a writing materials shop where patriotic books and pamphlets would be sold as well\textsuperscript{140}. The aim of the shop was to disseminate the Black Hundred literature among the population and to awaken its national consciousness\textsuperscript{141}. Additionally, the shop was supposed to disseminate its literature around neighboring villages through special couriers\textsuperscript{142}. The shop was opened on December 20 in the room of the tea-house at Torgovaya street\textsuperscript{143}. On February 22 a decision was made to move the shop to a different location. During the elections campaign the shop published and disseminated patriotic pamphlets\textsuperscript{144}.

Apart from the tea-houses and the bookshop the URP had a powerful workers’ organization. The URP set it up on October 1 1906. The organization had “purely economic
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character, which distinguish it from trade unions which are political means of revolutionaries…“

There were around 5000 persons present at the opening ceremony. The members of the URP acted as strike-breakers when the port workers stroke. On November 29th 1500 members of the URP worked instead of the strikers. The members of the URP worked also as guards in the port. They protected the ships against fired strikers who wanted to destroy them by explosive. They also protected the URP dockers against violence from the part of the fired strikers. The guards successfully prevented a few ships from destruction. There was an extensive agitation among the port workers against the URP members. Because of the agitation the port workers became very angry at the URP members. This animosity resulted in a violent conflict between the guards and the port workers which took place on the 4th of April. A few port workers were wounded and killed. On July 3 the URP set up its organization of sailors. It was opened as a substitute for a previous “sailors’ registration”. It had 300 members. On November 10 the newspaper reported that the 4th dockers’ cooperative is established. Its members could be only members of the OURP. Thus, one can see that the URP as well as the PLO was engaged in almost the same sorts of activities among the workers as the socialists. However, the URP had brought some innovations into that sphere. The URP became the first political organization the history of the city whose members acted as strike-breakers and port guards.

Sunday weekly general meetings where all of the members could participate were one of the most important URP activities. The meetings opened and closed with pray. At the meetings Konovnicin reviewed political and social events of the last week and announced
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important decisions made by the party leadership. The URP’s telegrams to the tsar, ministers, different officials\textsuperscript{151} and friendly organizations\textsuperscript{152} were read\textsuperscript{153}. Speakers of the party delivered speeches on enormous variety of political, social, economic and cultural issues\textsuperscript{154}. Sometimes the URP organized processions instead of the weekly meetings. One of these events took place at the 12\textsuperscript{th} of November. The procession moved the URP banner from Konovnicin’s apartment to the tea-house at Torgovaya street. Together with members of the URP Cossacks, priests and an orchestra participated in the procession. “The procession showed that thousands of people participating in it are not a small gang as their enemies depicts them but a strong and well-organized army ready to eliminate any enemy or to die for the Motherland. …it showed that the Russian people… are a living organism which has one soul, one heart and one political and religious idea”\textsuperscript{155}. Another important type of the URP regular activities were collective religious services. The URP prayed for murdered members, Cossacks, policemen and officials, for the tsar and his family.

The URP participated in various kinds of activities. It started to publish its own newspaper “Za tsarya i Rodinu” on March 18\textsuperscript{156}. On the 19th of March a delegation of the URP members and the head of the RA went to temporal Odessa general-governor Karangozov to show that the URP and the latter are united in their fight against the revolution. The delegation presented Karangozov with the URP badge. The delegation also reassured Karangozov that the URP does not provoke people to organize pogroms. The URP had a choir\textsuperscript{157}. The URP took
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part in Cossacks’ detachments holidays and celebrations. The URP participated in a ceremony which welcomed the queen of Greece Olga Konstantinovna in Odessa. On February 16, 1907, the URP set up its student branch. At the opening ceremony Konovnicin said that it is the first time when forces of intelligentsia join the OURP. A head of the student branch was Oleg Vlazinsky.

The Odessa Union of Russian Men (OURM)

It has been shown that as recently as in the early 1906 a piece of land for building a school was donated to the RA by one of its members. However, the URP established around the same time by members of the RA did almost nothing in sphere of school education in the first 9 months of its existence. This fact gave rise to resentment among part of the URP leaders (who also were members of the RA) who seceded and formed a new political party called the Odessa Union of Russian Men. Unlike the URP which dealt with the workers only, the OURP confined itself to the sphere of school education.

The OURM opening ceremony took place on October 22, 1906. At that meeting a couple of speeches revealing the party’s ideology and aims were delivered. The meeting began with a solemn church service with a consecration of water and accompanied by a choir’s singing “Bozhe tsaria kharni”, “Kol’ slaven”, and “Slav’sya” at the ceremony. Only members of the OURM and persons recommended by the members were allowed to participate in the ceremony. According to one of the persons speaking at the opening ceremony “the aim of the OURM is to create in international Odessa, which, however, is a possession of the Russian
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people, a “Russian thought”\textsuperscript{162}. “Those who visited the union’s opening ceremony could be ascertained that “Russian thought” has already emerged in the city which provides a favorable conditions for it. Local intelligentsia… realized that “the Russian”\textsuperscript{163} not only could exist in Russia but also should exist in Russia… The opening ceremony persuaded everyone that to develop the Russian thought is not a “reactionary enterprise”. This half-Jewish curse, which “osvoboditeli” use to throw dirt into eyes of people who are afraid of bugaboo\textsuperscript{164} words, could not undermine one’s trust in the defenders of the Russian matter\textsuperscript{165} and Russian freedom. It is evident that a new army is being born in Odessa, an army armed with a spiritual force, an army which will struggle by thought and light\textsuperscript{166} against incarnates of Jewish dark\textsuperscript{167}, called the revolution. A task for this army is to liberate captivated Russian souls, which got into a Jewish dark\textsuperscript{168} through enslavement of Russian minds and Russian hearts… That is a deed which equals Minin’s deed!”\textsuperscript{169} Unfortunately, Russkaya Rech’ does write plainly what exact meaning the OURM put into “Russian thought” concept, which, it appears, occupies one of the central places in the party’s ideology. However, basing on general background of the Black Hundred studies I may assume that it was simply the Black Hundred ideology itself.

At the same opening ceremony Novomirgorodsky bishop Dimitry gave a speech in which he, according to Russkaya Rech’, “expressed innermost thoughts of 100 million of Russian people”. The bishop noted that the ceremony coincided with a celebration day of Kazan’s mother of God icon. The latter date, he reminded to the audience, was established to

\begin{enumerate}
\item[162] Русскую мысль.
\item[162] Russkaya Rech’, October 24, 1906.
\item[163] Русский.
\item[164] Жупелные.
\item[165] Русское дело.
\item[166] Бороться мыслью и светом.
\item[167] Исчадия иудейской тьмы.
\item[168] Иудейскую тьму.
\item[169] Russkaya Rech’, October 24, 1906.
\end{enumerate}
commemorate Moscow’s liberation from Poles in 1612. Monks Dionisiy and Avramiy Palicin, the bishop proceeded, agitated people to fight against enemies of Moscow state and to stand for Orthodoxy and Fatherland. The people united around Minin and Pozharsky saved Moscow. Afterwards, Zemsky sobor elected Mikhail Romanov to be a tsar. His ancestor Nicolas II is a tsar today, the bishop continued. Then he said that the tsar got his autocracy from the Russian nation and the nation was able to choose any form of political organization of the state it wished, it could have been constitutional monarchy, it could have been republic. However, the people granted Mikhail with an autocratic power, and a tsar could not restrict that power. Even if he decided to renounce this power, he should give it to his heir or to the nation, and of course, the Russian nation would ask him to stay an autocratic ruler in order not to live through times of “Rule of the Seven Boyars”\textsuperscript{170} again. However, tsar Nicolas have not renounced his unrestricted power what could be proved by his words that “My autocracy will remain the same as it has always been”\textsuperscript{171}. Thus, the bishop addressed an issue which was central to the Black Hundred at that period, namely if the autocracy became restricted by the October Manifesto or not.

After the bishop’s words the OURM founder Davydov N.S. delivered a speech in which he said that a desire to unite all of the Russian men and of everyone who shares Russian “state ideas”\textsuperscript{172} is the main “motive power”\textsuperscript{173} for the union. A special attention, he said, would be paid by the union to education of children and youth in monarchist spirit. Afterwards the founder’s speech Rodzevich N.N. provided the audience with a short history of the OURM emergence. Then the OURM sent telegrams to the tsar, to the Prime Minister Stolypin, to the

\textsuperscript{170} Year 1610.
\textsuperscript{171} Russkaya Rech’, October 24, 1906.
\textsuperscript{172} Государственные идеи.
\textsuperscript{173} Двигатель.
Minister of National Education Kaufman and to a number of monarchist leaders in Moscow and St. Petersburg. In the telegram to the tsar the OURM expressed its gratitude to him for his latest political acts (granting Russian people with additional lands taken from the tsar’s lands and for helping the people in their payments for new lands and for making the Russian people equal in juridical respect). The OURM ensured the tsar that “everybody here, in Southern borderland of Russian land”, will stand for “native rights” of the Russian nation, and that harmful doctrines of foreigners will not pervert “neither us, nor our children”. In the telegram to Stolypin the OURM expressed its gratitude to him for “rejecting parliamentary way of ruling the empire since it has not been proclaimed by law”, for staying above party conflicts and for taking “a right course in his politics based on native Russian principles”. In the telegram to Kaufman the OURM griped about the situation in the New Russia University, in which, according to the authors of the telegram, “Jewish revolutionary gangs” patronized by the university administration rule. Afterwards, a few salutatory addresses from other monarchist unions praising the OURM opening were read, a few speeches delivered and the meeting ended up with “Spasi Gospodi” prayer performed174.

When asked how the newly emerged OURM relates to URP Rodzevich said that the parties’ programs are the same, the only difference lies “in a more detailed development of individual points of the program”. “The members of the OURM united for a more fruitful work to the good of Russian matter. The OURM promises to assist the URP in any good initiatives of the latter. An independent functioning of both of the organizations is desirable for a more wide propaganda of monarchist ideas and for a unification of like-minded persons. The unions will unite their actions when issues common for all of the monarchists will come to the fore”175. The

following fact proves that relations between the unions were good. Konovnicin, the URP leader, came to the OURM first anniversary to greet the union in person. The OURM members gave him a standing ovation and tossed their hats and kerchiefs in the air. Konovnicin noted that the programs and main goals of both of the unions are identical, he also noted that the unions live like brothers and expressed a hope that the unions will keep working hand in hand\footnote{Russkaya Rech’, October 4, 1907.}

The first issue the OURM started to deal with was establishment of educational intuitions for children. According to a party member “The fruits of the school will come to the fore later, each of the new schools is a long-range artillery which will undermine the enemy’s root”\footnote{Russkaya Rech’, November 24, 1906.}. The OURM council had done most of the organizational work concerning establishment of an exemplary two-year (with five-year course) religious school by October 31 1906. The party planned to make the education free of charge\footnote{Russkaya Rech’, October 31, 1906.}. The OURM’s school for boys started at November 21 1906 in old theological seminary building\footnote{Russkaya Rech’, November 21, 1906.}. It had two departments with 30 8-10 years boys each. Initially, only children of members of the OURM were allowed to study. The party planned to make the education free of charge\footnote{Russkaya Rech’, October 31, 1906.}. The OURM petitioned the local authorities for permission to open a women gymnasium. However, in order to strengthen financial state of the future educational institution and for the educational process there to be properly organized, the local authorities permitted the OURM to open a progyminasium\footnote{Прогимназию.} with 3 or 4 years first. Then, if the school business would go well, the authorities replied, the union would be allowed to open a gymnasium. The OURM described the aim of the school as follows “to provide Russian orthodox children with education in the spirit of orthodox faith, devotion to
tsar and fatherland and in awareness of high duties of women to motherland, society and family”\(^\text{182}\).  

At the OURM meetings party leaders instructed the party members on the elections to the State Duma procedures\(^\text{183}\). The OURM printed and disseminated special leaflets inviting people to take part in the elections\(^\text{184}\). The OURM petitioned mayor of the city to extend working hours of an office accepting applications from people wanting to take part in the State Duma elections to evening time, because, according to the OURM, most of working people of the city could not apply during daytime\(^\text{185}\). The OURM petitioned a city major and a general-governor asking for permission for members of the OURM to supervise over the electoral process\(^\text{186}\). On the eve of the elections the OURM disseminated leaflets “in a huge number” with following message “The State Duma elections! Russian people apply! In the City Duma from 10 am to 3 pm and from 7 pm to 9 pm. November 4 is the last date”\(^\text{187}\).  

Another way for the OURM to oppose revolutionaries in educational sphere was fighting for domination within the so called parents’ committees. The OURM did this through holding weekly so-called pedagogical meetings. The parents’ committees were established by the government under pressure of revolutionary youth in autumn 1905. Before this Russian school was a kind of entity within itself, opposing any external attempts to intrude into its business. Any critic of educational system by parents was prohibited in accordance with 1870s laws, and the parents did not have any influence upon school life\(^\text{188}\). The parents’ committees were established to make this situation different, to bridge the gap between the school and
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\(^{182}\) Russkaya Rech’, June 19, 1907.  
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society. According to Rodzevich, parents’ committees were the results of “liberation movement” in secondary school. Their activity, Rodzevich wrote, had been harmful to both school and the state regime. The Parents’ Union, he proceeded, accepted platform of the Union of Unions. At its meetings the Parents’ Union discussed inappropriate issues such as Provisional government convocation and establishment of the city militia. The parents’ committees are totally useless, Rodzevich claimed. The law which legitimized them is too uncertain and incomplete. Parents are too different in national and ideological respect. This circumstance makes it impossible for the committees to be productive. Nowhere in the world parents have influence upon school life. The unity between parents and school should be different, Rodzevich concluded\textsuperscript{189}. Therefore, it seems that the leader of the OURM was very skeptical about the parents’ unions. At the same time he did not oppose the very idea of the necessity of the unity between school and parents, without however describing what exact from that unity should take.

At the pedagogical meetings the OURM dealt with matters “with which parents’ committees should usually deal”\textsuperscript{190}. According to the OURM activist Slusarevsky the Russian parents should have come to parents’ committees meeting with clear position on all of the key problems of education. For that purpose every Saturday pedagogical meetings of Russian parents with pedagogues being at the chair were held\textsuperscript{191}. In a report on the first pedagogical meeting at the OURM it was written that “the meetings could help to unite Russian parents on a basis of common interest in education of new generations in spirit of true faith, love to motherland and awareness of duties to tsar and Fatherland. Here, on these “pedagogical Saturdays”, issues with which parents’ committees deal could be provisionally discussed, here

\textsuperscript{189} Russkaya Rech’, December 13, 1906.
\textsuperscript{190} Russkaya Rech’, November 2, 1906.
\textsuperscript{191} Russkaya Rech’, October 31, 1906.
the parents could listen to opinions of Russian by spirit pedagogues and could be “charged with” necessary arguments to confront Jewish and “Iudestvuyushie” ignorami192 while arguing about cultural improvement of their motherland”193. Thus, at the pedagogical meetings the Jewish domination in the Russian educational system was often discussed194. The pedagogical meetings had also an organizational importance as at those meetings the parents could get acquainted with each other and decide on candidates for presidents to be elected to pedagogical committees195. The meetings also served as a source of information for the OURM on what was going on in Odessa schools196. Most of the parents present at the pedagogical meetings were women197. It is hard to judge if the OURM achieved any success in its fight for domination in the parents’ unions in Odessa, as the sources of that period do not contain that kind of information.

The Elections

The First State Duma Elections

The Odessa Black Hundred was totally defeated at the First State Duma elections. The city was supposed to send one deputy to the State Duma, and that deputy became a representative of a local branch of Kadets party. The Black Hundred organizations did not put any serious efforts to achieve the victory, although Russkaya Rech’ in advance actively encouraged them to unite, to be more active and in various ways tried to underline importance of the elections198. By the “unification” Russkaya Rech’ understood an elaboration of a common for all of the right-wing parties (including the Octobrists and the PLO) list of

192 Иудействующие невежды.
candidates into electors, which was crucial considering a mechanism of electoral procedure and the strength of Kadets party in the city. The Elections were indirect. The city dwellers had to elect not a deputy to the State Duma, but a number of electors who in their turn had to elect a deputy. The list of persons on the basis of which the voters had to choose the electors was huge, while the voters had to vote for only a few candidates. Therefore, it was very important for each party to provide its followers with beforehand elaborated lists containing names of suggested candidates into electors so that the votes would not disperse. Each of the right-wing parties managed to elaborate their own lists. However, it was not enough. The right-wing parties understood that in order to get at least a vague chance to win, they had to elaborate a common list, which would include persons whose candidatures would be agreed upon by all of the parties. They did not manage to elaborate that list. The votes of their followers dispersed among three lists, a list by the PLO, a list by the URP and a list by the Octobrists and the Trade-Industrial party and their defeat was total.

Although Russkaya Rech’ partly attributed the defeat to an innate passivity of Russian soul, it also proposed a number of more rational explanations. Russkaya Rech’ had already predicted that result of the Elections, therefore it simply reminded its readers of what it had previously said with adding a few more minor details. The first and foremost reason for the Black Hundred’s defeat was, according to the newspaper, the nature of the electoral law which privileged inorodtsy population of the city. Its reasoning was the following. There are around sixty thousands of persons who have a right to vote in Odessa. Only around thirty thousands of them actually participated. Most of these people where Jews, since, the newspaper proceeds, most of the Russians preferred to ignore the elections, while most of the Jews who had the right to vote participated and voted for Kadets. Therefore, Russkaya Rech’ concluded, the electoral
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199 Russkaya Rech, April 8, 1906.
law should be changed by cutting down a number of Jews with voting rights. Moreover, that kind of argumentation allowed it to claim that the deputy sent to the State Duma did not represent the entire city including Christian population, but the Jews only. Yet, in the scope of the whole country the newspaper acknowledged that not only inorodtsy, but a lot of Russians also voted for Kadets. However, it proceeded, Kadets got those votes through lies and trickery, therefore Kadets won Russians’ votes, but they did not win Russian hearts. It is very difficult to assess plausibility of these arguments. Concerning the last argument, I think a scholar would confront a serious methodological problem of firstly getting inside minds and hearts of millions of voters and secondly distinguishing between them. In order to investigate whether the newspaper’s account of the electorate’s behavior is true one should conduct a separate tedious research which I cannot do here.

Other factors that brought Kadets the victory but where not as decisive as the previous one, according to the newspaper, were Kadets sympathizers’ control over the local municipality, poorly composed electoral rolls, which allegedly excluded a number of Russians from participation into the elections and enormous funds which allowed Kadets to conduct a wide electoral agitation\(^{200}\). The local municipality was indeed in the hands of Kadets’ supporters and provided the latter with a considerable administrative resource. The entire electoral process including calculation of votes was organized by Kadets’ sympathizers, which, probably, indeed had some impact upon Kadets’ victory. Concerning the electoral rolls, during the days preceding the elections Russkaya Rech’ often reported on instances of errors in their content, but from that evidence it is impossible to derive both if the Russian voters suffered from that more the Jewish ones and an extent to which this fact influenced the outcome of the

\(^{200}\) Russkaya Rech’, April 14, 1906.
elections. Concerning the Kadets’ funds, I do not have any evidence to either support or dispose of this argument. The only study on the Odessa Kadets does not contain such information.

Thus, although the Black Hundred parties in Odessa lost the first State Duma elections this fact did not demoralize them, as they did not consider it to be a confirmation of failure of their activities and of their lack of popularity comparing to Kadets. The Black Hundred still firmly believed that most of the Russian population of both the empire and the city shared its ideology and values. The Black Hundred in Odessa fully attributed its failure to alleged shortcomings of the electoral law, which, according to its deep persuasion, did not allow for Russian population in both Odessa and the Russian empire to elect its true representatives.

The Second State Duma Elections

The elections to the Second State Duma took place on January 29 1907. This time the Black Hundred parties took them much more seriously and put a lot of efforts into electoral agitation and supervision over the electoral procedure, but nevertheless they lost. Though, they got much more votes. The Russian right-wing organizations managed to pass all their electors at one of the electoral districts and at a few districts they managed to pass over one thousand electors comparing to the last year’s two or three hundred electors. They received 40 percent more votes compared to the last year’s election results²⁰¹. One of the greatest successes of the right-wing parties’ electoral campaign was the fact that they managed to elaborate a single common list of candidates into electors, thereby preventing their followers’ votes from being dispersed. These parties where the RA, the URP, the OURM and October 17 union²⁰². As on the eve of the First State Duma elections, Russkaya Rech’ actively published articles calling Russian people to awake themselves and those who were still sleeping. However, now the

²⁰² Russkaya Rech’, January 17, 1907.
newspaper also asked its readers to popularize its views and to encourage others to take part in the elections. The URP and OURM elaborated common lists of persons who would supervise the elections procedure. Especially active during the electoral campaign was newly emerged OURM. The head of the union published articles encouraging Russian people to check if they are included into electoral rolls beforehand and promising to ward Russian interests during the elections, to protest against any errors, to insist on their correction and on dismissing of those civil servants who made them.

As all of the right-wing parties of the city put forward a single common list of candidates into electors and all of the left-wing parties as during the previous elections put forward their own single common list, the struggle now went on between the two lists only. This fact appeared to be especially inspiring to Russkaya Rech’ which represented this situation as a struggle between the two basic principles: a Christian one and a Jewish one. On the one hand, journalist Platonov wrote, there are Christianity, historical heritage of the great state, native land, native language, native laws of eternal Divine truth, which advocate peace and love between nations, great power of native military forces, protection of property and a right to work freely for private and society’s good in accordance with a freedom given by the Tsar. On the other hand, the author proceeded, there is a fierce hatred towards humanity, racial hatred and historical hatred – heritage of hidden tribal wickedness of miserable nation, which separated itself from the entire outside world, which accepted a teaching of hostility and fierce anger and brought these awful feelings through millennia into the Russian nation’s land. Their hatred, Platonov continued, had been accumulating for more than two thousand years and now it is aimed at the Russian nation… and the fact that Kadets include traitors, murderers and Jews

204 Russkaya Rech’, November 12, 1906.
at all means that Russian population of Odessa could not call Kadets a Russian party. This is what should guide Russians’ and Christians in general in their attitudes towards that party, the author concluded\textsuperscript{206}. I think, it is interesting evidence on the way the Russian right-wing parties represented themselves and their rivals before the electorate on the State Duma elections. During the City Duma elections they presented the electorate with a very different picture of both themselves and their rivals, but I will dwell upon this later.

After the defeat at the Second State Duma elections, as well as after the previous elections, Russkaya Rech’ turned to a discussion of its reasons. Basically, it reproduced the same set of reasons and arguments, namely, that electoral law is against Russian nation\textsuperscript{207}, that it privileges inorodtsy and that it is inorodtsy, not Russians, who elected their representative to the State Duma in Odessa\textsuperscript{208}; that Kadets controlled local municipality etc. However, the newspaper also published another set of articles which attempted to provide a different explanatory system. Thus, according to Russkaya Rech’, the reasons for left-wing parties’ victory on the elections could be subdivided into three categories: external, internal and the Governmental. While accusing violent actions of left-wing parties, the newspaper wrote, the government nevertheless sympathized with aims of these parties. That circumstance made the government’s politics contradictory\textsuperscript{209}. External influences, according to Russkaya Rech’, are influences of foreign countries that subsidized Kadets, and influences of population of Russian borderlands which voted for left-wing parties. Bureaucracy at the borderlands, according to the newspaper, supported enemies of Russian state and to clean its ranks is one of the aims of the URP and the URM. Russkaya Rech’ called these organizations to unite or at least to coordinate

\textsuperscript{206} Russkaya Rech’, January 19, 1906.  
\textsuperscript{207} Russkaya Rech’, January 30, 1907.  
\textsuperscript{208} Russkaya Rech’, February 2, 1907.  
\textsuperscript{209} Russkaya Rech’, February 6, 1907.
their activities and material resources more\textsuperscript{210}. Internal reasons, according to the newspaper, stem from the deeps of people’s worldview. Thus, most of those Russians who had electoral right did not use it, while all of the non-Russian voters, especially Jews, came to the elections and voted. Therefore, the newspaper continued, most of the Russians did not take part in the elections. Most of the Russians including, those who came to the elections, were hostile to the very idea of elections. This, according to Russkaya Rech’, could be explained by the fact that people instinctively felt bankruptcy of the electoral system at least in its present form. Russian people did not like this system which, according to Russkaya Rech’, is indeed deeply penetrated by lies and deception. Therefore, the newspaper suggested, why not to abandon this corrupted system at all?\textsuperscript{211} It is not clear what kind of relations, according to the author, existed between the contradictory character of Russian politics and the Black Hundred’s failure at the elections. This could be interpreted as a fact that Russkaya Rech’ either did not know itself what exactly it wanted to say (which could be the case as it often published articles quite poor in analytical respect), or it resorted to a kind of Aesopian language, which current source and literature basis does not allow one to decipher. It is also not clear what kind of assistance, according to Russkaya Rech’, the bureaucracy in the borderlands provided to the “enemies of the Russian state” so that the latter were able to win the elections. I did not find any materials in the newspaper which would be able to explain that. What about the last point, Russkaya Rech’ often made more or less articulated hints at alleged shortcoming of parliamentary system in general and its manifestation in Russia in particular. Now it found another argument against it, namely, that the elections to the State Duma had shown that even Russian people intuitively understood the shortcomings and did not need that institution. Therefore, I conclude that that

\textsuperscript{210} Russkaya Rech’, February 10, 1907.
\textsuperscript{211} Russkaya Rech’, February 14, 1907.
new set of arguments does not add a lot to our understanding of the way Russkaya Rech’ explained the Black Hundred’s failure at the Second State Duma elections.

Thus, the Black Hundred’s failure at the Second State Duma elections again did not demoralize them. The second failure which came despite their best efforts only ensured them again that the electoral law indeed went against Russian nation and that no victory at the elections could be achieved until it is changed. They still firmly believed that most of the Russian population of both the state and the city is on their side and that due to their further educational, cultural and economic activities their power and influence will continue to grow. And the City Duma elections showed that that believe was not ungrounded.

**The City Duma Elections**

The City Duma elections took place on March 23 1907. A well-organized electoral campaign together with a favorable electoral law, which prohibited Jews from taking part in the elections, brought the Black Hundred a decisive victory. Exclusively those candidates proposed by the Black Hundred were elected to become new City deputies. Only two elected deputies were from their rivals’ camp. The elections were preceded by long and intensive agitation from the part of the Black Hundred. From its very inception Russkaya Rech’ engaged into a campaign against local municipality by regularly publishing articles thoroughly and meticulously analyzing and criticizing activities of the City Duma and City Uprava. It seems that the newspaper’s journalists were especially competent in that sphere and had some special access to information on the local municipality’s behind the scenes activities. The Black Hundred’s critique went along two main lines: accusations of corruption and current city municipality officials’ poor administrative skills combined with their tendency to prefer “big politics” at the expense of dealing with routine city affairs. A list of the Black Hundred’s
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212 Russkaya Rech’, March 25, 1907.
complaints contained eleven points. Here I will provide a short summary of them. The first one, concerning the “big politics” I have already mentioned. Thus, according to Russkaya Rech’s author who spoke for the city’s landlords, the local municipality failed to take a good chance to conclude a treaty with a Belgium company concerning introduction of a tram system in Odessa. Because of that the city lost 300 thousands rubles since 1889. Deputies from mutual loan society rarely visited the City Duma meetings which resulted in a fact that the meetings could not be held and discussions of the city affairs were postponed. After a 10-million loan was taken the municipality did not bother itself with finding new sources of income to pay the interest. As a result the loan sums were used to cover current expenses of the city. Some city officials spent a lot of millions and hundreds of thousands of rubles without providing appropriate accounts. Even when some of the accounts were provided the municipality did not examine them on time, which could prevent from a lot of money being lost. Accounts provided by the Uprava officials were not examined by the Duma, which led to escalation of the corruption and embezzlement of public funds. Individuals currently obtaining official positions at the municipality where assigned to those positions not for their professional skills but for a “right” political orientation, which led to a number of mistakes in their work. Because “progressive” deputies actions the City Uprava was left with a very little number of members which prevented it from taking appropriate care after the city affairs. An official responsible for the water conduit gave around 160 thousands rubles of unreasonable discounts, which appeared to be a poor loss for the city. The municipality brought all of the city institutions and buildings to such a decline that huge sums are needed in order to recover them. A lack of cash in the city budget forced the municipality to take short-term loans in private banks with a high interest.\footnote{Russkaya Rech’, March 16, 1907.}

Some of the points were supplemented by more or less detailed examples, another points also
contained vague hints. Be it as it may, one can see that Russkaya Rech’s accusations went along purely economic and administrative lines. Although, the newspaper also acknowledged that the municipality was highly sympathetic towards Jews and sometimes it called its officials “Jewish protégé”, it did not really play that card at the City Duma electoral campaign.

At the City Duma elections the Black Hundred consciously avoided representing itself as a political force with any political program or ideology which has anything to do with issues other than the city administration ones. They even avoided acting both under the name of the Black Hundred movement in general and particular parties. The newspaper reported about a group of voters, “old residents, who love their native city and are fully devoted to its interests”, who elaborated their list of desirable candidates into the city deputies and presented that list at an electoral meeting in the Old Seminary building. That building was the OURM residence, just to remind, and every event which took place there was always closely related to the union’s affairs. (A fact that it was the OURM that won the City Duma elections is confirmed by the party’s meeting which took place after results of the elections were announced. At the meeting the OURM celebrated its victory and greeted the newly elected deputies who were also members the party214). They called the list a “progressively-economic one” as opposed to a “progressively-political one” which included current City Duma deputies. The candidates included in a “progressively-economic” list, Russkaya Rech’ reported, wanted not to be engaged into political intrigues, but to care professionally and devotedly about the city affairs only215. If that list would win, the newspaper predicted, the city would be saved from devastating administration of liberals and would start to recover. Additionally, in case of the list’s victory, Russkaya Rech’ proceeded, Odessa would cease to be one of the major centers of
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215 Russkaya Rech’, March 17, 1907.
revolution, as the liberals are also responsible for escalation of revolutionary movement in the city\textsuperscript{216}.

Thus, one can assume that the City Duma elections confirmed that the Black Hundred indeed managed to win sympathies of owing electoral rights Russian part of the city. It is hard to say that it is their nationalist, monarchist ideology which brought them the victory. Rather, they managed to persuade the voters that they are professional administrators who could successfully handle the city affairs. It might be the case that individuals’ activities in a framework of the Black Hundred parties were regarded by the electorate as a proof of their organizational and administrative skills. As the Black Hundred deputies managed to dominate the City Duma at least by the World War I, I think it is possible to conclude that the voters were satisfied with their performance.

**Conclusion**

Since 1870s the socialist organizations had been active in milieu of Odessa workers. They managed to acquire some influence and although most of the strikes of 1905 were organized by the workers themselves, not by the socialist organizations, the workers acknowledged superior organizational skills of activists of the latter and often elected them to lead their initiatives. This gave the numerous workers’ strikes of 1905 a pronounced socialist hue. The educational institutions of the city, their students, teachers and professors, became another center of the revolutionary activity. The local university became the major center of revolutionary propaganda and a place where paramilitary revolutionary detachments were organized. The latter clashed with the army and police in the mid-October. The revolutionary terror and strikes caused a bad impact upon the city economy and the city life in general.

\textsuperscript{216} Russkaya Rech’, March 22, 1907.
The first Black Hundred movement emerged to oppose the revolutionary movement in Odessa. That is why it mostly dealt with those social strata of the city which were the most revolutionized and those areas in which the revolutionaries appeared to be the most successful. The first Black Hundred union emerged in Odessa in early 1905. It was the Russian Assembly (RA) which small membership consisted of members of the highest strata of Odessa society and was not particularly active during the most of 1905 year. In order to oppose the revolutionaries more actively and to establish contacts with broader city masses that could become loyal voters at the City Duma elections the RA members set up a branch of the Union of Russian People (URP). The latter concentrated on working in the workers milieu and violent street struggle against the revolutionaries. In the course of 1905-1907 years the union was preoccupied with setting up tea-houses, establishing of workers’ organizations in the city port and taking part in the State and City Duma elections. It is impossible to discuss in detail the union’s paramilitary activity as it was illegal and is almost not reflected in Russkaya Rech’ and the archival documents. Parallel to the URP and the RA in December 1905 another center of right-wing politics emerged in person of the Party of the Legal Order in Odessa. The party also worked in the workers’ milieu, established its workers organizations, but in the late 1906 it was absorbed by the URP. By the late 1906 part of the leadership of the URP were not satisfied with a fact that the party did nothing in sphere of education and formed the Odessa Union of Russian Men (OURM) which concentrated on establishing educational institutions, struggle to overcome the Left in the parents’ committees and the elections, of course. Thus, there existed a kind of a division of labor among the Black Hundred unions in Odessa in that period. The OURP concentrated on work among the workers, while the OURM worked among the intelligentsia and students. The OURP work among the workers was dictated by a desire to rescue the workers from “harmful” influence of the revolutionaries, while the OURM work among the
students was guided by the desire to win the educational institutions for individuals sharing the right-wing ideology. In establishing the economic organizations, libraries tea-houses and other intuitions for workers the Black Hundred drew upon the socialists’ experience. The Black Hundred took an active part in the State and City Dumas elections. It was one of the few occasions when the Black Hundred parties of Odessa acted as a single actor. On the elections they actively collaborated with the local Octobrist parties. The Odessa Black Hundred failed at both the First and the Second State Duma elections. The Black Hundred was quite poorly organized at the first State Duma elections. It did not manage to elaborate a single common for all right-wing parties of Odessa list of candidates into electors which was crucial for victory. Their failure was total. At the Second State Duma elections the Black Hundred acted as a much more well-organized force and thereby managed to get much more voices, however this did not prevent it from failure. The Black Hundred fully attributed its fail to the shortcomings of the electoral law which in their opinion privileged inorodtsy against the Russian nation. The Black Hundred continued to believe that majority of Russian population is on its side. At the Odessa City Duma elections, in which the Jewish population of Odessa could not participate, the Black Hundred got a complete victory. The present historical account also shows that that Omel'yanchuk’s conclusion are true – the Black Hundred had a huge variety of activities and some of the Black Hundred unions did not have any violent activities at all, and the Black Hundred unions’ members were numerous and belonged to various social strata.
Chapter 4. Conclusions

The analysis of the Odessa Black Hundred press has shown that views of its journalists in years 1905-1907 were the following. On the macro or strategic level they perceived the Odessa Black Hundred as a part of the broader all-imperial Black Hundred movement. The publicists assumed that the Black Hundred unions appeared throughout the Russian empire almost simultaneously and where of the same nature everywhere. The Black Hundred publicists of that time did not differentiate between different centers of the Black Hundred movement which could gravitate towards one or another ideological position. The publicists depicted the movement as a more or less coherent and homogeneous one. At the same time the publicists acknowledged that opinions of various Black Hundred activists even within a single party often did not concur, but they assumed that this situation was common for the entire Black Hundred movement whenever individual parties were located. Thus, the Odessa Black Hundred publicists assumed that the Black Hundred in Odessa was the same Black Hundred as everywhere else, but put into a specific Odessa circumstances.

According to the Odessa Black Hundred publicists, the Black Hundred movement was brought into life, by the circumstances of the Revolution of 1905, as a response to the latter and to the tsar’s will for subjects of the Russian state to participate in a new political system by forming political parties which would participate in the State Duma elections. The Revolution of 1905, according to the publicists, was not an organic result of development of the Russian state, as revolutions in Europe were. It was a plot of inorodtsy with Jews at the head against the Russian nation. The Jews, according to the publicists, decided to retake what had been left from Russians’ privileged position in the state. In that sense, the publicists thought, the revolution
was not of a socio-economic character but of a national one, because it was a struggle of one nation against another. The Odessa Black Hundred publicists believed that it was the Jews who stirred up the Russian students, peasants, workers and soldiers for riots and strikes by deceit. However, the publicists believed that even those Russians who submitted to the Jews’ influence did not constitute a sizeable part of the Russian nation. In their opinion, most of the Russians while being loyal monarchists and devout believers remained indifferent to the Jews’ appeal. The Odessa Black Hundred publicists attributed the decline of the revolution to the fact that the deceived Russian nation started to realize the Jews’ tricks and stopped to believe them. The publicists believed that the main and immediate task of the Black Hundred movement was struggle against the revolutionaries and the Jews who, in their opinion, threatened the very existence of the Russian nation. A belief that there existed a huge mass of Russian people loyal to the tsar and unsympathetic to the leftists’ ideas was absolutely central for justifying the existence of the Black Hundred in eyes of the Odessa Black Hundred publicists. The Odessa Black Hundred publicists perceived the Black Hundred as a conscious vanguard of the Russian nation which had to awaken the dormant part of the Russian nation. They thought that the Black Hundred could overcome both the revolution and the shortcomings of the Russian political regime if it managed to acquire enough influence over those members of the Russian nation. However, the Odessa Black Hundred publicists neither managed to specify how exactly that influence would result into achievement of those goals nor proposed what to do after those goals are achieved. After the internal enemy is defeated, they wrote, the monarchists should assemble and decide on their further activities. That was a general strategy, how it was perceived by the Odessa Black Hundred publicists, to which the Black Hundred in Odessa had to adhere.
The Black Hundred publicists acknowledged peculiar Odessa circumstances which determined the local Black Hundred’s tactics or, in other words, their considerations related to achievement of specific sub-goals that supported the general goal. The publicists believed Odessa to be a Russian city captured by the Jews who, in their opinion, dominated it both economically and politically. Economically - by monopolizing various fields of trade, industrial production and “intelligent” professions such as doctors, lawyers, engineers, journalists, teachers etc. Politically – by having Russian deputies in the City Duma who stood for their, Jewish, interests and by establishing a dense network of socialist organizations propagating among the city workers. The most dangerous in the Black Hundred publicists’ eyes were the alleged Jews’ domination in the sphere of education and labor organizations. The first one, the publicists believed, threatened the future of the Russian nation in Odessa, as the Jewish teachers would educate young Russians in a “cosmopolitan spirit” thereby making them the Jews’ servants. The second one threatened well-being and economic strength of the Russian nation in Odessa as it could destroy the Russian enterprises by devastating strikes. Thereby, the Odessa Black Hundred publicists perceived the Black Hundred’s task in Odessa to be especially complicated as they perceived the Jews’ to be especially strong there. The Black Hundred there had not only to fight against the Jews for the dormant part of the Russian nation, but also for those Russians who had already been “awakened” by the Jews in a “cosmopolitan spirit”. These considerations explain why the Black Hundred activities took exactly that shape which they took.

Evidence of the Black Hundred press allows us to make the following conclusions concerning activities of the Odessa Black Hundred parties of that period. Like the left-wing
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activists, the Odessa Black Hundred concentrated on issues of labor organizations and education. They established various workers’ organizations aimed at improvement of the workers’ living condition and at educating the workers in the Black Hundred spirit. In doing so the Black Hundred heavily drew upon experience of the socialists’ and workers’ activists which had been active in the workers’ for around 1905 before the Black Hundred emerged. In the field of education the Black Hundred set up its own schools and struggled for dominance in other city schools. They did the latter through the parents’ committees, which they wanted first be dominated by the Black Hundred-minded persons and second to cause an impact upon the school life. Additionally, the Odessa Black Hundred parties as constituted of loyal monarchists had to submit to the tsar’s will and to take part in the State Dumas electoral campaigns. In 1905-1907 there were two State Duma elections. The Black Hundred failed both of them and attributed this failure to the shortcomings of the electoral law which, in their opinion, privileged inorodtsy over Russians. The Black Hundred managed to win the City Duma elections in which the Jews were not allowed to participate. However, at the City Duma elections the Black Hundred presented itself not as a political force standing for traditional monarchist values, but as a company of good administrators who knew how to run the city affairs. Moreover, we can conclude that Omel’yanchuk’s conclusions concerning the Black Hundred’s social composition and activities are true for the case of Odessa. Unlike Soviet historiography suggested the activities of the Odessa Black Hundred parties were quite diverse and they could not be restricted to organization of paramilitary detachments only. The RA, the PLO and the OURM did not have any paramilitary detachments at all. The same is true concerning the social composition of the Odessa Black Hundred. The latter included members of various social groups, not of “lumpen-proletariat” only.
The analysis which has been made in the current thesis allows us to conclude that it is quite fruitful to look at the Black Hundred through the prism of its own subjective logic and at the background of other political actors’ activities. Unlike the previous historiography, it presents the Black Hundred’s activities and ideology as a more or less coherent and interconnected system, in which the former are determined by the latter. It should be noted that by ideology in this study I understood not some stable core of thoughts and beliefs but the entire intellectual production of the political actor manifesting itself in its daily press and including reflections on the immediate circumstances in which the actor had to act. In this sense the Black Hundred publicists’ reflections on the activities of their political rivals from the leftist camp proved to be the most important factor in determining the Black Hundred parties’ activities. Additionally, this correspondence also suggests that the Odessa Black Hundred’s publicists’ ideology was interlinked with that one of the Odessa Black Hundred activists. The way the activities of the Black Hundred were related to the activities of the revolutionaries could be interpreted as a fact that the Black Hundred movement had a negative general strategy and was of a reactionary nature. Namely, it was a reaction against particular revolutionaries’ activities and general government’s policies. The Black Hundred was deeply dissatisfied with what both the revolutionaries’ and the government had done. The Black Hundred tried to neutralize what it perceived to be negative effects of those two actors’ previous actions, to prevent them from continuing to act in the same manner and, finally, to crash the one, the revolutionaries, and to transform the another, the government. However, on the ground level, on the level of tactics, the Black Hundred policies could be characterized as positive ones. The Black Hundred parties’ activities were not about negative reactions against deeds of their rivals only. The Black Hundred parties did not implement any direct policies for their rivals’ newspapers, political parties, labor organizations and educational institutions were restricted by
the state, weakened, closed or destroyed. The only exception was the revolutionaries’ paramilitary detachments against which the Black Hundred waged the direct violent struggle. The Black Hundred activists opposed the leftists’ revolutionaries’ initiatives by implementing their own positive projects. They established their own newspapers, parties, theaters, shops, cooperatives, labor organizations and schools. These projects were intended to attract those persons who had been either previously politically indifferent, or participated in the revolutionaries’ projects before. It is these ground level projects’ success through which the Black Hundred wanted to indirectly neutralize its enemies deeds, to prevent them from further actions and finally to crash them. These conclusions could be further expanded. I will suggest that implementation of that theoretical approach concentrating on actors’ interactions and subjective logic would be especially fruitful for further studies of the Black Hundred both in regional and all-imperial dimension. The situational approach perspective applied for the Black Hundred history material could result in new interesting studies. As my research has shown, it shed a new light on the history of other political actors by showing their interconnectedness with the Black Hundred and therefore advances our understanding of broader historical phenomena.
List of abbreviations

The OURM – The Odessa Union of Russian Men
The PDR – The Party of Democratic Reforms
The PLO – The Party of Legal Order
The PPF - Party of People's Freedom
The PPR - Party of Peacful Renovation
The RA – The Russian Assembly
The URP – The Union of Russian People
Appendix

Russkaya Rech’, March 9, 1906
Russkaya Rech’, April 2, 1906
— Ну и как без него будет?
— Ша, киплер, оно еще не приехало...
Russkaya Rech’, August 26, 1907
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