

article. Examples are given of the German machinery and equipment usage by the local population. Research results are reported in the conclusion that the economic efficiency and profit served as an incitement to the German colonists' conversion from, solely, the agrarian position of their living to the production of the farm machinery. Colonists were rather progressive in their line of thinking, therefore all the innovation techniques were implemented in the machinery of imperial Russia as fast as possible, being improved in an attempt to make the machinery cheaper than the foreign one.

Key words: *the Germans, colonists, farm machinery, agricultural engineering, economy, relations.*

УДК 944:314.727.3(477.62)'' 1945/1953''

N. Shypik

ADAPTATION PROBLEMS OF THE UKRAINIANS DEPORTED FROM POLAND TO DONETSK REGION IN 1945-1947

The article examines characteristic features of adaptation process of resettlers from Poland to Donetsk region in 1945 – 1947 on the basis of wide range of sources. Nature of resettling process was determined by the substance of administrative and command system. It is proved that the adaptation process was significantly affected by violation of principle of zemlyachestvo during the resettlement, economic disorder, low level of property compensations, kolkhoz system rejection and the Holodomor of 1946-1947. It was difficult to supply the families with foodstuff with workdays served out in kolkhoz. Incomplete families settling caused lack of subsidiary means of subsistence. This put the resettlers to a disadvantage compared to the local kolkhozniks. Due to disorganization of work in kolkhozes they were more often shifted from one work to another that reduced the number of workdays served out, they were not engaged in piece work''. Besides the place of resettlement sometimes didn't respond to the newcomers' professional abilities. Owing to the entire set of reasons the number of resettlers' families in Donetsk region was reduced. In September 1947 there left 25,3 % of them. Having found out that in West Ukraine the private form of farm management had still prevailed most of resettlers tried to move there.

Key words: *resettlers from Poland, Donetsk region, adaptation.*

Donetsk region villages had one of the lowest levels of population density even before the war. Rural districts were considered to own much land; hence they were used for resettlement from time to time. After occupation rural population of the region amounted to 81,8% from the prewar number (as of the 1st of January 1944) [1, p. 10]. Soviet Party authorities continuing the practice of unlimited resource allocation directed their flows of people that had the form of resettlement when occasion offered. The first of them was the resettlement of the Ukrainians from Zakerzonnia. Its compulsory nature was proved owing to the inquiry of the former resettlers conducted by "Memorial" community. Deportation of the Ukrainians to Donetsk region was the aim of many explorations [2]. But particular aspects of resettlers' adaptation were left aside by the researchers. This fact defined the aim of the given article.

The source basis is comprised of Stalinsky Regional Party Committee Bureau minutes, certificates, information and correspondence between the government bodies as well as recollections of the witnesses.

In 1944 the problem of the post-war territorial settlement with Poland was decided to be resolved by leaving Kholmshchyna, Lemkivshchyna, Nadsyannya and Pidlyashya to it and by resettling compact groups of Ukrainians to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. At that time the internal needs of Donbas coincided with the state desire to place a big amount of “alien” Ukrainians in the artificially created Soviet lifestyle. Among 11 Eastern and Southern regions of the Ukrainian Republic Stalin region was defined the place for resettlement of the considerable part of migrants. M. Khrushchov in his letter to J. Stalin reported that “from 87.000 families 69.000 or 70 % are to be directed to the Eastern and Southern regions and only 18.264 (30 %) to the Western ones” [3, p. 18]. It was planned regardless of the fact that Western Ukraine was able to accommodate all Ukrainians resettlers in the houses of those Poles who left for Poland under the terms of Lyublin agreement. But the Western regions from the state’s point of view had sufficient deficiency which was prevailing of the private form of farm management.

It was planned to direct 7 thousand families or 28 thousand people to Stalin region. The plan of resettlers’ accommodation was considered and endorsed on the 8th of December 1944 at the meeting of the Regional Party Committee Bureau. It was agreed to accommodate newcomers in 28 districts of the region in groups of from 100 to 500 families. It was planned to prepare transport, provide hot meals at the stations, hygienic disposal, find the best agitators. Every kolkhoz and sovkhov was to allocate the necessary number of the flats with the respective outbuildings for every family detached settling. Later on it became apparent that it was impossible. The state obligation mustn’t be violated therefore it was agreed to change the ways of its realization. On the 15th of December 1944 the Decree of the Regional Party Committee ordering “to provide every family with liveable lodgement, in case it is impossible families should be accommodated in kolkhozniks’ and the locals’ houses if they agree”. To obtain benevolence of the local population 182 agitators conducted 4110 talks with kolkhozniks. On the 12th of January 1945 Stalin region reported on its complete readiness to meet 7293 resettlers families.

M. Khrushchov was informed that the majority of newcomers would be accommodated by means of concentration in kolkhozniks’ houses, 83 automobiles and 3597 carts would be allocated for their transportation. At the station there would be 11 buffet and canteens, bathhouses and hygiene disposal centers functioning. The trade organisations allocated salt, kerosene, soap, matches and so on for sale to resettlers [4, leaf 18; 5, leaf 12].

In 11 Eastern and Southern regions of Ukraine there were established departments in executive committees of Regional Party Councils. They were responsible for practical realization of resettling, providing vehicles, accommodation and household arrangements. The staff of the department consisted of a chief, a senior inspector and 2 ordinary inspectors [6, p. 230]. Such number of members enabled only to gather information, summarize and carry out certain coordination. The main burden of receiving and accommodating resettlers was laid on the district government bodies.

The first newcomers in Stalin region were recorded in the beginning of February 1945. On the 18th of October 1945 the regional authorities reported to the Secretary of the Central Committee of Communist Bolshevik Party of Ukraine D. Korotchenko by wire on the reception of 3053 families (13.223 individuals). Of the total number 1608 individuals joined kolkhozes, 50 were accommodated in sovkhovs, 33 were directed to industrial enterprises, and other 1336 newcomers worked in kolkhozes. They were prepared to join collective farms. Of the total number of households that joined kolkhoz 517 ones were provided with detached houses, 354 – with estates, 1352 – with vegetable gardens with kolkhoz’s potatoes and vegetables. Money loan of 135 thousand karbovantsiv for household arrangements was issued. Polish zlotys were exchange for 961,5 karbovantsiv. 349 families were given warrants for receiving 1,5 thousand centners of grain against that left in Poland. Number of the resettlers’

families sent was not equal to number of newcomers that proves certain losses en route. Thus, according to the summary report of the General Commissioner of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Government 3110 families were directed to Stalin region. Though different reports told about 3044, 3053 and 3067 families [7, leaf 168; 8, leaf 24].

Hence, more than 3 thousand families from 7 thousand maximum planned were directed to Stalin region. Only 9 % of all the resettlers instead of 30 % planned were directed to the Eastern regions. To compare 26 % instead of 49 % were sent to the Southern regions and, conversely, 65% instead of 21 % were directed to the Western ones. Disruption of large-scale resettlement to the Eastern regions was the first failure of resettling from the state's point of view [6, leaf 122].

The resettlers were distributed into 22 districts in groups of 19 – 457 families. The biggest number of resettlers was received by Starobeshivsky (457 families), Telmanovsky (322 families) and Dobropilsky (350 families) districts. More than 36 % of resettlers of the region were directed there. Settlement in kolkhozes was carried out according to the need in able-bodied population. So, in Telmanivsky district the resettlers were accommodated in 41 kolkhozes in groups of from 2 to 40 families. The largest group was accommodated in the kolkhoz named after Stalin. In Starobeshivsky district they were settled in 26 kolkhozes, in Velyko-Yanisolsky district – in 13 kolkhozes in groups of from 4 to 9 families, in Avdiyivsky district – in 19 kolkhozes in groups of from 3 to 21 families [8, leaf 5, 12]. Resettlement in small groups violated the principle of zemlyachestvo and family relations, in consequence of this there occurred isolated cases of unauthorized moving from certain kolkhozes to other ones [8, leaf 14].

Besides, in Donbas as in other areas of resettlement family splitting up took place. One of the first complaints from the resettlers concerned namely this issue. Thus, families who arrived at Novotroitske station had still been split up en route. In 1946 the editor of Vseslovyansky Committee named family splitting up the chief defect in settling newcomers. Among 34 families of Avdiyivsky and Selidivsky districts interviewed by him only one reached one of the kolkhozes in its entirety [9, leaf 96]. Andriy Tavpash, a former resettler to Donbas, calls family dispersion the greatest moral trial because Lemky people are “individuals with vivid genetic feeling of a united family” and “such family vacuum caused the beginning of creeping migration to the West” [10, p. 24].

One of the most topical issues for resettlers was compensation for property, crops and products left in Poland. The Decree of the Regional Party Committee commissioned district executive committees to gather information about the amount of winter crops left in hectares. Compensation was to be provided by the Regional Commissioner of People's Committee for stocking up on the basis of 4 centners for 1 hectare of winter crops. Regional authorities in their report of the 20th of November 1945 informed M. Khrushchov that “534 centners of grain were given as the compensation for agricultural products, 5468 centners of grain were given as the compensation for the crops left. Settlements with 1249 households were realised” [7, leaf 166]. They were to give 300 kilos of the same product for every hectare of spring crops and 12 centners of hay for every hectare of grass [11, leaf 6]. The allotment of compensations was accompanied by a number of violations. So, Dobropilsky Region Commissioner of People's Committee for stocking up included grain allocated as compensation for the crops left in Poland in kolkhoz realizing the state supply plan. Administrations of kolkhozes named after Rosa Luxemburg and “Pravda” made use of absence of control and gave moist musty grain to resettlers. In Selydivsky district the revision as of the 15th of June ascertained that in the kolkhoz named after Karl Marks 31 centners of grain allocated for crops compensation were spent on the kolkhoz's needs [12, leaf 13]. In their letter to Korotchenko of the 3rd of June 1946 they reported they had paid off for all crops left, as to agricultural products settling it was carried out only according to 178 documents presented [12, leaf 14]. The state of affairs in the

sphere of property settling was much worse. In the letter of the 30th of January 1946 the Council of People's Commissars reported that it could be realized only after factual housing of a household either in a dwelling house in kolkhoz or in a flat in town. Thus, settling for properties was tied to housing the resettlers [12, leaf 34].

A housing potential of Donbas wasn't large. Thus, in Oleksandrivsky district there were 15 state fund dwelling houses that had previously belonged to colonists, in Telmanivsky region there were 43 ones, in Avdiyivsky region there were none [13, leaf 119]. Even existing housing resources of the former German colonies were not always used as intended. On the 9th of December 1945 Stalin region reported M. Khrushchov on completing settlement. 755 households were resettled in the houses previously belonged to the former kolkhozes in German colonies and those of village councils' recourses. [7, leaf 161]. Others were located in kolkhozniks' houses by means of concentration tightly and irregularly. So in kolkhozes "Leninsky shlyakh", "Chervony prapor", "Vpered" and some others situated in Starobeshevsky district 2 families of resettlers (8-12 persons) were accommodated in one room. In kolkhoz "Nove zhyttya" of Chervonoarmiysky district 3 families took up 2 small rooms and had 2 beds. There was no table or chairs. The stove was heated with straw owing to this it was smoky and dirty in the rooms. Occasionally resettlement by way of concentration caused morbid relations between the dwellers of one house [12, leaf 8].

It's obvious that to rectify the situation with housing it is necessary to settle every family in a detached way. To this end still in autumn 1945 it was planned to build for resettlers 3827 houses during the first half of 1946. Stocking up bricks, lime, tiles, nails was to be realized mainly at the expense of local industrial enterprises and industrial cooperation allocations. Under the State plan of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic 2,5 thousand cubic meters of glass and 5 thousand nails were allocated. The need in timber was to be satisfied with the help of the felling resources through Administration of village and kolkhoz construction. 800 kolkhozniks went to Volyn and Zhitomir regions to fell timber [7, leaf 13].

During the first 6 months of 1946 there were built only 179 houses. The construction plan was derailed. On the 1st of July 1948 271 families of resettlers had to live in kolkhozniks' houses as before [14, leaf 70]. Some resettlers built or bought houses by themselves, but they were not numerous. Only in July 1949 the regional financial department sent to the district executive committees the letter permitting money settlements with newcomers. It was done in cases when resettlers were provided with separate apartments instead of houses as well as "when the dwellers of the apartment accepted sedentism". The deadline of complete pay-off was fixed on the 30th of December 1949, but total settlement wasn't carried out. The letters asking for settling came still in 1952 and even in 1953 [15, leaf 154].

Active large-scale political work was done in order to attract settlers to kolkhozes. In Telmanivsky district when the resettlers came 20 agitators were assigned. The party activists were sent to familiarize with domestic and international state of the USSR, kolkhoz production, the Charter of agricultural artel through holding meetings, readings and talks. As a result of agitation 270 households joined kolkhoz [8, leaf 6, 16]. The average percentage of resettlers involved in collectivization process in different regions was 77,8 %. The highest rate was in the Southern regions: Zaporizzhya region had 87,8 %, Mykolayiv region – 87,1 %, Odesa region – 82,5 %. The lowest rate was in the Eastern regions where there was the poorest housing provision. Particularly Stalin region had the rate of 64,8 % [16, leaf 26,128].

For attracting resettlers to kolkhozes both ideological work and corporeal factor were used. In some districts it was reported on the difference in size of ground areas given to kolkhoz's and non-kolkhoz's population. In that way in Staromlynivsky district kolkhozniks were given ground areas of 0,8 hectare, but non-kolkhozniks – 0,4 - 0,5 hectare. In Velyko-Novoselkivsky district kolkhozniks were given 0,43 hectare each and those who didn't join kolkhoz got 0,25 hectare of land. The Party leaders considered resettlers in the light of their

task to attract them to kolkhozes. Those who joined kolkhoz and worked hard were encouraged. The carpenter of the kolkhoz named after Molotov of Khartsyzsky district Model went over the quota of production for 110%. He was given bonuses thrice and his destroyed house was rebuilt at the expense of kolkhoz [12, leaf 31-39]. Those resettlers who opposed to joining kolkhozes received the brand of “nationalist elements with money grubber tendencies of petty owners”.

Resettlers' attitude to kolkhozes reflected in inquiries “On political climate among resettlers”. If in the beginning their attitude was estimated as more or less loyal then in spring 1946 many of them refused to work in kolkhozes, sent “their foot-messengers to the Western regions of Ukraine aiming to find the opportunity to cross the state border” [12, leaf 9]. Such organization form of farm management as kolkhoz turned unfamiliar for the majority of them. And it's not surprising because when moving to Eastern Ukraine they were deprived of the most valuable villager's thing, that is land. While examining 50 property letters of Telmanivsky district resettlers it's occurred that only 6 % of households had in Poland less than 1 hectare of ploughed land, 59 % had from 1 to 5 hectares, 29 % had from 5,1 to 10 hectares and 6 % had more than 10 hectares of ploughed land [15, leaf 210]. Some of them even after resettlement demanded land in quantity incredible for an ordinary Soviet peasant. Having found out that in the West of Ukraine the private form of farm management had still been prevailed they made attempts to move there. Some of them even were lucky to get an official permit for moving [17, leaf 12].

In the course of resettling natural conditions weren't taken into account. The editor of Vseslovyansky Committee in 1946 wrote about that felicitously: “People from the mountains, Carpathian forests were resettled in steppe, plain, hot climate they were not adapted to. As a result of drastic change of climate and water (it was saline in Stalin region) people fall sick. If one takes into account that the majority of the Lemky people are great masters working with wood, but in the Eastern regions they can't practise their abilities, then all of that causes extra stimulus to move to the Western regions” [3, leaf 134]. The witness of the events A. Tovpash wrote that “it was difficult to get used to natural contrasts. In Donbas it is incredibly hot, dust penetrates up to the bones, plants are grey. But in our mountains the grass is clean, it's green, rains are abundant...” [10, leaf 24].

Many of those who came there identified themselves as Lemky people. In one of the first reports of Starobeshivsky district of the 27th of July 1946 it was stated: “There are some Belarusians from Bilostok area who know the Soviet way of life. From 1939 to 1941 they lived on the territory of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. Others are Rusyns and Lemky people from Krakiv and Lyublin provinces” [8, leaf 12]. The representatives of this West Ukrainian ethnic group after resettlement in Russian-speaking environment experienced certain language barrier. One of the agitators of Khartsyzsk district Chornovil explained some words in Polish that was forbidden by the local authorities [18, leaf 6]. Periodicals and schooling for resettlers were to be in Russian and Ukrainian. About 25 % of all the newcomers were the school-age children [8, leaf 26]. The regional administration was to keep record of potential pupils and provide them with educational materials. They hastily reported on the complete schooling coverage of all school-age children, but many children of resettlers didn't go to school [7, leaf 163]. Thus, as of the 29th of January 1946 in Dobropilsky district 93 school-age children didn't attend school.

Among the resettlers as well as among other displaced categories of population increased incidence of parasitic typhoid was traced. There were a great number of lousy families that was connected mainly with unsanitary conditions of their dwellings. The decree of the 20th of October 1945 stated that district health care departments hadn't carried out skin disease control measures. Among the measures of parasitic typhoid control in the region in the period of

autumn – winter 1945 it was planned to build bath-houses and sterilizer rooms in all the kolkhozes where they were absent and to create epidemiological squads [19, leaf 40].

As a result of all the reasons such as violating principle of zemlyachestvo, a low level of property compensations, economy disorder and rejecting kolkhoz system the number of resettlers' families in Donbas was constantly reduced. As of September 1947 there left only 25,3 % of them. In that time reduction of resettlers' families took place irregularly. Reducing intensity was influenced by seasonality and famine. However famine wasn't the only cause of resettlers' number reduction because when famine was defeated as well as before its beginning resettlers' reducing in Stalin region continued.

The tight situation of the resettlers before famine started was certified by the documents from the districts. Payment for the workdays served out wasn't enough for maintaining families. Thus in kolkhoz named after Kalinin in Khartsyzsk district the resettlers received per 497 kilos of grain for their average 475 workdays served out in 1946. In 1945 they received per 710 kilos of grain for their average 396 workdays served out [18, leaf 53]. Amount of grain given for workdays in 1946 was less than in 1945. In 1946 Stalin Regional Party Committee and the regional executive committee requested the Council of Ministers to allocate to resettlers for 1946-1947: grain in amount of 500 tones, potato – 250 tones, fats – 3 tones etc [12, leaf 50]. In autumn 1946 Khartsyzsky district reported that the basic flaw in newcomers' settling in that period was lack of bread. It is proved by the locals' utterances. So the kolkhoznitsa Spinkina stated: "We ourselves are dying of starvation, why are you staying here? There will be nothing to eat" [18, leaf 9, 15].

Resettlers' migration took place both beyond the region's boundaries and within its territory. If as of autumn 1945 only 1,1 % of resettlers from Stalin region were accommodated in towns then in 2 years the percentage of resettlers who left for towns was 9,8 % [8, leaf 24]. The Secretary of the Regional Party Committee wrote in his letter of the 31st of July 1946: "In the course of March – May there were cases when those who had been settled in rural areas for permanent residence left for towns and working villages where they got jobs in industrial and railway transport sphere." The Regional Party Committee obliged "to check their job placement in mines and railway transport sphere". Starobeshivsky district reported that as of the 5th of August 1946 21 households worked in Karakubske mine group [12, leaf 11, 80, 41]. Intraregional migrations occurred mainly due to the following facts. Firstly, when the place of resettlement didn't respond to the newcomers' professional abilities and they had to search for jobs in towns in compliance with their professional and education demands. Thus, the resettler Pyrtey and his wife came to Khartsyzsky district. They had higher education and were professional teachers but were sent to kolkhoz. They were discontented that they weren't employed in their own field, refused to work in kolkhoz and were going to leave [12, leaf 9]. A. Tovpash's recollections have a tinge of negativity: "In Donbas we were settled in villages far from town civilization" [10, leaf 24]. Secondly, due to disorganization of work in kolkhozes because "the resettlers are more often shifted from one work to another that reduces the number of workdays served out, they are not engaged in piece work" [7, leaf 160]. Thirdly, it was difficult to provide their families with foodstuff with workdays served out in kolkhoz. Incomplete families settling caused lack of subsidiary means of subsistence. This put them to a disadvantage compared to the local kolkhozniks.

The first post-war resettlement to Donbas was an unsuccessful attempt to solve workforce problems in villages. The reason for this is neglecting many factors such as housing, professional, climate, and language factors. It's connected both with post-war difficulties and administrative and command system defects. Resettlement was ineffective also because it was realized basically because of political motivations of the state. With the help of such resettling it tried to ease tension in the national issue of the Western region and to collectivize the

population of the abovementioned region. Donbas had a role of "smithy" that would turn an "outdated" villager into a "politically conscientious" kolkhoznik.

References

1. Шипік Н. Соціально-демографічні процеси в Донбасі у 1943 – 1955 рр. : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. іст. наук : спец. 07.00.01 "Історія України". – Донецьк, 2005. – 20 с.; Shypik N. Sotsialno-demohrafichni protsesy v Donbasi u 1943 – 1955 rr. : avtoref. dys. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia kand. ist. nauk : spets. 07.00.01 "Istoriia Ukrainy". – Donetsk, 2005. – 20 s.

2. Байкеніч Д. Кількість та місця розселення депортованих українців Польщі у східних областях УРСР (др. пол. 1940-х рр.) / Д. Байкеніч. // Народознавчі зошити. – 2013. – №2. – С. 231–237; Baikienich D. Kilkist ta mistsia rozselennia deportovanykh ukraintsiv Polshchi u skhidnykh oblastiakh URSR (dr. pol. 1940-kh rr.) / D. Baikienich // Narodoznavchi zoshyty. – 2013. – №2. – S. 231–237; Алфьоров М. Депортації українського населення в Донбас 1944 – 1949 рр. / М. Алфьоров // Схід. – 2004. – № 3.; Alforov M. Deportatsii ukrainskoho naseleння v Donbas 1944 – 1949 rr. / M. Alforov // Skhid. – 2004. – № 3.; Шипік Н. Ф. Сільськогосподарські переселення в Донбас у повоєнні роки / Н.Ф. Шипік. // Нові сторінки в історії Донбасу. – 2003. – С. 122–137; Shypik N. F. Silskohospodarski pereselennia v Donbas u rovoienni roky / N. F. Shypik. // Novi storinky v istorii Donbasu. – 2003. – S. 122–137

3. Депортації: західні землі України кін.30-х - поч.50-х рр. Документи, матеріали, спогади. У 3-х т. – Львів, 1996. – 538 с. Deportatsii: zakhidni zemli Ukrainy kin.30-kh - poch.50-kh rr. Dokumenty, materialy, spohady. U 3-kh t. – Lviv, 1996. – 538 s.

4. Держархів Донецької обл., ф. 326, оп. 2, spr. 211; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. 326, op. 2, spr. 211.

5. Держархів Донецької обл., ф. 326, spr. 215; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. 326, spr. 215.

6. ЦДАВО, ф. 2, оп. 7 – 4.2, spr. 1420; TsDAVO, f. 2, op. 7. - 4.2, spr. 1420.

7. Держархів Донецької обл., ф. 326, оп. 2, spr. 865; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. 326, op. 2, spr. 865.

8. Держархів Донецької обл., ф.326, оп.2, spr.874; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. 326, op. 2, spr. 874.

9. ЦДАВО, ф.Р. – 2, оп.7, ч.3, spr.2627; TsDAVO, f.R. – 2, op.7, ch.3, spr.2627.

10. Что ищет бизнесмен Товпаш за Сяном? // Галицкие контракты. - №19 – 2002.; Chto yshchet byznesmen Tovpash za Sianom? // Halytskye kontrakty. - №19 - 2002.

11. Держархів Донецької обл., ф.326, оп.2, spr.66; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. 326, op. 2, spr. 66.

12. Держархів Донецької 166бл., ф.326, оп.4, spr.592; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. 326, op. 4, spr. 592.

13. Держархів Донецької обл., ф.Р.299, оп.2, spr.10; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. R.299, op. 2, spr. 10

14. Держархів Донецької обл., ф.326, оп.4, spr.132; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. 326, op. 4, spr. 132.

15. Держархів Донецької обл., ф.4098, оп.1, spr.12; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. 4098, op. 1, spr. 12.

16. ЦДАВО, ф. Р.-2, оп. 7 - 4.3, spr. 2627; TsDAVO, f. R.-2, op. 7. - 4.3, spr. 2627.

17. Держархів Донецької обл., ф.326, оп.4, spr.73; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. 326, op. 4, spr.73.

18. Держархів Донецької обл., ф.Р.2157, оп.1, spr.43; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. R.2157, op. 1, spr. 43.

19. Держархів Донецької обл., ф.326, оп.2, спр. 742; Derzharkhiv Donetskoi obl., f. 326, op. 2, spr. 742.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.10.2016 р.

Н.Ф. Шипік

ПРОБЛЕМИ АДАПТАЦІЇ УКРАЇНЦІВ, ДЕПОРТОВАНИХ З ПОЛЬЩІ У ДОНЕЦЬКІЙ ОБЛАСТІ У 1945-1947 РР.

Донецькі села і до війни мали один із найнижчих рівнів щільності населення в Україні. Сільські райони визнавалися багатоземельними, час від часу до них проводили переселення. Після окупації чисельність сільських мешканців області складала 81,8 % від довоєнної. Партійно-радянське керівництво, продовжуючи практику необмеженого розпорядження людськими ресурсами, при нагоді спрямовувало сюди людські потоки, котрі мали форму переселень. Першим з них було переселення українців із Закарпаття. У 1944 р., коли проблему повоєнних територіальних урегулювань з Польщею було вирішено розв'язати залишенням їй Холмищини, Лемківщини, Надсяння, Підляшшя і переселенням компактних груп українців в УРСР, внутрішні потреби Донбасу збіглися з державним бажанням утиснути велику масу “чужих” українців до штучно створеної радянської схеми життя. Донецька область була визначена місцем розселення значної частки всього переселенського загалу поміж 11 східних і південних областей УРСР.

Перше повоєнне переселення у Донецьку область було невдалою спробою влади вирішити проблеми трудових ресурсів на селі. На вересень 1947р. їх залишилося вже 25,3%. Причиною цього є неврахування багатьох чинників, таких, як житловий, професійний, кліматичний, мовний, що пов'язано як з повоєнними труднощами, так і з недоліками адміністративно-командної системи. Неefективним переселення було й тому, що відбувалося в першу чергу з політичних міркувань держави, що намагалася за рахунок таких переселень зняти напруження в національному питанні західного регіону і колективізувати населення вищеназваного регіону. Донбасу відводилася роль “кузні”, що переробить “відсталого” селянина на “політично свідомого” колгоспника.

Ключові слова: переселення із Польщі до УРСР, Донецька область, адаптація.

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Маріупольський державний університет

ВІСНИК
МАРІУПОЛЬСЬКОГО ДЕРЖАВНОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ

СЕРІЯ: ІСТОРІЯ. ПОЛІТОЛОГІЯ

ЗБІРНИК НАУКОВИХ ПРАЦЬ

Головний редактор чл.-кор. НАПН України, д.політ.н., проф. К. В. Балабанов

Заснований у 2011 р.

ВИПУСК 16



МАРИУПОЛЬ – 2016

УДК 3(05)

Вісник Маріупольського державного університету.

Серія: Історія. Політологія

Збірник наукових праць

Видається 3 рази на рік. Заснований у 2011 р.

Рекомендовано до друку Вченою радою МДУ (протокол № 4 від 26.10.2016 р.)

Вісник МДУ. Серія: Історія. Політологія включено до Переліку наукових фахових видань України з політичних наук (наказ МОН України № 793 від 04.07.2014 р.) та історичних наук (наказ МОН України № 261 від 06.03.2015 р.).

Видання включено до міжнародних наукометричних баз даних **Index Copernicus International sp.z o.o.** та «**Российский индекс научного цитирования**» (**РИНЦ**), а також до фонду наукової електронної бібліотеки «**КиберЛенинка**»

Головна редколегія:

Головний редактор – чл.-кор. НАПН України, д.політ.н., проф. К. В. Балабанов

Заст. головного редактора – д.е.н., проф. О. В. Булатова

Члени редколегії: д.філол.н., проф. С. В. Безчотнікова,
д.і.н., проф. В. М. Романцов, д.культурології, проф. Ю. С. Сабадаш,
д.ю.н., проф. О. В. Філонов, д.е.н., проф. Ю. І. Чентуков.

Редакційна колегія серії:

Головний редактор – чл.-кор. НАПН України, д.політ.н., проф. К. В. Балабанов

Заступник головного редактора – д.і.н., проф. В. М. Романцов

Відповідальний секретар – к.політ.н., проф. М. В. Трофименко

Члени редакційної колегії: д.політ.н., проф. В. А. Войналович, д.і.н., проф. А. В. Гедьо,
д.і.н., проф. І.М. Грідіна, д.і.н., проф. О. І. Гуржій, д.політ.н., проф. Г. І. Зеленько, д.і.н.,
проф. В. Ф. Лисак, д.і.н., проф. Р.О. Литвиненко, д.політ.н., проф. І. Г. Оніщенко, д.політ.н.,
проф. Н.П. Пашина, д.і.н., проф. І. С. Пономарьова, д.і.н., проф. О. П. Реєнт, д.політ.н.,
проф. С. Ю. Римаренко, д.соціол.н., проф. Б. В. Слющинський, д.і.н., проф. О.В. Стяжкіна,
д.і.н., проф. Н. Р. Темірова.

Іноземні фахівці: д.політ.н., проф. Т. Граціані (Італійська Республіка),
д.політ.н., проф. К. Карнасіотіс (Грецька Республіка), д.політ.н., проф. С. Корнеа
(Республіка Молдова),
д.і.н., проф. П-Р. Магочій (Канада),
д.політ.н., проф. А. Романо (Італійська Республіка).

Науковий секретар – к.і.н., доц. С. С. Арабаджи

Засновник: Маріупольський державний університет
87548, м. Маріуполь, пр. Будівельників, 129а
тел.: (0629)53-22-60; e-mail: visnyk.mdu.istoria.politologia@gmail.com
Сайт видання: www.visnyk-politologia.mdu.in.ua

Свідоцтво про державну реєстрацію друкованого засобу масової інформації
(Серія КВ №17802-6652Р від 24.05.2011)

Тираж 100 примірників. Замовлення №10.11

Видавець «Видавничий відділ МДУ»

87500, м. Маріуполь, пр. Будівельників, 129а

Свідоцтво про внесення до Державного реєстру суб'єкта видавничої справи
ДК №4930 від 07.07.2015 р.

ISSN 2518-1521 (Online)

ISSN 2226-2830 (Print)

© МДУ, 2016

Романцов В.М.	131
ЕТНОПОЛІТИЧНІ ТА ЕТНОКУЛЬТУРНІ ПРОЦЕСИ В МАРІУПОЛІ НА ПОЧАТКУ ДЕМОКРАТИЧНОЇ РЕВОЛЮЦІЇ 1917 р. ІСТОРИЧНІ УРОКИ ДЛЯ СУЧАСНОСТІ	
Стороженко І.С.	139
ВОЄННА ДОКТРИНА Б. ХМЕЛЬНИЦЬКОГО 1648-1652 рр.: РЕАЛІЗАЦІЯ ЇЇ ВІЙСЬКОВО-ТЕХНІЧНОГО ЗМІСТУ	
Тарасов С.В.	147
ЖИЗНЬ И ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ ГЕТМАНА ИВАНА ВЫГОВСКОГО В ИЗОБРАЖЕНИИ РОССИЙСКОЙ ДОРЕВОЛЮЦИОННОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ	
Швайка І.О.	155
ВНЕСОК НІМЕЦЬКИХ КОЛОНІСТІВ В ІСТОРІЮ РОЗВИТКУ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО СІЛЬСЬКОГОСПОДАРСЬКОГО МАШИНОБУДУВАННЯ (СЕРЕДИНА ХІХ – ПОЧАТОК ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ)	
Shyrik N.	160
ADAPTATION PROBLEMS OF THE UKRAINIANS DEPORTED FROM POLAND TO DONETSK REGION IN 1945-1947	

ПОЛІТИЧНІ НАУКИ

Булык М.В., Гаврилова Н.В.	168
ЕВРОПЕЙСКАЯ БЕЗОПАСНОСТЬ В КОНТЕКСТЕ СИРИЙСКОГО И УКРАИНСКОГО КРИЗИСОВ	
Бульдович П.В.	179
РИНКОВІ ЗАСНОВКИ НЕОІНСТИТУЦІОНАЛЬНОГО ПІДХОДУ В ПОЛІТИЧНІЙ НАУЦІ	
Виговська О.С.	186
ФІНАНСУВАННЯ АКАДЕМІЧНОЇ МОБІЛЬНОСТІ В УКРАЇНІ: ПРОБЛЕМИ І ШЛЯХИ ВИРШЕННЯ	
Гільченко О.Л., Рабчевська О.С.	191
СУЧАСНА МІГРАЦІЙНА ПОЛІТИКА ФРАНЦІЇ	
Грідіна І.М.	199
ОСВІТЯНСЬКИЙ ФРОНТ ВІЙНИ НА СХОДІ УКРАЇНИ	
Демчишак Р.Б.	209
ПРОБЛЕМА ФОРМИ ДЕРЖАВИ ТА РОЗПОДІЛУ ВЛАДИ У ПОЛІТОЛОГІЧНІЙ КОНЦЕПЦІЇ В'ЯЧЕСЛАВА ЛИПІНСЬКОГО	
Дорош Л.О., Лагода О.Б.	216
SWOT-АНАЛІЗ МИРОТВОРЧОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ УКРАЇНИ У КОНТЕКСТІ СУЧАСНИХ ВИКЛИКІВ МІЖНАРОДНІЙ ТА НАЦІОНАЛЬНІЙ БЕЗПЕЦІ	
Замікула Г.О.	225
ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ ПАРТІЙНОЇ СИСТЕМИ ТУРЕЦЬКОЇ РЕСПУБЛІКИ	
Іванець Т.М.	234
НОРМАТИВНО-ПРАВОВЕ ЗАБЕЗПЕЧЕННЯ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ ПОЛІТИЧНИХ ПАРТІЙ В ЯПОНІЇ	
Іванова І.І.	241
ЕРОЗІЯ НЕОКОРПОРАТИВНИХ ІНСТИТУТІВ У ШВЕЦІЇ	
Івасечко О.Я., Коваль О.В.	248
ЗАГРОЗИ ТА ВИКЛИКИ ДЛЯ КРАЇН БАЛТІЇ НА СУЧАСНОМУ ЕТАПІ ЄВРОІНТЕГРАЦІЇ	