



REVISTA INCLUSIONES

CENCIA EN TIEMPOS DE CAMBIOS

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Volumen 7 . Número Especial

Julio / Septiembre

2020

ISSN 0719-4706

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Editor Europa del Este

Dr. Aleksandar Ivanov Katrandzhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Lic. Graciela Pantigoso de Los Santos

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanese

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra

Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz

Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov

South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía

Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu

Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

REVISTA INCLUSIONES

REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie

Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar

Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo

*Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla,
México*

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto

Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandía

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar

Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau

Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg

*Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos*

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez

Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire

Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera

Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre

Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

+ Dr. Miguel León-Portilla

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura

*Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel",
España*

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros

Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández

Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango

Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut

Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras,
Honduras*

Dra. Yolando Ricardo

Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha

Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza

Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero

CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso
Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Dra. Elian Araujo
Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Romyana Atanasova Popova
Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa
Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal
Centro de Estudios Africanos, Portugal

Dra. Noemí Brenta
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca
Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel
Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik
Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec
INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant
Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalem, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro
Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov
Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez
Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio
Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Perú

Dra. María Laura Salinas
Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo
Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec
Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía
Santiago – Chile
Representante Legal
Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad de Concepción



BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN

CHANGING THE SYSTEM OF LAND RELATIONS AND RURAL DISPLACEMENT WITHIN THE PEASANT COMMUNITY IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STOLYPIN AGRARIAN REFORM: MODERNIZATION OR RESTORATION

Ph. D. Dmitry V. Kuznetsov
Omsk State Agrarian University, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3136-8943>
dv.kuznetsov@omgau.org

Fecha de Recepción: 11 de abril de 2020 – **Fecha Revisión:** 03 de mayo de 2020

Fecha de Aceptación: 30 de junio de 2020 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de julio de 2020

Abstract

The article deals with the issues of the correspondence of land relations and rural displacement, resulting in the implementation of Stolypin agrarian reform, to the ancient forms of Russian peasantry's community organization. Objective: To determine whether the Stolypin agrarian reform was an unfamiliar phenomenon for the traditions of community daily living activities in the Russian village. The *historical genetic method* will allow us to consider the evolutionary nature of changes taking place in the system of land relations within the peasant community during the implementation of Stolypin reform. Using the *ideographic method*, we will describe the unique and exceptional features of the Russian community, ensuring its long-term existence and functioning. The *retrospective method* will allow us to consistently penetrate deep into the historical past of the Russian peasant community. By means of the *comparative-historical method* an attempt will be made to provide the comparative and contrastive analysis of the situation existed in the Russian village during the Stolypin reform regarding the similar processes taking place in the Russian village during the Middle Ages. The *historical and typological method* will allow us to provide classification, by means of which it will be possible to determine the essence of the peasant community by identifying its main constituent elements. The *diachronic method* will be used to compare the main features of peasant community in different periods of its historical existence.

Keywords

March community – Khutor – Patrimony – Volost – "Golden age" of the Russian village

Para Citar este Artículo:

Kuznetsov, Dmitry V. Changing the system of land relations and rural displacement within the peasant community in the implementation of stolypin agrarian reform: modernization or restoration. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 130-154.

Licencia Creative Commons Attribution Non-Comercial 3.0 Unported
(CC BY-NC 3.0)

Licencia Internacional



PH. D. DMITRY V. KUZNETSOV

Introduction

Reforms by P.A. Stolypin in the agrarian sector of Russian social and economic life is a complex phenomenon. In the domestic historiography, they are characterized and evaluated ambiguously. The contradictory nature of judgments and assessments of the Stolypin reforms is usually explained by their "half-hearted", "limited" character, and their incompleteness. With all the contradictory opinions, the historians tend to agree that ultimately Stolypin failed to either destroy the peasant community or create a stratum of landowners. And, according to P.N. Zyryanov, "in general, all this venture with the khutors and land plots was a lot of far-fetched, doctrinaire. The khutors and land plots themselves did not ensure the rise of peasant farming, and the need for their widespread development is not proved by anyone."¹ In another of his books Zyryanov also writes: "The Stolypin reform had a smell of the lamp and abstractness, And the peasants fought against the reforms not because of their ignorance and inertia, but because most of them thought it was an absurd rich man idea interfering with the economic activities and diverting from the root issue of the land."²

It is also alleged that Stolypin instilled in the Russian peasants western patterns of life and thought, which are based on individualism, destroying the traditional forms of village life existence, and therefore the peasants actively opposed the reform. For example, according to V.D. Polkanov "...the reformers underestimated the deep essence of communal land ownership. The fact is that the community was not only the economic, but also the social and cultural (and politica as well) cell of Russian society. The collectivist values and the principle of social justice has developed in it. Therefore, Stolypin's tragic mistake consisted in that, under the onslaught of Western ideas, he encroached on the centuries-old way of peasant life, ignoring the Russian traditions and mentality.

Analysis of the situation also reveals the fact that Stolypin agrarian reform initially incorrectly formulated the concept of transformation itself: "community or farmer". That was a serious mistake: to turn the axis of Russia by reliance only on the private-owned peasant economy, the sale of land in private ownership. For a thousand-year history of Russia, the peasant land has never been sold. And in this respect Stolypin's reform was precisely that "great shock", against which Pyotr Arkadevich gave his famous Duma speech."³

A similar point of view is advocated by V.B. Shepelev: "Strongly and figuratively scourging his opponents on the left, and claiming that they would like to choose the path of radicalism, the way of liberation from" cultural traditions", Pyotr Arkadevich actually tried to become almost the most radical "burglar" of the historical past, spiritual traditions, and the most important strata of "cultural code" for the Russian great ethnos."⁴

¹ P. N. Zyryanov, Pyotr Stolypin: political portrait (Moscow: Higher education, 1992).

Lurie, S. "Russian statehood and the Russian community". Knowledge is a power, num 10 (1992): 4; 3 – 11.

² P. N. Zyryanov, Peasant community of the European Russia. 1907-1914 (Moscow: Science, 1992).

³ V. D. Polkanov "Lessons of the Stolypin Agrarian Reform". P.A. Stolypin and the historical experience of reforms in Russia. Proc. rep. and messages of the Scientific-practical. Conf, dedicated. 135th anniversary of the birth of. P.A. Stolypin, October 16 - 17, 1997 Omsk. Omsk State University, Om. Br. of the OIIF SB RAS, (1997): 87-90. C. 87 – 93.

⁴ V. B. Shepelev, "To the issue of modern historiographic situation concerning the reformist activities of P.A. Stolypin". P.A. Stolypin and the historical experience of reforms in Russia. Proc. rep. and messages of the Scientific-practical. Conf, dedicated. 135th anniversary of the birth of. P.A. Stolypin,

The examples of such assessments can be continued, but it seems that the above statements are enough to make a very definite conclusion. As an axiom of their arguments, the authors take the well-known scheme of the Russian communal collectivist tradition. Actively speaking against the idea of individual entities, they appeal to the ancient folk tradition, which, according to their point of view, consisted of the equalizing collectivism and the original aristocracy of the Russian peasant community, which did not accept the idea of isolated khutors. Taking into account the presented points of view, for his part the author of this study will try, based on the analysis of Russian literature, to find out what place in the community structure was occupied by the function regulating the land relations between its members in the period of formation and evolution.

Materials and Methods

The main methods used in this study were as follows:

1. The historical genetic method will allow to consider the evolutionary nature and the dynamics of changes taking place in the system of land relations within the peasant community during the implementation of Stolypin agrarian reform.

2. Using the ideographic method, the unique and exceptional features of the Russian community, ensuring its long-term existence and functioning, will be described.

3. The retrospective method will allow to consistently penetrate deep into the historical past of the Russian peasant community to identify its most typical and characteristic features and particularities. By means of this method it will be possible to carry out a gradual (retrogressive) movement from the later state of Russian peasant community to its earlier past state. In this way, the essential properties and qualities of Russian community will be singled out, and on this basis the measures taken by the government of P.A. Stolypin in the sphere of the communal and land relations transformation will be updated.

4. In this study the comparative-historical method means that by studying the known features of the peasant community a general idea of its internal structure will be revealed. This method will allow to provide the comparative analysis and draw the historic parallel between the system of land relations formed in the peasant community during the Stolypin agrarian reform and a similar system that existed in a historically earlier period - the period of classical Middle Ages. On the basis of comparative analysis it will be possible to establish the similarity of essential characteristics for the peasant community in different historical periods and to get an idea of its typological properties, functional purpose and forms of existence.

5. The historical and typological method will allow to make typologization, by means of which it will be possible to determine the essence of the peasant community by identifying its main constituent elements, clearly differentiating the concept of community as "a world" (rural society) and the community as an equalizing and remaking system of land ownership and land use within the framework of a more complex structural formation - a social institution, and a way of organizing the life activities of the peasant population in Russia. At the same time, the whole set of identified community's elements will allow to objectify it as a complex system, acting as a generic phenomenon in a broad sense, and the elements that enter it, as its simpler components in a narrower sense. Thus, it will be possible to

establish the qualitative certainty of the Russian peasant community, which is the main purpose of classification method.

6. The diachronic method will be used to compare the main features of peasant community in different periods of its historical existence and functioning. This method will help to reveal the essence and nature of changes taking place in the Russian countryside both during the implementation of Stolypin agrarian reform and in the period of developed Middle Ages, and provides an opportunity to trace the dynamics of development of the qualitatively new parameters in the Russian community.

Discussion

It is known that the community was formed in the pre-state era of peoplehood and at the early stages of history was the optimal form of organizing the life activities of population. If you appeal directly to Eastern Europe, in the territory of which the process of Russian state formation took place, then here - as claimed by L.V. Milov – "the formation of class society took place under the significant impact of natural and climatic conditions. The consequence of this, according to the author, was the centuries-old existence of Russian march community. The main reason for the viability of Russian community was its incomparably more important role in the organization of agricultural production than in Western Europe. It is in this lies its great inner strength and influence...Plowing of the virgin lands or the deposit, or the forest devastation, was a hard and laborious kind of agricultural production and required the combined efforts of several farms, and even the entire community, i.e. a cooperation"⁵. At the same time, the researcher admits that although the key points of the cycle of agricultural work (for example, plowing of the virgin lands) were associated with the production efforts of at least a few farms, the cycle itself was almost entirely "the object of individual, parcel farm work of the peasant household or small family"⁶.

Tracing the genesis of serfdom in the Russian state, Milov believes that the specificity of the development of feudal relations under the existence of march community was manifested in the system of rural settlement of peasants in the XIV - XV centuries, and partly in the XVII century. Characterizing this system, the historian refers to the results of a study conducted by A.Ya.

Degtyarev. In the course of his study of the history of the rural resettlement of peasants up to the XVII century, Degtyarev came to the conclusion that the small one- and two-court settlements were completely dominant in the Russian state until the end of the XVI century. According to data on 17149 settlements processed by A.Ya. Degtyaryov, there were 70.6% of one and two-court settlements in North-West Russia.⁷ According to L.V. Milov, apparently until the end of the XV century this type of rural settlement was also typical for the central part of country. However, since the end of the XV century, in the central regions this system

⁵ L. V. Milov, "Reasons for the emergence of serfdom in Russia". History of the USSR, num 3 (1985): 178–201.

⁶ L. V. Milov, "Reasons for the emergence of serfdom in Russia..."

⁷ A. Ya. Degtyarev, "Russian village in the XV-XVI centuries". Essays on the history of rural settlement. L.: Publishing House of Leningrad State University, 1980. 38,49, 103-107 and so on; 176; A. Ya. Degtyarev, "Rural settlements of the North-West of Russia". Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia in XVI century. (North, Pskov. General results of the development of the North-West) L. Science, vol III, sec II, ch 2 (1978): 145 – 146; 145 – 154 y T. I. Osminsky, "Population of the Novgorod pyatinas at the end of the XV century". Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia (second half of the XV - beginning of the XVI century.). L.: Science, vol I, sec III, ch 1 (1971): 324; 321 – 328.

of rural settlement is gradually replaced by another, with the predominance of a larger settlements (6 courts and more)⁸.

In fact, these findings do not contradict the results of research by a well-known pre-revolutionary specialist in the history of rural community in the medieval Rus, N.P. Pavlov - Silvansky, who once stated that "a significant part of villages described in our cadastres of XV-XVI centuries, consisted of one court... the villages with 2, 3, and 4 courts resulted from the division of a village, one farm yard apart (meaning the disintegration of patriarchal big family and the allocation of sons). The scribe books preserved the clear traces of the village unity, consisting of a few courts... the original type of village - a separate plow farm with a private courtyard"⁹. "Today our large villages - multi-yard villages - arose very late, and in ancient times, undoubtedly, the settlement was dominated by the khutors, as they named now. This is one of the firmly established provisions of our science. Originally, and in the North until the XVI century a separate farm was undoubtedly called the rural community and the village."¹⁰.

Right to the land of a free peasant was often called "patrimony", as well as the boyar possession¹¹. The totality of such courtyards was called a volost. The center of volost was a church built jointly by the isolated khutors - farms (villages), and sometimes its worldly monastery, where the treasury of community was kept, the worldly gatherings were held, children were taught letters, the charity affairs were organized, etc.¹²

As for the "ancestral" principles of land use, N.P. Pavlov - Silvansky proves that these principles were almost identical both in the German march, which became the foundation of the West European agrarian system, and in the Russian community before it became enslaved: "Members of the volost march community, in addition to their right to use communal lands, were the land owners on the right of ownership. They freely disposed of their hereditary plots, as evidenced by the numerous deeds of purchase and other acts. Our terms "rural community of the lands" and "village" exactly match with the terms "HUF" or "MANSUS" (land property of a peasant from the march). The whole farming household, a yard with a manor land (courtyard), arable land and reep, and all kinds of land, was called the "rural community"¹³.

The similarity of the Russian community with the German march, in the opinion of Pavlov-Silvansky, is explained not by the borrowing and unaccidental coincidence, but by the similar development under the influence of identical conditions and, in part, by the Aryan interrelationship of Russian law with the German law¹⁴. The right of private land ownership was especially developed in the Russian North. Sale, mortgage, exchange, withdrawal, donation and other transactions in relation to the land were made by the Russian peasants without any interference of state administration, at least until the first half of the XVII century,

⁸ L. V. Milov, "Reasons for the emergence of serfdom in Russia". History of the USSR, num 3 (1985): 178–201.

⁹ N. P. Pavlov-Silvansky, Feudalism in Russia (Moscu: Science, 1988).

¹⁰ N. P. Pavlov-Silvansky, Feudalism in Russia...

¹¹ L. Alaev, "Private property in the holy Russia". Novoe vremya, num 10 (1991): 37 – 39 y D. I. Raskin; I. Ya. Frayanov y A. L. Shapiro. "On the forms of state peasant landownership in XIV - XVII centuries". Problems of peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Russia. L.: Science, (1972): 5 – 44.

¹² N. P. Pavlov-Silvansky, Feudalism in Russia...

¹³ N.P. Pavlov-Silvansky, Feudalism in Russia...

¹⁴ N.P. Pavlov-Silvansky, Feudalism in Russia...

inclusively¹⁵. Even in the post-primal times, the Law Book of 1589 recorded throughout the territory the private property of state (chernososhnye) peasants on the land with the right to inherit and sell it, although with the consent of relatives¹⁶.

According to A.L. Shapiro, in cadastral and other documents that reflect the nature of agrarian relations in the North-West Russia in the XV-XVI centuries, "it comes to the private owners, who either purchase the communal lands or achieve their acquisition. In some cases, the land passes to those private owners completely, in others - partly in the documents examined the forestry, haymaking, fishing or hunting grounds served as the communal possessions. There is no mention of arable land and much less of a farmstead land, because the farmsteads and arable land were relatively early placed at the disposal of individual owners - the commoner-members; the community disposes of such plots only when they become escheated... The sources of XIV - XV centuries do not give grounds for the assumption of the existence at this time of community processing or redistribution of land. The allotment plots, arable land and sometimes meadows were owned by the individual peasant families"¹⁷.

In this case, the historian refers to the study of A.I. Kopanev, who considers the state land ownership of the XV-XVII centuries as a kind of synthesis of the private (mostly) and communal peasant land ownership. "We have, - wrote Kopanev, - the numerous evidences of land sale, exchange and testament to the monasteries by the volost peasants. This indicates that the peasants owned land on the rights of private property. But it is also certain that part of the volost lands was in the common possession of all peasants in the volost - at the disposal of the world"¹⁸. In another study, A.I. Kopanev also notes that in the state North of the XVI century, "with the private ownership of yard, the farmsteads and arable lands, part of the mowing and forests adjacent to the arable lands, there also was the communal ownership of pastures, commercial lands (part of the fishing lands, hunting grounds, sometimes haymaking, Etc.) and forests"¹⁹.

Another major and authoritative historian, N.E. Nosov, also, referring to the studies of A.I. Kopanev other authors and thousands of peasant acts of the late XV-XVI century, argues that "the state peasants already at this time had a real right to sell, buy, change, transfer by inheritance, mortgage" by bondage" and perform any other operations with their lands. And not only had this right, but also widely used it, as a rule, without any sanctions from the both volost and princely authorities. The role of so-called black volosts, in addition to the disposal of communal lands (mainly pastures and forests) that were not owned by the peasant, in XV-XVI centuries was reduced only to the tax administrative territorial

¹⁵ E. N. Shveikovskaya, Customary law in the land and administrative transactions of the North Russian peasants at the first half of the XVII century. (Based on the materials of Sol'vychevskiy Uyezd) // History of the USSR, num 2 (1985): 96 – 111 y A. I. Konapaev, "Peasant land ownership of the Dungeon in the XVI century". Problems of the peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Russia. L.: Science, (1972): 103 -137.

¹⁶ E. Starikov, "Community: from the Russian march to equalizing redistribution". Knowledge is a power, num 3 (1994): 18; 16 – 24. Strukov, D. B. Stolypin (Moscu: Veche, 2012).

¹⁷ A. L. Shapiro, "Black volost". Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia (Second half of the XVth - beginning of the XVI century). L.: Science, vol I sec II ch 1 (1971): 53 – 57.

¹⁸ A. I. Konapaev, The history of land ownership in the Belozersk region of the XV - XVI centuries (Moscow: Leningrad Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1951).

¹⁹ A.I. Konapaev, "Northern Dvina". Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia of the XVI century (North, Pskov, the general results of the development of the North-West). L.: Science, vol III, sec I, ch 1 (1978): 13; 5 – 36.

organization of the state peasantry, to protect the interests of peasant world, and to ensure its relations with the outside world - neighboring feudal lords and state authorities" ²⁰

Thus, the community of free peasants did not encroach on the regulation of land ownership and economic activities of its members, and its function was limited to the rules of secular self-government: protection from the external administrative or other pressures, mutual assistance, joint church construction, charity, etc. The presence of these forms of joint organization allowed the Russian peasants to perform such labor-intensive work as clearing of woods, shoots, shrubs, uprooting stumps, draining swamps, etc., which, due to the severe natural and geographical conditions of European Russia and the unusually busy budget of Russian farmers, was necessary to carry out as soon as possible. In any new region, where the Russian peasant colonization took place, the peasant communities were formed very quickly, the land use form was captive, i.e. every peasant could get as much land as wanted. Communities - the collective villages that have emerged because of the population densification, and the land deficit leads to the equalizing land use system. If the peasants were evicted to a new area, where the land was sufficient, the land use form once again became captive, and the volost acted as a community (several separate peasant households). The volost-based communities were widespread in Siberia as early as the beginning of XX century²¹. We also should notice that in Siberia the isolated peasant households were called zaimki (small settlements). In fact, this is perhaps the oldest borrowed form of the Siberian community²², widely spread even 100 years ago, was a late copy of the free-khutor settlement system, which dominated in the rural community of European Russia 500 years ago and earlier, i.e. before the enslavement. "Land mastered by the right to capture, - wrote N.P. Pavlov-Silvansky – represents the full ownership of the person, who captured it"²³.

The small settlements were especially widespread in the Old Believers, who were not only the adherents of ancient Orthodoxy canons, but also preserved the most archaic forms of settlements and the organization of economic and everyday life activities. "In the conditions of colonization of the Far East [and also of Eastern Siberia - D.K.], the zaimki were the most optimal variant of the Russian settlements, they gave opportunities to the economic experiment under new conditions, the adaptation to such conditions. The economic orientation of small settlements, khutors were facilitated by natural conditions. In the complex management of borrowing economy, one of the directions was allocated as the major, bringing the main income (plowing, paddy, reindeer, hunting, fishing directions)"²⁴.

One of the peculiarities of the Old Believer's small settlement in Siberia and the Far East is its similarity with the Old Believers' small monastery, which preserved the most

²⁰ N. E. Nosov, "On Two Trends in the Development of Feudal Landholding in the Northeast Russia in the XV - XVI Centuries". Problems of the peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Russia. L.: Science (1972): 44 – 71.

²¹ S. Lurie, "Russian statehood and the Russian community", Knowledge is a power, num10 (1992): 3 – 11.

²² L. G. Sukhotina, "Forms of the land use, agricultural systems and tools in the Siberian vil-lage of the second half of the XIX century". Questions of the history of Siberia, Issue 3. Tomsk, (1967): 58 – 70 y L. M. Goryushkin, "Siberian peasantry at the turn of the two centuries (late XIX - early XX)". Novosibirsk. Academy of Sciences of the USSR. CO. Institute of History, Philology and Philosophy, 1967.

²³ N. P. Pavlov-Silvansky, Feudalism in Russia (Moscu: Science, 1988).

²⁴ V. V. Kobko, "Zaimka of the Old Believer peasants. South of the Far East (the middle of the XIX century - 30-ies of XX century)", Russia and the Asia-Pacific Region, num 1, (1999): 59 - 67.

ancient tradition of eremitic hermitage, which was pointed out by N.N. Pokrovsky. The uninhabited, remote taiga places always attracted the Christian hermits, who decided to leave the worldly passions and live in solitude, pray and work. These places also served as a shelter for peasants, soldiers fled from the persecution of authorities for various reasons. "If you are strong - fight, if you are weak - run" - a slogan quite popular among the Old Believers who, since the split time, fled to the taiga wilderness, unknown lands from the persecution of official authorities, the church, and later from the "anti-christian Soviet authorities", collectivization. "... In the difficult matter of the initial development of region, the peasant escape and traditions of the hermitage life sometimes closely intertwined with each other"²⁵. It was difficult to predict in advance what would be the hermitage under favorable conditions like: "a traditional small peasant settlement or not less traditional Old Believers' desert"²⁶

At the same time, the Old Believers living in the isolated small settlements (or in the small monasteries) continued to consider themselves as members of the only one church and one community, within which the church was located. According to an ancient traditional terminology, such a church community was called "the world". This name accurately characterizes the inner essence of the peasant community based on the long traditions of territorial ("worldly") self-government.

In this regard, N.P. Pavlov-Silvansky pointed out: "In the community, two elements are easily distinguished: 1. a world, a worldly self-government; 2. the communal land ownership or land use with the land redistribution... For the first time, the redistribution appears in the XV-XVI centuries under the external, landlord or governmental taxation influence... the world has existed long before the communal land use arose"²⁷. In this regard, Yu.P. Borodai rightly stressed that "The distinction between two elements of the community is extremely important, since in the prevailing literature the tendency to identify the community relations with the system of joint land use and collective responsibility is very strong, i.e. to reduce their entire essence to a secondary, purely fiscal in function element imposed on the outside. The authors proceed from this common view, when trying to "bring" the jointly socialist features from the "ancient" worldly traditions"²⁸.

Proceeding from the foregoing, it seems that the introduction of Stolypin's farm system alongside the local self-management is *objectively* nothing more than the revival of the ancient, long-forgotten pre-serf principles of the worldly organization of Russian village, which is freed from the collective responsibility and forced equalizing collectivism in the landownership and land use imposed on the Russian peasantry by the bureaucratic-serf system of the absolutist state. "The establishment of Russian village from the community was considered by a reformer as a natural process of its resume to the natural course, getting rid of the historical deformations of serfdom and as a regular stage in the development of world agriculture"²⁹. In fact, Stolypin completed the work begun and unfinished by the reform of 1861; - the peasant liberation with land assigning. The community became a free association of family farms - what it was before the development

²⁵ N. N. Pokrovsky, "Peasant escape and hermitage customs in Siberia of the XVIII century". The peasantry of Siberia XVIII - early XX century: (Class struggle, social consciousness, culture) – Novosibirsk (1975): 19-49.

²⁶ N. N. Pokrovsky, "Peasant escape and hermitage customs..."

²⁷ N. P. Pavlov-Silvansky, Feudalism in Russia...

²⁸ Yu. P. Boroday, "Who should be the owner of the land", Our contemporary, num 3 (1991): 102 – 119.

²⁹ D. B. Strukov, Stolypin (Moscu: Veche, 2012).

of serfdom in Russia. At the same time, the weak communities died out, the viable co-existed alongside and together with the rural strips. In other words, P.A. Stolypin did not destroy all the communities by his reform³⁰, and mainly, the semi-integrated and not semi-integrated communities renounced the land-distribution functions were not destroyed, and converted, the land planning took place therein.

The main purpose of land planning, as known, was the destruction of multiline, strip farming, and far landing. As a consequence, many, and sometimes all, accompanying shortcomings were eliminated. Under the law of 29 May 1911, it was envisaged not only to improve the land area of peasants, but also to transfer land to the personal ownership of the householder without additional acts, immediately upon the approval of project by the land management commissions. It was not necessary to leave the community in advance to secure the land for yourselves, as it was before the adoption of this law. At the same time, part of the land plots (mainly pastures, forests and hayfields), usually should have remained in the communal or group ownership³¹. The mentioned above order existed in the Russian community during the Middle Ages³².

In addition, the Law of 14 June 1910 considerably simplified the procedure for leaving the communities subject to the land planning, in which there were no reorganizations after 1861. There were no needs to get permission from a rural gathering there, all you need to do is to file the application. Since the end of 1910, the applications of householders from such communities have already been registered separately. During 1910 - 1915 it was filed 618 thousand applications or almost 200 thousand less than from the communities with redistribution (811, 5 thousand) for the same years. This is probably due to the fact that in the uninhabited communities, essentially there was a homestead, rather than a communal land tenure³³. Such a community with a household ownership was already much closer to the original type - the farmstead that prevailed in the black-eared volosts of the medieval northeastern and north-western Russia up to the 2nd half of XVII century.

Consequently, the spirit of economic individualism in the Russian community was not only preserved, but also strengthened. "In all communities, - V.G. Tyukavkin noted, - it was not a collective property, as later on collective farms, but a household form of owning, processing and using the land plots. The land was divided between the courts, and the householder could rent the land or a portion of it. Each family processed its own strips separately, and all production in the community was not collective, but individual"³⁴.

Obviously, by analyzing it in this perspective, one can understand the conclusion made by F.A. Shakurova, which is that "the existence of communal property did not exclude, but on the contrary, presupposed the existence of independent (private) owners. Community ownership was not also an obstacle to the individual (or individual family) ownership of land.

³⁰ V. G. Tyukavkin, Great-Russian peasantry and Stolypin agrarian reform (Moscu: Monuments of historical thought, 2001).

³¹ V. G. Tyukavkin, Great-Russian peasantry and Stolypin...

³² Sh. M. Munchaev y V. M. Ustinov, History of Russia: Textbook for high schools - 3rd ed., rev.. and ext. (Moscow: Infra-M-Norma, 2000).

³³ K. Matsuzato, "Stolypin reform and the Russian agrotechnological revolution". Domestic history, num 6 (1992): 194 – 200 y A. M. Anfimov, "Unfinished disputes", Issues of History, num 6 (1997): 41 – 67.

³⁴ V. G. Tyukavkin, Great-Russian peasantry and Stolypin agrarian reform (Moscu: Monuments of historical thought, 2001. 303.

It rather acted as a guarantor of the existence of the latter, performing the function of external protection"³⁵.

Some elements of collectivism still remained in work: together they started sowing, haymaking, harvesting, and some families were equal to others. But this was more associated not with the communal property, but with the neighborly way of life in the village³⁶. Therefore, it is not necessary to speak of the artificial promotion of individualism by Stolypin among the peasants. Stolypin did not promote the individualism, but developed.

However, he took into account the psychology of rural inhabitants, who sought for objective or subjective circumstances to establish the community-based associations, already being the owner. Thus, when responding to the governors, Stolypin declared: "One can not help but take into account the fact that, according to firmly established practice, the subsequent resettlement of the already existing rural society to the khutors does not entail the destruction of this society as an administrative unit"³⁷. Therefore, he recommended flexible approach to the issue of the formation of new rural societies: "An administrative rural society can be formed from the farmers who settled within one estate or in the neighborhood closest to each other, if such a measure is caused by any economic or administrative considerations"³⁸.

These words clearly and unequivocally show that Stolypin, by his reformist policy in the agrarian sector, contrary to the claims of many critics who tried to reproach him for destroying the age-old principles and forms of social (wordly) self-government that underlie the traditional way of village life, did not at all attempt to them, but on the contrary testify how subtly and deeply he understood the psychology of the Russian peasant and at the same time with what respect he treated its mental attitudes. And this position was not only the personal opinion of P.A. Stolypin. It was the basis of the entire state land management policy of the government.

The fact that the government land administration bodies, implementing the policy of liquidation of the communal-redistributive system of land ownership and land use, by no means sought to destroy the traditional system of the wordly organization of life among the Russian peasants, which presupposed the joint solution of many administrative and legal issues of village activities, is evidenced by the statement of perhaps the most famous specialist in the field of land management - A.A. Kofod, who also denied the statement about the alienation of farm economy from the rural societies problems: "As the status of the farmer becomes more and more secure, hunting for public affairs awakens again, and in the countries, where peasants have long settled in the khutors, the social life thrives, as nowhere else"³⁹. Life in the farm formed in the peasant the respect for property, responsibility for the

³⁵ F.A. Shakurova, "Relating the issue of the relations between the concepts "owner" and "master." (Applied to the Community Traditions of the Peoples of the Eurasian World.)". *Russia and the East: Traditional Culture, Ethno-Cultural and Ethno-Social Processes: Proceedings of the IV International Scientific Conference "Russia and the East: Problems of Interaction"*, Institute of Oriental Studies, RAS; N.A. Tomilov (Ed.), et al.] Omsk: [unmb.], (1997): 33 – 35.

³⁶ V. G. Tyukavkin, *Great-Russian peasantry and Stolypin agrarian reform* (Moscow: Monuments of historical thought, 2001).

³⁷ Circular to the governors of June 16, 1910. P.A. Stolypin: *The Edge of Talent Politics* (Moscow: ROSSPEN: 274; 622

³⁸ Circular to the governors of June 16, 1910...

³⁹ A. A. Kofod, *Stolypin reform and land surveyor: Documents, correspondence, memoirs*. MOSCOW: the Russian way, 2003.

economic consequences of his actions. Based on his own experience, Kofod noticed: "In all the villages, where the peasants moved to the well-rounded farmsteads, all disputes about the land grabbing, wasting, felling, etc., cease after the settlement, and in connection with this, the fights also stop"⁴⁰.

Along with the transformations in the field of land relations P.A. Stolypin intended to implement the reform of local self-government, i.e., the peasant self-government shall be included in the work of zemstvo, which, in the reform of the sixties of XIX century was very apical, lordly. Stolypin's bill "On the establishment of main principles of the local self-government structure" abolished the estate-noble principle of local authority. Under the new provision the volost was a continuous territorial district. It included all the land estates "without distinction between the estate and the position of their owners." On this basis, in the distant future, the integration of two cultures - the nobility and the peasantry - was to be carried out. The volost governing body was organized on an electoral basis. The reform of local self-government, which was aimed at restoring the old, original "first element of the community" in the liberated village, i.e. the wordly rules universally accepted in Rus until the peasants were enslaved, was intended to become the political formulation of agrarian legislation⁴¹.

It is characteristic that the government-imposed khutors were also included in the rural societies with all their medieval features. The circular dated 16 June 1910, № 44 P.A. Stolypin pointed out that "from the farmers living in the neighborhood closest to each other, a rural society can be formed." The farmers could be the "members of their former societies". In general, as noted by S.M. Dubrovsky, "the government tried to maintain the old administrative and economic system. On 22 December 1914 the Minister of Internal Affairs, Maklakov, sent to the governors a "completely confidential" circular under No. 65, which stressed that in connection with the elections to the zemstvos and the upcoming elections to the State Duma, the volost, while retaining the character of administrative and economic unit, has acquired in addition the political value". In this regard, *from this point of view* [my italics - D.K.] it was proposed to find approach to the issue of creating new volosts or changing the boundaries of former one.

Thus, the tsarist government, by adopting the Decree of 9 November 1906, which became the Law on 10 June 1910, and then the temporary rules on land management on 4 March 1906, which became the Law on 29 May 1911, made a certain step forward in the bourgeois reforming of village. However, in these laws and their subsequent explanations, additions, and in the drafting new laws, many provisions reflected the remnants of semi-serfdom relations were remained as is"⁴². Under the "remnants of semi-serf relations" S.M. Dubrovsky evidently understood the elements of wordly administrative and legal structure of the rural communities preserved in them from the time of the late Middle Ages.

Desire of the tsarist government to include the newly formed khutors and other forms of organization of the individual peasant farms in the existing or newly created system of local self-government bodies was indicated by the contemporary researcher D. Strukov.

⁴⁰ A. A. Kofod, Stolypin reform and land surveyor: Documents, correspondence, memoirs (Moscow: the Russian way, 2003).

⁴¹ Yu. P. Boroday, "Who should be the owner of the land". Our contemporary, num 3 (1991): 102 – 119.

⁴² S. M. Dubrovsky, "Stolypin land reform". From the history of agriculture and peasantry of Russia in the early XX century (Moscow: Science, 1963).

"What concerns the European part of the country, the farms arose here in a considerable quantity and the separate peasant households, the small settlements located side by side, were sought to fit into the already established management structure the by the local government approval. It was a question of uniting these individual farms into the new administrative rural societies, even in those cases where their integration was still only in the initial phase. It was enough to have a common bakery store or school, so that such an association took place⁴³. At the same time, the peasants could remain the members of their former societies "using, until the voluntary withdrawal from them, all the related to the membership of these societies rights, equally bearing the corresponding responsibilities"⁴⁴.

Proceeding from the above observations and provisions, it is quite natural to raise the question of the need to develop a deeper and more correct methodological approach in determining the essence of the peasant community, clearly differentiating the concepts of the community as "the world" (or rural society) and the community as an equalizing and remaking farming system. It can be assumed that these two elements, by definition of N.P. Pavlov -Silvansky, *are two kinds that existed within the same type - community*, as a system of social organization of the life activities of Russian peasants. At that, the world (rural society), as a kind, was a private and moreover a much older form of peasants' existence. It can be interpreted as a community in the narrow sense of the word. This original, primordial kind of the rural community was an integral and main part of the community, as a type of social organization, as a community in the broad sense of the word, representing its essential side, its core. Along with this, the community as an equalizing system with the land redistribution was a different, much later form, which began to form around the end of the XV and especially in the XVI – XVIII centuries under the external governmental or taxation influence. This second kind of community "overlapped" the first kinds - the world (rural society) - and conditioned the existence of community as a type in the broad sense, as now a complex, combined social system consisting of two kinds (or elements by definition of N.P. Pavlov-Silvansky).

Therefore, when the researchers substantiate the thesis that "in the course of Stolypin agrarian reform there was a community destruction", it means the destruction of community, as a second, later type - the equalizing and remaking system. It should always be borne in mind that the first type of community, as a self-governing world within the community as the social and cultural type in the broad sense of the word, was preserved and restored in the former, long-lost rights.

And the world - a self-governing rural society, and the equalizing and remaking system of land ownership and land use, and the system of social organization of the life activities in the peasants is legitimate to call "community" as a whole. Only in the first and second cases it should be speak of communities - as kinds in the narrow sense, and in the third - about the community - as a type in the broad sense, consisting of these two kinds. In other words, to designate all three forms one concept of "community" can be used, but it will have three different meanings:

- 1 - "World", a self-governing rural society – the first kind of community in the original narrow sense;
- 2 – Equalizing and remaking system of land ownership and land use – the second, much more recent kind of community in the narrow sense;

⁴³ D. B. Strukov, Stolypin (Moscu: Veche, 2012).

⁴⁴ D. B. Strukov, Stolypin...

3 – The system of social (and also obviously cultural and religious) organization of the life activities in the peasants - a complex kind of community in a broad sense, consisting of two simple marked kinds.

The issue of distinguishing *two kinds of community within a single type of community*, as a social organization, is important precisely because "after the release of householders from the community, [as an equalizing and remaking system - D.K.], they remained legally the members of society [the world - D. K.] and had the right to vote at the gatherings, although there are some cases when the community members demanded to expel them from the gatherings. The latter was recognized by the authorities as a violation of the law. Consequently, the peasants' release from the community did not eliminate the rural society [the world - D.K.] and, most importantly, the village gathering, which was supposed to solve the issues of common economic activities and support to the widows and orphans, and the repair of roads and public wells, and many others.

On the other hand, in the farmstead, including the khutors, where there was no community [as a second kind in the narrow sense of the word - D.K.], there were some rural societies [the worlds - D.K.] and gatherings that solved almost all the same problems, except for only the land relations: gatherings in the farmstead could not cut off the part of land and transfer it to others, although they invaded the issues of crop rotation, the start of sowing, the struggle against weeds, and others"⁴⁵. As it was observed by V.G. Tyukavkin "the mass release of peasants from the communities did not mean the elimination of rural gatherings in the villages and should not eliminate... the positive aspects of "the world": its functions passed to the rural society, which was also characterized by a collective solution of issues at the gatherings, in the collective resolution of self-management issues or the emergence of domestic difficulties"⁴⁶. In other words, when the community was liquidated as a peasants' equalizing system of farming, both the housekeepers, the free peasants owned by the plot of land (otrubniki), and the farmers remained the members of the rural society - "the world" in the former terminology - endowed with very broad rights of volost self-government.

By the way, this important aspect was not fully appreciated by such great and authoritative researchers of the peasant community, who belonged to the liberal and populist trends, as A.A. Kaufman, K.R. Kachorovsky and others. For example, A.A. Kaufman clearly exaggerated, when he compared the Siberian peasant borrowers with the Robinsons on the uninhabited scraps of land. After all, he himself admitted that the borrowers were part of the community - the world. Summarizing the results of the Siberian studies, A.A. Kaufman came to the conclusion that by having developed a certain territory, the community - the world reserves the right for its use only for the members - it grants them the right, and does not allow the strangers to get the right for the land within its own territory developed"^{47 48}.

On the long existence of personal peasant property in the northern regions of medieval Rus, P.A. Stolypin was knowledgeable himself. He acquired this knowledge, obviously, from his own uncle, the famous researcher, an agrarian journalist - Dmitry

⁴⁵ V. G. Tyukavkin, *Great-Russian peasantry and Stolypin agrarian reform* (Moscu: Monuments of historical thought, 2001).

⁴⁶ V. G. Tyukavkin, *Great-Russian peasantry and Stolypin...*

⁴⁷ D. I. Raskin; I. Ya. Frayanov y A. L. Shapiro, "On the forms of state peasant landownership in XIV - XVII centuries". *Problems of peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Rus-sia. L.: Science*, (1972): 5 – 44.

⁴⁸ B. A. Alexandrov, "Occurrence of the rural communities in Siberia", *History of the USSR*, num 1 (1987): 54–68.

Arkadevich Stolypin. Over the course of his life, the latter was fascinated by the problems of agricultural reorganization, the organization of rural life, he became the author of many serious works on the ways of improving the agriculture published in Russia and abroad. Thoroughly studying the cadasters of ancient Novgorod, Pskov and some other cities, D. A. Stolypin was convinced that the communal system of land ownership and land use arose in the Russian state together with the appearance of serfdom in the XVI century⁴⁹, i.e., rather late.

Proceeding from all stated, it is possible to notice, that by his transformations Stolypin, obviously, not so much destroyed the Russian community, but mainly restored its ancient, primordial appearance with its first initial element, which it had before the enslavement and which it subsequently lost, namely, the wordly (rural) self-government under the individual ownership of arable land by the individual peasant farms. He destroyed the secondary fiscal function, which was not inherent in the traditional Russian community, imposed on it (the community) by the absolutist-serf-state system. This fiscal bureaucratic function consisted of petty tutelage and regulation of the economic life and activities of the peasant farmer.

That is why the assertion that Stolypin failed to destroy the community does not quite correspond to the truth, since Stolypin was destroying not the community itself, as a type of social organization of the peasantry in the broad sense of this concept, but the communal system of land ownership and land use as one, and the latter kind in a narrow sense, i.e. that rigid form of the community that kept the peasants in the semi-serfdom dependence through the mechanism of equalizing redistribution of the land and mutual responsibility.

Apparently, approximately the same conclusion was made by D.B. Strukov, asserting, for example, that "the Stolypin variant of strengthening small peasant property accelerated the self-destruction of secondary, deformed feudal layer of tradition, while the social core of national patterns of life and thought - the traditional family - received the additional incentives and advantages from the reform"⁵⁰.

From what has been said it is obvious that in the case of successful implementation of Stolypin agrarian policy by the autocracy, the tendency of capitalist development of agrarian production that was clearly apparent at the end of the XV century and not having received the proper normal development, and in the future, apparently, almost disappeared under the influence of such external adverse factors as oprichnina, and followed after it enslavement, absolutism, bureaucratization of government, etc., could later be realized in Russia.

Here it should be recalled that since the era of centralization, the end of the XV - first half of the XVI century and especially later, up to the second half of the XVII century, there were two opposing trends in the development of social and economic system in Russia: feudal serfdom and commodity-capitalism, although these terms may not fully correspond to the reality of that time and therefore not quite accurately and adequately reflect the essence of the ongoing processes. The first trend was mainly represented by the nobility, the second - by the peasantry. Both social strata have adapted their economy in different ways to the new economic conditions, to the conditions of the XV-XVI centuries that are beginning in Russia with the commodity-money market economy. The nobility - and this was

⁴⁹ G. P. Sidorovnin y P. A. Stolypin, *Life for the fatherland* (Moscú: TERRA - Book club, 2002)

⁵⁰ D. B. Strukov, *Stolypin* (Moscú: Veche, 2012).

supported by the growing power - "endeavored to establish a corvee serf system in their estates and to limit the peasant land use as much as possible; The peasants, on the contrary, sought to secure the right of land ownership to their lands, the maximum reduction of feudal duties and the right to maintain a free small-scale farm"⁵¹. Since, as N.E. Nosov noticed - "it is the intensity of development of small-scale peasant farming that usually leads to more progressive forms of the emergence of new bourgeois ties in the bowels of the feudal economy... And although in Russia of the XVI century not the second, but the first way of agrarian development won, both of which were ultimately the result of those serious changes in the economic development of the country that are characteristic of most European countries of the XV –XVI centuries...

As for the progress of this process in Russia, for its effectiveness, the decisive issue was the fate of black volost land as the social and economic unit that, in the conditions of the continuing peasant colonization and strengthening of Moscow Rus, directly opposed both feudal land ownership and serfdom and in the depths of which the earliest and most clearly manifested features of the new, early bourgeois regime that was emerging in the Russian village"⁵².

Namely in the XV-XVI centuries there was a very significant process of restructuring agrarian relations in Russia. According to N.E. Nosov, "at that time embracing most of the country's regions - and especially the city - the development of commodity-money relations could not but directly influence the fate of the state peasantry; *and, namely, the black land ownership of the XV –XVI centuries, because of its antisignorial nature and the maximum (according to the conditions of that time) freedom from the feudal dependence was precisely the medium in which the smallest commodity peasant economy is most rapidly and early developing in the bowels of the earth*"⁵³ [my Italics - D.K.]. To confirm this important conclusion, Nosov refers both to the work of many researchers, and to his own monograph⁵⁴. He notes that "in the field of land ownership, this [the development of small-scale peasant farming – D.K.] finds expression in the appearance of rural rich peasants, who in their economic activities are already following a new path. They conduct a wide trade in agricultural commodities, and the capital they receive from this is invested both in agriculture, and in trade and trade, the labor of the rural poor, ladies (tenant-sharecroppers) and hired workers-"laborers" and "Cossacks". Social differentiation among the state peasants is dramatically increasing. And many large villages of the XVI century, especially those connected with the salt production, generally turned into the trade and craft settlements of suburb type.

The most graphic illustration of this process is provided by the development of the black volosts of the Russian Pomerania, which in the XVI century was one of the most developed regions of Russia, a region that has turned into a region of almost complete black-landed landownership after the liquidation of Novgorod's boyarsis. According to the occupied territory, the Pomorian lands covered almost half of Russia in the XVI century"⁵⁵. Many peasants of Russian Pomerania, as Nosov's study of the history of the economic activities of their families show, for almost two centuries, later became large merchants and

⁵¹ N. E. Nosov, "On Two Trends in the Development of Feudal Landholding in the Northeast Russia in the XV - XVI Centuries". Problems of the peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Russia. L.: Science (1972): 44 – 71.

⁵² N. E. Nosov, "On Two Trends in the Development..."

⁵³ N. E. Nosov, "On Two Trends in the Development..."

⁵⁴ N. E. Nosov, Formation of the caste representative institutions in Russia. L.: Science, 1969. 602.

⁵⁵ N. E. Nosov, "On Two Trends in the Development..."

industrialists. "Suffice it to say that from among such Dvina peasants, rich in the late XV century, the famous Russian industrialists and merchants the Stroganovs came out. It is curious that it was from these Dvina peasants ("trade muzhiks"), and not from representatives of the Moscow eminent merchant class, that the first trade delegation to England was formed by Tsar Ivan IV, who went there in 1556 together with Captain Richard Chancellor.

The history of the process of bourgeoisizing the Russian peasantry is, of course, a special issue requiring the broader mediations and proofs, but it is important to state the very fact that *the initial source of this process was the private ownership of land, which in the XVI century had already acquired the features of early bourgeois property. It can hardly be doubted that such a process took place, although perhaps not on such a large scale, among the state peasants in the central regions of Russia*⁵⁶. [my Italics - D.K.].

The issue of two tendencies in the development of social and economic system of Russia in the XVI century was raised in a controversial manner right back in 1967, relating with the study of the land reform of Ivan the Terrible⁵⁷. And as a positive fact, N.E. Nosov pointed out that a special study of the agrarian history of North-West Russia at the end of the XV – XVI centuries, which was carried out by Leningrad historians - agrarians under the direction of A.L. Shapiro, largely confirmed his assumptions. In any case, the authors formulated the conclusions of Volume I this way: "At the end of the XV century two ways of the feudal agriculture development were clearly defined. *The first way* – is a way without a landlord (or a private patrimony), without serfdom, with a norm of exploitation that gives opportunities for some accumulation in the rich peasant holdings. This way contributed to the development of peasant economic initiative, the development of monetary value in the peasant economy, and the development of the peasants breaking. In the future, it *undoubtedly should lead to a more rapid transition to capitalism*. This way was planned for the sovereign rentable lands. Where, after the confiscation of Ivan III, the size of taxation decreased and there was no petty regulation of the peasants' life and welfare.

Another way meant strengthening and expansion of the landed and patrimonial landownership, gradual breaking of the traditional low levels of peasants taxation, an increase in the level of exploitation and associated enslavement. This way *inevitably led to the hampering of the producer's economic initiative, the development of base services, the delay in the rates of economic development*"⁵⁸.

All this suggests that in Russia at the end of the XV – XVI centuries, as in the several countries of Western Europe, there were the potential opportunities for the development of peasant landholding of the farmer type, which already has the bourgeois tendencies, but the development of landed system especially intensified during the oprichnina years, when almost all the state lands in the central region were distributed to the demesne lands, undermined this process. Agricultural development in Russia has gone a different path: the

⁵⁶ N. E. Nosov, "On Two Trends in the Development of Feudal Landholding in the Northeast Russia in the XV - XVI Centuries". Problems of the peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Russia. L.: Science (1972): 44 – 71.

⁵⁷ N. E. Nosov, The Council of "reconciliation" in 1549 and issues of local government (at the crossroads to zemstvo reforms). // Internal policy of tsarism (Mid-16th - early 20th century). L. 1967. Proceedings of LOII, vol. 8. Internal policy of tsarism. (Middle XVI - beginning of XX century.). L.: "Science". 1967. 5 – 68.

⁵⁸ A.L. Shapiro, "A few concluding remarks". Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia (second half XV - The beginning of the XVI century.). L.: Science, vol I (1971): 372 – 373.

commodity-money relations in the Russian ground did not turned the prosperous peasants into the farmers-entrepreneurs (the opposition to the ruling feudal class lasted too long), but on the contrary, accelerated the process of consolidating and broadening the base of feudal tenure as a manorial system with base services and serf labor. But it is this serf estate, by virtue of its internal economic organization, which is extremely weakly stimulating the growth of the initiative and efficiency of peasant labor (and, consequently, general development of the productive forces in the countryside) very soon – about the middle of the XVII century – becomes a brake on the economic development of Russia and far beyond its agrarian development. The growth of Russian trade, industry, and cities has slowed sharply the enslavement of peasantry⁵⁹.

This led to the fact that for almost three centuries of serfdom domination, by the beginning of the XX century, the significant changes occurred in the psychology of the Russian peasantry. Its mentality was essentially deformed by the serfdom-bureaucratic system of the absolutist state. Many peasants, especially those whose ancestors belonged to the category of owned one, had long been accustomed to the equalizing communal system formed over the previous several centuries. It is this distorted system imposed on them by the state and landlords, which they perceived as natural, and almost the only form of existence. Perhaps, it was this circumstance that gave Stolypin reason to believe that the communal system “rooted in the notion of people”. We can not say that they loved it; they simply do not understand another order and do not consider it possible”⁶⁰.

In different regions of Russia the degree of this misunderstanding, which arose and developed due to the deformation of peasant consciousness by the absolutist-serf system, was not the same. Obviously, it manifested itself to a greater extent there, where landlord ownership prevailed, to a lesser extent - in the black-socially-state.

Whatever it was, but by the beginning of the XX century, there were various categories of peasantry in Russia, which, reacting differently to the elimination of communal-equalizing system of agriculture during the implementation of Stolypin agrarian reform, revealed at the same time a different degree of assimilation, addiction and commitment to the system⁶¹, and, accordingly, the different depths of deformation and distortion of its "cultural code" expressed in a readiness to return to the original communal tradition.

These deformations and distortions affected the peasants - the Old Believers in the least extent. It was just easier for them to adapt to the "new" conditions of Stolypin reform, since in the "economic life of the Old Believers' settlements on the Russian borderlands, the northern regions and Siberia... the community, [as a system with egalitarian redistribution of land - DK], was often very weak and sometimes nonexistent, and the economy activities were conducted on the basis of the family farmstead”⁶².

Obviously, thanks to this circumstance, this category of the Russian population could enjoy relatively broad and freely the rights to acquire land granted to them under the Stolypin

⁵⁹ N. E. Nosov, “On Two Trends in the Development of Feudal Landholding in the Northeast Russia in the XV - XVI Centuries”. Problems of the peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Russia. L.: Science (1972): 44 – 71.

⁶⁰ G. P. Sidorovnin y P. A. Stolypin, Life for the fatherland (Moscu: TERRA - Book club, 2002).

⁶¹ V. D. Kiznetsov, “Social changes in the Russian village during the implementation of Stolypin agrarian reform”. Innovations in modern science. Materials of the IV International Spring Symposium (May 31, 2014). Sat. Sci. Tr. Moscu.

⁶² L. Afonsky, “Crossroads of the Russian Reform”. Grani, num 180 (1996): 202 – 223.

agrarian reform. However, in this case, we can only speak of a significant activation of this process of involving the land in trade turnover in the Old Believers' environment, since it could have a natural continuation and further development from the previous era. As it was observed by I.A. Kirillov and quoted in his book "The Truth of the Old Faith" as early as 1917, already "the peasant reform of 1861 gave a powerful impetus to the formation of strong Old Believer households. The peasants-Old Believers willingly bought the land for their own money. According to data of the Council of All-Russian congresses of the Old Believers, calculated on a statistical summary of 50 provinces of European Russia in 1905, the Old Believer household was accounted to 5.4 dessiatines of purchased land, and for each peasant household - only 1.1 dess."⁶³.

At the same time, along with the persistent rejection of Nikon's innovations in the religious sphere, the Old Believers retained their steadfast adherence to the ancient democratic traditions of a free self-governing community that is free from the equalitarian land redistribution and does not accept the enslaving policies of the landlord-absolutist state, which in their eyes is the embodiment of the kingdom of antichrist. As the American historian J. West writes: "Unlike the Orthodox peasantry, whose spiritual and economic independence was crushed by the severity of the autocracy, the Old Believers stayed bravely and steadfastly on the very path along which the Ancient Rus moved. They followed the traditions of zemstvo self-government and "conciliar democracy," which had long since not existed among the majority of the population. They also embodied the true diligence of the people, they were "harder, more energetic" than others, they were characterized by "diligence, sobriety and development" in all endeavors... Among them there is no class division, since the Old Believers of any social system were united by work, ethical and religious worship before the ancient piety"⁶⁴. It was the Old Believers, who revived the Russian national tradition of the person's closeness to work, when it becomes an internal need, and relationship between the employer and employees, according to the custom of tribal community, assumes the character of relations between the head of a large family (kin) and the members of this family⁶⁵.

This finding allows us to assert that the Stolypin agrarian course is largely corresponded to the way in which the Old Believers followed, who retained the ancient principles of secular communal self-government and the separate existence of family-labor farms. Owners of land on the basis of individual rights, these farms were united in the fellowship communities, which played an important role in the social, cultural and religious life of people. "Among the Old Believers there was not such a strong class stratification as among the Orthodox New Believers, because of their religious beliefs, the Old Believers were practically excommunicated from the nobility."⁶⁶

At the same time, the family forms of labor organization among the Old Believers existed not only in the agriculture, but also in fishing activities, as well as in the factory industry. A clear example of this kind of life activities organization was the communities of Russian Pomors, who had lived in the Russian North and, in particular, in the Vyg River basin. "In the form of its organization, Vyg joint residence was a brotherhood that originally

⁶³ M. Roshchin, "Old Belief and Labor". Grani, num 173 (1994): 237 – 245.

⁶⁴ J. West, "The bourgeoisie and public in pre-revolutionary Russia". History of the USSR, num 1 (1992): 197; 192 – 201.

⁶⁵ I. D. Afanassenko, "Economics and Spiritual Program of Russia" (St. Petersburg: Third millennium, 2003).

⁶⁶ M. Roshchin, "Old Belief and Labor", Grani, num 173 (1994): 237 – 245.

lived by its own labor. However, with the growth of its wealth, it began to use the hired labor force as well.⁶⁷ There was nothing fundamentally new in this fact too. The hired labor force in the farms made up the free self-governing community - "the world", was used by the state peasants of Pomerelia as far back as the XV century^{68 69}. This, obviously, was a natural extension of the ancient practice. Even in the times of Kievan Rus "Russian Truth" - a set of Russian laws, drawn up in the XI century. - "the hired workers were called hirelings, marketeers (ryadovichi). They were arranged (contracted), their work was paid in monetary. In the agrarian sector, the work of zakups (peasant in Kievan Rus working out a loan) was used"⁷⁰. And if the Soviet historian V.V. Mavrodin, who worked within the formative approach, spoke of feudal dependence, G.V. Vernadsky, one of the greatest and most authoritative historians of the Russian diaspora, over whom the Marxist schemes did not prevail, argued that the dependence of zakups on the feudal lords was not feudal, but financial (capitalistic)^{71.72} And at that time and later the workers, who concluded the contract of hiring, lived in the well-to-do peasant farms, where they worked, on the position of younger relatives. "The nature of relationship between the employer and the employee in those times was very different from the present. It still had the features of a kin (large family) and resembled the attitude of father (a master) to the family members. The term "hiring" meant a monetary payment for work."⁷³

Incidentally, such an order, when the relations between the employer-peasant and the hired worker took the nature of relations between the head of a large family (or kin) and the members of this family, was developed not only among the Old Believers, but, for example, in a country like Japan. As you know, in Japan, the most backward and stagnant of Asian countries, which never ventured the enterprising business foreigners on its threshold, the process of industrialization began only at the end of the XIX century. It began violently, but "improperly" - not with the peasantry expropriation at all. On the contrary, the Meiji revolution, which took place seven years after the abolition of serfdom in Russia, by freeing the Japanese peasants from feudal bonds, did not rob them at the same time (the "classical" European model), but approved the policy of transferring all land to the peasantry, while preserving and strengthening the principles of Community self-government. In accordance with this, as set by the Japanese researcher Kawamura Nozomu: "In 1868 the new government proclaimed, as an official line, that "all the land of the village should belong to the peasants", and three years later - the peasants' right to handle dry land. People got the right to sell and buy land... at the same time, the former villages continued to function as communities that are engaged in the mutual assistance for the agriculture and other domestic issues. The issue of the right to use the communal land (not included in the

⁶⁷ M. Roshchin, "Old Belief and Labo...

⁶⁸ N. E. Nosov, "On Two Trends in the Development of Feudal Landholding in the Northeast Russia in the XV - XVI Centuries". Problems of the peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Russia. L.: Science (1972): 44 – 71.

⁶⁹ A. L. Shapiro, "Economic division of the village". Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia (second half of the XV - beginning of the XVI century). L.: Science, vol I sec III ch 6 (1971): 369 – 370. Shapiro, A.L. (1971). Economic division of the village // Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia (second half of the XV - beginning of the XVI century). L.: Science, vol. I, sec. III, ch. 6, pp. 369 – 370.

⁷⁰ I. D. Afanasenko, "Russia in the flow of time". St. Petersburg: Third millennium, (2003): 317 – 318; 512.

⁷¹ V. V. Mavrodin, Formation of the Old Russian state and the formation of the Old Russian people. (Moscow: High School, 1971).

⁷² G. V. Vernadsky, Kievan Rus. Tver: Lean (Moscow: AGRAF, 1996).

⁷³ I. D. Afanasenko, "Russia in the flow of time" (St. Petersburg: Third millennium, 2003).

personal property) and irrigation remained within the competence of community... the legal landowners were the private persons, but in fact the land belonged to the family farms and, as a rule, only could be transferred to the subsequent generations" ⁷⁴

A similar situation developed in the Russian community during the Stolypin reforms. By decree of 9 November 1906, each member of the community ("the world") had the right to receive part of the communal land in personal property. The peasant was given the freedom to dispose of allotment land at his own discretion, although he was severely restricted by the fact that it was only possible to transfer land to the persons assigned to the rural community, to mortgage it only in the Peasant Bank, and to be bequeath by ordinary law to the instant heirs. Thus, the peasant could not sell the land to those, who were not members of the community. Eliminating the redistribution and transferring the land to peasants on the rights of personal land ownership, the law, as you can see, did not destroy the community - ("world"), which continued to fulfill its social and democratic role as an organization of local government and mutual assistance. "Merit" of the community destruction belongs not to Stolypin, but to Stalin's bureaucracy.

By the way, the Japanese themselves do not say the Meiji revolution, but the "Meiji restoration", because there was found a variant of "class capitalism" based on the communalism and clan solidarity that reproduces the type of inter-class contracts of the XI century. Then, in the era of feudal fragmentation and continuous wars, a symbiosis of three classes arose. The communities of peasants and the workshops of artisans were feeding and supporting the samurai squads, and those guarded them. In Rus, there was a similar situation, when the Russian princes with their kinsmen were supported by the Russian free community members - smerds, in return for defending themselves against the raids of other princes and nomads.

At the end of the XIX century, the industrial corporations of samurai and artisans were organized in Japan, and the emperor sent them to Europe to study for entrepreneurs and engineers, and the peasant communities were transferred to the factory as workers, while preserving the family-paternalistic structure of the community. "The owner was not an individual, but a "House"; the workers recruited from among the poor peasants were considered as the *members of House*, and it was expected that they would work diligently - for the sake of prosperity of their House"⁷⁵. The same order of family-clan economic relations, as noted above, existed at the Old Believer's enterprises in Russia.

In a short time, the idea of a patriarchal factory family, which was organized by the type of village community, began to give the impressive results in Japan. Proceeding from this, it can be said that, most likely, the Stolypin's transformations corresponded more to the American and non-Prussian ones (recall the Lenin's thesis about the two ways of Russia's agrarian development in the early XX century and the discussion of Soviet historians on this issue), and the Japanese model. At the same time, if we approach this issue more scrupulously and carefully, it is obvious that Stolypin did not follow his agrarian reform on the Japanese way, but on the contrary, the Japanese, in fact, implemented the Russian version of Stolypin's idea, not implemented in Russia, because with his reform Stolypin continued the line that was laid by the Great Peasant Reform of 1861 - a line that brought Russia back to its original pre-serf development path. Whereas, the Japanese "Meiji

⁷⁴ Yu.P. Boroday, "Who should be the owner of the land", Our contemporary, num 3 (1991): 102 – 119.

⁷⁵ P. Yu. Boroday, "Who should be the owner of the land..."

Restoration" took place 7 years after our Great Liberation Reform. And it turns out that not Stolypin "moved Russia along the Japanese path." He realized our, the Russian way, but did not have enough time to complete it, and the Japanese had and implemented the ideas similar to those that contained the Great Reform of 1861.

In the context of this analysis, it is appropriate to cite the conclusion of D.B. Strukov that "Stolypin reform was a way out, a worthy response not only to the challenge of the revolutionary crisis within the country, but also to the challenge of the world economy, where only the enterprising owner, capable of economic savvy and creativity, ready to match his business efforts with the efforts of other enterprising farmers, had a real chance of success. The Russian village from a static, closed and crushed by the community world was turning into an open, dynamically developing system, and, most notably, all of these transformations were carried out by Stolypin in the format of national self-consciousness, supported by the basic social institutions: a family, work collective and Russian ethnos, which in turn made the Russian experience of modernization not only unique, but also beneficial in the global division of labor"⁷⁶.

When providing a historiographic analysis of the works devoted to his agrarian policy, it's very important to draw a historical comparative parallel between the Japanese experience and the Russian experience carried out by P.A. Stolypin. Then, the imperfection of certain concepts and methodological approaches used in this field of research becomes evident. As in the Soviet times, and in many ways today, many scientists admire the Japanese experience with good reason, speak and write about the "Japanese economic miracle" and give it in the studies of social and economic sciences as a model and an example for imitation. At the same time, it is recognized that Japan has made a powerful breakthrough in the development of its productive forces, precisely because its ruling stratum, by force of the state, has imposed on society the production relations that imitate the social order of the XI - XII centuries. And when Stolypin proposed and carried out essentially the same thing, although in a less rigid and radical form, as a result of which our "Russian economic miracle", announced by the European newspapers at the beginning of the XX century, began, many authors were and are still, working in the mainstream of the Soviet liberal-radical historiographic tradition, albeit considerably modified, actively criticizing its agrarian policy and, in general, all reform activities.

Conclusion

Summarizing this analysis, it should be emphasized that if we try to investigate the problem at the macro level, and that is how it should be solved, considering a historical retrospective in a much broader mean tahn usually, it is not difficult to see that by its reform in the organization of settlement forms and actually land relations Stolypin did not introduce anything fundamentally new into the Russian village. His "new" is a well-forgotten old. Therefore, the opinion that Stolypin's reform was a cabinet, clerical, abstract, doctrinaire phenomenon, unfamiliar to the Russian national spirit and mentality of the peasants is, in our opinion, superficial and erroneous, contrary to the actual historical reality. Stolypin was not destroying the community as a whole, but the communal system of land ownership and land use, i.e. that relatively late stagnant form of the community, which forcibly kept the most independent, able-bodied, enterprising peasants in the semi-serfdom through a mechanism of collective responsibility.

⁷⁶ D. B. Strukov, Stolypin (Moscu: Veche, 2012).

After getting acquainted with all the material presented, an especially mindful and thoughtful reader may have an inevitable and quite logical question: "what exactly had happened in the peasant community of Russia at the beginning of the XX century during the implementation of Stolypin agrarian policy - the modernization, which provides for a radical renewal of the system of land relations within standing the fundamentally new model of agrarian development, or the restoration of the former forms of agrarian development in an unchanged form that existed since the early Middle Ages?" The author gives the following the answer to this question: Strictly speaking, neither that, nor another, but a kind of symbiosis of the old and new, namely, the modernization by restoration - i.e. restoration and affirmation of the ancient forms for the communal organization of peasants activities in the new historical conditions.

In other words, during the Stolypin agrarian policy *the community was not supposed to be liquidated, as a type of social organization of the peasantry, but its specific degeneration, i.e. radical transformation with the restoration of ancient forms of life activities, conditioned by the traditions of wordly (volost) self-government for the individual farms and other settlements of similar type, which got their fullest incarnation in the period of so-called. "Golden age" of the Russian village (about 1460's to the 1560s).*

Conclusion

Thus, thanks to the Stolypin agrarian reform, Russia regained its once lost national basis and re-turned to its long-standing historical path of development. At the same time, the right of peasants to their land was fixed at the legislative level and acquired a reliable guarantee of state protection. This conclusion makes a fresh look at the whole system of agrarian relations in the Russian village during the implementation of P.A. Stolypin agrarian policy.

Note.

"...even in the second half of the XV century, the so-called black lands predominated in north-eastern Russia, they were characterized by the communal land ownership of peasants with the individual ownership of a private plot and arable land, as well as an elected peasant rural municipality under control of the prince's administration"⁷⁷.

References

Afanasenko, I. D. "Economics and Spiritual Program of Russia". St. Petersburg: Third millennium. 2003.

Afanasenko, I. D. "Russia in the flow of time". St. Petersburg: Third millennium. 2003.

Afonsky, L. "Crossroads of the Russian Reform". Grani, num 180 (1996): 202 – 223.

Alaev, L. "Private property in the holy Russia". Novoe vremya, num 10 (1991): 37 – 39.

Alexandrov, B. A. "Occurrence of the rural communities in Siberia" History of the USSR, num 1 (1987): 54–68.

⁷⁷ Sh. M. Munchaev y V.M. Ustinov, History of Russia: Textbook for high schools - 3rd ed., rev. and ext. (Moscow: Infra-M-Norma, 2000).

Anfimov, A. M. "Unfinished disputes". *Issues of History*, num 6 (1997): 41 – 67.

Boroday, Yu. P. "Who should be the owner of the land". *Our contemporary*, num 3 (1991): 102 – 119.

Circular to the governors of June 16, 1910. P.A. Stolypin: The Edge of Talent Politics. Moscow: ROSSPEN. 1910.

Degtyarev A. Ya. "Rural settlements of the North-West of Russia". *Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia in XVI century. (North, Pskov. General results of the development of the North-West)* L. Science, vol III, sec II, ch 2 (1978): 145 – 146; 145 – 154.

Degtyarev A. Ya. "Russian village in the XV-XVI centuries". *Essays on the history of rural settlement. L.: Publishing House of Leningrad State University, 1980. 38,49, 103-107 and so on; 176.*

Dubrovsky, S. M. "Stolypin land reform". *From the history of agriculture and peasantry of Russia in the early XX century. Moscow: Science. 1963.*

Dyakin, V. S. "Stolypin and the nobility". (Failure of local reform). *Problems of the peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Russia. L.: Science. 1980.*

Goryushkin, L. M. "Siberian peasantry at the turn of the two centuries (late XIX - early XX)". *Novosibirsk. Academy of Sciences of the USSR. CO. Institute of History, Philology and Philosophy. 1967.*

Kobko, V. V. "Zaimka of the Old Believer peasants. South of the Far East (the middle of the XIX century - 30-ies of XX century)". *Russia and the Asia-Pacific Region, num 1, (1999): 59 - 67.*

Kofod, A. A. *Stolypin reform and land surveyor: Documents, correspondence, memoirs. Moscow: the Russian way. 2003.*

Konapaev, A. I. *The history of land ownership in the Belozersk region of the XV - XVI centuries. Moscow: Leningrad Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences. 90 and further. 1951.*

Konapaev, A. I. "Peasant land ownership of the Dungeon in the XVI century". *Problems of the peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Russia. L.: Science, (1972): 103 -137.*

Konapaev, A. I. "Northern Dvina". *Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia of the XVI century (North, Pskov, the general results of the development of the North-West). L.: Science, vol III, sec I, ch 1 (1978): 5 – 36.*

Munchaev, Sh. M., y V. M. Ustinov. *History of Russia: Textbook for high schools - 3rd ed., rev. and ext. Moscow: Infra-M-Norma, 2000.*

Kiznetsov, V.D. "Social changes in the Russian village during the implementation of Stolypin agrarian reform". *Innovations in modern science. Materials of the IV International Spring Symposium. Sat. Sci. Tr. Moscú: 144 – 145; 133 – 158 (May 31, 2014)*

Matsuzato, K. "Stolypin reform and the Russian agrotechnological revolution". Domestic history, num 6 (1992): 197; 194 – 200.

Mavrodin, V. V. Formation of the Old Russian state and the formation of the Old Russian people. Moscow: High School. 1971.

Milov, L. V. "Reasons for the emergence of serfdom in Russia". History of the USSR, num 3 (1985)178–201.

Nosov, N. E. Formation of the caste representative institutions in Russia. L.: Science. 1969.

Nosov, N. E. "On Two Trends in the Development of Feudal Landholding in the Northeast Russia in the XV - XVI Centuries". Problems of the peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Russia. L.: Science (1972): 44 – 71.

Nosov, N. E. The Council of "reconciliation" in 1549 and issues of local government (at the crossroads to zemstvo reforms). // Internal policy of tsarism (Mid-16th - early 20th century). L. 1967. Proceedings of LOII, vol. 8. Internal policy of tsarism (Middle XVI - beginning of XX century.). L.: "Science". 1967. 5 – 68.

Osminsky, T.I. "Population of the Novgorod pyatinas at the end of the XV century". Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia (second half of the XV - beginning of the XVI century.). L.: Science, vol I, sec III, ch 1 (1971): 321 – 328.

Pavlov-Silvansky, N. P. Feudalism in Russia. Moscú: Science. 1988.

Pokrovsky, N. N. "Peasant escape and hermitage customs in Siberia of the XVIII century". The peasantry of Siberia XVIII - early XX century: (Class struggle, social consciousness, culture) – Novosibirsk. 1975.

Polkanov V. D. "Lessons of the Stolypin Agrarian Reform". P.A. Stolypin and the historical experience of reforms in Russia. Proc. rep. and messages of the Scientific-practical. Conf, dedicated. 135th anniversary of the birth of. P.A. Stolypin, October 16 - 17, 1997 Omsk. Omsk State University, Om. Br. of the OIIF SB RAS. 1997.

Raskin, D. I.; I. Ya. Frayanov y A. L. Shapiro. "On the forms of state peasant landownership in XIV - XVII centuries". Problems of peasant land ownership and domestic policy of Russia. L.: Science. 1972.

Roshchin, M. "Old Belief and Labor". Grani, num 173 (1994): 237 – 245.

Shakurova, F. A. "Relating the issue of the relations between the concepts "owner" and "master." (Applied to the Community Traditions of the Peoples of the Eurasian World.)". Russia and the East: Traditional Culture, Ethno-Cultural and Ethno-Social Processes: Proceedings of the IV International Scientific Conference "Russia and the East: Problems of Interaction" / Institute of Oriental Studies, RAS; N.A. Tomilov (Ed.), et al.] Omsk: [unmb.], (1997).

Shapiro, A. L. "A few concluding remarks". Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia (second half XV -. The beginning of the XVI century.). L.: Science, vol I (1971): 372 – 373.

Changing the system of land relations and rural displacement within the peasant community in the implementation... pág. 154

Shapiro, A. L. "Black volost". Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia (Second half of the XVth - beginning of the XVI century). L.: Science, vol I sec II ch 1 (1971): 54; 53 – 57.

Shapiro, A. L. "Economic division of the village". Agrarian history of the North-West of Russia (second half of the XV - beginning of the XVI century). L.: Science, vol I sec III ch 6 (1971): 369 – 370.

Shepelev, V. B. "To the issue of modern historiographic situation concerning the reformist activities of P.A. Stolypin". P.A. Stolypin and the historical experience of reforms in Russia. Proc. rep. and messages of the Scientific-practical. Conf, dedicated. 135th anniversary of the birth of. P.A. Stolypin, October 16 - 17, 1997 Omsk. Omsk State University, Om. Br. of the OIIF SB RAS (1997): 53, 50 – 59.

Shveikovskaya, E. N. Customary law in the land and administrative transactions of the North Russian peasants at the first half of the XVII century. (Based on the materials of Sol'vychegorsky Uyezd) // History of the USSR, num 2 (1985): 96 – 111.

Sidorovnin, G. P. y Stolypin, P. A. Life for the fatherland. Moscú: TERRA - Book club. 2002.

Starikov, E. "Community: from the Russian march to equalizing redistribution". Knowledge is a power, num 3 (1994): 18; 16 – 24. Strukov, D.B. Stolypin. Moscú: Veche. 2012.

Sukhotina, L. G. "Forms of the land use, agricultural systems and tools in the Siberian village of the second half of the XIX century". Questions of the history of Siberia, Issue 3. Tomsk, (1967): 58 – 70.

Tyukavkin, V.G. Great-Russian peasantry and Stolypin agrarian reform. Moscú: Monuments of historical thought. 2001.

Vernadsky, G. V. Kievan Rus. Tver: Lean, Moscow: AGRAF.

West, J. "The bourgeoisie and public in pre-revolutionary Russia". History of the USSR, num 1 (1992): 197; 192 – 201.

Zyryanov, P.N. Peasant community of the European Russia. 1907-1914. Moscú: Science. 1992.

Zyryanov, P. N. Pyotr Stolypin: political portrait. Moscú: Higher education. 1992.

Lurie, S. "Russian statehood and the Russian community". Knowledge is a power, num 10 (1992).

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo
Puede hacerse sin permiso de **Revista Inclusiones, citando la fuente**.