

U.D.C. 316:349.412 (091)

SOCIOHISTORICAL PRECONDITIONS OF FORMATION OF THE PRIVATE LAND PROPERTY

Pryadka T.M., Chumachenko O.M., PhD, Associate Professor
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

Historical aspects of development of a private land property within the territory of Ukraine are investigated. The course of the main land reforms, the directions of their realization and results of carrying out are considered in a historical cut.

Problem statement. In Ukraine is particularly acute discussion of the right of private ownership of land in the agricultural sector, where the land is the primary means of production.

In most countries, private ownership of agricultural land is recognized as a precondition for efficient production. However, there are many countries with a market economy in which private ownership of land available. Regardless of the mode of operation of private ownership of land ownership is limited, emphasizing balanced and limited attitude to the use of agricultural land.

Analysis of recent researches. The question of the historical development of private land ownership and land use were studied by many scientists, including a significant contribution to the scientific achievements made D.S. Dobryak, S. Dorohuntsov, L.Y. Nowakowski, A. Tretiak, M.N. Fedorov et al.

The presence of opposite views, uncertainty and inconsistency of current land legislation of Ukraine require historical

research and international experience on the right of private ownership of land.

Thus, the solution of pressing contemporary issues related to the development and formation of private ownership of land is an urgent task that requires deeper scientific and historical research.

Article purpose. Explore historical aspects of private ownership of land and its impact on land relations.

Main material. In political systems Kyivan Rus belonged to feudal states in Europe. Establishment of feudal relations in Kyivan Rus almost coincided with the European tendencies but also had its own peculiarities. Eastern Slavic slave society had passed the stage of development of feudalism sprang from the primitive. The emergence of large estates has not led to landless peasants as within the national territory there was a significant number of uninhabited and undeveloped land. Feudalization occurred in Russia slowed pace compared with Europe, where in ancient times was established private property.

In feudal relations land became the primary means of production. In the days of Kyivan Rus (from the ninth century. Around 30 years of the twelfth century). In the socio-economic development of feudal relations began – the formation of private ownership. Actively created different groups of feudal serfs. The main sectors of the population were stinks, shoppers, privates, servants, slaves.

Stinks in Kyivan Rus called most of the farmers who have private facilities, housing, land holdings, paid tribute to Prince and were relatively free. Stinks recognized a full legal entity, although its value was estimated at 5 UAH, while the murder of lord paid 80.

Shoppers – people who have lost their own farm and had to go into bondage to the lord for a bunch of (money lending).

Privates – is the peasants who have signed contracts with a number of feudal lords (agreement) under which recognize their dependence on it, and therefore we worked on feudal lord.

Servants – people who lost their farm. These residents feudal homestead servants, cooks, washerwoman, etc.. They are sold, given away, transferred by inheritance.

Serfs – population, which was in full ownership of the feudal lord.

Evolution of feudal relations has meant that in the fourteenth-sixteenth century. began to grow not only princely feudal tenure, but knights. At the end of the fourteenth century Ukrainian lands were only a few dozen large feudal latifundia, and in the first half of the fourteenth century large landowners over 100 gentry families and about a thousand nobles. Princely and lordly estates protected by law Kyiv. «Ruska Pravda» foreseen penalty of heavy fines for

theft boyars bread, current arson, destruction of landmarks. In Kyiv region and the Dnieper largest landowners were Ruzhinsky, Zaslavsky, Kapysty, Nemyrychy.

The concentration of land in the hands of the barons led to large-scale offensive feudal peasant commune that began in the fourteenth-sixteenth century. As a result of this attack in the middle of the sixteenth century free communal lands in Ukraine almost gone.

With the growth of feudal tenure feudal dependence gradually grew into and legally formed in serfdom. The essence of feudalism was the attachment of peasants to the land, introducing compulsory rural works on master, ultimately limiting civil liberties peasantry.

At the end of the seventeenth century characteristic features of the socio-economic development of Ukrainian lands were landless peasants, his enslavement, establishment of capitalism in the economy, the formation of the national market. These processes took place in Ukraine, with some features – under statelessness on the right coast and the progressive collapse of the autonomy of the left coast.

In the early nineteenth century most of the Ukrainian lands (Left coast, Sloboda, Right coast, South Ukraine) was part of the Russian Empire. On the Ukrainian lands that belonged to the Russian Empire dominated landlordism, representing about 75% of all land. However, despite the significant concentration in the hands of landlords land, their state debt grew. Before the abolition of serfdom in Russia, there were 23.1 million serfs. In 1833 mortgage was 4.5 million people, and in 1859 – 7.1 million

In the 30–50-years of the nineteenth century. serfdom failed. It was not only a

regular form, but is economically viable. Agricultural Ukrainian lands in the Russian Empire had the following characteristics: dominance in the agricultural sector landlord, crisis, increased exploitation of the peasantry, the gradual destruction of natural economy.

The abolition of serfdom was an economic necessity. External stimulus that blew system of serfdom was the Crimean War (1854–1855 years), and internal – peasant revolts and uprisings, which were a threat to the autocratic government. Tsar Alexander II appealed to the representatives of the nobility with a request to wonder whether it would be better to abolish serfdom from above than it is below cancel itself [6].

February 19, 1861, Alexander II signed the text of the manifesto of the abolition of serfdom, prepared by the Moscow Metropolitan Filaret, and related to him the documents:

- Terms of peasants emerged from serfdom;

- provisions for placement serfs who emerged from serfdom;

- provisions on redemption of peasants in the field of land ownership;

- provision of provincial peasant affairs institutions;

- rules of procedure for triggering the provisions of the peasants, emerged from serfdom and others.

Manifesto of February 19, 1861, together with the documents attached to it, decided three fundamentally important questions:

- peasants became free in legal terms; enable them to be owners of the land, because without the ownership of a legal freedom is not enough for a normal life;

- satisfied the desire of landlords who have received redemption for the land.

Since the reforms were top, basic feudal structure to some extent retained their positions. The remaining landholdings, farming community, autocracy. Yet the peasant reform of 1861 was of great historical significance. It has opened new perspectives for Ukraine, has created opportunities for extensive development of market relations. Country confidently on the path of capitalist development. Capitalist competition and conversion of land for goods stimulated active sale of landed estates.

Social status, standard of living of the peasants remained low. Therefore, the «agrarian question» about the formation of the state to the peasantry needed cardinal solution.

In the early twentieth century. proposed many agricultural programs, but preference Stolypin agrarian reform. As in the past, and now the attitude towards reform Stolypin ambiguous. The issue of land ownership were linked not only to economic, but also political aspects. The dispute between supporters of private ownership of land and their opponents is relevant today. Opponents of private property especially fiercely oppose the sale of land, claiming that the land can not be traded, as well as their homeland. However, at a time when the reform came into widespread and formed a civilized rule of law, for developed market economy land market is the economic means of social protection [4].

The chief agricultural reform was the project Gurk, which formed the basis of the Decree of 9 November 1906. Gurke soon resigned, and Stolypin supported and continued the project. And only 14 June 1910 mentioned Decree III State Duma approved the law. This reform was one of the greatest events of pre-revolutionary years.

The main objective of the reform was the destruction of the community by transferring land to private ownership of farmers who were willing to leave the community. As Stolypin said: « Let this be a general, where the community has not yet come to life, let it be the household, where the community has not outlived its usefulness, but let it be strong, let it be hereditary».

In allotment and public lands, farmers had some amount of land in private ownership. Over time they became more and more. During the period from 1877 to 1905 peasant landownership changed as follows (Table 1).

1. Dynamics of purchase of land by peasants in Ukraine*

Years	On 100 acres of land allotment accounts purchased, acres		
	Prairie	Forest-prairie	Ukraine
1877	11,6	3,2	6,2
1905	44,9	19,2	27,9

Main in the Decree of 9 November 1906 was the elimination of the peasant community. Stolypin reform enabled all interested farmers with their plots to separate individual household – «cuts», namely independent economy in the community, or just go for a separate community from the ground – on the farm. And in the first and in the second case, the plot of land allocated one.

Farmers not only received permission to withdraw from the community, but also encouraged to do so. Each householder, who went from communal tenure to own, kept all the land, which were in its use as rented.

Stolypin reformed farm, keeping large estates of landlords, which also placed the main hope. But aristocratic possession

through a number of reasons receded into the past [7, 8].

In 1862 a peasant tenure was 818 thousand acres, and in 1914 – 8206 thousand acres, or 40% of the land that was in private ownership. In Ukraine, the number of purchased land in 1914 compared to 1862 increased by 10 times (Table 2).

2. Change in private possession of the peasants in the Ukraine from 1862 to 1914 *

Years	Private ownership of villagers (peasants and Cossacks), thousands of acres		
	Prairie	Forest-prairie	Ukraine
1832	354	464	818
1914	3597	4609	8206

In tenure farmers had leased land. According to approximate data in 1901, the area of leased land in Ukraine amounted to 1550 thousand acres.

The desire of farmers for land owned, has led to increased demand, which exceeded the significant increase proposals in the market and land prices are constantly raised (Table 3).

3. The growth of land prices in Ukraine, %*

Years	Prairie	Forest-prairie	Ukraine
1863–1865	100	100	100
1871–1875	186	144	157
1881–1885	271	232	243
1891–1895	579	320	381
1901–1905	1114	584	710
1906–1914	1443	772	933

Remnants of feudalism, the resistance of the communal peasants transition to

* Here and in Table 4 shows the data from the source [6].

private ownership did not give enough space to consolidate new forms of entrepreneurship. At the beginning of reform land bank totaled 9,000,000 acres and 2,000,000 owned Farmers Bank. During the years of reform, the bank had expanded (Table 4).

4. Characteristics of the Farmers Bank*

Years	Number sold estates	Area thousand acres	Cost, million rubles
1896–1905	504	961	68
1906–1915	3257	4326	465

Farmers and companies bought by Farmers Bank 4868.4 thousand acres of land, other citizens – 1043.4 thousand acres. From the land fund in the years 1907-1916 was 54.6% sold to settlers, 23.4 – farmers, 17 – rural unions and 5% of other aspirants [6].

The debate on the need for ongoing Stolypin's reform and its results continues to this day. But the indisputable fact is that in ten years of work, of which only seven falls in peacetime, and the reform was calculated for at least 20 years, a lot has been achieved: introduced peasant land ownership, free out of the community, concessional lending land and farmhouse accommodation. As a result, created a layer of enterprising independent farmers began to develop rural and cooperative banking system, expanding domestic market. It has been proven advantage of competitive farms, which were based on private ownership of land and property of landowners [1].

Since 1918 the reverse was observed in the land issue. January 27, 1918 the new government adopted a decree of the All-Russian central executive Committee of soviets of workers, soldiers and peasants

deputies on the «Socialization of land». This Decree fully ratified the principles of egalitarian land. From economic point of view a great mistake of the new government was disastrous devaluation role of land resources. It claimed that the land resources have no prices, no cost. In those circumstances the declaration of land «nationalization» achievement actually meant uncontrolled power of the totalitarian state, which neither legally nor economically responsible for rational land use.

Soviet agriculture was formed on the basis of two political principles – land nationalization and collectivization of agriculture. If socialization was carried out immediately after the arrival of the Bolsheviks to power, the collectivization of agriculture took place in 1928–1929. The land that belonged to the church, the nobility estates of large landowners confiscated and distributed among the peasants [5].

With the abolition in 1928 of the NEP initiative of private enterprise recognized as incompatible with the goals of the communist state. Thus, individual farms were considered a barrier to the construction of socialism [8].

Confronting collectivization was quickly overcome. From 1929 to 1932 farmers, single persecuted, deprived of their property and deported to Siberia. This period in the history of agriculture titled «cannibalization». Collectivization was actually completed until 1940. After World War II in Ukraine began the next phase of collectivization, when joined by the western region and their traditional individual farming and private land was replaced by.

Collectivization was accompanied by the development of the administrative-command system of agriculture, which

slowed the development of banking and credit policy in this area. Farms did not apply for loans, and the latter distributed by the central planning authorities. Purpose loans granted low-interest (1,2% per annum), as well as solvency without receiving credit. Farms were not able to return the loan, and therefore periodically debts forgiven. Consequently, modern individuals and organizations in Ukraine have no clear idea about the importance of debt. In addition, banks no experience in assessing applications for credit.

Worldwide experience confirms the legality and economic viability of the market turnover with appropriate land, often brutal

government regulation and control over the purchase and sale of land, the size of private ownership, land use regulations [2, 3].

Conclusions. Ukraine's experience shows that reforms related to private ownership, became an economic lever that can make economic mechanisms work effectively at all stages of development of the productive forces. Restoration of private land ownership puts on another, higher level of land relations and land management. Therefore, during the land reform in our country, special attention should be paid to identify patterns in changes of land use and land tenure and land use trends.

References

1. *Buzdalov I.N.* Agrarian relations: Theory, Historical practice, prospects of development / Y.N. Buzdalov. — M. : Nauka, 1993. — 270 p.
2. *Vitovsky M.P.* The transition to a market cost accounting / MP Vitovsky, P.T. Sabluk, V.L. Tovstopyat. — K. : Vintage, 1993. — 136 p.
3. *Lischnyuk T.N.* Historical aspects of private ownership of land / T.N. Lischnyuk: Proc. «Organizational and economic problems of agriculture». — K., 2001. — S. 275–278.
4. *McConnell Kampbell R.* Ekonomyky: Principles, problems and policies / R. McConnell Kampbell, Brue Stanley: In 2 volumes; lane. from English. 11th ed. — M. : The Republic, 1992.
5. *Panchenko P.P.* Agrarian History of Ukraine / P.P. Panchenko, V.A. Marchuk. — K. : Knowledge, coop, 2000. — 342 p.
6. Ukrainian agriculture. — H.: Ed. dep. NKZ, 1923. — 232 p.
7. *Tretiak A.M.* Land reform in Ukraine: the lessons of history. — Charles I (1861–1941 years) / A. Tretiak. — Chernivtsi: Chernivtsi. Institute for Land, 1993. — 90 p.
8. *Tretiak A.M.* The history of land relations and land in Ukraine / A.M. Tretiak. — K. : Agrar. Science, 2002. — 280 p.

* * *

Досліджено історичні аспекти розвитку приватної власності на землю на території України. Розглянуто в історичному розрізі хід основних земельних реформ, їхні напрями реалізації та результати проведення.

* * *

Исследованы исторические аспекты формирования частной собственности на землю. Рассмотрены в историческом разрезе ход основных земельных реформ, их направления реализации и результаты проведения.