

UDC 94(477):[316.62::63-051:338.43.021.8«1906/1913»](045)

DOI: 10.31651/2413-8142-2023-30-Lubko

Inna Lubko

Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of State and Legal Disciplines, The Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, Cherkasy, Ukraine

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7759-540X>

e-mail: mamulizka@ukr.net

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Lubko, I. (2023). Agrarian reform of 1906–1913: social reflections of the Ukrainian peasantry. *Ukrainskyi Selianyn. [Ukrainian peasant]*, 30, 26–38. (In English). doi: 10.31651/2413-8142-2023-30-Lubko

AGRARIAN REFORM OF 1906–1913: SOCIAL REFLECTIONS OF THE UKRAINIAN PEASANTRY

Abstract. *The purpose of the article is to study various forms of social reflection of the Ukrainian peasantry on the implementation of the agrarian reform of 1906–1913 in the regional dimension and in everyday practice.*

Scientific novelty of the study *lies in the analysis of the course and features of the implementation of the agrarian reform 1906–1913 in the form of social reflections of the Ukrainian peasantry as an effective subject of change in the reform of land relations.*

Conclusions. *The sustained interest of scholars in agrarian discourse, especially in the context of landmark events, reforms, and personalities, can be traced both at the scientific-theoretical and at the cognitive levels. The critical rethinking of the content, course, regional features, and consequences of the agrarian reform of 1906–1913, initiated by Ukrainian scholars using new methodological tools, continues. Through a combination of modern methods, principles, approaches, and the processing of previously unpublished archival sources, they study in more detail, in addition to the traditional ones, new dimensions of the reform – national, regional, migration, legal, and socio-psychological.*

The powerful scientific heritage of studies on P. Stolypin's agrarian reform, which differ in their chronology and ideological paradigm, seems insufficiently complete in terms of social reflection. This refers to the «visibility» of the peasant himself as a subject of agrarian transformations, who actively and consciously participates in the implementation of the planned measures, represents his own vision of rural problems and proposes ways to solve them, expresses his own and other people's emotions, criticizes central and local authorities, etc.

The social reflection of the Ukrainian peasantry during the implementation of the agrarian reform 1906–1913 demonstrated that the rural environment and its inhabitants were completely immersed in the new socio-economic realities, expecting the desired results. Although the heterogeneity of such expectations was evident: the conservative and traditionalist camp of the peasantry hoped for the collapse of the project and the preservation of the rural community, some entrepreneurial and wealthy farmers saw their future prospects as optimistic, the majority hoped for the foresight and wisdom of the government, which «knows what it is doing». Despite the conventionality of this separation, the government's new agricultural policy caused discontent among each of them. The forms of protest ranged from spontaneous (mutual claims, complaints, denunciations, property damage) to organized (arson, lawsuits, blocking the work of land management commissions).

The agrarian reform of 1906–1913, like any other, revealed its strengths and weaknesses, which are analyzed in a number of scholarly works. However, the experience of preparing and implementing the reform, the subjectivization of the peasantry as the main participant, and the instructive lessons of past agrarian transformations for future reforms deservedly attract the attention of contemporary researchers.

Keywords: *agrarian reform, anti-government protests, land management, resettlement policy, peasantry, social reflections, government measures.*

Інна Лубко

кандидат історичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри державно-правових дисциплін, Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького, м. Черкаси, Україна

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7759-540X>

e-mail: mamulizka@ukr.net

Бібліографічний опис для цитування: Лубко І. Аграрна реформа 1906–1913 рр.: соціальні рефлексії українського селянства. *Український селянин*. 2023. Вип. 30. С. 26–38. doi: 10.31651/2413-8142-2023-30-Lubko

АГРАРНА РЕФОРМА 1906-1913 РР.: СОЦІАЛЬНІ РЕФЛЕКСІЇ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО СЕЛЯНСТВА

Анотація. *Метою статті є дослідження різноманітних форм соціальної рефлексії українського селянства на перебіг реалізації аграрної реформи 1906-1913 рр. у регіональному вимірі та в повсякденній практиці.*

Наукова новизна результатів дослідження *полягає в аналізі перебігу та особливостей реалізації аграрної реформи 1906–1913 рр. у вигляді соціальних рефлексій українського селянства як дієвого суб'єкта змін при реформуванні аграрних відносин.*

Висновки. Стійкий інтерес науковців до аграристського дискурсу, і особливо в контексті знакових подій, реформ та персоналій, простежується як на науково-теоретичному, так і на пізнавальному рівнях. Не припиняється критичне переосмислення змісту, перебігу, регіональних особливостей та наслідків аграрної реформи 1906–1913 рр., розпочате українськими науковцями на основі використання нового методологічного інструментарію. Завдяки комбінації сучасних методів, принципів, підходів та опрацюванню раніше неопублікованих архівних джерел ними детальніше досліджуються, крім традиційних, нові виміри реформи – національні, регіональні, міграційні, юридичні, соціально-психологічні.

Потужний науковий доробок різних за хронологією їх появи та ідеологічною парадигмою досліджень, присвячених аграрній реформі П. Столипіна, виглядає недостатньо повним з точки зору соціальної рефлексії. Під нею розуміється «видимість» самого селянина як суб'єкта аграрних перетворень, який активно і свідомо бере участь в реалізації запланованих заходів, висловлює власне бачення сільських проблем і пропонує шляхи їх вирішення, транслює свої і чужі емоції, критикує центральну і місцеву владу тощо.

Соціальна рефлексія українського селянства під час реалізації аграрної реформи 1906–1913 рр. продемонструвала, що сільське середовище та його мешканці повністю поринули в нові соціально-економічні реалії, очікуючи від них бажаних наслідків. Хоч неоднорідність таких очікувань виявилась очевидною: консервативно-традиціоналістський табір селянства сподівався на крах проєкту і збереження селянської общини, частка підприємливих і заможних господарників вбачала свої майбутні оптимістичні перспективи, більшість сподівалась на далекоглядність і мудрість влади, яка «знає, що робить». Попри певну умовність подібного поділу, нова аграрна політика уряду викликала невдоволення в середовищі кожної з них. Форми протесту були різними – від стихійних (взаємні претензії, скарги, доноси, псування майна) до організованих (підпалив, судових позовів, блокування роботи землевпорядних комісій).

Аграрна реформа 1906–1913 рр., як і будь-яка інша, виявила свої сильні і слабкі сторони, аналіз яких містить масив наукових робіт. Однак досвід підготовки і реалізації реформи, суб'єктивізація селянства як основного учасника, повчальні уроки аграрних перетворень минулого для майбутніх реформ заслужено привертають увагу сучасних дослідників.

Ключові слова: аграрна реформа, антиурядові виступи, землеустрій, переселенська політика, селянство, соціальні рефлексії, урядові заходи.

Formulation of the issue. From time to time, a retrospective approach to earlier reforms allows us not only to return to the origins of their conception and authors, to trace the course of implementation and consequences, but also to reconsider the experience gained in order to obtain useful practices and avoid mistakes. The incompleteness of previous agrarian transformations is an important prerequisite for the next ones, which are designed to solve existing problems and address new ones dictated by political challenges, economic factors, and social demands.

Reforming land issues as an important component of any agrarian transformation cannot be viewed in isolation from the interests of the main actor - the peasant, who can be a farmer, an owner, and a rebel at the same time. After all, who else but he or she is capable of valuing freedom, loving the land, and fighting for the truth so desperately?

The agrarian reform of 1906-1913, so called the “Stolypin reform” in historiography, aimed at solving purely peasant problems (changes in land use, destruction of the rural community, encouragement of resettlement, creation of a land

market, etc.), at the same time contributed to the subjectification of the peasant as an active participant in social processes, capable of social reflection in everyday life.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The historiography of the problem of agrarian transformations of 1906-1913 is quite thorough, and scholars of different historical periods, scientific views, and directions have studied it. However, firstly, there is a problem of rethinking the existing scientific work due to its bias, and secondly, the study of manifestations and forms of social reflection of certain categories of the population on socially significant reforms, projects, and decisions that affect them directly remains out of the focus of scholars. In the works of contemporary researchers of agrarian transformations of the early twentieth century, special attention was paid to the attitude of the Ukrainian peasantry to the agrarian reform of 1900-1913 and the identification of social attitudes in the peasantry¹. The authors of a significant number of scientific works devoted to the reform studied various forms of protest activity of the Ukrainian peasantry in their regional dimension². It should be emphasized that reputa-

1 Бакало В., Гоцуляк В. Селянські виступи на Україні в часи столипінської аграрної реформи. *Вісник Черкаського університету. Серія історичні науки*. 2001. Вип. 27. С.92–94; Корновенко С., Герасименко О. Селянин-бунтар. Селянська революція в Україні 1902 – 1917 рр.: [монографія]. Черкаси : Чабаненко Ю. А., 2017. 204 с.; Короткова О. Зміни у соціальній свідомості селян України в період реформ 1906–1916 рр. *Український історичний збірник*. 2008. Вип. 11. С.181-184; Малиновський Б. Пауль Рорбах. Столипінська аграрна реформа і причини Першої світової війни. *Український селянин*. 2006. Вип. 10. С. 18–20; Реєнт О. Столипінська аграрна реформа: основні події, періодизація, особливості, наслідки. *Український селянин*. 2006. Вип. 10. С. 6–16.

2 Бочаров В. Переселення селян з Харківської губернії (1906–1914 рр.). *Вісник Східноукраїнського національного університету імені Володимира Даля*. 2004. №9. С. 35–39; Герасименко О. Селянський рух на Лівобережній Україні під час здійснення Столипінської реформи. *Український селянин*. 2005. Вип. 9. С. 146–149.; Герасимчук О. Реалізація столипінської аграрної реформи в Чернігівській

ble authors mostly publish their research papers in the collection of scientific works “Ukrainian Peasant”, which indicates the high appreciation of the professional scientific publication and encourages young researchers to participate in peasant studies.

The purpose of the research is to identify various forms of social reflection of the Ukrainian peasantry on the course of the agrarian reform of 1906-1913 in the regional dimension and in everyday practice.

Presenting the main material. The interpretation of history through the prism of agrarianism as a peasant-centered phenomenon has traditionally attracted the attention of the scientific community for the reason that the Ukrainian peasantry is the central figure of social transformations, as a carrier of national identity and state-building synergy. The creator of Ukrainian statehood, M. Hrushevsky, also perceived Ukrainians from the perspective of peasant-centrism. In his programmatic work “The Foundations of Great Ukraine,” he emphasized: “The main foundation of this Great Ukraine will be the peasantry for a long time, if not always, and it will have to be built on it. For many years of our pre-dawn existence, we kept repeating that the future, the Ukrainian revival, and the future of Ukraine in general lies in the peasantry and only in the peasantry. Throughout the entire 19th century, Ukrainians and the peasantry became synonymous. Since all other strata had betrayed their nationality, all the material for national construction has been drawn from it, and it has pinned its hopes on it...”³.

The original desire of the Ukrainian peasantry to live and work on their own land, the desire to be independent of anyone’s interference in the sphere of individual economic activity, and the intention to gain the desired economic freedom had a positive impact on the dynamics of the implementation of reform measures proposed by the tsarist government represented by P. Stolypin.

According to the Decree “On Supplementing Certain Provisions of the Current Law Concerning Peasant Land Tenure and Land Use” of November 9, 1906, three main components of

the reform were to be implemented: 1) separation of peasants from the community and assignment of land to them as private property; 2) creation of farms and cuttings; 3) resettlement policy. The tools for implementing the project are the Peasant Bank, the cooperative movement, farming, market relations, etc.

Substantiating the reasons for the agrarian reform of 1906-1913, O. Reynt points out that “agrarian unrest during the revolution of 1905-1907 caused the local nobility to be concerned and even fearful for the future of land ownership,” as stated during the congress of the All-Russian Union of Landowners on February 12-16, 1906. Measures aimed at solving this problem “will make it possible to immediately reassure the people, since every peasant will feel that he has acquired property and land ownership, which he can turn into money and build his well-being on it”⁴. Therefore, the appearance of the decree of November 9, 1906, on the withdrawal of peasants from the community and the procedure for assigning land to them as private property was not accidental, as it was caused by a public demand addressed to the authorities on behalf of landowners who feared losing their property as a result of peasant protests and the peasantry seeking “land and freedom.”

The peasantry’s intrinsic motivation to be able to manage their own land and their natural willingness to move toward the dreamy prospects presented by the reformers on behalf of the government were translated into new socio-political realities - the rapprochement between the peasantry and the government. The atmosphere of trust was strengthened by strong information support from pro-government periodicals and government-funded “independent” newspapers, which filled their materials with agrarian topics. Their content covered various spheres of peasant life, ranging from everyday problems and how to solve them with government support, to agricultural legislation and its easy-to-understand interpretation, to peasant sentiment about the implementation of reform initiatives.

The government’s demonstration of commitment and openness to a constructive dialog with the peasantry worked flawlessly. After all,

губерній (1906-1917 рр.): дис. ... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Чернігів. нац. пед. ун-т ім. Т. Г. Шевченка. Чернігів, 2014. 325 арк.; Герасименко О. Аграрний рух на Ніжинщині у 1900 – лютому 1917 рр. (за матеріалами місцевого архіву). *Література та культура Полісся*. 2005. Вип. 29. С. 145–152; Герасимчук О. Ставлення чернігівського селянства до аграрної реформи Столипіна. *Сіверянський літопис*. 2011. №1. С. 72–85; Сокирська В. Особливості впровадження Столипінської аграрної реформи на Уманщині в дослідженнях Г. Ю. Храбана. *Український селянин*, 2006. Вип. 10. С. 20–22.; Шевченко В. До питання про селянські виступи на Чернігівщині в період Першої світової війни (лютий 1914 – лютий 1917 р.). *Людина, суспільство, культура: Історія та сучасність*. Чернігів, 1996. С. 65–67.

3 Грушевський М. На порозі Нової України. Підстави Великої України. Село / Хто такі українці і чого вони хочуть. Київ: Т-во «Знання України», 1991. 162 с.

4 Реynt О. Столипінська аграрна реформа: основні події, періодизація, особливості, наслідки. *Український селянин*, 2006. Вип. 10. С.7.

those who had always been used, hardly noticed, and openly neglected, at some point felt their demand and even importance. The opinion of O. Korotkova, who identified an important component of the reform, is correct: to rebuild the social consciousness of the peasant, to deprive him of his former status and legal isolation, and to include him in active social life⁵. The feeling that they are not, as before, objects of commodity-money and production relations, but the main subjects of changes and processes, was strongly and optimistically responded to. Time will tell whether their expectations will become reality.

German publicist P. Rohrbach, assessing the importance of Stolypin's agrarian reform for the imperial government and the peasantry, pointed out that the peasantry learned (or was taught - author) to identify their own interests with the state's. "Before the reform, the peasants treated the state as an extortionist, giving taxes and recruits to the government without expecting anything good in return. Now the state granted property rights and acted as a guarantor of its preservation, and the peasants had a very strong motive to support it. Thus, in the person of the peasant, Russian "pan-Slavism" received a powerful support and could now resort to the implementation of its aggressive plans," P. Rohrbach concludes, calling the reform a turning point in world history⁶.

A similar opinion was expressed by O. Rezent, noting that the main idea of the agrarian reform of 1906-1913 was the attempt of the ruling elite of the empire to create a layer of "strong and powerful" landowners between landlords and peasants in the person of farmers and cuttings, who would become "a stronghold of the monarchist regime in the countryside"⁷. Therefore, a circular sent by the Ministry of the Interior to the governors in 1908 allowed for forced redistributions to be carried out on a regular basis, even though each such redistribution meant the transfer of all peasant strips. The Ministry explicitly emphasized that "the implementation of compulsory allotments... will undoubtedly make the latter more compliant"⁸.

Opponents of the reform, led by representatives of various political currents, especially the Black Hundreds, launched a powerful counter-

reform activity, agitating the peasantry to oppose the government's innovations. Evidence obtained by the Police Department points to numerous facts of the distribution of propaganda materials (leaflets, brochures, books) among the rural population by young people who had traveled to a particular area in various ways (on foot, on horseback, passing by, by train). Given the information vacuum of the time, such printed materials were in great demand among villagers and were distributed on the principle of "read it and pass it on. Public reading of the content of the materials with their subsequent discussion was also practiced. Police prosecutions of propagandists proved ineffective, as the mobility of young people made it difficult to track them. Therefore, the Police Department issued an order to detain persons involved in the distribution of prohibited literature⁹.

In contemporary scholarly works, it is often argued that Ukraine at that time was the region where the implementation of the government's agrarian initiatives met with the least resistance from the peasantry. The loyal attitude of the Ukrainian peasantry to Stolypin's decree is explained, in their opinion, by the fact that the territory of the Ukrainian provinces was dominated by household land tenure, in contrast to the permanent redistribution of land characteristic of the Russian community. Therefore, government initiatives were rather perceived as a chance to legitimize land ownership of a particular plot, and in its absence, to obtain it elsewhere.

If there was resistance from the peasantry, it was caused by other factors. In particular, O. Melnyk, a researcher of the impact of the reform on the situation of peasants of the Left Bank, believes that the main object of opposition was not Stolypin's legislation itself, but "the lack of land for a significant number of direct producers in the presence of aristocratic land tenure of the nobility"¹⁰.

The researcher of the mentality of the Ukrainian peasantry, Y. Prysiazhniuk, disagrees with such considerations of the author and her associates, who believes that the desire for farming was based on "archetypal properties" that were built on traditionalist approaches without understanding the nature of market relations. The

5 Короткова О. Зміни у соціальній свідомості селян України в період реформ 1906–1916 рр. *Український історичний збірник*, 2008. Вип. 11. С.183.

6 Малиновський Б. Пауль Рорбах, Столипінська аграрна реформа і причини Першої світової війни. *Український селянин*. 2006. Вип. 10. С. 20.

7 Реєнт О. Столипінська аграрна реформа: основні події, періодизація, особливості, наслідки. *Український селянин*. 2006. Вип. 10. С.7.

8 Дякин В. Был ли шанс у Столыпина? *Звезда*. 1990. № 12. С. 120–121.

9 Центральний державний історичний архів України (далі – ЦДІА України). Ф.1152. Оп.1. Спр.185. Арк.2.

10 Мельник О. Аграрна реформа П. А. Столипіна та її вплив на становище селян Лівобережної України. *Порівняльно-аналітичне право*, 2020. Вип 1. С. 49.

Ukrainian peasantry, according to the author, simply did not have enough time to innovate and perceive the private form of ownership¹¹.

It should be also emphasized that an important component of the agrarian reform was to solve, in addition to the priority socio-economic task, an even more important socio-political one - the final destruction of the peasant community where it was weak. Therefore, the undisguised resistance to P. Stolypin's reformist course on the part of a significant part of the nobility and even the peasants themselves, members of the community, could have taken on unexpected forms and threatening proportions. After all, in the post-reform period (after the peasant reform of 1861), the political system proved to be extremely unstable and sensitive to challenges, while long-term political stability and social favor were necessary for the implementation of Stolypin's reform. According to O. Pavlov, this posed a double danger for landlords: first, they risked losing control over the system of functioning of landlord farms due to its provision with a peasant component (work, rent, hired labor, rural servitudes, mutual responsibility, etc.), and, second, they had competitors in the form of peasant owners and village societies¹².

Proving that servitudes have become a real source of hostility between landlords and peasants, O. Reyent¹³ gave several specific examples. For many generations, on the basis of easement law, the residents of the village of Kachaly in the Borodyansky subregion of the Kyiv region had been litigating with the administration of Count Shembek. However, even after losing the case, the peasants continued to graze their cattle and "resisted the forest guard of the Borodyanska economy"¹⁴. Another case that occurred on January 30, 1913, in the village of Bakaly, Yezeryansk district, Vasylkiv subregion, Kyiv region, was quite typical. During the division of the grazing land, which was jointly used by Countess Branitsk and the peasants, the latter "behaved extremely defiantly toward a member of the land surveying commission." In the end, the peasants refused to divide the grazing land,

stating that "they did not need any land management, and the land should go to them"¹⁵.

The land management commissions appointed by the government to carry out the land distribution procedure had to fulfill the main technical task: to completely demarcate the allotment land. The regulatory basis for their activities was the Law "On Amendments and Supplements to Certain Resolutions on Peasant Land Tenure" of June 14, 1910, which provided for general internal redistribution of land plots, and enshrined the automatic transfer of all rural communities (regardless of their desire - author) formed before 1887 and the Law on Land Management, adopted on May 29, 1911, which regulated in detail the procedure for land management and was supposed to help overcome the gridlock and divide land into small plots whose owners refused to agree to its division. The response to their resistance was to increase administrative pressure on peasants by representatives of land surveying commissions. A special circular obliged provincial officials to personally travel to the counties and "influence" the peasants¹⁶.

The land surveying commission of the Cherkasy district of the Kyiv province, like other similar commissions, began active work on drafting projects for the development of land plots, their delimitation, and control over the process of transition to farming and cutting. The commission's reports noted that not all peasant citizens were in favor of the innovations: there was no need to convince younger and more educated peasants, but representatives of the older generation were determined not to disrupt the usual way of life inherited from their parents and grandparents¹⁷.

The scale and dynamics of land surveying, especially in the Ukrainian provinces, increased social tensions in the countryside. Its growth was primarily determined by who and how well they managed to navigate the new situation: some managed to improve their financial situation, while others lost even what they had. For example, the following data shows the property differentiation among the peasantry of

11 Присяжнюк Ю. Ментальні «почування» українського селянства в умовах проведення столипінської аграрної реформи. *Український селянин*. 2006. Вип. 10. с. 25

12 Павлов О. Столипінська аграрна реформа: погляд крізь призму століть. *Наукові праці: Науково-методичний журнал*. Т.88. Вип. 75. Історичні науки. Миколаїв: Вид-во МДГУ ім. Петра Могили. 2008. С. 64.

13 Реєнт О. Столипінська аграрна реформа: основні події, періодизація, особливості, наслідки. *Український селянин*. 2006. Вип. 10. С.10-11.

14 Державний архів Київської області (далі – ДАКО). Ф.2. Оп.229. Спр.22. Арк. 115–115 зв.

15 ДАКО. Ф.2. Оп.229. Спр.58. Арк.13.

16 Бутирін С. Роль земських дільничних начальників у період столипінської аграрної реформи. *Вісник Луганського державного університету внутрішніх справ імені Е.О. Дідоренка*, 2010. Вип. 2. С. 38.

17 Державний архів Черкаської області (надалі - ДАЧО). Ф.754. Оп. 9. Спр. 19. Арк.86.

Poltava province: the gross income of farms that owned land of up to one acre was 239.50 rubles, and those that owned 25-50 acres of land were 2315.87 rubles. As of 1910, 95 families did not have their own housing, so they were forced to rent it from kulaks and earned their living by working as laborers. One third of the peasants did not have their own cattle, and half had to work the land with cows¹⁸.

The violation of the principle of equality in the allocation of land to peasants was clearly one of the factors behind the peasant protests. The abuse of power and manipulative behavior of the commissioners were provoked by the “generosity” of wealthy peasants who wanted to get more productive and compactly located land. Poorer villagers, desperate for an adequate response from local authorities and regulatory bodies to violations, resorted to various forms of spontaneous protests (mostly arson of farm buildings, households of wealthy villagers, straw and hay bales). In addition, the forms of protest included damage to crops, obstruction of land surveying, beatings, and sometimes even murder of “farmers”¹⁹. The disdainful and prejudiced attitude of members of the peasant community toward the farmers and cut-offs was manifested even in the boycott of their presence in self-government bodies and village societies.

The peasantry’s dissatisfaction with the reform, in particular with the introduction of differentiation between the “strong and wealthy” and the “poor and drunk,” escalated into attacks “by the whole world” on the surveyors and their associates. For example, in the village of Tsarekonstantinivka, Ekaterinoslav province, peasants gathered to the east and threatened the “farmers.” The dissatisfied land surveyors were forbidden to carry out land surveying work. The governor had to come personally to restore order. The “order” was restored by dismissing the starosta and foreman and imprisoning the 20 most active rebels for 1 to 3 months²⁰.

Despite peasant resistance to the reform, land surveying work continued under security measures. The Chernihiv governor wrote in a secret memo to the Minister of the Interior on May 11, 1910, that each bailiff should organize

“a small detachment of cavalry that could appear as a military and political demonstration if necessary.” Such a practice had a preventive and calming effect on the behavior of the dissatisfied²¹.

Peasant resistance continued even when a third party appeared - representatives of the central government represented by the police. Using available means (labor tools, stones, sticks - author’s note), the peasants engaged in open confrontation with armed police officers. Such clashes resulted in arrests, injuries and killings of participants. Certain events that occurred in 1914, for example, in the village of Ledianyky, Iziaslav district²², and in the village of Vradiyevtsi, Ananiev province, Kherson region²³, are direct evidence of such clashes. The villagers’ obstruction of land surveying ended in an open armed confrontation with numerous victims.

There are regional differences in the readiness and openness of the peasantry to new realities. In particular, the peasants of the western region were more willing to show readiness for hamletization, as they could observe similar processes on the example of Polish and Austro-Hungarian manor individual farms, which were not subject to strict orders and community relations. The peasantry of the southeastern regions reacted even more painlessly to the need to revert (demarcate) land with its subsequent division into farms and parcels, as the original desire to become its full owner mobilized several thousand rural communities for a common cause.

A certain part of the peasantry of the Ukrainian provinces categorically refused to move to farms and receive cuts. For example, in 1910, the Poltava Provincial Land Management Commission received a complaint about the second Biyivska village community of the Kapustyn parish of the Hadiach district, where “as a result of underground propaganda” a large unrest against land management began²⁴. The example of some prompted the actions of others. In particular, the villagers of the Kapustyn village community, participants in a village meeting, told the land surveyors: “We don’t want any land plots, you want to ruin us, get out!”²⁵.

18 Євселевський Л. Кременчуччина у ХІХ – на початку ХХ ст. Історичний нарис. Кременчук, 1995. С. 92.

19 Бакало В., Гоцуляк В. Селянські виступи на Україні в часи столипінської аграрної реформи. *Вісник Черкаського університету. Серія історичні науки*. 2001. Вип. 27. С.92.

20 ЦДАІ України. Ф.442. Оп. 859. Спр. 19. Арк.173.

21 Бакало В., Гоцуляк В. Селянські виступи на Україні в часи столипінської аграрної реформи. *Вісник Черкаського університету. Серія історичні науки*. 2001. Вип. 27. С. 94.

22 ЦДАІ України. Ф. 442. Оп. 713. Спр.137. Арк.23.

23 ЦДАІ України. КМФ.12. Оп. 1. Спр. 448-449. Арк.37

24 Державний архів Полтавської області (надалі - ДАПО). Ф. 123. Оп. 1. Спр. 3. Арк. 1-9, 41, 53

25 Там само. Арк. 21-23.

According to S. Kornovenko and O. Herasymenko, disrupting village meetings where the content of decrees and laws on agrarian reform was explained was one of the most popular methods of fighting those who wanted to support the introduction of agrarian reform. “By disrupting village meetings, peasants tried to prevent the implementation of agrarian reforms in the countryside. They resorted to various means of protest, the reason for which was the fear of losing the best land and their belief that the exodus of some peasants to farms would worsen the already difficult land situation of the rest,” the authors argue²⁶.

The reaction of the peasantry to the organizational actions of the authorities to implement the reform was also affected by the failure to meet the deadlines. In particular, there were numerous instances of bureaucratic red tape in the preparation of the necessary documentation. For example, in 1911, members of the Kotelevka village community in the Akhtyrka district of the Kharkiv province (2621 people) applied to the Kharkiv Land Survey Commission with a request to ream out the land for logging. After a three-year process of land demarcation, they were informed that they should expect documentary confirmation of their rights no earlier than April 1917²⁷.

Peasant protests against reform measures can also be traced on the example of the Uman district of the Kyiv province, factually reflected in the publication of H. Khraban²⁸ and analyzed in detail by V. Sokyrskya²⁹.

In one of them, H. Khraban proved that most peasants, especially the poor, immediately felt significant risks in Stolypin’s law, especially when it came to the lands left for the cleanup. Their elimination deprived poor peasants of the opportunity to keep cattle, as there was no room for grazing on their own piece of land. While studying the social attitudes of the peasantry toward the reform, the author pointed out certain nuances. In particular, when the land of a poor or middle-class person was scattered in several places, it was difficult to cultivate, but at the same time it was possible to reduce the effects

of natural disasters (crop failure, drought, flood, lightning fire, etc.). When the land was supposed to be located in one place, the cutoff could fall on a “bad” place, and the crops would immediately die in the event of a disaster. The peasants would have to flee the village forever, giving the land to the village rich for nothing. Therefore, in his opinion, the majority of peasants opposed the farm system of land allocation³⁰.

Fully defending the position of collective land ownership and property equality in the countryside, Hraban rightly condemned the reform in that part of it that dealt with the intentions of dozens of wealthy peasants who, if they wanted to go to the farms, received the best land. This harmed hundreds of other farms that did not want either farms or land plots”, V. Sokyrskya said³¹.

Supporters of communal land use from the village of Babanky even decided to file a complaint with the tsar, asking him to intercede “for those who were offended and destroyed by the Uman Land Management Commission.” The peasants claimed that the commission had sent a surveyor to “allocate 250 owners of cutoff plots, giving them the best land on which to sow winter and spring crops, while leaving us, 335 community owners, with land with ponds, which will cause us losses due to the burning of bread and unfair cutting.” Therefore, on behalf of the community, the commissioners asked the tsar to “stop the illegal activities of the commission”³². They never received a response. Without waiting for the land division plan to be implemented, radical peasants went door-to-door and convinced their fellow villagers not to agree to exchange their fields with those who wanted to enter the farm, but to sow winter crops immediately after the harvest. The village was divided into two hostile camps: one was occupied by the community’s opponents, the wealthy peasants, and the other by the middle class and the poor. The hostility was often accompanied by fights with police calls and calls from the rebellious to a mediator. After the activists were arrested with the participation of the police, the farms were cut up³³. Similar

26 Корновенко С., Герасименко О. Селянин-бунтар. Селянська революція в Україні 1902 – 1917 рр.. Черкаси : Чабаненко Ю. А., 2017. С.111.

27 Державний архів Харківської області (надалі – ДАХО). Ф.57. Оп. 1. Спр.6.

28 Храбан Г. До 60-річчя боротьби селян Уманщини із столипінською аграрною реформою. *Уманська зоря*. 1970. 25–26 вересня.

29 Сокирська В. Особливості впровадження Столипінської аграрної реформи на Уманщині в дослідженнях Г. Ю. Храбана. *Український селянин*, 2006. Вип. 10. С. 20–22.

30 Храбан Г. До 60-річчя боротьби селян Уманщини із столипінською аграрною реформою. *Уманська зоря*. 1970. 25 вересня. С.4.

31 Сокирська В. Особливості впровадження Столипінської аграрної реформи на Уманщині в дослідженнях Г. Ю. Храбана. *Український селянин*, 2006. Вип. 10. С. 21.

32 ДАЧО. Ф. Р-5624. Оп. 1. Спр. 79. Арк.14.

33 Храбан Г. До 60-річчя боротьби селян Уманщини із столипінською аграрною реформою. *Уманська зоря*, 1970. 26 вересня. С.4.

battles took place in the village of Sobkivka in the same county. On the night of September 9, 1909, when the village fell asleep, someone set fire to a fellow villager's house, where the surveyors lived, with the intention of destroying the land management plans. Having failed to find the culprit, several villagers who actively opposed land surveying were exiled from the village for 2 years to Moldova³⁴.

O. Herasymchuk believes that the main reason for the dissatisfaction of the peasantry of Chernihiv province with Stolypin's land management was its focus on the interests of the wealthy peasantry. The distribution of land and the allocation of peasants to farms and cuttings often took place forcibly, without taking into account the wishes and needs of the peasants. In his opinion, the most typical forms of social activity and protest moods in the countryside were the following: refusal of village assemblies to grant permits for allotments, complaints to higher authorities against land surveyors and local authorities, and obstruction of land surveying. Protest actions caused by the obvious property differentiation among villagers included arson, pogroms, unauthorized seizure of land, and damage to the property of farmers. The most common form of protest was arson (51 out of 58 recorded cases). Although the protests of the Chernihiv peasantry did not become widespread, they forced the authorities to take appropriate measures to curb peasant activity³⁵.

In general, according to the calculations of F. Los and O. Mykhailiuk, in 1907-1914, Kharkiv province ranked first among the rebellious provinces in terms of the number of peasant uprisings on the Left Bank of Ukraine (185 recorded cases), Poltava province ranked second (106 cases), and Chernihiv province ranked third (67 cases)³⁶. Thus, the government's expectation of an active transition of Ukrainian peasants to individual farming was not entirely justified. Resistance to the innovations was expressed in both legal and illegal forms: from official appeals to outright resistance.

At the same time, O. Korotkova traced the onset of positive changes in the behavior, habits, and interests of a significant part of the peasantry that moved to the farms: increased

social activity and self-confidence, increased interest in acquiring new agronomic knowledge and technologies, a decrease in the craving for alcohol and the need for noisy company³⁷.

Contemporary researchers of agrarian history (I. Romaniuk, O. Rud, Y. Prysiashniuk, O. Herasymchuk), assessing the agrarian reform of 1906-1913, emphasize the ambiguity of its results in the regional context. For example, in the Podillia province, almost all peasants (99.6%) were yard workers. Therefore, the interest in the reform was expected and steady. In Chernihiv province, on the other hand, 53.6% of peasant land ownership was communal, so peasant expectations of the positive effects of the reform appear to be more modest, and the main irritant of peasant discontent is the factor of social differentiation. The peasantry of Poltava province was mostly smallholders (59.7%), so the hope of getting land in private ownership due to the created preconditions was nurtured primarily by those with purchasing power.

The main problem for Ukrainian peasants during Stolypin's agrarian reform, which turned out to be common to all regions, was agrarian overpopulation and small landholdings. After all, most peasants had little or no land, and the bulk of the land stock was owned by latifundists. Therefore, in the new economic realities, there were several options for peasants to behave optimally: 1) to buy land on credit through the Peasant Land Bank; 2) to take advantage of the government's resettlement program to sparsely populated but vast areas of Siberia, the North Caucasus, and Central Asia; 3) to sell a small plot of land and move to a city.

R. Bakal's opinion is correct, as he believes that the allocation of land to private ownership with the right to carry out civil law transactions was a significant factor in the migration of the rural population to the city, which contributed to the deepening of proletarianization and urbanization³⁸.

At the same time, the reformed peasant farms were reoriented to a more intensive path of development through the use of agricultural machinery and mechanisms and more advanced tillage technologies, and the Ukrainian peasantry,

34 ДАЧО. Ф. Р-5624. Оп. 1. Спр. 79. Арк. 8.

35 Герасимчук О. Реалізація столипінської аграрної реформи в Чернігівській губернії (1906-1917 рр.): автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук : 07.00.01. Чернігів, 2014. С.13-14.

36 Лось Ф. Класова боротьба в українському селі 1907-1914. Київ: Наукова думка, 1976. С.219.

37 Короткова О. Зміни у соціальній свідомості селян України в період реформ 1906-1916 рр. *Український історичний збірник*. 2008. Вип. 11. С. 184.

38 Бакало Р. Общинне та поміщицьке землеволодіння у роки столипінської аграрної реформи в Україні (1906-1913 рр.). *Вісник Черкаського університету. Серія історичні науки*. 2003. Вип. 50. С.109.

in turn, was drawn into the market system of commodity-money relations.

An integral part of the agrarian reform of 1906-1913 was the mass resettlement of peasants from the central regions of the empire to Siberia, Central Asia, and the Far East, organized by the government. In March 1906, the tsarist government issued an instruction “On the Procedure for the Application of the Law of June 6, 1904,” which provided a mechanism for implementing the resettlement policy and made it possible to use a loan program and benefits to improve the living conditions of the migrants in their new homes.

The resettlement movement reached its peak in 1907-1909. Overall, during the reform, one-third of the 3 million migrants were peasants from the Ukrainian provinces. As of 2014, the diasporas of Ukrainian migrants they created in Siberia (the “Gray Wedge”) and the Far East (the “Green Wedge”) numbered 2 million people³⁹. M. Yakymenko’s analysis of the resettlement policy during the period of P. Stolypin’s agrarian reform shows that the events of the 1905-1907 revolution influenced the intensification of the resettlement policy. In his opinion, the landless or small-landed peasantry, having resorted to pogroms of landowners’ estates, tried to regain the lands seized by the nobility⁴⁰.

Migrants from the Ukrainian provinces were also active during the revolutionary movement of 1905-1907 in the Far East, protesting against the violation of their civil rights, criticizing land surveyors for their bias against them and bureaucratic red tape, and demanding the creation of local governments. They are actively involved in anti-government protests organized by the military. Most of the Ukrainian rebels were sentenced to death for their participation in the uprising in Vladivostok (1907), which ended in the massacre of its participants.

Therefore, the internal political situation in the countryside required decisive action to “evict the politically dangerous part of the rural poor to the outskirts of the empire,” to which the nobility was actively involved through a network of zemstvo institutions. Groups of “walkers” from Poltava, Chernihiv, Kharkiv, and Kherson zemstvos, supported by them organizationally

and financially, were sent to inspect vacant state lands⁴¹. That is, M. Yakymenko’s logic suggests that not only government officials but also the landed aristocracy, who recognized the resettlement of peasants as “a priority from the state point of view,” were interested in implementing and intensifying the resettlement policy. Therefore, the resettlement program in such circumstances became large-scale.

According to the researcher, during 1908-1909, about 7,000 walkers were sent from the Kyiv province alone to various resettlement areas. Their impressions of such “reconnaissance” were not optimistic: the offered lands had poor soil quality, climatic conditions were quite harsh, there were no water bodies, swampiness, remoteness of future settlements, and difficult logistics. These circumstances did not meet the expectations and ideal hopes that villagers had imagined from letters from fellow villagers and relatives⁴².

The social guarantees promised by the government to the IDPs turned out to be scanty, as no one received free meals for “legal” residents at the stations or guaranteed milk for their children. Moreover, to purchase a ticket to the desired destination, one had to overpay a considerable amount of money. Therefore, it is not surprising that at the stations where the resettlement trains were formed, “a real hell was happening - screaming, noise, crying of children and mothers who lost each other, running, fussing, - unbelievable...”⁴³.

The extremely difficult and lengthy journey to their destination drove the immigrants to complete impoverishment, and so a common sight in cities on the way to the Far East was the appearance of a large number of people with knots in their backs, asking for help wherever they could. Between 1906 and 1917, tens of thousands of people died of disease and starvation on the way to their future homes (with a predominance of child mortality - author). People were virtually abandoned to their fate. Therefore, those who had the means returned back, while for the rest it was a “one-way ticket”.

Among those immigrants who were unable to adapt and for whom the road to their homeland was closed, there were those who

39 Україна і світ. Історія господарства від первісної доби до індустріального суспільства. Навч. посібник для вузів / ред. Б. Д. Лановика. К.: Генеза, 1994. С.278.

40 Якименко М. Переселення селян з України на Далекий Схід в епоху ринкових реформ кінця XIX – початку XX ст. Полтава. 2003. 130 с.

41 Якименко М. Переселення селян з України на Далекий Схід в епоху ринкових реформ кінця XIX – початку XX ст. Полтава. 2003. С. 50.

42 Там само. С. 54.

43 Там само. С. 91.

emigrated abroad (the United States, Canada, and Australia). For example, in 1907, about 200 people emigrated from the Far East⁴⁴. Therefore, return migration to the previous place of residence or emigration outside the empire should be considered a form of protest activity of the Ukrainian peasantry against the poorly organized resettlement program.

V. Bocharov studied the implementation of the government's resettlement policy on the example of the Kharkiv province. The author also believes that the revolution of 1905 dramatically changed the government's attitude to resettlement policy, and, refusing to create obstacles to the resettlement movement, it turned to the tactics of its acceleration⁴⁵. The scholar refuted the ideological clichés of Soviet researchers about the coercive nature of the resettlement policy, citing convincing factual data: during 1906-1914, more than 97 thousand people moved from the province to the eastern regions, which was 8.6% of the total number of migrants from Ukraine. However, only 40.6% of them received passage certificates that guaranteed the legality of resettlement and certain social benefits⁴⁶.

IDPs (internally displaced people) who arrived at their final destination complained about high travel and transportation costs and low earnings. As an example, one peasant from Kharkiv province complained: "I earned 350 rubles from the sale of my house, land, etc. It was cheap to travel on the cast-iron railroad; but when I arrived in Omsk, I had to take a steamer down the river, and then it was a disaster. I was not accepted with a large property, although I waited in line for three weeks, and I had to travel 700 miles on horseback. And when I arrived, I bought a hut and a couple of horses, and I had only 80 rubles left. There is no work here"⁴⁷.

Therefore, most of those who consciously decided to move (mostly middle-income peasants and migrant workers) relied primarily on their own strength, as they had a personal interest in settling in a new place as soon as possible (this could vary either due to difficulties in establishing a household or due to the problem of adapting to unusual climatic conditions) and starting a business.

Moving a large number of people over long distances proved to be an extremely difficult problem. Due to the excessive load on the railways, they required both routine and major repairs, the pace of replenishing the shortage of train rolling stock was extremely low, and the passenger traffic was so large that it was quite problematic to manage. In order to improve the situation with passenger transportation, in 1908 a plan for fixed-term rail transportation was first tested: the first stage included immigrants to remote areas (except for Amur), those wishing to get to the Amur region were enrolled in the second stage (only half of the immigrants could use it). For the Poltava province, for example, the following resettlement queues were established: 1st - those who received land in the Primorsky, Abaikal, Irkutsk, and Trans-Ural districts; 2nd - in the Akmola district; 3rd - in the Tomsk (on state lands) and Yenisei districts; 4th - in the Tomsk (on cabinet lands); 5th - in the Tobolsk district⁴⁸.

Land chiefs ('Zemstvo'), who were supposed to prepare supporting documents for issuance in order to relieve the rush among those wishing to relocate, deliberately slowed down this process. For example, a group of residents of the village of Maksymivka in the Lubny district of the Poltava province wrote in a complaint to the Minister of Agriculture B. Ivanitsky on 07.04.1910 that two years had passed since they had asked the local authorities to issue documents for resettlement to the Barnaul district of the Tambov province. "What are we going to do," the villagers asked, "because our family is hungry at home and waiting for bread!"

At the same time, constant reports from migrants about problems with the quantity and quality of the allocated land, poor organization of resettlement, difficult conditions of adaptation and living, and limited government assistance led to a decline in resettlement activity. In 1911, this trend became apparent. According to S. Kornovenko and O. Herasymenko, this was due to several factors: first, the land management authorities did not have time to allocate the required amount of land, second, the imaginary euphoria of rapid enrichment had passed, and third, there was a crop failure caused by climatic factors.

44 Бочаров В. Переселення селян з Харківської губернії (1906–1914 рр.). *Вісник Східноукраїнського національного університету імені Володимира Даля*. 2004. №9. С. 36.

45 Там само. С. 38.

46 Зуева Н.С. Переселенческая политика российского правительства на Дальнем Востоке в период столыпинских реформ: дисс. ... канд. истор. наук: 07.00.02 «Отечественная история». Москва, 2016. С.175–176.

47 Якименко М. Сорочинська трагедія: монографія. Київ: Вид-во політ. літ-ри України, 1990. С.90.

48 Корновенко С., Герасименко О. Селянин-бунтар. Селянська революція в Україні 1902 – 1917 рр. Черкаси: Чабаненко Ю.А., 2017. С.102–103.

Thus, the resettlement campaign as an element of the agrarian reform of 1906-1913 was aimed at solving the political (development of the free territories of the empire), economic (alleviation of the problem of small land), social (prevention of social confrontation in the countryside) and, most importantly, national (destruction of signs of Ukrainian identity) tasks of the imperial government. It is no coincidence that P. Stolypin, as a champion of the idea of a “powerful and unlimited” Russian autocracy, in one of his speeches in the State Duma (1911) stated: “The historical task of Russian statehood is to fight the movement, nowadays called the Ukrainian movement, which contains the idea of reviving the old Ukraine and organizing the Little Russian Ukraine on an autonomous national-territorial basis”.

Conclusions. The “divorce” from the communal form of land use and the community as a social environment was less painful for the mentality of the Ukrainian peasantry than for the Russian peasant who could not imagine his life without them. At the same time, the motivation of certain groups of peasants to leave the community was different, as some wanted to become independent farmers, others wanted to avoid splitting up the land during its distribution, and some, on the contrary, after purchasing land,

planned to sell it profitably and move to the city. That is why the peasantry can be divided into two categories: the first is peasants who, having acquired land in one way or another, moved towards creating strong households, and the second is peasants who, having received land and the corresponding rights to it, entered into commodity-money relations.

The implementation of the agrarian reform of 1906-1913 demonstrates its own forms and methods of social reflection - from mass (riots, blocking the work of land surveying commissions, village assemblies) to individual (arson, crop burning, unauthorized deforestation, plowing of land, beating land surveyors, resistance to the police), etc. Conflicts between former members of the community have escalated due to the formation of peasants with different property and social status. The objects of peasant anger are no longer landlords, but peasants who have been cut off or have gone to the farm. The revolution of social consciousness did take place, as community stereotypes could not resist the new agrarian ideology.

Funding. The article contains the results of a study based on the fundamental research ‘Socio-cultural space of Ukraine in the second

half of the nineteenth century - the first third of the twentieth century: the peasant world’ (state registration number: 0123U101600).

References:

1. Bakalo, V. & Hotsuliak, V. (2001). Selianski vystupy na Ukraini v chasy stolypinskoï ahrarnoi reformy. [Peasant demonstrations in Ukraine during the Stolypin agrarian reform]. *Visnyk Cherkaskoho universytetu. Seriiã istorichni nauky. [Announcer of the Tcherkasy University. Series are historical sciences]*, 27, 92–94. [in Ukrainian].
2. Bocharov, V. (2004). Pereselennia selian z Kharkivskoi hubernii (1906–1914 rr.). Resettlement of peasants from Kharkiv province (1906–1914). [Bulletin of the Eastern Ukrainian National University named after Volodymyr Dahl]. *Visnyk Shkhydnoукраїнського національного університету імені Володимира Дала. [Bulletin of the Eastern Ukrainian National University named after Volodymyr Dahl]*, 9, 35–39. [in Ukrainian].
3. Butyrin, Ye. (2010). Rol zemskykh dilnychnykh nachalnykh u period stolypinskoï ahrarnoi reformy. [The role of zemstvo district chiefs during the period of the Stolypin agrarian reform]. *Visnyk Luhanskoho derzhavnoho universytetu vnutrishnykh sprav imeni E. O. Didorenka. [Bulletin of E. O. Didorenko Luhansk State University of Internal Affairs]*, 2, 36–44. [in Ukrainian].
4. Herasymenko, O. (2005). Ahrarnyi rukh na Nizhynshchyni u 1900 – liutomu 1917 rr. (za materialamy mistsevoho arkhivu). [Agrarian movement in the Nizhyn region in 1900 – February 1917 (based on the materials of the local archive)]. *Literatura ta kultura Polissia. [Literature and culture of Polissia]*, 29, 145–152. [in Ukrainian].
5. Herasymenko, O. (2005). Selianskyi rukh na Livoberezhnii Ukraini pid chas zdiisnennia Stolypinskoï reformy. [Peasant movement on the Left Bank of Ukraine during the implementation of the Stolypin reform]. *Ukrainian peasant. Ukraïnskyi selianyn. [Ukrainian peasant]*, 9, 146–149. [in Ukrainian].

6. Herasymchuk, O. (2014). Realizatsiia stolypynskoi ahrarnoi reformy v Chernihivskii hubernii (1906 – 1917 rr.). [Implementation of the Stolypin agrarian reform in the Chernihiv province (1906 – 1917)]. *Candsdat's thesis*. Chernihiv. [in Ukrainian].
7. Herasymchuk, O. (2011). Stavlennia chernihivskoho selianstva do ahrarnoi reformy Stolypina. [The attitude of the Chernihiv peasantry to Stolypin's agrarian reform]. *Siverianskyi litopys*. [Severyan annals], 1, 72–85. [in Ukrainian].
8. Hrushevskiy, M (1991). Khto taki ukraintsi i choho vony khochut. [Who are Ukrainians and what do they want]. Kyiv: T-vo «Znannia Ukrainy». [in Ukrainian].
9. Diakyn, V. (1990). Bil li u Stolypina shans? [Did Stolypin have a chance?]. *Zvezda*. [Zvezda], 12, 113–124. [in Russian].
10. Yevselevskiy, L. (1995). Kremenchuchchyna u KhIKh – na pochatku KhKh st. Istorychnyi narys: monohrafiia. [Kremenchuk in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Historical essay]. Kremenchuk. [in Ukrainian].
11. Zueva, N. (2016). Pereselencheskaia polytyka rossiiskoho pravytelstva na Dalnem Vostoke v peryod stolypynskikh reform. [The resettlement policy of the Russian government in the Far East during the Stolypin reforms]. *Candidat thesis*. Moskva. [in Russian].
12. Kornovenko, S. & Herasymenko, O. (2017). Selianyn-buntar. Selianska revoliutsiia v Ukraini 1902 – 1917 rr. [Rebel peasant. Peasant revolution in Ukraine 1902–1917]. Cherkasy : Chabanenko Yu. A. [in Ukrainian].
13. Korotkova, O. (2008). Zminy u sotsialnii svidomosti selian Ukrainy v period reform 1906 – 1916 rr. [Changes in the social consciousness of the peasants of Ukraine during the period of reforms of 1906–1916]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zbirnyk* [Ukrainian historical collection], 181–184. [in Ukrainian].
14. Los, F. (1976). Klasova borotba v ukrainskomu seli 1907 – 1914. [Class struggle in the Ukrainian village 1907–1914]. Kyiv : Naukova dumka. [in Ukrainian].
15. Malynovskiy, B. (2006) Paul Rorbakh. Stolypinska ahrarna reforma i prychny Pershoi svitovoi viiny. [Paul Rohrbach. Stolypin's agrarian reform and the causes of the First World War]. *Ukrainskyi selianyn*. [Ukrainian peasant], 10, 18–20. [in Ukrainian].
16. Melnyk, O. (2020). Ahrarna reforma P. A. Stolypina ta yii vplyv na stanovyshe selian Livoberezhnoi Ukrainy. [The agrarian reform of PA Stolypin and its impact on the situation of the peasants of the Left Bank of Ukraine]. *Comparative and analytical law*. [Porivnialno-analitychne pravo], 1, 48–51. [in Ukrainian].
17. Pavlov, O. (2008). Stolypinska ahrarna reforma: pohliad kriz pryzmu stolit. [Stolypin's agrarian reform: a view through the prism of centuries]. *Naukovi pratsi: Naukovo-metodychnyi zhurnal*. [Scientific works: Scientific and methodical journal], 75. [in Ukrainian].
18. Prysiazhniuk, Yu. (2006). Mentalni «pochuvannia» ukrainskoho selianstva v umovakh provedennia stolypynskoi ahrarnoi reformy. [Mental «feelings» of the Ukrainian peasantry in the conditions of the Stolypin agrarian reform]. *Ukrainskyi selianyn*. [Ukrainian peasant], 10, 22–25. [in Ukrainian].
19. Reient, O. (2006). Stolypinska ahrarna reforma: osnovni podii, periodyzatsiia, osoblyvosti, naslidky. [Stolypin agrarian reform: main events, periodization, features, consequences]. *Ukrainskyi selianyn*. [Ukrainian peasant], 10, 6–16. [in Ukrainian].
20. Sokyrskya, V. (2006). Osoblyvosti vprovadzhennia Stolypynskoi ahrarnoi reformy na Umanshchyni v doslidzhenniakh H. Yu. Khrabana. [Peculiarities of the implementation of the Stolypin agrarian reform in the Uman region in the studies of G. Yu. Hraban]. *Ukrainskyi selianyn*. [Ukrainian peasant], 10, 20–22. [in Ukrainian].
21. *Ukraina i svit. Istoriiia hospodarstva vid pervisnoi doby do industrialnoho suspilstva*. [Ukraine and the world. The history of the economy from primitive times to industrial society]. (1994). Kuiv. [in Ukrainian].
22. Khraban, H. (1970). Do 60–richchia borotby selian Umanshchyny iz stolypynskoiu ahrarnoiu reformoiu. [To the 60th anniversary of the struggle of the peasants of the Uman region against the Stolypin agrarian reform]. *Umanska zoria*. [Uman star], 25 veresnia. [in Ukrainian].
23. Khraban, H. (1970). Do 60–richchia borotby selian Umanshchyny iz stolypynskoiu ahrarnoiu reformoiu. [To the 60th anniversary of the struggle of the peasants of the Uman region against the Stolypin agrarian reform]. *Umanska zoria*. [Uman star], 26 veresnia. [in Ukrainian].

24. Shevchenko, V. (1970). Do pytannia pro selianski vystupy na Chernihivshchyni v period Pershoi svitovoi viiny (liutyi 1914 – liutyi 1917 r.). [To the question of peasant demonstrations in Chernihiv Oblast during the First World War (February 1914 – February 1917)]. *Liudyna, suspilstvo, kultura: Istorii ta suchasnist.* [Man, society, culture: History and modernity], 65–67. [in Ukrainian].

25. Yakymenko, M. (2003). Pereseleattia selian z Ukrainy na Dalekyi Skhid v epokhu rynkovykh reform kintsia XIX – pochatku XX st. [Resettlement of peasants from Ukraine to the Far East in the era of market reforms of the late 19th and early 20th centuries]. Poltava. [in Ukrainian].

26. Yakymenko, M. (2003). Sorochynska trahediia. [Sorochyn tragedy]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo polit. lit-ry Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian].

Надійшла до редакції / Received: 13.11.2023

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 04.12.2023