

UDC 94:338.43.02(470+571)“1906/1917”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.19.233837

Oleh PRYIMAK

PhD hab. (History), Docent, Professor of the Department of Social Philosophy and Management, Zaporizhzhya National University, 66 Zhukovsky Street, Zaporizhzhya, Ukraine, postal code 69660 (olegpriimak75@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0003-0896-1431

Yulia PRYIMAK

PhD (Sociology), Docent of the Sociology Department, Zaporizhzhya National University, 66 Zhukovsky Street, Zaporizhzhya, Ukraine, postal code 69600 (priimakulyia@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-8575-9045

Олег ПРИЙМАК

доктор історичних наук, доцент, професор кафедри соціальної філософії та управління Запорізького національного університету, вул. Жуковського, 66, м. Запоріжжя, Україна, індекс 69600 (olegpriimak75@gmail.com)

Юлія ПРИЙМАК

кандидат соціологічних наук, доцент кафедри соціології Запорізького національного університету, вул. Жуковського, 66, м. Запоріжжя, Україна, індекс 69600 (priimakulyia@gmail.com)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Pryimak, O. & Pryimak, Yu. (2021). Dmytro Stolypin's social experiment repercussions in the agrarian reform of 1906 – 1917. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 19, 96–106. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.19.233837

**DMYTRO STOLYPIN'S SOCIAL EXPERIMENT REPERCUSSIONS
IN THE AGRARIAN REFORM OF 1906 – 1917**

Abstract. *The purpose of the research is to study Dmytro Stolypin's social experiment repercussions in the agrarian reform of 1906 – 1917 through the family's vision retrospective concerning the peasant issue's essence in the Russian Empire at the second half of the XIXth – at the beginning of the XXth century. The Methodology of the Research.* *The key to understanding the publication's subject essence could be found in the plane of the postmodern methodology. Due to the use of the principles of objectivity, multifactorialism, historicism, as well as historical genetic, problem chronological, historical and biographical, retrospective, prosopographic methods and content analysis, the goal was achieved. The scientific novelty.* *The D. A. Stolypin's experiment is considered not only as one of the domestic sociological science's sprouts, but also the family practice, which influenced P. A. Stolypin's worldview formation, as a microsocioal process from the steps of the “problem statement” and the “revolution in consciousness” that preceded the agrarian reform break out in 1906 – 1917. The Conclusions.* *The social experiment took place in 1874 – 1893 near the village of Mordvynivka, Berdyansk district (povit), Tavriya huberniya (province) and covered 214 people. Its purpose was to create the rental farms in order to increase D. A. Stolypin's estate profitability and to popularize among the local peasantry of the leading at that time the intensive forms of the local management.*

D. A. Stolypin, Comte's student and follower; the experiment was an empirical proof of the correctness concerning the views on the peasant issue's essence. It became the basis of a report proclaimed in March 1882 in the Moscow Imperial Society of Agriculture. The latter contained proposals for the relaxation and further abolition of ransom payments for the peasants, the introduction of private ownership of communal land, the land management, and stimulating the growth of the peasant land ownership. The comparison with the agrarian legislation of 1905 – 1911 allowed to reveal a number of similar features.

Key words: social experiment, khutir, peasantry, community, sociologist, agrarian reform.

ВІДЛУННЯ СОЦІАЛЬНОГО ЕКСПЕРИМЕНТУ ДМИТРА СТОЛИПІНА В АГРАРНІЙ РЕФОРМІ 1906 – 1917 рр.

Анотація. Мета статті – крізь ретроспективу родинного бачення сутності селянського питання в Російській імперії другої половини XIX – початку XX ст. дослідити відлуння соціального експерименту Дмитра Столипіна в аграрній реформі 1906 – 1917 рр. **Методологія дослідження.** Ключ до розуміння сутності предмета публікації лежить у площині методології постмодерну. Досягнення мети стало можливим завдяки використанню принципів об'єктивності, багатофакторності, історизму, а також історико-генетичного, проблемно-хронологічного, історико-біографічного, ретроспективного, просопографічного методів та контент-аналізу. **Наукова новизна.** Експеримент Д. А. Столипіна розглянуто не лише як один з паростків вітчизняної соціологічної науки, а й родинну практику, що вплинула на формування світогляду П. А. Столипіна, як мікросоціальний процес з кроків “постановки проблеми” й “революції в свідомості”, що передували аграрній реформі 1906 – 1917 рр. **Висновки.** Соціальний експеримент проходив у 1874 – 1893 рр. поблизу с. Мордвинівка Бердянського повіту Таврійської губернії та охопив 214 осіб. Мета його полягала у створенні орендних хуторів задля підвищення рентабельності маєтності Д. А. Столипіна та популяризації серед місцевого селянства провідних на той час інтенсивних форм ділянкового господарювання.

Для Д. А. Столипіна, як учня та послідовника О. Конта, експеримент був емпіричним доказом правдивості поглядів щодо сутності селянського питання. Він став основою проголошеної у березні 1882 р. доповіді в Московському Імператорському товаристві сільського господарства. Остання містила пропозиції щодо послаблення і подальшого скасування для селян викупних платежів, запровадження приватної власності на общинні землі, проведення землевпорядних робіт, стимулювання зростання селянського землеволодіння. Порівняння їх з аграрним законодавством 190 – 1911 рр. дало змогу виявити низку схожих рис.

Ключові слова: соціальний експеримент, хутір, селянство, община, соціолог, аграрна реформа.

The Problem Statement. The limit of research on the agrarian history at the second half of the XIXth – at the beginning of the XXth century determined by the Peasant and Stolypin reforms. Furthermore, it is impossible to be aware of the phenomena and processes essence of that time in the Ukrainian countryside without a detailed analysis of the social organization's forms' evolution, the economic system transformation, the commodity market relations development, the changes in agrarian policy. At the same time, the macro- and, sometimes, metahistorical nature of the vast majority of the scientific research involves modeling the object of study – the peasantry or the landlord nobility – as a social monolith or a complex community. Hence, the above-mentioned approach is thorough, comprehensive, but not infrequently faceless and depersonalized. That is why, recently the research on the microhistorical direction, the subject of which is on the edge of biography, social and agrarian history, became more and more vital. Bringing to the forefront and being in the limelight in the content of the last extraordinary historical figures, which were forgotten, little known, received the stigma of a person of secondary status, is quite natural, logical and relevant. One of such figures can be considered Auguste Comte's student, sociologist experimenter,

“zemskyi” and public figure, the South Ukrainian landowner Dmytro Arkadiyovych Stolypin. His ideas on solving the peasant and land issues were not only based on a complex theoretical and sociological basis, but also for a quarter of a century ahead of the basic principles implemented by his cousin – P. A. Stolypin – the agrarian reform. The possibility of using their historical experience in terms of reforming the agrarian sector of modern Ukraine, as well as the logic of the study of their repercussions in the agrarian reform of 1906 – 1917, determine the problem area of this publication.

The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications. There are few historiographical works, which mention D. A. Stolypin’s name. Diverse works were based on studies of historical and local lore (Karagodin, 1998, p. 176) and historical and biographical nature, which contained information about the stages of life (Golosenko, 2001), psychological (Dal, 1906, p. 272) and sociological (Pryimak, 2011) heritage, the course of the social experiment conducted by Dmytro Arkadiyovych (Pryimak, 2019). In addition, in the context of a general review of genealogy, P. A. Stolypin’s state and political activity was mentioned in a number of monographs (Kacharovskiy, 1911, p. 138; Zyryanov, 1992, p. 8). At the same time, achieving the goal of publication would not be possible without analyzing the landed economy’s state issue in the South of Ukraine during the inter-reform period. The researcher, N. R. Temirova managed to disclosure the above-mentioned issue comprehensively in the studies (Temirova, 2003), as well as publications, written by M. Kazmyrchuk (Kazmyrchuk, 2019, p. 61), O. Cheremisin and N. Mykhailenko (Mykhailenko & Cheremisin, 2020, p. 42).

In our opinion, it is expedient to include D. Macy’s article in the historiographical work, which proposes to recognize the Stolypin reform not only as the key to understanding the ‘tsarism’ fate, but also as the result of a number of complex and long intellectual, social and political processes. The researcher did not once mention D. A. Stolypin, when he was considering the reform from the standpoint of long-term perspective and retrospective and identified four stages of preparation of the latter: 1) the problem statement; 2) a revolution in consciousness, or an ideological revolution, associated with the rejection of those relations and policies that contributed to both the problem and the adoption of a new radical decision; 3) the program’s deployment of these new ideas in the government and in the society as a whole; 4) the political figure’s emergence, capable of providing the political support for the reforms needed to win their approval and further implementation (Macy, 1993, p. 3). To our mind, P. A. Stolypin’s activities as the Prime Minister and the implementation of the new course of the agrarian policy at this time was clearly synchronized with the last step of that linear process. But it should be mentioned that D. A. Stolypin’s idea concerning changing the course of the agrarian policy’s popularization from the community support to the peasant farming individualization and intensification coincided with the first two stages completely.

The purpose of the research is to study Dmytro Stolypin’s social experiment repercussions in the agrarian reform of 1906 – 1917 through the family’s vision retrospective concerning the peasant issue’s essence in the Russian Empire at the second half of the XIXth – at the beginning of the XXth century.

The Main Material Statement. Dmytro Arkadiyovych Stolypin was born on the 15th of January in 1818. He spent his childhood in the village. Mordvynivtsi, Berdyansk district (povit), Tavriya huberniya (province) (nowadays the village of Mordvynivka, Melitopol district, Zaporizhia region) (Holosenko, 2001, p. 1109). Dmytro graduated from the School of Guards Ensigns; took part in the Crimean War. In 1856 Dmytro went abroad, where he engaged in self-education. For several years he attended the private lectures of the father

of modern sociology, Auguste Comte, a follower and student of whom Dmytro Stolypin considered himself until the last days of his life. Upon his return to his homeland, during the 1860-ies he worked as an integral part of the Free Povit (County) presence on the peasant issues in Berdyansk Povit (County). After moving to Moscow, Dmytro Arkadiyovych became a member of the in 1867, and later on – the Farm Commission Chairman of the Imperial Society of Agriculture (Pryimak, 2011, p. 135). Based on Auguste Comte's sociological heritage in numerous reports, brochures, articles, monographs of the time, Dmytro Stolypin substantiated such ideas as the economic weakness of the rural community and the artificiality of its creation in southern Ukraine, the need to increase and intensify the agriculture, the feasibility of changing the agrarian policy, reforming the social system in the countryside and introducing a farm system. He substantiated these views on the basis of Comte's triad "observation – description – experiment" (Stolypin, 1890, p. 37).

Taken into consideration the level of contemporary sociological science, the social experiment was a method of empirical research, which was based on active, the purposeful intervention of the subject in the process of cognition of phenomena and objects of real social reality, by creating controlled and managed conditions to identify certain qualities, connections in the researched or created object and to reproduce them repeatedly. It included not only the observation, comparison and measurement of the social reality, but also the active influence on the created socio-economic unit in order to correct, improve, give it a boost for the self-development.

The main reasons for D. A. Stolypin's social experiment were the crisis of landlordism and the peasant scarcity, which hindered the agrarian capitalism development. The goal coincided with the direction of the search for social support in the countryside by the imperial elite. Its essence was to create the rental farms on the landed estates to increase the profitability of the latter and popularize among the local peasantry the leading at that time intensive forms of local management (Stolypin, 1876, p. 34). Furthermore, the general logic of D. A. Stolypin's social experiment consisted in choosing as an object of experience a group of peasants displaced from the community to the farms in order to influence them with the chosen specific means to trace the direction and level of sustainability of transformations. Dmytro Stolypin also set himself the task of making changes in the traditional social, economic and domestic relations of the peasants and control over the influence of these factors on the activities and behavior of not only the community members but also the "khutoryan" (farmers).

The experiment was implemented in the village of Mordvynivtsi from 1874 to 1893. Dmytro Arkadiyovych was not limited to passive observation, which was created in the middle of the peasant community space forms of the family farm organization of labor, but also deliberately interfered in the process of their genesis, during 19 years as the experiment was carried out. The popularization of the results obtained in numerous publications and public speeches not only stimulated the social development of the village, but also confirmed Dmytro Stolypin's status in the social environment as a sociologist experimenter and ideologue of the agrarian reform. In addition, an important place in the process was occupied by such a component as proving the effectiveness of the achievements of sociological science in solving the peasant issue.

Dmytro Arkadiyovych chose the community members from the village of Mordvynivka as the social experiment's subject. As a result, 22 peasant families took part in the experiment, which included 55 men, 54 women of working age, as well as 38 boys and 48 girls for 19 years. By ethnicity, members of 13 families were the Russians, 6 – the Ukrainians,

2 – the Germans, 1 – the Tatars. Taking into account the fact that 15 families of them kept 13 seasonal and 6 permanent employees, it is possible to determine the final number of participants was 214 people. Typically, all families were large or joined (Pryimak, 2012, pp. 440–442).

Hence, D. A. Stolypin's social experiment can be divided into three stages: 1874 – 1877, 1878 – 1888, 1889 – 1893. Each of them was marked by the groups of farms (khutir) consolidation, drafting or amending the text of the lease agreement, increasing the amount of rent or replacing the latter with a purchase and sale transaction (Stolypin, 1892, p. 15). In addition, over time, the social composition of farmers changed. If at the first stage the agreements were final exclusively with the 'kurkul' and wealthy peasants, then at the second stage there was one middle-class family among the wealthy families. The ratio between the last pair in the third stage was 50:50. In just 19 years, 20 farms were built. But the further course of the experiment was followed by Dmytro Arkadiyovych's death (For more details on the course of the social experiment in the village of Mordvinivka, see (Pryimak, 2019, pp. 77–84).

Recognizing the leading role of science, especially sociology, in the development of society Dmytro Stolypin used the experiment in Mordvynivka as an empirical justification of their views on the nature of the peasant issue and the nature of state agrarian policy after the abolition of serfdom. In his numerous publications at the time, he argued that the reforms of the 60–70s of the XIXth century stimulated the commodity capitalist relations development in the economy, including in the agrarian sector (Stolypin, 1874, p. 6). At the same time, in his opinion, the remnants of the patriarchal system in society played an important role. It hampered the rationalization of life of various social strata significantly, mainly the peasantry. In the peasants' daily life, these remnants were manifested not only in the economic and agricultural, but also in the social spheres. Subjecting to a detailed analysis of such features of the southern Ukrainian peasantry as traditionalism, the patriarchy of family life, extensive management, weakness of the community, Dmytro Stolypin concluded that the emergence of overcrowding and land famine in the rural areas (Stolypin, 1876, p. 9). The observations and descriptions supported by the experiment became for D. Stolypin a platform on the basis of which he formulated his vision of solving the agrarian problem.

Already during the second stage of the social experiment in Modvynivtsi, namely in March 1882, Dmytro Arkadiyovych made his fifteenth report at a meeting of the Moscow Imperial Society of Agriculture. The course was devoted to the farm settlement issues and the state of the peasant economy analysis. Proclaiming it, the researcher was already in the position of the Farm Commission Chairman, the Moscow Imperial Society of Agriculture, and allegedly proposed to the meeting the results of all previous activities. Outlining the established theses about the artificial nature of the community, the rural population differentiation existence, the need to intensify both the landlord and the peasant farming, Dmytro Stolypin focused on the analysis of the agrarian policy course. As a result, he brought in the recommendations, the content of which reflected the views of the most progressive representatives of the then elite on the issue concerning making changes in this area of the domestic policy. Hence, D. A. Stolypin's suggestions on the peasant issue solution were contained in the following paragraphs: 1) in the statutes of existing banks, it would be appropriate to make changes that would allow the peasants to purchase the land and sell the land in personal ownership, except to increase grazing. Unless the purchase was made by the peasant societies; 2) it was desirable to hand over the state leased land articles to individual peasants, and not to the rural communities. But both in the first and in the second cases, in order to avoid the

lack of fees and arrears issue, hence, the pressure of the latter must be tolerable and not damage the peasant economy; 3) delimitation of peasant land per capita allotments, as well as giving them the opportunity to separate from the community or move to the court ownership; 4) it was desirable to demarcate the lands of those belonging to several rural communities, as it was the cause of confusion and many misunderstandings and disputes; 5) the relief of Art. 165 on redemption – to allow a peasant to buy a plot for half the price set within the redemption operation; 6) the spread of Art. 165 on ransom for the peasant communities that paid their ransom, as well as for the peasants, who were on the allotment. Hence, in the above-mentioned six points, in fact, D. A. Stolypin predicted the content of the main directions of the agrarian reform of 1906 – 1917 (Stolypin, 1883, p. 11).

At the time of the announcement of this report, the peasants' payments on ransom payments lasted for 21 years. As a long-term government loan with 6% annual payments, they had to be terminated in 1910, subject to compliance with the schedule. But the accumulation of arrears prolonged the financial operation until 1932. In the spring of 1882, two tendencies were clearly observed in this direction – if a certain part of rural communities carried out redemption operations in advance, the vast majority accumulated arrears. However, neither in the fifth nor in the sixth paragraphs introduced by D. A. Stolypin did not explicitly point out the need to abolish the ransom payments completely. But his attention to Article 165 of the Regulations was quite logical. On the one hand, based on the intermediate results of Dmytro Stolypin's social experiment, he pointed to the expediency of freeing a strong, solvent, hard-working peasant from the influence of the community. He proposed to cancel the debt to those who paid the state half the value of their allotment with “the obligatory obligation of the rural community to allocate the appropriate plot to the peasant, if possible, in one place for consideration by the community” (Stolypin, 1883, p. 8). The latter, thus, became not merely the owner of the land; he was able to reduce his allotment strips into a single piece, in fact – in the cut. On the other hand, Dmytro Arkadiyovych proposed recognizing the peasants of those communities, who had paid the ransom payment as sole private owners of land plots. In both cases there was an understanding of the need to stimulate the agrarian capitalism by significantly easing the financial ransom burden for the peasants, the introduction of individual private ownership of allotted land, the departure from state support of the rural community.

In addition, the tendency, which was noticed by D. A. Stolypin, turned into a pattern at the beginning of the XXth century. The need for the complete ransom payments' abolition was recognized as urgent during the Special Meeting on the Needs of the Agricultural Industry. It was demanded by the peasants during spontaneous revolutionary demonstrations. The government of S.Yu. Witte and Nicholas II could not ignore these facts. Therefore, on the 3rd of November in 1905, the Manifesto and the accompanying order were published, according to which “ransom payments of former landlord peasants from the 1st of January in 1906 were reduced by half, and from the 1st of January in 1907 were abolished completely” (Sidelnikov, 1973, pp. 45–46). The imperial elite, therefore, deliberately made the largest financial sacrifice to the state, as the total budget losses from the abolition of redemption operations reached 1 billion. 674 million karbovantsi. Payments from the state treasury to the landlords of 4% of the state redemption obligations were supposed to last until 1955. Stolypin, who was appointed as the Council of Ministers Chairman on the 21st of July in 1906, did not have the laurels of authorship, but the official duty to implement the measures determined by his predecessor to abolish the ransom payments.

The discussion's level concerning the community's fate increased in a similar way. Even after returning from abroad, during trips to the territory of Berdyansk povit (district), Dmytro

Arkadiyovych noticed several interesting changes in the rural everyday life, for example, the plots' fragmentation, the multi-layered and distant lands' growth; the transition of the community from general to the partial redistribution, or even without a redistributive state; purchase of landlord or state lands by wealthy peasants united in a society; the peasant land lease development (Stolypin, 1877, pp. 3–8). It did not go unnoticed that the Mordvin community members, in order to prevent the allotment of new settlers and prevent the reduction of land, turned to the court system (Stolypin, 1874, p. 3). As D. A. Stolypin spotted the fragility of the community and the attraction of peasants to individual farming, he went on a social experiment to accelerate the trend. And the success was obvious – if on the eve of the experiment the Mordvinians were wary of the proposals of the master, because “in the community, as in a glove all together and warm”, then before the second stage behind the farms was a long queue (Stolypin, 1877, p. 3). The success of that, to some extent provocative step, was reflected in the third and fifth paragraphs of the fifteenth report written by Dmytro Stolypin. In fact, it provided not only the ransom payments abolition for the peasant elite, but also its release from the guardianship and the circular guarantee of the community, and the shaking of the social organism of the latter.

According to Macy, at first, the pair of points reflected the belief of the loner, but then in the 1890-ies the idea of the appropriateness of withdrawal from the state support of the community was already quite popular both among the liberal zemstvo and in the aristocratic salons (Macy, 1993, p. 18). It was brought to the level of discussion by the higher state bureaucracy by the commission of V.Y. Hurko and the Special Meeting of S. Yu. Witte (Pryimak, 2002, pp. 26–27). The order, issued on the 9th of November in 1906, which triggered Stolypin's agrarian reform, turned this idea into a public policy course. According to the content of his first article, the owner, who owned allotted land, was given the opportunity to consolidate their strips in the individual private property. According to the second article, in those communities where there was no general redistribution for 24 years, for each peasant who submitted a declaration of a desire to move from communal to private land ownership, both homestead and arable lands that were previously in permanent use were assigned to ownership. In the communities, where general redistributions took place on the eve of the reforms, the allotments that were given to him by the east for permanent use became the individual private property of the peasant. If a separate farm had more land than was established by the east during the redistribution, the peasant had to pay the community the value of the surplus. In addition, the surplus was determined by the initial redemption price (Sidelnikov, 1973, pp. 99–105).

Therefore, the Decree issued on the 9th of November in 1906 ensured the full right of the peasant to private ownership of the former communal allotment. On the one hand, the impoverished peasants, who did not have the opportunity to run their own farms, had the opportunity to sell the communal plots. On the other hand, conditions were created for the wealthy owners to increase the size of the sown area by purchasing the plots. However, the process of mobilization of communal land was limited by the Rules issued on the 6th of August in 1907, according to which the peasants had the right to concentrate in one farm no more than 6 purchased plots (Sidelnikov, 1973, pp. 150–151).

At the same time, the Decree issued on the 9th of November in 1906 was replaced in 1910 by the Law issued on the 14th of June. As a result, the process of introducing individual private property on communal lands accelerated – unrestricted communities were automatically transferred by law to a court or personal-private ownership. In addition,

the local administration was given broad powers to influence the process of peasants leaving the redistributive communities.

It should also be added that during the social experiment D. A. Stolypin had neither the right nor the opportunity to interfere directly in the land relations of Mordvyniv community. In his experience, Dmytro only hinted to the peasants at the backwardness and obsolescence of their economic system; it raised doubts in the community's social consciousness concerning the fidelity of traditional land use. But the third to fifth paragraphs of this report contained an indication of the appropriateness of the allocation of peasant strips to one side, the need for the boundary work, the transition to farming. Hence, on the basis of phenomena's observation derived from the experiment, Dmytro Stolypin, in fact, made the assumption that in the future the main object of land management should be the allotment of the rural community.

The first and second paragraphs of the fifteenth report conducted by D. A. Stolypin stemmed from the problem of peasant scarcity of land. Founded by the provisions of the 1861 reform, it was complicated by the weakness and limited financial mechanisms by the end of the 1870-ies, through which the land fund of the landlord nobility, the State and Specific Departments, could gradually become the property or long-term use of the main agricultural producer. The above-mentioned points were devoted to stimulating the development of the land market, with the obligatory involvement of individual farmers in the latter. But due to cast affiliation, Dmytro Stolypin could not directly point out that the nobility, especially small businesses, unrestrainedly withdrew from economic affairs and handed them over to managers, mortgaged and re-mortgaged property, plunged into debt, led a parasitic lifestyle. Instead, Dmytro spoke of the crisis of the landed economy, one of the ways out of which he considered the establishment in the estates of rental farms for peasants (Stolypin, 1893, p. 6). In meeting the land needs of the latter, Dmytro Solypin saw the prospect of a new social support for the state in the countryside. He defined his social experiment in Mordvynivka as an argument in the proven fidelity of such a step. Realizing the unprecedentedness of the latter, the amateur sociologist did not stop only at the lease of the created improved plot farms. Without the mortgage institutions' involvement, only on the basis of the terms of the agreement with the peasants, he initiated the mechanisms of direct purchase and sale of noble land by individual peasants (Stolypin, 1893, p. 12). Thus, the cost of proving the correctness and social viability of beliefs reached for D. A. Stolypin in the amount of about 246 thousand karbovantsi, which was equal to the value of more than 1,200 acres of their own land and the money spent on the construction of farms (the author's estimate).

Dmytro Stolypin put emphasis on the drastic need to accelerate the development of the land market in the fifteenth report, by removing class restrictions and stimulating servicing banking institutions, Dmytro wasn't cognizant of the fact that an order to establish the Peasant Bank would be signed two months later. From the very beginning, the Peasant Bank functions were limited to providing loans to the wealthy peasants on the security of purchased land. But with the adoption in 1885 of the new Statute, the range of its activities expanded significantly, the basis of which was the provision of local branches the opportunity to buy privately owned land at their own expense (Kacharovskiy, 1911, p. 137). The transformation of the bank into one of the main levers of the agrarian reform of 1906 – 1917 took place before P. A. Stolypin's appointment as the Prime Minister – from the 3rd of November in 1905 the bank received the right to use a wide range of mortgage services, to conduct brokerage activities, to circulate its own securities (Sidelnikov, 1973, p. 47). Its fund was replenished with large areas of land from the State and Specific Departments (Sidelnikov, 1973, pp. 90–91). In the South of Ukraine,

71% of bank plots, which were sold to the peasants looked like delapidated farms (Pryimak, 2002, p. 55). Although commodity management in the latter was possible only in 32% of cases (Pryimak, 2002, p. 50), the payment for them was calculated using the coefficient of soil profitability. It should be mentioned that the indicator became, at one time, the basis for deducting rent and payment created by D. A. Stolypin farms. Combined with the principles of marketability and individuality, the indicator was the amount, the detection of which allows us to speak about the conceptual identity of Stolypin's social-experimental and banking plots.

The Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research. Thus, it would not be appropriate to characterize D. Stolypin's paragraphs, in particular, the fifteenth report as a concept of agrarian transformations, since they were neither primarily nor in the future considered by the author as a pre-legislative initiative. They did not contain legally binding regulations and articles. In addition, the target audience of all reports D. A. Stolypin did not consist of the government officials or the representatives of the political elite of the Russian Empire, but of several hundred landowners, amateur farmers and scientists, who were members of the Moscow Imperial Society of Agriculture. The author of the paragraphs, like most of his like-minded people, who made similar proposals, belonged to the era of the "revolution in consciousness". Due to the "revolution in consciousness", the peasant issue was not only separated from the agrarian one, but also received the primary attention of the general public.

The experimenter Dmytro Arkadiyovych and the reformer Petro Stolypin considered the search for ways to solve the agrarian (peasant) issue a family affair certainly. The search logically fit into the Russian Empire progressive nobility's social consciousness elements system at that time, which chose the path of service to the state. Dmytro Stolypin, in this context, from the standpoint of the macro-administration, was one of the many amateur researchers, who were members of various metropolitan aristocratic scientific or public associations. He did not intend to make a bureaucratic career, and in the course of a long search for the self-development and self-realization, he focused on the idea of popularizing Comte's sociological knowledge principles, the agrarian sector capitalization, the peasant farming intensification. Through his social experiments, Dmytro Arkadiyovych not only drew attention to the possibility of creating a wealthy stratum among the rural population, which would become the mainstay of the monarchical regime but also formed an empirical basis for confirming the fidelity of the six points of the fifteenth report. Dmytro Stolypin was one of the farm business pioneers and at the time of the land leased plots establishment, he had no idea that his cousin's nephew would undertake its implementation on a national scale in more than thirty years. Dmytro Stolypin's activity occurred at a time when in the agrarian sector only tendencies of comradeship of the peasant economy were formed, when the entrepreneurial consciousness among the rural population of the South of Ukraine was still in its infancy.

Instead, Petro Stolypin chose a bureaucratic career as the stratagem of his life. At the time of receiving the post of Minister of the Interior and Chairman of the Council of Ministers, he had extensive experience at various levels of public administration. On the eve of the publication of the Order issued on the 9th of November in 1906, the reformer P. A. Stolypin saw quite clearly the way to bring the Russian Empire to the level of the world's leading countries. The Agrarian reform, in this regard, was seen by him as one of the most important tools needed for the chosen goal. It should also be taken into consideration that the above-mentioned order and other agrarian bills were not Petro Arkadiyovych's individual intellectual work product. In the historical literature, they are logically characterized as the result of the Special Meeting on the needs of the agricultural industry, the United Nobility and other small official commissions.

Hence, behind the reformer was not only the family experience of the experiment, but also the fruit of systematic work of several thousand progressive statesmen, the power of the imperial bureaucracy and society's expectations to improve things in all (including agrarian) sectors of economics, politics, education, culture, etc. In addition, the agrarian capitalization tendencies noticed in the 1870-ies by his cousin turned into the agrarian development regularities, among which the intensification of peasant economy belonged to one of the priority places at the beginning of the XXth century. The bet on the "strong and sober" in the reform of 1906 – 1917 was not only the family business echo, but also a socially expected pattern, the basis of the evolutionary path of further development of the state.

However, we should not ignore the fact that Petro Arkadiyovych Stolypin was well acquainted with the results of the social experiments implemented by his cousin. The latter, in turn, probably saw in his nephew the most likely heir to the family business. The paramount evidence for this thesis was the fact that in P. A. Stolypin's personal archive was a complex, albeit scattered, documents on the estate in the village of Mordvynivtsi, Berdyansk povit (district), Tavriya huberniya (province). But Petro Arkadiyovych could not make this family connection public and expose the case of hutorization as a family affair, as a politician, as the Head of the Executive Branch of Power of the Russian Empire. In his numerous reports, speeches, appeals, and reports, there was no mention of Dmytro Arkadiyovych and the rental farms in Priazov region. The world of family affairs for the reformer was clearly separated from the world of state-building practice. At the same time, D. A. Stolypin's peasant economy formation of trends in commerce echoed the sociological heritage of the contemporary era and responded to P. A. Stolypin's agrarian reform – when the regular capitalization of the agrarian sector received an additional incentive. At least such a connection was clearly traced on the thorns of the southern Ukrainian huberniya (provinces).

The publication is D. A. Stolypin's part of a comprehensive study on sociological views and practices. The prospects for further research are in the plane of analysis of the preconditions for the effectiveness of the social experiment in the South of Ukraine, the remnants of it in the socio-historical memory of the modern local rural population. The study on D. A. Stolypin's contribution in the sociological cognition methods development could be also interesting, as well as the evolution of his views on the social stratification issues, the peasantry intensification, the rural community fate.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for the given advice during the preparation of the article for publishing.

Funding. The authors did not receive financial assistance for research, preparation and publication of the article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dal, V. (1906). *Tolkovyi slovar [Explanatory dictionary]*. Sankt-Petersburg.: Tip. M. O. Volfa, Vol. 2, 349 p. [in Russian]

Golosenko, I. A. (2001). Petr Stolypin i sotsiologiya Ogyusta Konta [Pyotr Stolypin and the sociology of Auguste Comte]. *Vesnik RAN*, 12, 1109–1116. [in Russian]

Kacharovskiy, P.N. (1911). *Agrarnaya reforma i Krestyanskiy bank. [Agrarian Reform and the Peasant Bank]*. Varshava, 621 p. [in Russian]

Karagodin, A. I. (1998). *Istoriya Zaporozhskogo kraya (1770 – 1917) [History of the Zaporozhye Territory]*. Zaporizhia: "Stat", 285 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kazmyrchuk, M. (2019). Ukrainian manorial estates culture in the researches at the end of the XIXth and the beginning of the XXth centuries. *Skhidnoievropeiskiy Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 13, 60–67. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.13.188660. [in English]

Meysi, J. (1993). Zemelnaya reforma i politicheskie peremeny. Fenomen Stolypina [Land Reform and Political Change. Stolypin's phenomenon]. *Voprosy istorii*, 4, 23–34. [in Russian]

Mykhailenko, H. & Cheremisin, O. (2020). New Ukraine vs Novorossia: myths and realities of geopolitical changes during the second half of the XVIIIth – at the end of the XIXth century. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 14, 36–45. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.14.197177. [in English]

Pryimak, O. M. & Pryimak, Yu. O. (2019) Korektsiia ob'iekta sotsialnykh eksperymentiv D. A. Stolypina [Correction of the object of social experiments DA Stolypin]. *Hrani. Naukovo-teoretychnyi almanakh*, 3, 77–84. [in Ukrainian]

Pryimak, O. M. (2002). *Stolypinska ahrarna reforma na Pivdni Ukrainy (1906 – 1917) [Stolypin's agrarian reform in the South of Ukraine (1906 – 1917)]*. Zaporizhzhia: RA “Tandem-U”, 187 p. [in Ukrainian]

Pryimak, O. M. (2012). *Selianstvo Pivdennoi Ukrainy: sotsialna istoriia kintsia XIX – pochatku XX stolittia [The peasantry of southern Ukraine: the social history of the late XIX – early XX centuries]*. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizkyi natsionalnyi universytet, 458 p. [in Ukrainian]

Pryimak, Yu. O. (2011). Metodolohichne pidgruntia sotsiolohichnykh pohliadiv D. A. Stolypina [Methodological basis of D.A. Stolypin's sociological views]. *Visnyk Akademii pratsi i sotsialnykh vidnosyn Federatsii profspilok Ukrainy*, 2, 135–138. [in Ukrainian]

Sidelnikov, S. M. (1973). *Agrarnaya reforma Stolypina. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov [Stolypin's agrarian reform. Collection of documents and materials]*. Moskva: Moskovskiy universitet, 338 p. [in Russian]

Stolypin, D. A. (1874). *Pravo na zemlyu [The right to land]*. Moskva: Tip-ya A. Gattsuka, 18 p. [in Russian]

Stolypin, D. A. (1876). *Dva doklada v Komissiyu Moskovskogo Imperatorskogo Obshchestva selskogo khozyaystva po voprosu ob ustroystve krestyanskikh khutorov na vladelcheskikh zemlyakh [Two reports to the Commission of the Moscow Imperial Society of Agriculture on the question of the arrangement of peasant farms on the owned lands]*. Moskva: Tipografiya V. Gote, 126 p. [in Russian]

Stolypin, D. A. (1877). *Doklad № 3 v Komissiyu Moskovskogo Imperatorskogo Obshchestva selskogo khozyaystva po voprosu o khutorakh i sovremennom sostoyanii krestyanskogo khozyaystva [Report № 3 to the Commission of the Moscow Imperial Society of Agriculture on the issue of farms and the current state of the peasant economy]*. Moskva: Tipografiya A Kleyna, 102 p. [in Russian]

Stolypin, D. A. (1883). *Doklad № 15 v Komissiyu Moskovskogo Imperatorskogo Obshchestva selskogo khozyaystva po voprosu o khutorakh i sovremennom sostoyanii krestyanskogo khozyaystva [Report № 15 to the Commission of the Moscow Imperial Society of Agriculture on the question of farms and the current state of the peasant economy]*. Moskva: Tipografiya A. Kleyna, 22 p. [in Russian]

Stolypin, D. A. (1890). *Nauchnye ocherki. Nachala sotsiologii [Scientific essays. The beginnings of sociology]*. Moskva: Tipografiya A. Gattsuka, 66 p. [in Russian]

Stolypin, D. A. (1892). *Ob ustroystve arendnykh khutorov na vladelcheskikh zemlyakh i krestyanskom khozyaystve voobshche [About the device of rent farms on the owner's earths and a peasant economy in general]*. Moskva: Tip-ya M. Golovina, 20 p. [in Russian]

Stolypin, D. A. (1893). *Uchenie Konta. Nachalo sotsiologii. Po voprosu ob organizatsii zemelnoy sobstvennosti i polzovanii zemley [The Comte's doctrine. The beginning of sociology. On the organization of land ownership and land use]*. Moskva: Tip-ya M. Golovina, 15 p. [in Russian]

Temirova, N. R. (2003). *Pomishchyky Ukrainy v 1861 – 1917 rr.: sotsialno-ekonomichna evoliutsiia [Landlords of Ukraine in 1861 – 1917: socio-economic evolution]*. Donetsk: DonNU, 319 p. [in Ukrainian]

Zyryanov, P. N. (1992). *Petr Stolypin. Politicheskiy portret [Pyotr Stolypin. Political portrait]*. Moskva: “Nauka”, 207 p. [in Russian]

*The article was received May 30, 2020.
Article recommended for publishing 19/05/2021.*