History Essay: Russia

Name of Student

[Name of the Institution]

# Introduction

The land reform measures of Stolypin were undertaken by the government of Russia in which they allow peasants to individually own the land. The main objective of this is to encourage industrious peasants to gain their land and work as a prosperous class. They also provide small farmers an opportunity that they will contribute in stabilizing the economy and will support the autocracy (“The Peasant Commune and the Stolypin Reforms: Peasant Attitudes, 1906–14 | SpringerLink,” n.d.). In 1861, when the serfs were emancipated by the government, the land was allotted to every peasant although the land was owned collectively by the community of villagers. (“The Russian Revolution - Sheila Fitzpatrick - Google Books,” n.d.).

Following emancipation, Russia lacked in economic success and the uprising of violent peasant ultimately happened during the 1905 revolution. It was suggested that there is a need to abandon the community land tenure as well as it was replaced by the individual land ownership (“Stolypin’s Agrarian Reform: An Appraisal on JSTOR,” n.d.). On November 22, 1906, when the formal legislative body, Duma was not in the session, Pyotr Arkadyevich Stolypin, the Russian Prime Minister issued the decree which enables every peasant household that claims the individual ownership of their land allotment as well as the opportunity to withdraw their land from the community. The household can demand from the community that they must provide him with the combined plot which was equivalent to the cultivated scattered area (“The Peasant Commune and the Stolypin Reforms: Peasant Attitudes, 1906–14 | SpringerLink,” n.d.). Also, this decree abolished the ownership of the joint household and encouraged sole ownership of the property. Duma finally confirmed the decree in 1910. These reforms were only considered as a moderate success. By the 1916 end, only the 20% peasant household titled their land, however, only 10% received the consolidated plots. Though peasantry was not transformed by these reforms into support bulwark which autocracy required. In 1917 peasants all over participated in seizing properties and there was a revolution by Stolypin farmers.

# Tsarist Autocracy

It is the form of autocracy which is related to Moscow Grand Duchy who later become the Russian empire and Russian Tsardom. In this system, all the power and wealth was controlled by the Tsar. As the Tsar has more power as compared to the constitutional monarchy that was mostly vested through law as well as legislative authority counterbalance it. They also had authority over religious issues more than western monarchs. But this monarchy was completely collapsed during 1917 because the small farmers who owned land used to pay high revenues that leave less for them to survive. It was the demand of landowners to that the nobles' land must be given to them and there should be reduction in land revenue. Although their demand was not fulfilled and they become extremely dissatisfied. The population of Russia wanted to leave war however the Tsar was not willing to do so. This makes Russian people against them as well as this situation encouraged them to take action against the government (“Stolypin’s Agrarian Reform: An Appraisal on JSTOR,” n.d.). The theory of Karl Marx played a vital role in this scenario by giving the idea that this misery of workers is because of capitalist and the worker's condition can only be improved when the industries and land will be controlled by the people of the society. His theory inspired the workers to rebel against capitalists and landowners.

# Russian Revolution

The 1917 Russian Revolution produce a huge impact on politics globally for several decades. This violent revolution ends the century’s Imperial rule in Russia and the Romanov dynasty (“The Russian Revolution - Sheila Fitzpatrick - Google Books,” n.d.). It also made various political and social changes and led to the Soviet Union formation. Russia was viewed as the undeveloped backward society by Western Europe. The Russian empires also practiced feudalism in which peasant was forced to work for owners even in the nineteenth century (“The Russian Revolution - Sheila Fitzpatrick - Google Books,” n.d.). Although this practice is completely disappeared in Europe. These are the circumstances that lead to the Russian revolution.

Army throughout stayed loyal with Tsar and crushed the opposition in cities as well as the forces moved against the workers who formed soviet in Moscow. The Russian people union established in defense of revolutionary groups. They have the power to arrest and execute these groups who have committed a crime against the state. In this scenario of execution and trials in 1910 the revolutionary groups’ membership was reduced from 100,000 to 10,000. The name ‘Stolypin's Necktie' became the method of oppression and fear. Although, the revolutionary groups survived in the underground and they continued to provide support. In the end in 1911 revolutionaries managed to assassinate Stolypin.

# Reforms of Stolypin

For the modernization of Russia, Stolypin made various agricultural reforms as well as he made it more competitive as compared to the other European powers. He believed that land reorganizing will enhance Tsar's support with the unskilled farmers. He also hoped that the success was based on the increase in the peasant landowners’ number that will result in peasantry which was more beneficial (“Stolypin’s Agrarian Reform: An Appraisal on JSTOR,” n.d.). It abolished the redemption payments that were the state loans and the new schemer was started in which loans were given to peasants for buying the land. Apart from this, peasants were also provided the financial incentives that they can move to the Siberia remote areas for widening the countryside. Through these reforms output of agriculture was increased by one-third while the ownership of peasant land was increased through 30% (“Where is the backward Russian peasant? Evidence against the superiority of private farming, 1883–1913: The Journal of Peasant Studies: Vol 42, No 2,” n.d.). The Kadets number dramatically enhanced as well as the Tsar support was also increased. It was also believed that agrarian reforms also reduce the labor demand in the countryside. It also increased urbanization as the huge number of people came to towns and cities for work (“The Peasant Commune and the Stolypin Reforms: Peasant Attitudes, 1906–14 | SpringerLink,” n.d.). It also considerably improved the heavy industry. The steel and iron production improved by 50% as well as through the WWI outbreak Russia became the fourth largest producer of coal, iron, and steel (“Stolypin’s Agrarian Reform: An Appraisal on JSTOR,” n.d.). In 1905, the trade union formation also become legalized. Also, in 1912 factories were incorporated with safety inspectors. The workers also get the incentives which include insurance schemes that protect against the illness and accidents. Although, the Lena goldfield strike in 1912 gave the impression that it still required to be improved. In this process, more than a hundred protestors died from police and army officers. It can be observed that the Tsarist state opposition is also increased. As a result of the expansion of railroad Trans-Siberian as well as the other roads from Ural mountain east to the Caspian Sea the migration towards Siberia was enhanced (“Stolypin’s Agrarian Reform: An Appraisal on JSTOR,” n.d.). It was estimated that more than 10 million people freely migrated through Western Russia to the Urals east area. The agrarian reforms of the Stolypin are based on the resettlement benefits for the peasants who came to Siberia. In 1906 agriculture ministry developed the emigration department. It assisted the settlers and organized the resettlement in the first year. The settlers have received 16.5 hectares of land per man on average. The entire allocated area was about 21 million hectares. The migrants also received the subsidy at a small scale with the exemption of few taxes as well as advice through the state agencies particularly developed for the peasant resettlement. The Stolypin reforms also provide a series of cooperative assistance about the Stolypin agrarian reforms which was based on the production cooperation, consumer cooperation and cooperation of financial credit (“The Peasant Commune and the Stolypin Reforms: Peasant Attitudes, 1906–14 | SpringerLink,” n.d.). There are several elements in the cooperation-assistance Stolypin program which incorporate later in the early Soviet Union agrarian programs which produce Stolypin's lasting influence.

# Examination of Stolypin Solution

The Stolypin reform's historical interests were focused on the administrative, economic and juridical results which were measured primarily through the local and governmental levels statistically. Though the revolutionary outcomes of the tsarism produce the reforms negative evaluation impact on the countryside with both Soviet and Western historians (“H-Net Reviews,” n.d.). Stebut, agronomist said, "It is impossible to organize people, and therefore they should not be organized, but it is possible and necessary to help them organize themselves.” The Stolypin legislation enclosed farmer reforms failed to fulfill the expectation of reformers as they remained under-performed (“H-Net Reviews,” n.d.). The reforms of Stolypin also remained controversial within the Russian scholars. As the historians also paid less attention to this issue. Soviets also stressed their ideological implications although their western counterparts always remained in doubt about the accomplishments of these reforms. These reforms are never been examined critically. In Stolypin’s Agrarian Reform, the author believes that his agrarian reforms are neither failed nor successful. It also does not draw any conclusion as the reforms were never been completed. The conclusive verdict can only be possible in case the process was brought to a conclusion although its results were never claimed as evident. Therefore, Stolypin's reforms from the period of 1907 to 1914 were neither evaluated nor completed about the WWI and because of the revolution (“The Peasant Commune and the Stolypin Reforms: Peasant Attitudes, 1906–14 | SpringerLink,” n.d.). These reforms were only operated for seven years which can be seen as an insufficient period. This small period is not enough for the undertaking to be completely functional. One can observe that the undertakings take a long time to proceed.
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