

Isa Zeinalov, PhD in political science
Andrei Rytchenko, PhD in Law

MODERN AGRARIAN POLICY OF THE STATE IN THE CONTEXT OF RUSSIAN REFORMS

The article discloses the mechanism of formation of modern agrarian policy in the context of modernization processes in Russia. The existing and perspective legal framework was researched.

The authors have paid a special attention to agrarian reform as one of the directions in a social and economic reformation of Russian society and transformation of the state policy in the context of Russian conversions. The new agrarian policy which was formed by means of controversial and painful Russian modernization is described.

The analysis of Russian reforms made by the authors gives the opportunity to say that a proper control over the implementation of agrarian policy decisions is not exercised, what negatively influences the effectiveness and results of agricultural production.

At the beginning of liberal economic reforms in Russia existed five key questions, the answers to which determined certain variant of the general strategy of reforms in the agricultural sector: 1) on the form of land ownership (private ownership / state ownership, collective ownership); 2) on the land market, including the land of agricultural purposes (“the land is a commodity as like as any other commodity” / “can not sell the land”); 3) on the forms and sizes of agricultural enterprises (development of small and medium-sized individual farms / preservation or reformation of the system of collective farms of the Soviet type); 4) on the role of the state in regulation of agricultural sector (free market, the principle of non-intervention of state to economy / government regulation and budget support); 5) on the pace of market reforms (accelerated radical changes / gradual implementation of the elements of a market economy).

Researchers identify, as a rule, two opposing positions, conventionally designated them as “liberal” and “conservative”. Each of them exists in a “radical” and “moderate” version. These positions are directly related to sustainable historically established structures.

The most important result of reforms in agricultural sector and the definite result of the reorganization of land ownership relations is a formation of a mixed economy. At the first stage of reform (1991-1993) a policy of reorganization of agricultural enterprises was carried out. The main legal acts of this period: The Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of December 27, 1991 № 323 “On urgent measures for the implementation of land reform in the Russian Federation”; The Resolution of a Government of the Russian Federation of 28 December, 1991 № 81 “On the reformation of the public administration system in agricultural complex of the Russian Federation”; The Resolution of a

Government of the Russian Federation of December 29, 1991 № 86 “On reorganization of collective and soviet farms.

They reflect the ways of reorganization of collective and soviet farms and methods for their implementation. There have been marked three main ways: 1) division of a management on peasant farms and small enterprises with their subsequent voluntary integration in associations or cooperatives; 2) reorganization of the economy or its part to a joint-stock company; 3) reorganization of the economy or its part into a production cooperative (collective entity). In 1994 the agrarian reform in terms of organizational transformation of agricultural enterprises largely was completed and the formation of a mixed economy has been fixed. Also the organizational and legal structure of agricultural production has changed. Three basic forms of management developed: agricultural organizations (enterprises), peasant (farmer) farms and farms for population. These forms are the essential socio-economic principles that reflect the current socio-economic structure of the domestic agricultural sector which is unusual in terms of international practice. The “campaigning” traditional for Russia has led to the fact that the redistribution of land took place formally, urgently, under the pressure of political circumstances in conditions of struggle for a power and confrontation between the legislative and executive branches of government.

In conditions of the collapse of collective and soviet farms and the attenuation in state regulation of the economy, the idea about farming way of life as a salvation for Russia confirmed. Therefore, the main content of political decision-making of a new stage (1994-1995) was the support for farmers and the development of small businesses. Legal framework of the second period is The program of the agrarian reform for 1994-1995 years, approved with the Government Resolution of the Russian Federation, dated July 6, 1994 № 791 and the Federal Law “On state support of small business in the Russian Federation” adopted on May 12, 1995. These documents reflect the first results of agrarian reform and due to analysis of current socio-economic situation in agricultural complex of Russian Federation concluded the need to continue the reorganization of farming on the basis of formation of production agricultural cooperatives and organization of farms.

A key element in the project of market transformations was the issue of land. It was assumed that the establishment of private property and other legal conditions for the release of peasants from the collective and soviet farms will automatically lead to overcoming of the “dependent moods”, established as a result of the ages of “forced labor”, will awaken in a peasant the sense of an “owner” and the interest for free entrepreneurship. Such contradistinction of a strong “peasant-owner” to a

slow and ineffective “community” in many ways, in our opinion, is mythologized and dates back to discussions on the agrarian question of the late XIX – early XX century-in particular, to the polemic of P. Stolypin with L. Tolstoy. At the beginning of the 1990s, adherents of the liberal views in support of their position often referred to the experience of the Stolypin reforms, positively evaluating its results and sympathetically quoted Stolypin, who believed that the reason of “indigenous disorder” in Russian village is the community landownership¹.

The new agrarian policy was formed in the course of socio-economic reforms of the 1990s as a part of the system of state-management relations.

The agrarian reform is one of the directions of socio-economic reformation of Russian society; it has inherent to this process faults and contradictions. These faults are reliance on liberal views about the market as a “natural order”, reinforced imposition of the “market” models, and a refusal of any other institutional forms on the basis of its backwardness. The results of such market reformation, carried out at the specified scenario are the contradictions and the deformation of the institutional order in Russia.

The purpose of agricultural policy is to improve the competitiveness of domestic agricultural production, its stability, ensuring of its profitability, the development of agricultural market. But market development requires the creation of conditions for agricultural income for business entities in this sector, the establishment of appropriate institutional structure. Therefore, the designation of institutional changes should to become the main content of agrarian policy of transformational society, accompanied, as any political action, with the struggle around the basic institutions, in this case, the institution of property for land. The change of land relations in the context of reforms and the formation of a new structure of the agricultural complex are the main areas of agrarian policy in the process of formation of a market economy².

A significant role in the process of postcommunist transformation in Russia belonged to new political elite, which representatives changed their value orientations significantly faster than a society in general. On this basis, the adaptability of the political system increased or reduced depending on the extent to which the creation of new political institutions or the modification of old structures relied on informal culture of mass groups. However, intensive superficial liberalization of mass consciousness, the spread of orientations to the Western consumption standards en-

¹ Кирчик, О. (2004). Дискуссии по аграрному вопросу в постсоветской России. *Отечественные записки*, 1.

² Абрамова, И.Е. (2009). *Механизмы функционирования и реализации государственной аграрной политики в условиях модернизации (политологический анализ)*: автореф. дисс. ... докт. полит. наук. Ростов н/Д.

sured public support of the democratic reforms in the initiation stage of a transformation process. This fact allowed to overcome the crisis of “constitutional diarchy” and to move forward the formation of institutions, which determine the image of the political system of modern Russia¹.

The transformation of the political system in postsoviet Russia was held in difficult social and cultural conditions when traditional components of the value system, formed types of political consciousness, the dominant strategies of political behavior began to hinder the adoption of democratic standards and the strengthening of democratic institutions. As like as the majority of transition countries, Russian democratic transition was accompanied with value delegitimization of institutional innovations. Limited social base of transformation of the political system has stimulated a fixation of the principle of “exchange of resources” in relations between the new regime and forming regional and economic elites, who compensated the lack of mass support. Instability of democratic institutions and a high level of inversion of political processes predetermined the achievement of regime consolidation in two basic forms: the oligarchic authoritarianism (1996 – 1999) and plebiscitary democracy with a strong executive power (2000 – 2007). The regime of oligarchic authoritarianism is non-viable, as it produces mechanisms of self-destruction, in particular, the negative mass mobilization, the delegitimization of power, separatism in the regions. The regime of plebiscitary democracy with a strong executive power is more stable due to limitation of the destructive forces that exert pressure on the system, but this regime is not able to ensure the reproduction of the political system without a leader whose legitimacy supports the functioning of the main political institutions².

The late 1980s – early 1990s are characterized by the establishment of political procedures for resolution of basic public issues. Along with positive political changes the phenomena previously unknown in the country appeared and had significant devastating consequences, such as the “war of laws”, “parade of sovereignties”. Therefore, institutional changes of agriculture sector have been transformed from technical and technological problem of formation of effective management structures into an arena of cruel political struggle.

The political struggle artificially delayed the solution of problems in agrarian sector, despite the hasty adoption of many legal acts. Most of the changes were made in illegitimate ways. As a result, existed management

¹ Бродовская, Е.В. (2008). *Трансформация политической системы современного российского общества: институциональные и социокультурные составляющие*: автореф. дисс. ... докт. полит. наук. Тула.

² Бродовская, Е.В. (2008). *Трансформация политической системы современного российского общества: институциональные и социокультурные составляющие*: автореф. дисс. ... докт. полит. наук. Тула.

structure collapsed. The result of reform, however, was the emergence of a private property for land and the formation of multiculturalism in Russia. However, a comprehensive assessment of the results of reformation shows that the overcoming of deformation in agrarian relations has not happened. If previously permanent agrarian crisis was the result of general nationalization, not taking into account the specifics of regional agriculture, now deformations were associated with transformation of institutions into the private sector, combined with incompleteness of institutional reforms¹.

The scenario of institutional transformation implemented in the early 1990s was reduced to reformation of land relations on the basis of contrast between public and private land ownership and the recognition of private property as the foundation for new agrarian system (principles of liberalism). But as a result of limitations in market turnover (purchase and sale of land) and formation of new forms of collective ownership, an institutional model oriented to a mixed economy has developed (although the structure of Russian version of mixed economy does not correspond to the ideal models of implementation of proprietary powers). Thus, the majority of joint stock companies in the agricultural sector can be considered as such only conditionally. Their capital does not work as a joint stock company and do not bring any income to farmers.

In connection with certain political stabilization of the early 2000s the opportunity appeared to shift attention from political struggle to a legal procedure and scientific justification for economic policy. The task consists in gradual and consistent conformation of land relations and the structure of national economy as well as the improvement of the mechanisms and procedures for realization of new proprietary relations and rights.

New agrarian policy was formed during a controversial and painful implementation of Russian modernization. The period of social and economic reforms in late XX was extremely difficult for Russian countryside. Reforms of those years were conducted excluding social and economic consequences of institutional changes in property relations for land. Those reforms showed that the formation of agrarian policy grounded on the indifference to the level and quality of life, indifference to the fate of concrete people leads to the ruination of a large part of the peasants and to the degradation of a huge sector of the domestic economy. In a result it is danger not only because of loss of a significant part of mass political support, but also threats to a national security associated with the food supply.

¹ Абрамова, И.Е. (2009). *Механизмы функционирования и реализации государственной аграрной политики в условиях модернизации (политологический анализ)*: автореф. дисс. ... докт. полит. наук. Ростов н/Д.

In the end of 2006, the Federal Law of the Russian Federation “On the development of agriculture” was adopted. This law established «the legal basis for implementation of state social and economic policy in the sphere of agriculture as an economic activity for the production of agricultural produce, the provision of services in order to ensure population with Russian food products and the promotion of a sustainable development of rural areas in the villages and corresponding territories»¹.

In conclusion, we’ll note that new agrarian policy was formed in Russia in the course of modernization and socio-economic reforms of the 1990s as a part of a system in state-management relations. The most important result of reforms in agricultural sector and the result of reorganization in land ownership relations was the creation of a mixed economy. Three basic forms of management developed: agricultural organizations (enterprises), peasant (farmer) farms and farms for population. However, the situation of social uncertainty generated a plurality of conflicts.

New agrarian policy was formed during a controversial and painful implementation of Russian modernization. A significant role in the process of postcommunist transformation of Russia belonged to new political elite, which representatives changed their value orientations significantly faster than a society in general. The political struggle of elites began over the land ownership relations and changing of the land relations in the course of reforms. This political struggle artificially delayed problem solving in agricultural sector, and most of the changes were made in illegitimate ways. As a result, the overcoming of deformations in agrarian relations has not happened. If previously permanent agrarian crisis was the result of general nationalization, not taking into account the specifics of regional agriculture, now deformations were associated with transformation of institutions into the private sector, combined with incompleteness of institutional reforms.

Bibliography:

1. Кирчик, О. (2004). Дискуссии по аграрному вопросу в постсоветской России. *Отечественные записки, 1*.
2. Абрамова, И.Е. (2009). *Механизмы функционирования и реализации государственной аграрной политики в условиях модернизации (политологический анализ)*: автореф. дисс. ... докт. полит. наук. Ростов н/Д.
3. Бродовская, Е.В. (2008). *Трансформация политической системы современного российского общества: институциональные и социокультурные составляющие*: автореф. дисс. ... докт. полит. наук. Тула.

¹ Бродовская, Е.В. (2008). *Трансформация политической системы современного российского общества: институциональные и социокультурные составляющие*: автореф. дисс. ... докт. полит. наук. Тула.