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ABSTRACT

At the beginning of the 20th century the problem of the resettlement movement in Russia was considered both in the context of agrarian issue study, and in the study of the Asian part of the country history in Germanic Russian studies of the second half of the last century. At that, a special attention was paid to the Far East since the 1980-ies. In addition to the historians of the former FRG, and the united Germany of 1990-ies, the interest to the problem was also shown by the experts of Russian history in Austria and the German part of Switzerland. At that, the scholars’ attention was aimed at the resettlement movement during Stolypin's agrarian reform implementation period. Initially, not without the influence of the Soviet historiography assessments concerning the issue, the skeptical assessments of governmental agrarian policy effectiveness prevailed in German-speaking Russian studies. However, since the second half of the 1980-ies, there has been a partial revision of previous postulates in German and Austrian Russian studies; A. Morich and German historians who specialized in the Far Eastern problems (D. Landgraf, L. Deeg) noted not only the difficulties, but also the achievements of tsarism resettlement policy: the improvement of the demographic situation in a region, the progress in the development of capitalist relations, and a certain intensification of agriculture.
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INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction to the problem

Mass migrations of the population are generated, as a rule, by a complex set of causes and have a diverse effect on the internal situation of the country as a whole. The Russian example of the early twentieth century in this respect is sufficiently revealing. Resettlement movement played a significant role in P.A. Stolypin's agrarian policy; at that the reformer expected to solve a number of problems related to the economic and social development of both European and Asian Russia. A great attention in domestic and foreign historical science was given to the resettlement in Asian Russia; there were also the researchers of German-speaking countries among the scientists who addressed the problem. At the same time, the latter paid a close attention to the Far Eastern region in 1980-1990-ies.

Problem relevance
The problem of migrations, including internal ones, is one of the most significant at the present time - this thesis is true for Russia. In this regard, it is undoubtedly important to study the historical experience of migrations. The Russian experience is extremely interesting here; at that it should be remembered that one of the most mass immigration movements in history took place in the Russian Empire at the beginning of the 20th century. It also affected the Far Eastern region; Russian colonization of this region attracted the attention of both domestic and foreign historians. Among other things, Russian scholars of German-speaking countries addressed the issue. This article presents the analysis of their assessments concerning the most important aspects of the resettlement movement to the Far East during the first decade and a half of the last century.

**Issue study**

The foreign historiography of the Stolypin's agrarian reform has been actively analyzed by domestic historians since the 1970-ies. The main attention, however, was paid to the problem consideration and criticism by English-speaking researchers. The studies by P.N. Zyryanov, N.B. Selunskaya, E.B. Shashina, O.V. Efimov were devoted to this topic (Zyryanov P.N., 1973; Selunskaya N.B., 1992; Shashina E.B., 1992; Efimov O.V., 1995). The issue of resettlement is also affected in the context of reform historiography analysis; on the contrary, V.G. Tyukavkin's work considered the foreign historiography of Stolypin's agrarian policy in a general form, without a special appeal to immigrant subjects, although the author used the works of foreign Siberia history experts at the beginning of the last century (Tyukavkin V.G., 2001, pp. 26-31, 233). The Germanic (and generally German-speaking) historiography of the issue is described much worse; a thorough review by T.L. Moiseenko on the monograph of the Austrian historian A. Morich is worthy of attention, where A. Morich's interpretation of migration problem to Asiatic Russia is also touched upon (Domestic history, 1993, No. 6. pp. 191-193). One of the authors of this work paid attention to the analysis of the resettlement movement to Siberia and, partly to the Far East by German-speaking Russian studies (Dorozhkin A.G., 2005. pp. 215-223). But until now, the study of resettlement problem to the Far East has not yet been studied by German-speaking historians of the twentieth century as an independent subject of research. This circumstance predetermined the choice of the article topic.

**Hypotheses**

The study of resettlement problem interpretation to the Far East by the historians of the German-speaking countries of the second half of the last century during the Stolypin's agrarian reform will make it possible to understand the state of the problem study better, as well as the development of world Russian history study in the second half of the 20th century, its relationship with the domestic historiography of the agrarian issue in Russia.

**METHODS**

The problem of resettlements to the Far East during the Stolypin's agrarian reform as such is being considered in the context of the Russian Empire modernization. It should be taken into account that for the main part of German-speaking Russian history experts of the second half of the 20th century, the modernization approach was typical when the issues of industrial and agrarian development of the Russian Empire were solved. At the same time, the resettlements to the Far East are considered taking into account both all-Russian and local factors that determined the modernization of the area agriculture.

In order to study the highlighted problem German-speaking historians of the past century apply the scientific principles of historicism, objectivity, comprehensiveness and systemic nature. The work is based on the following general scientific and general historical methods: ideographic, expressed in the description of approaches and concepts of individual Russian history experts; the method of periodization, according to which the study of historiography is carried out within a specific period, which allows us to identify the beginning of new trends; system, historical-comparative, historical-genetic and historical-typological methods.
MAIN PART

German and German-speaking literature in general at the beginning of the 20th century did not consider the issue of Russian peasants to Asian Russia resettlement specifically. The historians of German-speaking countries have turned to this issue in the last third of the twentieth century. The focus was on the resettlement movement of the period 1906 - 1914; At that it was analyzed in the context of both the Stolypin's reform and the history of pre-revolutionary Siberia and the Far East, with an increased attention of the researchers to the last decades of the twentieth century, to the Far Eastern region. At first, the pessimistic approach prevailed among German-speaking Russian history experts. The attention was focused on the difficulties in resettlement arrangement and the adaptation of the colonists to new conditions, on the impossibility to solve the agrarian issue by organizing the migration of numerous rural population of European Russia beyond the Urals, and also on the difficulties of land provision to the colonists (Notzold J., 1966. pp. 59-64, 94-97, Raupach H., 1964. p. 14).

The Swiss historian K.Spiss and the German researchers D.Landgraf and L.Deeg (Spiess K., 1980; Landgraf D., 1989; Deeg L., 1986) considered the importance of migrations more carefully in the 1980-ies and 1990-ies. Having paid a considerable attention to the role of resettlement in the economic development of the Far East, they noted the assistance of the government to the region colonization, the provision of significant benefits to the migrants. An extreme remoteness of the region from European Russia, an unsatisfactory overall condition of the roads, considerable material costs, the extremely difficult conditions for moving to a new place and the adaptation to the Far Eastern realities, created huge obstacles for colonization. The construction of the Transsib, the removal of the restrictions on resettlement for the peasants and government assistance intensified the migration to the region in 1907 - 1914. But, according to the mentioned researchers, as well as the Austrian historian A. Morich, not a single governmental instance was ready for a massive influx of immigrants (Moritsch A., 1986. pp. 178-179). Unlike K. Spissis and D. Landgraf, A. Morich, however, admitted that since 1908 the authorities managed to improve the work of the Resettlement Department somewhat (Deeg L., 1986. S. 206-207, Moritsch A., 1986. S. 179-182, Landgraf D., 1989. S. 736.)

K. Shpiss, D. Landgraf, L. Deeg, A. Morich recognized the presence of economic, internal political and geopolitical calculations by the tsarist government during the colonization of Siberia and especially the Far East. The danger of this region colonization by the immigrants from neighboring countries was realized by the central government and the administration of the Amur general governorate. In an effort to stimulate colonization, the government granted a considerable land allotment to each peasant family moved in the region (Deeg L. 1996. S. 206, Moritsch A., 1986. S. 178, Landgraf D., 1989. S. 697.). However, D. Landgraf noted, that among the general flow of migrants who headed for Siberia during the Stolypin's agrarian reform, the share of those who chose the Far East as the place of their new residence was negligible. The main regions of Siberia, where migrants rushed in 1896 - 1914, were the Tomsk province and the Akmola region. But the Amur general governorate had a significant population increase largely due to resettlement (Landgraf D., 1989. S. 736-737, 812), although, according to L. Deyeg, even in 1910-1917 the population density here was 0.6-0.7 people per 1 sq.km. (Deeg L., 1996. S. 206).

K. Spies and D. Landgraf noted the government measures stimulating the Russian colonization of the Far East: the allocation of land to immigrants, the provision of subsidies for the establishment of a farm (Spiess K., 1980. S. 26-27,31; Landgraf D., 1989. S. 746 -747). Nevertheless, not only the conditions for the movement of peasants continued to be severe, but the problem of colonist adaptation to their new place of residence remained acute. D. Landgraf notes that the growth of settlers surpassed all expectations during the Stolypin's reform, which exacerbated both the housing problem and the difficulties with health care, as well as with the allocation of land for new settlers (Landgraf D., 1989. S. 749-751, 775). K. Spies and D. Landgraf stressed the latter circumstance; Moreover, surveying was often conducted superficially, which caused further disputes between farmers. Undeveloped areas retained land ownership by capture (Spiess K. 1980. S. 101; Landgraf D. 1989. S. 747). To order the
allotment of land for new settlers the rule was introduced in 1907 according to which the families of potential migrants to the Far East were obliged to send their authorized walkers in advance since 1908 (Landgraf D., 1989. S. 752).

A shortage of a free land fund was revealed quickly in a number of areas of the Amur and Primorye. D. Landgraf wrote that often the settlers were given scanty or swampy soils, which were of little use for agricultural work, which was the main reason for repatriation. The German historian stated that another reason for the return was the lack of water, including drinking one, the lack of timber, the lack of sufficient labor and capital, and the difficulties of adaptation to the Far Eastern climate. This predetermined the significance of "back migration" from the Far East; The peasants, who returned to their former residence, disseminated information that frightened off those who wished to resettle. Nevertheless, the share of "return migrants" was inferior to the general Siberian indicator, and since 1912 the flow of returnees has declined in relative terms (Landgraf D. 1989. S. 753, 811).

K. Spiss noted the government desire to create an economically well-founded middle peasantry in the Far East. Already in 1904, the subsidization of settlers was somewhat restricted by the authorities in order to restrain the movement of economically less powerful peasants to the region. But the same K.Spiss, as well as D.Landgraf and A.Morich, noted an extremely weak development of private ownership of land in the province - Stolypin's reform did not change the situation in fact (Spiesz K. 1980. S. 103, Landgraf D. 1989. S. 777). And in general, as A. Morich pointed out, the situation was more in keeping with the preservation of the communal system in Asiatic Russia. The latter was quite adequate to the real situation in a number of regions of Siberia (and especially this applies to the Far East). The community here did not prevent the progress and could promote the spread of cooperation (Moritsch A., 1986. S. 182-183).

K.Spiss pointed out the government desire to soften the agrarian issue in European Russia through the organization of resettlements (Spiesz K., 1980. pp. 26-31). In the 1960-ies Yu. Nezold gave a negative answer to the question of how much this succeeded, noting that in 1896 - 1915, resettlement absorbed only 27.2% of European Russia population natural increase on the average. G.Gross also believed that with all his successes, the resettlement organization could only make a limited contribution to the solution of the problem concerning the agrarian overpopulation in European Russia. Earlier, at the beginning of the twentieth century, V.D. Preyer and O. Hatch (Notzold J. 1966. S. 59, 94-97; Preyer W.D., 1914. S. 73-75; Hoetzsch O., 1917. S. 304-307; Handbuch… S. 423) assessed the possibilities of migration policy by the government as weak. However, it is necessary to dwell on the qualitative characteristics, and first of all, on the areas of migrant origin as an objective assessment of these possibilities. K. Dice had pointed out already that significant population transfers during the reform years took place from the South, the West and from the chernozem provinces of Russia - that is, from the most overpopulated regions (Dietze C., 1920. S. 69-70).

The modern researchers A. Morich and D. Landgraf analyzed this issue. The latter noted that during the period of the reform performance, the main places of person origin who moved to the Far East were Poltava, Kharkov, Ekaterinoslav, Kherson (the author named Odesskaya by mistake) and Tavricheskaya province (Landgraf D. 1989. S. 812). It is significant that the first three of them belonged to the regions with the greatest acuteness of the agrarian issue. A.Morich pointed to the modest role of the Non-Black Earth Region (excluding Belarus) as the region of immigrant origin due to the relative well-being of the rural population there. The importance of peasant migrations of the non-Black Earth region for capitalist industrialization and urbanization of Russia was noted by another Austrian historian, P. Felch (Moritsch A., 1986. S. 181, Felch P., 1984. S. 249-250). There were migrations from the Ural provinces - the reason for this was a complex situation for metallurgy due to the constantly growing competition of the South of Russia. The main flow of migrants was sent to Siberia from the black earth regions (Little Russia, Central Chernozemye). But here, A. Morich noted, the migrations absorbed only half of the natural population growth (Moritsch A., 1986. S. 181, 184). On the whole, the outflow of the excess part of the rural population from the unfavorable provinces in
the agrarian aspect relieved tension to a certain extent, but the significance of this factor should not be overestimated (Moritsch A., 1986. S. 153, 181, 184).

The course on turning new settlers into the owners of strong farms oriented to the market turned out to be a failure in the opinion of K. Spiss and D. Landgraf: “new migrants”, among which the poor prevailed since 1907, received much smaller and worse quality sites as compared with the “old” immigrants. The current circumstances turned settlers into the debtors of Cossacks and old-timers, and also into hired workers. D. Landgraf, sharing this conclusion of K. Spiss, pointed, however, to the better provision of the Far Eastern peasantry with livestock in comparison with European Russia. In general, however, instead of creation of an economically well-founded middle peasantry in the Far East due to new settlers, a layer prone to proletarianization was formed and the differentiation of the population intensified. This, however, created the basis for the development of the capitalist way of life in a Far Eastern village (Spiss K., 1980. S. 31-32, Moritsch A., 1986. S. 180). K. Spiss, D. Landgraf and L. Deeg pointed to a higher payment of hired labor in the agrarian sector of the Far East as compared to European Russia due to a shortage of workers in the region agriculture. However, the influx of colonists in 1907 - 1908, conditioned the lowering of prices (Spiss K., 1980. S. 27, 31-32, 104, Landgraf D., 1989. S. 720, 778, Deeg L., 1996. S. 215). At the same time K. Spisses rightly noted the increasing role of cities as a new residence for migrants; thanks to the latter, the urban population of the Far East increased at faster rates than the regional population as a whole. The share of townspeople in the total number of inhabitants was significantly higher in the province than in the whole Russian Empire (Spiss K., 1980. S. 15, 17-19, 34-35, Landgraf D., 1989. S. 737-738, 754).

Helping to solve the problem of labor in the province, the resettlement was accompanied by the improvement of agriculture. K. Spiss and D. Landgraf noted an undoubted growth of machine application in the farms of Far Eastern peasants. At that, there was a huge gap between old-timers and new settlers in favor of the former ones (Landgraf D., 1989. S. 776; Spiss K., 1980. S. 104-106; Starkov M.I., 1962. S. 70). Perhaps, however, the gap was not so significant - M.I. Starkov, to whom K. Spiss refers, does not specify whether there are any new settlers, or only those for whom their own economy was the main source of livelihood. K. Spiss noted better provision of Far Eastern agriculture with living equipment and machinery in comparison with European Russia (Spiss K., 1980. S. 104-105). However, one should not exaggerate the intense nature of Far Eastern agriculture. K. Spiss and D. Landgraf recognized that during the years of the Stolypin’s reform, the economy in the Amur and Primorye was largely carried out by the plowing of new lands. Nevertheless, according to D. Landgraf, the dependence of the Amur governorate general on grain imports was significantly reduced after 1905 (Spiss K., 1980. S. 100; Landgraf D., 1989. S. 777). The range of crops cultivated in the region has also expanded. The increase of intensification stimulated the production of agricultural machinery, but the capacities of the enterprises that existed here were far from sufficient to cover the growing needs of the peasants, and most of production tools were still imported from abroad (Landgraf D., 1989. S. 777-778).

Focusing on the difficulties of settler adaptation to the conditions of life in the region, K. Spies and D. Landgraf did not consider the resettlement policy by P.A. Stolypin as failed one. With all the problems, the bulk of the colonists lived in a new place of residence, often contributing to the intensification. L. Deeg noted the tendency to the living standard increase of the rural Far Eastern population, the relative prosperity of the regional peasants, the constant growth in demand for various consumer goods, furniture, agricultural machinery and improved production tools. This stimulated trade in the province and contributed to the success of a number of trading firms (Deeg L., 1996. S. 214; Landgraf D., 1989. S. 777).

CONCLUSIONS

Summing up, it is necessary to note the predominance of a sufficiently balanced, objective approach, both in the analysis of the organizational and economic activities of the government with regard to migrations, and at the consideration the movements to the Far East in the German-speaking historiography by the 21st century. Both positive and negative aspects of the Stolypin’s policy were...
pointed out, and an ambiguous impact of colonists on the development of the region productive forces was noted. It is important to note that after the revival of interest to the problem in German Russian studies (1980-ies), the data they cited called into question the former, clearly and unambiguously pessimistic assessments of the Stolypin's reform as a whole objectively, characteristic for the historiography of the two preceding decades.
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