land, or from exploitation by the agrarian nobility, there being none such in Siberia or in Central-Asiatic Russia, or at least only in spots.

In view of what has just been said, it is necessary, in a discussion of the Russian Agrarian Question, to consider principally, although not exclusively, the agrarian conditions in the above-indicated fifty governments.

In order to get an idea of these agricultural conditions, let us first turn to the quantitative distribution of landed property between the peasantry and the great landholders of these fifty governments, and consider the mutual economic dependence of these two groups of proprietors.

The chief development of peasant ownership until the most recent times was on the apportioned lands of the peasants, which were allotted to them from the feudal estates, state lands and appanage lands* by the agricultural reform of 1861. These lands the peasants acquired by purchase, on payments to the feudal holders, to the state, or to the Department of Appanages. At the present time the peasants of these 50 governments, not including the Cossacks, hold 124,000,000 dessyatins** of apportioned land.

How many dessyatins are there to one peasant holding? This is a variable quantity and depends on numerous local conditions which were taken into consideration by the makers of the agrarian reform laws. The state's peasants got more than any others, the appanage peasants got holdings of medium size, the feudal peasants least of all. Thus, one group of peasant communities, with a total number of 3,000,000 farms, received an average of only 3 dessyatins per farm; another group of peasant farms, with more than 5,000,000 units, has an average of $7\frac{1}{2}$ dessyatins per farm; and only the remaining 4,000,000 farms have not less than 10 dessyatins per farm.

** Dessyatina: a Russian land-measure equal to 2.702 English acres.

The data given above show that with the low stage of advancement of peasant agriculture in Russia the great majority of the peasant holdings in 50 governments had not land enough to support the occupants. The insufficiency will be more evident if we consider the area of land per single inhabitant of peasant population. This area per individual, after the Reform of 1861, has been going down steadily, since the peasant population has been rising, while the area of the apportioned land has remained constant. Owing to this fact, while the area of apportioned land per peasant inhabitant, immediately after the Reform of 1861, was 234 dessyatins; in 1905, still more than 1½ dessyatins; it had gone down in 1915 to about 1-1/3 dessyatins per individual; for the peasant population of European Russia had more than doubled since 1861.

In view of these statistical data, there can be no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the Russian peasantry do not have enough land to raise enough to feed their families and pay their taxes. Under more intensive cultivation, these parcels would of course yield more satisfactory results. For instance, the small peasantry of France, Belgium, Germany, Sweden, Austria-Hungary, and Italy, have, on the average, less land, than in Russia, but owing to the very much more advanced methods of agriculture, they obtain a much higher yield from their holdings, than do the Russian peasants. For decades the latter lived in half-starvation on pieces of land that would have enabled the peasants of economically more advanced countries to lead a comfortable existence. Viewed in the light of this fact, there is nothing improbable or exceptional in the statistics of A. N. Maress, which show that 7/10 of the entire peasant population of Russia could not feed themselves on the product of their lands, 2/10 could feed themselves, but not their cattle, and only 1/10 could feed both themselves and their cattle from their own apportioned lands.

This unquestionable land-poverty forced the Russian peasants to add by purchase additional land to their allotted portions, buying the same from the feudal holders, the state, or the Department of Appanages. For these purchases, the peasants received financial assistance from the State Agricultural Bank, founded by

^{*} Appanage lands: the property of the Imperial House; from these came the incomes of the Grand Dukes, Dukes, and other members of the prolific Imperial Family.