

Przemysław Czernicki

THE STATE LAND FUND AS A LEGAL INSTRUMENT OF THE STALINIST STATE'S IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM OF REBUILDING THE AGRARIAN AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE IN POST-WAR POLAND

1. Introduction – ideological and systemic premises for establishing the State Land Fund

The Marxist doctrine of property, which is the ideological basis of the communist movement, is the starting point for the views of its leaders and activists on the issues related to the socialization of property. However, it is not about focusing on the positive program of organizing social and economic life, but on adopting the doctrinal assumption about the necessity of private property liquidation [Pańko 1972, 178]. Karl Marx and his followers, in relation to the introduction of the modern agricultural system, assumed the need to depart from the small-scale peasant economy in favour of organizing it into forms of collective management that favoured the mechanization of the production process. So, in the name of promoting social and economic progress, Marxists postulated the concentration of agrarian resources through the implementation of ownership changes assuming the necessity of the so-called socialization of individual agriculture [Dobieszewski 1993, 9-25]. In rural relations, the authors of the Marxist doctrine recognized the achievement of the socialist mode of production as a means of class struggle and the main means of liquidating the capitalist system [Engels 1949, 21-38; Idem 1968, 448; Marks 1962, 329-35; Idem 1969, 64-67; Marks and Engels 1962, 528].

DR. PRZEMYSŁAW CZERNICKI, Institute of Political Sciences and Administration, Faculty of Social Sciences, Siedlce University of Natural Sciences and Humanities; correspondence address: ul. Żytnia 39, 08-110 Siedlce, Poland; e-mail: przemcz5@wp.pl; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1184-1556>.

The aforementioned ideological premises determined the approach to the agricultural policy of the created communist state on the part of Vladimir Lenin after the victory of the October Revolution. The leaders of the Bolshevik party attached great propaganda importance to demonstrating the superiority and effectiveness of the socialized sector over private agriculture [Tkaczyk 1979, 305]. Therefore, in the “Decree on the Land”¹ (*de facto* written by him), Lenin sanctioned the abolition of all private land ownership forever [Service 2003, 319-20; Sukiennicki 2003, 351-83]. At the same time, he planned to transfer the confiscated private land to a special nationwide agricultural fund [Pisarek 1934, 30-32]. An important institutional innovation of the communist system was the establishment of a dichotomy amid the communist party, the state completely subordinated to it, and the administrative apparatus formally at its disposal [Malia 1998, 123-73].

In Russia, the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks and their action of collectivization of agrarian lands (and then the dissemination of this pattern in countries controlled by the Soviets) was conditioned by an inflow of publications, speeches and appeals on this subject. The communists’ ideological and propaganda activities had both theoretical and instructional dimensions. The aim of these activities was to instill in the society and the party-state apparatus the conviction about the necessity or popularization of ways of socializing the peasant land [Lenin 1949, 5-11; Idem 1951, 42; Idem 1954, 350-51; Idem 1987, 351-60; Stalin 1949, 165-74; Idem 1951, 150-58; Idem 1953, 188-95; Idem 1955, 325-49]. However, the resistance of the Russian countryside to the attempts of collectivization prompted Lenin to choose a long-term concept of land nationalization, divided into many intermediate stages. Whereas, another Soviet leader, Joseph Stalin, who in the 1930s decided to conduct the largest social operation in the history of mankind, did not show similar resistance [Holzer 2000, 30]. The collectivization of the land of peasants led to their transformation into a group of hired workers who were employed in rural production cooperatives and completely subordinated to the directives of the communist party. Taking over these economic resources allowed the Soviet state, in its

¹ This legal act was formally passed on November 8, 1917 by the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets.

turn, to finance accelerated industrialization [Malia 1998, 192-208; Smoleń 1994, 85-90; Swianiewicz 2003, 313-28]. According to Stalin's plan, the discussed agrarian revolution was supposed to become a model of revolutionary changes; after the Second World War, attempts were made to copy and implement it in the countries under the rule of the Soviet Union.

In the case of Poland, the main obstacle to the implementation of that plan was the peasants' attachment to private land ownership and the extreme reluctance of the majority of society to introduce the system of government modelled on the Soviet one. Taking into account the existence of the above-mentioned conditions, the leaders of the communist party tried to win the acceptance of the new political order by the rural population announcing a radical program of land reform (aimed at the liquidation of large landed estates) in the summer of 1944.

The State Land Fund (SLF) was to be the legal organizational institution which was to serve the peasants owing the arable land obtained largely from the property of expropriated land gentry.² In fact, the fund was to serve revolutionary processes in terms of legal consequences and social agrarian transformations (bearing the hallmarks of a drastic class struggle), which constituted an important pillar of the Stalinist system constructed in post-Yalta Poland [Grzybowski 1947, 46].

Socio-technical propaganda efforts were aimed at consolidating the power that the communists received from the Soviet mandatory. For this purpose, they also tried to use institutional models associated with the interwar attempts at agrarian reform. Attention is drawn to the use of the structure of the fund institution (with a name not directly associated with the implementation of the land reform), and in order to implement them in a very radical version. It seems that it opened up wide opportunities for the reconstruction of the ownership and for the agrarian relations existing in the Polish countryside. The use of the institution of the State Land Fund allowed the communist authorities to pursue agrarian policy in line with Bolshevik patterns (including collectivization of peasant land). However, as practice showed, the attempts to carry out the so-called

² Established on the basis of the decree of the Polish Committee of National Liberation of September 6, 1944 on the implementation of the land reform, Journal of Laws of 1945, No. 3, item 13 as amended.

socialist reconstruction of villages in People's Poland were generally made with the rejection of brutal and dogmatic Soviet methods.

2. Institutional specificity of the State Land Fund and the state's implementation of the policy of rebuilding of the agrarian system and the system of social relations

With the thought of the programmatic projections of the communist movement and the propaganda theses disseminated by its agents, the creation of the so-called Land Fund [Karolak 2016, 92; Słabek 2009, 190-92; Kumoś 1983, 166-70] was to serve the legal and organizational revolutionary service in terms of the scale and legal consequences of the agricultural reform.

However, the tactical approach of the leadership of the Polish Workers' Party to the consolidation obtained from the granting of power to it by the Soviet principals was visible in the institutional use of the SLF in a way that went beyond the officially declared purpose of this institution. At the same time, they tried to camouflage the real nature of those changes, emphasizing their implementation in accordance with the principles of the rule of law and justice. Moreover, they wanted to create the impression of an institutional reference to the interwar experience in the field of correcting the then existing agrarian structure. The institution established by the Polish Committee of National Liberation was supposed to be a continuation of the interwar Agricultural Reform Trade Fund, which functioning was widely accepted by political circles and public opinion. It seems that it was precisely for propaganda reasons and in order to implement the Moscow vision of a totalitarian state that the new entity was given the name that was more "neutral" and camouflaging for the intentions of the Kremlin governors. As a result, the basic solutions regulating functioning the pre-war Agricultural Reform Trade Fund (ARTF) were included in Article 3, 4 and 5 of the Land Reform Decree. In Article 3(2) of the aforementioned legal act, the communist regulator also decided to transfer the property assets previously owned by the ARTF to the sphere of resources of the State Land Fund [Zieliński 1980, 35-37].

Apart from creating the fund and the elementary principles of its functioning Article 3-5 of the decree on the land reform (formally binding

until now), no provision was published later to define clearly the legal nature of the SLF. In the light of Article 3(1) of the decree on carrying out the land reform, this institution was officially established to carry out the process of rebuilding the existing agricultural system. However, the above-mentioned decree provisions (formally binding until now) and later legal acts do not define the concept of this transformation; although at the same time, they tried to give it a more definite content by means of specified provisions.³ As one can guess, the authorities avoided making unequivocal declarations in this respect due to the aforementioned reluctance of the majority of the society to “socialize” (collectivize) Polish agriculture in line with Soviet patterns.

As a result, even today, an unambiguous definition of the legal nature of the State Land Fund may cause considerable difficulties.⁴ It seems that the legal essence of the State Land Fund (at least after its legal reorganization in 1950) was best expressed by the definition that it is an institutionally separated state resource (supply, reserve) of real estate (primarily agricultural). Those property resources were characterized by the fact that they were owned by the State Treasury and were not managed (owned) by other state legal persons [Zieliński 1980, 33-42; Czechowski and Prutis 1985, 62-81].

The Minister of Agriculture and Agricultural Reforms played a leading role in managing the SLF’s assets, and while performing administrative functions, he not only used the departmental management of the Land Fund, but primarily, he used the help of local authorities. In general, those were units operating at the *poviat* and *voivodship* level, and appropriate structural reorganisations were carried out in that respect several times. Focusing the management of the fund within the state administration allowed the socialist state to control conveniently the implementation of the land policy conducted in a given period. At some of its stages, either the purely production function or the systemic function prevailed (aimed at

³ Resolution of the Supreme Administrative Court in Warsaw of 18 September 1995, ref. no. VI SA 5/95, <https://sip.lex.pl/orzeczenia-i-pisma-urzedowe/orzeczenia-sadow/vi-sa-5-95-uchwala-naczelnego-sadu-administracyjnego-do-520104343> [accessed: 11.07.2021].

⁴ For more see *ibid.*

a thorough reconstruction of the agrarian system through socialization and collectivization of the agricultural economy) [Zieliński 1980, 13, 28-33].

This facilitated the creation of a very broad legal basis enabling the increase of the property resources of the State Land Fund. This property was augmented by issuing a number of relevant sources of normative acts (often changed) over the next decades. A legal group was distinguished in the literature, after all (apart from the decree on the land reform, those were, inter alia, the provisions of the act of March, 20 on the takeover of dead-hand goods by the state, guaranteeing parish priests to own farms and establishing a Church Fund).⁵ They formed the primary sources of the SLF assets [Tkaczyk 1979, 21-26], which, in fact, arose due to the liquidation of large gentry land property and the elimination of the consequences of the war [Zieliński 1980, 13-17].

3. SLF as a tool for the elimination of large gentry land ownership by the communist state, as well as the economic and social degradation of landowners

From the very beginning of the existence of the State Land Fund, its activity was thoroughly ideological, class and political in nature [Iwaniak 1999, 69]. Under the new political conditions, the ideological priority of the communist authorities was the destruction of the economic importance of the landowners in the Polish countryside through expropriation of private agricultural land from its owners. In this way, an attempt was made to reconstruct thoroughly the model of ownership relations, which had been shaped in the agrarian economy over the past centuries [Szemberg 1953, 10-16].

The class liquidation of large gentry's property was caused mainly by the perception of the aristocracy and landlords as the social strata of the declared enemies of communist rule. Therefore, the leadership and activists of the Polish Workers' Party were determined in their efforts to remove political, economic or cultural influences of the nobility in the countryside [Góra 1969, 59-60]. At the same time, it was about replacing the existing social elites with those more sympathetic and controlled by

⁵ Journal of Laws No. 46, item 339 as amended.

the new authorities. Therefore, as it seems, the State Land Fund was established primarily to deprive the representatives of the landed gentry of their privileged economic and social position.

As a result of the aforementioned political and ideological decisions, during the first period of the existence of the new state, the main source of the expansion of SLF resources was primarily landowners' farms, which were obtained by taking them over for the purposes related to the Polish Committee of National Liberation agricultural reform. It should be mentioned, though, that we do not have fully reliable data in this respect, because it was only from 1956 that functioning of the fund was covered by the rules of statistical reporting, which was officially carried out by the socialist state [Bodalski 1966, 13-15; Zieliński 1980, 25]. However, in the literature on the subject it is estimated that over half of the land covered by the decisions on nationalization of the so-called former lands belonged to gentry's estates before their acquisition to the SLF resources [Słabek 2009, 86]. The above-mentioned tendencies are even more clearly indicated by the research carried out in relation to the individual regions, because, for example, in the Krakow voivodeship, as much as 92.5% of the land intended for the purposes of the agricultural reform came from the parcelling of gentry estates. It is characteristic that in the aforementioned voivodeship, as of January 1, 1948, only 7.5% of the land remaining in this way was post-German real estate, farms of convicted persons and properties previously included in the resources of the State Treasury [Brzoza 1988, 165].

The legal basis for the takeover of landowners' farms for the benefit of the SLF by the state by means of compulsory parcelling was Article 2(1)(e) of the PCNL decree on the land reform. According to the above-mentioned provision, the process of transformation of agrarian and ownership relations was to be initiated by the use of specific land properties of an agricultural nature, which were owned or jointly owned by natural or legal persons. At the same time, the communist legislator decided that the total size of the said land was to exceed either 100 hectares of the total area or 50 hectares of arable land. The aforesaid subject criterion was increased in western and northern Poland (i.e. in the Poznań, Pomorskie and Śląskie voivodeships). In the said area, it was possible to seize agricultural land with a total acreage exceeding 100 ha of the total area (regardless of the agricultural land area) for the purposes related to the implementation

of the agricultural reform (Article 2(1)(e) of the decree on carrying out the land reform).

Contemporary research clearly shows that the acquisition of resources at the disposal of the State Land Fund was especially favoured with the ambiguous definition of the land real estate in the land reform decree. This was accompanied by the decision-making practice of administrative bodies (including, in particular, the activities of the above-mentioned land offices and the Land Fund Department operating under the Ministry of Agriculture and Agricultural Reforms). The aforesaid state agencies assumed that, in line with the general tendency of the decree, its provisions should be interpreted broadly, considering that it was a legal act that largely determined the shape of the Polish economic system [Kłusek 2014, 19-33].

The decree did not provide any compensation for former landowners whose properties were earmarked for the land reform. They passed, *ex lege*, into the property of the State Treasury, but in practice were managed by the State Land Fund as an institution covering the expenses related to the implementation of the agricultural reform [Zieliński 1980, 35-37]. Among the forms of symbolic compensation, attention is drawn to the possibility of allocating independent farms to expropriated landowners (on the same terms as peasants) from the resources of the SLF, but in a poviát other than their former property (Article 19(1) of the decree on carrying out the land reform). In addition, the discussed agrarian transformations were carried out in the administrative mode, which precluded the possibility of appealing to judicial institutions [Jastrzębski 2018, 31].

In fact, the landowners' management was fought and possible conflicts between the "village and the manor" over forest services were liquidated through the confiscation of property [Tkaczyk 1979, 24-25]. The course of the land reform, shaped according to Bolshevik patterns, led to the destruction of the landowners' layer, which had been the mainstay of the Polish authenticity for centuries [Bałtowski 2009, 149].

Contemporary research emphasizes the long-term occurrence of a number of negative effects of an economic, social or cultural nature. It is indicated that the acquisition of land gentry's real estate with the use of the SLF resulted in the destruction of the majority of the palaces and manors that were covered by the ownership transformations under the communists

and also in the plunder of their usually rich content. After all, it consisted of genuine works of art, literature, book collections and household items, which were a kind of testimony to the high material culture of Polish manors, and hence, they were of unprecedented importance for Polish society [Tracz 2016, 8-11; Sowa 2001, 37].

In the years of 1944-1948, the forms of administration of the State Land Fund performed a typically political (systemic) function as a link in the transformation of large gentry's property into individual and public property (creating the basis of the socialized sector in agriculture). At that time, the state had more land at its disposal than it had been originally presumed when the agrarian reform had been launched [Tkaczyk 1979, 45-70; Zieliński 1980, 165]. As a result, as early as at the end of 1948, the institutions under its control ruled nearly 11% of the total area of agricultural land in Poland [Bałtowski 2009, 148-49].

Achieving the above-mentioned results, however, would not be possible without the creation of an extensive catalogue of legal acts that allowed for the creation of the property foundations of the SLF (State Land Fund). In addition to the decree on the implementation of the land reform, the reference was made to the act of March 20 on the takeover of dead-hand goods by the state, guaranteeing the ownership of farms to the parish priests and establishing the Church Fund). The legal literature stated that the primary sources of SLF resources were, first of all, legal acts liquidating large land ownership and regulating the consequences of World War II [Tkaczyk 1979, 21-26; Zieliński 1980, 13-17].

4. The role of the State Land Fund in the preparation of the process of the collectivization of Polish agriculture by the authorities

In the light of the decree of the Polish Committee of National Liberation (constituting an ideological announcement of the shape of the policy of the communist authorities), the agricultural system in Poland was to be based on functioning peasant farms capable of efficient agricultural production. The implementation of the agricultural reform in its original version was, therefore, to consist primarily in the completion of the existing farms. Thus, the creation of new farms was only in the second place.

However, the actual course of the parcelling questioned the achievement of the maximum healing of the existing agrarian structure (alongside with its unification throughout the country) and the strengthening of the working peasants [Tkaczyk 1979, 35-39]. Ideological considerations, the need to authenticate the new governments in the eyes of the Polish society and the pressure of Soviet decision-makers led to the implementation of a completely different scenario of structural changes. As a result, the land resource under the SLF was divided in a way that was clearly contrary to the assumptions declared to the Polish society and to the premises of rational agricultural management [Żenczykowski 1990, 138-42].

Thus, the class nature of the land reform led to a radical reduction in the capitalist and large peasant land ownership by favouring the allocation of land primarily to the poorest inhabitants of the countryside. Such a shape of the parcelling policy led in practice (especially in the western and northern areas) to the process of “averaging” the area of existing farms [Suchoń 2008, 141-43; Tkaczyk 1979, 45-54; Wawrzyniak 2004, 53; Ziętara 2005, 109].

According to some experts in agrarian economy, a fundamental mistake of the communist authorities (with far-reaching consequences) was to limit the parcelling to the area of only 6 million hectares of the land. In the situation at that time, it was possible to allocate about 3 million ha more of the arable land for this purpose, but it was decided to give it to state farms and leave it at the disposal of the State Land Fund. The land reserve at the disposal of the state should rather supply the existing individual farms in order to further enlarge the area owned by them. The rationality of this type of concept could be proved by the possibility of obtaining potentially better economic effects than it would result from the creation of new, dependent and poorly efficient farms [Poniatowski 1965, 58].

However, the general social and economic strategy of the communist movement outlined by the Kremlin envisaged the replication of radical transformation of society and economy by all communist countries of the Soviet pattern. These directives prompted the communist leadership in mid-1948 (formally under the command of the communist party platform in the form of the so-called Cominform) to start proclaiming the slogans of socializing the countryside as supposedly the only rational way

to increase agricultural production, and announced the fight against “capitalist elements” in agriculture. The real political goal behind the initiation of this action was, however, to subordinate the peasants, who were so far economically independent from the socialist state, to the central political leadership of the communist party [Albrecht (Roszkowski) 1994, 165-66].

As a result, starting in 1949, the creation of not only private, but even state-owned farms with the help of SLF resources was minimized, transforming the fund into a typical land reserve for vigorously conducted collectivization. Due to the period of preferential treatment of the development of agricultural production cooperatives in the agrarian policy of the state in the period until 1956, the systemic role of the forms of managing the funds was clearly taken to the fore [Zieliński 1980, 165]. This was facilitated by administrative and financial pressure on the peasants (increasing taxes or introducing so-called compulsory deliveries from the countryside) in order to persuade them to join the socialized agricultural sector. In order to accelerate these processes, the authorities issued a decree on the complete management of agricultural land on February 9, 1953.⁶ Although those regulations were to counteract the phenomenon of neglecting farmsteads officially, in practice they created grounds for individual farmers to donate land to the resources of the State Land Fund. As a result, only between 1953 and 1956, the institution in question acquired about 350,000 ha [Tokarzewski 1966, 70]. Due to the lack of reliable statistics in this respect, it is currently indicated that SLF acquired much larger land resources [Suchoń 2008, 146; Wawrzyniak 2004, 61].

At the same time, for example, in the years 1950-1954, the acreage in question decreased from 700,000 ha to 500,000 ha as a result of transferring the lands to the intensively developed sector of the socialized agrarian economy (agricultural production cooperatives or State Agricultural Farms).

Conclusions

Apart from perpetuating the fragmentation of the peasant structure of agriculture, the direct effect of the takeover and distribution of land by the SLF was the reduction of the global agricultural commodity

⁶ Journal of Laws No. 11, item 40.

[Tkaczyk 1979, 310-11]. As it took place in the face of the great problems of the post-war reconstruction of the agrarian economy, therefore, in the face of increasing production difficulties [Zieliński 1980, 154] and the resistance of the village, it was not possible to use this institution to support the collectivization action quickly. As a result of its relatively slow pace, Poland was the only country with a relationship of political dependence on the Soviet Union, in which it was virtually impossible to implement the process of “socialization” of individual agriculture and the socialist transformation of the countryside.

The political changes in the autumn of 1956 (the so-called “October”) brought about the mass disintegration of artificially created cooperatives. This corresponded with the attempts to modify the hitherto conducted agrarian policy with the use of the State Land Fund. Unlike before, the land collected under it was transferred to a large extent to private farms by concluding appropriate civil law contracts (mainly sale and lease). This proved the existence of flexibility with regard to the possibility of administrating SLF as a legal form of disposing of the land gentry real estate owned by this institution. Paradoxically, however, the aforementioned land acreage even increased during the period after 1956. The main reason for this was the transfer of land to the resource of the discussed fund, which previously belonged to the then widely liquidated (and thus intensively developed) agricultural production cooperatives [Tkaczyk 1979, 114-55].

Summing up, it can be generally stated that the communist authorities after 1944 resorted to the use of the institution of a state special purpose fund known as an instrument of the interwar agricultural reform. The legal norms adopted by the socialist state were aimed not only at the liquidation of large gentry’s property, but also at the elimination of the richest class of peasants (so-called “kulaks”) [Ehrlich 1950, 15-20; Stelmachowski 2002, 30]. The SLF was, therefore, to be an instrument used to carry out one of the most important undertakings in the field of so-called “social engineering” in the Polish history in the form of preparing the process of socialization of the countryside. However, the policy of socialization of arable land with the help of the State Land Fund, bearing the hallmarks of a drastic class struggle, ended in failure for the reasons indicated in this article.

REFERENCES

- Albert, Andrzej. (Roszkowski, Wojciech). 1994. *Najnowsza historia Polski 1914-1993*. Vol. 2. Londyn: Wydawnictwo Puls.
- Bałtowski, Maciej. 2009. *Gospodarka socjalistyczna w Polsce: geneza, rozwój, upadek*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Bodalski, Mieczysław. 1966. *Państwowy Fundusz Ziemi i jego zagospodarowanie*. Warszawa: Zakład Wydawnictw CRS.
- Brzoza, Czesław. 1988. *Reforma rolna w województwie krakowskim (1945-1948)*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Czechowski, Paweł, and Stanisław Prutis. 1985. *Grunty rolne: problemy prawno-organizacyjne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Spółdzielcze.
- Dobieszewski, Adolf. 1993. *Kolektywizacja wsi polskiej 1848-1956*. Warszawa: Fundacja im. Kazimierza Kelles-Krauz.
- Ehrlich, Stanisław. 1950. "Teoria kolektywizacji Józefa Stalina." *Państwo i Prawo* 1:15-20.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1949. *Kwestia chłopska we Francji i w Niemczech*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1968. "Przedmowa [Do drugiego wydania (1870) „Wojny chłopskiej w Niemczech”]." In Marks, Karl, and Friedrich Engels, *Dzieła wybrane*. T. 16 [wrzesień 1864-lipiec 1870], 446-48. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Góra, Władysław. 1969. "Reforma PKWN oraz rola partii robotniczych w jej przeprowadzeniu." In *Historia polskiego ruchu robotniczego 1864-1964*. Vol. 2: 1939-1964, 55-120. Warszawa: Zakład Historii Partii przy KC PZPR.
- Grzybowski, Konstanty. 1947. "Ustrój polityczny Polski." In Konstanty Grzybowski, *Zarys historyczno-polityczny I-go rządu demokratycznego w Polsce 1944-1946*, 40-68. Warszawa-Kraków: Ludowa Agencja Wydawnicza "Sygnał".
- Holzer, Jerzy. 2000. *Komunizm w Europie: dzieje ruchu i systemu władzy*. Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy Bellona.
- Iwaniak, Stefan. 1999. *Dzieje gospodarcze wsi kieleckiej 1944-1974*. Kielce: WSP im. Jana Kochanowskiego.
- Jastrzębski, Robert. 2018. "Reforma rolna po drugiej wojnie światowej. Ustawodawstwo państwa polskiego." *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne* LXX, no. 1:111-51.
- Karolak, Adrian. 2016. "Kwestia reformy rolnej i powojennych granic Polski w audycjach rozgłośni im. Tadeusza Kościuszki." *Studia z Dziejów Rosji i Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej* 51, no. 2:85-114.

- Kłusek, Mirosław. 2014. *Nieruchomości ziemskie i ich właściciele w postępowaniach administracyjnych z lat 1944-1950 wywołanych realizacją dekretu o przeprowadzeniu reformy rolnej*. Kraków: Drukarnia Eikon Plus.
- Kumoś, Zbigniew. 1983. *Związek patriotów polskich: założenia programowo-ideowe*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Ministerstwa Obrony Narodowej.
- Lenin, Włodzimierz. 1949. "Przemówienie wygłoszone 8 listopada 1918 roku do delegatów Komitetów Biedoty Obwodu Moskiewskiego." In Włodzimierz Lenin, and Józef Stalin. *O spółdzielczości produkcyjnej na wsi*, 5-11. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Lenin, Włodzimierz. 1951. "Z Tez Kwietniowych." In *Dzieła wybrane: [w dwóch tomach]*, vol. 2, 242. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Lenin, Włodzimierz. 1954. "Przemówienie wygłoszone 11 grudnia 1918 roku na I Ogólnorosyjskim Zjeździe Wydziałów Rolnych, Komitetów biedoty i komun." In *Dzieła*. Vol. 28: *Lipiec 1918 – marzec 1919*, 350-51. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Lenin, Włodzimierz. 1987. "Przemówienie na I Zjeździe Komun i arteli rolnych. 4 grudnia 1919." In *Dzieła wszystkie*, vol. 39, 351-60. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza (Moskwa: Politizdat).
- Malia, Martin. 1998. *Sowiecka tragedia. Historia komunistycznego imperium rosyjskiego 1917-1991*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Philip Wilson.
- Marks, Karl. 1962. "Projekt ustawy o zniesieniu powinności." In Karl Marks, and Friedrich Engels, *Dzieła wybrane*. Vol. 5: *Marzec 1848 – lipiec 1849*, 329-35. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Marks, Karl. 1969. "Nacjonalizacja ziemi." In Karl Marks, and Friedrich Engels, *Dzieła wybrane*. Vol. 18: *Marzec 1872 – maj 1875*, 64-67. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Marks, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1962. "Manifest Partii Komunistycznej." In Karl Marks, and Friedrich Engels, *Dzieła wybrane*. Vol. 4: *Maj 1846 – marzec 1848*, 523-28. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Pańko, Walerian. 1972. "PFZ jako instrument przepływów międzysektorowych w rejonie uprzemysłowionym." In *Wpływ uprzemysłowienia na stosunki własnościowe w rolnictwie w Legnicko-Głogowskim Okręgu Miedziowym*, edited by Krystyna Trawińska, 120-40. Warszawa: PWN.
- Pisarek, Edward, W. 1934. *Od obszczyzny do kołchozu: z form pospólnego użytkowania ziemi na wschodzie Europy*. Kraków: Nakładem Autora.
- Poniatowski, Józef. 1965. "Uwagi o ustroju rolnym PRL." In *Dylematy gospodarki polskiej*, edited by Witold Czerwiński, 53-75. Londyn: Polska Fundacja Kulturalna.

- Stalin, Josif, W. 1949. "O trzech podstawowych hasłach partii w kwestii chłopskiej. W odpowiedzi tow. Janskiemu." In Josif Stalin, *Zagadnienia leninizmu*, 165-74. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Stalin, Josif, W. 1951. "O trzech podstawowych hasłach partii w kwestii chłopskiej." In Josif Stalin, *Zagadnienia leninizmu*, 150-58. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Stalin, Josif, W. 1953. "W kwestii polityki likwidacji kułactwa jako klasy." In *Dzieła*, vol. XII, 188-95. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Stalin, Josif, W. 1955. "W kwestii polityki agrarnej w ZSRR. Przemówienie wygłoszone na konferencji agrarystów-marksistów 27 grudnia 1929 roku." In Włodzimierz, Lenin, and Josif W. Stalin, *O socjalistycznej przebudowie wsi*, 325-49. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Suchoń, Aneta. 2008. "Ekonomiczne aspekty reformy rolnej i osadnictwa." In *Reformy rolne w Polsce międzywojennej i powojennej: prawo – realizacja – skutki – problemy reprivatyzacyjne*, edited by Ewa Borkowska-Bagińska, and Wojciech Szafranski, 139-54. Warszawa: PWN.
- Service, Robert. 2003. *Lenin. Biografia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Iskry.
- Słabek Henryk. 2009. *O społecznej historii Polski 1945-1989*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza (Kutno: Wyższa Szkoła Gospodarki Krajowej).
- Smoleń, Mieczysław. 1994. *Stracone dekady: historia ZSRR 1917-1991*. Warszawa-Kraków: PWN.
- Sowa, Andrzej L. 2001. *Wielka historia Polski*. Vol. 10: *Od Drugiej do Trzeciej Rzeczypospolitej (1945-2001)*. Kraków: "Fogra" (Warszawa: Świat Książki).
- Stelmachowski, Andrzej. 2002. "Kształtowanie się rolnictwa i prawa rolnego w Polsce (rys historyczny)." In *Polskie prawo rolne na tle ustawodawstwa Unii Europejskiej*, edited by Paweł Czechowski, Małgorzata Korzycka-Iwanow, Stanisław Prutis, et al., 28-55. Warszawa: LexisNexis.
- Sukiennicki, Wiktor. 2003. "Kolektywizacja rolnictwa w ZSRR w okresie pierwszej pięciolatki: studium prawnopolityczne." In *Polska szkoła sowietologiczna. 1930-1939*, edited by Marek Kornat, 351-83. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Arkana.
- Swianiewicz, Stanisław. 2003. "Rzut oka na zasadnicze problemy sowieckiej polityki gospodarczej." In *Polska szkoła sowietologiczna. 1930-1939*, edited by Marek Kornat, 309-50. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Arkana.
- Szemberg, Anna. 1953. *Reforma rolna PKWN*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Tkaczyk Tadeusz. 1979. *Państwowy fundusz ziemi. Rola i funkcje*. Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza.

- Tokarzewski, Tadeusz. 1966. "Społeczne formy zagospodarowywania PFZ." In *O socjalistyczny rozwój wsi: dyskusji ciąg dalszy*, edited by Kazimierz Barcikowski, and Henryk Chołaj, 50-77. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Tracz, Grzegorz. 2016. "Sytuacja prawna byłych właścicieli nieruchomości ziemskich w III Rzeczypospolitej." *Forum Prawnicze* 4:3-29.
- Wawrzyniak, Bogdan M. 2004. *Przemiany struktury agrarnej w rolnictwie polskim*. Włocławek: Lega – Oficyna Wydawnicza WTN.
- Zieliński, Andrzej. 1980. *Formy prawne gospodarowania nieruchomościami rolnymi Państwowego Funduszu Ziemi*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Ziętara, Wojciech. 2005. "Reformy rolne w Polsce w okresie między i powojennym." In *Kwestia agrarna w Polsce i na świecie*, edited by Bogdan Klepacki, 100-20. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SGGW.
- Żenczykowski, Tadeusz. 1990. *Polska Lubelska 1944*. Warszawa: Editions Spotkania.

**The State Land Fund as a Legal Instrument of the Stalinist State's
Implementation of the Program of Rebuilding the Agrarian and Social
Structure in Post-War Poland**

Abstract

This article is an attempt to present the legal and institutional issues related to the use of the State Land Fund (SLF) as the main instrument of the agrarian policy of the Polish communist state during the period of 1944-1956. Established by the first economic decision of the authorities of "Polska Lubelska" [Lublin Committee], the fund was an institution that was primarily intended to enable the conduct of the agrarian policy in line with Stalinist patterns. In the first place, the goal was to liquidate large gentry's landowner ships and allocate land from the SLF resources to peasants coming mainly from the rural poor. Subsequently, the land acquired by the fund (also owing to the state's policy of discriminating against private farms) was to be used to prepare the collectivization of Polish agriculture. The then ownership and land policy preferred to use SLF resources to support the creation of collective forms of farming. The decline in the marketability of agriculture, however, led to the attempts to use the legal institution differently, in the form of the State Land Fund as part of the post-1956 agrarian and land policy pursued by the state. The reconstruction of the aspects of the agricultural policy of the post-war state outlined in the title of this article required an analysis of the relevant normative material. It was about examining the content of the legal acts that controlled the discussed social and ownership processes with the use of SLF (in the form of agrarian reform and preparation of the collectivization

of agriculture). Due to the multifaceted nature of the discussed processes, attempts were also made to bring closer (in a much more modest size) some statistical data that indicated changes in the functions performed by the State Land Fund in the discussed processes.

Keywords: agricultural policy, decree, property, legal institution

**Państwowy Fundusz Ziemi jako prawny instrument realizacji
przez stalinowskie państwo programu przebudowy struktury agrarnej
i społecznej w powojennej Polsce.**

Abstrakt

Niniejszy artykuł stanowi próbę przybliżenia problematyki prawnej oraz instytucjonalnej związanej z wykorzystaniem Państwowego Funduszu Ziemi (PFZ) jako zasadniczego instrumentu polityki agrarnej komunistycznego państwa polskiego w latach 1944-1956. Powołany pierwszą gospodarczą decyzją władz „Polski Lubelskiej” fundusz stanowił instytucję mającą umożliwić przede wszystkim prowadzenie polityki agrarnej zgodnej ze stalinowskimi wzorcami. W pierwszej kolejności zmierzano tutaj do likwidacji wielkiej własności ziemskiej oraz przydzielenia z zasobów PFZ gruntów chłopom wywodzącym się przede wszystkim z kręgu wiejskiej biedoty. W dalszej kolejności pozyskana przez fundusz ziemia (także dzięki polityce dyskryminowania przez państwo sektora prywatnych gospodarstw) miała służyć przygotowaniu skolektywizowania polskiego rolnictwa. Ówczesna polityka własnościowa oraz gruntowa preferowała bowiem wykorzystywanie zasobów PFZ do wspierania tworzenia zespołowych form prowadzenia gospodarki rolnej. Spadek towarowości rolnictwa doprowadził jednak do prób odmiennego wykorzystywania instytucji prawnorolnej w postaci Państwowego Funduszu Ziemi w ramach prowadzonej przez państwo po 1956 r. polityki agrarnej i gruntowej. Rekonstrukcja zarysowanych w tytule niniejszego artykułu aspektów polityki rolnej powojennego państwa wymagała przeprowadzenia analizy odpowiedniego materiału normatywnego. Chodziło tutaj o zbadanie treści aktów prawnych, które stanowiły o sterowaniu przy użyciu PFZ omawianymi procesami społecznymi i własnościowymi (w postaci reformy rolnej oraz przygotowaniu kolektywizacji rolnictwa). Z uwagi na wieloaspektowość omawianych procesów starano się także przybliżyć (w znacznie skromniejszym rozmiarze) pewne dane statystyczne, które wskazywały na przemiany funkcji pełnionych w omawianych procesach przez Państwowy Fundusz Ziemi.

Słowa kluczowe: polityka rolna, dekret, własność, instytucja prawna

Informacje o Autorze: DR PRZEMYSŁAW CZERNICKI, Instytut Nauk o Polityce i Administracji, Wydział Nauk Społecznych, Uniwersytet Przyrodniczo-Humanistyczny w Siedlcach; adres do korespondencji: ul. Żytnia 39, 08-110 Siedlce, Polska; e-mail: przemcz5@wp.pl; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1184-1556>