

СЕЛЯНСТВО УКРАЇНИ ТА ЄВРОПИ ЗА УМОВ СОЦІАЛЬНО-ЕКОНОМІЧНИХ ТА СУСПІЛЬНО-ПОЛІТИЧНИХ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЙ ДРУГОЇ ПОЛОВИНИ XIX – XX СТ.

THE PEASANTRY OF UKRAINE UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND SOCIO-POLITICAL TRANSFORMATIONS OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH – THE 20TH CENTURY

UDC 94(497.2):378.09+330

DOI: 10.31651/2413-8142-2020-24-Georgieva

M. Georgieva

*Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor at Department of Theory and History of State and Law of the National Transport University
ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0567-1589>*

MATERIAL AND TECHNICAL BASE OF THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR OF THE BULGARIAN ECONOMY

The article reveals the measures of the state policy of Bulgaria on the modernization of logistics of the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy in the period 1989-1996. The situation of technical and technological equipment of agricultural production of the transition period is analyzed and the main problems of material and technical support of agriculture are pointed out.

Key words: Bulgaria, Agriculture, investment, European Union, innovation and investment development, public policy.

Problem statement. The development of the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy is closely linked to the innovation and modernity of its material and technical base. The basis of the production and technical potential of Bulgarian agriculture was agricultural machinery. Therefore, constant modernization and technical renewal for agricultural production in the context of European integration were quite important.

Research analysis. Issues of logistical, technological and scientific support of the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy were considered by Bulgarian researchers. In particular, K. Bashev in his work considered the situation of Bulgarian farmers during the implementation of agrarian reform [1]. G. Zacharieva considered the issue of adaptation of the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy in the European integration conditions, also considered the logistics of the sector [2]. The works of Bulgarian researchers B. Ivanov, I. Natan and D. Vachkov are devoted to the study of crisis phenomenon in the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy [3; 4; 5]. The works of I. Penkov, D. Ruscheva and M. Anastasova are devoted to the problem of modernization of the technical base of agricultural production [6; 7; 8]. The study of public, private and bank investments in agriculture was conducted by Bulgarian researcher D. Vachkov [9]. The development of the Bulgarian village, its logistical, technological and personnel support was studied by

B. Ivanov. Peculiarities of the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in Bulgaria in the context of increasing the productivity of agricultural production and quality of products through the modernization of agricultural enterprises are considered in the work of I. Tyutyundzhiev [10].

The purpose of the study is to study the state of logistics of the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy in terms of economic orientation to the European Union.

The statement of the basic material. A long period of agricultural cooperation in 1944-1989 began the process of introducing a mechanized method of agricultural production, but the command type of management and regulation of the agricultural sector of the economy led to the stagnation of material and technical equipment of the production sector. At the beginning of the period of agrarian transformations, the material and technical basis of agricultural production was morally and physically obsolete, which significantly affected the level of productivity of the sector, investor interest and quality of products.

Reorganization of large agricultural enterprises after choosing the course of land reform and the adoption on July 10, 1996 of the Law "On registration and control of agricultural and forestry machinery" [11, 116]. This led to the fact that most of the agricultural machinery to be unsold was technically unsuitable for agricultural work. In addition, the material and technical base of the agricultural sector during the cooperative system was not updated. Therefore, in the 1990s, Bulgaria found itself in a certain technical and technological vacuum. According to the National Statistical Institute, in the period 1994-1996, 57% of agricultural machinery of the former cooperatives were not used in agricultural production [11, 118].

Modernization of the material and technical base of agriculture was carried out rather slowly and in homogeneously [12, 23]. As before, there was a shortage of production assets, agricultural equipment, farm buildings. Insufficient funding and the use of manual labor in agricultural production further slowed down and complicated the implementation of agrarian reform. Most of the agricultural households were forced to return to the original positions of industrialization of agricultural production, to re-create the material and technical base [13, 26]. The introduction of agrarian reform in Bulgaria led to the fact that the Bulgarian agricultural sector of the economy was forced to catch up with European countries with industrialized agriculture. During the 1990s, the difference in the

level of labor productivity in agriculture of developed European countries increased 6.6 times. This gap, despite subventions from the European Union, has been growing steadily. Overcoming the social problems of the Bulgarian countryside is possible only by increasing agricultural production assets by 3-4 times [3,179], which is possible with a high (25%) level of profitability for 25-30 years.

During the reform of the agricultural sector in Bulgaria, there has been a decrease in the number of agricultural machinery and its use, a reduction in the number of cattle, milk, cheese and butter. Livestock farmed from large farms to individual farms, which concentrated in their production farms 80% of cows, 60% of pigs, 80% of poultry, which was typical for the underdeveloped countries of Africa and Latin America. During the entire reform period, agricultural production fell threefold, compared with the transition period of the late 1980s.

The buildings of the former cooperatives were not involved in agricultural production, mainly due to the fact that the large size of the premises was not used in the conditions of land restitution and reorganization of the cooperatives. The technical condition of farm buildings and agricultural machinery was usually in poor condition. Yes, in the village Tervel, Dobrich region sheep dairy farms after the start of land reform, were disbanded, and the property was privatized among many new owners. Consolidation of interest in the development of both the mentioned farm and greenhouses, irrigation systems in the village Tervel was not found. This situation has developed throughout the country. At the same time, it should be noted that in the conditions of liberalization of agricultural production to European norms and standards, most of the property of the disbanded cooperative farms in terms of their technical parameters and condition did not meet European requirements for use [2, 83]. The fact that in the process of reforming land relations in Bulgaria and in conditions of uncontrollability by public authorities, there were frequent cases of theft, misappropriation of property of former cooperative farms, which led to its destruction and devaluation.

In the light of these circumstances, the development of legislative norms for the transfer of property of former cooperatives to new owners and production structures was urgent [14, 172]. Legal accuracy in the process of transferring property to newly created agricultural production units was achieved by making a number of amendments and amendments to the Law "On Protection of Agricultural Property" of July 12, 1974 on July 21, 1995 [1, 116]. However, in the period 1989-1996, uncertainty in resolving the property issue led to the loss of property rights by the owners.

Thus, in the conditions of restructuring of large agricultural enterprises, there was a crisis of material and technical equipment of agricultural production, which was not used at all, technically obsolete and did not provide additional value. As already mentioned, no large investments were made in the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy in the mid-1990s, and the formation of a new organizational system of agricultural production was not accompanied by

financial support from the state and major investors to upgrade agricultural technology.

According to the National Institute of Statistics of Bulgaria, in 1992 the investment in the agricultural sector of the economy amounted to 11 Bulgarian levs per 1 hectare. In 1985, the amount of investment in the sector was 23 levs per 1 hectare, and during 1994 - 1996 the amount of investment fell to 8 levs per hectare [7, 29]. Bulgarian economists explain this situation with investing in the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy by the ambiguous attitude and caution of investors to the reform of agricultural relations. The lack of a clear state policy on the issue of logistical, scientific, technological and personnel support of agricultural production in the context of reforming the sector was accompanied by a deterioration of the investment climate within the country. In addition, the condition of the material and technical base of agricultural production was constantly deteriorating, which further reduced the investment attractiveness of Bulgarian agriculture.

A study of the material and technical equipment of agriculture in Bulgaria in the period 1989-1996 showed that the degree of wear of agricultural machinery was 35.7% - tractors, 41.2% - combines, 29.2% - special agricultural machinery. Bulgarian researcher Y. Slavova, analyzing the process of reforming the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy, argues that the transformation of agriculture has covered only the land issue, and problems such as modernization of material and technical base, introduction of the latest achievements of Bulgarian and world agricultural science, retraining for the needs of agricultural production, remained out of the attention of the reformers [15, 11].

Mainly, in the period 1989-1996, agricultural machinery in agricultural production was used Bulgarian production.

May 25 - June 3, 1990 in Bulgaria, in Plovdiv for the first time a large-scale exhibition of agricultural machinery "Agrotech - 90" was organized to acquaint potential buyers with the equipment of Bulgarian production. The event was organized by the Agricultural Academy and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry [4, 30]. The aim of the exhibition was to popularize Bulgarian agricultural science and technology, innovations and to establish integration links between research institutes and agricultural producers. It was the basis for the annual demonstration of the achievements of agricultural science in accordance with the needs of farmers and mechanization of production with the introduction of a wide range of fertilizers and pesticides.

Later, agricultural exhibitions were organized in 1991 in Kostinbrod, in 1992 - in Ruse, in 1993 - in Troyan, in 1994 - in Sofia, in 1995 - in Michurin, in 1996. - in the town of Aksakovo [10, 64; 6,117).

Between 1989 and 1996, Bulgarian agricultural enterprises purchased about 1,600 machines annually, including 90-100 combines [16, 129-130], which accounted for about 5% of the capacity and production capacity of these agricultural machines.

With Bulgaria's choice of foreign policy and economic course for integration with the European

Union, purchases of agricultural machinery produced by European countries increased, which had a negative impact on the Bulgarian agricultural machinery manufacturer. Consumer interest in tractors and combines made in Bulgaria is declining in proportion to the increase in purchases of machines from European manufacturers. The situation with the purchase of agricultural machinery in the period 1989-1996 was as follows.

In 1994, the government adopted a number of decisions that formalized the procedure for importing imported agricultural machinery. In particular, the decision №240 “On facilitating the import of imported machinery” of the Council of Ministers of Bulgaria laid the foundation for supporting the development of leasing in agricultural production, equipping the material and technical base with new agricultural machinery. This decision allowed duty-free import of 505 pieces. combine harvesters, including 212 pcs. from well-known world manufacturers (CLAAS, Massey Ferguson, Grimme, JCB) [7, 141-142]. In the same year, 340 tractors with an engine capacity of 80 were imported duty-free and more than 10 million spare parts for agricultural machinery.

By Decision №432 of February 14, 1995 “On Facilitation of Customs Clearance of Agricultural Machinery”, the Council of Ministers of Bulgaria further simplified the customs clearance procedure for imported agricultural machinery [11, 271]. This decision allowed duty-free import of agricultural machinery of European production. Thus, by August 1, 1995, 260 units of tractors and 70 units of combine harvesters were imported.

The monetary volume of purchases of agricultural machinery in the period 1994-1996 reached more than 60 million dollars USA.

In addition, another reason for the stagnation of the material and technical base of Bulgarian agriculture was the state of vacuum in which the agricultural sector of the economy entered after 1989.

Until 1989, the available agricultural machinery was manufactured in Bulgaria, the Soviet Union and Germany. Bulgarian agricultural machinery was produced mostly on Soviet-made spare parts. Therefore, it was after the beginning of the political and economic crisis in the USSR in the late 1980s that a certain crisis arose in Bulgarian agricultural production in the supply of the sector with combines and tractors [5, 327. After 1989, the USSR continued to produce agricultural machinery. However, after the unification of Germany on October 3, 1990, the production of the *Forschrift E-516* combine harvester, an IFA tractor, was stopped because spare parts for them were produced in Germany. 35-40% of all agricultural machinery was produced in Germany, so Bulgarian farmers faced the problem of finding and ordering spare parts for existing agricultural machinery. The same situation has developed with *K-700* and *Don 1500* combines. This circumstance also gave impetus to the search for alternative markets for the supply of agricultural machinery and spare parts for it. In 1992-1993, intermediary firms appeared on the Bulgarian agricultural market, importing spare parts for Russian-made agricultural machinery of rather low quality [4, 142]. Therefore, farmers increasingly

paid attention to Western European manufacturers, whose machinery was highly profitable. The quality of European agricultural machinery exceeded the quality of Russian-made machinery.

Thus, in Bulgaria there was a situation when the market of agricultural machinery was in a difficult situation that needed to be addressed. For example, in Dobrich there were more than 20 intermediary companies that traded in spare parts for agricultural machinery of foreign production. In these circumstances, the Bulgarian agricultural producer needed a manufacturer who not only sold machinery, but also concentrated in Bulgaria service centers for the maintenance of their machinery. In 1994, the Austrian manufacturer of agricultural machinery *Vogel & Noot* started working with farmers in Dobrich. By August 1994, *Vogel & Noot* had delivered 17 tillage machines (6 plows, 4 cultivators, 2 compact disc harrows, 1 rotary harrow, 1 agricultural field roller, 3 deep tillage machines) [7, 109]. *Vogel & Noot* began the process of pre-sale demonstration of machinery, when the manufacturer sent farmers his machinery for acquaintance and testing.

In addition to the well-established relationship between Bulgarian farmers and machinery manufacturers, the Bulgarian government has implemented a test program of financial support for farmers.

The main source of financing for agriculture in the period 1989-1996 were commercial banks, which under the Law on Banks and Credit Unions of March 27, 1992, are autonomous in their activities. To a lesser extent, the agricultural sector was financed by producers' own funds and by investments. At the beginning of this period, the activity of offered and used loans was quite low. The reason for this was the lack of high confidence of farmers in banks and credit institutions. Banks were reluctant to lend because the land ownership problem in Bulgaria had not been finally resolved in the early 1990s. The main function of the agrarian reform introduced in the early 1990s was to establish land ownership. At the end of 1993, the process of restoring ownership in the agricultural sector was not completed and most farmers could not use their land as collateral to obtain credit for the development of agricultural business. Liquidation councils were temporary institutions that had no right to provide guarantees or act as guarantors for farmers to creditors. The instability of agricultural prices and high inflation also affected banks' reluctance to lend to agricultural development. In the domestic consumer market, agricultural products of Bulgarian origin had significant competition, and export quotas were severely limited.

Prices for agricultural products were low and could not cover the money invested by farmers in sowing, agricultural machinery and fertilizers. As a result, the profitability of agricultural production and the solvency of farmers decreased. At the end of 1992, unpaid loans to farmers reached 4.7 billion levs, however, most of these loans were borrowed from the former economic structures. Unpaid loans were the reason for banks' refusal to issue new loans to farmers until the overdue payments were closed.

On March 27, 1993, the National Assembly passed the law “On financial support of the agricultural sector”. The law required commercial banks with more than 50% of the state’s shares to provide short-term soft loans at 3% per annum to farmers, private cooperatives, and agricultural educational and research organizations engaged in agricultural production. However, the law excluded the possibility of lending to vegetable growers. The law defined the terms of loan repayment. Thus, the farmer had to pay only 1/3 of the debt, the rest was compensated by subsidies from the state budget. Banks have pledged to accept future harvests as a means of securing credit [9, 93].

However, this Law had some difficulties in its implementation. The obligation of banks to accept future harvests as collateral is aimed at solving the problem of collateral for the loan. However, the conditions for lending to farmers increased the demand for loans. The law required farmers to insure their crops.

Thus, government loan guarantees were a very effective incentive for lending in cases of high risk of debt default. Lending guarantees were more effective than subsidizing the industry, from a budgetary point of view, as the risks were shared 50%: 50% between the state and creditors [9, 93-94].

The problem of low profitability of the industry was solved by subsidizing prices by 2/3. In practice, the law foresaw that agricultural producers of early crops would not be able to pay bank interest rates without subsidizing prices for agricultural products.

These data show that farmers could not cover their investments, even without the burden of interest.

Producers of late (autumn) crops, especially wheat, can cover their sowing costs, pay interest on the loan and even make a profit. These data show that the Law aimed to support those producers who needed it and increase the level of profitability of the industry, which should increase the interest of landowners in agricultural production [12, 164]. The total amount of loans granted after the adoption of the Law in the period April-October 1993 exceeded 3 billion levs, of which 2.3 billion levs were repaid.

At the beginning of 1993, the Agricultural Credit Exchange (ACE) was established, which provided medium-term and long-term lending to agriculture and aimed at preventing the decapitalization of the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy. The exchange started its activity with the authorized capital of 106 million levs provided by the Foreign Aid Agency. The shareholders in it were public organizations and state-owned enterprises - the Grain Foundation and the Agromashinex trading company. ACE is a joint-stock union controlled by the public council and operated with funds received from the Foreign Aid Agency [16, 331], which makes it possible to say that the activities of the Exchange are one of the vectors of the state policy of lending to agricultural production.

The Agricultural Credit Exchange was created to encourage the development of market orientation of the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy. It did not give priority to increasing profits, but only sought to cover its costs. The proposed loans were directed exclusively to private farmers or newly formed cooperatives based on private land ownership and were

intended for the purchase of agricultural machinery, construction of technical and ancillary facilities.

In 1993, the main activities of the Agricultural Credit Exchange (ACE) were:

- encouraging private landowners to grow cereals and oilseeds, sugar beets. The exchange proposed to allocate about 75% of all land for the production of these crops;

- about 20% of the Exchange’s budget was allocated for the development of livestock farms.

- the remaining 5% of the budget was to be spent on agricultural development in areas with high levels of recessions, unemployment and social problems.

The size of the loan for the development of farms was limited and ranged from 40 thousand levs to 180 thousand levs, the loan repayment period was 7 years.

Agricultural Credit Exchange did not have its own network of representative offices. This function was performed by the largest bank, Balkanbank, which accepted applications for loans and serviced them [9, 108]. On the one hand, this distribution reduced the maintenance costs of the Agricultural Credit Exchange staff, and on the other hand, it disrupted the relationship between the lender and the borrower.

The second problem faced by ACE in its activities was the unstable dynamics of the exchange rate. In 1992 and 1993, a moratorium on foreign debt payments was introduced, which helped maintain a relatively stable exchange rate of the lion.

Thus, the transition from command and administrative management of the Bulgarian economy by 1989 to the market structure in the agricultural sector. As a result of the incomplete agrarian reform and the issue of land ownership, the criteria of leadership responsibility have not been outlined. For this reason, a functioning land market has not been established in Bulgaria. Farmers who did not engage in this type of activity before the beginning of the agrarian reform and did not have management and production skills are beginning to engage in agricultural production.

These problems were caused by the temporary inefficiency of the implementation of the market mechanism of management of the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy.

In 1993, the government was able to intervene in the agricultural loan market through the Law on Financial Support of the Agricultural Sector. The law guaranteed the provision of subsidies to farmers in the amount of 2/3 of the amount of interest payments on loans. The scale of this intervention reached 3/5 of the need for working capital in 1993, thus increasing the volume of short-term lending and slowing down the decline in agricultural production.

At the same time, the Law “On Financial Provision of the Agrarian Sector” of 1993 had certain shortcomings [9, 114]. The provisions of the law provided support for the production of crops, the cultivation of which did not require financial subsidies. The law burdened Bulgaria’s state budget with additional expenditures, which were stipulated by the law. In these conditions, there was a deformation of the motives for the use of alternative sources of funding. Credit subsidies encouraged agricultural production, but this could not affect the side effects and associated costs.

Thus, state subsidies for credit loans helped to increase the purchase of agricultural machinery of European production. The created conditions helped to improve the economic forecast of the agricultural sector of Bulgaria, to attract the world's leading agricultural machinery companies, which in a short period of 1994-1996 opened offices in Bulgaria and began to create technical centers for training and service of the proposed equipment. Indicative is the fact that in 1996 the world manufacturer of agricultural machinery - John Deere - entered the Bulgarian agricultural market.

Thus, in the period 1989-1996, the structure of consumption of agricultural machinery changed in the direction of increasing the involvement of agricultural tractors and combines in agricultural production. The Bulgarian producer of agricultural products was reoriented to foreign-made machinery. Accordingly, the dynamics of the use of agricultural machinery of Bulgarian and foreign production in the period 1989-1996 is as follows:

- in 1989-1990 - 550 units. combine harvesters (including 15 foreign production);
- 1991-1993 - 630 units equipment (including 26 - foreign production);
- 1994-1996 - 2280 units (including 700 - foreign production).

Insufficient thoughtfulness and sophistication of the support mechanism for the supply of agricultural machinery through a specially created Exchange has led to the monopolization of the market for lending to farms. At the same time, farmers were given the opportunity to upgrade their fleet of agricultural machinery and equipment on preferential terms. Bulgarian agricultural machinery manufacturers have the opportunity to recover financially. In addition, European producers have expanded their representative networks throughout Bulgaria and established trade relations with Bulgarian agricultural producers. In the period 1989-1996, the share of credit support for technical renewal of agricultural production was 17% of the real needs of farmers [8, 313-314].

Between 1994 and 1996, the government accelerated the pace of land restitution and the introduction of a loan guarantee mechanism for farmers to upgrade the material and technical base of their enterprises.

The conclusions. Thus, in the period 1989-1996, credit relations in Bulgaria developed in accordance with the Law "On Financial Support of Agricultural Production" and the needs of the Bulgarian agricultural sector of the economy, which did not fully contribute to updating the material and technical base of agricultural producers. With the destruction of command-and-control methods of agricultural production management and the transition to a new market-oriented system, Bulgarian agricultural producers gradually began to move to European requirements and production standards. In Bulgaria, the system of innovation in the agricultural sector has acquired the following characteristics:

Program of renewal of the technical park of agricultural production was introduced, which united Bulgarian manufacturers of agricultural machinery, dealers of European machinery and trade and service

centers for maintenance of European machinery, the Agricultural Credit Exchange and farmers;

System of providing European manufacturers with their equipment for pre-sale testing by Bulgarian farmers was formed, which contributed to more sustainable cooperation;

System of providing farmers with fertilizers and plant protection products (PPP) was formed. This was done by domestic PPE producers, intermediaries and official distributors of foreign companies.

The created system of logistical support of the agricultural sector of the Bulgarian economy combined market levers and legislation, took into account the level of supply and demand, while creating a competitive environment in which a situation was created in which the farmer took into account the quality of the proposed equipment quality". The analysis of the development of market relations, agricultural sector of Bulgaria in 1989-1996 allows us to conclude that during the transition of the economy to market relations there were significant changes in its agricultural sector - reformed cooperatives, restored the rights of former owners and their heirs to land. The transfer of land to new owners took place with restrictions and for payment, which was differentiated depending on its categories.

Bibliography:

1. Башев Х. Ефекти от прилагане на европейски политики върху земеделските стопанства в Р. България : монография. София: ИАИ, 2018. 378 с.
2. Захариева Г. Измерване на националната конкурентоспособност : монография. Свищов: АИ „Ценов”, 2007. 211 с.
3. Иванов Б. Устойчивост в земеделието : учеб. пособие. София: Авангард Прима, 2009. 230 с.
4. Натан И. Икономика на България : учеб. пособие. София: Наука и изкуство, 2013. 171 с.
5. Вачков Д. НРБ от началото до края : монография. София: Институт за изследване на близкото минало, 2011. 480 с.
6. Пенков И. Икономическа география на България : учеб. пособие. София: Наука и изкуство, 2008. 422 с.
7. Русчева Д. Продоволствените ресурси на България при осъществяване на Общата селскостопанска политика на ЕС : учеб. пособие. София: Унив. изд. «Св. Климент Охридски», 2010. 151 с.
8. Анастасова М. Миграционните процеси на населението в Р. България при прехода към пазарна икономика : монография. София: Издателство на институт по икономика на селското стопанство, 2015. 830 с.
9. Вачков Д. Българският външен дълг: Банкрътът на комунистическата икономика : монография. София: Институт за изследване на близкото минало, 2009. 456 с.
10. Тютонджиев И. Стопанска история на България : монография. София: Ровита, 2011. 204 с.
11. Герганов Г. Икономика на аграрното предприятие : монография – Свищов: АИ „Ценов”, 2010. 310 с.
12. Орешин В. П. Государственное регулирование национальной экономики : учебное пособие для высших учебных заведений экономического профиля. М.: изд-во МГУ им. Ломоносова, 1999. – 272 с.
13. Дмитриченко Л. И. Государственное регулирование экономики: методология и теория : монография. Донецк: УкрНТЭК, 2001. 330 с.
14. Маренич Т. Г. Трансформаційна динаміка та механізми економічного регулювання агроформувань (питання теорії, методології, практики) : монографія. К.: ННЦ “Інститут аграрної економіки”, 2005. 454 с.
15. Славова Я. Влияние на ОСП върху аграрния износ – оценка и проблеми : монография. Русе: Изток, 2012. 168 с.
16. Попов Р. Анализ на конкурентоспособността на зеленчукопроизводството в България : монография. София: БНБ, 2012. 412 с.

Refererces:

1. Bashev, K. (2018). Efekti ot prilagane na evropejski politiki vŭrkhu zemedelskite stopanstva v R. Bŭlgariya [Effects of implementation of European policies on agricultural holdings in the Republic of Bulgaria]. Sofiya. [in Bulgarian].
2. Zakhariyeva, G. (2007). Izmervane na natsionalnata konkurentosposobnost [Measuring national competitiveness]. Svishtov. [in Bulgarian].
3. Ivanov, B. (2009). Ustoichivost v zemedelieto [Sustainability in agriculture]. Sofiya. [in Bulgarian].
4. Natan, I. (2013). Ikonomicheska geografiya na Bŭlgariya [Economy of Bulgaria]. Sofiya. [in Bulgarian].
5. Vachkov, D. (2011). NRB ot nachaloto do kraya [PRB from beginning to end]. Sofiya. [in Bulgarian].
6. Penkov, I. (2008). Ikonomicheska geografiya na Bŭlgariya [Economic geography of Bulgaria]. Sofiya. [in Bulgarian].
7. Rusheva, D. (2010). Prodovolstvenite resursi na Bŭlgariya pri osŭshchestvyavane na Obshtata selskostonpanska politika na ES [Bulgaria's Food Resources in the Implementation of the EU Common Agricultural Policy]. Sofiya. [in Bulgarian].
8. Anastasova, M. (2015). Migratsionnite protsesi na naselenieto v R. Bŭlgariya pri prekhoda kŭm pazarna ikonomika [Migration processes of the population in the Republic of Bulgaria in the transition to a market economy]. Sofiya. [in Bulgarian].
9. Vachkov, D. (2009). Bŭlgarskiyat vŭnshen dŭlg: Bankrutŭt na komunisticheskata ikonomika [Bulgarian Foreign Debt: The Bankruptcy of the Communist Economy]. Sofiya. [in Bulgarian].
10. Tyutyundzhiev, I. (2011). Stopanska istoriya na Bŭlgariya [Economic History of Bulgaria]. Sofiya. [in Bulgarian].
11. Gerganov, G. (2010). Ikonomika na agramoto predpriyatie [Economics of the agricultural enterprise]. Svishtov. [in Bulgarian].
12. Oreshin, V. (1999). Gosudarstvennoe regulirovanie natsional'noi ekonomiki [State regulation of the national economy]. M. [in Russian].
13. Dmitrichenko, L. (2001). Gosudarstvennoe regulirovanie ekonomiki: metodologiya i teoriya [State regulation of the economy: methodology and theory]. Donetsk. [in Russian].
14. Marenich, T. (2005). Transformatsiina dinamika ta mekhanizmi ekonomichnogo reguluyavannya agroformuvan' (pitannya teorii, metodologii, praktiki) [Transformational dynamics and mechanisms of economic regulation of agroformations (issues of theory, methodology, practice)]. K. [in Ukrainian].
15. Slavova, Y. (2012). Vliyanie na OSP vŭrkhu agrarniya iznos – otsenka i problemi [Impact of the CAP on agricultural exports - evaluation and problems]. Ruse. [in Bulgarian].
16. Popov, R. (2012). Analiz na konkurentosposobnosta na zelenchukoproizvodstvoto v Bŭlgariya [An analysis of the competitiveness of vegetable production in Bulgaria]. Sofiya. [in Bulgarian].

М. Георгієва

**МАТЕРІАЛЬНО-ТЕХНІЧНЕ ЗАБЕЗПЕЧЕННЯ
АГРАРНОГО СЕКТОРА ЕКОНОМІКИ
БОЛГАРІЇ (1989-1996)**

Постановка проблеми. Важливе значення в розвитку аграрного сектора економіки Болгарії в 1989-1996 рр. мало матеріально-технічне оснащення. Рівень технічного забезпечення аграрної сфери сприяв підвищенню продуктивності праці сільськогосподарських підприємств, якості виробленої продукції, використання земельних ресурсів та зайнятості населення болгарського села. Конкуренентоздатність болгарського сільськогосподарства зумовлена використанням новітньої сільськогосподарської техніки та передових технологій в товаровиробництві.

Впровадження аграрної реформи, головною метою якої було відновлення прав колишніх землевласників та надання їм історичного права власності на землю, що

належала їх родинам до 1946 р. призвело до руйнування попередньої системи аграрних відносин в Болгарії. Дрібні фермерські господарства не мали достатнього капіталу для формування матеріально-технічної бази своїх підприємств та шукали можливостей для раціонального господарювання в умовах відсутності сучасних сільськогосподарських машин.

Метою статті є дослідження стану матеріально-технічного забезпечення аграрного сектора економіки Болгарії в перехідний період до європейської інтеграції.

Основні результати дослідження. В статті розкрито перспективні напрями техніко-технологічного оснащення аграрного сектора економіки Болгарії. З'ясовано основні механізми оновлення матеріально-технічної бази сільськогосподарства Болгарії. Проаналізовано рівень готовності Болгарії до повного матеріально-технічного забезпечення болгарського села.

Висновки. Здійснене дослідження дозволило зробити висновок, що створені на основі приватної власності сільськогосподарські підприємства були неідеальними без техніко-технологічної бази. Встановлено, що державна політика Болгарії щодо підвищення ефективності аграрного товаровиробництва була скерована на фінансову підтримку фермерів шляхом надання пільгових кредитів, лізингових програм та державних асигнувань. Підвищення ефективності аграрного виробництва було можливим лише за всебічного сприяння держави та залучення інвесторів в галузь та її матеріально-технічне забезпечення. Результати вивчення впливу здійснених заходів державного управління технічним оснащенням сільськогосподарства будуть покладені в основу подальших наукових досліджень.

Ключові слова: Болгарія; сільське господарство; інвестування; Європейський Союз; інноваційно-інвестиційний розвиток; державна політика.

УДК 94:332.2.01(4)''18/19''(045)

DOI: 10.31651/2413-8142-2020-24-Kornovenko-Telvak

С. В. Корновенко

доктор історичних наук, професор, професор кафедри інтелектуальної власності та цивільно-правових дисциплін

Черкаського національного університету

імені Богдана Хмельницького

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6268-2321>

В. П. Тельвак

доцент кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X>

**АГРАРИЗМ ЯК СЕЛЯНОЦЕНТРИЧНИЙ
ФЕНОМЕН КРАЇН ЦЕНТРАЛЬНОЇ ТА
ПІВДЕННО-СХІДНОЇ ЄВРОПИ ДРУГОЇ
ПОЛОВИНИ ХІХ – ПЕРШОЇ ТРЕТИНИ ХХ СТ.:
ВИТОКИ І СУТНІСТЬ ЯВИЩА***

У статті розкрито, що у другій половині ХІХ – першій третині ХХ ст. європейські країни зазнали нелінійних соціокультурних трансформацій. Вони

* Стаття містить результати досліджень, проведених за грантом Національного фонду досліджень України «Аграризм: селяноцентричний феномен Української революції 1917 – 1921 рр.» (реєстраційний номер 2020.02/0120).