

# THE PROBLEM OF THE APPLICATION OF THE TERM SECOND SERFDOM IN THE HISTORY OF CENTRAL EASTERN EUROPE: THE CASE OF LITHUANIAN ECONOMY IN THE 16TH-19TH CENTURIES (UNTIL 1861)

*Darius Žiemelis*

Mykolas Romeris University, Institute of Philosophy and Humanities, E-mail:  
dariusziemelis@inbox.lt

## **Acknowledgments**

The publication of this paper is supported by EEA Grants, contract no 4/22.07.2014.

## **Abstract:**

*In the 16<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> centuries (until 1861) the term second serfdom is not applied in the investigations of the economic organization of Lithuania. However, the theory of the neo-Marxist capitalist world system (CWS) of the most famous and influential American comparative historical sociology representative I. Wallerstein offers to look at the phenomenon of the second serfdom from a global perspective emphasizing external causes and to consider it a manifestation of peripheral capitalism in Central Eastern Europe. In his fundamental work *The Modern World System*, the Polish and Lithuanian social economic order in the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries is treated as the periphery of the CWS at that time. The goal of this article is using the access of modern comparative historical sociology to answer the question of whether the term second serfdom is applicable (and if so, when) to describe the economic organization of Lithuania in 1557-1861. The article states that in view of the economic development of Lithuania in 1557-1861 considering an essential component of the CWS theory – the concept of peripheral capitalism, the features of the second serfdom are most distinctly seen in Lithuania not in the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries (as I. Wallerstein stated), but in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century – 1861.*

**Rezumat:**

*Termenul de a doua iobăgie nu este aplicat pentru secolele al XVI-lea – al XIX-lea (până la 1861) în ceea ce privește investigarea organizării economice din Lituania. Totuși, teoria neomarxistă a sistemului capitalist mondial a celui mai faimos și influent reprezentant american al școlii sociologice istorice comparative, I. Wallerstein, și-a luat libertatea de a privi fenomenul celei de-a doua iobăgii dintr-o perspectivă globală, subliniindu-i cauzele externe, și de a-l considera ca o manifestare a capitalismului periferic din Europa Centrală și de Răsărit. În lucrarea sa fundamentală intitulată Sistemul Mondial Modern, ordinea economico-socială din secolele al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea este tratată ca o periferie a sistemului capitalist mondial din acele vremuri. Scopul acestui articol este de a face apel la sociologia istorică comparativă modernă pentru a răspunde la întrebarea dacă termenul de a doua iobăgie este aplicabil (și dacă da, când) pentru a descrie organizarea economică a Lituaniei între anii 1557 și 1861. Articolul afirmă că privind dezvoltarea economică a Lituaniei între 1557 și 1861 prin prisma unei componente esențiale a teoriei sistemului capitalist mondial – conceptul de capitalism periferic, trăsăturile celei de-a doua iobăgii sunt cel mai vizibile nu în secolele al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea (așa cum afirmă I. Wallerstein), ci din a doua jumătate a secolului al XVIII-lea până la 1861.*

**Keywords:** second serfdom, 16<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> centuries Lithuanian social economic history, concept of peripheral capitalism, *corvée* farmstead economy

**Introduction**

The term second serfdom was first used by F. Engels at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, while describing agrarian relations based on *corvée* farmstead economy, which formed and established itself at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century–17<sup>th</sup> century, in the territories east of the Elbe river<sup>1</sup>. Later, the term universally established itself in Marxist historiography, in interpreting the social-economic development of Central Eastern Europe in the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>2</sup>. Talking about the genesis of the second serfdom in the

<sup>1</sup> See 'Letter from F. Engels to K. Marx dated December 15, 16 and 22, 1882', in Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels, *Briefwechsel 4. Bd.: 1868-1883* (Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1950), 691, 693 and 698.

<sup>2</sup> On this aspect historiography is wider discussed in: И. И. Костюшко, 'К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс об аграрном развитии Восточной Европы', in *Ежегодник по аграрной истории Восточной Европы 1970 г.* (Рига, 1977): 5-13; Johannes Nichtweiss, 'The Second Serfdom and the So-Called „Prussian Way“: The Development of Capitalism in Eastern German Agricultural Institutions', *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 3, 1 (1979): 99-140; Alfredas Bumblauskas, 'Kur buvo

historiography it is necessary to highlight the problematic aspect of this term. There is a dispute of how to understand the process which took place from the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, in the Central Eastern Europe: whether as a new serfdom for peasants after some pause in development of serfdom relationships or as a higher stage of continuous serfdom process?<sup>3</sup> According to F. Engels it was peasant serfdom after a certain pause (the weakening in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries). It was resumed in the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century with the second edition and legalized the serfdom relations in the territories east of the Elbe river<sup>4</sup>. The medieval historian S. Skazkinas of the Soviet period pointed out that in this case we are not talking about the second serfdom, but only about its second edition i.e. the continuation of the peasant serfdom process, which began in Europe already in the early Middle Ages<sup>5</sup>. In this way, in the traditional Marxist historiography (and not only there) the term of second serfdom means the re-feudalization process in the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries in Central Eastern Europe (and in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth). According to this concept precisely the internal causes (rural and estate relationship) determined the social-economic order and political development of Central Eastern Europe in the

---

Lietuva feodalizmo epochoje? [Where was Lithuania during Feudalism?] in *Europa 1988: Lietuvoos persitvarkymo sąjūdžio almanachas* / sud. R. Ozolas (Vilnius: Mintis, 1988): 153–172.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Benedykt Zientara, 'Z zagadanień tzw. „wtórnego poddaństwa” w Europie Środkowej', *Przegląd Historyczny* 47, 1 (1956): 3–47; Władysław Rusiński, 'Drogi rozwojowe folwarku pańszczyźnianego', *Przegląd Historyczny* 47, 4 (1956): 617–655; Сергей Д. Сказкин, 'Основные проблемы так называемого второго издания крепостничества в Средней и Восточной Европе', *Вопросы истории* 2 (1958): 96–119.

<sup>4</sup> See 'Letter from F. Engels to K. Marx dated December 15, 16 and 22, 1882', 691, 693 and 698.

<sup>5</sup> According to S. Skazkin at the end of the early Middle Ages in Western Europe while commercial and monetary relations were developing, and peasant dependence weakened, and later, during the emergence of capitalist relations, gradually disappeared. The Central Eastern Europe was the opposite process – after weakening there was a new wave of feudal reaction, which caused the strengthening the serfdom peasant dependency and exploitation. See Сказкин, 'Основные проблемы так называемого второго издания крепостничества в Средней и Восточной Европе', 104; Сергей Д. Сказкин, 'К вопросу о генезисе капитализма в сельском хозяйстве Западной Европы', in *Ежегодник по аграрной истории Восточной Европы 1959 г.* (Москва, 1961), 28–29.

16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>6</sup>. However, from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the new opinion formed in the traditional Marxist historiography, based on new research, that the term second serfdom should not be used to describe the agrarian relationships of 15<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries, talking about certain countries, in particular Poland and Lithuania. According to the proponents of this approach (J. Jurginis<sup>7</sup>, W. Hejnosz<sup>8</sup>, Z. Janel<sup>9</sup>, A. Kahan<sup>10</sup>, J. Nichtweiss<sup>11</sup>, J. Topolski<sup>12</sup>, J. Kiaupienė<sup>13</sup>, A. Bumblauskas<sup>14</sup>) there was a continuous process of peasant serfdom whose prosperity coincided chronologically with the apogee of new feudal reaction in typical lands of the second serfdom. These authors distinguish the western outskirts of habitat of Central Europe, in particular the East German territory, where we can actually talk about the second phase of strengthening of serfdom relations in the 15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> centuries, and call this process the second

---

<sup>6</sup> Read more about the concept of genesis of second serfdom in traditional Marxist and non Marxist historiography, see Darius Žiemelis, 'Lietuva Vidurio ir Rytų Europoje XVI-XVIII amžiuje: „feodalinė reakcija“ ar periferinis kapitalizmas? [Lithuania in the Central and Eastern Europe of the 16th-18th Centuries: „Feudal Reaction“ or Peripheral Capitalism?]', *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 18 (2006), 55-60.

<sup>7</sup> See Juozas Jurginis, *Baudžiavos įsigalėjimas Lietuvoje [Establishment of Serfdom in Lithuania]* (Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1962).

<sup>8</sup> See Wojciech Hejnosz, 'Zagadanie tzw. wtórnego poddaństwa chłopow w Polsce feudalnej: Uwagi krytyczne', in *Nauki Humanistyczno-Spoeczne Zeszyty* 6, 19 (Prawo: Naukowe Uniwersytetu M. Kopernika w Toruniu, 1966): 57-61.

<sup>9</sup> See З. К. Янель, 'О некоторых вопросах второго издания крепостного права и социально-экономического развития барщинного поместья в России', *Исторические записки* 78 (1965): 150-180.

<sup>10</sup> See Arcadius Kahan, 'Notes on Serfdom in Western and Eastern Europe', *The Journal of Economic History* 33, 1 (1973): 86-99.

<sup>11</sup> See Nichtweiss, 'The Second Serfdom and the So-Called "Prussian Way": The Development of Capitalism in Eastern German Agricultural Institutions', 99-140.

<sup>12</sup> See Jerzy Topolski, 'Continuity and Discontinuity in the Development of the Feodal System in Eastern Europe (X<sup>th</sup> to XVII<sup>th</sup> Centuries)', *Journal of European Economic History* 10, 2 (1981): 373-400; Topolski, 'The Manorial Serf-Economy in Central and Eastern Europe in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *Agricultural History* 48, 3 (1974): 341-352.

<sup>13</sup> See Jūratė Kiaupienė, *Kaimas ir dvaras Žemaitijoje XVI-XVIII a. [Village and Estate in Samogitia 16th-18th Centuries]* (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1988).

<sup>14</sup> See Bumblauskas, 'Kur buvo Lietuva feodalizmo epochoje? [Where was Lithuania during Feudalism?]: 153-172.

serfdom<sup>15</sup>, and the rest of the habitat (where the serfdom's establishment was primary) – the natural extension of the development of feudal relations. After the establishment of this concept, when we want to identify Lithuania's social-economic order of the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries, the term the second serfdom is not applied. In the discussion of using the term the second serfdom the third conception should be distinguished. This is the neo-Marxism capitalist world-system (CWS) theory<sup>16</sup> created by the most

---

<sup>15</sup> Actually, in the last decades of the last century the term second serfdom (in the strict sense) is no longer applied speaking about the social-economic development of German lands East of Elbe river, see first of all: Edgar Melton, 'Gutsherrschaft in East Elbian Germany and Livonia, 1500-1800: A Critique of the Model', *Central European History* 21, 4 (1988): 315-349; Melton, 'Population Structure, the Market Economy, and the Transformation of *Gutsherrschaft* in East Central Europe, 1650-1800: The Cases of Brandenburg and Bohemia', *German History* 16, 3 (1998): 297-327; Melton, 'The Decline of Prussian *Gutsherrschaft* and the Rise of the Junker as Rural Patron, 1750-1806', *German History* 12, 3 (1994): 334-350.

<sup>16</sup> The CWS theory was developed in opposition to Eurocentrism, believing in the perpetual (linear) progress of European civilization and downplaying other (non-European) cultures, see William G. Martin, 'The World-Systems Perspective in Perspective: Assessing the Attempt to Move beyond Nineteenth-Century Eurocentric Conceptions', *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 17, 2 (1994): 145-185. The peak of I. Wallerstein's popularity and influence in Western social sciences was in the second half of the 1970s and the first half of the 1980s. An important source for becoming acquainted with the dissemination of I. Wallerstein's thinking is his collection of essays. See Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Essential Wallerstein* (New York: The New York Press, 2000). Even though belated the acquaintance with the CWS theory could provide new qualitative impulses to Lithuanian socio-economic history and highlight those aspects of this history which previously could not be noticed and articulated. Examples of application of CWS theory in Lithuanian historiography, see Darius Žiemelis, *Abiejų Tautų Respublikos socialinė ekonominė raida XVI-XVIII amžiuje: feodalizmas ar periferinis kapitalizmas? Istoriografinė analizė [Social Economic Development of the Republic of the Two Nations in the 16th-18th Centuries: Feudalism or Peripheral Capitalism? An Historiographic Analysis]*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Vilnius, 2009); Darius Žiemelis, *Feudalism or Peripheral Capitalism?: Socio-Economic History of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th-18th Centuries* (Saarbrücken: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing GmbH & Co. KG, 2011); Zenonas Norkus, *Du nepriklausomybės dvidešimtmečiai: Kapitalizmas, klasės ir demokratija Pirmojoje ir Antrojoje Lietuvos Respublikoje lyginamosios istorinės sociologijos požiūriu [Two Twenty-Year Periods of Independence: Capitalism, Class and Democracy in the First and Second Republics of Lithuania from the Viewpoint of Comparative Historical Sociology]* (Vilnius: Aukso žuvis, 2014); Zenonas Norkus, 'Moving up and Down in the Capitalist World System: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of Patterns in Post-Communist

famous and influential representative of comparative historical sociology in the United States I. Wallerstein, which suggests that the second serfdom phenomenon should be seen from a global perspective, which emphasizes the external causes and to consider it as a manifestation of peripheral capitalism in Central Eastern Europe. In the first volume of the main I. Wallerstein's work *The Modern World System*<sup>17</sup>, dealing with the emergence of the CWS in the 16<sup>th</sup> century and its early development, the social-economic system of the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries in Poland and Lithuania is treated (with America) as the CWS periphery of those times<sup>18</sup>. The purpose of this article is to use the comparative historical sociology approach and reveal that the term the second serfdom is mostly applicable while describing the Lithuania's economic development in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century until 1861.

The article consists of two parts and conclusions. The first part of the article analyzes how I. Wallerstein defines the concept of peripheral capitalism - a main component of the CWS theory. The second part looks into Lithuania's economic development in 1557-1861 considering peripheral capitalism - the CWS theory's essential component. The period of 1557-1861 is the stage of *corvée* economy existence in Lithuania.

---

Transformation', in *Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for Global Sociology: XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology, 13-19 July 2014, Yokohama, Japan: Book of Abstracts* (Yokohama: International Sociological Association, 2014): 707.

<sup>17</sup> I. Wallerstein's work *The Modern World-System* is considered to be a story about the history of the development of the CWS, but it is not finished, the four volumes covering the 16<sup>th</sup> - first half of 20<sup>th</sup> c. have been published, see Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press, 1974); Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy 1600-1750* (New York: Academic Press, 1980); Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System III: The Second Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy* (New York: Academic Press, 1989); Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789-1914* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

<sup>18</sup> Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System I*.

## I. The concept of peripheral capitalism in the CWS theory

Why precisely the CWS theory? It was determined in the previous study that the neo-Marxist I. Wallerstein's economic development concept (the CWS theory<sup>19</sup>), when compared with non-Marxist ideas of K. Bücher, M. Weber and Marxist W. Kula ideas concerning economic development analysis has the following advantages: 1) it seeks to cover the economic organization of not only the developed, but also the backward countries of the world, 2) in its analysis of capitalism it avoids methodological nationalism seeking methodological globalism<sup>20</sup>.

During the 'long' 16<sup>th</sup> century (1450–1640) Europe is considered to be the starting point of the CWS development in the image presented by I. Wallerstein.<sup>21</sup> This system became global in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century including all the regions of the planet into its structures<sup>22</sup>. Until the 16<sup>th</sup> century the social, political and economic life was organized within the confines of social mini-systems and world-empires. I. Wallerstein names the local economic communities

---

<sup>19</sup> The most important sources of the CWS theory are the theory of dependence, F. Braudel's theory of history, the capitalism theory of K. Marx and the theories of Marxist imperialism. Due to the dominant meaning of the Marxist sources the CWS is considered to be a neo-Marxist theory, see Christopher Chase-Dunn and Peter Grimes, 'World-Systems Analysis', *Annual Review of Sociology* 21 (1995): 387–417; Daniel Chirot and Thomas D. Hall, 'World-System Theory', *Annual Review of Sociology* 8 (1982): 81–106; Stephen K. Sanderson, 'World-Systems Analysis after Thirty Years: Should it Rest in Peace?' *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 46, 3 (2005): 179–213; Darius Žiemelis, 'Immanuelio Wallersteino kapitalistinės pasaulio sistemos teorija [Immanuel Wallerstein's Theory of the Capitalist World-System]', *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 16 (2005): 65–81.

<sup>20</sup> For more information, see Darius Žiemelis, 'The Socio-Economic History of Lithuania from the 16th to the 19th Century (until 1861) from the Perspective of Economic Development Concepts', *Revista Română de Studii Baltice și Nordice / The Romanian Journal for Baltic and Nordic Studies* 5, 2 (2013): 57–90.

<sup>21</sup> It should be noted that the CWS originally included only Western, Southern and Central as well as part of Eastern Europe (I. Wallerstein considers its eastern limit at that time to be the PLC border with Russia), as well as Latin America, but the latter's influence on the formation of this social system was secondary, see Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System I*, 67–129.

<sup>22</sup> See Immanuel Wallerstein, 'The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16, 4 (1974): 387–415.

as mini-systems. They were closed organisms in which one culture, a limited division of labor, and primitive technology dominated. One can find such mini-systems only in primitive (of hunters, gatherers) societies. The fate of the mini-systems is dual – they either disappeared after being seized by another mini-system, or having expanded (due to conquests) they would be transformed into an economic world – an economic community based on an inter-local division of labor (between the center and the periphery), a multi-faceted culture. All that exists as long as the world-empire “does not swallow” up the economic world. This world was a historically unstable structure – it could fall apart or in it one of the constantly warring political formations could become established. In such an instance, the economic world was transformed into a world-empire<sup>23</sup>. The world-empire lived on conquests and looting. According to I. Wallerstein, they were destined to fail, because in them there was no constant accumulation of the capital necessary to upgrade the method of production. With the expansion of territory the apparatus of suppression would inevitably increase, and as the translocal (domestic) exchanges decreased, the economic basis of the empire would erode<sup>24</sup>.

The CWS is an economic world, based on capitalist production and the world division of labor between geo-economic zones, politically organized in the form of a system of sovereign, competing with each other for hegemony states. Capitalism, in I. Wallerstein’s opinion, cannot exist if there is a single world state – it needs a system of competing sovereign states. The latter is a phenomenon of the modern era. Independent states coexist side by side, their power is similar, blocking the road to prevent one country from becoming sufficiently strong to seize neighboring countries. They control each other, so that any of them would not become too strong.

An essential feature of the concept of the CWS is the differentiation into three economic zones: the core, the periphery and the semi-periphery

---

<sup>23</sup> Such empires were China, Egypt, Rome, see Wallerstein, ‘The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System’, 390–391.

<sup>24</sup> The reason – the vicious circle between the increase in the taxes needed to maintain the growing apparatus and carry out external expansion, the resistance arising from this increase, the increase in the necessary apparatus to suppress such resistance, the raising of the taxes needed for this increase, the determined decline in business and exchanges caused by the increase in taxes, the increase in taxes qualified by this decline (seeking to maintain at least the current level of treasury income), and so on.



(according to the role in the hierarchical international division of labor)<sup>25</sup>. Countries are classified according to the role that they play in the world division of labor. Intensive capital accumulation, high wages, most advanced technological production, lower labor utilization for production are assigned to the core zone. The states of this zone are in particular very strong economically; they produce complex products, requiring at a certain time the most advanced technologies. In these countries, capital is concentrated most intensively (which is continually invested in production and generates high profits), new ideas are developed and adapted. Such states are politically powerful, and effectively protect the national interests of the capitalist class<sup>26</sup>. The specialization of the peripheral area is the extraction of raw materials and the production of agricultural goods. The countries of this zone are marked most often by weak statehood or colonial, semi-colonial dependence, are technologically backward, almost have no industry, and the layer of hired workers is sparse. They supply raw materials to the core states and use the excess output production of the core. The political government supports the national class of capitalists less, but special attention is given to the strengthening of the coercive apparatus that helps to maintain the export sector<sup>27</sup>. It is especially important to note that repressive control of the work force is characteristic of the peripheral capitalist countries. Unlike K. Marx and M. Weber, who classified serfdom, debt slavery etc. as various forms of non-capitalist production relations, I. Wallerstein does not make an essential difference in the situation of legally hired free-lance workers (forced by economic violence, famine to be subordinate to their employers) and of serfs and slaves. In his view, in determining the nature of the production relations between direct producers and the owners of the means of production, important are not the relations inside individual production units, but the purpose of the production. If the production is assigned for sale and export and world market prices dictate the orientation of production, then also the landowner's manor (farmstead), in which serfs cultivate the landowner's field with their implements and the cotton plantation exploiting the work of slaves are capitalist enterprises. When a country is drawn into the system of the international division of labor, then the slaveholder, feudal

---

<sup>25</sup> See Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System I*, 100–103.

<sup>26</sup> See Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System I*, 349.

<sup>27</sup> See Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System II*, 129–130.

and other non-capitalist production relations become capitalistic. And that country is also capitalist, as well as others included in the CWS, but its capitalism is special – peripheral. As already mentioned, in the first volume of I. Wallerstein's main work, *The Modern World-System*, in which the emergence of the CWS in the 16<sup>th</sup> century and its early development is discussed, the socio-economic system of Poland and Lithuania in the 16<sup>th</sup> - 18<sup>th</sup> centuries is treated (together with America) as the periphery of the CWS at that time<sup>28</sup>. Therefore in interpretation of I. Wallerstein's history of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the totality of these phenomena, which are defined in traditional Marxist historiography with the term second serfdom, refers to peripheral capitalism. The difference is revealed not only by the names of the terms, but also by interpretations of assumptions of this phenomenon. In terms of traditional Marxist historiography the second serfdom in the Central Eastern Europe was caused by the internal economic – social reasons, and in the CWS theory – by external reasons, i.e., the involvement in the global division of labor in peripheral status<sup>29</sup>.

Semi-peripheral zones – is a kind of synthesis of the core and peripheral zones, which is characterized by a medium level of technological advancement, military power and cost of living. The productivity of the applied technology of the states of this zone is behind those of the core, but in the periphery their industrial goods can compete with the core products, as they are significantly cheaper. Thus, using the raw materials supplied by the periphery, the states of the semi-peripheral zone produce lower quality products or semi-finished goods and agricultural products. Labor is relatively cheap and skilled. These states of this zone have a quite efficient administrative system; it is often authoritarian. The states of this zone are usually weakened former core states, or states seeking the status of core states. The role of semi-peripheral zone countries in the global division of labor is the export of small

---

<sup>28</sup> See Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System I*, 67–129.

<sup>29</sup> According to I. Wallerstein, grain cultivation and export to the core area countries caused the periphery status for Central Eastern Europe in Europe's economic world. The effects of peripheral capitalism was the dominance of serfdom, the advent of large estates, the deterioration of urban network in Central Eastern Europe. The beginning of CWS creation had the hardest impact on developing cities in Central Eastern Europe. Their development was halted in the early stage due to the increased for grain demand in the world market. See Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System I*, 112–114.

quantities of material to the core zone countries, and production – to the peripheral<sup>30</sup>.

The three categories of the geo-economic zone countries are necessary for the CWS structure because none of them could exist without the other. This existence of categories is based on the struggle for the realization of markets, sources of raw materials, to colonize areas suitable for monopolistic control. Having abundant capital resources, the core zone states impose no equivalent exchanges on the peripheral countries in order to obtain cheap raw materials. The CWS remains a stable hierarchy of three categories of countries, but in it there is a constant rotation of the countries of the core, peripheral and semi-peripheral zones, a constant struggle for control of resources. A sufficient quantity of capital determines this, but it migrates from one geo-economical zone to another. Among the CWS core zone countries there are competitions for hegemony. From these, for a limited time one economically, politically, militarily dominant state arises<sup>31</sup>. Such a hegemonic state does not destroy the other sovereign states – omnipotence in the CWS does not exist<sup>32</sup>.

Recipients and critics of the CWS theory point out the most important drawback of the CWS theory – too prominent emphasis on the influence of the processes of international exchange and global market on the internal social-economic development of the countries. In preference of global context, a local context “suffers”<sup>33</sup>.

As we can see, in the conception of the CWS the economies of the countries are differentiated by the place held in the hierarchy of the international division of labor. The CWS theory is at the same time an analysis of the geopolitical and economic interaction and typological analysis of the distinguishing features of the CWS countries of different

---

<sup>30</sup> See Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System I*, 349.

<sup>31</sup> See Immanuel Wallerstein, ‘The Three Instance of Hegemony in the History of the Capitalist World-Economy’, in Wallerstein, *The Essential Wallerstein*, 253–263.

<sup>32</sup> In CWS history up to now three hegemonic states have existed: the Netherlands (1620–1672), Great Britain (1815–1873), USA (1945– ?), see Wallerstein, ‘The Three Instance of Hegemony in the History of the Capitalist World-Economy’, 255.

<sup>33</sup> See first of all: Robert Brenner, ‘The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism’, *New Left Review* 104 (1977): 25–92; Chirot and Hall, ‘World-System Theory’, 81–106. More on CWS theory criticism and reception, see Darius Žiemelis, ‘Immanuelio Wallersteino kapitalistinės pasaulio sistemos teorija [Immanuel Wallerstein’s Theory of the Capitalist World-System]’, 77–80.

structural positions (core, semi-periphery and periphery). The nature of the economy of a certain country is treated in accordance with its position in the CWS, which the structure of its exports and imports shows.

## **II. Lithuanian economic development in terms of the concept of peripheral capitalism in 1557-1861**

In this way, the countries (from the peripheral capitalism area engaging in the global division of labor) play a role of supplying agricultural production to core area countries and the consumption of the excess goods produced by the countries of this area. The political organization of the periphery can be characterized by weak statehood from the political and military aspects or by colonial or semi-colonial dependence. Finally, the capitalist class of the periphery consists of slave-owners and landowners, whose plantations and folwarks are capitalist enterprises, which produce the goods for sale and export. Which of the following elements of peripheral capitalism can we recognize in economic development of Lithuania in the years 1557-1861? The identification of peripheral capitalist elements which are treated as a manifestation of second serfdom from the CWS point of view in Central Eastern Europe (dominance of serfdom, emergence of large folwarks whose production goal is the growing of grain and their export to the core zone states, deterioration of cities network), could answer the question of whether the term second serfdom is applicable (and if so, when) to describe the social economic system in Lithuania, in 16<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The starting point is the fact that in 1557-1861 in the development of Lithuanian economy according to historical comparative economical sociology, we can relatively distinguish two economic development stages: 1) from the Wallach reform (1557) until the coming of Enlightenment ideas to Lithuania; 2) since the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century until the abolition of serfdom (1861). The distinguished stages differ according to the intensity of development of the *corvée* economy.

In the first stage of the economic development the *corvée* farmstead system was dominating, which was based on the feudal method of production and focused on the ordinary commercial manufacture of goods. However, the socage was prioritized only in large estates farms, where

goods were produced for the market<sup>34</sup>. We have determined that in typologies of economic development by K. Bücher and M. Weber, the simple commercial production is attributed to an “urban economy” type, which they identified with medieval economic life of Western Europe (12<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries)<sup>35</sup>. In the CWS conception the agrarian structure in Central Eastern Europe in the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries was also similar in many ways to the “feudalism” of 11<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries. Western Europe from a Marxist viewpoint means having in mind the agrarian structure, rather than the political “superstructure”<sup>36</sup>. We cannot unambiguously talk about the basically medieval phenomenon – feudalism in Central Eastern Europe (also in Lithuania) in the 16<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> centuries simply because of the fact that from the 16<sup>th</sup> century the intensified relations with Western Europe that were supported by evolving capitalist relations had an influence on its socio-economic order at that time.

In the CWS conception in Lithuania the commercial farmstead *corvée* economy that appeared after the Wallach reform, exporting agricultural products to the CWS core countries is considered to be peripheral capitalism. The *corvée* farmsteads of Lithuania and Poland are classified as the same peripheral capitalist enterprises, which in the 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> centuries were the coffee and cotton plantations of slaveholders in Brazil and the Southern states of the U.S.

Thus, can we qualify the farmstead farms that existed in the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries Lithuania as “grain factories” or “agricultural production factories”, producing for the (especially foreign) market? The diachronic comparative analysis of the structures and trends of development of the 11<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries Western European manor and 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries Central Eastern European (especially in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) farmstead structures and trends does not allow one to qualify the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries Polish and Lithuanian manor farms, affected by Western Europe’s developing capitalist relations, as typical feudal farms (which the

---

<sup>34</sup> For more information, see Mečislovas Jučas, *Baudžiavos irimas Lietuvoje [Deterioratio of Serfdom in Lithuania]* (Vilnius: Mintis, 1972), 14–16, 103–104.

<sup>35</sup> See more Žiemelis, ‘The Socio-Economic History of Lithuania from the 16th to the 19th Century (until 1861) from the Perspective of Economic Development Concepts’, 61–67.

<sup>36</sup> See Žiemelis, ‘Lietuva Vidurio ir Rytų Europoje XVI–XVIII amžiuje: „feodalinė reakcija“ ar periferinis kapitalizmas? [Lithuania in the Central and Eastern Europe of the 16th–18th Centuries: „Feudal Reaction“ or Peripheral Capitalism?]', 51–68.

medieval manor farms of Western Europe are considered to be)<sup>37</sup>. The Western European manor system as an economic and political unit (mini-state) was based on the implicit exchange agreement of the master and peasant, while the farmstead system of Central Eastern Europe (especially in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) was based on the absolute dominance of the master in respect to the peasants. The farmstead was only an economic, but not a political entity (the district was such as an autonomous territorial corporation of the nobility). The manor of 11<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries Western Europe and the farmstead farm of 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries Central Eastern Europe developed a simple commercial production, but the orientation of their production was different. Without the price scissors between the manor's centers and the commercial ports the manor farm was oriented primarily to satisfying the needs in kind of the master. The purpose of the production of the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth farmstead farm due to the price scissors between the domestic and foreign markets (the influence of the CWS) was the production of commercial products, but the received funds were invested not in maximizing the held resources, but to the expansion of the usage of the social elite. Thus, "in the economic behavior of the farmstead owners we miss the features, which summarize the concept of capital accumulation (the persistent investment of profit, technologically upgrading production"<sup>38</sup>. All of this hinders one from considering the *corvée* farmsteads of Lithuania as capitalistic enterprises (in the sense of the CWS theory).

In recognizing a too prominent factor of outside influence of the CWS theory to the social-economic development of Lithuania, it should be

---

<sup>37</sup> About the first time in historiography carried out diachronic comparative analysis of the 11th-15th c. Western European manor and the 16th-18th c. farmstead farm structures of Central Eastern Europe (especially of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) and trends of development, see Darius Žiemelis, 'XVI-XVIII amžiaus Abiejų Tautų Respublikos palivarko ūkis marksistiniu bei neoinstitucionalistiniu požiūriu [The Manor Estate Economy of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th-18th Centuries from the Marxist and Neo-Institutionalist Perspectives]', *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 27 (2011): 11-38.

<sup>38</sup> Zenonas Norkus, 'Kapitalizmo raidos Lietuvoje bruožai ir etapai (iki 1940 m.) postmarksistiniu požiūriu [The Features and Stages of the Capitalist Development of Lithuania (before 1940) from the Post-Marxist Viewpoint]', *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 29 (2012), 20.

however emphasized that during the researched period Lithuania's export structure which shows in the highest degree the nature and location of the national economy in the CWS according to the CWS theory, best represents the peripheral capitalistic nature of Lithuanian economy. As mentioned, the preference to labor rent was available only in large estates farms, whose production was destined for the market. For this reason, until the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century in the export structure of Lithuanian economy, the *corvée* farmstead economy farm products (i.e. grain) were not dominant. Similar to Poland, due to the favorable geographical location (close to the port of Riga) and nature conditions (Nemunas water path, huge areas of land of forest and lands suitable for developing agriculture) Lithuania had very good opportunities to get involved in international trade, by supplying consumer goods, especially grain and forest production<sup>39</sup>. However, in comparison with a small involvement of Poland in international trade (which is one of the major suppliers of grain to foreign markets)<sup>40</sup>, Lithuania was even less involved in this trade. The reason was the inability of *corvée* economy to produce such an amount of (grain) production, which could be realized in the international market. This was influenced by low yields, the late introduction of the regular three-field crop rotation, the war and poor crop years, and most importantly by the fact that a *corvée* farmstead economy until the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century had not reached its maximum development limits in respect of labor rents. In the commodity structure of Lithuanian export from the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century – to the second half of 18<sup>th</sup> century, the central

---

<sup>39</sup> See Darius Žiemelis, 'Tipologiškai artimi Lietuvai ūkiai: Čekija, Lenkija, Vengrija ankstyvaisiais Naujaisiais laikais [Economies Typologically Akin to Lithuania: the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary in the Early Modern Period]', *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 2013 metai / 2 (2014): 87–116.

<sup>40</sup> For more information, see Antoni Maćzak, 'Export of Grain and the Problem of Distribution of National Income in the Years 1550–1650', *Acta Poloniae Historica* 18 (1968): 75–98; Maćzak, 'The Sound Toll Accounts and the Balance of English Sea Trade with the Baltic Zone, 1565–1646', *Studia Historiae Oeconomicae* 3 (1969): 93–113; Maćzak, 'The Balance of Polish Sea Trade with the Wets, 1565–1646', *The Scandinavian Economic History Review* 18, 2 (1970): 107–142; Maćzak, 'Agricultural and Livestock Production in Poland: Internal and Foreign Markets', *Journal of European Economic History* 1, 3 (1972): 671–680; Darius Žiemelis, 'XVI–XVIII a. Abiejų Tautų Respublikos užsienio prekybos struktūra bei mastas: Lenkijos atvejis [Foreign Trade Structure and Scope in the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th to 18th Centuries: Poland's Case]', *Lituanistica* 57, 1(83), (2011): 1–25.

place was occupied by flax production of peasant origin<sup>41</sup>. Lithuania also provided cannabis and their seeds, leather and its products, malt, potash, timber and grain<sup>42</sup>. The fact that Lithuania's export sales structure was dominated by agricultural and forest productions, was due not only to the fact that Lithuania's *corvée* economy did not produce the goods with high surplus value, but also the fact that it was influenced by the market needs of Western Europe. Some Western European countries needed certain high quality Lithuanian flax kinds for production of fabric fibers and Lithuanian forest materials because of the growing needs of the Western shipping industry<sup>43</sup>.

The second stage of economic development (since the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century until 1861) – was the expansion of the *corvée* farmstead economy by increasing the maximum labor rents of the peasants. The historiography notes that, as in other Central Eastern European countries, in Lithuania from the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century until the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century due to the political and demographic crises<sup>44</sup> bondage was replaced with feudal land rent<sup>45</sup>. However, from the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century a paradoxical trend became clear: there was once again a return to the extensification of the *corvée* farmstead economic system by

---

<sup>41</sup> Flax prevalence in the commodity structure of Lithuanian export – is a unique feature of the Lithuanian economy in the context of Central Eastern European region, see Žiemelis, 'Tipologiškai artimi Lietuvai ūkiai: Čekija, Lenkija, Vengrija ankstyvaisiais Naujaisiais laikais [Economies Typologically Akin to Lithuania: the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary in the Early Modern Period]', 87–116.

<sup>42</sup> For more information, see Karl von Loewe, 'Commerce and Agriculture in Lithuania, 1400–1600', *The Economic History Review* 26, 1 (1973): 23–37; Darius Žiemelis, 'The Structure and Scope of the Foreign Trade of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th to 18th Centuries: The Case of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania', *Lithuanian History Studies* 17 / 2012 (2013): 91–123.

<sup>43</sup> See, for example, Lucian R. Lewiter, 'Russia, Poland and the Baltic, 1697–1721', *The Historical Journal* 11, 1 (1968), 29–30.

<sup>44</sup> The Grand Duchy of Lithuania experienced two major demographic crisis in the 17th–18th c.. In the middle of the 17th c. it lost about 48 percent of its population, at the beginning of the 18th c., not yet having recovered from the first crisis, again lost 35 percent of its population. See Z. Kiaupa, J. Kiaupienė, A. Kuncevičius, *The History of Lithuania before 1795* (Vilnius: Lithuanian Institute of History, 2000), 254.

<sup>45</sup> For more information, see Žiemelis, 'XVI–XVIII amžiaus Abiejų Tautų Respublikos palivarko ūkis marksistiniu bei neoinstitucionalistiniu požiūriu [The Manor Estate Economy of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th–18th Centuries from the Marxist and Neo-Institutionalist Perspectives]', p. 34–35.



increasing the norms of labor rent as well as establishing new farmsteads<sup>46</sup>. Historiography noted that in Lithuania in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the *corvée* farmstead economy still remained the most profitable form of farming<sup>47</sup>. In Marxist historiography, this phenomenon is described as the renaissance of the *corvée* farmstead economy, which is associated in Western Europe with the again developed conjuncture favorable for the producers in Central Eastern Europe of grain and other agricultural products. With this renaissance of the *corvée* farmstead economy the most difficult period of serfdom in Lithuania began<sup>48</sup>.

In Lithuania in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century there were attempts to reform the farmstead economy based on the economic theory of physiocracy<sup>49</sup>. It is a question whether the ideas of the Enlightenment, claiming a new farming system based on the experimental work methodology, the classification of different experiences and the emerging new work concept affected the Lithuanian economic development of the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century – the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The research shows that the impact of Enlightenment ideas in the second stage

---

<sup>46</sup> See Jučas, *Baudžiavos irimas Lietuvoje [Deterioratio of Serdom in Lithuania]*, 103–104.

<sup>47</sup> See, for example, Liudas Truska, *Bažnytinė žemėvalda Lietuvoje feodalizmo epochoje (XVIII a. 2-oje – XIX a. 1-oje pusėje) [Church Land Ownership in Lithuania in Feudalism (The Second Half of 18th c. – the First Half of 19th c.)]* (Vilnius: Lietuvos TSR aukštojo ir specialiojo vidurinio mokslo ministerijos leidybinė redakcinė tarnyba, 1988).

<sup>48</sup> Many researchers note that in general up to the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century in most Central Eastern European countries, *corvée* was an objective factor determining country's development, see, for example, Stanislovas Pamerneckis, *Agrarinių santykių raida ir dinamika Lietuvoje: XVIII a. pabaiga – XIX a. pirmoji pusė (statistinė analizė) [The Evolution and Dynamics of Agrarian Relationships in Lithuania: The End of 18th Century – the First Half of 19th Century (Statistical Analysis)]* (Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2004), 119.

<sup>49</sup> Its reception in Lithuania is tied to the wave of the "new agriculture" that arose at the junction of the 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> c. in the Norfolk county of England, which reached the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth from France some what delayed. According to the statement by E. Raila, that the reception of this theory was encouraged not so much by the unique view of the elite of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth toward this product of political economy thought as one of the possible options for European culture but as the total invasion by the culture of France bringing this physiocratic idea as an integral element of this culture. More about the origin and evolution of physiocracy theory and the configuration of physiocracy in Lithuania see Eligijus Raila, *Ignotus Ignotas: Vilniaus vyskupas Ignotas Jokūbas Masalskis [Ignotus Ignotas: Vilnius Bishop Ignotas Jokūbas Masalskis]* (Vilnius: Aidai, 2010), 117–144.

of development of the Lithuanian economy gave (compared to the economies of other Western European countries) the opposite result – the *corvée* farmstead economy was intensified. According to the statement of E. Raila, after visiting many countries in Europe and becoming acquainted with some of the most advanced economic models of the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century Lithuanian nobles only imitated in their estates the principles of Western activities, i.e. they tried to insert the “pliable” principles of Enlightenment entrepreneurship and individual labor into the stagnant *corvée* farmstead economic system. So the structure of serfdom life that ignored personal freedom and guaranteed a strict hierarchy of society, in principle, was unable to absorb the economic potential based on the labor and responsibility of a free individual. One of the Lithuanian noblemen who represented the mentioned spread of the economic process was A. Tyzenhauzas, who “intensified” the farm of royal economies by using serf labor. E. Raila very aptly defines such “intensification of the farm” as: “the reanimation of the *corvée* farmstead system using part of the technology of Western Europe and the latest farming methods”<sup>50</sup>.

In 1795 when the greater part of ethnographic Lithuania became part of the Russian Empire – serfdom policy exercised by the CWS in semi-periphery space<sup>51</sup> –because of political reasons and the absence of a port its

---

<sup>50</sup> Raila, *Ignotus Ignotas: Vilniaus vyskupas Ignotas Jokūbas Masalskis [Ignotus Ignotas: Vilnius Bishop Ignotas Jokūbas Masalskis]*, 188.

<sup>51</sup> Russia’s government always maintained control of the country’s economic ties with CWS, trying to use them for the purposes of its imperial expansion, according to Russia’s economic engagement in the world declares the nature of the entry of Russia’s economic world into the CWS, but not the subordinate integration nature of the CWS. The differentiation geography of Russian economic area was affected by two processes – the interaction of the integration of Russian Empire to CWS in semi-peripheral status and internal differentiation of economic area. Because of this, not only the great imperial metropolitan megacities developed economically at the fastest pace (Moscow and St. Petersburg), but also the territories which from the political and geographical point of view were political peripheries of the empire (colonies). In addition to the so-called “new Russian” lands on the Black Sea, to it belonged the provinces of Courland, Liflandia and Estland, the ports (Riga, Liepaja, Tallinn) of which became the empire’s “windows to Europe.” For more information, see Norkus, ‘Kapitalizmo raidos Lietuvoje bruožai ir etapai (iki 1940 m.) postmarksistiniu požiūriu [The Features and Stages of the Capitalist Development of Lithuania (before 1940) from the Post-Marxist Viewpoint]’, 21–22; Norkus, *Du nepriklausomybės dešimtmečiai: Kapitalizmas, klasės ir demokratija Pirmojoje ir Antrojoje Lietuvos Respublikoje lyginamosios istorinės sociologijos požiūriu*

economy was also focused not on the industry, but on the supply of raw materials to the imperial centers and Western market, resulting in its even more increased agrarian nature of the economy. The result was that by means of increasing peasant labor rents the *corvée* farmstead economy system up to 1861 reached its maximum expansion limits. For example, S. Pamerneckis, one of the few persons that investigated with a statistical method the development and change in agrarian relations in Lithuania at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century – first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, stated that the increase in the peasants' obligations from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century to the 1820–1830s reached the extreme development of the *corvée* farmstead system<sup>52</sup>. He is inclined to talk even about the apogee of feudal serfdom relations during this period, rather than the disintegration of serfdom and the conversion of the farmstead to the capitalist economy (Marxist point of view) in Lithuania (M. Jučas proved this<sup>53</sup>). According to S. Pamerneckis, “at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century – first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century simple commodity production dominated and grew stronger in Lithuania. The reckless increases in the annuity rates, resulting in the stagnation of total agricultural production, which has nothing to do with qualitative shifts, i.e. the beginning of capitalism, made up the basis of the intensity of farmstead production. Its emergence in the structure of agrarian relations is tied to the post-reform period (i.e. after the abolition of serfdom in 1861 – D. Ž.)”<sup>54</sup>

The final dominance of the *corvée* farmstead economy is testified by the fact that, unlike in the first development stage of Lithuania's economy (middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century – the second half of 18<sup>th</sup> century), the Lithuanian export structure during the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century until 1861 is

---

[*Two Twenty-Year Periods of Independence: Capitalism, Class and Democracy in the First and Second Republics of Lithuania from the Viewpoint of Comparative Historical Sociology*], 180–182; Žiemelis, ‘The Socio-Economic History of Lithuania from the 16th to the 19th Century (until 1861) from the Perspective of Economic Development Concepts’, 80–82.

<sup>52</sup> Pamerneckis, *Agrarinių santykių raida ir dinamika Lietuvoje [The Evolution and Dynamics of Agrarian Relationships in Lithuania: The End of 18th Century – the First Half of 19th Century (Statistical Analysis)]*, 196–197.

<sup>53</sup> For more information, see Jučas, *Baudžiavos irimas Lietuvoje [Deterioratio of Serfdom in Lithuania]*, 103–104.

<sup>54</sup> Pamerneckis, *Agrarinių santykių raida ir dinamika Lietuvoje [The Evolution and Dynamics of Agrarian Relationships in Lithuania: The End of 18th Century – the First Half of 19th Century (Statistical Analysis)]*, 115.

dominated by grains, which were mainly grown in the *corvée* farmsteads<sup>55</sup>. Thus, Lithuania, which in the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries had been a granary of raw materials for the countries of Western and North Western Europe, due to its incorporation into Russia from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century became the agrarian periphery of the empire beginning with the 20<sup>th</sup> century. All of this “conserved” even more the peasant production for family consumption in agriculture and determined the weak development of Lithuania’s cities.

The typological characteristics of the economic development of the greatest part of ethnographic Lithuania in Russian Empire is described by Z. Norkus in this way: “When the greater part of ethnographic Lithuania became a part of tsarist Russia at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the country’s involvement in the hierarchical international division of labor occurring from the 16<sup>th</sup> century in the framework of the capitalist world-system (CWS) was deformed, when Lithuania became a colonial double periphery (the periphery of the economic space of Russia as a semi-peripheral CWS country)”<sup>56</sup>. This was a period of the true second serfdom in social-economic development of Lithuania.

## Conclusions

1. Unlike the traditional Marxist historiography, which describes in terms of second serfdom the re-feudalization process in the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries in Central Eastern Europe (also in Lithuania), the CWS theory, overlooking the discussed region from the perspective of world

---

<sup>55</sup> For more information about the commodity structure of Lithuania’s exports and imports in the second half of 18th c. – 19th c. (until 1861) see Žiemelis, ‘The Structure and Scope of the Foreign Trade of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th to 18th Centuries: The Case of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania’, 91-123; Людас Труска, Римантас Ясас, ‘Внешняя торговля Великого Княжества Литовского в последние годы его существования (1785-1792)’, *Lietuvos TSR mokslų akademijos darbai*, serija A, 1, 32 (1970): 23-53; Leonid Żytkowicz, ‘Kilka uwag o handlu zewnętrznym Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w ostatnich latach Rzeczypospolitej’, *Zapiski Historyczne* 41, 2 (1976): 87-101; Витовт Ю. Меркис, ‘Экспорт зерна и льна из Литвы в 1795-1861 гг.’, in *Ежегодник по аграрной истории Восточной Европы 1963 г.: (доклады и сообщения шестой сессии межреспубликанского симпозиума по аграрной истории, состоящегося в г. Вильнюсе с 19 по 24 сентября 1963 г.)* (Вильнюс, 1964): 436-447.

<sup>56</sup> Norkus, ‘Kapitalizmo raidos Lietuvoje bruožai ir etapai (iki 1940 m.) postmarksistiniu požiūriu [The Features and Stages of the Capitalist Development of Lithuania (before 1940) from the Post-Marxist Viewpoint]’, 35.

history, treats this phenomenon as a manifestation of peripheral capitalism. The difference implies a different interpretation of the assumptions of this phenomenon. According to the traditional Marxist historiography the second serfdom of Central Eastern Europe was caused by internal economic and social reasons and according to neo-Marxist CWS theory – external reasons, i.e. involvement in the global division of labor in the peripheral status.

2. The distinctive feature of peripheral capitalism according to the CWS theory is the use of forced labor (slaves, serfs). Weak statehood from a political and military point of view or colonial and semi-colonial dependence can be characteristic of the periphery's political organization. The periphery's capitalist class consists of slave-owners and landlords, whose plantations and farmsteads are capitalist enterprises producing products for sale as well as export. In the global division of labor the role of supplying the core zone states with mining and agricultural production falls to peripheral capitalism.

3. In the 16<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> centuries (up to 1861), the Lithuanian export trade structure (agricultural and forest production) best reveals the character of peripheral capitalism of the Lithuanian economy. However, the poor involvement of the Lithuanian economy during this period in international market and capital accumulation, features non characteristic of the behavior of the owners of the *corvée* farmsteads, do not allow to consider the Lithuanian *corvée* farmsteads as capitalistic enterprises.

4. However, in view of the economic development of Lithuania in 1557-1861 considering an essential component of the CWS theory – the concept of peripheral capitalism, the features of the second serfdom are most distinctly seen in Lithuania not in the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries (as I. Wallerstein stated), but in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century – 1861. In this period from the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century to 1795 weak statehood was typical of Lithuania, while after 1795 it was colonial dependency to the Russian Empire. The features of the economic organization of Lithuania in the period from the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century to 1861 are: the prevalence of an ordinary commercial production, the maximum expansion limits of the economic *corvée* farmstead farm at the expense of increasing the labour rents of the peasants and the domination of grain production of the *corvée* farmsteads in the commodity structure of exports.

## References:

- Bumblauskas, Alfredas. 'Kur buvo Lietuva feodalizmo epochoje? [Where was Lithuania during Feudalism?]', in *Europa 1988: Lietuvos persitvarkymo sąjūdžio almanachas* / sud. R. Ozolas (Vilnius: Mintis, 1988): 153–172.
- Brenner, Robert. 'The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism', *New Left Review* 104 (1977): 25–92.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher ; Grimes, Peter. 'World-Systems Analysis', *Annual Review of Sociology* 21 (1995): 387–417.
- Chirot, Daniel; Hall, Thomas D. 'World-System Theory', *Annual Review of Sociology* 8 (1982): 81–106.
- Hejnosz, Wojciech. 'Zagadnienie tzw. wtórnego poddanstwa chłopów w Polsce feudalnej: Uwagi krytyczne', in *Nauki Humanistyczno-Społeczne Zeszyty* 6, 19 (Prawo: Naukowe Uniwersytetu M. Kopernika w Toruniu, 1966): 57–61.
- Jučas, Mečislovas. *Baudžiavos irimas Lietuvoje [Deterioratio of Serdom in Lithuania]* (Vilnius: Mintis, 1972).
- Jurginis, Juozas. *Baudžiavos įsigalėjimas Lietuvoje [Establishment of Serdom in Lithuania]* (Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1962).
- Kahan, Arcadius. 'Notes on Serfdom in Western and Eastern Europe', *The Journal of Economic History* 33, 1 (1973): 86–99.
- Kiaupa, Zigmantas; Kiaupienė, Jūratė; Kuncevičius, Albinas. *The History of Lithuania before 1795* (Vilnius: Lithuanian Institute of History, 2000).
- Kiaupienė, Jūratė. *Kaimas ir dvaras Žemaitijoje XVI–XVIII a. [Village and Estate in Samogitia 16th-18th Centuries]* (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1988).
- Lewiter, Lucian R. 'Russia, Poland and the Baltic, 1697–1721', *The Historical Journal* 11, 1 (1968): 3–34.
- Martin, William G. 'The World-Systems Perspective in Perspective: Assessing the Attempt to Move beyond Nineteenth-Century Eurocentric Conceptions', *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 17, 2 (1994): 145–185.
- Marx, Karl und Engels, Friedrich. *Briefwechsel 4. Bd.: 1868–1883* (Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1950).

- Mączak, Antoni. 'Agricultural and Livestock Production in Poland: Internal and Foreign Markets', *Journal of European Economic History* 1, 3 (1972): 671–680.
- Mączak, Antoni. 'The Balance of Polish Sea Trade with the Wets, 1565–1646', *The Scandinavian Economic History Review* 18, 2 (1970): 107–142.
- Mączak, Antoni, 'The Sound Toll Accounts and the Balance of English Sea Trade with the Baltic Zone, 1565–1646', *Studia Historiae Oeconomicae* 3 (1969): 93–113.
- Mączak, Antoni. 'Export of Grain and the Problem of Distribution of National Income in the Years 1550–1650', *Acta Poloniae Historica* 18 (1968): 75–98.
- Melton, Edgar. 'Population Structure, the Market Economy, and the Transformation of *Gutsherrschaft* in East Central Europe, 1650–1800: The Cases of Brandenburg and Bohemia', *German History* 16, 3 (1998): 297–327.
- Melton, Edgar. 'The Decline of Prussian *Gutsherrschaft* and the Rise of the Junker as Rural Patron, 1750–1806', *German History* 12, 3 (1994): 334–350.
- Melton, Edgar. 'Gutsherrschaft in East Elbian Germany and Livonia, 1500–1800: A Critique of the Model', *Central European History* 21, 4 (1988): 315–349.
- Nichtweiss, Johannes. 'The Second Serfdom and the So-Called „Prussian Way“: The Development of Capitalism in Eastern German Agricultural Institutions', *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 3, 1, (1979): 99–140.
- Norkus, Zenonas. *Du nepriklausomybės dvidešimtmečiai: Kapitalizmas, klasės ir demokratija Pirmojoje ir Antrojoje Lietuvos Respublikoje lyginamosios istorinės sociologijos požiūriu* [Two Twenty-Year Periods of Independence: Capitalism, Class and Democracy in the First and Second Republics of Lithuania from the Viewpoint of Comparative Historical Sociology] (Vilnius: Aukso žuvys, 2014).
- Norkus, Zenonas. 'Moving up and Down in the Capitalist World System: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of Patterns in Post-Communist Transformation', in *Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for Global Sociology: XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology, 13–19 July 2014, Yokohama, Japan: Book of Abstracts* (Yokohama: International Sociological Association, 2014): 707.

- Norkus, Zenonas. 'Kapitalizmo raidos Lietuvoje bruožai ir etapai (iki 1940 m.) postmarksistiniu požiūriu [The Features and Stages of the Capitalist Development of Lithuania (before 1940) from the Post-Marxist Viewpoint]', *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 29 (2012): 9–36.
- Pamerneckis, Stanislovas. *Agrarinių santykių raida ir dinamika Lietuvoje: XVIII a. pabaiga – XIX a. pirmoji pusė (statistinė analizė) [The Evolution and Dynamics of Agrarian Relationships in Lithuania: The End of 18th Century – the First Half of 19th Century (Statistical Analysis)]* (Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2004).
- Raila, Eligijus. *Ignotus Ignotas: Vilniaus vyskupas Ignotas Jokūbas Masalskis [Ignotus Ignotas: Vilnius Bishop Ignotas Jokūbas Masalskis]* (Vilnius: Aidai, 2010).
- Rusiński, Władysław. 'Drogi rozwojowe folwarku pańszczyźnianego', *Przegląd Historyczny* 47, 4 (1956): 617–655.
- Sanderson, Stephen K. 'World-Systems Analysis after Thirty Years: Should it Rest in Peace?', *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 46, 3 (2005): 179–213.
- Topolski, Jerzy. 'Continuity and Discontinuity in the Development of the Feodal System in Eastern Europe (X<sup>th</sup> to XVII<sup>th</sup> Centuries)', *Journal of European Economic History* 10, 2 (1981): 373–400.
- Topolski, Jerzy. 'The Manorial Serf-Economy in Central and Eastern Europe in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *Agricultural History* 48, 3 (1974): 341–352.
- Truska, Liudas. *Bažnytinė žemėvalda Lietuvoje feodalizmo epochoje (XVIII a. 2-oje – XIX a. 1-oje pusėje) [Church Land Ownership in Lithuania in Feudalism (The Second Half of 18th c. – the First Half of 19th c.)]* (Vilnius: Lietuvos TSR aukštojo ir specialiojo vidurinio mokslo ministerijos leidybinė redakcinė tarnyba, 1988).
- von Loewe, Karl. 'Commerce and Agriculture in Lithuania, 1400–1600', *The Economic History Review* 26, 1 (1973): 23–37.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Essential Wallerstein* (New York: The New York Press, 2000).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press, 1974).



- Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World-System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy 1600–1750* (New York: Academic Press, 1980).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World-System III: The Second Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy* (New York: Academic Press, 1989).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789–1914* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 'The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16, 4 (1974): 387–415.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 'The Three Instance of Hegemony in the History of the Capitalist World-Economy', in Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Essential Wallerstein* (New York: The New York Press, 2000): 253–263.
- Zientara, Benedykt. 'Z zagadnień tzw. „wtórnego poddaństwa“ w Europie Środkowej', *Przegląd Historyczny* 47, 1 (1956): 3–47.
- Żytkowicz, Leonid. 'Kilka uwag o handlu zewnętrznym Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w ostatnich latach Rzeczypospolitej', *Zapiski Historyczne* 41, 2 (1976): 87–101.
- Žiemelis, Darius. 'Tipologiškai artimi Lietuvai ūkiai: Čekija, Lenkija, Vengrija ankstyvaisiais Naujaisiais laikais [Economies Typologically Akin to Lithuania: the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary in the Early Modern Period]', *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 2013 metai / 2 (2014): 87–116.
- Žiemelis, Darius. 'The Structure and Scope of the Foreign Trade of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th to 18th Centuries: The Case of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania', *Lithuanian Historical Studies* 17 / 2012 (2013): 91–123.
- Žiemelis, Darius. 'The Socio-Economic History of Lithuania from the 16th to the 19th Century (until 1861) from the Perspective of Economic Development Concepts', *Revista Română de Studii Baltice și Nordice / The Romanian Journal for Baltic and Nordic Studies* 5, 2 (2013): 57–90.
- Žiemelis, Darius. 'XVI–XVIII a. Abiejų Tautų Respublikos užsienio prekybos struktūra bei mastas: Lenkijos atvejis [Foreign Trade Structure and Scope in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the

- 16th to 18th Centuries: Poland's Case]', *Lituanistica* 57, 1(83) (2011): 1-25.
- Žiemelis, Darius. 'XVI–XVIII amžiaus Abiejų Tautų Respublikos palivarko ūkis marksistiniu bei neoinstitucionalistiniu požiūriu [The Manor Estate Economy of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th–18th Centuries from the Marxist and Neo-Institutionalist Perspectives]', *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 27 (2011): 11–38.
- Žiemelis, Darius. *Feudalism or Peripheral Capitalism?: Socio-Economic History of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th-18th Centuries* (Saarbrücken: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing GmbH & Co. KG, 2011).
- Žiemelis, Darius. *Abiejų Tautų Respublikos socialinė ekonominė raida XVI–XVIII amžiuje: feodalizmas ar periferinis kapitalizmas? Istoriografinė analizė [Social Economic Development of the Republic of the Two Nations in the 16th-18th Centuries: Feudalism or Peripheral Capitalism? An Historiographic Analysis]*, *Unpublished doctoral dissertation* (University of Vilnius, 2009).
- Žiemelis, Darius. 'Lietuva Vidurio ir Rytų Europoje XVI–XVIII amžiuje: „feodalinė reakcija“ ar periferinis kapitalizmas? [Lithuania in the Central and Eastern Europe of the 16th–18th Centuries: „Feudal Reaction“ or Peripheral Capitalism?]', *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 18 (2006): 51–68.
- Žiemelis, Darius. 'Immanuelio Wallersteino kapitalistinės pasaulio sistemos teorija [Immanuel Wallerstein's Theory of the Capitalist World-System]', *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 16 (2005): 65–81.
- Янель, З. К. 'О некоторых вопросах второго издания крепостного права и социально-экономического развития барщинного поместья в России', *Исторические записки* 78 (1965): 150–180.
- Костюшко, И. И. 'К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс об аграрном развитии Восточной Европы', in *Ежегодник по аграрной истории Восточной Европы 1970 г.* (Рига, 1977): 5–13.
- Меркис, Витовт Ю. 'Экспорт зерна и льна из Литвы в 1795–1861 гг.', in: *Ежегодник по аграрной истории Восточной Европы 1963 г.: (доклады и сообщения шестой сессии межреспубликанского симпозиума по аграрной истории, состоящегося в г. Вильнюсе с 19 по 24 сентября 1963 г.)* (Вильнюс, 1964): 436–447.

- Сказкин, Сергей Д. 'К вопросу о генезисе капитализма в сельском хозяйстве Западной Европы', in *Ежегодник по аграрной истории Восточной Европы 1959 г.* (Москва, 1961): 21–29.
- Сказкин, Сергей Д. 'Основные проблемы так называемого *второго издания крепостничества* в Средней и Восточной Европе', in *Вопросы истории* 2 (1958): 96–119.
- Труска, Людас; Ясас, Римантас. 'Внешняя торговля Великого Княжества Литовского в последние годы его существования (1785–1792)', *Lietuvos TSR mokslų akademijos darbai, serija A*, 1, 32 (1970): 23–53.