

DOI 10.23947/2414-1143-2020-24-4-96-103
UDC 94(470):631.1

FEATURES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL- INDUSTRIAL STRUCTURES OF THE AGRARIAN SECTOR IN SOUTH OSSETIA (1953 - 1970) ¹

© *Irina K. Dzhioeva, Lira K. Gurieva, Albert V. Techov*

*South Ossetian State University, Tskhinval,
Republic of South Ossetia;
North Ossetian State University, Vladikavkaz,
Republic of North Ossetia-Alania, Russian Federation
djioeva_irina@mail.ru, 443879@mail.ru, albert.texov@mail.ru*

The article examines the problems of agriculture in the Soviet period and their causes; the consequences of the most popular reforms in agriculture carried out in the studied period are reasonably revealed, trends and results of the transformation of the organizational and production structures of the agricultural sector, as well as the economic and social consequences of the formation of vertical structures of the agro-industrial complex are revealed. The scientific work carried out a historical and economic study of the development of agriculture in South Ossetia with consideration of the features of conceptual approaches to the analysis of the economic transformation of agriculture in the conditions of the development of the socialist mode of production. The prerequisites and incentives for economic development, indicators of economic growth, as well as existing problems in the social and economic development of society in the period under study have been clarified.

Key words: South Ossetia; agricultural reform; collective farm-state farm system; private household plots.

[И.К. Джюева, Л.К. Гуриева, А.В. Техов Особенности развития организационно – производственных структур аграрного сектора в Южной Осетии (1953 – 1970 гг.)]

В статье рассматриваются проблемы сельского хозяйства в советский период и их причины; аргументированно раскрываются последствия наиболее популярных реформ в сельском хозяйстве проводимых в исследуемом периоде, выявляются тенденции и результаты преобразования организационно – производственных структур аграрного сектора, а также экономические и социальные последствия формирования вертикальных структур агропромышленного комплекса. В научной работе проведено историко-экономическое исследование развития сельского хозяйства Южной Осетии с рассмотрением особенностей концептуальных подходов к анализу экономической трансформации сельского хозяйства в условиях развития социалистического способа производства. Выявлены предпосылки и стимулы экономического развития, показатели экономического роста, а также существующие проблемы в социальном и экономическом развитии общества в исследуемом периоде.

Ключевые слова: Южная Осетия; реформа сельского хозяйства; колхозно-совхозная система; личные приусадебные хозяйства.

Irina K. Dzhioeva – Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor, South Ossetian State University, Tskhinval, Republic of South Ossetia.

Lira K. Gurieva – Ph.D. (Advanced Doctorate) in Economics, Professor, North Ossetian State University, Vladikavkaz, Republic of North Ossetia-Alania, Russian Federation.

Albert V. Techov – Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor, South Ossetian State University, Tskhinval, Republic of South Ossetia.

Джюева Ирина Константиновна – кандидат экономических наук, доцент, Юго-Осетинский государственный университет, г. Цхинвал, Республика Южная Осетия.

Гуриева Ли́ра Константи́новна – доктор экономических наук, профессор, Северо-Осетинский государственный университет, г. Владикавказ, Республика Северная Осетия-Алания, Российская Федерация.

Техов Альберт Васильевич – кандидат экономических наук, доцент, Юго-Осетинский государственный университет, г. Цхинвал, Республика Южная Осетия.

For scientists of the Soviet and post-Soviet periods, the study of the sequence of development of the collective farm - state farm system was one of the most priority aspects of scientific activity. The existing problems in the activities of collective farms in the post-war five-year plans were discussed in detail in the works of I.M. Volkova [4] V.A. Illykh [7], V. L. Dryndina [6], M. A. Beznin [3], the collective farm - state farm system was considered by S.N. Andreenkov [1] and N.S. Tonaevskaya [14].

Great changes in this period under study took place not only in industry, but also in the country's agricultural sector. During the years of the thaw, this resulted in the restriction of personal farmsteads, further enlargement of farms (which began before the war), the transfer of collective farms to state farms, and the possibility of a quick breakthrough in the agrarian sphere through enthusiasm and strengthening labor discipline. Since the Soviet reformers believed in the advantages of large-scale production, they perceived their personal farmstead as something existing to the detriment of social and state production [8, p. 221], which contributed to the constant reduction of subsidiary farms, and significantly reduced the standard of living of the population.

One of the opinions shared by many researchers, including T.G. Nefedova, is that the industrial development of cities was carried out at the expense of agriculture, condemning the rural population to poverty and stagnation [12, p. 38]. This historical fact is difficult to refute, since in the first half of the 20th century, the rapid growth of industry was carried out practically at the expense of free labor of peasants on collective farms, and all investments were made in cities. In addition, almost 10 million people were dispossessed and their farms plundered. Due to ineffective collectivization methods, according to the results of official statistics, agricultural production from 1913 to 1960 only doubled, while the volume of industrial production increased 40 times.

The second half of the 20th century was characterized by a manifold increase in capital investments in agriculture. In the period under study, from 20% to 28% of all investments of the country were allocated for rural development instead of the post-war 7% [9].

By the mid-1950s, a number of reforms were carried out, which in many ways contributed to the development of agricultural production: a decrease in the agricultural tax, the implementation of appropriate measures to write off tax arrears for the past period, an increase in the area of personal plots of collective farmers, a decrease in the norms for the supply of livestock products to the state, and expansion of collective farm markets.

South Ossetia has always been an agrarian region, in 1950 the rural population was 82.4%. The enlargement of collective farms in the post-war period closely affected this region, where in 1940 there were 467 collective farms, and by 1970 there were only 33 left on the entire territory of South Ossetia, i.e., over 30 years their number has decreased by more than 14 times. One of the reasons for the reduction in the number of collective farms is the migration of the rural population to the cities. Between 1950 – 1970, the population of rural areas fell from 85.9 thousand to 63 thousand people. This can be explained by the insufficient development of the social infrastructure of the village, the unattractiveness of the rural way of life, and agrarian overpopulation. All these factors contributed to the fact that rural youth left their permanent places of residence and moved to cities.

In 1953 – 1964, the organizational and production structures of the agrarian sector were collective and state farms, which together form a collective and state farm system,

which at the first stage included machine and tractor stations, subsidiary plots of large enterprises, as well as personal household farms of the country's population.

The period of the 60s for the USSR was characterized by a new stage of development, which under L.I. Brezhnev was considered the era of developed socialism, and the collective farm - state farm system underwent a period of convergence, with a clear strengthening of the latter.

When analyzing the process of Khrushchev's reforms, many modern economists have focused on their negative results. For example V.V. Babashkin, S.I. Tolstov note that this is a thoughtless enlargement of collective farms and the liquidation of "unpromising villages", which some analysts called "the second collectivization did not give anything positive" [2] V.P. Popov in his work "The Unknown Initiative of Khrushchev" explains that "back in 1951, N.S. Khrushchev published an article "On agro-cities", where he put forward the idea of turning a village into a city, and peasants into workers for agriculture. This task could be accomplished only if there was large-scale agricultural production. To implement this initiative in 1940 – 1952. 33,266 people were resettled across the country together with family members [13, p. 36] ". V.N. Gorlov examines the problem of the consolidation of collective farms in more detail and concludes that the consolidation of collective farms took place at a rapid pace. It was planned to build new housing estates with a developed infrastructure, but this idea could not be financially supported, since the implementation of such volumes of construction required lengthy preparation [5].

In the analyzed period, not only the concentration of collective farms took place, but also large state agricultural associations like state farms began to be created. In 1965 there were 3 state farms in South Ossetia, and by 1970 there were 8 of them. The dynamics of collective farm production was much more efficient in almost all respects than state farms. In the period under study, the collective farm-cooperative form of ownership in South Ossetia worked more efficiently than state enterprises. We do not have data on the capital equipment, capital-labor ratio and power-to-weight ratio of agricultural enterprises in Ossetia, either for public farms as a whole, or separately for collective and state farms. But we dare to assume that the state farms were better provided for. Nevertheless, the collective farms, despite the unequal position, had more favorable indicators. And this despite the fact that the situation in the agricultural sector as a whole in the country and the republic was difficult. In the first years of the period under review, the consequences of collectivization in the 1930s and the war of 1941 – 1945 were evident. It is known that the first post-war five-year plan, carried out according to all the main indicators, revealed the difficulties of the agricultural sector, which gave an increase in production by only 1% against the planned target of 27%. In 1951, gross agricultural output amounted to 93.3% of the level of 1950. Already in 1953, the state experienced a grain procurement crisis, more grain was consumed than it was procured.

In the agricultural sector of the country in the period 1953 – 1965. various measures were taken to get him out of a difficult situation. Here we should mention the September 1953 plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU; the task of developing virgin lands, put forward in 1954, transformation of MTS in 1958 and March 1965 plenum.

In accordance with the decisions of these authorities, the purchase prices for agricultural products were increased, capital investments directed to the agricultural sector increased, incl. for the production of tractors and other agricultural machinery. This made it possible to raise the level of mechanization of work in field cultivation and animal husbandry. Collective farms were strengthened by leaders and machine operators.

Fundamental changes were made by N.S. Khrushchev into the management system of the agro-industrial sector. At the session of the Supreme Soviet (February 1958), the law "On the further development of the collective farm system and the reorganization of machine and tractor stations" was adopted, which stated: "Tractors, combines and other

agricultural machines belonging to machine and tractor stations should be sold to collective farms that have expressed a desire purchase this technique. Collective farms that did not have the opportunity to immediately pay for the tractors and machines they bought should be provided in installments, depending on their economic condition" [15].

In connection with the reorganization of the MTS, agricultural equipment was sold to the collective farms of the region in the amount of 2336 thousand rubles. The transfer of equipment to collective farms at first had a beneficial effect. However, many farms did not have enough of it, which led to poor-quality cultivation of land, delaying field agricultural work.

Despite the improvement in the situation in the agrarian sector in the second half of the 50s, in 1959 agriculture again slowed down the pace of its development. The results of the seven-year plan of 1959 – 1965 turned out to be negative instead of the planned growth of 70%, the gross output of the industry increased by only 12%.

The March 1965 Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, where a decision was made to increase the material interest of workers in the agrarian sector, increase the purchase prices for agricultural products, was of great importance on the way of overcoming difficulties; more attention began to be paid to the social problems of the village.

However, despite such a number of measures, agriculture continued to work ineffectively. If the main production assets for 1951-1970 grew almost 6 times, the gross agricultural output only 2.2 times. Despite the fact that the capital-labor ratio in the countryside was growing, capital productivity fell and the industry still did not meet the needs of society.

Most scientists now believe that the reason for the failure is due to the lack of private ownership of land, a high degree of state control. But this was also affected by subjectivity in the leadership, mistakes in planning, financing of agriculture, shortcomings in the organization of procurement and purchases of agricultural products, as well as in the price policy, which did not ensure an equivalent exchange of cities and villages. Unjustified interference in the activities of collective farms and state farms, a systematic rise in the cost of building materials, machinery, fertilizers, fuel and other means of production, negatively affected the economy of collective farms, again led to an unequal exchange of industry and agriculture. During this period, the leftist concept of the withering away of subsidiary farming, the liquidation of unpromising villages, was being carried out, and trade cooperation was closed.

The transformations that were carried out in the period under study were a consequence of the development of industrialization in the production of agricultural products and were carried out simultaneously with the transformation of the agrarian sector. The staged changes in the agrarian economy and rural society were called "agro-transition" and became an integral part of the modernization of Russian society in the second half of the 20th century.

A lot of work during the study period was carried out on land reclamation. As already noted, the territory of South Ossetia is 385.543 hectares. Most of this area is occupied by forests and pastures. The harvest of vegetable crops reached 259 centners per hectare.

Attention is drawn to the high degree of development of poultry and beekeeping in this period, which testified to the progressive structure of animal husbandry and the diversity of its products. It was in 1955 that the number of bee colonies in the region reached 4625 [10, p.117], which was the highest result in the entire history of beekeeping in the region.

At the same time, in the fifth five-year plan, due to natural disasters (landslides, mudflows), the number of livestock per 100 hectares of agricultural land significantly decreased from 202 thousand heads in 1950 to 54 heads in 1955, which affected the efficiency of animal husbandry as a whole. Accordingly, the number of cattle decreased from 63 thousand

heads in 1950 to 44 thousand heads in 1955. The number of pigs increased slightly. But in the fifth five-year period the productivity of livestock increased substantially. The average annual milk yield from one fodder cow increased in 1955 to 656 kg on average in the region against 280 kg in 1950. The average annual shear of wool from one sheep in the collective farm sector reached 2.6 kg against 1.6 in 1950.

In the same period, significant changes took place in the development of animal husbandry both in social production and in personal subsidiary farming. As of January 1, 1950, there were 36.4 thousand heads of cattle in social production, and 37.5 thousand heads in personal subsidiary plots, and by 1970 there were already 41.3 thousand heads in social production, and personal only 27.9 thousand heads. This was primarily the result of state policy aimed at concentrating livestock on large farms, as a result of the next enlargement of collective farms, which was unjustified in a particularly mountainous zone.

It is characteristic that the efficiency of agricultural production in collective farms and administrative districts differed significantly from the regional average. This is due to the fact that attention to farms operating in extreme conditions was insufficient, and financial opportunities for the development of social infrastructure there were limited. This is confirmed by the slower growth rates of monetary incomes in the highlands. During the study period, monetary incomes in the collective farms of the Java region, which is the highest mountainous region, increased by only 33.3%, Leningorsky by 44.1%, Znaursky by 65.7%, Stalinirsky by 203%. And it was during this period that the foundation was laid for the orientation of animal husbandry to imported feed grain, and, consequently, to undermine its fodder base. Apparently, this should also explain the decrease in the number of cattle in the region from 74 to 69.2 thousand heads.

State purchases of livestock and poultry by 1960, compared with 1950, increased by 1.6 thousand tons, and by 1970 by 2.6 thousand tons. Government purchases of milk also had a tendency to increase, during the study period they were increased by 1.5 thousand tons. As for government purchases of eggs, during the study period their number decreased by 1 million pieces. This is due to the fact that poultry farming in South Ossetia was most developed in the fifth five-year period, and then with the enlargement of farms it began to decline [11, p. 57].

During this period, there were processes of inter-farm cooperation. Inter-farm ties arose already at the beginning of the mass collective farm movement, they were expressed in helping each other with seeds, machines, spare parts, although they were temporary. Such cooperation in the area of capital investments was especially important. The December (1958) Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU obliged "party organizations, Soviet and agricultural bodies to contribute in every way to the development and expansion of inter-collective farm production ties, to support the initiative and to assist collective farms in organizing joint construction. According to this decree, in 1959, an "inter-collective farm construction" was organized in South Ossetia, carrying out a program of construction work in the collective farms of the region. His activities are also of interest because he contributed to the involvement of local building materials in the national economic turnover. Inter-collective farm cooperation in the area of construction remained the most widespread type of inter-farm ties in these years. In the period under study, collective, public farms played a predominant role in the agricultural sector in the production of agricultural products; small peasant farming was ousted, the share of personal subsidiary farming was reduced.

Fruit and berry farming successfully developed in the seventh and eighth five-year plans, for 5 years the volume of production was doubled. At the same time, viticulture in the eighth five-year plan practically did not make any progress, although the natural conditions here are favorable for this culture. Livestock production was developing unevenly -

meat production in the eighth five-year plan failed to maintain the achieved level of the seventh five-year plan, but milk production was significantly increased.

Summing up the results of the development of agricultural production in South Ossetia during the period under study, it should be noted that it was diversified: in animal husbandry - cattle, pig breeding, poultry farming, beekeeping; in plant growing the production of grain and legumes, industrial crops, vegetable growing, fruit growing, viticulture. Moreover, there was no clear specialization of farms by types of products, although in the whole country these processes were already taking place.

There were changes in the structure of the agricultural sector - large state enterprises (state farms) were created. Despite the fact that their number was still 4 times less than that of collective farms, they already had large sown areas and livestock, which meant the nationalization of the agricultural sector.

The number of rural residents has decreased due to the outflow to cities due to agrarian overpopulation, worse living conditions in the countryside, and the unattractiveness of agricultural labor. Agricultural production developed more intensively in the lowland (plain) and foothill zones; due to a lack of funds, the mountainous zone did not receive proper development. And although the share of agriculture in the gross social product remained the highest, it declined due to the rapid development of other branches of material production, especially industry.

Литература

1. *Андреенков С.Н.* Колхозно-совхозная система СССР 1946–1964 годов в научной и публицистической литературе советской эпохи // Вестник НГУ. Серия: История, филология. 2018. Том 17. № 8. С. 136–146.
2. *Бабашкин В.В.* Особенности аграрного реформирования 1930–1950 годов. [Электронный ресурс]. Историческая психология и социология истории. 2016. №2. С.216–234. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/osobennosti-agrarnogo-reformirovaniya-1930-1950-h-godov> (дата обращения: 24.06.2020).
3. *Безнин М.А.* Крестьянский двор в Российском Нечерноземье 1950–1965 гг. М.: Вологда. 1991. 253 с.
4. *Волков И.М.* Трудовой подвиг советского крестьянства в послевоенные годы. Колхозы СССР в 1946–1950 гг. М.: Мысль. 1972. 293 с.
5. *Горлов В.Н.* Неудачная попытка Н.С. Хрущёва создать агрогорода в Московской области в послевоенное время. [Электронный ресурс]. Вестник Московского государственного областного университета. Серия: История и гуманитарные науки. 2019. № 4. С. 226–229. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/osobennosti-agrarnogo-reformirovaniya-1930-1950-h-godov> (дата обращения: 27.06.2020).
6. *Дрындин В.Л., Криворотов А.Ф.* Попытка реформирования аграрной и промышленной сфер РФ (1953–1964 гг.) в контексте специфики отечественной истории. Оренбург. 2000. 689 с.
7. *Ильиных В.А.* Аграрный строй Сибирь в XX веке: этапы трансформации. Ежегодник по аграрной истории Восточной Европы. 2012: Типология и особенности аграрного развития России и Восточной Европы XX–XXI вв. М.: Брянск. 2012. С. 620–629.
8. *Коньшеев Д.Н.* Аграрные реформы периода оттепели 1953-1964гг. Власть. №2. 2020. С. 218–225.
9. Народное хозяйство СССР в 1965 г. [Электронный ресурс]. М.: ЦСУ СССР. 1996. URL: <http://istmat.info/node/26603> (дата обращения: 24.06.2020).

10. Народное хозяйство Юго-Осетии. Том IV. Статистический сборник. Цхинвали. 1960. 486 с.
11. Народное хозяйство Юго-Осетинской АО 1922–1982 гг. Статистический сборник. Цхинвал. 1983. Изд-во «Иристон». 122 с.
12. *Нефедова Т.Г.* Трансформация сельского хозяйства России: мифология и реальность // Мир России. 2013. № 1. С. 29–60
13. *Попов В.П.* Неизвестная инициатива Хрущёва // Отечественные архивы. № 2. 1993. С. 31–40.
14. *Тонаевская Н.С.* Рабочие совхозов Западной Сибири. 1959–1965 гг. Новосибирск: Наука. 1978. 189 с.
15. *Хрущёв Н.С.* О дальнейшем развитии колхозного строя и реорганизации машинно-тракторных станций. Н.С. Хрущёв. М. Госполитиздат. 1958. 34 с.

References

1. *Andreyenkov S.N.* Kolkhozno-sovkhoznaya sistema SSSR 1946–1964 godov v nauch-noy i publitsisticheskoy literature sovetskoy epokhi [The collective-farming system of the USSR in 1946–1964 in the scientific and journalistic literature of the Soviet era]. Vestnik NGU. Seriya: Istoriya, filologiya. 2018. V. 17. No. 8. pp. 136–146 (In Russian).
2. *Babashkin V.V.* Osobennosti agrarnogo reformirovaniya 1930–1950 godov. [Features of the agrarian reform of the 1930-1950]. Istoricheskaya psikhologiya i sotsiologiya istorii. 2016. No. 2. pp. 216–234. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/osobennosti-agrarnogo-reformirovaniya-1930-1950-h-godov> (accessed: 24.06.2020) (In Russian).
3. *Beznin M.A.* Krestyanskiy dvor v Rossiyskom Nechernozemye 1950–1965 [Peasant yard in the Russian Non-Black Earth Region 1950–1965]. Moscow: Vologda. 1991. 253 p. (In Russian).
4. *Volkov I.M.* Trudovoy podvig sovetskogo krestyanstva v poslevoyennyye gody. Kolkhozy SSSR v 1946–1950 gg. [Labor feat of the Soviet peasantry in the postwar years. Collective farms of the USSR in 1946-1950]. Moscow: Mysl. 1972. 293 p. (In Russian).
5. *Gorlov V.N.* Neudachnaya popytka N.S. Khrushchova sozdat agrogoroda v Moskovskoy oblasti v poslevoyennoye vremya. Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta. Seriya: Istoriya i gumanitarnyye nauki. [An unsuccessful attempt by N.S. Khrushchev to create an agro-city in the Moscow region in the post-war period. Bulletin of the Moscow State Regional University. Series: History and Humanities]. 2019. No. 4. pp. 226–229. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/osobennosti-agrarnogo-reformirovaniya-1930-1950-h-godov> (accessed: 27.06.2020) (In Russian).
6. *Dryndin V.L., Krivorotov A.F.* Popytka reformirovaniya agrarnoy i promyshlennoy sfer RF (1953–1964 gg.) v kontekste spetsifiki otechestvennoy istorii [An attempt to reform the agrarian and industrial spheres of the Russian Federation (1953-1964) in the context of the specifics of Russian history]. Orenburg. 2000. 689 p. (In Russian).
7. *Ilinykh V.A.* Agrarnyy stroy Sibir v XX veke: etapy transformatsii. Yezhegodnik po agrarnoy istorii Vostochnoy Yevropy. 2012. Tipologiya i osobennosti agrarnogo

- razvitiya Rossii i Vostochnoy Yevropy XX–XXI vv. [The agrarian system of Siberia in the XX century: stages of transformation. Yearbook on the agrarian history of Eastern Europe. 2012: Typology and peculiarities of the agrarian development of Russia and Eastern Europe in the 20th-21st centuries]. Moscow: Bryansk. 2012. pp. 620–629 (In Russian).
8. *Konyshev D.N.* Agrarnyye reformy perioda ottepeli 1953-1964 gg. [Agrarian reforms of the thaw period 1953-1964]. *Vlast*. No. 2. 2020. pp. 218–225 (In Russian).
 9. *Narodnoye khozyaystvo SSSR v 1965 g.* [The national economy of the USSR in 1965]. Moscow: TSSU SSSR. 1996. Available at: <http://istmat.info/node/26603> (accessed: 27.06.2020) (In Russian).
 10. *Narodnoye khozyaystvo Yugo-Osetii. Statisticheskiy sbornik* [The national economy of South Ossetia. Statistical collection.]. Tskhinvali. V. IV. 1960. 486 p. (In Russian).
 11. *Narodnoye khozyaystvo Yugo-Osetinskoy Autonomous Region 1922–1982 gg. Statisticheskiy sbornik* [National economy of the South Ossetian Autonomous Okrug 1922–1982. Statistical collection.]. Tskhinval. 1983. Izdatelstvovo «Iriston». 122 p. (In Russian).
 12. *Nefedova T.G.* Transformatsiya selskogo khozyaystva Rossii: mifologiya i realnost [Transformation of Russian agriculture: mythology and reality]. *Mir Rossii*. 2013. No. 1. pp. 29–60 (In Russian).
 13. *Popov V.P.* Neizvestnaya initsiativa Khrushchova [Khrushchev's unknown initiative]. *Otechestvennyye arkhivy*. No. 2. 1993. pp. 31–40 (In Russian).
 14. *Tonayevskaya N.S.* Rabochiye sovkhozov Zapadnoy Sibiri. 1959–1965 gg. [Workers of state farms in Western Siberia. 1959-1965]. Novosibirsk: Nauka. 1978. 189 p. (In Russian).
 15. *Khrushchov N.S.* O dalneyshem razvitii kolkhoznogo stroya i reorganizatsii mashinno-traktornykh stantsiy. [On the further development of the collective farm system and the reorganization of machine-tractor stations]. Moscow. Gospolitizdat. 1958. 34 p. (In Russian).

3 August, 2020

¹ The article was funded by The Russian Humanitarian Science Foundation, project number 20-510-07003 of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of South Ossetia, "Development of the agricultural sector as a factor in improving the standard of living and migration attractiveness of the Republic of South Ossetia."