

On Some Aspects of Soviet Kolkhoz Farmers'
Attitude toward the Stalin Regime

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2016-03-10 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 日臺, 健雄 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://saigaku.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/146

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0
International License.



On Some Aspects of Soviet Kolkhoz Farmers' Attitude toward the Stalin Regime

日 臺 健 雄

HIDAI, Takeo

After the collectivization process in the late 1920s and early 1930s, the Soviet authorities introduced a new model charter for all kolkhozy from the year 1935. The process seemed to be successful, but in fact there were many violations of the charter by kolkhozniki (kolkhoz farmers). This paper discusses some aspects of kolkhoz farmers' attitude toward the new charter, especially violations against it in the latter half of the 1930s, focusing on the Ural region.

Introduction

After the collectivization of the farmers under the Stalin regime, the relationship between the Soviet authorities and farmers changed. Kolkhoz farmers felt that they had been dispossessed of their lands by the state authorities through the process of collectivization.

Under these circumstances, the Stalin administration changed its policy towards the peasants. In February 1935, the Second Congress of Outstanding Kolkhozniki (*kolkhozniki-udarniki*) was held in Moscow. At the Congress, a new version of the Kolkhoz Model Charter was recognized. This new charter was to be adopted by every kolkhoz,

by a full membership meeting, with only small adjustments for specific conditions in each kolkhoz. The same year, in July, a new law was passed, "On the issue of certification of indefinite (eternal) land-use of the agricultural cooperative association (*artel'*).” According to this new law, every *artel'* (kolkhoz) had the right to receive "state certification as an agricultural *artel'* with indefinite (eternal) land-use rights," or "state certification." This meant that the Stalin administration made concessions to the peasants:¹⁾ it recognized eternal tenure of land for the kolkhoz collectives and private use of specific plots by the members of the kolkhoz. This meant that the state authorities approved private cultivation by the kolkhoz farmers.

キーワード：ソ連、ウラル、スターリン体制、コルホーズ、農民
Key words : Soviet Union, Ural region, Stalinist regime, kolkhoz, farmer

These concessions were included in the chapters of the new version of the Kolkhoz Model Charter, and the Stalin administration made each kolkhoz adopt the new charter. The process of adoption by kolkhozy seems to have been completed rapidly. For example, in Sverdlovsk *Oblast'* (State), located in the Ural region, this process was almost 90% complete by the end of 1936. But what seemed to be a high level of acceptance belied an underlying disregard for what was meant to be the most basic and important directive to kolkhozy by the state in the late 1930s and afterwards.

This negligence by peasants of the new version of the charter raises the following question: how did Soviet peasants react to the new policy of the Stalin administration that included some concessions to the kolkhozniki (kolkhoz peasants)? The reactions of the peasants showed that they accepted the new kolkhoz policy on the surface and the adoption process of the new charter by kolkhoz full-member meetings had been swift,²⁾ but after this adoption, the kolkhoz peasants violated the new charter that they had at first officially accepted. We have to inquire into the real aspects of how peasants adopted (or neglected and violated) the new version of the Kolkhoz Charter.

We will discuss these subjects using a number of historical materials, including fiscal statements of individual kolkhozy, stored in the archives in Sverdlovsk *Oblast'* (State) of the Ural region, on the border between the European part and the Siberian part of the Russian Republic.

As already discussed, in February 1935, the Second Congress of Outstanding Kolkhozniks was held, and at the Congress, a new revised version of Model Charter of Artel' was approved. In July of the same year, new legislation followed, "On the issue of certification of indefinite (eternal) land-use rights to the agricultural artel'." After these acts announced from Moscow, each district (raion) administration made a concrete draft of the new charter for each kolkhoz, filled with specific figures to be met within the kolkhoz, and each kolkhoz adopted it after discussion in the full-member meetings. These adopted charters were registered by the Soviet state, and in exchange for state registration, the Soviet regime issued state certification for eternal land-use rights to the kolkhoz. Almost all the content of the drafts is the same as the Model Charter, except for a very few concrete figures to be met according to the specific conditions of each kolkhoz. Therefore, we can discuss the situation around the new Kolkhoz Charter using the material of the Model Charter.

1. On the usage of an employed external workforce in general

According to the provisions of the new charter, kolkhoz work in general, such as cultivation, should only be done by members of that kolkhoz, and using externally provided labor for these works was prohibited in principle. Article No.13 of the charter required that, in the kolkhoz, "employed laborers can be used for agricultural works only for their

expertise and education such as agricultural engineers, industrial engineers, assistant engineers, etc.,” and “temporary force laborers can be employed only when the required works cannot be accomplished within a given period by using the workforce of that kolkhoz, or for construction work.” The regulations of the new charter were very strict, but in fact there were many violations due largely to labor shortages, broadly in the late 1930s in Sverdlovsk State.

1.1 Trends in using an employed external work force

Table 1 indicates the trends in using an external workforce in Sverdlovsk State (this table was attached to the explanatory document on the review of the main discussion topics of the annual reports by kolkhozy in Sverdlovsk State of the year 1939).³⁾ According to the table, the number of employed laborers who were engaged in cultivation amounted to 70.1% of the entire employed labor force (unit: person-day). This tells us that the number of laborers engaged in cultivation, the “core work” of the kolkhoz,

was large.

In the next year, 1938, the proportion above decreased to 38.1%, and, in 1939, to 16.3%. This decrease is assessed in Table 2 and Table 3, as well as in the document below. “This decrease in using employed workforce in the kolkhozy of the state is insufficient. Employment of a workforce is in violation of the Charter of the Agricultural Artel’. In our state, there are many violations of this kind. A total of 13,329 kolkhozniki did not achieve the minimum work-days, 2,792 kolkhozniki did not work even one work-day, 89,951 kolkhozniki worked fewer than 100 work-days, and 1,616 kolkhozy were dependent on employment of labor force.”

This assessment indicates that in spite of the decreasing use of employed labor, dependence on employment of labor force in their “core” work, cultivation, was still widely seen, a basic violation of the charter. It is noteworthy that about 77% of all kolkhozy in the state, 1,616 kolkhozy, still employed a labor force, though the number of employed laborers decreased remarkably from 1937 to 1939.

Table 1 Employment of Work Force in Kolkhoz of Sverdlovsk State

	1937		1938		1939		1940	
	(person per day)	(%)	(person per day)	(%)	(person per day)	(%)	(person per day)	(%)
Whole number of employment of work force, including temporary one	1,488,954	100	824,417	100	503,835	100	479,598	100
Cultivation work	1,043,794	70.1	314,384	38.1	82,267	16.3	128,582	8.5
Construction work	148,270	10.0	169,441	20.6	146,497	29.1	152,421	17.3
Supporting firms	112,014	7.5	120,270	14.6	84,178	16.7	54,241	10.6
Other works	184,876	12.4	220,322	26.7	190,893	37.9	144,354	97.0

Source: 1937-1939; ЦДООСО . Ф . 4. Оп . 35. Д . 286. Л . 43-51 об . (also in *Колхозная жизнь на Урале 1935-1953*, Москва , 2006, С.304.)
1940; ЦДООСО . Ф . 4. Оп . 35. Д . 287. Л . 55-79. (also in *Колхозная жизнь на Урале 1935-1953*, Москва , 2006, С.320.)

Table 2 Trends of Work-Day Unit of Kolkhozniki in Sverdlovsk State

	1937	1938	1939	1940
Whole number of <i>Kolkhozniki</i> who engaged in production work of Kolkhoz	271,975	262,158	286,302	–
Overage male, workable	108,201	105,714	113,162	–
Overage female, workable	126,478	118,825	129,647	–
Underage members (age 12-16)	37,296	37,619	43,493	–
Proportion of work-day unit of <i>Kolkhozniki</i> (including underage member) in the accounting years				
under 50 units of work-day	19.2	19.6	17.6	
51-100 units of work-day	13.0	13.0	13.8	11.4
101 – 200 units of work-day	23.1	21.9	22.9	25.3
201-300 units of work-day	21.0	19.7	19.2	22.9
301 – 400 units of work-day	13.7	13.9	13.8	
over 401 units of work-day	10.0	11.9	12.7	40.4
Numbers of <i>Kolkhozniki</i> who didn't achieve even one unit of work-day				
Overage male, workable	n.a.	1,847	528	–
Overage female, workable	11,769	4,722	2,264	–
Underage members	n.a.	5,946	n.a.	–
Numbers of over age <i>Kolkhozniki</i> who didn't achieve legal minimum unit of work-day (under 60 units of work-day)				
	n.a.	n.a.	13,329	10,047

Source:1937-1939; ЦДООСО . Ф . 4. Оп . 35. Д . 286. Л . 43-51 об . (also in *Колхозная жизнь на Урале 1935-1953*, Москва , 2006, С.304.)
 1940; ЦДООСО . Ф . 4. Оп . 35. Д . 287. Л . 55-79. (also in *Колхозная жизнь на Урале 1935-1953*, Москва , 2006, С.320.)

Table 3 Numbers of Kolkhozniki who didn't achieve even one unit of work-day in Sverdlovsk State (excluding underage member)

	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
Male	9,290	n.a.	1,847	528	271
Female	10,002	n.a.	4,722	2,264	833
Total	19,292	11,769	6,569	2,792	1,104
Percentage in whole number of <i>Kolkhozniki</i>	7.8	4.7	2.8	1.1	0.5

Source: ЦДООСО . Ф . 4. Оп . 35. Д . 287. Л . 55-79. (also in *Колхозная жизнь на Урале 1935-1953*, Москва . 2006. С.320.)

Here, it can be said that there are in fact many kolkhozy after the year 1935 that deviated from “what kolkhozy should have been” from the viewpoint of the Stalin regime. There were many such kolkhozy especially in 1936 and 1937, according to the trend of usage of employed labor force and trend of the number of kolkhozniki who did not work even one work-day.

1.2 Incentives to use an employed external workforce

Let us consider the following quotation from the document above. “Kolkhozy spent a lot of money on payment for an employed workforce. A total of 5,101,628 rubles were spent for the purpose above from kolkhoz accounts (in Sverdlovsk State), but most of that money could be spent on payment for kolkhoz members.” Here, we see that a large amount of money was spent on the employment of workforce using the cash

income of the kolkhoz, with concrete figures. It should also be added that kolkhoz members chose to spend money for employment of an external workforce in exchange for decreased cash stock. The important point to note is this: What was the incentive for kolkhoz peasants to avoid cultivation work on their own kolkhoz at the expense of the cash money of the kolkhoz? The following sentence of the document offers some clue. "With suitable organization and discipline to regulate kolkhoz works, kolkhozy in our state could have undertaken their work without employment of workforce, and they could have provided highly much more workforce for industrial sector than that of actual achievement."

There is a suggestion here that in those days in Sverdlovsk State, there were many demands on the workforce, and the necessity for labor transfer from the agricultural sector to industrial was very high, with the background that the Stalin administration forced this industry-centered economic plan on the Union nationwide. Here, we can point out the possibility that a kolkhoz member who lived not far from a factory might choose to work there and avoid cultivation work in his own kolkhoz, at the expense of the cash income from the kolkhoz. And external laborers, kolkhozniki of other kolkhozy or independent farmers, who might want to earn some cash, might fill any gaps in the workforce there. There is another possibility: kolkhoz members might choose to work on the garden plots of their own houses, not on the common land of the kolkhoz, because they could

dispose of products from their garden plot relatively freely. The number of working hours devoted to work in garden plots might have increased because the earnings from common kolkhoz working such as cultivation works were very little, not enough to survive on.

So this was the situation, "unusual" and "unexpected" from the viewpoint of Stalinism, whereby there was high employment of an external workforce in kolkhozy, in other words, there were many violations of the "core" regulation of the new Kolkhoz Charter. But this situation was caused by such incentives for kolkhoz peasants to avoid cultivation work on their own kolkhoz, and these incentives were the result of Stalin's extreme industrialization strategy as well as the survival strategy of the peasants.

2. Case study of a kolkhoz and policy change of the Stalin regime

We have discussed the use of employed labor force by kolkhozy in Sverdlovsk State in general. Let us devote more space to discussing the concrete situation there, examining some specific cases of kolkhozy. The following is an example of usage of an employed external labor force in a kolkhoz, located in Komensk district (raion), the name of which is Proletarka. Every kolkhoz had to submit annual documents to the Soviet government, and in the State Archive of Sverdlovsk State (GASO/ГАСО) there are annual documents of the kolkhoz Proletarka, submitted to the People's Commissariat of Land, and the documents include annual

accounting reports of Proletarka kolkhoz from 1936 to 1939, with specific figures (see Table 4 and Table 5).

2.1. Case of the kolkhoz Proletarka

Table 4 indicates that in this kolkhoz in 1936, the number of *dvor* (rural family unit) was 86 and the number of *kolkhozniki* was 302. It is clear from Table 5 that the ratio of expenditure on employment of workforce to the whole cash expenditure is large. There are no data on the amount of expenditure on employment of a workforce itself for the year 1936, because the item of “other expenditure, cost” in Table 5 includes this amount.

In 1936, in “expenditure relevant to production,” there is an item “Other expenditure, cost (including employment of workforce).” In the item is included payment for employment of workforce, so in the year 1936, there is no concrete figure for such payment, but in 1937, there is a concrete figure for “Employment of workforce,” that is, 12,809.5 rubles.

According to Table 6, in the year 1936, the

total person-days of the employed workforce in the kolkhoz was 1,078, and in 1937, this figure is 2,713, about 2.5 times that in 1936. So, with simple calculation, payment of rubles per person-day in 1937 was about 4.72 rubles.

The figure for payment for employment of workforce in 1937 is about 20% of the total cash income of the kolkhoz (63,780.24 rubles) and about 46% of the total expenditure relevant to production (27,764.2 rubles). It should be noted that in the payment for “Employment of workforce,” payment for employed construction workers is included, so we cannot evaluate the amount of payment for an external workforce engaged in the “core” work of the kolkhoz, cultivation work, with the data of the year 1937. But the data indicate that the payment for construction workers was 5,093 rubles in 1938 and 1,910.32 rubles in 1939, so an estimated figure of payment for cultivation work might be around 3493.74 rubles in 1938 and 984.54 rubles in 1939.

These data coincide with the general trend, that is, decrease in employment of an external workforce by kolkhozy.

So, from the viewpoint of participation of

Table 4 *Dvor* and *Kolkhozniki* of “Proletarka”

	Jan.1,1937	Jan.1,1938	Jan.1,1939	Jan.1,1940
Number of <i>Dvor</i> (including single persons)	86	96	84	96
Number of <i>Kolkhozniki</i> (excluding withdrawal persons as of Jan. 1)	302	295	296	266
Over age of 16, workable	128	179	181	184
Age from 12 to 16	35	30	25	24
Other <i>Kolkhozniki</i> who went out from Kolkhoz as of Jan. 1 (Red Army, school, seasonal work, service)	17	34	12	38

Source: 1937 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303. Оп . 1. Ед . хр . (Дело) . 451. Л . 1.
 1938 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303. Оп . 1. Ед . хр . (Дело) . 454. Л . 2.
 1939 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303. Оп . 1. Ед . хр . (Дело) . 458. Л . 2.
 1940 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303. Оп . 1. Ед . хр . (Дело) . 459. Л . 6 о б .

Table 5 Annual Fiscal Statements of Kolkhoz "Proletarka" (extracts)

(unit: rubles)	1936		1937		1938		1939	
	plan	result	plan	result	plan	result	plan	result
Total cash income	-	57,038.09	-	63,780.24	-	74,149.63	-	60,797.74
Tax on cash income	3,010	2,795	2,813	1,786	4,093.74	5,570.80	4,500	4,313.37
Insurance cost	3,000	1,700	3,200	2,020	2,700	7,084.77	5,200	4,581.24
Other expenditure	600	2,143.6	500	0	-	-	-	-
Deduction to undivided fund	13,400	6,883	14,000	2,323.2	-	11,122	12,765	9,179
Expenditure relevant to production								
Repair of facility, machine	1,530	1,059.5	1,600	598.3	1,000	562.45	2,000	1,465.46
Purchase of seed, plant	100	293.3	700	446.7	2,500	2,096.5	4,000	3,913.05
Purchase of feed for animal	500	584.6	2,000	1,597.1	0	192.5	10,000	4,095
Medical cost of animal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	609.77
Purchase of fertilizer	-	-	400	0.0	250	-	200	-
Purchase of tools to exterminate vermin	150	130.9	150	80.1	50	197.05	150	138.98
Purchase of fuel and lubricating oil	2,500	3,318.5	4,500	4,266.4	3,000	4,722.63	5,000	3,715.43
Purchase of materials for supporting firm	100	725.4	100	258.5	500	442.16	500	430.13
Payment for work of MTS	1,000	184.7	500	50	1,000	650	1,000	1,267.45
Payment for employed specialist (veterinarian, agronomist, etc.)	1,300	2,387.6	3,000	2,711.6	2,300	2,128.25	-	-
Purchase of flour mill	1,300	972.3	2,000	2,106.9	1,000	437.06	1,000	869.69
Payment for employed work force	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,000	2,894.86
Other expenditure, cost (including employment of work force) (breakdown)	3,700	6,552.6	-	-	(unidentified)	8,586.74	-	-
Employment of work force	-	-	5,500	12,809.5	-	-	-	-
Fine and penalty	-	-	-	2,439.7	-	-	-	-
Total expenditure relevant to production	12,780	16,209.7	20,450	27,764.2	(unidentified)	20,829.5	25,357	20,017.17
Payment for employed administrative personnel	350	232.3	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
Other expenditure	750	718.3	1,400	877.1	1,000	350.96	1,000	534.76
Total expenditure for administrative work	1,050	950.5	1,400	877.1	1,000	350.96	1,000	534.76
Payment for employed work force relevant to construction work	-	-	-	-	4,000	5,093	7,000	1,910.32
Deduction to specific fund	3,200	1,000	4,500	2,000	-	-	-	-

Source: 1936 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303. Оп . 1. Ед . хр . (Дело) 451. Л . 4 о б .
 1937 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303. Оп . 1. Ед . хр . (Дело) 454. Л . 6 .
 1938 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303. Оп . 1. Ед . хр . (Дело) 458. Л . 6-6 о б .
 1939 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303. Оп . 1. Ед . хр . (Дело) 459. Л . 11-11 о б .

Table 6 Incentive and Usage of Employed Work Force of Kolkhoz “Proletarka” (unit: person-day)

	1936	1937	1938	1939	
Cultivation	Individual farmer	307	1,473	920	-
	Member of other Kolkhoz	21			
Construction	690	1,000	620	476	
Firms (supporting)		-	60	-	
Other works	30		30	-	
Service			-	-	
	Driving vehicle	30	240	210	286
Total person-day	1,078	2,713	1,840	762	

Source: 1936 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303 . Оп . 1 . Ед . хр . (Дело) . 451 . Л . 1 .
 1937 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303 . Оп . 1 . Ед . хр . (Дело) . 454 . Л . 2 .
 1938 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303 . Оп . 1 . Ед . хр . (Дело) . 458 . Л . 2 .
 1939 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303 . Оп . 1 . Ед . хр . (Дело) . 459 . Л . 6 о б .

kolkhozniki in common kolkhoz work, Table 7 indicates that in the kolkhoz, in the year 1936, about 25% of kolkhozniki achieved only 50 or fewer work-days, and at the same time, the kolkhoz employed an external workforce for cultivation, according to Table 6. Here, we notice that in the kolkhoz Proletarka, many members did not engage in their “core” work—cultivation—and the kolkhoz employed an external workforce by way of compensation. Table 6 shows that among

these employed external laborers, about 30% in 1936 and about 54% in 1937, were engaged in cultivation works.

Note that, from what has been discussed, the figures for the kolkhoz Proletarka coincide with the general trend of employment of external workforce in the whole of Sverdlovsk State.

Table 7 Trend of participation in common works of Kolkhoz “Proletarka”

Year	Over age 16								Over age 12, under 16				Total			
	Male				Female											
	1936	1937	1938	1939	1936	1937	1938	1939	1936	1937	1938	1939	1936	1937	1938	1939
Under 50 units of work-day	9	11	14	6	27	11	19	10	21	19	13	10	57	41	46	26
51-100 units of working -day	14	7	8	5	11	10	12	5	11	7	5	6	36	24	25	17
101-200 units of work-day	13	22	13	13	24	22	25	15	7	4	4	8	44	48	42	36
201-300 units of working -day	22	20	21	19	25	29	15	23	4	2	2	-	51	51	38	42
301-400 units of work-day	10	16	16	22	18	15	7	13	-	-	1	-	28	31	24	35
over 400 units of work-day	9	9	10	15	3	12	10	5	-	-	-	-	12	21	20	20
Total number of <i>Kolkhozniki</i> who participated in common works of Kolkhoz	77	85	82	80	108	99	88	71	43	32	25	24	228	216	195	176
Numbers of <i>Kolkhozniki</i> without achievement of work-day unit	1	9	1	1	4	18	4	11	-	-	6	-	5	27	11	12

Source: 1936 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303 . Оп . 1 . Ед . хр . (Дело) . 451 . Л . 1 .
 1937 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303 . Оп . 1 . Ед . хр . (Дело) . 454 . Л . 2 .
 1938 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303 . Оп . 1 . Ед . хр . (Дело) . 458 . Л . 2 .
 1939 : ГАСО . Ф . р -2303 . Оп . 1 . Ед . хр . (Дело) . 459 . Л . 6 о б .

2.2. Policy change of the Stalin regime toward kolkhoz

Confronted with these widespread violations of the new charter's regulation, in 1938, the Stalin regime changed its policy toward the kolkhoz peasants, from concessionary to offensive. The Communist Party and Soviet government decided to enact the laws "On the prohibition of expulsion of kolkhoz members from their kolkhoz" and "On the unjust distribution of income in kolkhozy." In the next year, 1939, for kolkhozniki, the regulation of minimum work-days assignment of common work on the kolkhoz was established legally. According to this legal minimum work-day regulation, those kolkhoz members who did not achieve the minimum work-days of common work in their kolkhoz would lose their benefits as a member of the kolkhoz. In May of the same year, a new decision was promulgated: "On measures for protection of common kolkhoz land from seizure by members," which prohibited kolkhozniki from unregulated diversion of common land of the kolkhoz for their own garden plot purposes.

These changes in policy toward the kolkhoz peasants resulted in a decrease in the number of kolkhozniki who did not achieve even one work-day in 1938, and at the same time, the number of external laborers employed by the kolkhoz decreased.

3. Conclusions

As discussed, in kolkhozy, there was significant use of external workforce, in

violation of the new version of the Kolkhoz Charter after 1935, especially until 1937. The local Soviet powers criticized those kolkhozy that used excessive external labor while there was very little common work done by kolkhoz members, with such expressions as "appearance of sovkhov in the form of kolkhoz" in the proceedings of the Council of Sverdlovsk State "On expulsion of kolkhozniki from kolkhoz" as of March 19, 1938.⁴⁾ Here, the members of the Council used metaphors such as "sovkhov in the form of kolkhoz." The sovkhov was a state firm with employed workers and all workers including cultivation workers were paid wages, and the kolkhoz was instead a cooperative whose members were not paid "workers." So, against the existence of many kolkhoz that used an external employed workforce on temporary cash pay, the local authorities used the metaphor "appearance of sovkhov in the form of kolkhoz," finding common ground between such kolkhozy and sovkhov. There was a large difference between them, however. Sovkhov workers were guaranteed an income and pension by the Soviet authorities as they were members of a state firm, but kolkhoz members were not guaranteed an income or pension by the Soviet authorities, because they were only members of a cooperative, not a state firm. It was only after World War II that the pension system was extended to members of kolkhozy.

With no guarantee of income by the Soviet State, kolkhozniki had to act so as to survive and they ignored the Kolkhoz Charter and

other regulations, independently and sometimes systematically. Here, kolkhoz members were not exemplary conformists to the Stalin regime as was expected of them, but tough peasants who acted in their own way.

References

- 1) About this “concession,” see S. Fitzpatrick, *Stalin's Peasants* (Oxford, 1994), p. 121.
- 2) On this process, see T. Hidai, “New model charter of kolkhoz and Soviet peasants in the latter half of the 1930's: State certifications and arrangements of land-use in the Ural region,” *Japanese Journal of Comparative Economics*, vol. 49, no. 2, 2012 (in Japanese).
- 3) Source: Центр документации общественных организаций Свердловской области (ЦДООСО). Ф. 4. Оп. 35. Д. 286. Л. 43-51 о б. (also in *Колхозная жизнь на Урале 1935-1953*. Москва. 2006. С.301-316.) .This document was written in May 1940 by the deputy vice chief of national economic calculation of the Sverdlovsk State Department, and the chief of national economic calculation of the section for agricultural accounting, Sverdlovsk State Department.
- 4) ЦДООСО. Ф. 4. Оп. 31. Д. 30. Л. 178. (also in *Колхозная жизнь на Урале 1935-1953*. Москва. 2006. С. 207) .