

UDC 94(477):331.108(1-22)«1929–1939»
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.10.159168

Sergii BILAN

PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor, Head of Department of International Relations and Social Sciences of National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, 15 Heroiv Oborony Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 03041 (bilanso@ukr.net)

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0256-2499>

ResearcherID: B-6760-2019 (<http://www.researcherid.com/rid/B-6760-2019>)

Сергій БІЛАН

доктор історичних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри міжнародних відносин і суспільних наук Національного університету біоресурсів і природокористування України, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна, 03041 (bilanso@ukr.net)

Бібліографічний опис статті: Bilan, S. (2019). Staffing the Ukrainian village with agricultural specialists (1929 – 1939). *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 10, 149–160. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.10.159168

**STAFFING THE UKRAINIAN VILLAGE
WITH AGRICULTURAL SPECIALISTS (1929 – 1939)**

Summary. *The purpose of the research is to analyze the problems and ways of personnel support of agricultural production, its impact on the formation of the social composition of the Ukrainian peasantry and to highlight its impact on the processes of transformation in 1929 – 1939. The research methodology is based on the principles of historicism, objectivity, pluralism, multifactor, systematic character, comprehensiveness and continuity. The principle of historicism was implemented by a consistent analysis of the dynamics of the structural elements of the socioeconomic and national-cultural development of the Ukrainian village in 1929 – 1939 in the context of Soviet national policy. In his research the author kept to the principle of objectivity by using a significant number of historical facts, achievements of historiography, authenticity of written sources. Methodological pluralism is determined by the presence of various theoretical models of elucidation of political and social history, the main conceptual foundations of which are theories of totalitarianism and the principles of modernization. The system approach required an adequate methodology that avoids one-sidedness, fragmentarity and specificity, and hence the selectivity of problem analysis. System and comprehensive approaches to the research of the history of the Ukrainian peasantry involves multidisciplinary synthesis and analysis of the chosen problem in the context of the history of Soviet politics, political science, social history, sociology, the culture of Soviet everyday life, economic history, etc. The analysis shows that the ways of forming the labor potential of the Ukrainian village and the expanded reproduction of national-cultural personnel were determined by the party-state leadership in the 30's of the twentieth century and have become an objective tendency that could be slowed down or distorted under the influence of Stalin's terror, but not canceled. The scientific novelty of the study lies in the fact that for the first time in modern historiography stereotypes regarding the production activities of agricultural structures are critically revised under the conditions of building a general Soviet mechanism and forced industrialization in Ukraine during 1929 – 1939 and the conceptual foundations of the formation of the system of training agricultural specialists, its forms are defined and the influence on the formation of the production layer and the intellectual and professional provision of the Ukrainian village is revealed.*

Proved that the peasantry as a holistic social group suffered significant deformation and a new type of rural workers was gradually formed – collective-farmers that were influenced by Bolsheviks

ideology. They were the most characteristic and most numerous group of all able-bodied members of the population of rural territories of Ukraine with all their peculiarities that were in the interests of totalitarian power. Additionally, in 1929 – 1939 the collective-farm peasantry formed the socio-professional groups, among which the most popular and notable people were machine operators, harvester and tractor drivers, which fit into the administrative-command system and could implement the planned agrarian reforms. Thus, in fact, the beginning of the break-up of the established way of life of Ukrainian peasants was the continuous collectivization and expropriation of individual peasant farms.

Conclusions. Consequently, the conceptual foundations for the formation of the Soviet in-service training system for agrarian specialists had determined its influence on the formation of the industrial stratum and the intellectual and professional provision of the Ukrainian village and the contribution of the Ukrainian peasantry to the implementation of the social programs of the Bolshevik regime and the «socialist modernization» of Soviet society, the development of which required new labor resources.

Key words: Staffing, Ukrainian peasantry, totalitarian regime.

НАПОВНЕННЯ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО СЕЛА ФАХІВЦЯМИ АГРАРНОГО ПРОФІЛЮ (1929 – 1939)

Анотація. Мета дослідження – аналіз проблем та шляхів кадрового забезпечення сільськогосподарського виробництва, його впливу на формування соціального складу українського селянства та висвітлення його участі у трансформаційних процесах 1929 – 1939 рр. **Методологічну основу дослідження становлять** принципи історизму, об'єктивності, плюралізму, багатofакторності, системності, всебічності та наступності. **Пропонований аналіз свідчить**, що визначені партійно-державним керівництвом у 30-х рр. ХХ ст. шляхи формування трудового потенціалу українського села та розширеного відтворення національно-культурних кадрів, стали об'єктивною тенденцією, яка за умов сталінського терору могла бути уповільненою, спотвореною, але не скасованою. **Наукова новизна** дослідження полягає у тому, що вперше в новітній історіографії критично переглянуто стереотипи щодо виробничої діяльності сільськогосподарських структур за умов побудови загальногосподарського радянського механізму та форсованої індустріалізації в Україні впродовж 1929 – 1939 рр., а також концептуальні засади формування системи підготовки фахівців-аграрників, визначено її форми, розкрито вплив на формування виробничого прошарку й інтелектуально-професійне забезпечення українського села. **Висновки.** Доведено, що селянство як цілісна соціальна група зазнало істотної деформації, поступово був сформований новий тип сільських працівників – заідеологізовані більшовицькою владою колгоспники, які становили найхарактернішу і найчисленнішу групу всього працездатного населення сільських територій України з усіма притаманними їм особливостями, що відповідали інтересам тоталітарної влади. Крім того, в 1929 – 1939 рр. у складі колгоспного селянства відбулося становлення соціально-професійних груп, серед яких найбільш популярними і знатними людьми стали комбайнери, трактористи та механізатори, які вписувалися в адміністративно-командну систему та могли здійснити заплановані аграрні реформи. Відтак, фактично початком зламу усталеного укладу життя українських селян стали суцільна колективізація та експропріація індивідуальних селянських господарств.

Ключові слова: кадрове забезпечення, українське селянство, тоталітарний режим.

Problem statement. During the last years, problems in the sphere of preservation and development of the labor potential of the Ukrainian village, which has lost its attractiveness for living, work and development of the rural population, has become considerably aggravated. This situation has been the result of long unsuccessful political and economic reforms. In particular, Ukraine has been affected by the consequences of disastrous Soviet agrarian policy, which requires a detailed study of the fundamental changes that have taken place in Ukrainian lands in the twentieth century.

The analysis of sources and recent researches. Problems of regulation of the processes of using the labor potential of the Ukrainian village and the formation of the culture of its social and labor relations were studied by N. Anisimov, M. Viltan, Yu. Kurnosov, V. Sadovsky and others (Anisimov, 1946, Vyltsan, 1973, Kurnosov, 1981; Sadovsky, 1935).

Among the works of the modern period the most notable are the researches of Yu. Borisov, G. Burshanov, O. Grishnova, V. Danilenko, S. Drovosyuk, T. Zayats, G. Kasyanov, B. Kravchenko, S. Kulchytsky, L. Kustrich, L. Lanovyuk, O. Lisovskaya, V. Marochko, Y. Prisyazhnyuk, I. Rybak, I. Romanyuk, Y. Fedorenko, Yu. Shapoval, M. Shytyuk, in which the political, socio-economic and spiritual aspects of collectivization, dispossession, famine, deportations and repression of the rural population of Ukraine during the 1930's were uncovered (Borisov, 1991; Burshanov, 2001; Grishnova, 2013; Danilenko, Kasyanov, Kulchytsky, 1991; Dorovyuz, 2005; Zayats, 2017; Kravchenko, 1997; Kulchyts'kij, 1999; Kustrich, 2017; Lanovyuk, 2018; Lisovskaya, 2018; Marochko, 2012; Prisyajnyuk, 2018; Rybak, 2000; Romanyuk, 2011; Fedorenko, 2018; Shapoval, 1993; Shitjuk, 2014). Of considerable interest are the dissertations of T. Vronskaya, O. Lukashevich, Ya. Mandryka and V. Sharpathy (Vronska, 2009; Lukashevich, 2006; Mandrik, 1998; Sharpathy, 2007). However, despite a large number of works directly or indirectly affecting the chosen problem, most of them have fragmentary coverage of the 1929–1939 period. This period is characterized by the final approval of the totalitarian political regime, the introduction of command and administrative methods of governance, changes in ownership forms and management and, ultimately, the socio-economic and national-cultural shift of the Ukrainian peasantry.

Therefore, the **aim of this paper** is to analyze the influence of the transformational processes of the agrarian sector on its intellectual and professional provision, quantitative and qualitative parameters of training of agricultural specialists in the late 1920's and 1930's.

Statement of the basic material. The transformation of the agrarian sector and changes in the structure of an agricultural production during the period 1929 – 1939 led to the demand for skilled agricultural personnel. However, in conditions of forced and expanded reproduction of professional generation, all the peculiarities inherent to the Soviet system led to a radical change in the social composition, including agricultural specialists. The party-state leadership of the USSR did not pay attention to the personnel issue in the agrarian sector, but instead they focused on the spread of their influence on the process of personnel selection, and gradually the code of professional dignity was replaced by a code of ideological stamps, which radically changed the socio-psychological type of Ukrainian peasantry.

In particular, the organization and nature of production in collective and state farms of Ukraine in 1929 – 1939 led to the use of both permanent and temporary employees. The contingent of permanent employees included a managerial unit (the director (chairman of the collective farm), his deputies, district heads), agrotechnical staff (engineering and technical workers, agronomists), accountants and skilled workers (tractor and harvester operators, drivers, maintenance workers). The group of temporary employees consisted of seasonal workers who worked at farms from early spring to early winter (assistant drives and operators, refuellers etc.) and hired workers who were hired for the period of performance of certain works (threshing, trituration, loading and transport work, etc.).

The staff of state farm workers of the Ukrainian SSR were approved in 1929 and did not change throughout the prewar period (Table 1).

Table 1

Staff of the state farms (1929)

| Employees | Number of People |
|---|------------------|
| Permanent employees: | |
| – managerial unit | 5 |
| – agrotechnical staff | 18 |
| – engineering and technical staff | 16 |
| – office staff | 34 |
| – tractor drivers and other skilled workers | 133 |
| – unskilled workers | 64 |
| – Temporary employees | 540 |
| Total | 810 |

(CSAHAAU, f. 4860, d. 1, c. 4826, p. 12)

Thus, in 1929 – 1933, temporary employees accounted for the overwhelming majority of the total number of employees of the state farms (66%), which explained the low level of mechanization of harvesting operations. However, during the 1934 – 1936 the technical base of agriculture was improved, which led to the decrease of the number of temporary employees in state farms to 27% and, therefore, the vast majority of workers were the permanent employees (CSAHAAU, f. 4860, d. 1, c. 4823, p. 38).

The contingent of temporary employees was formed in several ways, the main of which was the agreements between collective and state farms, which, at first, was based on the mutual interest of both parties: the state farms cultivated a part of the collective farm lands, and the collective farms provided workers and draft animals. Subsequently, the state farms were unable to conclude agreements of this nature due to emergence of serious difficulties in the economic development of the land, and therefore, administrative methods were used. According to the instructions of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U the district and regional party committees issued orders to the administrations of the collective farms to supply workers to the state farms.

The administration of the state farms began the recruitment of employees both through the regional departments of the People's Commissariat of Labor, and through state-owned enterprises. For the most part, recruitment took place in the villages of the area where the state farm was located, but sometimes recruiters also brought employees from remote regions of Ukraine.

The widespread way of forming the contingent of temporary employees was to «mobilize» workers of urban industrial enterprises, servicemen, students, and in the state farms themselves – housewives and students of general schools. It should be noted that the use of the large number of casual people as temporary employees in the grain industry proved to be inefficient, because as a result of short-term professional training, employees had low level of qualification that did not correspond to the complex nature of mechanized production. In addition, the situation was complicated by the huge flow of temporary employees, which reached 60–70% of the total number of workers each year.

Gradually, with the expansion of the activity of state-owned companies, the staffing of management personnel and specialists occurred through training courses, contracting and free hiring. Thus, most directors of Ukrainian state farms were appointed after short courses at the Central Committee of the CPSU(b). The positions of the technical deputy directors

were staffed with specialists from the sugar industry. In particular, for the training of management specialists of state farms, the Higher agro-industrial courses with a one-year training period were opened in Kharkiv in 1933 (SARF, f. P-5446, d. 14, c. 2439, p. 46).

In the second half of the 1930-ies the training of management personnel and specialists for state farms and collective farms was organized through a network of higher educational institutions and technical schools. In particular, they studied in the Kiev Agricultural Institute, a number of higher educational institutions in the city of Kharkiv (Institute of grain crops, agricultural, engineering-economic and road-building institutes), Odessa Institute of grain crops, Kherson Agricultural Institute and many others.

Engineering, technical and agronomic staff were formed through contracting students and the use of hiring systems. It is noteworthy that the graduates were selected based on social background and party affiliation and the level of qualification of future specialists was not considered, and therefore, the hired personnel was unskilled. Thus, in 1933 – 1934, due to «some difficulties in agriculture» in the Ukrainian SSR the higher educational establishments had early graduations of students, who, by contracting, were assigned to the positions of engineers, instructors, technicians, assistant managers (CSAHAAU, f. 27, d. 13, c. 88, p. 19).

The specialists of agronomic and accounting groups were mostly hired for work, which was explained by their small number in comparison with engineering and technical workers in the agriculture of the investigated period. Despite the huge size of land, the state farms had only 1–3 agronomists, who often had low qualifications. For example, in Dnipropetrovsk region, in 1933, there were 150 agronomists with special agricultural education for 600 production sites (CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 20 (part III), c. 6270, p. 37), and the rest were farmers from collective farms – people who did not even know the basic principles of agronomy.

Insufficient staffing, especially the lack of local staff (district agronomists, mechanics who directly provided technical instruction, etc.) is clearly demonstrated in Table 2.

Table 2

The staffing of the collective farms of the Ukrainian SSR as of June 1, 1933

| Region | Local agronomists | | | Local mechanics | | |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| | Necessary | Available | Percentage | Necessary | Available | Percentage |
| Kyiv | 271 | 226 | 83,4 | 396 | 193 | 48,3 |
| Vinnitsa | 546 | 199 | 36,4 | 440 | 152 | 34,5 |
| Kharkiv | 288 | 100 | 34,5 | 288 | 107 | 37,1 |
| Chernihiv | 84 | 10 | 11,9 | 84 | 15 | 17,8 |

(CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 20 (part III), c. 6270, p. 37)

The existing agronomic staff was simply unable to manage the areas, which occupied 8–12 thousand hectares, since agronomists were not well acquainted with the agricultural machinery that came to the collective farms and state farms – vehicles, harvesters, tractors. It became a serious obstacle for them to act as real managers of a large mechanized economy. The vast majority of mechanics were practitioners without theoretical training who did not know the basic requirements of agrotechnics, the reasons that caused the froth of fields, the effects of shallow plowing. It reflected in the incorrect use of a vehicle park, irrational combination of mechanization with agrotechnics, inefficient use of all the technical capacity of the collective and state farms production.

The emergence of new means of labor, machines (tractors, harvesters, motor vehicles, etc.) and the creation of vehicle-tractor stations exacerbated the problem of mechanization personnel in the Ukrainian SSR agriculture, since it was required to train masses of illiterate peasants to become specialists of previously unknown mechanization professions. The Ukrainian village could not have prepared more than a quarter of a million mechanics per year; the collective farms did not have the financial resources, material resources, teaching resources and experience for this, and large industrial enterprises participated in the formation of production personnel of state farms and collective farms. Thus, at the factories of Kyiv and Kharkiv, courses for the training of mechanic instructors from among the skilled workers (turners, locksmiths, mechanics, etc.) were opened, after which they left for permanent work in the state farms and collective farms.

The greatest shortage of technical personnel during this period was felt in the field of livestock breeding. There was absolutely no information in central institutions on the number of specialists who worked in livestock farms, since their number was significantly less than the farms themselves. Therefore, there were specialists who traveled and serviced whole groups of farms, they were united in district units and were subordinate not to single farms, but to districts, and sometimes to regions. According to the data of July 1, 1934, the meat and dairy farms of the USSR were served by 2,395 specialists of higher qualification, which was only 17% of their needs and 4,625 specialists of average qualification, or 14.6% of the needs. Later, in spite of the powerful system of training of specialists in Ukraine in 1938, one zootechnic and animal husbandry technician had to service two farms, that were provided with technical specialists with higher and secondary education by 15% (Arzumanyan, 1939, p. 89).

At the beginning of the second five-year plan, the staffing problem in the state farms became so acute that even in official publications it was impossible to conceal it. In particular, in the article collection «Socialist Ukraine» it was noted: «The fluidity of the staff is incredible: it is difficult to meet a tractor driver who would work at the same state farm for 2–3 seasons. Such fluidity is also observed in the administrative and technical personnel of state farms» (Asyatkin, 1937, p. 108).

The fluidity of the personnel of agriculture has led to the fact that in collective farms, new employees occupied almost a third of the positions each year. Thus, in 1937, 45.9% of heads of collective farms, 41.1% of heads of audit commissions, 34.9% of accountants, 40% of gardeners, 54.4% of livestock workers, 33.9% of veterinarians, 43.5% of heads of livestock farms had worked for less than a year. That is, most of the former workers of these professions in 1937 had quit their job for various reasons and were replaced by others. The fluidity of collective farms personnel in 1937 exceeded the corresponding figures of 1933 – 1936 (CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 20 (part III), c. 6268, p. 91, 115, 136).

The main reason for the fluidity of the employees of the collective and state farms were the unbearable material and living conditions, which, primarily, concerned housing. In 1933, only 12% of workers of Ukrainian grain-farm holdings were provided with relatively decent housing, while the rest lived in huts, dugouts and other temporary buildings (CSAHAAU, f. 27, d. 14, c. 417, p. 94). Most of the so-called dormitories at state farms, especially in production departments, were sheds in which people slept on the ground, straw, or pallet, at best.

The Head of the Dnipropetrovsk Regional Committee of the Trade Union of Grain State Farm Workers O. Bodryi described the material and everyday state of the grain farms of 1934 – 1935: «Disorganized hostels, straw, lice, typhus, death» (CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 20 (part III), c. 6282, p. 135). The living conditions of the workers of the state farms were explained

by the policies of the Stalinist government, which mercilessly exploited the workers of the state farms for the purpose of carrying out adventurist projects. Without sufficient funding, state farm directors were not able to create decent living conditions for workers, as the construction of dozens of mechanized agricultural enterprises could only be carried out at the expense of people's health.

At the end of the second five-year plan, central farmsteads and workshops in many farms were still unfinished. Even at those farms where the number of confiscated dwellings was sufficient, their repairs were not carried out on time. Thus, in the report on the results of the trip to the state farms of the Kherson Grain Trust in the spring of 1937, the People's Commissar of the Soviet Union, T. Yurkin, wrote: «The central farmsteads of the «Bolshevik Offensive» grain farm occupies a beautiful house owned by the local kulaks, which it is very well built. However, now it is in terrible state – the walls are peeled off, the roof has holes, dirt, manure, and all the trees are broken ... The same is observed in the «Red Lighthouse» grain farm, where the central farmsteads is located in the premises of the former monastery» (Mandrik, 2005, p. 156).

The workers of the state farms of the Ukrainian SSR and their families lived hand to mouth, satisfied with a meager ration of 800–1 000 g of bread per day for workers and 400 g for servants and dependents.

The principle of remuneration of ordinary collective farm workers did not differ from the payment to their management, since for all employees of agriculture the main unit of accounting and remuneration was a workday, the difference was only that the work of heads of collective farms, foremen, heads of farms and other managers was calculated at higher rates. Thus, in 1935 in the Ukrainian SSR, on average, 158 workdays were credited to an able-bodied collective farm worker, 431.6 – to the head of the collective farm, 398.9 – to the head of the dairy farm, 350.7 workdays were credited to the foreman-farmer. In the process of income distribution, by the number of accrued working days, an average of 5.6 quintal of grain was given to the able-bodied farmer, 14.2 quintal to the head of the collective farm, 10.9 quintal to the head of the dairy farm, and 10.2 quintal to the foreman-farmer (CSAHAAU, f. 539, d. 11, c. 366, p. 18). Therefore, even if one carries out elementary calculations and divides 5.6 quintal by year for one able-bodied farmer, then it turns out to be about 1.5 kg per day, and if there were 3–5 children and infirm in his family, then they received only an average of 300–500 g per person, which actually forced the family to starve. In addition, a collective farm remuneration was not permanent and guaranteed and depended on the results of the agricultural year and the implementation of the grain procurement plan.

The difference in the salaries of the specialists of the lowest level of land authorities and vehicle-tractor station was significant as compared to the salaries of specialists who worked in regional and district organizations. Thus, in 1934 in the Kharkiv region, the head of the agronomic-industrial sector of the People's Commissariat of the USSR received 475 rubles per month, the head of the agronomy-production district department – 500, the senior agronomist of vehicle-tractor station – 210–260, agronomic deputy director of the vehicle-tractor station – 275–300. That is, the senior agronomist who worked in the field, received wages almost twice lower than a specialist in the middle category of the central and regional apparatus of the People's Commissariat of Land, who worked in the office (CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 20 (part III), c. 6292, p. 39, 46, 53). A regional agronomist who was directly responsible for the state of agriculture in the entire region, carried out complex and local agronomic planning, managed collective farms that were not serviced by vehicle-tractor station, and had to qualify

no less than a senior agronomist of the vehicle-tractor station, receive only 35% of senior agronomist's salary.

The situation was similar with respect to the senior mechanics of vehicle-tractor station, whose salary, compared to officials of the People's Commissariat of Land, was actually twice lower. The leader of the operation group of the vehicle-tractor park of the People's Commissariat of Land of the Ukrainian SSR received 450 rubles per month, engineer operator – 400, the senior mechanic of vehicle-tractor station – 180–230, the senior mechanic of the state farm – 180–220 (CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 20 (part III), c. 6291, p. 26, 28).

The measures to increase the material interest of the agricultural workers most affected mechanizers. For tractor drivers, in 1933, a guaranteed minimum wage for a working day of 2 rubles 50 kopecks and 3 kg of grain was introduced. Payment for works on the plow, where higher prices were set, was especially stimulated. Gradually, with the increase in the share of other types of tractor works (harrowing, sowing, cultivating, cleaning, etc.), there was a need to increase the payment for tractor drivers, depending on the size of the worked area. It was proposed by the All-Union Meeting of Managers of the vehicle-tractor stations and Land authorities in January 1936 by the People's Commissar of agriculture of the USSR.

The question of the use of harvesters in agriculture, the preparation of harvester drivers and their payment was discussed at the November Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) in 1934. According to their recommendations, the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) and the SNK of the USSR in April 1935 issued a resolution «On the work of harvester drivers and the compensation for their labor at the state farms and vehicle-tractor stations». Base on the resolution, the collective farm harvester drivers were enrolled in the state-owned enterprises – vehicle-tractor stations, which provided them with guaranteed wages. Importantly, the fact that the wages of harvester drivers accounted for a premium-progressive system. The same principle of payment was used as the basis for the resolution of the party and the Government «On the payment of drivers and other operators of threshing-machines», adopted in early June 1935. The arrangement of the system of remuneration of machinery mechanics significantly influenced the reduction of their fluidity. By 1933 almost half of the mechanics had left the vehicle-tractor stations each year, but in the next period (1934 – 1939) the number had reduced to only a quarter of workers.

The increase in the productivity of the vehicle-tractor park in many cases depended on the rational organization of work. Vehicle-tractor station mechanics in general, and most important and numerous of their category – tractor drivers, established a permanent tractor brigade as a basic form of organization of work. They had fixed assignment of equipment and fields, and the work of machine operators was evaluated and paid for the results of labor. The engineering and technical personnel and workshops of vehicle-tractor stations ensured the operational maintenance of the vehicles in the tractor brigades, monitored the quality of the equipment directly on the fields, therefore, the productivity of labor in the collective farms increased by more than 3–4 times in short time, substantially increasing the production of agricultural products (Gayduksky, 1997, p. 59).

The vehicle-tractor stations employed tractor and field brigades, which were a different form of labor organization, unlike collective farms and state farms. Collective farmers and mechanics had formed mutually interested relations in the tractor and field brigades, which lead to better use the labor resources of vehicle-tractor stations and collective farms. By 1935, collective farms had specialized brigades: orchard, horticultural, construction and livestock based on animal species – dairy, pig, poultry, and the others. In pursuit of a better form

of labor organization in some advanced collective farms it was decided to create integrated brigades who could fully use the vehicle-tractor station technology. They worked together on the implementation of the technological processes envisaged in the contracts of vehicle-tractor stations with the collective farms. One of the important points of the correct relationship between collective farms and vehicle-tractor stations was a rational combination of the work of the tractor brigade of vehicle-tractor stations and the collective farm's brigade. If the tractor brigade was not attached to a particular field-type brigade or a team of brigades of one collective farm, then the production results declined. Thus, in Vinnytsya region in 1936, four tractor brigades served more than 20 collective farms each, which resulted in excessive waste of working time and fuel for frequent transfers from one collective farm to another. On the other hand, there were cases when two or three tractor brigades served the same collective farm: one plows, the other sows, the third harvests, which led to the depersonalization, irresponsibility, a poor quality of work, and lower yields (Rybak, 2000, p. 14).

Gradually, the party organizations have achieved the consolidation of vehicle-tractor stations tractor brigades with certain collective farms or their field brigades. The Presidium of the Kharkiv Regional Executive Committee and the Bureau of the Regional Committee of the CPSU (b) in its resolution of February 16, 1936 «On the Plan of Spring Sowing in 1936 and Measures to Increase Productivity» decided that the tractor brigade is assigned to the collective farm for the whole year to cultivate the areas of the same field brigades (Marochko, 2012, 1, p. 247).

The charter of the agricultural artel, adopted in 1935, consolidated the collective farm brigade as its main production unit. The brigades have become larger, and their composition became constant. Thus, in 1937, on average, there were 2.2 brigades per artel, each, on average, consisted of 62 people (24 men, 30 women and 8 teenagers).

It was difficult to find favorable organizational forms among livestock farmers. People's Commissar of the Ukrainian SSR L. Papernyi in 1936 noted that «... the existing instructions on the organization and remuneration of labor in livestock collective farms, which played a great positive role in introducing unit payment on farms, are now obsolete and need to be revised» (CSAHAAU, f. 27, d. 14, c. 154, p. 23).

The main organizational disadvantage in a collective livestock farming was that a significant part of the workdays were credited for the care for cattle, and not for the production of livestock products. Taking into account the experience of leading livestock farms, the People's Commissariat of Land of the USSR developed and implemented in February 1936 a new instruction on the organization and payment for labor on farms. According to the new instruction, the collective farm management had to create a permanent livestock brigade for a period of at least three years, headed by a foreman appointed for at least two years. At the dairy farm, which was served by one brigade, the foreman was also a manager of the farm. With more than 100 cows and calves on the farm, several brigades were organized. The number of the collective farmers who worked in a permanent brigade was established taking into account the full service of all livestock. For each livestock brigade and farm, a certain amount of livestock, inventory and buildings were assigned as needed. «The work between the individual members of the brigade – as indicated in the instruction – is distributed directly by the foreman, who is obliged to use every collective farmer of his brigade at his best potential, while not allowing any nepotism during the division of work, and strictly taking into account qualification, experience and a physical strength of each of his workers». Each member of the brigade received annual and monthly tasks from the collective farm board (expectations of milk, number of calves, average daily gain of live weight of calves, etc.).

The norms of the load and the rates of the working days of each type of work on the farm were developed and approved at the general meeting of the collective farmers, taking into account the equipment of the farms, the degree of mechanization of individual production processes of the collective farms. For example, for every 100 liters of milk from the group of cows a milkmaid was credited with 1.7 workdays. Under conditions of over-fulfillment of the annual task, a milkmaid's wage was increased by 2 times in accordance with the bonus plan (CSAHAAU, f. 27, d. 14, c. 154, p. 24–25).

In line with the increase in livestock of the collective farms, the number of livestock brigades increased, they became larger and more permanent in their composition. Thus, livestock brigades who looked after cattle, were divided into three groups – for the care for dairy cattle, meat cows, young animals. The brigade serving dairy cattle (approximately 350 cows) consisted of a supervisor, a senior milkmaid, 22 main milkmaids, 4 substitute milkmaids, 8 cattle breeders, a substitute cattle breeder, a veterinarian, a controller-accountant (Viltsan, 1978, p. 105).

The flaws in the system of remuneration and the general difficulties of the collective farm's material situation were not the only reason for the high fluidity of agricultural workers. In most cases, an excessively frequent change of collective farm managers was the result of an excessive administration and unjustified interference with collective farms and vehicle-tractor stations by various organizations. Yu. I. Shapoval, analyzing the shortcomings of the personnel policy of the Soviet government, came to the conclusion that «... the negative effects of the cult of I. Stalin's person were more strongly than anywhere else» (Shapoval, 1993, p. 35). The personnel problem of the collective farms and state farms of the Ukrainian SSR was exacerbated by «cleansing» and repressions, most of which were committed at the end of the first and second five-year plans, when the Stalinist government punished the leaders for not fulfilling the five-year plans and «purified the production teams from dissidents». During the mass repressions of 1937–1938, the leadership of the collective farms and state farms suffered the most, and therefore, in order to eliminate the huge shortage of heads of various rank, the People's Commissariat of Land and the People's Commissariat of Soviet State farms began to widely apply the principle of «nomination of personnel», the essence of which was to appoint active workers to the positions of managers, most of whom did not have the appropriate education and practical experience of management work. In particular, in 1937 in the Kyiv region out of 145 directors of vehicle-tractor stations 85 were dismissed, in 7 vehicle-tractor stations directors were changed twice, and as of January 1, 1938 more than 300 vehicle-tractor stations of the Ukrainian SSR did not have directors (SSASSU, f. 16, d. 32, c. 35, p. 210–214).

Conclusions. Therefore, the adventuristic attempt by the Stalinist government to form production personnel of collective farms and state farms in the process of their forced organization has failed, and during the investigated period, the process of their final staffing was not finished. The accelerated form of training of specialists did not justify itself, because, first of all, it caused their low professional level and the inability to adequately serve agricultural production. At the same time, the striking mismatch between the needs of skilled agricultural specialists and the state of their preparation in 1929 – 1939 still forced the state to expand the system of preparation of agricultural specialists. The gradual introduction of the brigade organization of labor and the rise of the production and technical level of the peasantry improved the process of using human resources of agriculture and increased the productivity of their labor.

In order to clarify and supplement the scheme of socio-economic and national-cultural life of the Ukrainian peasantry during the years 1929 – 1939 such promising thematic groups and areas of concrete historical research can be offered: adaptation of the development of individual branches of

Ukraine's agriculture to the needs of a totalitarian state; the policy of the authorities regarding certain social and professional groups of the Ukrainian peasantry the inclusion of the Ukrainian peasantry in the ideological system of the totalitarian regime in order to influence its consciousness.

Acknowledgments. Thanks to the employees of the Sectoral State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine, the Central State Archive of the Highest Authorities of Ukraine and the Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine in Kyiv for the opportunity to process materials of different content and origin.

Funding. The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anisimov, N. (1946). *Radianske selianstvo [The Soviet peasantry]*. K.: Ukrainske vydavnytstvo politychnoi literatury, 95 p. [in Ukrainian].

Arzumanyan, A. (1939). Zhivotnovodstvo na perelome [Livestock on the turn]. *Na agrarnom fronte, 1*, 88–106. [in Russian].

Asatkin, O. M. (ed.). (1937). *Sotsialistychna Ukraina: Statystychnyi zbirnyk [Socialist Ukraine: Statistical Collection]*. Kyiv: Narodne gospodarstvo ta oblik, 267 p. [in Ukrainian].

Borysov, Yu. S. (1991). *Proizvodstvennye kadry derevni, 1917–1941: Tsivilizovannye khozyaystvenniki ili «vintiki» gosudarstvennoy mashiny? [Production personnel of the village, 1917 – 1941: Civilized business executives or «cogs» of the state machine]*. Moscow: Nauka, 227 p. [in Russian].

Burnashov, H. (2001). *Zlochyyny bilshovyzmu [The crimes of Bolshevism]*. Ivano-Frankivsk: Nova Zoria, 183 s. [in Ukrainian].

Danylenko, V. M., Kasianov, H. V. & Kulchytskyi, S. V. (1991). *Stalinizm na Ukraini: 20 – 30-ti roky [Stalinism in Ukraine: 1920 – 1930]*. Kyiv: Lybid, 344 p. [in Ukrainian].

Drovoziuk, S. I. (2005). *Natsionalno-kulturne ta dukhovne zhyttia ukrainskoho selianstva u 20 – 30-kh rr. XX st.: Istoriohrafichnyi narys [National-cultural and spiritual life of the Ukrainian peasantry in the 20 – 30's of the 20th century: Historiographical essay]*. Vinnytsia: PPO. Vlasiuk, 364 p. [in Ukrainian].

Fedorenko, Ya. (2018). Rozvytok ahrokhodnyhovykh struktur u silskii mistsevesti Ukrainy (tekhnolohichni perevahy ta sotsialni zahrozy) (Development of agricultural holding structures in Ukraine's countryside (technological advantages and social threats)). *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk, 7*, 181–189. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130673. [in English].

Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Rossiyskoy Federatsii [SARF – State Archive of the Russian Federation].

Haidutskyi, P. I. (1997). *Vidrodzhennia MTS [Restoration of vehicle-tractor stations]*. Kyiv: Polithrafknyha, 508 p. [in Ukrainian].

Haluzevyi derzhavnyi arkhiv Sluzhby bezpeky Ukrainy [SSASSU – Sectoral State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine].

Hrishnova, O. A. (2013). Sotsialni innovatsii u trudovii sferi: sutnist, vydy, osoblyvosti realizatsii v Ukraini [Social innovations in the labor: the nature, types, peculiarities of implementation in Ukraine]. *Demohrafiia ta sotsialna ekonomika, 2 (20)*, 167–178. doi: 10.15704/dse.2013.02.167. [in Ukrainian].

Kravchenko, B. (1997). *Sotsialni zminy i natsionalna svidomist v Ukraini XX st. [Social changes and national consciousness in Ukraine of the twentieth century]*. Kyiv: Osnovy, 423 s. [in Ukrainian].

Kulchytskyi, S. V. (1999). *Ukraina mizh dvoma viinamy (1921 – 1939 pp.) [Ukraine between the two wars (1921 – 1939)]*. Kyiv: Vyd. Dim «Alternatyvy», 336 p. [in Ukrainian].

Kurnosov, Yu. O. (1981). Kolhospna intelihentsiia yak sotsialna katehoriia [Collective farms intellectuals as a social category]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal, 6*, 45–54. [in Ukrainian].

Kustrich, L. O. (2017). Ekonomichna efektyvnist vykorystannia trudovykh resursiv u silskomu hospodarstvi [Economic efficiency of human resources utilization in agriculture]. *Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu «Ostrozka akademiia». Seriia «Ekonomika», 7(35)*, 28–32. doi: 10.25264/2311-5149-2017-7(35)-28-32. [in Ukrainian].

Lanoviuk, L. P. (2018). Radianskyi mif pro ukrainske selo: instrumenty manipuliatsii istorychnoiu pam'attiu [Soviet myth about the Ukrainian village: tools of manipulation of historical memory]. *Storinky istorii: zbirnyk naukovykh prats, 46*, 158–163. doi: 10.20535/2307-5244.46.2018.136739. [in Ukrainian].

- Lisovska, O.** (2018). Rol kadrovoho zabezpechennia pry intensyfikatsii silskoho hospodarstva Ukrainskoi RSR (60–80-ti roky KhKh st.) (The role of personnel supply in the intensification of agriculture in the Ukrainian SSR (1960s – 1980s)). *Skhidnoevropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk*, 6, 221–227. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.6.123757. [in Ukrainian].
- Lukashevych, O. M.** (2006). *Pobut ta dozvillia silskoho naseleння Ukrainy (1920 – 1930 rr.): (dys. ... kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.01 – Istorii Ukrainy)* [Life and leisure of the rural population of Ukraine (1920 – 1930)] (Candidate's thesis). Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskyi, 217 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Mandryk, Ya. I.** (2005). *Polityka radianskoi derzhavy u sferi kultury v ukrainskomu seli (kinets 20-kh – 30-ti roky): (dys. ... d-ra ist. nauk: 07.00.01 – Istorii Ukrainy)* [The policy of the Soviet state in the field of culture in the Ukrainian village (late 20's – 30's)] (Doctoral thesis). Lviv, 433 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Marochko, V. I.** (2012). Povsiakdenna robota v kolhospykh bryhadakh [Everyday work in collective-farm brigades]. *Ukrainske radianske suspilstvo 30-kh rr. XX st.: narysy povsiakdennoho zhyttia (1921 – 1928 rr.)*. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2, 243–252. [in Ukrainian].
- Marochko, V. I.** (2012). Trudoden – shchodenna povynnist kolhospykiv [Workday – collective farm workers' daily duty]. *Ukrainske radianske suspilstvo 30-kh rr. XX st.: narysy povsiakdennoho zhyttia (1921 – 1928 rr.)*. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2, 252–261. [in Ukrainian].
- Prysiashniuk, Yu.** Perspektivy selianoznavstva yak sfery doslidzhen suchasnoi ukrainskoi istoriografii (Prospects of peasant studies as areas of research of modern Ukrainian historiography). *Skhidnoevropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk*, 8, 187–193. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.8.143300. [in English].
- Romaniuk, I. M.** (2011). Osobyste prysadybne hospodarstvo ta yoho mistse v zhytti ukrainskoho sela 1920 – 1930 rr. [Personal household economy and its place in the life of the Ukrainian village of 1920 – 1930's]. *Visnyk instytutu istorii, etnologii i prava. Vinnytsia*, 6, 29–31. [in Ukrainian].
- Rybak, I. V.** (2000). *Sotsialno-pobutova infrastruktura ukrainskoho sela (1921 – 1991 rr.)* [Social-household infrastructure of the Ukrainian village (1921 – 1991)]. Kam'ianets-Podilskyi: Abetka, 304 s. [in Ukrainian].
- Sadovskyi, V. V.** (1935). *Robocha syla v silskomu hospodarstvi Ukrainy* [Labor force in agriculture of Ukraine]. *Pratsi Ukrainskoho naukovoho instytutu*. Varshava, 26, 147 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Shapoval, Yu. I.** (1993). *Ukraina 20–50-kh rokiv: storinky nenapysanoi istorii* [Ukraine 20-50s: unpublished history]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 351 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Sharpatyi, V. H.** (2007). *Stanovlennia ta funktsionuvannia systemy sotsialnoho zabezpechennia v Ukrainii RSR v 1920 – 30-kh rr.: istorychnyi aspekt: (dys. ... d-ra ist. nauk: 07.00.01 – Istorii Ukrainy)* [Formation and functioning of the social security system in the Ukrainian SSR in the 1920 – 30s: historical aspect] (Doctoral thesis). Kyiv, 380 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Shytiuk, M. M.** (2014). Holod 1928 – 1929 rr. u pivdennomu rehioni URSR [The famine of 1928 – 1929 in the southern region of the Ukrainian SSR]. *Naukovyi visnyk Mykolaivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu. Istorychni nauky*, 3.34, 134–148. [in Ukrainian].
- Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv hromadskykh ob'iednan Ukrainy u m. Kyiv* [CSAPAU – Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine in Kyiv].
- Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchyykh orhaniv vlady ta upravlinnia Ukrainy u m. Kyiv* [CSAHAAU – Central State Archives of the Higher Authorities and Administration of Ukraine in Kyiv].
- Vronska, T. V.** (2009). *Represii proty rodyn «vorohiv narodu» v Ukraini: ideolohiia ta praktyka (1917 – 1953 rr.): (dys. ... d-ra ist. nauk : 07.00.01 – Istorii Ukrainy)* [Repressions against the families of «enemies of the people» in Ukraine: ideology and practice (1917 – 1953)] (Doctoral thesis). Kyiv, 460 s. [in Ukrainian].
- Vyltsan, M. A.** (1973). Trudovye resursy kolkhozov v dovoennye gody (1935 – 1940 gg.). [Human resources of collective farms in the pre-war years (1935 – 1940)]. *Voprosy istorii*, 2, 31–40. [in Russian].
- Vyltsan, M. A.** (1978). *Zavershayushchiiy etap sozdaniya kolkhoznogo stroya (1935 – 1937 gg.)* [The final stage of the creation of the collective farm system (1935 – 1937)]. Moskva: Nauka, 340 s. [in Russian].
- Zaiats, T. A.** (2017). Modernizatsiia sotsialno-trudovykh vidnosyn Ukrainy: priorytetni napriamy ta pryntsyipy realizatsii [Modernization of social and labor relations of Ukraine: priority directions and principles of implementation]. *Demohrafiia ta sotsialna ekonomika*, 2, 179–192. doi: 10.15407/dse2013.02.179. [in Ukrainian].

The article was received on January 21, 2019.
Article was recommended for publishing 3.03.2019