



DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/EO.2015.006>

Федорова Марина **Peasant resistance**
(Marina I. Fedorova) **to the state reforms –**
(Omsk University of design and **1905–1964**
technology, Omsk, Rosja)

Абдыльманова Райхан
(Raykhan Abdylmanova)
(Omsk State Agrarian University
named after P.F. Stolypin,
Omsk, Rosja)

Słowa kluczowe: światowe rozwiązania; bunt; przemówienia; rajdy; kołchozy; spółdzielnie rolnicze; statut; protokoły posiedzeń zarządu i walnych zgromadzeń kołchozu pracowników; dyscyplina pracy

Keywords: global solutions; rebellion; speeches; rallies; collective farms; agricultural cooperatives; statutes; minutes of board meetings and general meetings of collective farm workers; labor discipline

Agriculture of Russia suffers structural deformations, receiving experience of interaction with the market. The peasantry influences these processes definitely: or tries to render resistance, or adapts for them¹.

Perception of socio-economic changes is one of the new directions of domestic and foreign researches of the second half of the XXth century². Not pretending on completeness of problem statement, we shall try

¹ I. E. Koznova, "Peasantry and power" – scientific conference in State Duma, w: *Peasantry. Theory. History. Modernity*, Москва 1996, s. 346–348.

² T. Shanin, *Perspectives of peasant's research and problems of parallel perception of social forms*, w: *Peasantry. Theory. History. Modernity*, Москва 1996, s. 8–24.

to consider the peasant resistance to reforms “from above” and its influence on intensity modern processes.

The active forms of resistance further are considered as open collective actions of the lowest layers and groups of the population expressing the own socio economic and political interests. They include revolts, performances, meetings concern communal decisions.

Attempting to influence a course of socio-economic transformations in the beginning of XX (1905–1907) it is possible to consider centuries communal of the decision: verdicts, orders, applications, applications, decisions, resolutions, letters, telegrams etc.³

In verdicts and orders the peasants required gratuitous alienation landowner's, state, specific, monasterial, church grounds, cancellation redeem payments and replacement of all taxes by uniform progressive – surtax for all estates, liquidation country estate, cancellation of a private property on land. For example the peasants of Mohovy village of Kursk province wrote: “Recognizing that the land is natural wealth and came into existence without human and is necessary for each person, can not belong in the property of one man, and should be general property for everyone, who processes it...”⁴.

Revolts in Northwest of the Soviet Russia in 1918–1919 S.V. Yarov illustrates as an opposition between peasantry and authorities during the Civil War and shows the meetings as the usual household phenomenon of military communist period. The author subdivides excitements into the “uncompleted” performances, “chaotic” and “meeting” of excitement, deserter's uprising⁵.

The basic reasons of the peasant excitements in villages of the northwest Soviet Russia in the specified period (including territory Arkhangelsk, Vologda, Novgorod, Olonetsk, Petrograd, Pskov, Severodvinsk and Cherepovets provinces) were requisition of bread and cattle as the taxes and extreme mobilization, and also military mobilization of people. The listed above excitements unite common features: the revolts had no the brightly expressed political orientation, peasants were basically dispersed by Red Army Men, the revolts were short – no more than two days. The revolts

³ L. T. Senchakova, *Peasant's mandates and verdicts 1905–1907, w: Russia. XX century. Fates of the Russian peasantry*, Москва 1996, s. 56–80.

⁴ Ibidem, s. 134–136, 143–148.

⁵ S. Y. Yarov, *Peasant's disturbances in the Northwest of Soviet Russia in 1918–1919, w: Peasantry. Theory. History. Modernity*, Москва 1996, s. 134–136, 139, 143–148.

testified about mass discontent by politics of the militarian communism and finally promoted transition to new economic politics.

In soviet historiography the folding of a command-administrative system of the state set-up was confirmed, which resulted from needs of isolated country elements of the inevitably requiring strong person (so-called country monarchism)⁶. Peasantry itself was considered as inert social mass which is indifferent enough to state businesses. There are many bases to keep such concept.

At the same time R.U. Devis, O.V. Hlevnyuk, I.E. Zelenin and others pay attention to the facts, which fall out of this circuit.

The construction of Stalin model of socialism was accompanied by mass arrests of the peasants that in turn caused their resistance. In 1929 more than 1300 myatezhes were registered in the country⁷. At the end of 1929 – beginning 1930 the politics of mass creation of collective farms also has met resistance: in January 346 mass performances were registered with participation of 125 thousand peasants, in February – 736 performances in which 220 thousand peasants, in March – 1642 mass performances, 800 thousand peasants have taken part in them (given without Ukraine). The given data testify about scale and mass of the peasant resistance conducted in village to transformations. And the revolts have influenced collectivization – in result government was compelled to pass to softer politics. (In March – April, 1930 on a short interval of time the management (manual) has softened a rate – March 2 the newspaper “Pravda” has published Stalin’s article “Vertigo from successes”, in which the fault for “excesses” collectivization was assigned to the executors – the lowest party and state leadership⁸. In April the government even more has weakened politics by the decision UK VKP (b), providing the application of punishment to the most rigid executors and was permitted by a free output of the peasants from collective farms⁹. At the same time the control of a situation in village was saved and since autumn of 1930 violent collectivization was renewed.

⁶ N. Pokrovsky, *Village-community and monarchical traditions in the history of Russian peasantry*, “New World” 1989, nr 9, s. 225.

⁷ Documents are testified. *From the history of village during collectivization 1927–1932*. Pod red. V.P. Danilova, N.A. Ivnitckogo, Москва 1989, s. 23.

⁸ P. U. Devis, *Extensive attack of socialism on the whole front // Soviet society: formation, development, historical final. Russia. XX century*. Pod red. P. U. Devis, O. V. Hlevnyuk, Y. N. Afanasjev, T. 1, Москва 1997, s. 124–125, 127–129.

⁹ Reader on History of USSR. 1917–1945: text book for pedagogical institutes / S.I. Degtjev etc.; E.M. Shagin. – Москва 1991, s. 333–336.

The new wave of mass peasant resistance began in 1932. The peasants attacked state grain storehouses, left collective farms. So, according to the data given by I.E. Zelenin, since January till July, 1932 the number of collective farms in RSFSR was reduced to about 1370.8 thousand¹⁰. In spring the protest began in cities: “So, in the beginning of 1932 in Vychug of the Ivanovo area children received 60 gr. of bread per day, instead of 100 gr. On April 7–9, for example, large groups of the inhabitants of the Byelorussian Borisov town attacked grain storehouses, have organized the meeting invasion of the women and children to Red Army Men’s barracks... The marchers have met the certain support from the representatives of local authorities and militiamen... In the Ivanovo area local communists took an active part in strikes and demonstrations”¹¹.

As a result the government had to change to more “liberal” politics. Under the certificate of the researchers R.U. Devis and O.V. Hlevnyuk, in May, 1923. SNK, CIK USSR and CK VKP (b) have published a number of resolutions permitting reduction of the state plan of bread and meat purveyance, free bread trading since January 15, 1933 (after performance of bread purveyance), meat, after performance of deliveries in state funds; and also about inadmissibility of liquidation of personal collective farmers’ subsidiary plots, about returning to the collective farmers earlier socialized cattle and others¹².

The inconsistent concessions on the part of Stalin management to the village in these years could not prevent the hunger, epidemics, industrial crisis, as the basic methods of collectivization realization were repressions. At the same time the active peasant resistance corrected politics “greater horse race” both in village, and in city. So, the plan of the second five-year plan already provided reduction of industrial production growth rate and capital investments, and in village the peasant court, on the contrary of the state strategic purpose, has saved a personal subsidiary plot.

Probably at the end of 1920 – beginning 1930 XX there was last burst of peasant discontent shown in the active forms, against forcible transformations in village. Further transformations carried more loyal character, and the peasantry, having saved a personal subsidiary plot, flexibly adapted to varied socio-economic conditions. The leaving from active, externally shown position in the specified period is a result of final destruction of the

¹⁰ *History of Russia. Social- economic and internal political aspect. In 2 parts, p. 2. XIX–XX centuries.* N. N. Baranov and others, Ekaterinburg 1992, s. 62.

¹¹ I. E. Zelenin, *Was the kolkhoz “neonep”?*, “Domestic History” 1994, nr 22, s. 106.

¹² P. U. Devis, *op. cit.*, s. 129.

peasant world and final infringement of interests balance of peasant and interests of all society. (In 1930s XX, according to Pokrovsky's opinion, the interaction of a countryside and state was finally broken)¹³.

Further expression of a peasantry's position to reforms and transformations it is necessary to consider from passive reaction (economic activity, survival, development) of the peasant's yard¹⁴. In domestic literature the researches in this area only began (scientific direction (peasantry) headed by T. Shanin works fruitfully).

As for the problem of perception of state agricultural reforming by peasantry D. Scott paid attention to four ordinary resistance: poaching, peasant's resistance to taxation, desertion, village resistance to the state socialism¹⁵.

Even during the Stalin's collectivization period stealing (according to Scott's terminology- "poaching") was not rare in peasant's life, it was one of the form of surviving within the tough bound. For example, the peasant's story was written and published by V. Vernadsky, that to take wilfully the sack of grain from the collective farm was not stealing within peasant society¹⁶.

We do not dispute ordinary peasant's resistance to the reforms named by D. Scott as the village resistance against state socialism, we give proof of breaches labour discipline and other clauses of the collective farm Rules – as one form of passive peasant protesting against state agrarian reforms in the "thawing" period 1953–1964. At the same time this phenomena corresponded to the collective farm (kolkhoz) (socialist according to political sign) and was not the protest against state socialism.

Statement of breaching labour discipline facts practically were in every record of general meeting of peasants and in meetings of management board: breaching daily routine (coming and leaving from the work personally), absence from work without validity, bad work without results, making decisions willfully: where to work without permission of Brigade leader (e.g. willfully cut fire wood, leave the farm according to their private affairs (for wood, straw etc.) stoppage of draught power – horses and machinery,

¹³ N. Pokrovsky, op. cit., s. 230.

¹⁴ E. M. Kovalev, *History of peasant families: methodics and first results*, w: *Peasantry. Theory. History. Modernity.*, Москва 1996, s. 285–290.

¹⁵ D. Scott, *Weapons of weak people: ordinary forms of peasant's resistance (1985)*, w: *Peasantry. Theory. History. Modernity*, Москва 1996, s. 37–41.

¹⁶ *From published notes taken down by V. Vernadsky in 1990–1992. Peasant's voice: rural Russia of XX century in the peasant memoirs*, Москва 1996, s. 185–290.

usage of animal and mechanical draught in private farm¹⁷, damage, caused to a field by cattle (grain, peas and other crops)¹⁸, absence from work from 1 day to 1,5 month¹⁹. There were accidents when young collective farmers left the farm without permission to study for tractor driving²⁰. Widespread phenomenon was drunkenness²¹.

The results of breaching were lamentable in every concrete phenomenon. In animal breeding they resulted in cattle-plague: for example, “collective farmer... left the flock of sheep... 7 lambs were died”²². Cattle fed not enough, absence of litter for several days, as a result the farm lost 1,5–2 ts. of milk daily²³. As a result the collective farm lost: milk yields and animal weight, milk was lost within brigade (water addition, reduction of milk during the records, exaggeration the amount of milk for calves drinking, reduction of egg production etc.²⁴ Drunkenness resulted in not carried out work duties.

Breaching of labour discipline and damage of social property were ordinary phenomenon. The board of the collective farm tried to oppose according to or not the Rules of collective farm. It raised money fines in the

¹⁷ GATO (State archive of Tyumen region), F(fond) 2196, O. (inventory) 1, D (case) 34. Meeting of management board of the collective farm named after Voroshilov of Krasnov Village Soviet Isetsk district of Tyumen region May, 20. 1957, k. 39.

¹⁸ TF (tobol'sk branch) GATO, F. 1125, O. 1., D. 13. Collective farm named after Kalinin of Begishevsk Village Soviet, Dubrovinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meetings of collective farmers and meetings of management board of the collective farm. April, 29. 1963, k. 4.

¹⁹ GATO, F. 1645, O. 1, D. 5. Collective farm “Pobeda” Omutinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meeting of collective farmers and management board of the collective farm during 1953, k. 1–2, 4.

²⁰ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D (case). 34. Meeting of management board of the collective farm named after Voroshilov of Krasnov Village Soviet Isetsk district of Tyumen region May, 20. 1957, k. 36.

²¹ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D. 34. Meeting of management board of the collective farm named after Voroshilov of Krasnov Village Soviet Isetsk district of Tyumen region May, 20. 1957, k. 10–15.

²² TF GATO, F. 1125, O. 1, D. 13. Collective farm named after Kalinin of Begishevsk Village Soviet, Dubrovinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meetings of collective farmers and meetings of management board of the collective farm. April, 29. 1963, k. 8.

²³ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D. 34. Meeting of management board of the collective farm named after Voroshilov of Krasnov Village Soviet Isetsk district of Tyumen region May, 20. 1957, k. 15.

²⁴ TF. GATO, F. 1125, O. 1, D. 12. Collective farm named after Kalinin Begishevsk Village Soviet, Dubrovinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meeting of collective farmers and meetings of management board of the farm from April, 7 1961, k. 6–7.

type of removal 5 working days. For example, for unloading wood in the brigade consisting of 4 workers, money fines were 209 roubles and removal 5 working days, for stoppage of saw wood device – 400 roubles. At the same time after the written complaint to management board the money brought back to farmers but not 5 working days according to the Rules²⁵. In the case of stoppage of draught, stableman was punished by money fine of 25 roubles for a day²⁶.

Incidents connected with damage of farm properties: loss of harness, damage of tractor parts, tuds, milk-cans, spilled milk etc. – after money fine, management board wrote off the losses according to the farmers' complaints²⁷. Taken measures were to frighten but not a real material punishment²⁸.

Damage, caused to a field (grains, peas and other crops) was connected with breaching of daily routine and damage of collective farm's property. It was very difficult to fight against such incidents because there were few herdmen. That is why the decisions in such incidents were compromise: management board required to organize the pasturage in turns or to make barriers between cattle²⁹.

Decisions on breaches of daily routine of collective farm vital activity were quite different and in every particular case management board made decisions separately: notice, registration in farmer's book, day off deprivation, the accountant had to make the farmer's card for penalty and encouragement. There were some exceptions: money fines, removal of 5 working days according to the Rules weren't formal (in spite of farmer's complaint,

²⁵ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D. 34. Meeting of management board of the collective farm named after Voroshilov of Krasnov Village Soviet Isetsk district of Tyumen region May, 20. 1957, k. 1–2.

²⁶ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D. 34. Meeting of management board of the collective farm named after Voroshilov of Krasnov Village Soviet Isetsk district of Tyumen region May, 20. 1957, k. 39.

²⁷ TF. GATO, F. 1125, O.1, D.12. Collective farm named after Kalinin Begishevsk Village Soviet, Dubrovinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meeting of collective farmers and meetings of management board of the farm from April, 7 1961, k. 10–11.

²⁸ GATO, F. 2196, O.1, D. 34. Meeting of management board of the collective farm named after Voroshilov of Krasnov Village Soviet Isetsk district of Tyumen region May, 20. 1957, k. 3–6.

²⁹ TF GATO, F. 1125, O. 1, D. 13. Collective farm named after Kalinin of Begishevsk Village Soviet, Dubrovinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meetings of collective farmers and meetings of management board of the collective farm. April, 29. 1963, s. 4.

who left the herd without attendance, to restore his 200 working days he met with a refusal)³⁰.

In some cases of cattle-plague the decision of money fine remained in force even after the guilty's application. In the case of debts or escape, the case was passed to the Court³¹.

During cattle-plague, writing off the cattle was an ordinary incident, even the reasons were concrete – don't-care attitude to work, absence preventive work, unfeeding, oversight for cattle³². Punishing the board could withhold straw³³. For leaving farm without permission – fine of 5 working days and transfer to another low-paid job: "For absence without leave in the town of Kemerovo Sanina Pelageya was fined 5 working days and Sanin Alexander was discharged from forage-maker and transferred to the brigade № 1 for general work"³⁴. Extreme measure is exclusion from collective farm, breaches of working discipline (more than 3 times) were rarity.

Punishments for absence and drunkenness were mild: from 34 farmers, violated discipline in a single farm during single month: 16 were noticed, 5 were given an official reprimand, 9 were fined 5 working days, 4 cases were discussed on the Party meeting of organization. Collective farmers confirmed that the order was on the collective farm when farmers gave the sack for drunkenness and absence from work³⁵.

The most popular measure to counteract the breaches of labour discipline and damage of collective farm's property was the fine (5 working days), according to the Rules. Such fines with real sum were repeated but after

³⁰ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D (case). 34. Meeting of management board of the collective farm named after Voroshilov of Krasnov Village Soviet Isetsk district of Tyumen region May, 20. 1957, k. 14.

³¹ TF GATO, F.1125, O.1, D.11. Collective farm named after Kalinin, Begishevsk Village Soviet, Dubrovinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meetings of the collective farmers and meetings of management board of the farm from April, 9, 1960, k. 6.

³² TF GATO, F. 1125, O. 1, D. 13. Collective farm named after Kalinin of Begishevsk Village Soviet, Dubrovinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meetings of collective farmers and meetings of management board of the collective farm. April, 29. 1963, s. 10–11.

³³ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D. 33. Collective farm named after Voroshilov, Krasnovsk Village Soviet, Isetsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meetings of the collective farmers and meetings of management board of the farm for 1956, k. 5.

³⁴ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D. 33. Collective farm named after Voroshilov, Krasnovsk Village Soviet, Isetsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meetings of the collective farmers and meetings of management board of the farm for 1956, k. 12.

³⁵ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D. 34. Meeting of management board of the collective farm named after Voroshilov of Krasnov Village Soviet Isetsk district of Tyumen region May, 20. 1957, k. 15.

farmer's application the request was complied and the property was written off from balance. These rigid measures were short-lived³⁶.

The reasons of breaches labour discipline from management board and farmers points of view were inability of managerial staff to coordinate the work, bad personal example (seldom presence of farm manager in place for work, the managers and chairmans wives were on the list but didn't work and others³⁷. As a result the workers copy negative manners. "Comrade Isakov V.F. said that cattle breeding is very serious business and that is why managerial staff; team-leaders and others are negligently disposed to their work. I don't like such bad attitude to work"³⁸.

Bringing moral pressure to bear upon workers were declared: team-leader must not credit farmers with work-day units if they leave place for work and deprive them of the cart to market place or to go to see somebody³⁹. Management board had to charge team-leaders to take stock of carts given out to workers for private needs and the lists of workers not submitted to leader and left working place too early⁴⁰.

It is difficult to say how much these measures were actual, you may suppose that everything left as before because all social status: leaders, specialists, workers breached labour discipline and daily routine.

We see, the management board of the collective farm, leading section, workers establishing facts of breaching labour discipline paid attention to the irresponsibility of leading section, separate specialists and some workers.

Management board of a collective farm wrote off all defects on the farm, farmers who breached discipline saw and marked leaders' irrespon-

³⁶ TF GATO, F. 1125, O. 1, 11. Collective farm named after Kalinin, Begishevsk Village Soviet, Dubrovinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meetings of the collective farmers and meetings of management board of the farm from April, 9, 1960, k. 3a.

³⁷ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D. 43. Record book of collective farm's meetings and meetings of management board of the farm 1960. Collective farm "Sibir" Krasnovsk Village Soviet, Isetsk district of Tyumen region. 1959–1960, k. 34, 37.

³⁸ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D. 43. Record book of collective farm's meetings and meetings of management board of the farm 1960. Collective farm "Sibir" Krasnovsk Village Soviet, Isetsk district of Tyumen region. 1959–1960, k. 49.

³⁹ GATO, F. 1645, O. 1, D. 5. Collective farm "Pobeda" Omutinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meeting of collective farmers and management board of the collective farm during 1953, k. 19.

⁴⁰ GATO, F. 1645, O. 1, D. 5. Collective farm "Pobeda" Omutinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meeting of collective farmers and management board of the collective farm during 1953, k. 19–20.

sibility. Shifting the responsibility for unsolved problems, particularly in cattle breeding had objective reasons. Firstly, the level of education was school and sometimes vocational courses couldn't analyze cause-effective relations. Secondly, the scope of the farm works according to partial mechanization were beyond their strength, it was impossible to control the carrying out works. For example, veterinary had to be on each farm from early morning, but he was the only on several farms, the farmers performed not only their duties but also different works on the farm. Their functions included: cleaning attached part of the wood, weeding beet, corn, hay-making operations, picking up potatoes, carrots, cabbages etc. Thirdly, in the period of industrial processes not all members of the farm maintained peasant nature – peasant status, part of inhabitant lost it and the will to work on the land. Finally, this part of collective farmers lost their responsibility as a necessary composition of production process. According to the records, unsatisfactory labour discipline was mass occurrence and was the reflection of passive resistance to collective farm system. Thus, tedious work of collective farm maintenance duplicated the work on the private farms and the choice of carefulness work was mainly left after the latter. The collective farmers had an opportunity to work on the farm, besides their duties, they were faced with the choice and silently choose their private farm. Labour discipline on the collective farm was damaged.

The relation process between collective farm and collective farmers private property was disinterested. On the contrary, on the state farms personal subsidiaries were the part of kolkhoz property and was destined to maintenance on collective farm's part. Such economic measures involved: plowing kitchen gardens, cutting wood, house building, giving out hay and straw etc.⁴¹

Domestic farm activities of the collective farms, in spite of uncontrol was not chaotic – had not only departmental development plans but also domestic time-limit of vital activity, regulated collectively. In this point of view collective farm's property was viable. Private subsidiary didn't compete with collective and was its component part. Resistance to the state reforms was positioned by farmers, agricultural officials as a way of survival in the conditions of massive Soviet industrialization.

⁴¹ GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D. 43. Record book of collective farm's meetings and meetings of management board of the farm 1960. Collective farm "Sibir" Krasnovsk Village Soviet, Isetsk district of Tyumen region. 1959–1960, k. 28, i 30.

Streszczenie

Opór chłopski wobec reform państwowych z lat 1905–1964

W artykule omówiono aktywne i pasywne formy chłopskiego oporu skierowanego przeciwko państwowej polityce przekształceń w rolnictwie rosyjskim w XX wieku. Aktywne formy oporu zostały potraktowane jako działania zbiorowe niższych warstw i grup społecznych, w których odzwierciedlały się ich interesy społeczno-gospodarcze i polityczne. Opór przejawiał się w kilku formach: pokojowych wystąpieniach, lokalnych powstaniach, buntach, manifestacjach i wiecach. Na podstawie analizy zawartości Statutów kolchozowych kolektywów i ich zgodności z protokołami Walnego Zgromadzenia i posiedzeń Rady Pracowników, autorzy opisują różne naruszenia dyscypliny pracy oraz zbiorowe dozwolone wystąpienia, omawiają reakcję Zarządów kolchozów na te naruszenia, ich przyczyny i skutki. Występujące wśród kolchozowego aktywu zjawiska naruszenia dyscypliny pracy i złe obchodzenie się z kolchozowym majątkiem zostały zakwalifikowane przez autorów jako formy biernego oporu wobec reform agrarnych prowadzonych przez władze państwa.

Summary

Peasant resistance to the state reforms – 1905–1964

Active and passive forms of peasant resistance to the state agrarian reforms in the period of XX century are considered in this article. Active forms of resistance are considered as collective activities of the lowest section and groups of population, expressing their social- economic and political interests publicly: in village-community verdicts, revolts, performances, meetings. Analysis of the collective-farm Rules and its observance according to the records of common meetings of collective farmers and management board of collective-farms (1953–1964) allowed authors to characterize different breaches of labour discipline and damage of kolkhoz property, consequences and the reasons of breaches. The breaches of labour discipline and the damage of kolkhoz property are considered as the forms of passive resistance to the state agrarian reforms.

Bibliography

- Koznova I.E., *“Peasantry and power” – scientific conference in State Duma, w: Peasantry. Theory. History. Modernity*, Москва 1996.
- Shanin T., *Perspectives of peasant’s research and problems of parallel perception of social forms, w: Peasantry. Theory. History. Modernity*, Москва 1996.
- Senchakova L.T., *Peasant’s mandates and verdicts 1905–1907, w: Russia. XX century. Fates of the Russian peasantry*, Москва 1996.
- Yarov S.V., *Peasant’s disturbances in the Northwest of Soviet Russia in 1918–1919, w: Peasantry. Theory. History. Modernity*, Москва 1996.
- Pokrovsky N., *Village-community and monarchical traditions in the history of Russian peasantry*, “New World” 1989, nr 9.
- Documents are testified. From the history of village during collectivization 1927–1932*, pod red. V. P. Danilova, N. A. Ivnickogo, Москва 1989.
- Devis P.U., *Extensive attack of socialism on the whole front // Soviet society: formation, development, historical final. Russia. XX century*. Pod red. P. U. Devis, O. V. Hlevnyuk, Y. N. Afanasjev, T. 1, Москва 1997
- Reader on History of USSR. 1917–1945: text book for pedagogical institutes*, S. I. Degtev etc.; E. M. Shagin, Москва 1991.
- History of Russia. Socio-economic and internal political aspect. In 2 parts, p. 2. XIX–XX centuries*. N. N. Baranov and others, Ekaterinburg 1992.
- Zelenin I. E., *Was the kolkhoz “neonep”?*, “Domestic History” 1994, nr 2.
- Kovalev E. M., *History of peasant families: methodics and first results, w: Peasantry. Theory. History. Modernity*, Москва, 1996.
- Scott D., *Weapons of weak people: ordinary forms of peasant’s resistance (1985)*, w: *Peasantry. Theory. History. Modernity*. Москва 1996.
- From published notes taken down by V. Vernadsky in 1990–1992. Peasant’s voice: rural Russia of XX century in the peasant memoirs*, Москва 1996.
- GATO (State archive of Tyumen region), F. (fond) 2196, O. (inventory) 1, D. (case) 34. Meeting of management board of the collective farm named after Voroshilov of Krasnov Village Soviet Isetsk district of Tyumen region May, 20. 1957.
- TF (tobol’sk branch) GATO, F. 1125, O. 1, D. 13. Collective farm named after Kalinin of Begishevsk Village Soviet, Dubrovinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meetings of collective farmers and meetings of management board of the collective farm. April, 29. 1963.
- GATO, F. 1645, O. 1, D. 5. Collective farm “Pobeda” Omutinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meeting of collective farmers and management board of the collective farm during 1953.
- TF GATO, F. 1125, O. 1, D. 12. Collective farm named after Kalinin Begishevsk Village Soviet, Dubrovinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meeting of collective farmers and meetings of management board of the farm from April, 7 1961.

-
- TF GATO, F. 1125, O. 1, D.11. Collective farm named after Kalinin, Begishevsk Village Soviet, Dubrovinsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meetings of the collective farmers and meetings of management board of the farm from April, 9, 1960.
- GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D.33. Collective farm named after Voroshilov, Krasnovsk Village Soviet, Isetsk district of Tyumen region. Record book of general meetings of the collective farmers and meetings of management board of the farm for 1956.
- GATO, F. 2196, O. 1, D. 43. Record book of collective farm's meetings and meetings of management board of the farm 1960. Collective farm "Sibir" Krasnovsk Village Soviet, Isetsk district of Tyumen region. 1959–1960.