

# Washington Law Review

---

Volume 26 | Number 1

---

2-1-1951

## The Legal Nature of Soviet Collective Farms

George C. Guins

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr>



Part of the [Comparative and Foreign Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

George C. Guins, Far Eastern Section, *The Legal Nature of Soviet Collective Farms*, 26 Wash. L. Rev. & St. B.J. 66 (1951).

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol26/iss1/8>

This Far Eastern Section is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews and Journals at UW Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington Law Review by an authorized editor of UW Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [cnyberg@uw.edu](mailto:cnyberg@uw.edu).

# FAR EASTERN SECTION

---

## THE LEGAL NATURE OF SOVIET COLLECTIVE FARMS

GEORGE C. GUINS\*

SOVIET legislation concerning collective farms (kolkhozes) reveals in an exceptionally clear manner all the peculiarities of the centralized economy.

As a legal entity a kolkhoz owns its "socialist property," but this does not include the most valuable element of agricultural economy, that is, the land. Members of collective farms work on land which belongs to the state. Even the house and garden plots which are placed at the disposal of individual farmers and their families do not belong to them.<sup>1</sup> Actually, only the surplus production belongs to the kolkhozes and they may dispose of it as they see fit, selling it, for example, in the open market.

Thus a kolkhoz is an institution of public rather than private law. Similarly to the *trests* and *torgs*, kolkhozes are organized for the purpose of carrying out an important part of the state's national plan.<sup>2</sup> They perform the public function of supplying the socialist state with agricultural products. The organization of kolkhozes, with their duties and activities, is determined by the charter of an agricultural *artel* which was approved by the second convention of Shock Workers of the Collective Farms and confirmed on February 17, 1935, by the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., and by the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (CC of the ACP(b)).<sup>3</sup>

Theoretically, kolkhozes are voluntarily organized coöperatives (*artels*) but actually, their organization was required by the govern-

---

\* Magister of Civil Law, Lectures in Political Science and Slavic Languages, University of California.

<sup>1</sup> "The land, its natural deposits, waters, forests . . . belong to the whole people." Art. 6 of the Constitution of 1936.

<sup>2</sup> "The *artel* binds itself to conduct its collective farming according to plan, observing exactly the plans of agricultural production drawn up by the agencies of the workers' and peasants' government, and the duties of the *artel* toward the government."

"The *artel* shall accept for precise execution the programs of sowing, fallow ploughing, weeding, harvesting, threshing, and autumn ploughing prescribed in consideration of the condition and peculiarities of collective farms, and also the government plan for the development of stock breeding." Art. 6 of the Standard Charter of an Agricultural *Artel* of February 17, 1935.

<sup>3</sup> The Charter is translated by V. Gsovski and is included in his *II Soviet Civil Law*, pp. 441-462.

ment. For evidence of this we need only to refer to Stalin's famous article, "Dizziness of Success" (March 2, 1930), in which he reprimanded the local agencies for overdoing the organizing of the kolkhozes, abusing coercion, and rushing on ahead without the necessary contact with the masses. The belated resolution of the XVIth Congress of the Communist Party, which declared that "kolkhozes can be organized on a voluntary basis only," obviously contradicted the preceding practice with its prosecutions of wealthy peasant individualists.

While the formation of kolkhozes may be instigated or even forced by the government, their liquidation is impossible other than by means of law. The permanent character of collective farms is indirectly expressed in the Constitution which provides kolkhozes with "land for ever."<sup>4</sup>

The public character of kolkhozes as economic organizations of the Soviet state is clearly expressed in the provisions of the charter of an agricultural artel.<sup>5</sup>

## I

As organizations of great public significance, kolkhozes are subject to the control of various government and Party organs.<sup>6</sup>

The Machine Tractor Station (M.T.S.) not only assists the kolkhozes but also controls their activity and attitudes. For this purpose the CC of the ACP(b) decided, in 1947, to establish a new post in the Machine Tractor Stations, namely, Assistant Director in charge of Political Activities, whose duties are "to insure the improvement of the work of the party organizations of the M.T.S. and to expand political education work among tractor and combine mechanics, and other

<sup>4</sup> "The land occupied by collective farms is secured to them for their use free of charge and for an unlimited time, that is, for ever." Art. 8 of the Constitution of 1936.

<sup>5</sup> "The toiling peasants of the village [settlement, hamlet, *khutor*, *kishlak*, *aul*] of.....in the district of.....voluntarily band together into an agricultural artel in order to establish, with common means of production and with organized common labor, a collective, *i.e.*, a joint farm, to insure complete victory over the *kulak*, over all the exploiters and enemies of the toilers, over want and ignorance, over the backwardness of small individual farms, to create high productivity of labor, and, by this means, to insure the well-being of the members."

"The path of collective farming, the path of socialism, is the only right path for the toiling peasants. The members of the artel take upon themselves the obligation to strengthen their artel, to work honestly, to distribute the collective farm income according to the amount of work done, to guard the common property, to take care of the collective farm property, to keep the tractors and machinery in good order, to tend the horses carefully, to execute the tasks imposed by the workers' and peasants' government in order to make theirs a bolshevist collective farm and all its members prosperous." Art. 1 of the Charter.

<sup>6</sup> The organization of control over the kolkhozes is described by A. Vucinich in *The Kolkhoz: its Social Structure and Development*, *The American Slavic and East-European Review* (February, 1949).

workers of the M.T.S."<sup>7</sup> Having a strong Communist nucleus in its organization, local M.T.S., under the leadership of Party organs and in coöperation with the Communists inside the kolkhoz, can control the activity of the Communists.<sup>8</sup>

Besides the Communists of the kolkhoz and M.T.S., secretaries of the district Communist Party committees, presidents of the district executive committees, and other Party and government officers are responsible for the realization of the government and Party instructions and orders.<sup>9</sup> The administrative personnel of the kolkhozes is treated as though it consisted of government officials.

Andreev, a member of the Politbureau, in a report to the Plenum of the CC of the ACP(b) in February, 1947, criticized the existing practice of ousting administrative personnel of the kolkhozes and M.T.S. He said that in the Kostroma region, for instance, 50 per cent of the chairmen were dismissed in 1946; in the Kuibyshev region, 540 chairmen in 1945; in the Penza region, fifty-four directors of the M.T.S. out of 115 were dismissed. Although this practice was then condemned,<sup>10</sup> it illustrates how illusory is the self-government of the kolkhozes.

Among the government organizations under whose control and leadership are found the kolkhozes, the closest to them are the village soviets. A village soviet has the right to hear kolkhoze reports and to suspend its resolutions if it finds them illegal. In the latter case the village soviet presents the matter to the Raisoviet (District Soviet of the Working People's Deputies) which has the right to abrogate kolkhoz resolutions. The local soviets are also vested with the responsibility of securing control over the kolkhoz in order to see that it carries out the state plan for agricultural produce and cattle breeding and observes the provisions of the charter.

<sup>7</sup> Resolution X of the CC of the ACP (b), *Izvestia*, Feb. 28, 1947.

<sup>8</sup> A kolkhoz as a coöperative organization (artel) must have "the leading core" in the person of the Communist organization as have "all organizations of the working people, both public and state." Art. 126 of the Constitution.

<sup>9</sup> Point 4 of the Resolution of the CC of the ACP (b) of May 27, 1939, concerning Measures to Protect the Collective Farm from Diversion. (See II Gsovsxi, *op. cit.*, *supra*, note 3, at 478.)

By the Decree of Sept. 19, 1946, it was confirmed that "It shall be the duty of the leaders of the Party and Soviet organizations, as well as of the leaders of the regional and provincial organizations to restore the full effect of the Resolution of May 27, 1939." (See II Gsovsxi, *op. cit.*, *supra*, note 3, at 494-495.)

<sup>10</sup> "The regional and district committees often resort to mass replacement of workers. Great fluidity has been observed in a number of districts. In other places penalties are abused. It is easy to relieve the president of a backward kolkhoz of his duties; it is harder to teach him the art of managing the complex economy of an agricultural artel. If penalties are abused they cease to be a medium of education, a means of spurring on the lagging workers." *Pravda*, editorial, May 18, 1947.

The fundamental duty of village soviets and Raisoviets is to see that the charter is observed. They are also obliged, however, to assist the kolkhozes in all their economic activity with the intention of strengthening them, protecting their property, and bringing about a successful achievement of their plans and undertakings.<sup>11</sup>

The direct leadership for the economic activity of the kolkhozes, however, belongs to the District Agricultural Bureaus (*Raiotdel Selskogo Khoziastva*). They have to assist the kolkhozes in the organization of management, as far as the selection of cadres is concerned, in making and carrying out plans of production and estimates, as well as in increasing efficiency in labor and absorbing advanced methods of agricultural economy.<sup>12</sup>

Besides the above described dependence of kolkhozes on Party organizations, local soviets, and other government agencies, they are also under the general leadership of the Ministry of Agriculture of the U.S.S.R.<sup>13</sup> and of the newly organized Council on Collective Farms. The Council is composed of men who have a great deal of experience in farm management, and of persons from various sections of the country who are familiar with specific local problems of the Ukraine, Siberia, Armenia, Turkestan, etc.<sup>14</sup> The Council must provide incentives to stimulate the interest and efforts of the members of the collective farms, must support discipline, and protect the principles of "self-government," as well as promote the just distribution of profits. The Council has to protect kolkhozes from grabbers and parasites.

The reference to "grabbers" and "parasites" has a double significance. In the first place it points out the widespread abuse of power by the party workers who direct the kolkhozes. Secondly, it indicates a struggle against the excessive growth of the administrative personnel—growth at the expense of the productive and responsible workers.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>11</sup> "The local soviets, including the village soviets, have every possibility of becoming leaders of kolkhozes." *Osnovy Sovetskogo Gosudarstva i Prava*, Izdanie Ministerstva Iustitsii, M. 1947, p. 481.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 482.

<sup>13</sup> In 1940, the Commissariat of Agriculture of the U.S.S.R. issued 1,113,000 letters, orders, decisions, regulations, and instructions. *Izvestia*, March 11, 1941.

<sup>14</sup> *Moscow News*, October 12, 1946.

<sup>15</sup> The Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. emphasized in its Decree of September 19, 1946, the undesirability of "unfounded and extravagant increase of administrative and managerial jobs," "artificially invented jobs avoiding productive work," and "kept at the expense of the collective farms," and ordered to have cut "artificially boosted appropriations" and "the expenses for business management." (The full text of the Decree is in II Gsovskii, *op. cit.*, *supra*, note 3, No. 35, pp. 487-497).

In total, Soviet farmers maintain not less than five million people composing the administrative and technical personnel which is closely connected with the kolkhoz economy. After the Decree of Sept., 1946, in one year 535,000 top-heavy personnel of

The government's measures against the excessive bureaucratism in the agricultural economy, as well as its efforts to decrease the high overhead of the kolkhozes for the maintenance of a huge administrative personnel, are futile, as bureaucratism and an augmented apparatus of management are inherent in the centralized economy as such.

## II

Economically the kolkhozes are still more dependent on the government than on their own management. The most important source of their existence—the land—belongs to the state, and the exploitation of this land is predetermined by the national plan. Every kolkhoz receives orders which are part of the government plan and must carry them out under the supervision of the above-mentioned agencies.

The elected administration of a kolkhoz is in fact at the service of the state. As we have seen, chairmen of kolkhozes are ousted without much ado—merely if they do not serve a given purpose. Elections serve only to indicate to the authorities the people who can do the job. Candidates are mostly approved in advance by the local soviets.

The most important difference between kolkhozes and other economic agencies of the Soviet state, namely, *trests* and *torgs*, consists, as said before, in the right of the kolkhozes to have their own "socialist property."<sup>16</sup> One section of this property—livestock, implements, buildings—has an accessorial character in agricultural economy and is in fact an essential element in carrying out government assignments. A kolkhoz may not dispose of this property. It cannot sell, for instance, its "own" implements, horses, or buildings. This is possible neither formally nor practically. It is impossible formally since the sale of implements, livestock, or buildings would stop the work and make impossible the completion of planned assignments. Such a transaction, which would be obviously prejudicial to the state and to socialism, cannot have any effect.<sup>17</sup> But should such a transaction be concluded, then not only the contracting parties but also the supervising bodies

---

the kolkhozes, and 213,000 persons having no relation to actual kolkhoz work, (a total of 748,000 people) were removed from the pay rolls. *Pravda*, editorial, September 19, 1947.

<sup>16</sup> "The common enterprises of collective farms and coöperative organizations, with their livestock and implements, the products of the collective farms and coöperative organizations, as well as their common buildings, constitute the common socialist property of the collective farms and coöperative organizations." Art. 7 of the Civil Code.

<sup>17</sup> "A legal transaction made for a purpose contrary to law, or in fraud of law, as well as a transaction directed to the obvious prejudice of the state, shall be invalid." Art. 30 of the Civil Code.

would certainly be prosecuted as "enemies of the people" with all the drastic consequences of this paramount crime.<sup>18</sup>

Practically a kolkhoz cannot sell its implements, livestock, etc., for without them it could not continue its economy. Neither can it sell its property and liquidate its economy in bulk, because it would then deprive itself of the means of existence.<sup>19</sup> Peasants, like all citizens in the Soviet Union, cannot move freely in the country because of the passport problem and are not permitted to choose a job without approval of the authorities.

To the second category of the "kolkhoz socialist property" belong the products of the collective farms. This property is theoretically at the free disposal of the kolkhozes. This freedom is, however, only apparent. Kolkhozes must supply the state with agricultural products, and they are compelled to make deliveries of these products. Therefore, they may dispose of only surplus produce, which is in fact the farmers' remuneration for their work for the state.

Thus the "kolkhoz socialist property," as a component part of the socialist planned economy, cannot be disposed of at the discretion of collective farms and is in fact a "fettered property." It differs essentially from the private property of legal entities. It is rather a part of national property allotted to the kolkhozes,<sup>20</sup> in addition to the land for the development of their agricultural economy in the interests of the nation.

The only difference between the "state socialist property" and the "kolkhoz socialist property" is found in the system of exploitation and management. In contrast to the workers of state factories and mines, the members of kolkhozes do not receive wages. As compensation they have at their disposal some part of the "socialist property." This means that their existence depends wholly on the result of their work. Not only the managers, as in a factory, but all farmers are responsible for the effectiveness of their work inasmuch as their share depends on

<sup>18</sup> Art. 18 of the Charter of Collective Farms and Art. 58 of the Penal Code.

<sup>19</sup> There are in practice, transactions concluded by the kolkhozes for the sale of some parts of their property, especially of the young of livestock. Andreev in his above cited report remarks that "cattle breeding is conducted negligently," "pigs are wasted like small change."

<sup>20</sup> The government has generously transferred to the kolkhozes the confiscated property of the *kulaks*, valued at more than 400,000 rubles. *Osnovy Sovetskogo Gosudarstva i Prava*, Institut Prava Nauk S.S.S.R., M. 1947, pp. 486-487.

In the Soviet Union, *kulaks* are those farmers, mostly wealthy peasants, the most industrious, thrifty, and skillful, who opposed the collectivization and were *dekulakized*, i.e., deprived of their property and banished to remote parts of the country to work at forced labor.

what they produce. Their only chance then to better their condition in life is to have a rich harvest of produce.

Because of the difference in the system of remuneration, the administrative and economic power in regard to the kolkhozes is not concentrated indivisibly in the hands of the state, as happens in the case of "state socialist property."<sup>21</sup>

Members of collective farms, in spite of the risk they take, are nevertheless limited in their economic activity by the planning system, by special controls, and by their dependence on different institutions supplying them with equipment, seeds, credits, and agronomic assistance.

The kolkhoz economy is organized on the basis of an interlocking dependence. An individual farmer depends on the kolkhoz, and the kolkhoz on the M.T.S., a purely governmental organization. An individual farmer as a rule does not own a horse or any breeding cattle, and he is not allowed to produce grain on his house and garden plot of land. A kolkhoz cannot own tractors or combines, but must rent them from the M.T.S., just as an individual farmer must rent from the kolkhoz horses for work and transportation, and studhorses for breeding.

### III

The efficiency of the kolkhoz economy depends not so much on the organization of the management as on the economic stimuli for efficient work, which in turn depends first and foremost on the distribution of income and the share the farmers have in this distribution.

According to Article 11 of the Standard Charter, every kolkhoz is obliged, above all, to cover its debts to the government. Accordingly, it must deliver a part of its produce to the government as payment for various supplies and a part to the M.T.S. for its work in the kolkhoz. The kolkhoz is further obliged—and this is its heaviest obligation—to deliver to the government a specific quantity of produce. The amount of these deliveries is determined without correlation to the actual harvest but to the harvest which should have theoretically been obtained from all the arable land at the disposal of a given kolkhoz rather than from the sown area only.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> A. Venediktov, p. 321.

<sup>22</sup> The decree of the Council of Ministers and the CC of the ACP (b) of April 6, 1940.

"The collective farms were obliged to contribute to the state a certain percentage, not of their crop, but of the harvest which they theoretically should have received from their sown area. In this way the collective farms were forced to struggle for a good yield per acre, or they might not have enough bread to last them through the winter.



The reason for this system is to encourage members of kolkhozes to till and sow all the arable land in order to get a larger crop. After discussion by the Plenum of the Communist Party in February, 1947, it was decided to continue this method of computing quotas of deliveries, as being the best incentive to increase acreage. The only amendment approved by the Party Plenum at its conference in February, 1947, consists in permitting the reduction of deliveries of a kolkhoz possessing a large tract of land when it is short of manpower.<sup>23</sup>

Thus all contributions in kind are levied on the kolkhoz according to the area at its disposal, regardless of what part of it is actually being tilled. On the basis of these regulations, if a kolkhoz extends its tillage, it has an opportunity to increase its own share, as the assessment remains the same. On the other hand, the share of the government and of the M.T.S. in the produce of a kolkhoz always consists of a high percentage of the crop, and is equivalent to a lion's share in case of drought and poor harvest, while the farmer's share increases in case of a rich harvest. Climatic conditions may impair the position of the farmers but never of the state.

The deliveries to the state are compulsory.<sup>24</sup> They and the prices paid to the kolkhozes for them are fixed by the government. The norms for delivery are excessively high while the prices are too low. Therefore, the obligation to make deliveries is considered as the heaviest kind of taxation.

After all deliveries to the government have been made, the kolkhoz, before disposing of its own share, must set aside a certain quantity for seed and forage reserves, in accordance with the government sowing

---

Since the spring of 1940, however, the process has gone one step further. The collective farms were required to contribute a certain percentage of the theoretical harvest from all arable land at their disposal. It thus became the duty of the president of the collective farm to see that all his arable land was sown if he wanted to have enough bread for the winter. Decrees of this nature had been published applying to grain, meats, dairy products, hemp, flax, wool, fruits, and truckgarden products. The entire Soviet agricultural system was speeded up." "This I explained in detail to the newly arrived [Yugoslav Ambassador] Gabrielovich. He would not believe me. 'It is impossible,' he said. No peasants would stand such regulations.'" JOHN SCOTT, *DUEL FOR EUROPE* (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1942). p. 128.

<sup>23</sup> Resolution IX of the Plenum of the CC of the ACP (b). Feb. 1947. (See note 7, *supra*.)

<sup>24</sup> "The legal norms concerning compulsory deliveries of the agricultural products do not regulate the relations of material character only, but also the relations based on power and submission." Prof. M. M. Agarkov, "Fundamental Problems of the Soviet Civil Law," *Sovetskoe Gosudarstvo i Pravo*, No. 3, 1947, p. 36. See also Prof. Karass, "Ob Obiazatelstvakh po Postavke Gosudarstvu Selsokkhoziastvennoi Produktsii," *ibid.*, No. 3, 1947, p. 51 (note 29).

The norms of compulsory deliveries were established at first in 1932 for grain, and later, for meat, dairy products and industrial crops. See references in I Gsovoski, *op. cit.*, *supra*, note 3, at 738-740.

plans.<sup>25</sup> Only then can the remainder of the produce be partly sold by the kolkhoz and partly distributed among the collective farmers.

Theoretically, deliveries definitely fixed for a kolkhoz exclude all other obligations in kind. However, the state has at its disposal various ways for increasing its share. First of all, local soviets and Party organs inspire kolkhozes to take upon themselves a voluntary obligation, solemnly voted by the general assemblies, to increase production and to deliver to the state more than is assigned. Every year, since 1947, *Izvestia* and *Pravda* have widely opened their pages to the solemn pledges of kolkhozes, addressed to Stalin, to fulfill conscientiously their obligation to produce more and to deliver more to the state. This system is characterized in the Soviet Union as one of the manifestations of the "socialist competition."

Being a universal monopolist, the Soviet state has also another means for getting more agricultural products from its farmers. There are always different shortages on the market, and it depends completely on the state to supply its special organs and coöperatives with the short commodities for the purpose of exchanging them for agricultural products. The organs of the Ministry of Food Reserves of the U.S.S.R., in whose competence it is to secure stock-piling of different agricultural products, like *Zagotzerno* (grain procurement administration), and the coöperatives supplied with the products of industry, acquire surpluses of agricultural produce for relatively low prices or on the basis of barter. Needless to say, these operations are more profitable for the state than for the kolkhozes of individual farmers, as the conditions of exchange are dictated and there is no choice for the farmers.<sup>26</sup>

The system for distributing such agricultural products as meat, wool, dairy produce, and technical crops (cotton, flax, hemp, sugar beets) is the same as that for grain distribution. The norms for the compulsory deliveries of all these products were established in 1940, on the same basis as the deliveries of grain—that is, in accordance with potential and not actual production. For instance, deliveries of meat are determined not by the actual size of the collective herd, but on the basis of the combined acreage of tillable land and pastures held by the farm. The norms remain the same if a kolkhoz increases the number of its

<sup>25</sup> Decree of the Council of Ministries and of the CC of the ACP (b) July 28, 1947.

<sup>26</sup> The circle of trading enterprises and especially the operations of the producers' and consumers' coöperatives was widened by the decree of Nov. 9, 1946, and as *Pravda* explained (Nov. 11, 1946), the Soviet government expected the producers' coöperatives to be able to supply the village with various kinds of household utensils and articles which the state industries do not produce at all or produce in insufficient quantity, and the village to give its surplus produce in exchange.

animals; thus the more animals a kolkhoz possesses, the more benefit to it. The Soviet government and the Party take for granted that this is the best stimulus for the development of collective agriculture and husbandry.<sup>27</sup>

In addition to the compulsory deliveries, as described above, the Soviet government applies also the so-called *kontraktatsia* system, which is a special kind of contract requiring kolkhozes to deliver meat or certain kinds of crops. These contracts usually require the application of new methods and measures of an agricultural character designed to raise production or improve the quality of produce. The government agencies, as another party of the contract, are obliged to supply kolkhozes with seeds, machines or spare parts, fertilizers, credits, and even with some of the commodities of which the market happens to be short.

#### IV

While the state's share in the agricultural production of a kolkhoz is determined in absolute figures, the individual members of a collective farm are remunerated according to the quantity of produce which remains after all compulsory deliveries and required storage reserves are provided for.

Remuneration of individual farmers depends on the number of "labor days" credited to them. A "labor day" is a conditional unit. During one calendar day a member of the collective farm may earn several "labor days" or only a fraction of a "labor day," depending upon the type of work done and the results achieved.

For instance, according to the practice of many kolkhozes, reaping harvest from one acre is one labor day unit; one calendar day's work of a watchman is .3 labor day, and of a chairman of the kolkhoz, three labor days. For every kind of work there is a special kind of norm, but the final amount of remuneration is indefinite until the moment of distribution, as the share of each member depends as much on the number

---

<sup>27</sup> Before 1939-1940, when deliveries of grain were established in proportion with the sown area (see *supra*, notes 22 and 24) the quality of meat and dairy products to be delivered to the state by kolkhozes was determined according to the number of head of livestock. In spite of the subsequent changes of the conditions for the delivery of these products, calculations and reckonings of the government proved, evidently, to be wrong and the results of the deliveries did not meet with anticipations. Consequently, in April, 1950, a new three-year plan for the development of the cattle-breeding industry was approved (*Sotsialisticheskoe Zemledelie*, April 19, 1949) and the new norms and regulations about deliveries of meat and dairy products were established (*Vedomosti Verkhovnogo Soveta*, April 30, 1949. No. 19, May 28, 1949; No. 25, July 3, 1949; No. 31).

of his labor days during the year as on the quantity of the surplus which remains at the disposal of a kolkhoz.

Some farmers might prefer not to earn many labor days in their kolkhoz and work on their plots of land or elsewhere instead. It was stated that in contrast to members who earn as many as from 200 to 600 labor days, there are others who have no more than twenty to thirty labor days credited to them annually. Therefore, an obligatory minimum of from sixty to one hundred labor days was established in 1939,<sup>28</sup> and increased in 1942.<sup>29</sup>

## V

A very important provision of the kolkhoz legislation is the right given to farmers to cultivate individual plots of land, the so-called house-and-garden plots. Not being very confident of the results of his work in the kolkhoz, every member of the collective farm is interested in his household enterprise on the small plot of land assigned to him and to his family. The size of this plot varies in conformity with local conditions of the agricultural economy, but is not less than .62 of an acre and only in a few districts more than 1.24 acres.

The private farming economy is limited not only by the size of the plot at the disposal of the *dvor* (peasant family) but also by its special use, as, for instance, a vegetable garden or orchard.<sup>30</sup>

The number of animals which may be owned privately by each farm is also limited. It is sufficiently large in nomadic districts, less in semi-nomadic or nonnomadic districts, where agriculture is of small importance, but in the greater part of European Russia each household may have in its individual possession "one cow, not more than two calves, one sow with sucklings, not more than ten sheep and goats altogether, an unlimited number of fowl and rabbits, and not more than twenty beehives."<sup>31</sup>

In spite of all limitations the small household enterprises of the members of the collective farms not only feed the farmers and their families but also serve a general need. They are not only a form of

<sup>28</sup> Joint Resolutoin of the CC of the ACP (b) and the U.S.S.R. Council of People's Commissars of May 27, 1939. See II Gsovski, *op. cit.*, *supra*, note 3, No. 33, § 14.

<sup>29</sup> Joint Resolution ordering an increase in the obligatory Minimum of Labor Days for Collective Farmers, of April 13, 1942. II Gsovski, *op. cit.*, *supra*, note 3, No. 34. This law, although issued for the period of the war, had not been abrogated, according to the Resolution of the Plenum of the CC of the ACP (b) in February, 1947.

<sup>30</sup> Standard Chapter, Sec. 2, par. 4: "Farmers should abstain from raising field crops such as rye or wheat on their private plots." (See I Gsovski, *op. cit.*, *supra*, note 3, p. 769 and references *ibid.*, note 5).

<sup>31</sup> Standard Chapter, Section 5.

additional remuneration to farmers but also a means of producing vegetables, fruits, technical crops, eggs, etc.—items not usually produced by the kolkhozes and for which an industry on a large scale is not everywhere possible.

Nevertheless, the character of the household enterprise is too individualistic. It does not agree with the collectivism of kolkhozes and is not supported by the socialist state, which highly taxes the income from household deliveries of vegetables, meat, milk, etc.<sup>32</sup> Indirectly the government compels farmers to sell their products to kolkhozes by requiring them to make such deliveries (of meat, for instance) that they cannot help but purchase from individual farmers. If a kolkhoz buys meat elsewhere or pays too high a price for it, the losses of this kolkhoz are none the less losses of the farmers.

However, the household economy has developed very successfully. Farmers are working industriously and willingly on their small plots which, as a matter of fact, support them during the more unsuccessful years. When possible farmers try to expand their house-and-garden plots on account of the collectively held fields. They consider their plots as their own property and dispose of them as such, forgetting that land cannot become private property in the Soviet Union and that their plots are a part of the collective farm's land. One of the resolutions in which these trends were pointed out says that "in a number of collective farms, the practice is really to transform the house-and-garden plot into the private property of the household, so that not the collective farm but the individual member of the collective farm disposes of it at his own discretion, i.e., rents it or retains the plot for his own use, although he himself does not work in the collective farm."<sup>33</sup>

Having prohibited for the future any attempt to reduce the collectively used land for the benefit of individual husbandry, as well as any increase of privately held plots in excess of the size provided for by the Standard Charter, the resolution dictated the elimination of all land surpluses from the house-and-garden plots, the withdrawal from personal use of all land apart from house lots, such as vegetable garden, watermelon patches, *levada*, and the like, and the liquidation of

<sup>32</sup> A new and very high taxation was established by the Ukase of July 13, 1948. This applied especially to incomes from the household economy of members of kolkhozes.

<sup>33</sup> Resolution of the CC of the ACP (b) and the U.S.S.R. Council of People's Commissars of May 27, 1939, concerning Measures to Protect the Collectively Held Fields of the Collective Farms from Diversion. U.S.S.R. LAWS 1939, text 235. И Гсовски, *op. cit.*, *supra*, note 3, No. 33.

house-and-garden plots of the enclosure type (khutor) located in the midst of collectively held fields.<sup>34</sup>

Seven years later the Soviet government and the Party in their Resolution of September 19, 1946,<sup>35</sup> quoted above, had to reiterate that squandering of collective fields occurs along the line of enlargement of the house-and-garden plots of collective farmers by means of unauthorized seizures or illegal additions made by the management and the chairmen of collective farms to advance personal farming to the detriment of collective farming.

According to Andreev's report in February, 1947, 1,800,000 hectares (about 4,500,000 acres) were withdrawn from "illegal use" and returned to 80,000 kolkhozes, in conformity with the Resolution of September 19, 1946.

The Soviet government not only protects collective farms from different violations, but it tries to stimulate directly or indirectly their development in the interests of the formers. For instance, after the issuing of a three-year plan of the development of cattle-breeding,<sup>36</sup> the government has established new norms for the compulsory deliveries of meat,<sup>37</sup> and these norms became in practice higher for the individual households than for the kolkhozes. At the same time kolkhozes are required to increase the number of their cattle and for this purpose to acquire young animals. They can do this only by buying them from the individual farmers. The government's policy is clear. It desires to intensify the activity of kolkhozes and strengthen the dependence of individual farmers on the collective farms.

## VI

Individualistic trends among the collective farmers are held by the government to be a definite survival of private property psychology and are therefore condemned as

the interests of the collective farming, the basis of which is the fields held by the collective farms, are sacrificed to the elements of private ownership and avarice, which abuse the collective farms for the purpose of speculation and personal profit.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>34</sup> The same Resolution, Sections 3 and 7.

<sup>35</sup> Resolution concerning Measures to Be Taken for the Liquidation of Violations of the Charter of an Agricultural Artel in the Collective Farms. II Gsovskii, *op. cit.*, *supra*, note 3, No. 35.

<sup>36</sup> The "Three-Year Plan of the Development of the Kolkhoz and Sovkhoz Cattle-Breeding, 1949-51." Resolution of the Soviet of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the CC of the ACP (b). *Sotsialisticheskoe Zemledelie*, April 19, 1949, No. 91.

<sup>37</sup> Decree of May 25, 1949 (*Sotsialisticheskoe Zemledelie*, May 26, 1949).

<sup>38</sup> This quotation from the Resolution of May 27, 1939, was replaced by the text of the Resolution of Sept. 19, 1946. (See II Gsovskii, *op. cit.*, *supra*, note 3, at 490.)

Despite a growing political and social awareness there are still "background elements" and even now "the idea of private property is strong."<sup>39</sup>

The Soviet government, nevertheless, firmly believes in kolkhozes and consistently strengthens and expands the collective farming, which it considers as one of the most important measures leading to the final victory of socialism.<sup>40</sup>

The collectivization of agriculture is at present an actual problem of the Soviet government in all the countries annexed after World War II: in Bessarabia, the western regions of Byelorussia, and the Ukraine, in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.<sup>41</sup>

The satellites are also encouraged to undertake and hasten the organization of kolkhozes.

## VII

It is still difficult for the Soviet government to overcome the resistance and inertia of farmers, and it needs special measures to encourage the loyal elements and suppress opponents.

On March 29, 1947, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet issued an order in regard to conferring the title "Hero of Socialist Labor" and the awarding of orders and medals of the U.S.S.R. to kolkhoz, M.T.S., and sovkhoz workers as a premium for obtaining large crops of wheat, rye, corn, sugar beets, and cotton. *Pravda* remarked that only in the Soviet Union is such attention paid to the "working man."<sup>42</sup>

The system of encouraging industriousness among farmers by individual rewards for record harvests was extended still further by the decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet on April 24, 1948. This decree established various indices for wheat, rye, corn, rice, cotton, sugar beet, sunflower, clover, lucerne, and timothy grass harvests. Indices are different for different regions, and the law specifies which

<sup>39</sup> *Bolshevik*, August, 1946. Cf. "In the Bashkir Autonomous Republic the state production quotas have not been met. The explanation given is shortage of fuel, which is untrue. It is not because of lack of fuel but of the anti-government attitudes which exist in the region." *Pravda*, Oct. 26, 1946.

<sup>40</sup> The elimination of the kulaks, the most numerous of the exploiting classes, and the adoption of collective farming by the bulk of the peasants led to the destruction of the last roots of capitalism in the country, to the final victory of socialism in agriculture, and to the complete consolidation of the Soviet power in the countryside." *HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION*. (International Publishers, New York, 1939.) p. 329.

<sup>41</sup> N. D. Kazantsev, "Zakonodatelnye Osnovy Zemelnykh Otnoshenii v. S.S.S.R." *Izvestia Akademii Nauk SSSR Otdel Ekonomiki i Prava*. M. 1948, No. 5.

<sup>42</sup> *Pravda*, March 31, 1947. Also the article "Stalinski Premii" (Stalin Prizes for Achievement and Work in the Field of Agricultural Economy) *Sotsialisticheskoe Zemelnelie*, April 9 and 10, 1949.

of the four possible rewards can be received by farmers if the harvest has reached or surpassed these indices. This system of rewards certainly expands the economic differentiation among peasants and provides incentive hardly in line with collective philosophy.

The same policy was applied and enlarged in 1949, when indices of cattle-breeding and of large harvests of some technical crops were established.<sup>43</sup> The Soviet newspapers are full of the conferring of titles and medals awarded to farmers who proved worthy of them in reaching or surpassing the established indices.

The system of making generous rewards as a means of encouragement is probably more effective at present than the application of penalties against the idle or disloyal kolkhoz members. Nevertheless, this latter system must not be ignored.

The mildest method of repression to be applied is contained in a disciplinary order.<sup>44</sup> This method is applied by the kolkhoz itself. Another measure at the disposal of a kolkhoz is the expulsion of its members from the collective farms. This punitive step was evidently abused and the government prohibited its employment unless a member proved to be "incorrigible, subversive, and disruptive to the collective farm," and only after all preventive and educational measures provided for in the charter had been exhausted. Moreover, the decision ordering expulsion cannot be put into effect until the district executive committee has made the final judgment on the decision.

The limitation of the right and practice of expulsion from collective farms was addressed to those leaders of such farms who "fail to realize that expulsion from a collective farm means to the one expelled deprivation of his source of subsistence; it means not only exposure to disgrace in public opinion, but also condemnation to starvation."<sup>45</sup>

Expulsion really creates disastrous conditions for an expelled member, since according to existing regulations he receives only a very

---

<sup>43</sup> Ukase of April 20, 1949, on Indices in Cattle-Breeding (*Vedomosti Verkhovnogo Soveta*, April 30, 1949, No. 19); Ukase of May 20, 1949, on High Harvest of Cotton (*Vedomosti*, May 28, 1949, No. 25); Ukase on Indices of Jute Produce (*Vedomosti*, July 3, 1949, No. 31).

<sup>44</sup> "Members who fail to take good care of, or who neglect, the collective property, who fail to report for work without a justifiable reason, who work badly, or who violate labor discipline or the charter, shall be punished by the management in accordance with the rules of internal organization. For example, such member may be ordered to do the poor work over again without any credit in labor days. He may be warned, reprimanded, or reproved at the general meeting, or his name may be put on the blackboard. He may be fined up to five labor days; he may be demoted to a lower paid job, or suspended from work." Art. 17. par. 2 of the Charter.

<sup>45</sup> Resolution of April 19, 1938, Prohibiting Expulsion of Members from Collective Farms. The full text is in II GsovSKI, *op. cit.*, *supra*, note 3, No. 32.



small part of the property contributed by him to the collective farm at the moment of its organization or his becoming a member of it. The initiation fee and the greater part (from one-half to three-quarters) of his property which he transfers to the kolkhoz, such as cattle, agricultural machines, if any, implements, and even building, become the "indivisible capital" of the kolkhoz. Only the remainder, from one-quarter to one-half of a member's contribution is assigned to the "share capital" as a certain member's share. When leaving the kolkhoz, a member's share is returned to him in the form of compensation according to the fixed prices, which are always considerably lower than those on the open market. Any increase in the working capital of the kolkhoz belongs to it and is also indivisible.<sup>46</sup>

As a rule, the departing member of a collective farm also loses his plot of land for household economy.<sup>47</sup> No wonder that he is deprived "of his source of subsistence," as is correctly pointed out in the above quoted official document.

Even more severe repressions against farmers are established by the criminal law. Some acts committed by collective farmers, such as the malicious slaughter or intentional maiming of livestock or horses, the spoiling or damaging of any tractor, the criminally negligent handling of any horse, are punishable according to the penal codes of the Union of Soviet Republics.<sup>48</sup>

The most drastic punishment threatens those members of collective farms who are prosecuted for the pillage of socialist property as "a betrayal of the common cause of the collective farm and aid to enemies of the people." This crime is considered a counter-revolutionary act and is punishable "with all the severity of the law"<sup>49</sup> (the death penalty, substituted by twenty-five year confinements according to the law of May 26, 1947, and restored by the Ukase of January 12, 1950).

<sup>46</sup> Art. 10 of the Charter.

<sup>47</sup> "The departing member may obtain a land allotment only outside the land enclosure belonging to the artel." *Ibid.* This regulation deprives even the member of a collective farm who leaves voluntarily of the possibility to get a plot of land, since it is practically impossible to get land outside the kolkhoz.

<sup>48</sup> Art. 79 (1-4) of the Penal Code of the R.S.F.S.R.

<sup>49</sup> Art. 18 of the Charter and Laws of Aug. 7, 1932, and of June 4, 1947.

"Judicial reprisals for the absence of kolkhoz members or their refusal to work are to be taken either against persons who, while being absent, conduct propaganda against the kolkhoz labor discipline and thus disintegrate the kolkhoz, or against kolkhoz officials who do not combat the violators of labor discipline in the kolkhoz. In the first case Art. 58-10 of the Criminal Code is to be applied." Ruling of the Supreme Court of the R.S.F.S.R. of Nov. 24, 1933.

"Clandestine grist, even manual, in farms belonging to nontoilers and also by toilers, if affected as a trade for profit entails punishment according to Art. 107 of the Criminal Code," i.e. by deprivation of liberty for a period of not less than five years with the

## VIII

Collective farms, from both a technical and ethical point of view, might be a progressive form of agricultural economy. As a coöperative, a kolkhoz is supposed to have at its disposal modern agricultural equipment, to utilize the organized assistance of agronomists, to apply advanced work methods, and to have all the advantages of a rational division of labor. Undoubtedly there are in the Soviet Union some prosperous and advanced kolkhozes which can be shown to be model collective farms. Some of them are better equipped, some are closer to large cities and consequently to the best markets, and some possess lands of better quality. But in general, as the Soviet papers announce annually and as statistical analysis of the results of collectivization convincingly indicates, the kolkhozes are not as profitable as they were supposed to be.<sup>60</sup>

The reason for the failure of collectivization, from the point of view of its returns, lies in the peculiarities of the centralized system of economy and the nonconformity of its legal basis to actual human psychology. Every kolkhoz is first of all a part of the huge economic machinery of the integral planning system. The kolkhoz administration is in turn a very small part of a huge bureaucratic apparatus submitted to the control, supervision, and leadership of numerous economic, political, and administrative organs and agencies. Besides, a kolkhoz depends economically on M.T.S., and the latter in turn, on various industrial enterprises and shops. Every inefficiency or nonfulfillment of the plan, for instance, in supplying machines or spare parts, or in the repair of machines, causes a repercussion in the whole system.

## IX

Kolkhoz economy and the activities of members of collective farms are regulated by public and not by private law. This is of paramount significance. If a kolkhoz were really organized on a voluntary basis and had in its possession the necessary machines, if it were vested with the right to dispose freely of its produce as an independent subject of private law, then it might be a very progressive agricultural organization. But, on the contrary, it is not a voluntary organization, it does

confiscation of the entire property. Ruling of the Supreme Court of the R.S.F.S.R. of Sept. 13, 1934.

<sup>60</sup> The net agricultural production in the U.S.A. before the war was approximately 50 per cent higher than in the U.S.S.R., although the agricultural population of the U.S.A. was only one-third of that of the U.S.S.R. The increase in profit does not correspond to the increase in expenses. N. M. Yasny, "Akhillesova Piata Kolkhoznoi sistemy." *Novy Zhurnal*, v. XIV, New York, 1943.

not own the most important machines, and can dispose of but a small part of the produce assigned to the members of a kolkhoz as their remuneration, at its own discretion. To denominate a kolkhoz, Soviet literature has established a Russian term—*artel*. This name is constantly used in Soviet official documents, as well as in special economic works. In Russian prerevolutionary law a typical form of artel was a voluntary organization of several persons who joined together to carry on certain kinds of work and earn money which they divided among themselves according to their mutual agreement. Members of an artel usually owned the necessary implements and were organized as a legal entity with a chairman (*starosta*) and sometimes with a board of directors at its head. Usually an artel did not work for itself but for another party from whom it received remuneration.

A kolkhoz is also an artel *sui generis*. As a matter of fact, this definition illustrates its essential characteristics. The so-called property of the collective farm is in reality a "socialist property" which cannot be disposed of freely because of its special designation for the needs of socialist economy. The farmers till, sow, and harvest certain parts of the state land, divided into portions and distributed among numerous artels. Members of collective artels (kolkhozes) receive remuneration in the form of a share in produce.<sup>51</sup> This share, as we know, is mostly too small, is insufficient for the existence of a farmer and his family, and therefore, as an additional remuneration, farmers have house-and-garden plots of land for their individual use.<sup>52</sup>

However, a kolkhoz and an artel of prerevolutionary times differ essentially as legal institutions. Both are legal entities, but the artel, as a form of coöperative, was an organization of private law. The kolkhoz, on the other hand, is an organization of public character. Like a *trust* it is a government economic organization for fulfilling the agricultural part of the national economic plan. For this reason a kolkhoz cannot help but be submitted, as it really is, to the government and Party agencies. For the same reason any violation of the rules and obligations binding on the kolkhoz is considered a crime against the state ("a betrayal of the common cause" and "aid to enemies of the people").

---

<sup>51</sup> The prerevolutionary practice was acquainted with the share-cropping, the so-called *ispolnaia arenda*, land leased from squires in return for half of its produce ("ispolnaia" means "half-half"). The squire's share was too great; nevertheless, both squire and peasant divided profit and loss. The Soviet state, having a fixed amount of the crops, runs no risk at all.

<sup>52</sup> "For the satisfaction of consumer needs of a member of the kolkhoz until these needs can be satisfied by the Kolkhoz." D. Shepelev. *Sotsialisticheskaya Kolkhoznaia Sobstvennost*, 1940, p. 33.

A kolkhoz, the same as any other organization of public law, cannot be liquidated by a general assembly of its members. It cannot even exclude a member without approval by the district executive committee. In fact, members of kolkhozes are attached to their farms and cannot freely choose their residence or jobs.

There are some misleading expressions and formulations in Soviet law which give a false idea of the real nature of kolkhozes. Thus Article 8 of the Constitution, for instance, declaring that "The land occupied by collective farms is secured to their use free of charge," is not precise because the land is given to a kolkhoz first and foremost for production in the interests of the state. Hence it is the state which has to remunerate the farmers and guarantee their existence as its agricultural workers, but the farmers are not debtors of the state who can be charged for "the use" of land. Farmers work on the state's lands and with the state's machines and give up to the state a fixed amount of crops and other agricultural products. It is no less misleading when kolkhozes are mentioned on a par with other coöperative organizations which "may possess all kinds of property equally with private persons."<sup>53</sup> Almost the whole property of kolkhozes is "socialist property" and not private property which they may possess "equally with private persons." Collective farm property on a par with state property, is "sacred and inviolable,"<sup>54</sup> protected by the same penal law.<sup>55</sup> "Kolkhoz socialist property" is a part of the national fund distributed among 250,000 artels for the fulfilling of some parts of the national plan.<sup>56</sup>

## X

To summarize, we may define a kolkhoz as an artel of farmers who are compulsorily organized for agricultural work on a certain part of the state land, in accordance with the state economic plan, and who receive remuneration in the form of a share in their produce and the right to independent but limited exploitation of house-and-garden plots.

Every kolkhoz is subject to numerous controlling and guiding organs and regulations, and consequently to the inevitable bureaucratism inherent in the system of centralized economy. Agriculture, a branch of economy which should be most flexible because of its very nature, be-

<sup>53</sup> Art. 57 of the Civil Code.

<sup>54</sup> Art. 5 and 131 of the Constitution. "State property and kolkhoz coöperative property are of the same type." A. Koshelev. *Sotsialisticheskaia Sobstvennost*, Ogiz, 1946, p. 46.

<sup>55</sup> Law of August 7, 1932.

<sup>56</sup> Law of March 18, 1946, "on the Five-Year Plan for 1946-50." "The obligation to deliver produce to the state arises from the basis of the economic plan—in other words, from the system of regulated economy." Agarkov and others. *CIVIL LAW TEXTBOOK*, p. 298 (1944).

comes less successful, therefore, than it might be.

As an organization fulfilling certain public functions, a kolkhoz presupposes a collective psychology on the part of its members. But this psychology does not exist and cannot be created on order. Hence there is a struggle of the farmers for more freedom and their devotion to their individual plots of land. On the other hand there is the exertion of the government to submit the kolkhozes to its sway. Hence the idleness of the farmers and their lack of interest in harvests and machines which do not belong to them; hence the futile efforts of the government to overcome the peasants' individualism and to force them or encourage them to give their solemn pledge to Stalin "to produce more and deliver more to the state."

The history of Soviet legislation concerning kolkhozes shows an uninterrupted struggle between the individualist trends of the peasantry and the collectivist tendencies of socialism. Constant fluctuations characterize this legislation. Now the government strengthens penalties, now it distributes generous rewards, transforming additional and subsidiary motives into the principal stimuli. Sometimes it tries to suppress individualistic trends by force, sometimes it yields to the farmer's psychology.

Undoubtedly rewards encourage the farmers to energetic efforts, since the medals and honorary titles, as well as the material privileges and donations, meet egoistic interests and motives half way. Besides rewards, the Soviets in 1948 and 1949 applied one more measure which again made a compromise with the individualistic psychology of the farmers. Some parts of the arable area in the use of a kolkhoz were assigned to certain groups of farmers (*zveno*) for a special kind of crop. In such cases the farmers composing the group did not receive their reward on the basis of labor days but in a share of the harvest in conformity with the efficiency of their work. They were thus interested in the quality of the tillage, in timely sowing and harvesting, and in careful storage. This measure was put into effect as an experiment in a few kolkhozes. It transformed some kolkhoz farmers into what we would call tenant farmers, those who give a share of the crop to the landowner.<sup>57</sup> Here the hidden essence of the kolkhoz as a state enterprise becomes more evident. This was at the same time another partial return to the principles of private interests and a concession to the psychology characterized in the Soviet press as petty bourgeois psy-

<sup>57</sup> The experiment is described in the *Sotsialisticheskoe Zemledelie*, No. 18, January 22, 1948. The author of the article states that the experiment proved to be successful.

chology. Its success should be another proof that labor on the basis of private interest and individual independence and initiative is more efficient than on the basis of compulsory collectivism. However, the experiment, although approved by Andreev, a member of the Politbureau, was flatly rejected by the Party at the beginning of 1950.<sup>58</sup>

Almost simultaneously with the attack against Comrade Andreev's utterances the Soviet papers began to propagate the necessity of the "consolidating kolkhozes" (*ukrupnenie kolkhozov*).<sup>59</sup> Misappropriations, embezzlements, and other kinds of theft of kolkhoz property still have been continued in spite of all measures applied by the C.P. and the government. Many kolkhozes remained in great arrears to the state in the delivery of agricultural products. For these reasons and in order to achieve more proper organization of labor and the maximum utilization of modern machinery the Politbureau has decided to tear out any vestiges of peasants' individualism and to convert agricultural labor into a type of industrial labor. This has to be achieved by the consolidation of kolkhozes.

The new large farms are to be formed of each three, five, and even more old ones. Villages are to be replaced with "agricultural towns." All common buildings, inventories, cattle and other property become the property of one consolidated kolkhoz. Peasants have to be resettled, leaving their homes and house-and-garden plots of land, which they so zealously cultivated. "Coöperative property" of kolkhozes is forcibly merged; "personal property" of farmers' families is ignored. Undertaking these measures "the Party of Lenin-Stalin is confidently leading the Soviet people toward the victory of communism."<sup>60</sup> The advantage of the large kolkhoz will be in "strengthening of socialist discipline, fostering of communism in the soul of the peasant and the transformation of his psychology."<sup>61</sup>

The new reform, the "second collectivization," is carried out in a *blitz* manner. Every step of planting, harvesting, livestock breeding, etc. is regulated. The fictitious economic and administrative independence of collective farms (agricultural artels) is strikingly uncovered; the legal nature of Soviet Collective Farms, as government economic organizations for fulfilling the agricultural part of the national economic plan, becomes still more evident.

<sup>58</sup> *Pravda*, editorial, February 19, 1950. See SOVIET PRESS TRANSLATIONS, No. 8, April 15, 1950.

<sup>59</sup> *Izvestia*, March 31, April 27; *Pravda*, June 15, 1950, etc.

<sup>60</sup> *Pravda*, February 19, 1950, Editorial.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. *Izvestia*, November 22, 1950, p. 1.