



Copyright © 2014 by KAD International
All rights reserved.
Published in the Ghana

<http://kadint.net/our-journal.html>

The Soviet State Social Policy in the Sphere of Development of the Material Culture of the Southern Russian Peasants in the 1920-ies

Susanna D. Bagdasaryan

Sochi State University, Russian Federation
PhD (History)
E-mail: BSD73@mail.ru

Abstract

This article discusses the problems of formation of the Soviet state social policy transformations in material culture of the southern Russian peasants in the 1920-ies. The necessity of studying the Soviet state social policy in Russia in the period of 1920-ies the historical aspect is determined by several factors. First, in the study of Russian history of the XX century, one of the main directions of national historiography was and remains the study of social problems at various stages of its development. In this regard, relevant is the consideration of the main challenges for social development at country and regional level. Secondly, in the formation of a new concept of social development of the country increases the need to adequate understanding of the role and importance of the Soviet state in the modernization of Russian society. One of the fundamental principles of state social policy is the principle of state responsibility for creating the conditions necessary for the development of society and the individual. In this regard, special scientific and practical interest becomes the problem of the essence of social policy in different historical periods, especially in the 1920-ies the history of the Soviet state, when it formed the Soviet system. In the analysed time clearly showed different approaches to solving social problems: in the framework of the state ideology and assumptions in Economics elements of private property (1921-1929).

Keywords: The Soviet State Social Policy; Material Culture; House Building; Rural Inhabited Construction; Dwelling; Hut.

Introduction

Material culture housing south of the Russian peasantry was in the early 1920's stronghold in the traditional way: hata (Kuban hut called wattle and daub dwelling structure, tuloksia, and other mud-dwelling). In particular, the researchers rightly indicate that in the architectural appearance of the Kuban house combined features of the dwellings of the steppe and forest-steppe areas of Ukraine, and in the Eastern districts of Kuban was influenced by the "dispensation of the Don Cossacks and the population of the southern regions". [1]

The first steps of the Soviet government in the housing sector of the southern Russian village were as shifts in many other areas of the peasant everyday life, almost negative. The Civil War was one of the inevitable consequences of large-scale destruction of housing. This was especially noticeable in the South of Russia (in particular, on the Don, where the vast majority of the Cossacks made against the Bolsheviks and where, therefore, were the most fierce battles and the front not once moved in one direction and then in another hand. No wonder that such a violent confrontation village of Kazanskaya, for example, was "destroyed to the root"[2] like many other villages and stanitsas. Their contribution to the growth of the housing crisis has made famine of 1921 - 1922, at that time contemporaries testified as a result of the extinction of entire families and the flight of the population in the more prosperous areas "houses are abandoned", and "courts were thrown". [3] Orphan housing, of course, was bought for construction materials and fuel by the local population and, thereby, the housing stock continued to decline. Before the Soviet state began the task of rebuilding housing, improvement of its quality.

Materials and Methods

The article is based on historical, journalistic, monographic materials that reveal the condition of the material culture of South-Russian peasantry in the 1920-ies. Methodological basis of the work was the method of historical comparison preserved state information of peasant housing in the study period and the first measures of the Soviet government's social policy to restore not only the economy but also to increase the level of life of the peasant population.

Discussion

The Soviet government at the end of the Civil War tried to implement measures for the repair and reconstruction of housing in relation to the representatives of those social layers and groups which were its allies and support. In this case, the demonstration that took place in October 1920, the Congress of the Kuban-black sea regional and divisional committees to assist farms of red soldiers expressed the intention "to take all measures to repair buildings" in those farms. [4] It is obvious, however, that in the post-war devastation such measures could not have any wide distribution; moreover, it was often that all the help had been limited only to declarations.

After the transition to civilian life and the proclamation of the NEP from the peasants and representatives of party and Soviet leadership came opportunities for restoration and expansion of housing stock and modernization of the housing sector. However, the analysis of sources allows us to assert that the representatives of the ruling in the USSR party and administrative structures, on the one hand, and the main mass of the peasantry on the other, were different positions on the question of whether to introduce innovations in the economy and how much to do it.

The greatest degree of innovation in the housing sector was visible in the collective farms, the first of which appeared in Soviet Russia in October 1917 [5] In contrast to individual farmers, collective farmers practiced common forms of living. Typically, this differed Communards, uniting not collectives or PC (*partnership cultivation*), and in the communes, which were characterized by a maximum socialization of production and life. In particular, the Kuban Communards and working farmers did not live in private homes but "in rooms of socialized houses, which in the past belonged to the military Cossack authorities or large landowners. The apartments workers and Communards walls were decorated with posters, portraits of the heroes of the revolution. Russian stove, unnecessary in the case of public catering, was replaced by a small oven - Dutch stove or stove". [6] In the commune "Communist lighthouse" of George region Tersky district of the North Caucasus territory in 1928, its members lived in a shared house, where for each family was allocated a "tidy and well cleaned separate apartment" and two rooms for boys and girls. [7]

If the commune was based on the empty place and its members could not settle in any empty manor, they built dormitories by themselves. So did the members of the commune "Future" Labinsk area, Armavir district of the Kuban region in 1922, erecting the first time adobe building with five living rooms and one big room for school". [8] When in the spring of 1923 in Kushevskaya district of South-East Russia emerged emigrant (Estonian) commune "Coit" ("dawn"), the Communards for a short time built, in addition to a number of outbuildings, two-storey residential building type community".[9]

Not always, however, the Communards had at hand roomy accommodations or the ability to build them. In such cases, they had to settle for any housing, regardless of its condition and even despite the fact that it was not appropriate for collective life. Thus, according to the Kuban regional subdivision of farms, in the early 1920s, 75 % of the members of local agricultural cooperatives and even communes lived in dilapidated huts, houses or hastily constructed huts, leading to increased morbidity: for example, in farm artel "General labor" three quarters of the team suffered from malaria. [10]

During the era of the NEP "housing" in the communes of Soviet Russia (the Soviet Union) became less urgent because as the organizational-economic strengthening of a number of collective farms and the elimination of many weak and unstable collective associations. But, at the end of the 1920s, this issue has again become acute in the total collectivization, when the pointer and under pressure of the authorities on an empty place there was mass hasty and failed farms, many of which had no business premises and housing for its members. So, for example, the commune "Bolshevik" Blagodarnenskiy district of the Stavropol district of the North Caucasus region in 1929 "placed its members in the barns", [11] and similar collective farms were many.

Despite all the exceptions to the rule, similar to the above, housing in collective farms (communes) significantly differed from the traditional household in villages and villages of the South of Russia. As for the individual farms in the 1920s, they showed a different balance between tradition and innovation in the housing sector.

It should be emphasized that the authorities and the ideologists of Bolshevism in the 1920s, urging farmers to restore destroyed by the war economy and, in particular, to repair old and build new housing, constantly recommended them as widely as possible apply non-traditional villages materials (bricks, concrete, tiles etc.) and building technology (construction comfortable brick houses and so on). Actually, these recommendations were not new: long before the Bolsheviks with similar councils was Zemstvo. Propaganda apparatus of the Communist party only provided a rational propose a new ideological motivation, which boiled down to the fact that the Soviet countryside, first, should become immeasurably richer and stronger than autocracy and, secondly, it must be converted by the pattern of the city and, eventually, turn into its exact likeness.

The last requirement was dictated by the Bolshevik (Marxist) ideology, with positions that the city and living there factory workers were the ideal modern (of course, for that historical period) of industrial civilization and the basis of socialism-communism and peasantry was hopeless outsider historic race mired in the "idiocy of rural life". [12] Even more important was the fact that eliminating differences between village and city helped to transform peasants into workers and, thereby, strengthen the social base of the Communist regime (in more generally, as argued Bolshevik theorists, the rebuilding of the village on the model of the city was "of paramount importance for the construction of communism") [13].

If not proceed from ideological dogmas, but quite practical calculations, the fact that the pre-Soviet and Soviet authorities to the peasants proceeded similar calls to modernize the field of economy and Economics, was explained by the presence in the village era of NEP serious unresolved domestic problems, such as a modest residential area rural houses, poor sanitary and hygienic conditions in them.

In those years, enthusiasts, such as A. Skachkov in the newspaper "New village" offered pre-kolkhoz village, a new method of housing construction, namely, the construction of houses of solomit and canes. Modern technology, wrote Skachkov, "invented a way to do the straw, dry and completely covered with clay, fireproof material, namely "solomit"". [14] That new building material was a "made on special presses the plates or mats of dry not mint straw, tightly drawn two rows of wire; series wire tightened special wire hooks". The usual thickness of this straw plate was 5 - 10 cm, a width of 1 m, the length is slightly more than 2 m, and the last two parameters could be of any size to order. Just looked and canes, with the only difference that it, as the name implies, was made not of straw and reeds. [15]

Skachkov gave a flattering description of solomit, noting that this material is very durable and yet lightweight, different fire resistance, low heat conductivity.[16] Undoubted advantage of solomit was its cheapness: if, for example, the cost of 1 square fathoms cork plate thickness of 1 inch was 75 rubles, the same size piece of felt in three layers - 36 rubles, the same parameters for the plate solomit thickness of 1.5 inches is only 8 to 12 rubles Moreover, Skachkov argued that such a low price can be significantly reduced, "solomit currently still relatively expensive and cheaper when the peasants themselves will establish themselves in its production". [17]

The disadvantages of solomit were: minimum resistance (solomit afraid of water and it is impossible to make a roof for the roof, though for thermal insulation of ceiling it was quite good); high probability of damage by rodents - rats and mice (therefore, before use in construction dolomit plates were encouraged to dip in a solution of iron sulphate or stand in strong wormwood water); low density, resulting in solomit very poorly kept clogged nails ("solomit you can drive anywhere, nails, but these nails to hold will not and the big weight hang impossible. To do this, you must first be nailed to the posts tesino and nails). [18] It was obvious, however, that the merits of solomit were noticeably more, and its limitations were relatively easy to overcome.

Among the most important advantages of solomit were ease of use in the economy. The construction of the house using solomit resembled the construction process turluk hut: there also first collected the wooden frame, which, however, was not daubed with clay, and trimmed dolomit (reed) plates. Those plates could easily be cut and it was equally easy to tack nails to a wooden base (but the nail could easily completely away in the straw plate, and therefore the experts advised to put under the hats of nails "shaibochki of roofing iron") [19]. Sheathing wooden frame solomit

could be had for the day and ready solomit wall should be plastered, and pre-treatment or upholstery it felt was not required. Recommended inside cover solomit "alabaster or clay solution, and outside lime, cement or mixed (calcareous cement)". [20]

As stated in the press, solomit was invented in pre-revolutionary Russia. Already in 1915, two plants near Moscow had produced about 2 thousand cubic yards of this valuable building material". [21] The first method of manufacturing solomit was kept secret, but in 1924 the machines and the right production solomit were sold construction engineering organization of cooperative Barybinsky partnership (cooperative farm), which, in turn, resold them Mospromstroy (the Office of the state industrial construction, located in Moscow). There and began to make solomit in the era of NEP, and they did it on a large and complex machine weighing about 100 pounds, for a service which had 15 people. Prices 1925, the cost of the machine was 7 thousand rubles, which was not allowed farmers or cooperatives to buy it: "this amount [was] not under force." [22]

Of course, all this prevented widespread solomit in the Soviet countryside. Skachkov, however, optimistic argued that there are already simple and cheap machines (for example, authorship technique F. A. Gogin), and indeed, "solomit curried in many places of the Union of artisanal on cheap machines, and in Novorossiysk and other southern cities were made canes. [23] In General, solomit was interpreted as a modern, efficient and very convenient building material, which was confirmed by using its foreign counterparts in France and Belgium when restoring destroyed during the First World War settlements. [24]

We emphasize that the representatives of the party and Soviet bodies and technical experts advised the villagers to upgrade and improve the economy and home life not only new, but traditional methods and materials, primarily from the same clay. It was recommended, for example, to build a mud-thatched and mud-brushwood (*wooden-earthen*) construction, [25] use of clay to cover the fire shingle [26] and straw [27] roofs, etc.

Such calls might seem inconsistent with the spirit of modernization of the housing sector of the Soviet pre-kolkhoz village, for such involved the introduction of new (or at least not widely used in pre-Soviet times) materials and technologies. However, they were motivated not by the desire of the authorities to preserve the tradition, but rather to provide all of the same upgrades, but a cheaper price.

In fact, few of the farmers in impoverished post-revolutionary and post-war Soviet Russia could afford to build a brick house, or at least to cover the roof of the house not straw or shingles, because it had cost a pretty penny (especially in terms of devastation price of construction materials had risen). Yes, actually, and had suffered greatly during the war industry was not in the state to provide the country with capacity of materials (and the authorities had no means and opportunities for a radical reconstruction of the housing sector pre-kolkhoz village on the model socialist city). The use of traditional materials - clay, straw, brushwood, etc., that was allowed to reduce, simplify and speed up construction. Skachkov, for example, noted that mud-brushwood construction cost the farmer "very cheap, as the material on them is the cheapest and not the purchase, namely: clay, wood, straw, and sometimes just a little bit of lime". The walls of such buildings are erected "twice the speed of the individual stones or bricks, you can build for "5 or the biggest 10 days". [28]

However, traditional materials and technologies were used so that with their help the task was run modernization of peasant economy and housekeeping. The same mud-thatched building, it was possible to give a more substantial volume than single-chamber a log hut (increasing, thereby, the living space), make it large windows that contributed to the creation of favorable sanitary conditions; this building was characterized by increased resistance, etc. That is, the use of traditional materials was not contrary to modernization, and reduced it (although, of course, it still was a coercive measure).

In any case, in the 1920s, part of the rural population listened carefully to the recommendations of the authorities on the application in the economy of modern materials and technologies and, moreover, sought those recommendations were to perform. In particular, in 1925, the press stated intention of some rural residents to build a "tree-concrete huts", which had a high resistance and were relatively cheap: if the construction of "medium wood-concrete huts" was 1,7 thousand rubles, traditional huts, log - 8,1 thousand rubles, and brick house - 8,1 thousand rubles [29]

Rustic enthusiasts with more or less success tried to produce modern materials and construction of their homes. In 1927 one of these enthusiasts wrote in the "New village" to engineer A. I. Skachkov, as he with companions, placed in the magazine's advice and started making concrete blocks. [30] In response to the demand from the peasantry on bricks, tiles and other materials, agricultural cooperative associations were created appropriate workshops. In 1926, for example, credit farmer organization in the village Scrotum Kaluga province was opened a workshop for the production of tiles; the main consumers of its products were farmers and it was significant that there were many orders, as a result, as witnessed by his contemporaries, machine tools of workshop "work hard". [31]

But, the vast majority of people pre-kolkhoz village, for a number of reasons (not always willingly, but under the pressure of circumstances), followed the tradition in the economy and living arrangement. This trend was dominant in the 1920s in the USSR and, including, in the South of Russia.

Conclusion

The causes which influenced the traditional practice of dispensation in South Russian pre-kolkhoz village remained were diverse. Select those that, in our opinion, were the most important. First of all, let us note an acute shortage of those building materials, without which the building of modern wooden and brick houses was not possible: wood, brick, tile, roofing iron, etc. This deficit was a stable phenomenon throughout the 1920s, and was felt even in the Central, North-Western and other, more or less wooded, regions of the USSR; and as for the steppe region of Southern Russia, where brick and wooden houses before and were a little bit, lack of such materials had killed the idea of modernization of the economy on to.

References:

1. Kuban Cossack villages. P. 108 - 109; history of Kuban (historical essays) / Resp. ed. V.N. Ratushnyak. - Krasnodar, 1993. P. 179.
2. Verbatim report [of the North Caucasus] regional meeting of the poor peasants, Cossacks and mountaineers. Rostov on/D., 1926. P. 24.
3. K. D. Kevsalinskii delegates // Farmer. 1923. No. 8. P. 37.
4. CDNI QC, F. 1, op. 1, D. 76, L. 6.
5. Vyultsan M. A., B. P. Danilov, Kabanov V. V, Moshkov Y. A. Collectivization of agriculture in the USSR: the ways, forms, achievements. P. 31.
6. Kuban Cossack villages. P. 130.
7. Sytov S. P. Commune "Communist lighthouse" // Path of the North-Caucasian largest. 1928. No. 3. P. 49.
8. Saprykin D. F. Commune "Future" gradually evolves // Path of the North-Caucasian largest. 1928. No. 6 - 7. P. 45.
9. Rauk A. I. Companions of the commune "Coit" // the Dawn / Comp. A. F. Chmyka, M.O. Levkovich. M., 1981. P. 102.
10. Ustinovskiy I. V. First steps of Kuban-Black sea regional party organization in the collective farm movement (1920 - early 1921) // Creativity, practice, experience. P. 103.
11. State archive of the Stavropol territory, F. R-602, op. 1, D. 79, L. 47.
12. Marx K., Engels, F. the Communist Manifesto. M., 1948. P. 52.
13. Karnaukhova E. O. About the elimination of significant differences between town and village. M., 1953. P. 20.
14. Skachkov A. I. What should know the farmer about solomita // New village. 1926. No. 13. P. 43.
15. Skachkov A. I. What should know the farmer about solomita // New village. 1926. No. 13. P. 43.
16. Speaking of high strength solomit, Skachkov explained that this is achieved by a dense baling straw plates. Despite this, tightly pressed plate solomita was relatively easy: it was "poods are many, many inches in thickness solomit". For example, the plate is longer than 2 meters, 1 meter wide and 5 cm thick weighed only 33,3 kg. Fire of solomit has been proven by tests: "many times when testing dolomit plate was soaked in kerosene and set alight. They were not burned, and only the top quarter inch was charred, the middle of solomit was always quite strong. Solomit

plastered no damage if the fire had not been". The thermal conductivity of solomit was lower than that of wood: outdoor solomit wall thickness of 2.5 vershok, plastered on both sides, as well kept the house warm, like a wall of logs in 5 vershok or bricks in the 16 vershok. (Skachkov A. I. What should know the farmer about solomit // New village. 1926. No. 13. P. 43 - 44).

17. Skachkov A. I. What should know the farmer about solomit // New village. 1926. No. 13. P. 44, 45.

18. Skachkov A. I. What should know the farmer about solomit // New village. 1926. No. 13. P. 44, 45.

19. Ibid., P. 45.

20. Ibid., P. 44.

21. All // New village. 1924. No. 1. P. 86.

22. Skachkov A. I. What should know the farmer about solomit // New village. 1926. No. 13. P. 47; His: Machines for the manufacture of solomit // New village. 1926. No. 14. P. 33.

23. Ibid., S. 47; ibid, P. 34.

24. All // New village. 1924. No. 1. P. 86.

25. Mud-thatched buildings were constructed by pouring clay solution ("mash") in a wooden form, where before it was put straw (Skachkov A. I. Mud-thatched buildings // New village. 1927. No. 19. P. 40 - 43). "Mud-brushwood buildings were constructed in a similar fashion: first, did the formwork, then she applied a layer of clay mass ("honemade"), which was pressed layer of brushwood. Then the operation was repeated until the wall until he reached the desired height (Skachkov A. I. Mud-brushwood rural fire resistant residential buildings // New village. 1927. No. 13. P. 31).

26. Skachkov A. I. How to make fireproof the shingles roof // New village. 1927. No. 23. P. 33 - 36.

27. All the same Skachkov rightly wrote that a thatched roof, "saturated fatty clay and fermented in the clay one or two days, will be on the roof is not a dangerous". Moreover, the impregnation of clay will increase the durability of the roof, as with proper care it can serve up to 35 years. In response to the attacks of skeptics that such roof is too heavy, Skachkov confidently stated: "that's not true. Mud-brushwood roof crude[,] only what is done[,] weighs from 16 to 18 pounds, and wet and very ready from 10 to 12 pounds, and simple thatched roof after a rain weighs 15 to 20 pounds" (Skachkov A. I. Pay attention to the roof // New village. 1926. No. 11. P. 35).

28. Skachkov A. I. Mud-brushwood rural fire resistant residential buildings // New village. 1927. No. 13. P. 31.

29. Farmers build refractory huts // Young Leninist. 1925. September 25.

30. Carneichik O. How we did concretes // New village. 1927. No. 23. P. 27.

31. From rustic letters // New village. 1926. No. 17. P. 37.