



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2026.3.10>

UDC 94(47)

LBC 63.3(2)614

Submitted: 13.10.2024

Accepted: 18.01.2025

CHANGES IN URBAN EVERYDAY LIFE UNDER COLLECTIVIZATION CONDITIONS (BY THE EXAMPLE OF THE STALIN COLLECTIVE FARM IN THE CITY OF STAVROPOL IN THE NORTH CAUCASUS KRAI)

Karine R. Ambartsumyan

North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, Russian Federation

Tamara A. Bulygina

North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, Russian Federation

Abstract. *Introduction.* The understanding of urban everyday life during Soviet modernization is deepened in contemporary studies with an account of Stavropol's experience of daily routine. The relevance of the topic stems from active development of such fields as the history of urban everyday life and intellectual history, as well as new local history, which allows us to understand the regional dimension of Soviet history. *Methods and materials.* The paper aims to study the process of transformation of everyday life in the city of Stavropol under the influence of collectivization at the turn of the 1920s and 1930s. For the first time, a set of archival materials dedicated to the creation of the Stalin collective farm and stored in collection 329 of the State Archives of the Stavropol Krai is introduced into scientific circulation. The basic approach, along with traditional methods of history, was new local history. The main sources were official documents: applications for membership and withdrawal from the collective farm, as well as minutes of board meetings of the artel or individual sectors. *Analysis.* With the launch of collectivization, the main trend in urban everyday life was the outflow of peasants to cities. The case was different in Stavropol. Here, the urban socio-cultural space was traditionally intertwined with the features of rural life. Therefore, under the conditions of collectivization, three collective farms emerged in the urban area. One of them is the Stalin collective farm, which existed from 1929 to 1957. Different aspects of the everyday life of city dwellers, motives for joining and leaving the collective farm, and various domestic difficulties have been studied. Collective farm establishment was carried out under the guidance of the city council, from the decision to use city property, city land, and city premises. In addition, not only city farmers joined the collective farm but also city residents: workers and employees. *Results.* In terms of everyday life, collectivization had a specific manifestation in Stavropol. The city demonstrated a special way of Soviet urban everyday life as the urban population became collective farmers with their own unique way of life. *Authors' contribution.* K. Ambartsumyan studied the peculiarities of collective farm construction in the city of Stavropol with reference to archival material. T. Bulygina identified the features of the socio-cultural space of Stavropol and studied its transformation during collectivization. The empirical material was collected and processed collaboratively. *Funding.* The reported study was funded by the Russian Science Foundation, project No. (№ 24-18-20073), <https://rscf.ru/project/24-18-20073/>

Key words: Stavropol, everyday life, collectivization, Stalin collective farm, new local history.

Citation. Ambartsumyan K.R., Bulygina T.A. Changes in Urban Everyday Life Under Collectivization Conditions (By the Example of the Stalin Collective Farm in the City of Stavropol in the North Caucasus Krai). *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 4. Istoriya. Regionovedenie. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. History. Area Studies. International Relations], 2026, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 105-116. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2026.3.10>

ИЗМЕНЕНИЯ ГОРОДСКОЙ ПОВСЕДНЕВНОСТИ В УСЛОВИЯХ КОЛЛЕКТИВИЗАЦИИ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ КОЛХОЗА им. СТАЛИНА В СТАВРОПОЛЕ СЕВЕРО-КАВКАЗСКОГО КРАЯ)

Каринэ Размиковна Амбарцумян

Северо-Кавказский федеральный университет, г. Ставрополь, Российская Федерация

Тамара Александровна Булыгина

Северо-Кавказский федеральный университет, г. Ставрополь, Российская Федерация

Аннотация. *Введение.* Понимание городской повседневной жизни в условиях советской модернизации в современной науке углубляется за счет изучения Ставрополя, имевшего своей частный опыт повседневного бытования. Актуальность темы обусловлена активным развитием такого направления, как история городской повседневности и интеллектуальная история, а также новая локальная история, которая позволяет понять региональное измерение советской истории. *Методы и материалы.* Целью исследования является изучение процесса трансформации повседневности города Ставрополя под влиянием коллективизации в черте города на рубеже 1920–1930-х годов. Впервые вводится в научный оборот пласт архивных материалов, посвященных созданию колхоза им. Сталина и хранящихся в фонде 329 Государственного архива Ставропольского края. Базовым подходом, наряду с традиционными методами исторического исследования, стала новая локальная история. Главными источниками являются делопроизводственные документы – заявления о вступлении и выходе из колхоза, а также протоколы собраний правления артели и отдельных секторов. *Анализ.* С началом коллективизации в стране основной тенденцией изменений городской повседневности стал фактор оттока крестьян в города. Иначе было в Ставрополе. Здесь городское социокультурное пространство традиционно переплеталось с признаками сельской жизни. Поэтому в условиях коллективизации на городской территории возникли три колхоза. Один из них – колхоз им. Сталина, просуществовавший с 1929 по 1957 год. Исследованы разные стороны трудовой повседневности горожан, мотивы для вступления и выхода из колхоза, различные бытовые сложности. Колхозное строительство осуществлялось под руководством горсовета: от решения до городского имущества, городской земли, городских помещений. Кроме того, в колхоз вступали не только земледельцы города, но и городские жители: рабочие и служащие. *Результаты.* Коллективизация специфически отразилась на повседневной жизни Ставрополя. Город демонстрировал пример особой советской городской повседневности, когда население города становилось колхозниками, но со своим особым укладом. *Вклад авторов.* К.Р. Амбарцумян изучила на архивном материале особенности колхозного строительства в черте города Ставрополя. Т.А. Булыгина выявила особенности социокультурного пространства Ставрополя, исследовала его трансформацию в период коллективизации. Эмпирический материал собран и обработан авторами совместно. *Финансирование.* Представленное исследование было профинансировано Российским научным фондом, проект № (24-18-20073), <https://rscf.ru/project/24-18-20073/>

Ключевые слова: Ставрополь, повседневность, коллективизация, колхоз им. Сталина, новая локальная история.

Цитирование. Амбарцумян К. Р., Булыгина Т. А. Изменения городской повседневности в условиях коллективизации (на примере колхоза им. Сталина в Ставрополе Северо-Кавказского края) // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 4, История. Регионоведение. Международные отношения. – 2026. – Т. 31, № 3. – С. 105–116. – (На англ. яз.). – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2026.3.10>

Introduction. In modern science, there is a general concept of the city, which is the stronghold of economic and settlement systems [36, p. 201]. The diversity of features typical of a particular city also includes the peculiarities of urban everyday

life as a consequence of civilizational, historical, and local characteristics. The French sociologist A. Lefebvre contributed to the study of the processes of urban space transformation, developing the thesis that each type of society and

mode of production form a unique urban physical and social space [44, pp. 51-52]. According to Lefebvre, if a revolution does not entail a change in space and a new formation, then it is lost. The proposition is essential for our study, as one of the main tenets of the Bolsheviks concerned the creation of a new world, including individuals and their everyday life. A novel construct of sociocultural space in cities as a prerequisite for the birth of an original everyday life became one of the tasks of the Soviet power in the first two decades of its existence.

Since the late 1920s in Soviet Russia, under the influence of the social reality of theoretical disputes between urbanists and de-urbanists, the models of the future Soviet society were formed. The city served its center as an example of a new form of collective relations and a new way of life [41, p. 254].

Everyday life in the Soviet urban environment has been the subject of interest for foreign historians [5; 6; 8; 10]. Already in the late 1920s – early 1930s, a series of notes, *Everyday Life in Russia* by L.H. Putney, was written after a trip to the USSR and published in the *Bulletin of Education at Boston University* [35]. In Russian historiography, everyday life in the Soviet urban environment became most in demand in the last quarter of the 20th century [1; 9; 11; 13; 14; 16; 17; 41; 43]. In local historiography, the problems of everyday life of the relevant period are addressed in the works on the history of the Cossacks, the collective farm movement, and collectivization [7; 15; 38]. However, the topic of everyday life in the urban environment has been little studied. A number of appealing observations and generalizations on the history of everyday life in the Soviet Union by the example of the southern regions are given in the monograph by E.F. Krinko, T.P. Khlynina, and I.G. Tazhidinova [12], yet examining urban everyday life was not specifically the subject of the study.

Methods and materials. The purpose of the paper is to examine a particular feature of everyday life associated with the process of collectivization in the city of Stavropol. With reference to approaches from new local history [3], the process of change in the urban everyday life of the southern province under Stalin's modernization is examined. New local history draws on the real historical experience of

urban local communities with their unique circumstances and exclusive features. According to A.S. Senyavskiy, a city has always been understood as a settlement distinct from its rural surroundings in terms of functionality and even appearance. However, a city has many facets: the size, the number of residents, economic parameters, and administrative status. The set of parameters is variable [37].

With regards to unique characteristics of Stavropol, its distinctiveness is determined by its origins, specifically Fortress No. 8 of the Azov-Mozdok defensive line and the rural outskirts of Stavropolskaya Stanitsa and Soldatskaya Slobodka. The duality between a military and bureaucratic city and a rural way of life persisted in Stavropol until the mid-20th century and found its reflection in everyday life. One of the aspects of this duality concerns collectivization.

New local history helps to reveal the uniqueness of particular urban history while simultaneously embedding it within a national context [2]. The subject of this study is the daily life of members of one of three collective farms in the city of Stavropol during the formation of the collective farm in 1929–1930. The choice of the Stalin Collective Farm is preconditioned by the use of a new local history approach, which addresses the history of local communities, including urban ones. In this case, the members of the collective farm are treated as such.

The State Archives of Stavropol Krai houses a separate collection dedicated to this collective farm (GASK Fund 329). The study used applications for membership and withdrawal and minutes of board meetings of the Stalin Collective Farm and its individual sectors. The reference to microhistory allows us to uncover hidden information about everyday life in official documents and gain insight into the collective farm workers in the urban environment.

Analysis. According to the 1923 census, more than half of the population of Stavropol (50.7%) was concentrated in Pyatigorsk and Stavropol [16]. At the same time, many city residents were rural by way of life. A significant part of the Stavropol population of the outlying districts of Stavropol was engaged in commercial agricultural production. With the launch of the collectivization policy, the situations in the cities changed, respectively. In general, collectivization

and dispossession provoked peasants to move to the cities, which led to the acceleration of urbanization [11]. A historical peculiarity is that collective farm construction was carried out within the boundaries of the urban territory of Stavropol. In 1929, the Stalin Collective Farm was organized, which actually existed until February 25, 1957. The decision to establish collective farms was made not by the district, but by the city council. A meeting of the Stalin Collective Farm with the city council was held on November 20, 1929 [19, l. 24]. A month later, at a meeting of the city council, a plan was adopted for the "complete collectivization of the agricultural population on the outskirts of Stavropol city," and the Committee for Assistance to the Complete Collectivization of the City of Stavropol was organized [45, l. 14].

Labor is an aspect of everyday human existence. Collectivization intruded into this daily routine, introducing a new work-related reality. A study of applications for membership and withdrawal from the agricultural artel provides an opportunity to construct a comprehensive portrait of city residents involved in collective farm construction and to identify reactions to novel working conditions. The portrait rendered certain features to the urban community as collectivization unfolded. The analysis of applications from collective farmers and those wishing to join the artel reflects the general trend of the first stage of collectivization, when peasants became disillusioned with the potential of the collective farm, where they had to work for everyone as much as for themselves. Thus, from January 24 to March 20, 1930, 24 applications for membership in the artel and 58 for withdrawal were submitted [56; 57]. Evidently, stricter conditions could have provoked a social upheaval, especially in grain-producing regions. That could have disrupted collectivization, which is why Stalin's article *Dizzy with Success* [40] and a decree on excesses in the collective farm movement [18] were published.

A study of the minutes of collective farm board meetings also reveals enforced expulsions from the collective farm, reflecting the city peasants' attitude toward the collective farm as something non-owned, something one does not mind. A common reason for expulsion from the artel was failure to show up for work. Theft of collective farm property was also common [23,

l. 29-29 r.]. Alongside the policy of fighting "excesses," administrative measures were in effect. At production meetings, it was stated, "...the recruitment commissions for the brigades are working poorly; the inflow of new members into the collective farm is insignificant" [33, l. 21]. This did not help increase the number of collective farmers in the Stavropol collective farm.

The social composition of those joining the collective farm can illustrate the impact of collectivization on everyday urban life in 1930. Among them were middle and wealthy peasants as well as workers and the poor. The motives of these urban residents varied. 1st Mutnyanskaya Street alone demonstrates the social diversity of those wishing to join the artel. For example, Sergey F. Maryin, a 56-year-old laborer, joined the artel with one dairy cow, a plot of vegetable and garden land, and potato seeds [48, l. 1-1 r.]. M.V. Samovarov, a 38-year-old peasant from the same street, also joined; his possessions included not only a garden and vegetable plot but also cultivated areas. His property records also indicated forage, a horse with harness, tools for cultivating the land, and a pig [51, l. 2-2 r.]. Among those who expressed interest in joining the collective farm was 65-year-old Lavr S. Tarasov, a watchman in the city executive committee's public utilities department and a former employee. In the former case, the motive was either the propaganda image of the collective farm as a source of collective prosperity or the desire to improve one's financial state [52, l. 3-3 r.]. In the latter case, the motive was either the fear of dispossession or the hope of regaining the prestigious status of a full citizen, unlike those disenfranchised.

The city collective farm attracted local workers. For example, metalworker O.L. Glushchenko, who joined the artel in February 1930, was the head of a family of seven and had no property [46, l. 12]. During the same period, tinsmith M.V. Zaitsev, also propertyless and with three children, applied [55, l. 15]. For these applicants, joining the artel was a means of survival. It should be noted that while all these people were considered city dwellers, their lifestyles, standards of living, and social practices varied. By becoming collective farmers, they became equal in social status, living, and working conditions. Applications for membership were filled in on pre-printed forms,

which, on the one hand, makes it impossible to get the human emotions of those signing up for the collective farm, but on the other, allows for the use of quantitative analysis, in particular content analysis, to derive more comprehensive qualitative characteristics.

A more varied picture is presented by requests to leave the collective farm. Unlike applications for membership, these were written in free form, which allows us to understand the expectations and feelings of city residents who had been collective farmers. Many did not understand the purpose of the collective farm movement, were dissatisfied with the collective labor that engendered egalitarianism, and were disappointed with their hopes for easy living on the collective farm. It should be noted that none of the applicants directly stated these reasons; they can be discerned in slips of the tongue, stylistic turns of phrase, or between the lines. The most common reasons for leaving the collective farm were personal issues. These included poor health and family disagreement. Sergey Malykh, a resident of the Novoforstadt district of the city, requested that he and his sons be deregistered from the artel due to "trouble with his wife," who refused to join the collective farm [47, l. 49]. In March 1930, Mikhail Kharitonovich Panibratets, a peasant from the Novoforstadt district, applied for resignation. He was unable to work in the fields due to disability; moreover, he was a tailor by profession [49, l. 26]. Ksenia Volodina, a city resident, asked to leave the collective farm because of her young children, whom she, as a widow, could not leave alone [54, l. 21]. Maria Prozorova, a resident of the Vorobyevsky district of Stavropol, declared her resignation in March 1930 because she "no longer wished to remain on the collective farm" [50, l. 3]. It conveyed disillusionment with collective farm life. The applications reflect, like a mirror, a whole gallery of portraits of city residents with a unique way of life. A study of the daily life of the city collective farmers shows that a Stavropol resident, being an agricultural producer, had the opportunity to earn money through non-agricultural types of labor, while a member of the artel did not.

Letters to the collective farm office also reveal peculiarities of social self-identification. The formulas for addressing and communicating within Soviet society, developed by the authorities,

were unstable in the public consciousness even by the early 1930s. The most literate, in the old-fashioned way, wrote not "applications" but "petitions," which testified to the transitional state not only of society but also of mass consciousness. In the application of the semi-literate Konstantin Pavlovich Gavrilchenko, the first entry was "from the comrade," which was then crossed out and replaced with "from the citizen." He submitted his application to the collective farm without parental consent, claiming "...how could they allow me to do this in their absence, even though I am now doing forced labor?" [53, l. 11].

One of the features of daily life on the city collective farms (three were established in Stavropol) was the opportunity to earn extra income, which the collective farm leaders sternly discouraged. Poverty was the driving force behind the search for work. Thus, M.P. Matyushenko and I.A. Iskakov appealed to the board to allow them to work but were refused: "The request is denied. The comrades recommended to begin working in the artel in order to provide for themselves" [29, l. 53].

City residents' petitions to the collective farm board reveal their attitudes toward collective farm construction. Most of those who joined did not expect financial support. There were recorded cases where the head of the family and children signed up for the collective farm, but the property was registered in the name of the wife, who had not joined the artel. In such cases, the property remaining in the woman's name was not socialized [30, l. 12 r.]. The leadership classified such cases as 'kulak tricks' [30, l. 12 r.]. Symptomatic was the appeal of the collective farm board to the city council requesting the liquidation of kulak farms, which included strong middle peasants [34, l. 15 r.]. Such appeals served as an administrative resource for eliminating competitors to the weak collective farm and contributed to the implementation of the policy of eliminating the kulak as a class.

Located in the city of Stavropol, the Stalin Artel interacted with city authorities and municipal government. The daily life of the collective farm was, to varying degrees, intertwined with city structures and the municipal economy. There were numerous reasons for appealing to the city, including a labor shortage for field work, which was compensated for by sending Komsomol members

and students from city schools [28, l. 38]. In October 1930, the artel faced a labor shortage during the harvest, so the collective farm leaders approached the city council and the trade union council with a request to organize subbotniks (community work days) for city workers and employees, as well as to recruit residents of the city outskirts who were not members of the collective farm for agricultural work. The decision was made at a joint meeting of the board of the Stalin Artel and the board of the Stavropol Industrial Cooperative [21, l. 88].

The placement of the collective farm within the city borderline raised questions about the use of the confiscated property. The artel laid claim to many of the premises, while the city authorities were free to use them for their own needs. At the end of 1929, the city communal department (GORKO) of Stavropol signed an agreement with the Probuzhdenie gardeners' artel for the lease of several dachas (summer houses) within the city border: the Pavlov dacha (owned by one of the honorary citizens of the city, a well-known philanthropist), the Grubi dacha (owned by a family of brewers of Czech origin), and the Alafuzov gardens (a well-known family of entrepreneurs and brewers in Stavropol) [4, l. 32]. A few months later, as collectivization was unfolding in 1930, GORKO signed an agreement with the Comrade Stalin Artel for the lease of the same territories, and the agreement with the Probuzhdenie artel was annulled [4, l. 39 r.].

Moreover, in November 1930, the artel board decided to petition the city council for space for the communalized livestock, seeds, and inventory. The collective farm petitioned the city authorities to allocate the Armenia Hotel with "a number of adjacent Kovalev courtyards" for such needs and requested that the labor exchange building be vacated for the artel office. There was a shortage of space for various economic needs (stables, forges, and warehouses) of the artel, and they were sought on the outskirts of the city, including the buildings of the former St. John the Baptist and St. Mary convents [34, l. 15 r.]. In an attempt to increase employment for women, including mothers with children, the artel board was concerned with the establishment of childcare facilities. However, additional space was also needed for these. Some of the houses of dispossessed city residents ended up under city control; the artel requested that they be transferred

to childcare facilities and that all residents be evicted [20, l. 45].

There was also a shortage of land to expand the production plan and grow the artel, which was replenished at best with the farms of middle peasants. In January 1931, the list of the Karabino-Kamenolomskaya brigade included 34 farms of poor peasants, 4 farm laborers, 2 middle peasants, and 5 farms were classified as artisans [39, l. 20-26]. The Tashla district at the end of 1930 had 121 farm laborers, 119 poor peasants, 28 middle peasants, 7 workers, 1 employee, and 2 artisans. As for the farms, the poor and farm laborers together made up 122, while the middle peasants had 23 [42, l. 16]. By the end of 1931, poor peasants and farm laborers' families constituted the majority of collective farmers; only 10 percent were middle peasants. This circumstance was declared a success in collective farm construction [31, l. 37]. This composition correlated with the ideological foundations of the Soviet state, but economically, the artel needed individual farmers, a fact that was the subject of decisions that were common at meetings.

The collective farm board asked the city council to allocate a land plot of 5 thousand hectares [32, l. 43]. There were seizures of collective farm lands (they were sown by residents of the Stavropol outskirts who did not join the artel), and then the collective farm board turned to the city council and the city committee with a request to get these areas back [27, l. 34]. Due to the weak organizational capabilities of the artel, the resulting kulak property was not always used on the farm. For example, socialized movable property could be stored in municipal utility warehouses, which the artel rented. In this regard, the collective farm board sought to sell unused property and "transfer household ownership to self-financing" [32, l. 43]. Some of the households (for example, in the Mamaika area – Kudryashev's house; in the Vorobyovka area – Sinelnikov's property; and in Tashla – Zinoviev's and Novikov's houses), the board decided to allocate for children's playgrounds [20, l. 45]. Another seized house (owned by Zhuravlev, the kulak) was planned to be used as a hostel for farm laborers and the poor. Residents who were not members of the collective farm lived on such premises, so they tried to evict them through the courts in order to free up living space for the artel

members [20, l. 45]. Kudryashev's house had already been claimed by the hunters' union (Okhotsoyuz), and the city council made a positive decision on this issue. However, the collective farm board asked him to reconsider this decision and give the premises to a children's institution [26, l. 48]. Judging by the available minutes of meetings of the collective farm board in 1930 on confiscated kulak real estate, it was not easy to come to an agreement with the City Council. Numerous mentions of the question in the protocols indicate its sustained relevance. The board of the artel stubbornly demanded that the kulak houses be transferred from the city economy to the management of the artel.

Cultural and educational work among collective farmers was also carried out through the city political education department, demonstrating the integration of collective farm daily life into urban affairs. The collective farm expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of educational work, demanding that it improve the quality of work among artel members and eliminate general and political illiteracy. The collective farm board requested that they be given more attention and even that a special structure be created specifically for working with collective farmers [24, l. 13]. The need to strengthen the connection between political education and the collective farm was ritually reiterated in a number of minutes of meetings at various levels [22, l. 2 r.]. The daily work life of the collective farm dictated new directions for cultural and educational work, which were determined by the needs of production. The problem with the seed fund and cases of seed sales in city markets provoked the artel's request to the political education structures to oblige the *izbachi* (hut workers) to conduct public work with the public condemnation of seed hoarders [22, l. 1 r.]. The problems of labor, arable land, equipment, seeds, and work organization were more pressing and acute than ideological issues.

The fact that numerous meetings were held and the issues discussed at them were repeated proves that the tasks of collective farm construction were poorly carried out and the work of the artel was ineffective: there were no foremen, a shortage of seed stock, a shortage of forage, practically no work was done to involve women in the collective farm, etc. [25, l. 10].

For instance, on January 29, 1931, a general meeting of artel members was held, which is documented in protocol No. 167 [25, l. 10]. Firstly, the protocol number confirms the thesis that real efficiency was being replaced by a huge number of meetings and conferences. Secondly, judging by the content of the discussions, the participants once again identified the difficulties in involving new participants in collective farm construction, as "to involve new participants in the collective farm, preparations must be made: playgrounds, canteens, and the workforce must be properly deployed. It is necessary to attract the individual farmer to the collective farm with all his equipment so as not to go from house to house buying up the missing seed material" [25, l. 10]. Apparently, the management understood that without restructuring the collective farm life, the problem of recruiting and involving people in the collective farm could not be solved. The problem had a gender dimension, since women who joined the artel constituted a low percentage, and it was necessary to provide for the living conditions of working women. Compared to the industrial centers of Russia, industrial workers in Stavropol were few in number, and families retained a patriarchal structure for a longer period, which affected women's participation in public life. One of the speakers at the meeting emphasized, "Here at the meeting there is a clampdown; women want to speak, but here they are not allowed" [25, l. 10-10 r.]. Moreover, it was noted that no separate work was being done to involve women in the collective farm. One of the points of the resolution was the decision to organize women's production meetings [25, l. 10-10 r.].

The All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks policy of dispossession and the central government rhetoric of searching for an internal enemy were viewed not only by local city officials but also by the collective farm board as a guide to action. The following context can serve as an example of a failed effort: "There is a counterrevolutionary nest in the Old Forstadt. It is unthinkable for a city council member to speak out against the collective farm. Such members should be recalled from the City Council. Kulaks' yes-men have become city council members" [25, l. 10 r.]. The fact is that the artel's performance varied across the city. For example, the Old Forstadt area is often considered a problem area,

in part due to the high number of refusals to go to the fields.

Over time, the leadership of the collective farm and its individual sectors began to embrace the political rhetoric of the center. However, in the initial stages of collective farm development, practical issues were of far greater concern to the artel leadership. Referring again to the minutes of board meetings, one can note that issues of combating the kulaks, “hangers-on,” “grabbing and abuse,” “the artel’s impurity with unnecessary and alien characters,” and so on, were discussed formally, largely in connection with economic and organizational problems, which comprised the majority of agenda items.

The socialization of property and labor was accompanied by the socialization of elements of everyday life. Improving living conditions and providing the artel members with all necessities was a concern for both the collective farm management and the leadership of individual sectors. The reasons for their involvement and immersion in the everyday lives of ordinary collective farmers were explained by pragmatism and production necessity. Everyday trivialities often became items on the agenda of general meetings. At a meeting of collective farmers in the Tashlyansky sector in October 1930, the issue of supplying collective farmers with clothing and footwear was discussed, since in the

autumn “the untimely supply of footwear threatens to disrupt the harvesting of vegetables from the fields” [25, l. 28-28 r.].

Results. Thus, collectivization in Stavropol created a unique atmosphere in the everyday life of this local community. Not only were elements of rural and urban life intertwined, but a new model of Soviet everyday life was also being developed. The process occurred in close collaboration between the ideas of socialist cities and the collective farm village. This symbiosis can be seen as a drag on Soviet urbanization in Stavropol, which only fully unfolded in the 1960s. The transformation of urban everyday life in Stavropol occurred not only in line with Soviet changes but also under the influence of collective farm construction, but in a somewhat different way than in the larger cities of Soviet Russia. The population of Stavropol did not increase through the influx of peasants fleeing from collectivization; on the contrary, it included collective farmers with their own way of life. A distinctive feature of Stavropol everyday life, as sources indicate, was the more diverse social composition, including workers and lower-class employees among those joining the collective farm. They brought not only their property with them but also their habits, their way of life, which were leveled out in the process of organizing collective farm life.

REFERENCES

1. Barysheva E.V. Prazdnichnoe ubranstvo sovetskikh gorodov 1920–1930-kh gg. [Festive Decorations of Soviet Cities in the 1920s and 1930s]. *Uralskiy istoricheskiy vestnik* [Ural Historical Bulletin], 2016, no. 3 (52), pp. 23-32.
2. Bulygina T.A. Istoriya povsednevnosti i «novaya lokalnaya istoriya»: issledovatel'skoje pole i issledovatel'skiy instrument [Everyday History and the “New Local History”: Research Field and Research Tool]. *Novaya lokalnaya istoriya: po sledam Internet-konferenci. 2007–2014* [New Local History: In the Footsteps of Internet Conferences. 2007–2014]. Stavropol, Izd-vo Sev.-Kav. feder. un-ta, 2014, pp. 113-117.
3. Bulygina T.A., Malovichko S.I. Sovremennaya istoricheskaya nauka izucheniya novoy lokalnoy istorii [Modern Historical Science of Studying New Local History]. Bulygina T.A., Malovichko S.I., eds. *Novaya lokalnaya istoriya: metody, istochniki, stolichnaya i provincialnaya istoriografiya. Vyp. 1: materialy internet-konf., 23 maya 2003 g.* [New Local History: Methods, Sources, Capital and Provincial Historiography. Iss. 1. Proceedings of the Internet Conference. May 23, 2003]. Stavropol, Izd-vo Stavropol. gos. un-ta, 2003, pp. 6-23.
4. Dogovor 1929 g. oktyabrya 15-go dnya [Treaty of 1929 October 15th]. *Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 12. 50 l.
5. Kiaer C., Naiman E., eds. *Everyday Life in Early Soviet Russia: Taking the Revolution Inside*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2005. 310 p.
6. Fitzpatrick Sh. *Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999. 288 p.
7. Gadickaja M.A., Bondarev V.A. *Trudovaya povsednevnost kolkhoznoy derevni: skladyvanie novykh proizvodstvennykh otnosheniy v selakh i stanicakh Yuga Rossii 1930-kh godov* [Everyday Life in a Collective

Farm Village: The Emergence of New Production Relations in the Villages and Stanitsas of Southern Russia in the 1930s]. Novocherkassk, Lik Publ., 2014. 282 p.

8. Goldman W. *Women, the State and Revolution. Soviet Family Policy and Social Life, 1917–1936*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993. 294 p.

9. Ivancov I.G. Povsednevnost provincialnogo goroda 1920–1930-kh godov, kulturnaya istoriya emociy v dokumentakh organov partiynogo-gosudarstvennogo kontrolya VKP (b) [Everyday Life of a Provincial Town in the 1920s and 1930s, the Cultural History of Emotions in the Documents of the Party and State Control Bodies of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)]. *Kulturnaya zhizn Yuga Rossii* [Cultural life of the South of Russia], 2014, no. 2 (53), pp. 68–72.

10. Johnston T. *Being Soviet: Identity, Rumour, and Everyday Life under Stalin 1939–1953*. New York, Oxford University Press, 2011. 240 p.

11. Kessler H. Kollektivizatsiya i begstvo iz dereven – socialno-ekonomicheskie pokazateli, 1929–1939 gg. [Collectivization and Escape from Rural Area: Socio-Economic Indicators, 1929–1939]. Borodkin L., ed. *Ekonomicheskaya istoriya. Obozrenie* [Economic History. Review], iss. 9. Moscow, Izd-vo Mosc. gos. un-ta, 2003, pp. 77–79.

12. Krinko E.F., Tazhidinova I.G., Khlynina T.P. *Povsednevny mir sovetskogo cheloveka 1920–1940-kh gg.: zhizn v usloviyakh socialnykh transformatsiy* [Everyday Life of a Soviet Person in the 1920s–1940s: Life in Conditions of Social Transformations]. Rostov-on-Don, Izd-vo Yuzhn. nauch. tsentra RAN, 2011. 359 p.

13. Leбина N. *Sovetskaya povsednevnost: normy i anomalii. Ot voennogo kommunizma k bolshomu stilu* [Everyday Life in the Soviet Union: Norms and Anomalies. From War Communism to Grand Style]. Moscow, Novoe lit. obozrenie Publ., 2015. 488 p.

14. Leбина N.B. *Povsednevnyaya zhizn sovetskogo goroda: normy i anomalii 1920–1930-kh gg.* [Everyday Life in a Soviet City: Norms and Anomalies of the 1920s–1930s]. Saint Petersburg, Jurnal “Neva”, 1999. 320 p.

15. Malceva N.A. *Ocherki istorii kollektivizatsii na Stavropol’ye* [Essays on the History of Collectivization in Stavropol]. Saint Petersburg, Nestor Publ., 2000. 143 p.

16. Nogina E.V. *Sociokulturnoe razvitiye gorodskogo naseleniya Stavropolya v 1920–1930-e gody: opyt istoricheskogo issledovaniya* [Social and Cultural Development of the Urban Population of Stavropol in the 1920–1930s: An Experience of Historical Research]. Stavropol, 2004. 263 p.

17. Orlov I.B. *Sovetskaya povsednevnost: istoricheskiy i sociologicheskiy aspekty stanovleniya* [Soviet Everyday Life: Historical and Sociological Aspects of Formation]. Moscow, Izd-vo Vyssh. shk. ekonomiki, 2010. 320 p.

18. Postanovlenie CK VKP(b) o borbe s iskrivleniyami partiynoy linii v kolkhoznom dvizhenii [Resolution of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on the Fight Against Distortions of the Party Line in the Collective Farm Movement]. *Tragediya sovetskoy derevni. Kollektivizatsiya i raskulachivanie. Dokumenty i materialy. Tom 2. Noyabr 1929 – dekabr 1930* [The Tragedy of the Soviet Village. Collectivization and Dispossession. Documents and Materials. Volume 2. November 1929 – December 1930]. Moscow, ROSSPEN, 2000, pp. 303–305.

19. Protokol № 1 ob’edinennogo Pravleniya Soveta i Revkomissii Stavropolskoy gorodskoy krupnoy s.h. arteli im. Stalina, sostoyavshegosya 20 noyabrya 1929 g. [Record No. 1 of the Joint Board of the Council and the Commission of the Stavropol City Large Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin, Held on November 20, 1929]. *Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 5. 110 l.

20. Protokol № 1 zasedaniya pravleniya s.h. arteli im. Stalina 13 maya 1930 [Record No. 1 of the Meeting of the Board of the Artel Named After Stalin, May 13, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 10. 120 l.

21. Protokol № 10 zasedaniya rabochey troyki pravleniya arteli im. Stalina 01.10.1930 g. [Record No. 10 of the Meeting of the Working Triple of the Board of the Stalin Artel on 1 October 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 10. 120 l.

22. Protokol № 14 ocherednogo zasedaniya s.h. arteli im. Stalina 6–7 marta 1930 [Record No. 14 of the Regular Meeting of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin on March 6–7, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 10. 120 l.

23. Protokol № 14 sobraniya kolhoznikov Tashlyanskogo sektora 2-go sentyabrya 1930 g. [Record No. 14 of the Meeting of Collective Farmers of the Tashlyansky Sector on September 2, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 67. 50 l.

24. Protokol № 16 zasedaniya pravleniya arteli im. Stalina 22–23 marta 1930 goda [Record No. 16 of the Meeting of the Board of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin, March 22–23, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 10. 120 l.

25. Protokol № 167 obshhego sobraniya chlenov arteli im. Stalina v chisle 130 chelovek ot 29 yanvarya 1931 [Record No. 167 of the General Meeting of Members of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin, Numbering 130 People, January 29, 1931]. *Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 43. 147 l.

26. Protokol № 2 zasedaniya pravleniya s.h. arteli im. Stalina 22 maya 1930 g. [Record No. 2 of the Meeting of the Board of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin, May 22, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 10. 1201.
27. Protokol № 20 zasedaniya pravleniya s.h. arteli im. Stalina 27 aprelya 1930 g. [Record No. 20 of the Meeting of the Board of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin, April 27, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 10. 1201.
28. Protokol № 21 zasedaniya pravleniya s.h. arteli im. Stalina 8 maya 1930 g. [Record No. 21 of the Meeting of the Board of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin, May 8, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. 329, inv. 1, d. 10. 1201.
29. Protokol № 3 zasedaniya pravleniya s.h. arteli im. Stalina 2 iyunya 1930 [Record No. 3 of the Meeting of the Board of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin, June 2, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 10. 1201.
30. Protokol obshhego sobraniya chlenov arteli im. Stalina prozhivayushhih v Oktyabrskom rayone g. Stavropolya ot fevralya 14 dnya 1930 goda [Record of the General Meeting of Members of the Artel Named After Stalin Living in the Oktyabrsky District of Stavropol, February 14, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 4. 221.
31. Protokol obshhego sobraniya arteli im. Stalina s uchastie edinolichnikov St. Forshtadskoy brigady ot 18.11.1931 [Record of the General Meeting of the the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin with the Participation of Individual Farmers of the Old Forstadt Brigade, November 18, 1931]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 43. 1471.
32. Protokol obshhego sobraniya upolnomochennyh s.h. arteli im. Stalina 2-go sozyva 11 maja 1930 [Record of the General Meeting of Authorized Representatives of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin of the 2nd Convocation, May 11, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 10. 1201.
33. Protokol proizvodstvennogo soveshaniya pri s.h. arteli im. Stalina ot 04.12.1930 [Record of the Production Meeting at the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin, 04.12.1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R.-329, inv. 1, d. 4. 221.
34. Protokol zasedaniya pravleniya arteli im. Stalina ot 18.11.1930 g. [Record of the Meeting of the Board of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin, November 18, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 4. 221.
35. Putney L.H. Everyday Life in Russia. *The Journal of Education*, 1929, no. 20, pp. 520-525.
36. Savchenko V.A. Bolshie, srednie i malye goroda v strategii prostranstvennogo razvitiya Stavropolskogo kraya [Large, Medium and Small Cities in the Spatial Development Strategy of Stavropol Krai]. *Vektor nauki TGU* [Vector of Science Tomsk State University], 2014, no. 4 (30), pp. 201-205.
37. Senyavskiy A.S. Ekonomicheskie osnovy rossiyskogo urbanizatsionnogo processa: teoreticheskiy analiz (strukturnye i institucionalnye aspekty) [Economic Foundations of the Russian Urbanization Process: Theoretical Analysis (Structural and Institutional Aspects)]. *Voprosy teoreticheskoy ekonomiki* [Issues of Theoretical Economics], 2019, no. 1, pp. 133-146.
38. Skorik A.P. *Mnogolikost kazachestva Yuga Rossii v 1930-e gg.: ocherki istorii* [The Many Faces of the Cossacks of the South of Russia in the 1930s: Essays on History]. Rostov-on-Don, Izd-vo Sev. kav. nauch. tsentra vyssh. obrazovaniya JuFU, 2008. 344 p.
39. Spisok chlenov s.h. arteli im. Stalina Karabino-Kamenolomskoy brigady polevodchesko-zhivotnovodcheskogo sektora po sostoyaniyu na 01.01.1921 g. [List of Members of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin, Karabino-Kamenolomskaya Brigade of the Field and Livestock Sector, January 1, 1921]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 43. 1471.
40. Stalin I.V. Golovokruzhenie ot uspehov. K voprosam kolhoznoy dvizheniya [Dizzy with Success. On the Issues of the Collective Farm Movement]. Stalin I.V. *Sochineniya* [Essays], vol. 12. Moscow, Gos. izd-vo polit. lit, 1949, pp. 191-199.
41. Stas I. Urban History: mezhdru istoriey i socialnymi naukami [Urban History: Between History and Social Sciences]. *Sociologicheskoe obozrenie* [Sociological Review], 2022, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 250-285.
42. Svedeniya o lichnom sostave s.h. arteli im. Stalina Tashlyanskogo sektora po sostoyaniyu na 01.01.1930 g. [Information on the Personnel of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin, Tashlyansky Sector, January 1, 1930]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 38. 1071.
43. Turkina V.G., Antonova E.L. Sovetskiy gorod v prostranstve sovetsoy povsednevnosti [Soviet City in the Space of Soviet Everyday Life]. *Colloquim-Journal*, 2019, no. 21 (45), pp. 74-78.

44. Vershinina I.A. Anri Lefevr: ot «prava na gorod» k «urbanisticheskoy revolyucii» [Henri Lefebvre: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 18. Sociologiya i politologiya* [Moscow University Bulletin. Series 18. Sociology and Political Science], 2018, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 48-60.
45. Vypiska iz protokola № 35 zasedaniya Prezidiuma Stavropolskogo gorodskogo soveta ot 27 dekabrya 1929 g. [Extract from Minutes No. 35 of the Meeting of the Presidium of the Stavropol City Council Dated December 27, 1929]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 5. 110 l.
46. Zayavlenie Glushhenko A.S. v pravlenie s.h. arteli im. Stalina [Application of A.S. Glushchenko to the Board of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 88. 21 l.
47. Zayavlenie Malyh S.I. v pravlenie s.h. arteli im. Stalina [Application of Malikh S.I. to the Board of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 89. 65 l.
48. Zayavlenie Mar'ina S.F. v pravlenie s.h. arteli im. Stalina [Application of S.F. Maryin to the Board of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 89. 65 l.
49. Zayavlenie Panibratca M.H. v kontoru arteli im. Stalina [Application of Panibrats M.Kh. to the Office of the Stalin Artel]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 89. 65 l.
50. Zayavlenie Prozorovoy M.A. v pravlenie kolhoza im. Stalina [Application of Prozorova M.A. to the Board of the Stalin Collective Farm]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 88. 21 l.
51. Zayavlenie Samovarova M.F. v pravlenie s.h. arteli im. Stalina [Application of Samovarov M.F. to the Board of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 89. 65 l.
52. Zayavlenie Tarasova L.S. v pravlenie s.h. arteli im. Stalina [Application of Tarasov L.S. to the Board of the Agricultural Artel Named After Stalin]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 89. 65 l.
53. Zayavlenie v kontoru kolhoza imeni tovarishha Stalina Gavrilchenka K.P. [Application to the Office of the Collective Farm Named After Comrade Stalin Gavrilchenko K.P.]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 89. 65 l.
54. Zayavlenie Volodinoy K.N. v pravlenie kolhoza im. Stalina [Application of Volodina K.N. to the Board of the Collective Farm Named After Stalin]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 88. 21 l.
55. Zayavlenie Zayceva M.V. v pravlenie s.h. arteli im. Stalina [Application of Zaitsev M.V. to the Board of the Agricultural Artel named after Stalin]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 88. 21 l.
56. Zayavleniya grazhdan o prieme i uvolnenii iz kolhoza [Applications of Citizens for Admission and Dismissal from the Collective Farm]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 89. 65 l.
57. Zayavleniya kolhoznikov o prieme i ob isklyuchenii ih iz chlenov kolhoza im. Stalina [Applications of Collective Farmers About Their Admission and Exclusion from Membership in the Stalin Collective Farm]. *Gosudarstvennyy arhiv Stavropolskogo kraya* [State Archives of Stavropol Krai], f. R-329, inv. 1, d. 88. 21 l.

Information About the Authors

Karine R. Ambartsumyan, Doctor of Sciences (History), Associate Professor, Department of World Politics and Foreign Regional Studies, North-Caucasus Federal University, Pushkina St, 1, 355017 Stavropol, Russian Federation, karina-best21@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9397-6197>

Tamara A. Bulygina, Doctor of Sciences (History), Professor, Leading Researcher, Department of the History of Russia, North-Caucasus Federal University, Pushkina St, 1, 355017 Stavropol, Russian Federation, bul.tamara2011@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1846-9360>

Информация об авторах

Каринэ Размиковна Амбарцумян, доктор исторических наук, доцент департамента мировой политики и зарубежного регионоведения, Северо-Кавказский федеральный университет, ул. Пушкина, 1, 355017 г. Ставрополь, Российская Федерация, karina-best21@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9397-6197>

Тамара Александровна Булыгина, доктор исторических наук, профессор, ведущий научный сотрудник кафедры истории России, Северо-Кавказский федеральный университет, ул. Пушкина, 1, 355017 г. Ставрополь, Российская Федерация, bul.tamara2011@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1846-9360>