

From the countryside to the cities: a comparative historical analysis of rural-urban migration in Russia and in the Soviet Union during the industrialization drive

Sokolov, Andrej K.

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Sokolov, A. K. (1991). From the countryside to the cities: a comparative historical analysis of rural-urban migration in Russia and in the Soviet Union during the industrialization drive. *Historical Social Research*, 16(2), 110-127. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.16.1991.2.110-127>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

From the Countryside to the Cities

A Comparative Historical Analysis of Rural-Urban Migration in Russia and in the Soviet Union During the Industrialization Drive

*Andrei K. Sokolov**

Abstract: The author investigates the prerequisites and circumstances of the most rapid urbanization in world history which took place in the USSR during the 1930s. The work is based on mass statistic sources, for instance, a census of 1918. The author of the paper was one who actively participated in processing the original data of that census. What were primary »pull« factors in the cities: salaries, independency, new style of living or something else? Some possibilities for answering these questions exist on the basis of the 1918 census data. The courses of passport system in the USSR and the courses of »propiska« (a stamp in one's passport which indicates a person's residence) are analysed. The reason for this was an attempt of the Soviet government to stop uncontrolled migration.

»Muzhiks have come into the proletaryat to be counted«

A. Platonov. »Kotlovan«

The aim of this paper is to illuminate the prerequisites and circumstances of the most rapid urbanization in world history which took place in the Soviet Union during the 1930s and which was accompanied by an unprecedented movement from the countryside to the cities. According to estimates covering the short period of 12 years (between the 1926 and 1939 census figures) 19 to 23 million rural migrants became city and town residents¹ and the country's urban population increased from 18 to 33 per cent.

* Address all communications to Andrei K. Sokolov, Institute of History of the USSR, 117036, Dm. Uljanova 19, Moscow, USSR.

¹ Discrepancy appears from different methodologies of counting. While the urban population increased by 30 million peoples, about 6 million of them due to the natural reproduction in cities and towns; about 5 mil-

In order that the social historian might understand and explain this phenomenon, he should take into consideration general laws of migration processes in industrializing societies, get a general impression of urbanization in Russia and use new methodology and sources to solve this problem (modelling, computerization and quantification).

This paper doesn't pretend to give a full picture of rural-urban migration in Russia. It should be viewed only as the first approach to the theme and maybe provide the impetus for a new research project.

A number of difficulties and limitations are faced by a social historian who wants to study this process. First of all, it's necessary to point out the absence of any serious works in the Soviet historiography. Not only rural-urban migration but migration in general throughout Russian history still attracts very little scholarly attention. Some labor historians have shown an interest in this problem when studying the sources and the forms of recruiting the Soviet working class. Thus they cannot overlook the violent stream of people that rushed into the cities at the cusp of the 1920's and 1930's, which entailed serious consequences to the worker's social image. But this is only one side of the matter. The urbanization process demands a broader vision than a »one class approach«, which can bring certain losses to the research as the whole spectrum of the interrelated urban social strata is ignored.

The rapid but gradually decelerated urbanization lasted in the Soviet Union for the next several decades and continues nowadays, representing the bulk of social problems for the society. Geographers, as well as sociologist and demographers who examine the roots of those problems are sometimes looking for the past but doing it very rarely and not at all satisfactory in the historical sense. The most interesting things in their books for historian are models and methods they propose for someone who wants to use them after specification in his own research.(1)

Of course, the much more abundant literature in English may render additional support, especially concerning the historical aspects of those questions. It's known that western scholars also studied migration in Russia and some of them used quantitative methods.(2) It's not easy to get a full picture of the research but it seems that there is a gap in the study of the period from 1900 up to the 1917 revolution when new tendencies came into being and stimulated urbanization. In any case that period needs close scrutiny.

Rural-urban migration after the revolution has been analysed by western scholars but most of them looked at the problem mainly in terms of »peasant-worker« relations.(3)

lion due to reorganisation of the rural settlements into the urban. The point of difference is how to treat the second one as residents of these settlements were not migrants on the whole.

Another area of difficulties and limitations exist in light of shortcomings and incompleteness of sources. Many of them contain divergent data. Even the rate of urban population in prerevolutionary Russia differs significantly - from 14 to 21 per cent in various records. It should be emphasized that the conception of »gorod« (city and town) in Russia was not the same that is usually meant elsewhere. It stressed primarily the administrative but not the economic role of the settlement. That may help to explain the stable number of cities and towns in Russia. In 1811 there were 630 of them and 655 in 1917 (183 in the Central Industrial Region - CIR).(4)

Among the sources that help somewhat in understanding rural-urban migration in Russia is the 1897 census. Published statistics contain data about the birth place of residents in some urban areas and provinces. On this basis it is possible to make up a quadrangle matrix and to get an approximate picture of the migration fluxes when one considers that the coefficient of migration mobility² was low at that time in Russia. (The same can be said about the 1926 census in the Soviet period.) It seems that statistical possibilities are exhausted in this respect as historians have to process only this amount of data. Some statistics would be extracted from city and town surveys which took place in Russia from time to time. It's necessary to add to this the mysterious urban census of 1917 because very little is known about it. Passport and zemstvo statistics, accounts of industrial inspection and other mostly non-aggregated data can be used in the research. Of course, gathering and combining disseminated records is not a simple task. A hope is supported by the time-saving process of computerization and organization of data banks.

A special place should be given to the 1918 census. This is a unique mass data source which affords the study of rural-urban migration in various aspects for the early 20th century (68 parameters in the original data and almost a half of them can be used for this purpose) if a data base can be established. That can be done by taking into account certain limits and barriers: 1)working only in the archive with the original data as the published records add nothing to such research; 2)the census did not include a large part of the country under anti-Soviet control; 3)only the personnel of industrial enterprises was registered in the census; 4) the original data on Moscow which are very attractive for scholars have dissappeared (except printshops and suburban plants); 5)the census was carried out under very unfavorable conditions that heavily influenced quality of data.

The author of this paper was one who actively participated in processing the original data of that census. Some data bases were produced to study

² The ratio of immigrants and emigrants in the given area to the number of population in this area for a certain period of time multiplied by 100.

social composition of workers, employees, engineers and managers. Though migration was not a special task for this research, rural-urban ties and social origin played a significant role in the analysis. Some observations are summarized in this paper. It would be very helpful now to process the data again for more details and to apply an advanced methodology and technique, but unfortunately the data bases were made up at the dawn of computerization. They are obsolete and it is not easy to convert them into the required form.

The sources on the Soviet period provide more statistics about migration especially for the 1920's. Besides the 1926 census, already mentioned above, there is the urban census of 1923. A number of services were employed for the special purpose of studying migration. Most of the data for the 1930's are concentrated in the archives. Personal data of governmental bodies and state enterprises can be used. The official accounts of the 1939 census give only a few indicators of urbanization. Scholars got access to the archival data of the census only recently, including the 1937 census which was repressed by Stalin's regime.

* * *

Migration from the countryside to the cities is usually identified with urbanization and industrialization. Most scholars consider that industrialization in Russia began at the end of the 19th century. This view is supported by an acceleration of urban population growth: for 34 years, from 1863 up to 1897, there was an increase of 6 million people but for the next much shorter period from 1897 up to 1914 - 6 million as well.⁽⁵⁾ The related figures of annual growth were not very high but a considerable variety existed among the regions. A few of them the North-West, CIR and some of the Baltic provinces - were on the eve of the crucial point of urbanization when rural population should reduce not only relatively but absolutely too. In countries where the process of urbanization is expressed weakly, as in prerevolutionary Russia, a natural increase of urban population is too low to support a simple reproduction of it without an influx of rural migrants. This was true for Russia: both the 1897 and 1926 census figures show that the majority of big cities residents were of rural origin.

Another particular feature of Russia was the lower level of urbanization compared to its industrial development. Migration to the cities was slowed by the conservation of the traditional forms of life in the countryside and, above all, the rural commune («mir»), which blocked the process of peasants differentiation and a loss of labor force in the agrarian sector of the economy. The rural commune tied each of its members in the status of a potential land holder. Probably some changes occurred in that relation after

the Stolypin agrarian reform and the acceleration of the urban growth before the war and Revolution was partly due to this. But far too little evidence exists to prove that preposition. It is necessary to add that percentage of peasant plots with little or no sowing areas was very high in the CIR and in other industrializing regions and it increased rapidly. (6) Regarding the low level of agriculture and the need for increased income, a large portion of the rural population preferred to be engaged in small crafts and industries («promisly»). Heavy industry had to adjust to the existing forms. At the end of the 19th century almost 60 per cent of mills and factories were situated in countryside, primarily in the areas where a surplus of the labor force and propensities for non-agricultural occupation existed. But the introduction of industry to the countryside promoted its transformation. Theory does not exclude the probability of industrialization outside the city. But in this case rural areas were gradually transformed into urban areas by »substitution of signs« (new technology, concentration of population, specialization of functions, strengthening contacts etc.). This process took place in Russia, but as it was weakly urbanized, a rural influence could leave strong marks on urbanization. Not accidentally many towns and blocks in large cities resembled villages and preserved the villagers' culture.

But neither big nor small industries could absorb a surplus of the labor force in the rural families. Thus a stimulus to migrate appeared. There were many patterns of internal migration but not all of them were oriented towards the cities. Migration to the country was strongly influenced by nature, climate and economy. Some occupations required a permanent migrant, who was ready to change his residence, some could rely on a temporary worker. This also depended on distance and transportation, but seasonal migration obviously prevailed. Annually about 5-6 million people went to work in agriculture, woodcutting, local transportation, railroads, construction, industry, trade and services. Migration flows assumed a stable character for a long time. It should be noted that in the given series of economic branches their relation to the city grew from one to the other.

The specifics of Russia had another aspect of seasonal migration when urban dwellers went to the villages for participating in agricultural works. That was determined as the »tie with the land«. Many scholars refer to this tie only in terms of working class as a testimony of its imperfection. But in light of what took place, this imperfection would be a feature of other urban social groups in Russia.

Urbanization in that country had one more remarkable tendency: metropolitan growth left the rest of it behind. At the beginning of the 20th century St.Petersburg and Moscow absorbed one third of the total increase in urban population. In 1897 St.Petersburg had 1,265 thousand people, in 1917 Petrograd 2,300 thousand. Moscow in 1897 had 1,039 thousand, in

1917 almost exactly 2 million. (7) This trend continued in the Soviet period until the introduction of the limits on their growth in 1932.

In looking for causes of this phenomenon it should be pointed out that history gave examples of such a rapid growth of the cities in some underdeveloped countries and that it be due to causes other than beyond industrialization. But this was not a case to draw an analogy. It's rather necessary to take into account the complexity of historical, economic, social and cultural causes. First of all, it should be taken into account that both cities before the revolution were the capitals of the country (after this the role passed only to Moscow and determined a more rapid tempo of its population growth) with its many functions of government. In the second phase, as was the case of St.Petersburg and Moscow, there was a coincidence of many favorable conditions for industry, trade and transportation. That is why both cities were the centers of the two swiftly industrializing and interrelating regions. Universities and colleges, the concentration of cultural and political activities added more to their roles. Thus they were cities with the superimposed functions. In this respect both cities had a huge influence on the rest of the country and on the surrounding regim. The influx of rural migrants to them proceeded with hardly any obstacles. That helped to explain why spatial urbanization was poorly expressed in Russia. The figures for 1897 showed that in Moscow the rate of those born outside it was 74 per cent and St.Petersburg 69 per cent while in the whole urban population it was only 47 per cent. (8)

In the light of multifunctional roles of the both cities the view that their rapid growth was caused only by industrialization and by the increasing number of the working class should be considered a stereotype. In fact, in St.Petersburg and in Moscow the working class and, moreover, its industrial core had never been a majority of even the active population. On the eve of the first world war the main capital had 265 thousand industrial workers; prior to world war II - 161 thousand.(9) During the war the number of workers increased but it was a somewhat unnatural and abnormal process. Certain differences between the cities were obvious. While 19 per cent of all industrial equipment of the country was in Petrograd, in Moscow there was only 19 per cent.(10) That meant a more industrial power of the first one and for migrants more gravitation towards it.

In the case of metropolis it was necessary to distinguish among three patterns of migration from outside. The first pattern should be oriented towards administrative powers. The second one - towards its economic role in general. And the third - towards cultural, educational and other activities. Thus, not the same models should be applied to verify those processes.

Such observations suggest a multidimensional character of urbanization in Russia and stress a particular role of the metropolitan cities in the

process of modernization. The cities which were in the second line of population growth (Riga, Odessa, Baku, Tiflis, Tashkent and some others) were also subjected to the same patterns, though on a smaller scale.

In the research concerning rural-urban migration it's necessary to take into consideration two interacting processes. One - when the city created new jobs for business and employment, the other - when the countryside unleashed a free labor force which was inclined to migrate. It seemed that both processes had never been in agreement in Russia and that caused some deviations from the normal course of urbanization.

The Russian specifics have a great meaning for specification of models if somebody should want to apply them to research of rural-urban migration. It is doubtful, for example, that the utility of »central places theory« (hexagonal greed of Cristaller) which can be applied in other circumstances. Some other well-known models can also be of limited use though they may be used as a working hypothesis. Bradford (see ref.2) tried to apply various types of models for the study of a dependency between the scale and the intensity of migration ties and distance in order to describe migration flows in the CIR and the behavior of migrants. A serious problem emerged when he tried to separate permanent and seasonal migrants. Though his results can be attributed only to the industrial working class he managed to show that in the CIR migration, flows had been drawn to certain points of destination. Migrants moved along strictly determined trails where distance was not significant because of poor transportation and weak ties between regions. He pointed out that a substantial part of rural migrants had been integrated into the working class at that time. In the calculated »push-pull« model 47 per cent of dispersion was due to the factor »rate of the industrial population« in the cities. This means that the main pulling factor for rural migrants in the city was a level of industrial development.

Some additional data can throw a light on what kind of industrial groups became more or less urbanized in the country. Per thousand of urban workers the distribution was in 1923 as follows:

| | large cities | other towns | urban settlements |
|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|
| metal workers: | | | |
| in Russia | 589 | 284 | 187 |
| in the Ukraine | 335 | 403 | 252 |
| textile workers | 297 | 386 | 347 |
| miners in the Ukraine | 4 | 88 | 908 |

All scholars agree that rural-urban migration in Russia had a very selective character that usually marked the early steps of urbanisation. The main factor in the decision was the information that the rural dwellers got

from their relatives and friends who already went to the cities. On that basis some queer flows of the migrants arose which were, at first glance, chaotic and accidental. It is difficult to know exactly what kind of information was received through informal contacts and that makes an aggregate data analysis difficult. This pattern of migration maintained a striking stability and sometimes led migrants to the cities even in the 1930's. A survey of construction workers in those troubled times showed 82 per cent of them coming to the city on the basis of their fellow-villagers stories.(11)

But this pattern cannot answer the question as to the why and from what migrants moved away and what they encountered in the cities. The first part of the matter is connected with the analysis of potential migrants. Much is unclear in this respect though it seems that scholars have shown all causes of migration: agrarian overpopulation, land starvation, deterioration of farming possibilities, lack of investment etc. But some controversies and questions are still left. For example, what was the composition of migrants? Is the ascertainment of some scholars justified that typical figure among them was from the middle stratum of peasants? What was the interrelation between the two types of seasonal migration? The second part of the problem is no less interesting for the analysis. What did »the tie with the land« really mean and how did it influence the centrifugal processes of urban classes? What were primary »pull« factors in the cities: salaries, independency, new style of living or something else?

Some possibilities for answering these questions exist on the basis of the 1918 census data. It is impossible to say whether what was registered in it was fully unknown to the scholars. But the possibility emerges to put all things together, in terms of establishing an interdependency and a determined order of facts.

* * *

The data processing showed that the urban industry was strongly oriented towards a stable professionally trained worker. That's why the number of temporary workers constantly decline before the revolution while the number of urban residents increased though living conditions for them were in the most cases unsatisfactory. The familiar barracks of the 19th century began to disappear. The number of urban families increased and the most of them lived in their own houses, flats or rooms (or a part of the room - »ugol«). The number of seasonal migrants from the countryside was very low in factories and mills.

The migrants from the countryside which flowed into the working class, employees and service personnel were mostly juveniles and youths. The number of them was directly proportioned the size of the city or town. In

the large cities the influx of village-born migrants was greater than in the others. Stable flows of migrants existed in Petrograd, Yaroslavl and Tula where contingents from the same small administrative units (volost, uезд) were registered.

The younger generation of peasant families prevailed among the former villagers. It was a result of some kind of division of labor inside the peasant household under the influence of the rural commune's common law: the eldest (except old men and women) should tend the farm, the young should help and get earnings. Males went away for this purpose earlier after finishing a rural or parish school or after two to three years of learning. Females went a little later until reaching a certain age having a lot of domestic obligations and often never going to school.

Careers in the city usually began with the status of »malchik« (»boy«), a person who should make some petty charges. After 5-10 years in the factory (the duration depended on the occupation) he or she got a chance to become a real worker who acquired, with some practice and skill, the habits to urban life. In such a pattern it was primarily workers of the first generation who dominated in the working class. But the transformation of the new recruits into »cadre« workers was eased by an early entry to industry and to the city. The working class of Russia on the whole was relatively young since the experience of Russian industrialization was not very long.

The individual data about workers does not supply much variation if they were to be compared to this pattern. However, for further careers and for the orientation to urban political and social activities, participation in the war and revolution and other non-factory experience played an appreciable role.

The pattern of working class formation gave a special content to rural-urban ties. The symbiosis of the city and the village was inherent not only to Russia but to other industrializing countries, but here it had some distinctive traits. The rural-urban ties were a complicated mixture of economic, family, friendly and other attitudes. The flow of young migrants from the countryside produced a rather high rate of single workers and small urban families in the urban working class. Until the certain age such workers maintained ties with their native families, sent them money, helped on the farm, went on holidays, brought fresh food from there and so on.

Thus »the tie with the land« was only one thread in the tangle. The young single workers had the closest ties to the villages. When the time came to marry a somewhat crucial point emerged in the worker's life. His »tie with the land« depended on the place of his marriage - city or village. Before the revolution the trend was already in favor of the city, but even in this case workers did not hurry to break old ties off. These gradually died

off as life in the city absorbed the time of a former villager and assimilated him. Such workers were typical for the social image of the working class, and continued for a long time. Other groups in the city industry - employees, engineers - were more inclined to the urban life while the service personnel was not very much distinct from the working class.(12)

* * *

It seemed that from 1917-1920 the course of urbanization was completely ruined and the process reversed. The size of the urban population was cut by 20 per cent in the aftermath of destruction, ravages and devastation of the Civil War. In the CIR, the urban population was reduced by one-third, in Moscow and in Petrograd it fell below its 1897 levels. The rural population returned to the same level as before the revolution. A dissemination of urban classes to the countryside took place. All these facts let some scholars see an »agrarianization« of the country after the revolution. Of course, there was a delay in the urban growth and industrialization. However, the speed of restoration after the war proved the irreversible character of urbanization. The data show that the number of refugees from the cities to the countryside were exaggerated. Most of them went there to wait till the mess was over. A substantial part of the urban population was mobilized. Only in Moscow did the number of those mobilized to the Red Army reach 300 thousand people.(13) It is necessary to add other forms of mobilization in the cities. As a result many people were dispersed throughout the country. Migration mobility increased dramatically. The urban classes suffered heavily from hunger, epidemics, repression and emigration from Russia.

Many authors assume that in the 1920's there was a restoration of all tendencies in rural-urban migration that existed in prerevolutionary Russia, »ancestors, habits and traditions«. But something else should be taken into consideration and, above all, a change in the situation in the cities and countryside.

The redistribution of land in 1917-1922 led to an increase in peasant holdings and an equalization of plots. But most of them were very small and had no prospects for develop. In spite of such redistribution in some regions as in the CIR, the old tendencies didn't only reemerge but turned out to be more acute. The rate of holdings with no or little sowing plots even increased, but small industry and crafts were destroyed and various forms of seasonal migration were reduced to a minimum. The pressure of a surplus labor force in peasant families was intensified. The 1926 census registered in the countryside 47 million adults as »persons helping in the occupations The surplus labor force was about 30 per cent.(14)

The restoration of crafts and small industries in the 1920's was low because of the restraints to hire laborers but seasonal migration renewed was at increased rates: in 1924/25 it was 2,687 thousand, 1925/26 3,285 thousand, 1927/28 - 3,945 thousand, 1928/29 - 4,383 thousand and in 1931 (with the organized recruitment) - 5,454 thousand people.(15)

In the middle of the 1920's a unique survey of seasonal migration showed the significant differentiation of the process. The regions of the consumption belt« (the North West, the CIR) was distinguished by a high rate of holdings with little or no sowing strips (54 per cent were less than 2.2 desyatins). The number of holdings which released the labor force was equal to 32 per cent and in these 19 per cent worked in the same locality and 13 per cent moved away. But in both cases migration to industry prevailed, and was followed by construction, woodcutting, local transportation etc. The correlation coefficient between the size of sowing plots and the rates of migration equaled - 0.714. That means that seasonal migration depended on possibilities of agriculture (determination coefficient 50.8 per cent). But migration to industry had some distinctive trends. In the two polar groups of holdings it was greater. A closer analysis pointed out that a main factor of this migration was the possibility to get a stable salary.

In the regions of the »productive belt« in Russia and in the Ukraine the process was substantially different. Seasonal migration was less than half and more local especially in the Ukraine, though industrial migration prevailed, while in the other regions it lacked a definite tendency. But in any case the huge amount of rural inhabitants meant that in the scale of the whole country a great number of migrants existed.(16)

Seasonal migrants from the countryside to the cities had some special features. Their age composition was various and their roots were still in villages. An abrupt displacement of the traditions was necessary before this mass of people started to settle in urban areas. Yet crowds of seasonal workers flooded the labor market in the cities. Annually about 200 thousand seasonal migrants swamped Moscow and in addition 100 thousand more newcomers were incorporated into it's population.(17)

It would be reason to ascertain that the rural-urban ties were inherited from the past. The small but very interesting additional elaboration of the 1926 census data on Moscow compiled by M.Krasilnikov clearly supported this view though not all scholars have interpreted them properly. These data showed that most of those »tied with the land« consisted of single persons. They also belonged to those who took part in field work. It was obvious that some other members of families did this work. Such pattern of rural-urban migration was first of all registered in non-mechanized production .(18)

But it would be necessary to take the whole country to take into account in order to describe some changes in the migration flows from the coun-

tryside to the cities. A comparison of two censuses - 1923 and 1926 - indicated that in the first case industrial cities grew (19) and this tendency became more and more apparent during the following years. The pressure of industrialization was getting heavier.

One more point should be added: a structural change in the urban population especially in Moscow and Leningrad continued to absorb migrants in huge numbers. But in Moscow the most rapidly increasing groups were officials. An additional pressure on to the city was created by the military reform and demobilization of the army. In 1921-1924 3,583 thousand were dismissed (20) and a significant number of them wanted to settle in the cities with a view to get some official post for their merits. The probability of work in the private sector was reduced to the pre-war period in spite of the New Economic Policy (NEP). The number of professionals, proprietors, rentiers and domestic servicewomen also decline. The narrowing of the labor market and pressure from the countryside led to the rise of unemployment. It reached the 2 million mark at the end of the 1920's, undermining the official policy of alliance between the city and the countryside («smichka»).

In spite of all these difficulties, the urbanization process continued throughout the 1920's. In the middle of the decade it reached the pre-war level though some urbanized territories were now no longer part of the state. In part the progress was due to a new conception of «gorod» with its special stress on its economic functions. The inhabitants of «urban-type settlements» were added to the urban population. There were 709 cities and towns and 1925 settlements of the urban type in 1926.(21)

In the 1920's the urban population increased by about one million annually. As in former times the bulk of immigrants consisted of villagers. The gravitation to the main cities proceeded. In 1926 the population of Moscow once more reached the two million mark but Leningrad was still behind (1,592 thousand people). The rate of Moscow's growth was higher than before the revolution (before 1917 - 5.6 per cent, 1921-23 - 11 per cent, 1924-26 - 7 per cent) (22). The main cultural and educational backgrounds were concentrated: in both cities there were 21 institutions of higher education in Leningrad and 16 in Moscow but the latter had more party political schools to train the leading cadre for the country.

Data in the 1926 census on Moscow showed that only 13 per cent of its population growth was due to the natural reproduction process and only one third of its residents were Muscovites by origin while workers represented only 19 per cent. People of rural origin outnumbered by 48 per cent and 18 per cent were from other cities and towns. Almost 64 per cent were born in the CIR. The decreasing level by provinces went as follows: Moscow, Ryasan, Tbla, Kaluga, Smolensk, Tver, Vladimir. Altogether contiguous provinces provided 64 per cent of all migrants. The next level of

the outlying provinces added 12 per cent. Excluding temporary population, 56 per cent of migrants arrived in Moscow after 1917 (officials and employees - 61 per cent). Owners were on one hand newcomers (11 per cent) and on the other - old Muscovites as 27 per cent of them had lived in the city more than 20 years.(23)

The whole picture showed that the process of urbanization was complex and contradictory. The country stood once more on the eve of great structural changes. But as so often in Russian history, these changes were effected by forceful and extraordinary measures.

* * *

In autumn 1929 »the Great Breakthrough« swept it's tide. Though its sphere of actions seemed to be mostly economical, the social effects of them were tremendous and migration to the cities was part of the process. Scholars have various views regarding the role of previous tendencies, what novelties actually emerged and what caused the dramatic increase in urbanization. Some authors stress that the actions undertaken by the leadership led to a situation where all social processes went out of control. Others, following to old Soviet tradition, hold the position that all of them were tightly regulated by the party and the state. David Hoffmann in his unpublished paper that in terms of the peasant who rushed the cities the process contained both features. The leaders tried to exploit traditions of the rural-urban interchange and by incorporating them to the needs of practical policy were able to form a new pattern of a developing industrializing state with its creative possibilities.

The transition to the planned economy and the acceleration of industrialization goals were accompanied by plans for enlisting a new labor force. Based on figures for the First Five-Year Plan the urban population was 29 million people. Even the optimum version of this plan proposed that it would increase up to 34.7 million (by 5.7 million).(24) As it turned out, the growth of the urban population exceeded the last figure by almost two times. (25) The number of workers and employees was planned at 15.7 million.(26) In fact in 1932 it reached 23 million. Drawn into the National Economy were 12.6 million people (4 million city-dwellers, 1,7 million youths, 0.5 million students, 1,4 million non-working women and 8.6 million peasants).(27) The dynamics of the urban annual population growth in the first half of the 1930's gave the following figures of migrants (in thousand)(28):

| | | | | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1929 | 1930 | 1931 | 1932 | 1933 | 1934 | 1935 |
| 1,392 | 2,683 | 4,100 | 2,719 | 0,772 | 2,452 | 2,527 |

These figures pointed out that the pressure of the countryside on the city increased in 1930 and reached its maximum the next year.

It looked like a flight of peasants from the countryside and could be definitely explained by the forced collectivization. It was no accident that 1930-31 saw the culmination. After the establishment of many collective farms in the spring of 1930 a significant number of peasants did not join them later, as some historians asserted, but escaped to the cities and construction.

Some data show also that Moscow and Leningrad were obviously preferable for the migrants. The population of Moscow increased by 60 per cent during the First Five-Year Plan and reached 3,663 thousand inhabitants.[^]) That is to say, many migrants moved along the same routes which were well known to them. The flood of newcomers to Moscow and Leningrad created a lot of troubles for the cities and caused unprecedented tension.

In the countryside a need for labor emerged which was made more acute by the policy of the liquidation of well-to-do peasants and by their exile to distant areas. At the end of 1932 a passport system was imposed in order to stop uncontrolled migration. Simultaneously the limitation on »propiska« (a stamp in one's passport which indicates a person's residence) was introduced. People with no occupation, »kulaks« (well-to-do peasants), alien class groups criminals and other »anti-socialist elements« were deprived of »propiska«. As shown above, at first these measures produced some effect: in 1933 the rate of the population growth decreased to the minimum. But than the process renewed in spite of all limitations and restraints. Rural migrants began to seek for new routed and ways to the cities.

Once again hundreds of thousands continued to swamp Moscow and Leningrad in the hope of finding a job. Up to the end of the 1930's Moscow experienced a campaign of labor arrangements for people of temporary identification of personality«. Though regulation produced some slowing down of the rates in the big cities growth of population, on the whole it was ineffective. In 1939 the population of Moscow was 4,137 thousand and Leningrad 3,191 thousand.(30)

The growth of population in other cities showed the new routes for migrants. Excluding the towns that just came into being (Magnitogorsk, Komsomolsk, Kemerovo etc.), first place would be given to Stalingrad, Kharkov, Nijniy Novgorog, Stalino, Chelyabinsk, Sverdlovsk, Novosibirsk, Zaporozje, Yaroslavl, Ivanovo. Some of them increased their population by three, five or even ten times. The main distinctive feature of these cities was that all of them were primarily industrial giants. The highest rates of urban growth were in such regions as the Ukraine, the CIR, the Urals, the North West, West Siberia, and Kazakhstan.

Paradoxically, in spite of the huge amount of rural migrants the urban enterprises experienced an acute need for labor. The speeding of indu-

strialization was determined in a purely extensive way, that of creating new jobs and attracting additional workers. These requirements led to introduction of the organized recruitment («orgnabor») of labor force by initiating contracts with collective farms. But this policy did not produce substantial results for several reasons, though for some years the number of recruits was significant. The composition of this labor force was unsatisfactory for the industry as unskilled occasional people were predominant. These seasonal migrants sought the cities not so much to work as to escape from collective farms. It is necessary to add that planned regulation of labor required investments but the government did not care much about them. So, non-controlled migration prevailed and determined the course of rural migrants to the cities. In fact, there was no sphere of society which had underwent regulations and where these attempts were successful. Even graduates from schools of higher learning subjected to the strict state distribution scheme found hundreds of ways to escape it.

In the 1930's patterns of migrations and social mobility gradually changed, though some authors argue this point. Of course, the former experience has a certain meaning but limits put on free migration, structural changes in the economy, social and cultural life finally led to the formation of new flows of migrants.

Going from the countryside to the city construction works became the main flow of migrants. From the end of the 1920's the number of the construction workers began to increase rapidly. In the middle of the decade there were 400-500 thousand of them, in 1929 - 723 thousand, in 1930 - 1,963 thousand, in 1931 - 2,549 thousand, in 1932 - 3,126 thousand.^) Construction was like a school for migrants and after finishing it most of them remained in factories and plants. The majority of construction workers were reinforced by the young people as sixty per cent of them were younger than 23.(32) This process coincided with the increased number of women in construction.

In addition, another channel emerged in the 1930's for moving from the countryside: the Machine-Tractor-Stations (MTS). Mechanized workers of MTS very often fled to the cities because they had passports of which the collective farmers were deprived. In 1934 -1939 one quarter of mechanized workers (100-200 thousand) left for the cities.(33)

The orientation to higher education created a stimulus for social mobility. Data show that many Soviet officials and leaders were of the rural origins. And, at last, one more channel - service in the army became a very significant feature of life by the end of the 1930's.

The rural-urban ties also began to change during the 1930's. The great flow of rural migrants to the cities caused density and diversity in the urban population, rapid désintégration of the old traditions and way of life. The family ties with villagers were supported but the economic ties

were restricted now by »personal auxiliary husbandry«. Many city dwellers used to go to the villages for summer vacations.

The rural background of the huge mass of the urban population left its signs not only on the working class but on all urban groups, their psychology and behavior.

The confluence of all the migration flows led to the rapid growth of the urban population and large cities. In this process a crucial point of urbanization was passed and the rural population started to decrease. That was only the beginning of the process that came in full swing later.

Notes

1. There are a number of books published in the Soviet Union and related to the problem: *Migracionnaja podvignost naselenija v SSSR*. Moskva, 1974; Chorev B. S. *Problemy gorodov*. Moskva, 1975; Perevedecv V.I. *Metody isuchenija migracionnyh processov*. Moskva, 1976; *Problemy migracii naselenija SSSR*. Moskva, 1976; Pivovarov J. L. *Sovremennaja urbanisacija*. Moskva, 1976; *Sovremennyje voprosy geografii SSSR*. Leningrad, 1977; Megevich M. N. *Socialnoje raselenije i gorod*. Leningrad, 1979; Kovalev S. L., Kovalskaja N. J. *Geografija naselenija SSSR*. Moskva, 1979; *Urbanisacija i demograficheskiye processy*. Moskva 1982; and others.
In addition, many books were translated from foreign languages including English, and they mainly concern the methodology. See for example: *Modeli v geografii*. Moskva 1971. (Models in geography).
2. Anderson B. *Internal Migration During Modernization in Late Nineteenth Russia*. Princeton, 1980; Bradford B.C. *Migration Models and the Russian Experience: the Case of the Central Industrial Region of European Russia, 1861-1864*. Ph.D. diss. 1975; Bradly J.C. *Muzhik and Muscovite: Peasants in Late Nineteenth Century Urban Russia*. Ph.D. diss. 1977; Johnson R.E. *Peasant and Proletarian: the Working Class of Moscow at the End Nineteenth century*. New Brunswick, 1979. See also articles in M.Hamm (ed.), *The City in Russian History*. Lexington, Kentucky, 1976.
3. In Hamm (ed.), *The City in Russian History* some articles are devoted to the Soviet period. See also: Chase W.J. *Workers, Society and the Soviet State: Labor and Life in Moscow. 1918-1929*. Univ. of Illinois Press. Urbana and Chicago. 1987; Fitzpatrick Sh. *Education and Social Mobility in the Soviet Union. 1921-1934*. Cambridge, 1979; Hoffmann D. *Soviet Urbanization and Patterns of Peasant In-Migration: the Case of Moscow during the First Five-Year Plan* (unpublished paper).

4. Drobigev V. Z., Kovalchenko I. D., Muravjev A. V. Istoricheskaja geografija SSSR. Moskva, 1973, S. 197.
5. Rashin A.G.- Naselenije Rossii za 100 let. Moskva, 1956, S. 95.
6. The number of superfluous labor force in the agrarian sector increased from 23 to 30 million between 1900 and 1913. (Istorija SSSR s drevnejshih vremen do nashich dnei. Tom VI. Moskva, 1976. S. 304.
7. Materialy po statistike Petrograda i Petrogradskoj gubernii. Petrograd, 1921; Statisticheskij egegodnik g. Moskvy i Moskovskoj gubernii 1914 - 1925. Moskva, 1925.
8. It was calculated on the basis: Obshij svod po imperii rezultatov obrabotki dannych vseobshej perepisi naselenija 28 maja 1897 g. Tom 2. Petersburg, 1905.
9. Materialy po statistike Petrograda...; Statisticheskij egegodnik g. Moskvy...
10. Malaja sovetskaja enciklopedija. Tom 4-5. Moskva, Leningrad, 1930.
11. Cit.: Istorija sovetskogo rabocheho klassa. Moskva, 1984. S. 202.
12. For more details and concrete figures see: Drobigev V. Z., Sokolov A. K., Ustinov V. A. Rabochij klass Sovetskoj Rossii v pervyj god proletarskoj diktatury. (Opyt strukturnogo analiza materialov professionalnoj perepisi 1918 g.) Moskva, 1975; Sokolov A. K. Rabochij klass i revolyucionnyje ismenenija v socialnoj strukture obshestva. M. 1987.
13. Krasnaja Moskva 1917-1920. Moskva, 1920. S. 104.
14. Danilov V. P. Krestjanskij otchod na promysly v 1920 gg. Istoricheskije zapiski. 94. 1974.
15. Klivanskij S. Otchodnichestvo v SSSR v 1928-1931 gg. Voprosy truda. 10, 1932.
16. Statisticheskije obozrenije. 1928, 5. S. 28-30.
17. Danilov V. P. Op. cit.
18. Statisticheskije obozrenije. 1928, 6. S. 103-107.
19. Goroda Sojuza SSR. Moskva, 1927. S. 17.
20. Itogi 10-letija sovetskoj vlasti. Moskva, 1927. S. 74.
21. Vseobshaja perepis naselenija 1926.
22. Calculated by W. Chase in: Chase W. J. Workers..., pp. 73-74.
23. All figures are calculated on the basis: Vseobshaja perepis naselenija 1926 g. Tom 36. Tabl. III-IV. S. 174-201.
24. Pervij patiletnij plan razvitija narodnogo hozijajstva SSSR. Tom 2, Chast 2, S. 9. Moskva, 1929.
25. Itogi vypolnenija pervogo pjatiletnego plana razvitija narodnogo hozijajstva SSSR. Moskva, 1934. S. 268.
26. Pervij patiletnij... Ibidem.
27. Itogi vypolnenija... S. 173-174.
28. Socialisticheskije stroitelstvo SSSR. Moskva, 1936. S. 545.
29. Hoffmann D. (Unpublished paper).

30. **Ito gi perepisi naselenija 1959 g. Moskva, 1962.**
31. **Trud v SSSR. Moskva, 1936. S. 12-13.**
32. **Golzman M.T. Sostav stroitelnych rabochich SSSR v gody pervoj paitetki. (Formirovanije i razvitije sovetskogo rabocheho klassa.) Moskva, 1961. C. 176-177.**
33. **Arutunjan J. V. Kollektivizatia sel'skogo hoziajstva i vysvobogdenije rabochej sily dlja sela. S. 102.**