

Pavlo M. Kravchenko

Vinnitsia Mykhailo Kotsyubynsky State Pedagogical University

PhD. (History), Associate Professor

e-mail: pablokk@ukr.net

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1066-4460>

Podilia Village in 1944: Social and Economic Situation

Abstract. *The aim of the article is to analyze and characterize the social and economic processes in Vinnytsia region agriculture, which accompanied the Soviet regime restoration after the region was liberated from the German-Romanian occupation in 1944. The research methodology is based on a combination of general scientific principles of analysis, synthesis, generalization and special-historical principles of historical-criticism, historical-systematic and specific-problematic research, quantitative methods with the principles of historicism, systematics, and scientific verification. The scientific novelty of the work lies primarily in the fact that the author researched and analyzed new sources, critically examined Soviet party documents of the stated time and revealed the characteristics of the social and economic situation in the Podilia village after the restoration of Stalin's regime and collective farming. Conclusions.* *The restoration of the colonial communist Soviet regime in the Vinnytsia region did not improve the social and economic situation for the collective farm peasantry. On top of the material and human losses inflicted by the German-Romanian occupation and military operations of the warring parties, there was added a strict exploitative policy of state procurement, and forced relocation of the population to Crimea and Donbass, which further weakened Podilia village. Some aspects of the problem need further study and research of archival documents of the time.*

Key words: *Soviet regime, collective farm peasantry, procurement, mobilization, labor force, relocation, personnel, moods.*

Formulation of the problem. The publications devoted to Vinnytsia region agriculture in 1944 reveal mostly the material and human losses of the rural population in the Vinnytsia region caused by the Second World War. Much less attention is paid to the social and economic processes that accompanied the restoration of communist Soviet rule in the Vinnytsia region, and the conditions in which this took place.

Analysis of sources and recent publications. The state of agriculture in the Vinnytsia region in 1944 has not been the subject of a comprehensive study yet, although some issues have been partially discussed in the scientific literature. Thus, the peculiarities of postwar Ukraine development are analyzed in the works of M. Koval [Koval, M., 1990], O. Bazhan [Bazhan, O., 2005], V. Baran and V. Danylenko [Baran, V. K. & Danilenko, V. M., 1999]. The researchers V. Kononenko [Kononenko, V., 2005a] and O. Koliastruk [Koliastruk, O., 2012] partly characterized everyday life of Ukrainian peasants in the postwar period. Some aspects of tax policy for the collective farm peasantry is considered in the article by B. Romaniuk [Romaniuk, B., 2016]. O. Melnychuk and T. Melnychuk offered a thorough study of Podilia peasantry's everyday life in the period of late Stalinism on the material of a separate village [Melnychuk, O. & Melnychuk, T., 2020]. This paper uses the data obtained in the Vinnytsia region State Archives as the base source for research.

The purpose of the article is to analyze new archival sources to examine social and economic conditions of the Podilia collective farm village in 1944.

Main research. The Ukrainian National Liberation Revolution of 1917–1921, the New Economic Policy and repressions against nationally conscious Ukrainians in the 1920s, collectivization, the Holodomor-Genocide, political repressions against the Ukrainian peasantry, World War II – all these events took place in a very short period in history, within the lifespan of one generation – from 1929 to 1945. It is in this context, in our opinion, that the situation in the Ukrainian / Podilia village in the early postwar years should be considered: these years saw the resumption of the colonial policy towards Ukraine, introduced after the liquidation of the Ukrainian Peoples' Republic and the occupation of this territory by the Red Army in 1920–1921. In 1941–1944, the Soviet occupation regime was substituted by the German-Romanian, that had actually the same goal as the previous one: to pump out as many resources as possible. However, the Ukrainian peasants felt that it was easier to survive “under the Germans and the Romanians” than “under Stalin.” The main reason for this was clear: private property. Though very limited, private property in 1941–1944 still gave more chances for peasants to survive by working much of their time for themselves, which was considered a crime and was punishable under the Stalin regime.

With the liberation of the Vinnytsia region from the German-Romanian occupiers, the situation of the peasantry didn't change much. The village, which even before the German-Soviet war in 1941 was in a state of poverty in all respects, had to return to the old Stalinist collective farm rules that became even harsher due to the ongoing war which still required enormous resources.

The situation in the Vinnytsia region villages after the return of the Soviet regime is to some extent reflected in the "Concise economic reference of the Vinnytsia region", which contains general figures at the time of liberation and compares them with the pre-war years. Thus, the rural population of the region decreased by 478,483 thousand people compared to 1939. The number of state farms, in comparison with January 1, 1941, increased by 1 – from 43 to 44, and the number of collective farms decreased by 20 – from 1959 to 1939. The number of machine and tractor stations remained unchanged – 84. The number of collective farm households in the region increased slightly during the years of the German-Romanian occupation – from 463,766 to 490,629 [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 21. Ref. 76. Arc. 1].

The above-mentioned document makes it possible to characterize certain aspects of the agriculture management in 1944. Thus, there was a sharp decline in yields in 1944 compared to 1940 (Table 1) [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 21. Ref. 76. Arc. 1, 2]:

Name of culture	Yield 1940 (cents)	Yields 1944 (cents)
Winter rye	15.0	11.8
Winter wheat	15.6	12.3
Buckwheat	10.0	6.7
Millet	19.2	7.4
Spring barley	18.0	7.2
Oat	13.3	8.3
Corn	21.1	11.0
Sugar beet	172.3	111.4
Potato	87.3	85.3

Sowing areas were significantly reduced. If the 1940 harvest was grown on 1,816,887 hectares, in 1944 the figure was 1,397,147 hectares [SAV&R. F. P-136. Op. 21. Ref. 76. Arc. 1]. This created extraordinary conditions in the Vinnytsia region, which threatened it with a humanitarian catastrophe, especially in the conditions of the war.

Official statistics also show a significant decrease in the number of livestock (Table 2) [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 21. Ref. 76. Arc. 2]:

Livestock	January 1, 1941	After liberation from German-Romanian occupation
Cattle	625.055	315.840
Including cows	324.414	221.769
Pigs	511.670	80.119
Sheep and goats	251.946	108.649
Horses	268.543	125.783

The number of various kinds of collective and state farms which bred cattle and poultry decreased sharply: out of their total number of 7,933 as of January 1, 1941, by the time of region liberation there remained only 3,125 [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 21. Ref. 76. Arc. 2].

Another important indicator for the agriculture characterization is the availability of machinery (Table 3) [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 21. Ref. 76. Arc. 2]:

Equipment, implements	01.01.1941	After liberation from German-Romanian occupation
Tractors of all brands	7.493	2.957
Combines	1.439	599
Trucks	4.169	26
Tractor / horse plows	5.244 / 56.549	2.242 / 28.946
Tractor / horse drills	2.646 / 8.798	1.171 / 4.388
Bundles	291	71
Reapers (various types)	9.564	3.122

Thus, even the small amount of equipment used by collective farmers before the German-Soviet war has decreased significantly, which, respectively, decreased labor productivity.

It is difficult to determine today the extent to which the official figures reflect the real situation in agriculture. For example, how did these indicators take into account or display the interests of the collective farms authorities, district and regional Soviet party leaders, individual services and departments?

In many cases, it is impossible to state with certainty the exact time this or that figure refers to, although the precise date is important for analyzing such situations. When was, for example, the number of rural population recorded – at the time of liberation from the German-Romanian occupation, or was the data collected later, after the mobilization of a significant number of men to the Red Army? The same applies to cattle, especially horses taken by the Red Army and, of course, cars and tractors. One way or another, the above data describe the very general state of agriculture in the Vinnytsia region in 1944.

As for the individual districts, the general conditions can be illustrated, in our opinion, on the example of Bar district, where the situation in April 1944 was as follows:

as of April 28, 1944, there were 64 collective farms in the district, with 46,763 residents. Of these, 18,017 were able-bodied, of which 2,440 were men, 13,094 – women, and 2,483 – adolescents. There were 2,953 horses in the collective farms, including 2,126 horses used for labor, and 283 cows, with 14 cows for labor. Other figures characterize the situation with the provision of machinery and agricultural equipment (Table 4) [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 3. Arc. 12]:

Title	Quantity
Carts	541
Seeders (grain / beet)	145 / 69
Reaper	109
Plows	1461
Threshing machines	41
Tractors	69

Of the total number of tractors, as is mentioned in the above document, only 20 were used for sowing, others were idle due to lack of fuel and oil.

The situation in other districts of the region was not better. Bratslav district, for example, showed the following indicators: there were 6,688 collective farms in the district. The population of 25,392 people included 12,038 able-bodied people: 2,419 men, 8,627 women, and 992 adolescents [SAV&R, F. R-1304. Op. 23. Ref. 7. Arc. 18].

On April 17 the machine-and-tractor stations (MTS) of the district comprised:

40 tractors, including 38 serviceable, 46 tractor plows, 17 cultivators, 21 tractor seeders, 6 combines, 29 threshers [SAV&R, F. R-1304. Op. 23. Ref. 7. Arc. 19].

At that time 38 collective farms of the district owned: serviceable horse plows – 400, cultivators – 121, iron harrows 217, wooden harrows – 506, grain seeders – 13, beet seeders – 6. There were 1224 working horses in collective farms, in population households – 225, oxen in collective farms – 86, in population households – 0, cows in collective farms – 0, population households – 1332 [SAV&R, F. R-1304. Op. 23. Ref. 7. Arc. 20].

Thus, in the spring of 1944, the material and technical support of collective farms was significantly worse than in the pre-war period, and the number of workers, especially men, decreased significantly.

Upon return, the Soviet authorities faced a serious problem: with the retreat of the Germans and the approach of the Red Army, in period without the authorities, the collective farmers plundered much of the property of the farm where they worked and used them in their households. The same happened in 1941, with the retreat of the Red Army. Then, the new German occupation authorities were compelled to use force to reclaim at least part of the “public” property. Everything repeated in 1944.

On April 13, 1944, the Executive Committee of the Bershada District Council stated that its resolution of March 22 “on the collection of looted inventory and property” was not carried out. In this regard, the head of the NKVD district department and the heads of village councils were obliged to organize the return of property by April 25, and for this purpose “to form village brigades that will check suspicious households and deliver the collected property to the District Executive Committee storehouses” [SAV&R, F. R-5073. Op. 2. Ref. 5. Arc. 16].

On April 5, 1944, the commandant of the town Bar and the head of the district military commissariat signed Order № 2. In particular, it said that the city's loyalists hid much trophy and domestic property in their households during the German occupation: “weapons, ammunition, medicines, uniforms, leather and leather goods, various spare parts for cars, implements, grain, flour, sugar, cereals, etc.”.

.....
The order required all property to be handed over to the city commandant's office within three days. "In case of non-surrender, the perpetrators will be arrested and subjected to wartime court" [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 1. Arc. 8]. The very content of the document is contradictory: if citizens are loyal to the Soviet government, then why do they not want to voluntarily surrender the property they hid and have to be threatened by repressions?

On April 24, 1944, the Executive Committee of the Bar District Council passed a resolution obliging the director of the Yaltushkivsky Sugar Plant to take from the citizens of the district the cows that belonged to the state farms of the said plant before the war [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 1. Arc. 17]. The resolution was accompanied by a list of "livestock users" that included 54 people [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 1. Arc. 19]. And the decree of July 1, 1944 obliged the collective farmers who "used the collective farm property, implements, carts, plows, and other agricultural inventory and equipment that the collective farms urgently needed" to return them immediately for the community usage. Particular emphasis was placed on the return of horses, which, according to the Statute of the Agricultural Cooperative, collective farmers "had no right to use" [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 1. Arc. 42].

Such measures of the authorities, in our opinion, significantly reduced peasants' interest in work: they were forced to give away cattle and property which they cared for and used during the German-Romanian occupation. In addition, this later led to mass deaths of livestock in collective and state farms: like in the pre-war period, it was the result of the indifference to public "socialist" property.

Over time, the Soviet regime coped with the task, although the seizure of equipment or food from the peasants in favor of collective farms was sometimes accompanied by repressive measures due to resistance from their new owners.

A necessary condition for the successful implementation of the regime's policy was the personnel, staff of the collective farm village. This, in particular, concerned the posts of the collective farms heads. The war continued, majority of the men from the villages were at the front or in evacuation, from where they were just beginning to return. Those who stayed "in the temporarily occupied territory" were not appointed to leadership posts due to distrust of them. So, there was little choice, and in some cases there was no choice at all. Therefore, it is obvious that sometimes random people were appointed the heads of collective farms. Add to this the following requirements for a candidate: first of all, he had to answer to the Communist Party and the state for the implementation of their procurement plans which were extremely difficult to fulfill in the extreme conditions of war. For this reason, far not everyone wanted to take on the responsibility for performing unrealistic tasks, and therefore in many cases the appointment to the post of the head of a collective farm was forced. Of course, collective farmers' meetings were held to carry out the appointment, but they were formal and had only one right: to approve the choice done by the district committee of the Communist Party.

Official data on the heads of collective farms in 1944 – information from 14 districts of the Vinnytsia region, as of January 1945, shows that of the 611 heads of collective farms only 6 people had higher education, 55 people had secondary and incomplete secondary education, 550 people – primary. Regarding the total length of service, the division was as follows: length of service up to one year – 411 people, from 1 to 3 years – 96 people, more than three years – 87 people. Of the total number of 618 heads of collective farms in 1944, 270 people did not change their posts, 223 people were replaced once, 87 people – twice, 26 people – three or more times. Among the reasons for dismissal were: failure to carry out the work – 176 people, abuse and embezzlement – 42 people. Naturally, there were relatively many war invalids among the heads of collective farms – 88 people. Of the 618 heads, only 14 were women. There were 47 members of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks (VKP(b)) and candidates to membership (calculated by the author of the article) [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op.21. Ref. 118. Arc. 2–42].

The frequent change of heads of collective farms was primarily due to their non-compliance with the orders of the highest party and Soviet bodies. This was required of them in the first place. Why was the head of the collective farm removed? In 1944, during the war, there were more than enough reasons. For example, the head of the Manuilsky collective farm in the village of Bilashok, Pohrebyshche district, "did not pay due attention to necessity to increase the yield of sugar beet and to pest control; the collective farm failed to remove local fertilizers collected by collective farmers, as well as to dig up areas for new and old beets, to create a network of shallow ditches, to export the hens, to repair equipment for pest control / goose traps, flea traps, sprayers, did not start layering sugar beets. By the decision of the Executive Committee of the district council and the district committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine he was brought to trial [SAV&R, F. R-2002. Op. 13. Ref. 2. Arc. 7].

Immediately after the restoration of the Soviet collective farm system, there became apparent a problem that the regime found extremely difficult to solve and that significantly affected the implementation of state plans. Just like in the pre-war years, collective farmers used various pretexts not go to work and did not earn even the labor days' minimum. As a result, collective farms, having very few workers, especially men, and with the almost complete absence of labor cattle and

agricultural machinery, were unable to fulfill their tasks. The figures speak for themselves: in 1944, 252 thousand collective farmers, or 45 % of their total number, did not earn the minimum of labor days in the region [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 12. Ref. 169. Arc. 42]. In the Bratslav district, according to the resolution of the district council of workers' deputies of July 14, 1944, 11 out of 676 able-bodied men did not accomplish the minimum; the same is true about 980 out of 6552 women, and 131 out of 796 teenagers. In some collective farms the situation was worse: in the Dymytrov collective farm, 165 people, or 70 % of 235 able-bodied collective farmers did not earn the minimum of labor days; in the collective farm "Way of Ilyich", out of 156 collective farmers – 136 people (87 %) did not work their minimum; in the Kirov collective farm – 212 out of 267, in Shevchenko collective farm – 131 out of 160. What, from the government's point of view, were the reasons for such low labor discipline? "This happened due to the insufficient mass and political work carried out among the collective farmers, and due to the lack of measures taken against those collective farmers who did not earn the minimum of labor days." There was one more reason: the lack of nurseries. Local authorities were obliged to open them within 3 days... [SAV&R, F. R-1304. Op. 23. Ref. 4. Arc. 38].

In the village Malynka of Pohrebyshche district, the issue of labor discipline was discussed at a meeting of the collective farm board on October 2, 1944. The head of the collective farm in his speech noted the shortcomings of the sowing campaign and named the collective farmers' refusal to work as the main reason for the failure to fulfill the plans. Those who even came to work, came too late. On October 2, only 8 women showed up at work.

Collective farmer Fatkulin Horpina did not come to work and was fined by 5 labor days. The collective farmer Krasnoselska O. was fined 5 labor days "for failure to come to work with a cow in the harness."

They discussed "crimes and sabotage" of the collective farmer Anna Shvaiko, who systematically missed work, so the collective farm board decided to expel her from the collective farm [SAV&R, F. R-4146. Op. 1. Ref. 7. Arc. 20].

The issue of saboteurs was discussed the same day at the general meeting of collective farmers. The head of the collective farm noted that a certain number of collective farmers "still did not understand the importance of sowing. They did not bring the cows to work in the harness and refused to work for the collective farm." The head of the village council said that labor discipline helps the victories of the Red Army. He also stressed "the importance of the loan, the military tax, which the collective farmers did not want to understand. All taxes... had to be paid to the state as soon as possible" [SAV&R, F. R-4146. Op. 1. Ref. 7. Arc. 21].

Obviously the problems with labor discipline and not only these ones, were not solved in the above-mentioned collective farm. On December 25, 1944, the head of the collective farm said at the collective farmers meeting that "they were poorly prepared for the new year, namely: all spring wheat was still unthreshed lying in the field together with 2 stacks of winter crops. A number of collective farmers do not understand the importance of this issue and they do not thresh the wheat." The head noted that the plans for state supplies of bread were fulfilled. Unthreshed bread was left "for sowing and as labor days pay. All that had to be done was to thresh it. But if the collective farmers were indifferent to this, they committed this crime against themselves" [SAV&R, F. R-4146. Op. 1. Ref. 7. Arc. 40]. An interesting situation: collective farmers do not want to receive bread for the labor day... Either they were sure that the bread would be taken away from them, or the labor day pay was so low that it made no sense to make an effort to thresh. The document does not answer this question. One thing is clear: the collective farmers were in no way interested in the results of their work on the collective farm.

In addition to the above mentioned problems, there was another one, which, in our opinion, also affected the social and economic situation in the villages of the Vinnytsia region and concerned Ukraine as a whole. The point is – the resumed mobilization of labor forces to go to Donbas in order to rebuild mines and work there, which evidenced the return of Stalin's pre-war rules in the full. Given the catastrophic shortage of labor on collective farms and young people's reluctance to go to Donbas, which was notorious for its high mortality rate among miners, it was extremely difficult to follow the orders of Soviet and communist party authorities. In fact, such forced mobilizations were little different from the forced deportation of Ukrainians to Germany during World War II. Except that the slogans under which it was done.

Following the government's decisions, on June 13, 1944, the Executive Committee of the Pohrebyshche District Council of Workers' Deputies passed a resolution on the recruitment of labor, which, in particular, spoke of "disruption the labor mobilization to the Donbas coal industry in the villages: Yunashki, Svytyntsi, Krupoderyntsi." In the war circumstances, the conclusions were made appropriately: for the disruption of mobilization, the head of the village council of Yunashki was dismissed and brought to trial; the head of the collective farm in Svytynets village was brought to trial for refusing to send his daughter to Donbas, which resulted in failure of mobilization in the village of Svytyntsi... "; the head of the Krupoderynets village council was severely reprimanded "for incomplete

.....
execution of mobilization orders". The resolution warned all heads of village councils of the district about "severe measures of punishment in accordance with the laws of war" for the failure of mobilization plans [SAV&R, F. R-2002. Op. 13. Ref. 2. Arc. 14].

But the recruitment to Donbas mines in the villages of Pohrebyshche district didn't improve. On June 24, 1944, the Pohrebyshche District Council of Workers' Deputies responded with a new resolution. This time the defendants were the heads of collective farms of 6 villages of Pohrebyshche district who did not fulfill the mobilization plans, as a result of which "the wagons at Rzhevuska station were delayed for the total of 146 hours." For the idle stay of wagons, the heads of collective farms were fined 230 rubles each [SAV&R, F. R-2002. Op. 13. Ref. 2. Arc. 34].

A similar situation with the Donbas labor mobilization developed in the Bar district. On August 15, the executive committee of the district council decided to mobilize 150 able-bodied people to work in the Dzerzhynsk-Coal Association: men aged 16-55 and women aged 16-50. The work had to be carried out within three days [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 2. Arc. 32].

Local authorities faced a dilemma: on the one hand, it was necessary to follow the orders of higher authorities. On the other hand, the collective farms lost their manpower, which was already scarce. This was stated in the Resolution of the Vinnytsia Regional Council of Workers' Deputies of September 10, 1944, which indicated extremely unsatisfactory implementation of party and government orders to mobilize labor for the reconstruction of mines in Donbas: by September 5, only 1,300 people were actually sent instead of 8,900 people as demanded [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 6. Arc. 29]. Due to the reluctance to lose the labor force, which was extremely necessary in agriculture, local authorities embarked on the path of "improper mobilization": they included in the lists those persons who could not be sent to Donbas due to physical problems, age and family reasons. These were underage boys and girls, the disabled, people who supported disabled mothers or young children... [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 6. Arc. 29]. There was another problem: few people wanted to go to Donbas voluntarily, and the mobilization to the mines often resembled being sent to work in Germany during World War II. Therefore, the mentioned resolution obliged the heads of executive committees of district councils and mobilization officials to "strictly ensure that materials on the persons who evaded mobilization were processed timely and were handed over to district prosecutors for bringing them to justice" [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 6. Arc. 30].

Stalin's national policy of genocide against the Crimean Tatar population in May 1944 caused one more problem – the new settlements on the peninsula. The Vinnytsia region also took part in this process, despite a significant reduction in the region's population as a result of the war.

In pursuance of the State Defense Committee resolution of August 12, 1944 and the resolution of the Central Committee and All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee of August 19, 1944 on the relocation of collective farmers to the Crimea, Vinnytsia region Council of deputies and workers and the bureau of the regional committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine issued resolution № 59 under the seal "Top Secret" on August 22, 1944. It provided for the relocation of 600 farms (1,800 collective farmers) from the Vinnytsia region to the Kuibyshev district of the Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic by October 1, 1944. Among the relocated: heads of collective farms – 8 people, heads of village councils – 7 people, teachers – 7 people, combine harvesters – 3 people, tractor drivers – 9 people, 2 agronomists and 1 zootechnician. The resolution stated that it was necessary to relocate "...conscientious and hard-working collective farmers, especially those familiar with gardening, viticulture and tobacco growing". There had to be at least 1 able-bodied person in each relocated family [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 6. Arc. 12].

To encourage the relocation of collective farmers who agreed to move to the Crimea, all their debts were written off from state procurement, and in the new settlements they were exempted from all taxes and mandatory state procurement in 1944/1945 [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 6. Arc. 14]. In addition, in order to prevent or complicate the flight of migrants from the Crimea, paragraph 17 of the Resolution stated: "The houses and yard buildings received by the collective farmers-migrants cannot be sold or let on rent. They become their personal property only after 5 years of continuous work on the collective farm" [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 6. Arc. 15].

Paragraph 15 of the decree recalls the orders of the Bolshevik regime during the dekulakization and the Nazi policy on the property of the Jewish population during World War II: "Families of the collective farmers-migrants receive houses with the yard buildings and households. They are given ... agricultural implements and household items that previously belonged to specially relocated individuals" [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 6. Arc. 15]. Now it concerned the property of the Crimean Tatar people, who were declared "enemies of the people" and who now suffered of genocide.

The relocation plan was announced in every district which was to provide the appropriate number of collective farmers. From the Bar district, for example, it was necessary to relocate 25 families of collective farmers to the Crimea by September 17, 1944 consisting of 75 people, one head of the collective farm, tractor driver and agronomist [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 1. Arc. 74; Ref. 3. Arc. 22]. By September 9, 1944, 25 farms were relocated in the number of 83 people, including: able-

bodied – 56 people, children under 14–25 people, the elderly – 2 people [SAV&R, that the board of collective farms sent honest collective farmers to the Crimea. At least from the point of view of common sense and the interests of the collective farm, the very loss of even a small part of the workers was highly undesirable.

The Vinnytsia region also lost its working population as a result of the implementation of the state policy on labor resources. Thus, the Resolution of the Executive Committee of Vinnytsia Regional Council of September 18, 1944 obliged to “carry out the conscription / mobilization of the youth” into craft, railway schools and factory training schools in the amount of 4555 people. The document provided for the mobilization of primarily urban youth, not employed in production and training, aged 15-18. In case the plan was not be accomplished, it was considered appropriate to mobilize some categories of pupils [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 6. Arc. 31].

Stalin regime's policy on liberated territories was largely dictated by the war, which required large resources and, according to the authorities, the Vinnytsia region had and could offer them to the state.

The first settlements of the Vinnytsia region were liberated from the German occupants in late 1943, and on February 7, 1944 the Soviet People's Commissar of the USSR approved a plan for provision and purchasing of bread harvested in 1943 in 6 districts of the region, whose names are not specified in the document: the plan required to collect 765 thousand poods of bread into the bread fund of the Red Army, and 250 thousand poods – to public procurement [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 1. Arc. 1].

It is difficult to say how reasonable and realistic such tasks were. The experience of state procurement plans in the 1930s shows that in many cases the planned figures were not economically justified, but pursued political interests or were generated by the Stalin government's own considerations about the availability of bread in collective farms or individuals. On the other hand, it is unlikely that the returning communist authorities knew about the amount of grain harvested in 1943 during the German-Romanian occupation and the scale of their procurement. Let us assume that it was not less than in the 1930s, under the Stalin regime, and therefore the Podilia peasants probably had a minimum that allowed them to live to a new harvest at best. Thus, the situation after the liberation by the Red Army was critical for the villagers in terms of physical survival. It is unlikely that the Stalin regime assumed that the German-Romanian occupiers did not plunder the population of the Vinnytsia region, and that the peasants had enough bread to share with the Soviet state. The issue needs further study for a more detailed reconstruction of the situation, although the documents found to date suggest that at the time of liberation at least some villages had some grain stocks.

In our opinion, it's interesting to look at the official statistics of collective farms in the Pohrebyshche district, which was liberated in late 1943 and early 1944. It shows that in the first days after the arrival of the Red Army a significant number of farms had oats, peas, barley, millet, buckwheat. Moreover, it was about tens or even hundreds of centners of grain left over from the harvest of 1943. Yes, the village Popivtsi had: potatoes – 520 centners, oats – 102 centners, peas – 189 centners, barley – 280 centners, millet – 198 centners, buckwheat – 84 centners. [SAV&R, F. R-2002. Op. 13. Ref. 4. Arc. 21]. In the barn of Kuryanka village in early January 1944 there were stored 102 centners of oats, 121 centners of peas, 207 centners of barley, 15 centners of millet, 42 centners of buckwheat. In addition, in their procurement point there was grain of other collective farms: oats – 150 centners, millet – 230 centners, buckwheat – 85 centners, peas – 226 centners. [SAV&R, R. 2002. Op. 13. Ref. 4. Arc. 17]. The situation was similar in other farms. For some reason, there are no reports of wheat or rye in the reports. Probably, the bread was taken away by the German occupiers.

According to the documents, there was a certain amount of cattle in all collective farms of Pohrebyshche district. In the already mentioned Popivtsi they had 70 horses, of which – 13 young animals, 24 oxen, 6 sows [SAV&R, F. R-2002. Op. 13. Ref. 4. Arc. 20]. The village of Borshchahivka reported 65 horses, 12 of them – young animals, 33 oxen, 29 sows. In addition, the collective farm had 20 carts and grabbers [SAV&R, F. R-2002. Op. 13. Ref. 4. Arc. 22]. The collective farm in the village of Kuryantsi had 98 horses at its disposal, 21 of them were young animals, 16 oxen, 18 sows, 20 carts and grabbers [SAV&R, F. R-2002. Op. 13. Ref. 4. Arc. 23]. Thus, in general, the villages of the district at the time of liberation from the German occupiers had certain stocks of grain for food and seeds, livestock and implements of various qualities for management and sowing and harvesting campaigns.

In response to the already mentioned order of the USSR People's Commissar of February 7, 1944, the Pohrebyshche District Council of Workers' Deputies on February 27, 1944 adopted a resolution “On the plan of bread procurement and purchase from the 1943 harvest in Pogrebyshche district.” The decision provided for the delivery of 3,600 tons of grain to the Red Army Fund and 1,195 tons – to public procurement [SAV&R, F. R-2002. Op. 13. Ref. 2. Arc. 3].

On April 18, 1944, the Soviet People's Commissar of the USSR adopted another resolution on the plan for the purchase and procurement of bread, which also applied to the Vinnytsia region. The state was to procure and purchase 3,972,000 poods of bread in the newly liberated districts of the

Vinnitsia region. In total, the plan for the purchase and procurement of bread from the harvest of 1943 reached the figure of 4,987 thousand poods [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 1. Arc. 4].

Thus, the agriculture of the Vinnitsia region immediately after the liberation began to implement state procurement plans, which, in our opinion, were not justified in terms of the reality of their implementation. This is confirmed by numerous documents of the time about the failure to fulfill the grain harvesting plans. The problem was complicated by the fact that together with the harvesting campaign, people had to collect seed material for sowing. In both cases, the plans were implemented at the expense of the harvest of individual farms of collective farmers, who, in addition to being physically unable to perform the tasks assigned to them, did not want to give grain to the state.

The task of our study is not a detailed analysis of the sowing campaign. In general, despite the catastrophic lack of machinery, seed, people, the Vinnitsia region managed the sowing.

When the harvest time came, the collective farms faced the shortage of manpower. This initiated the appearance of such resolutions as "On the mobilization of urban, rural population for agricultural work in collective and state farms" which was adopted on July 18, 1944 by the Executive Committee of the Bar District Council of Workers' Deputies. It required the mobilization of all men aged 14–55 and women aged 14–50 for agricultural work. Exceptions were women with infants and those who had children under the age of 8 [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 1. Arc. 55]. Without the involvement of additional labor under the conditions prevailing in 1944, it was impossible to gather crops. Let's note, that harvesting is a process that takes almost six months: from July to October–November. From the point of view of the physical strength of the people and cattle employed in this work, in the complete absence of technology, the harvesting was much delayed.

The result of untimely harvesting was the loss of its significant part: overripe grain fell from spikelets to the ground and rotted, sugar beets lost their sugar content as a result of frosts, and some of them was left in the field unharvested. In general, Soviet-era agriculture suffered heavy losses in harvesting and storage due to poor quality of work and lack of interest in a result.

The unsatisfactory state of harvesting in the Vinnitsia region worried the top Soviet leadership of Ukraine. In early August 1944, the head of the Council of People's Commissars M. Khrushchev sent a telegram to the leaders of the region about the shortcomings identified during the inspection during the harvest. In particular, the head of the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR noted that some collective farms showed significant losses of bread: in the collective farm named after 8 March of Tulchynsky district, in the harvesting areas up to 25 spikelets of crops were found per square meter [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 11]. In some cases, the accounting of grain threshing by combine harvesters and threshers and its protection were poorly organized. A lot of grain remained in the chaff and straw. "This shows that some Soviet and party leaders and employees of land institutions and machine-tractor station lost their sense of responsibility for combating crop losses" [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 11].

Then the head of the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR gave recommendations on what local party and Soviet leaders should do to ensure that the collective farmers gather the harvest properly: 1. Within five days, check the condition of the areas where the harvest was gathered and re-harvest the spikelets. Establish control over the quality of the work done; 2. "Organize the manual mowing of the areas missed by mowing machines, raking of the spikelets in all areas with a horse and hand rake, manual collection of spikelets, involving pupils in this work"; 3. Prepare places for threshing in all collective farms "and to tamp them down well so that every day after the end of the threshing machine work it would be possible to sweep and collect grain residues, to organize accurate weighing and accounting of grain near threshers and combines"; 4. "To ensure field brigades foremen's obligatory daily reception of the collected plots from the collective farmers and the reception of these areas by the heads of the collective farms from the foremen" [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 11].

This is what the head of the Ukrainian government was doing: he was teaching the peasants how to harvest in order to save every kilogram, every spikelet. How could collective farmers know how to work on the land? The help of the party and the Soviet state in this respect, as in all the others, was not only necessary – it kind of saved the state from incompetent peasants...

N. Khrushchev was a few days ahead of Stalin. On August 24, 1944, a telegram was sent to D. Korotchenko and N. Khrushchev, signed by the Chairman of the USSR People's Commissar I. Stalin and G. Malenkov (he headed the Committee at the USSR Council of People's Commissars for the Restoration of the National Economy in the Areas Liberated from Fascist Occupation) which determined the policy of harvesting in 1944 in Ukraine. In particular, it said that "all talks and requests to reduce the plan should be stopped immediately, all anti-procurement sentiments should be restrained, because they disrupt grain supplies and thus undermine the country's defense capabilities. [...] We cannot tolerate such rotten considerations." The text of the telegram spoke about the personal responsibility of the first secretaries of regional committees, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, chairmen of regional executive committees and the People's Commissar of the

Republic “for the full implementation of the state plan of grain procurement.” The last phrase of the telegram was very specific: “The Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Soviet People’s Commissar of the USSR warn that leaders who do not fulfill the grain procurement plan and indulge the saboteurs will be blacklisted publicly in press, dismissed from their posts and severely punished by being brought to justice in court in accordance with the laws of war” [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 21]. The tone of the telegram showed no doubt: the leader even remembered the black boards, infamous in 1932–1933.

It is noteworthy that, as before, the party Soviet document did not say a word about those who actually grew bread: what did they get from the harvest?

The above-mentioned documents called for a natural reaction from the Vinnytsia region leadership. On September 8, 1944, a letter was sent to the districts of the region, signed by the leaders of the regional party organization and the regional executive committee. The preamble to the letter stated that the collective and state farms of the region hand over the bread to the state very slowly, “and the district committees of the CP(b)U, the district executive committees do not pay enough attention to this anti-state practice.” Bread threshing is extremely slow. By September 5, only 42.2 % of bread was threshed in the region, and in some districts this figure was even lower: in Plyskiv district – 26.4 %, in Monastyryshchensk district – 24.3 %, in Teplyk district – 25 %, in Bershad – 29.3 %. Large losses of grain occur during threshing and export of grain. There takes place “squandering and theft.”

Delays in receiving grain at procurement points. There are facts when collective farms violate the law on grain supplies, spending more than 15 % of the harvest on their needs. Some heads of collective farms spend bread “on household needs” and fail to fulfill of bread delivery plans. The regional committee of the Communist Party (of bolsheviks) explained this disgraceful situation “only by the fact that the secretaries of the district committees of the party, the chairmen of the district executive committees, follow and agree with the saboteurs, instead of bringing them to the strictest responsibility.” The regional party committee regarded the situation as “direct sabotage” and warned the district leadership about taking the most serious responsibility for failure to perform “important state tasks” [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 28].

Did the situation with grain supplies change for the better after such a stern warning from the district party and Soviet authorities? Here’s information of the authorized regional committee official of the CP(b)U in Tulchyn district dated October 7, 1944. According to this official, on October 7 the plan of delivery of grain to the state was fulfilled by the district by 70 %. The Commissioner saw the main reason for non-compliance in the “lack of unity in the leadership of the Council of CP(b)U”. What did it mean? “The so-called bush commissioners appointed in collective farms, such as secretaries of the district committee, chairman of the executive committee, head of the NKGB, district military committee and others, instead of practical help in the organization of labor discipline in collective farms were engaged in small raids to the collective farms and from early spring and till now seldom visited the collective farms, restricted their work to giving correct political instructions but did not organize collective farmers to solve the main task [-] of grain delivery to the state” [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 49]. One of the negative results – a significant part of collective farms had grain that wasn’t accounted, which, therefore, did not fall under the state’s supply of grain.

Another significant shortcoming, according to the commissioner, is the lack of educational work with the of collective farms’ and village councils’ authorities: “no work to improve the ideological and political level of management by the district committee was ever carried out”. Therefore, it is not surprising that the organization of labor in the vast majority of collective farms “is at a very low level.” Evidence of this is, for example, the fact that in the collective farm named after 8 March, 50 % of collective farmers earned after the liberation from Romanian occupation only up to 30 labor days. Besides, in almost half of the collective farms of the district “traction force was not in common property yet, and even if it was, the bolshevik order wasn’t established in the use of this force yet” [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 50]. In our opinion, the establishment of the “bolshevik order” soon led to a sharp decline in the number of horses on collective farms: if the farmers (during the Romanian occupation) owned horses as private property and took care of them, with the return of socialist management principles they returned to the indifference to public property.

The letter also stated that the heads of collective farms are reluctant to start harvesting corn, and the district committee of the party and the district executive committee did not break this negative trend. The district also lags behind in winter sowing, “solely due to poor organization of work among collective farmers and poor work of machine-tractor station.” However, it is said that to improve work of Tulchyn machine-tractor station they must be provided with “spare parts” and measures should be taken “to establish labor discipline among tractor drivers” [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 50].

The author of the report also stated that “the prospects of the district for the spring of 1945 are very sad as most collective farms will not have sowing material in the full...”

.....

How to fix the situation? The commissioner of the regional committee of the CP(b)U offered to take part of the grain for sowing from collective farmers who grew bread on their homesteads. It is obvious that the harvest was considerable, because during the Romanian occupation some peasants significantly expanded their sowing areas, thus violating the Statute of the Agricultural Artel, and now the state had the right to take away this grain... [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 50]. This is what the government would soon do.

In addition to direct forceful methods to help and promote harvest, various forms of party Soviet institutions' work included different campaigns conducted under the relevant slogans of the time. According to the government, they had to bring positive results.

On September 7, 1944, a letter was distributed in the region, signed by Isay, Secretary of the CP(b)U Regional Committee, and Ryabukhin, Commissioner of the People's Commissariat of Procurement in the Vinnytsia region, proposing "to help the front and the Red Army and to improve the situation with the supply of industrial centers by holding in the period from September 8 to October 8, a month of procurement of livestock products and carrying out the following specific tasks." Each district received target figures for meat, milk, eggs and wool, which had to be met as part of the annual mandatory delivery plan. Our attention was drawn to the point which demanded "to organize the mass surrender by collective farms, collective farmers, workers and employees and individuals, of the livestock and poultry in advance at the expense of meat supplies in 1945." [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 27]. Given the desire of some local leaders to "fulfill and overfulfill", such a requirement for the farmers could mean forced additional meat deliveries to the detriment of their families.

The Vinnytsia region, in addition to all the above mentioned types of food, was also a supplier of vegetables. In particular, the resolution of the Executive Committee of the Vinnytsia Regional Council of Workers' Deputies of September 30, 1944 approved a plan for the receipt and use of vegetables from the 1944 harvest. Among other things, it provided for the supply of the Red Army in the amount of 32,901 tons, for trade and catering – 2920 tons, export to Moscow – 1050 tons. The plan also provided for the processing and preservation of vegetables. Within the next 5 days, it was to be brought to the attention of those who were to carry it out [SAV&R, F. R-5091. Op. 2. Ref. 1. Arc. 81].

Interesting, in our opinion, is the information about the supply of vegetables to Moscow in terms of war. Vinnytsia region was liberated from the German-Romanian occupiers just a few months before. It suffered significant material destruction, huge human losses – this was confirmed by the Stalinist regime, which restored its power. But Moscow immediately returned to the previous, colonial policy (in the 1930's the practice of providing Russian cities with food from Vinnytsia region was carried out even in 1932–1933). Until recently occupied by the Germans and Romanians Vinnytsia region, immediately after the "liberation" began working for the previous occupiers, who did not quite take into account the interests of the people of the region.

Among the forms of "stimulating" the implementation of procurement plans were various prohibitions. In particular, as was often the case in the pre-war years, a lot of prohibitions applied to trade. Thus, on August 2, 1944, the Bershad District Executive Committee adopted a resolution banning trade of grain, flour, oil-producing plants until the full implementation of state supplies [SAV&R, F. R-5073. Op. 2. Ref. 5. Arc. 167a]. Among other things, sale of food gave the peasants the opportunity to get the money needed to pay taxes: labor days, earned in the collective farm, were not paid at all, or the money was not enough. Now the collective farmers were in an even worse situation.

The last discovered document of national importance, dated 1944, concerning the procurement and supply of food by the Vinnytsia region, was the resolution of the Soviet People's Commissar of the USSR № 1653 "On the delivery of bread to Sverdlovsk and Chelyabinsk regions", which included Vinnytsia region: it was obliged to send to the Sverdlovsk region 10 thousand tons of bread in order to ensure "uninterrupted supply of bread to the population" in January-March 1945 [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 1. Arc. 48].

Characterizing the state of agriculture in Vinnytsia, we should pay attention to another important, in our opinion, aspect that helps to estimate effectiveness of the collective farm management system. As is a well-known fact, not a single important issue, whichever aspect of life it concerned, in the Soviet period could be resolved without the opinion of the communist party. This also applied to the functioning of collective farms. With the liquidation of the private ownership in the village, the collective farmers lived and worked from the beginning of the establishment of the collective farm system in strict correspondence with the party guidelines. An example of such leadership is a letter signed by the secretary of the regional committee Mishchenko that accompanied a copy of the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b), which, in our opinion, deserves publication: "To the secretary of the district committee of the party. The regional committee of the party sends you a copy of the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) of October 4, 1944 "On the unsatisfactory plowing in collective and state farms."

Attaching great importance to the issue of plowing as the best guarantee for timely spring sowing and high yields in 1945, the Party Regional Committee draws your attention to this question

and demands to organize plowing and to unconditionally provide accomplishment of the plowing plan in your area, being guided thus by the decision of regional executive committee and the regional committee of the CP(b)U of September 27, 1944 "On the plowing and the plan of deep plowing for sugar beet sowing in the collective farms of the region in 1945" [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 51].

Thus, plowing the land without a party decision was impossible and even dangerous, because self-government could be regarded as sabotage and punished according to the party and state decisions.

Another example. At the end of 1944, the regional party committee and the regional executive committee prepared a letter addressed to each head of the village council in the Vinnytsia region, reminding them of the need to fulfill their obligations to the state, and the first one was: "Immediately check the state of supply of bread, potatoes, vegetables, meat, milk and other products to the state by the collective farms of your village council. Mobilize the attention of all Soviet and collective farm assets, raise all the resources and opportunities of your village and in the nearest future complete the fulfillment of all obligations of your village to the state" [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 25]. Then followed the reminder about the end of the gathering of sugar beets and potatoes from the fields and ensuring the supply of raw materials to the country's industry, about the "great obligation to the state coal industry to provide mines with manpower, scaffolding, to provide rail transport and enterprises with firewood." The next task inscribed to increase the number of collective farm herds by removing young animals from contracting and ensuring their proper stay on farms. (Note that this decision very quickly led to a reduction in livestock due to lack of food, poor care, disease, etc., but the state plan to increase the collective farm herd had to be implemented...). And this despite the fact that the appeal stated that "... it is necessary to prepare and insulate [...] the premises, to establish proper care for young animals in order to fully preserve all young animals and help them survive winter in good, well-fed condition." [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 25].

As for the sowing campaign of 1944–1945, the Communist Party and the Soviet state took care of this as well. They advised to organize a "thorough inspection of the availability of seeds for the entire planned sowing area for each collective farm. The seeds have to be cleaned, exchanged and purchased. Examine all agricultural equipment, organize its repair and manufacture of the new one. Organize proper care for working cattle in winter, so that they survived winter well-fed and in full efficiency" [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 5. Arc. 25]. It seems that without a reminder from the Communist Party, the peasants may not have known that seeds were needed for sowing, and cattle needed to be fed...

It is noteworthy that not a single of such documents had a word about the state's obligations to the peasantry, about the interests of those who kept the army, fed millions of workers in industrial centers and city dwellers, and sent food to Moscow...

The assessment of the agriculture development in Vinnytsia region in 1944 was given by the collective farmers themselves, whose statements show a deep understanding of the situation: "Life in our collective farm has never been like this. Horses are skinny, there is no food for them, except rye straw, half of them have already died. The carts are all broken and there's no one to repair them" (December 1944, Nemyriv district, Sypachky village); «...complete mismanagement/arnachy in the collective farm. Everything is ruined and no one is concerned with putting the collective farm in order. The bread from the collective farm didn't come. The horses were all infected, almost all of them were shot. There are three horses left for the whole collective farm. Calves get sick, several of them have to be slaughtered every day..." (January 1945, Kryzhopil district, Kryzhopil village); "... the collective farm distributes horses, and they die because there is nothing to feed them on. Two-three horses die every day. Ten horses were given to our brigade, but no one wants to take them" (January 1945, Voronovysia district, Volovodivka village); "The situation is so shameful in our collective farm that you can't imagine. Spring is coming, there are no seeds, no traction forces. There were 27 horses, 9 cows in the collective farm, but only 20 horses and 3 cows remained. They die because of the lack of food. Seeds for sowing are collected from collective farmers" (Chechelnytskyi district); "It's already March, sowing is coming soon, and there are no seeds or horses in our collective farm. There were 12 horses in our brigade, and only two remained, the others died. The governors don't do anything. We are all doomed to grief and famine" (Tomashpil district); "Spring is approaching, fields need to be sown, and there are no seeds to sow in the collective farm. Almost half of the village is currently starving, and authorities demand seeds for sowing from them. Almost all the horses are dead, only two pairs remained" (Obodov district); "There are no seeds for sowing in the collective farm, there is no traction force, I do not know what we will do in the spring with such leaders" (Monastyryshchensk district) [SAV&R, F. P-136. Op. 13. Ref. 25. Arc. 23, 26, 27, 63]. Thus, the peasants noted the complete inability of local authorities to establish proper functioning of collective farms. In addition, analyzing the economic situation in the collective farms, the peasants concluded and foresaw the inevitable famine that occurred in some villages in early 1945.

Conclusions. The consequences of German-Soviet war and German-Romanian occupation significantly worsened the social and economic situation in the Vinnytsia district. Significant human casualties and decrease in the population of the region, destruction of the already weak material and technical base of collective farms were the consequences of the management of the new occupants. 1944 was characterized by a significant reduction in livestock, especially cows and horses, which could to some extent replace the technique. The personnel support of collective farms was unsatisfactory.

At the same time, the return of Soviet power and the Stalin order was accompanied by a rapid resumption of procurement policies, which increased significantly.

The lack of material interest in the results of work in the collective farm led to low labor discipline, refusal to work.

In 1944, Vinnytsia region was an important supplier of food to the army, large industrial centers and Moscow. Stalin's government used the inhabitants of the Vinnytsia region as "labor reserves", as evidenced by the mobilization of young people to Donbas mines, the relocation of Podilia peasants to the Crimea. The central government of the Soviet state and the leadership of the bolshevik party were not concerned with a significant reduction in the number of workers in collective farms.

The social and economic situation in the region was characterized and assessed by collective farmers in late 1944 – early 1945. Emphasizing the inability of various levels of government to establish effective collective farms work, the peasants foresaw a new famine. Thus, the foundations of the Holodomor of 1946–1947 were laid in 1944 by the social and economic policy of the Stalin regime.

Gratitude. Sincere gratitude to the staff of State Archives of Vinnytsia and the region for help with the research materials, and to members of the editorial board of the journal – for constructive advice during the preparation of the article for publication.

Financing. The author did not receive financial support for the research and publication of this paper.

References:

- Baran, V. K. & Danylenko, V. M.** (1999). *Ukraina v umovakh systemnoi kryzy (1946–1980-ti rr.)* [Ukraine in the conditions of systemic crisis (1946-1980)]. K.: Vydavnychiy dim «Alternatyva», 304 s. [in Ukrainian].
- Bazhan, O.** (2005). Osoblyvosti vidbudovchoho periodu v Ukrainskii RSR u druhii polovyni 40-kh – na pochatku 50-kh rokiv XX st. [Features of the reconstruction period in the Ukrainian SSR in the second half of the 40's – early 50's of the twentieth century]. *Naukovi zapysky natsionalnoho universytetu Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia – Scientific notes of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy*. T. 41. 20–29. [in Ukrainian].
- Danylenko, V. M.** (2005). Povsiakdenne zhyttia ukraïnskykh selian u povoiennyi period (1945–1955 rr.) [Everyday life of Ukrainian peasants in the postwar period (1945-1955)]. *Ukraina XX st.: kultura, ideolohiia, polityka – Ukraine of the twentieth century: culture, ideology, politics*. Vyp. 9. 3–18. [in Ukrainian].
- DAViO [SAV&R]** – Derzhavnyi arkhiv Vinnytskoi oblasti [State Archives of Vinnytsia Region]. [in Ukrainian].
- Koliastruk, O. A.** (2012). Povsiakdenne zhyttia ukraïnskoho suspilstva u pershi povoienni roky (1944–1947) [Everyday life of Ukrainian society in the first postwar years (1944–1947)]. *Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Seria: Istorii – Scientific Papers of Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyyi State Pedagogical University. Series: History*. Vyp. 20. 131–136. [in Ukrainian].
- Kononenko, V. V.** (2005a). Stanovyshche ukraïnskoho selianstva u povoiennyi period (1945–1947 rr.) [The situation of the Ukrainian peasantry in the postwar period (1945–1947)]. *Ukraïnskyi selianyn – Ukrainian peasant*. vyp. 9. 234–236. [in Ukrainian].
- Melnychuk, O. & Melnychuk T.** (2020). Povsiakdenne zhyttia kolhospnoho selianstva Podillia u povoiennyi period (1944–1953) (na materialakh kolhospu «Chervonyi promin» s. Melnykivtsi) [The daily life of the collective farm of Podillya in the postwar period (1944–1953) (on the materials of the collective farm "Red ray" of Melnykivtsi)]. *Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Seria: Istorii – Scientific Papers of Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyyi State Pedagogical University. Series: History*. Vyp. 32. 52–63. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31652/2411-2143-2020-32-52-63>. [in Ukrainian].
- Romaniuk, B.** Osoblyvosti derzhavnoi podatkovoi polityky dlia kolhospnoho selianstva v pershi povoienni roky [Features of the state tax policy for the collective farm peasantry in the first postwar years]. *Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Seria: Istorii – Scientific Papers of Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyyi State Pedagogical University. Series: History*. Vyp. 24. 105–108. [in Ukrainian].

Паєло Кравченко

Вінницький державний педагогічний університет імені Михайла Коцюбинського
кандидат історичних наук, доцент

Подільське село у 1944 р.: соціально-економічне становище

Анотація. Метою статті є аналіз і характеристика соціально-економічних процесів у сільському господарстві Вінниччини, що супроводжували відновлення радянського режиму після звільнення області у 1944 р. від німецько-румунських окупантів. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на поєднанні загальнонаукових принципів аналізу, синтезу, узагальнення та спеціально-історичних – історико-критичного, історико-системного, конкретно-проблемного, кількісного з принципами історизму, системності, науковості та верифікації. **Наукова новизна** роботи полягає передусім у тому, що автор на основі дослідження та аналізу нових джерел, критичного осмислення партійно-радянських документів тієї доби розкрив характерні риси соціально-економічної ситуації, що склалась у подільському селі з відновленням сталінського режиму та колективного господарювання. **Висновки.** Відновлення колоніального комуністичного радянського режиму на Вінниччині не змінило на краще соціально-економічну ситуацію для колгоспного селянства. До матеріальних та людських втрат, нанесених німецько-румунськими окупантами, військовими операціями ворогуючих сторін, додалася жорстка визискувальна політика державних заготівель, примусових переселень населення до Криму та на Донбас, яка ще більше знесилила подільське село. Окремі аспекти проблеми потребують подальшого вивчення шляхом досліджень архівних документів того часу.

Ключові слова: радянський режим, колгоспне селянство, заготівлі, мобілізація, робоча сила, переселення, кадри, настрої.

Джерела та література:

- Бажан, О.** (2005). Особливості відбудовчого періоду в Українській РСР у другій половині 40-х – на початку 50-х років ХХ ст. *Наукові записки національного університету Києво-Могилянська академія*. Т. 41. 20–29.
- Баран, В. К. & Даниленко, В. М.** (1999). *Україна в умовах системної кризи (1946–1980-ті рр.)*. К.: Видавничий дім «Альтернатива», 304 с.
- ДАВіО** – Державний архів Вінницької області.
- Даниленко, В. М.** (2005). Повсякденне життя українських селян у повоєнний період (1945–1955 рр.). *Україна ХХ ст.: культура, ідеологія, політика*. Вип. 9. 3–18.
- Коляструк, О. А.** (2012). Повсякденне життя українського суспільства у перші повоєнні роки (1944–1947). *Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Історія. Вип. 20*. 131–136.
- Кононенко, В. В.** (2005а). Становище українського селянства у повоєнний період (1945–1947 рр.). *Український селянин*, вип. 9. 234–236.
- Мельничук, О. & Мельничук Т.** (2020). Повсякденне життя колгоспного селянства Поділля у повоєнний період (1944–1953) (на матеріалах колгоспу «Червоний промінь» с. Мельниківці). *Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Історія. Вип. 32*. 52–63. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31652/2411-2143-2020-32-52-63>.
- Романюк, Б.** Особливості державної податкової політики для колгоспного селянства в перші повоєнні роки. *Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Історія. Вип. 24*. 105–108.

Статтю надіслано до редколегії 14.04.2022 р.
Статтю рекомендовано до друку 21.05.2022 р.