Vol XV
No. 2

APRIL-
JUNE
1960

ISSN 0019-5014

INDIAN JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

INDIAN SOCIETY OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
BOMBAY

ON SOME IMPORTANT PROBLEMS OF COLLECTIVE FARM DEVELOPMENT*—A HISTORICAL REVIEW

A. I. Tulupnikov

SYSTEM OF ORGANIZING FARM WORK AND REMUNERATING LABOUR

In the earlier period, *i.e.*, soon after the establishment of collective farms in our country, we were faced with a problem: in what way should we organize farm work in the collective farms? How should farmers' labour be remunerated? In solving this problem we proceeded from the premise that the method for organizing farm work and for remunerating labour should be such that it ensures the timely performance of all agricultural operations and guarantees a constant increase in labour productivity. I shall first of all describe here how the system of organizing farm work in our collective farms was improved.

We tried various methods from which we chose the most efficient ones. The range of these methods during the first years (when the collective farms were just organized) was extremely broad. Here I should like to dwell on the two extremes which, if I may put it this way, formed the boundaries of this range. In some collective farms the work was organized in the following way: each farmer got for himself a definite section for work and he was made fully responsible for it. In other collective farms it was different; there a great mass of people straightaway received one section to work on.

These methods had one shortcoming. When organizing farm work on an individual basis the accounting of labour was improved. It was easy to single out workers who worked more zealously and efficiently than others. This made it possible to stimulate the work of the best collective farmers. However, the distribution of work on an individual basis was possible only in conditions when manual labour was the prevailing form of labour on collective farms. This method did not promote but counteracted the process of mechanization of labour processes on the farms.

The other methods proved a handicap in individual accounting of the labour done and it required too much time to organize farm work (for instance, to collect people and arrange them by sections). Sometimes this method of organizing farm work brought about some economic losses. For example, during the harvesting period about 10 combines would line up on the same section close to one another. If one of the harvester combines went out of order, the rest would lie idle for the time being. (This could, of course, be avoided if the combines were dispersed in several sections).

These two extreme forms and other forms similar to them did not find a wide application and they were therefore rejected. The practical experience brought forth new and more perfect forms of organizing farm work.

The creation of collective farm brigades can be regarded as one of the basic forms of the new type of organising work. Each of these brigades, with a brigade

* Extracts from a report delivered at a meeting of research students and members of the staff of Delhi School of Economics, University of Delhi.

leader at its head, worked in one particular branch of collective farm economy. For example, there are brigades of field workers, market-gardeners, horticulturists, pig-breeders, etc. If any of the brigades has to do manual work on a comparatively large scale, then the brigades are subdivided into smaller units — teams with a team-leader at the head.

Practical experience also helped in defining the optimal strength of a brigade and a team. A brigade, as a rule, consists of 40 to 60 people and the team of 5 to 6 people.

But all these forms of organizing farm work were, naturally, not final. With increased use of agricultural machinery and with enlargement of collective farms it was necessary to improve the whole system of organizing farm work. The collective farms started to shift to multipurpose brigades, which had proved to be most efficient in the new conditions. The difference between such a brigade and a branch brigade is that it is territorial sub-division in charge of all work done in the given sector of the collective farm with one leader at its head who is in command of all means of production and man-power on this territory. Besides grain fields, the brigade may also be in charge of a poultry farm, dairy and pig-breeding farms, etc.

By setting up multipurpose brigades it became possible to cut down the administrative machinery in the collective farms and, thus reduce the unproductive expenditures. At present the following form of organising and managing our collective farms may be considered as typical:

(1) The general meeting of collective farm members forms the highest body. The farmers meet regularly to solve most important problems, to approve the annual production plans, to establish production quota and rates of remuneration of labour, to determine the amount of money from the annual income which go to the indivisible fund and which are distributed among the collective farmers, etc. The general meeting elects the farm board as its managing body headed by the Chairman. The Board commands all work done at the farm.

(2) Multipurpose brigades — territorial economic divisions headed as a rule by an agricultural specialist with a higher or secondary specialized education — practically implement the decisions of the Board.

(3) Besides these brigades, there are also in the collective farms divisions of general economic designation — repair workshops, enterprises for initial processing of agricultural raw materials, building teams for the construction of residential and economic premises.

(4) Specialized farms, as dairy and poultry farms, etc., are usually singled out within the multipurpose brigades which are directly subordinated to the multipurpose brigade leader.

I shall now dwell on the accounting and remuneration of farm work done in the collective farms. I consider it the most important question because its correct treatment will help to understand how our collective farms gave more impetus to

the material incentive of farmers in the development of collectively-owned economy, and how they induce them to work better and more efficiently. Regarding the misapprehension in some quarters regarding the existence of a system of compulsion, it may be pointed out that actually for our people to work in our collective farms, and anywhere in the Soviet Union, is a matter of joy and honour. Those whose work is a model for others are the most popular and the most respected people in our country. The best people from the multi-million army of our workers and peasants receive from the state high government honours.

In what way is the remuneration of labour in our collective farms effected and how does it promote the material incentive of collective farmers?

During the first years of our work we made many mistakes so far as accounting of labour was concerned, and for this reason we were not always able to apply efficiently the principle that "each gets according to the work done by him." With the improvement in organizing the farm work, as I have mentioned earlier, these mistakes were corrected and the accounting of labour was considerably improved upon.

In the first stage of the development of collective farms the work done by farmers was measured in terms of units known as work-day units. For every form of work done in the collective farms a daily production quota was established. One work-day unit was taken as a quota for a comparatively simple item of work.

All other forms of work were calculated according to a part of a work-day unit or some work-day units: 0.1; 0.5; 0.75; 1.25; 1.5; 1.75; 2.25; 2.5. The more difficult, complicated and important the work done, the more work-day units were counted in performing it. During a working day a collective farmer could earn one work-day unit, a part of it or some work-day units.

The incomes of collective farms were distributed according to the amount of labour spent, which was accounted in the way described above. If, say, the amount of labour spent by a collective farmer in a particular period equalled 100 work-day units, and that of the other 200 units then it meant that the second farmer had received two times more from the income fixed for distribution than that received by the first farmer.

Such a method of accounting and remunerating labour had two substantial shortcomings which soon made themselves felt. The income earned according to work-day units was distributed only once a year, exactly at the end of the farming season. Besides, a collective farmer, knowing the amount of work-day units he had put in, could not know how much money he was to receive as the amount of total income of the collective farm earmarked for distribution was made known only at the end of the agricultural year when all the expenditures of a collective farm were calculated.

The collective farms began to guarantee the remuneration per work-day unit, *i.e.*, they set up minimum rates below which the remuneration per work-day units would not drop. This gave a greater impetus to collective farmers' incentive in running the collectively-owned economy more efficiently.

But, as life has proved, the collective farmers evince still more interest even when the guaranteed income for their work-day units is paid to them, not at the end of the agricultural year, but on a monthly basis. This has resulted in monthly payments for the work-day units put in by collective farmers in a month.

Later, when an ever greater part of farmers' incomes was distributed in cash, vast possibilities opened up for further improving the system of accounting and remunerating labour. The collective farms passed from work-day units to monetary evaluation for a particular production quota. In other words, they came to adopt a system of accounting and remunerating labour which is typical for industrial enterprises. Under this system, every collective farmer, having completed his working day, can easily determine the amount of money he earns because he knows exactly from payment rates how each operation performed by him is remunerated.

This system is gaining ever wider use with every passing day. We are sure that within a year or so it will be adopted in all collective farms.

Some of our economists recommend that the average wages received by a collective farmer from the collective-owned economy of the farm should be on the level of wages of an average industrial worker in the same locality. In connection with this they propose to establish appropriate rates for production quotas.

In what way should the income of the collective farm be distributed in this case? I shall give an example here so as to make a rough calculation. In 1955 the gross cash income of the N. collective farm amounted to 1,000,000 roubles. It was distributed in the following way:

Capital investment — 200,000 roubles, *i.e.*, 20 per cent

Current expenditure — 200,000 roubles, *i.e.*, 20 per cent

Outlays for housing construction — 100,000 roubles, *i.e.*, 10 per cent
cultural facilities, etc.—

Cash income paid to collective farmers — 500,000 roubles, *i.e.*, 50 per cent.

If, say, there are 50 people in a collective farm, each of them receiving 10,000 roubles a year, the industrial worker's average pay in the same area should also amount to 10,000 roubles a year. In 1959 the gross cash income of this collective farm reached 2 million roubles while industrial worker's average pay was 11,000 roubles a year. If so, the picture of distribution of this income in accordance with the recommendations of economists should be as follows:

Current expenditure — 400,000 roubles, *i.e.*, 20 per cent

Cash income paid to collective farmers — 550,000 roubles, *i.e.*, 27.5 per cent.

(*i.e.*, average farmer secured 11,000 roubles a year, just the amount received by an industrial worker in the given area).

Of the remaining sum amounting to 1,050,000 roubles, more than 20 per cent can now be spent on capital investment (*i.e.*, on expanding production of collectively-owned economy) and the rest should be spent on the improvement of living conditions of all collective farmers and, particularly, on providing them with cultural facilities and on building houses with modern conveniences, nurseries, medical centres, maternity homes, different servicing establishments (laundries, repair shops, etc.), cinemas, theatres, sport grounds, roads, pavements, water main system, sewage, local power stations, etc. In other words, for improving cultural and living conditions the collective farm spends now, not 10 per cent as it used to, but still greater share of its gross cash income. As for the total sum, it is more than five times than what it was before. This means that a collective farmer gets not 11,000 roubles a year, *i.e.*, not merely his pay, but also more than that which is obtained through other channels.

CHANGING SIZE OF COLLECTIVE FARMS

The advantages of a large scale socialist farming system over a system of small individual farms are widely known and there is hardly any need to discuss it in detail here.

It is the large scale farm of socialist type which can use fully agricultural machinery and constantly introduce the achievements of science and advanced experience in production process. It is just this type of farm which possesses unlimited potentialities for raising labour productivity.

That is why the size of collective farms kept on growing for the last 30 years. This can be seen from the following table.

CHANGES IN NUMBER AND SIZE OF COLLECTIVE FARMS IN U.S.S.R.

Year	No. of collective farms (thousands)	Average per collective farm			Cash income (thousand roubles)
		Households	Land (acres)	Indivisible fund (thousand roubles)	
1928	33	13	240	—	—
1937	243	73	3800	47	59
1950	124	165	7700	430	490
1953	93	220	10500	770	550
1958	69	276	11300	1800	2000
1959 (July) ..	59	320	13500	2100	2200

The enlargement of collective farms has taken place with the progress in the mechanisation of farming and with the accumulation of experience in running a large scale farm.

Soon after World War II when our industry began to produce more and more tractors and other agricultural implements it became evident that it was impossible to use a great number of machines most efficiently if the cultivated area was limited.

Let me remind you that at that time the collective farms had on an average only 4,000 acres of land. The farmers themselves were well aware of this. The collective farms started undergoing a process of amalgamation. It means that several small, less efficient farms merged into a large scale and highly productive farm with a centralised management. This process started at the close of 40's and continued up to 1958. As a result, our collective farms have now on an average 13,500 acres of land, *i.e.*, 4 times more than that 15-20 years back.

Another aspect of the policy of amalgamation should also be pointed out. We have set ourselves, as you may know, the task of overtaking the U.S.A. in the shortest time possible in the production of livestock products.

We had to introduce new methods in running our animal husbandry and to organize the raising and feeding of livestock in a new way. We had to develop a large scale livestock industry.

The analysis made by U.S.S.R. Research Institute for Agricultural Economics on the basis of statistical data collected in a district of Kursk region proved that the input in terms of human labour per centner of milk (1 centner=220 lbs.) is the lowest if the number of milch cows at the livestock section of a collective farm is not less than 1000-1200. Moreover in this case less capital investment per centner of produce is required.

But we could not achieve this on account of the limited size of collective farms. The fact that we overtook the U.S.A. in 1949 in per capita production of butter and in gross production of milk, when only recently we had lagged far behind it, is a vivid proof that the enlargement of collective farms was a very important factor in creating highly productive animal husbandry in our country.

In other words, high labour productivity, higher labour productivity and still higher labour productivity—is the principal task our people have set before themselves in the sphere of agriculture.

At present the amalgamation process has a limit. This limit lies only in our own know-how and in the experience gained by us in running a large scale farm at present stage. A further amalgamation of collective farms entailing difficulties in management will result in efficiency in work.

However, the need for a further rise in the efficiency of production is strongly felt. Life itself calls for new ways to achieve this aim—like a river finding a new bed—overcoming in its course all the obstacles.

One of the ways consists in the promotion of co-operation between several collective farms in building some projects which for one farm are either uneconomical or beyond its capacity. Thus, we consider it expedient to unite the efforts of several collective farms in solving such problems as the construction of power stations, roads, boarding schools, etc. When this construction is carried out on a large scale the cost per unit is lower and it proves to be more efficient.

GOVERNMENT MEASURES IN AGRICULTURE

The financial aid rendered by the socialist state to collective farms is a very important factor in strengthening them. The state helped the farms from the

very first days of their establishment and this aid was particularly significant in the initial period when it was necessary to support the newly-born social system in the countryside with all possible means. Naturally, as the economic might of our country grew the state aid increased more and more, particularly in recent years. During the last 3 to 4 years the annual capital investment in agriculture was 12 times more than that in the collectivisation period. The following table will illustrate the point.

CAPITAL INVESTMENTS BY STATE AND COLLECTIVE FARMS IN AGRICULTURE

(in Comparable Prices)

Year	Crores of roubles per year	In per cent to the volume of capital investment in the national economy
1918-28	10	6
1929-32	300	18
1933-37	400	14
1938-VII 41	600	13
VII 1941-45	400	11
1946-50	1100	15
1951-55	2600	18
1956-58	4600	20
1958	5000	19
1959-65 (target)	7100	—

Over half of these investments were made by the state.

The state concentrates its particular attention on the development of industry, manufacturing farm machinery. I shall give below some figures to show the growth in the use of main agricultural machines in our country. I would like to mention here that the farm machinery industry is constantly promoting the manufacture of specialised machines. The industry is improving the old models of agricultural machines and is designing new ones suitable and highly effective in different climatic conditions.

The state is greatly interested in the training of agricultural specialists whose number is constantly going up. Whereas in 1941 there were 35,000 specialists with higher and secondary specialised agricultural education directly engaged in agriculture, in 1953 their number was 96,000 and in 1957 it went up to 281,000. At present actually all our collective and state farms are provided with highly qualified specialists. They help to improve the management efficiency of the collective farms and to introduce advanced methods in the production process and also put into effect the findings of agricultural science.

In this connection I would like to refer to the establishments which conduct comprehensive research in the field of agriculture.

At present there are about 800 scientific agricultural establishments in the U.S.S.R., including five agricultural academies in the Union Republics, about 140 research institutes and hundreds of experimental stations.

The existing 99 agricultural colleges, and over 1,500 variety test centres run by state, also conduct scientific work on a large scale. There are in all about 15,000 research workers in the field of agriculture. Well-equipped laboratories and large experimental farms are placed at the disposal of scientists. These actively help the collective and state farms to spread the best crop varieties and animal breeds, to introduce new labour-saving machines, to apply better methods of soil treatment and manuring, etc.

Besides the research done in the sphere of agricultural science, we are also carrying on an intensive work in the sphere of agricultural economics. The U.S.S.R. Research Institute for Agricultural Economics as well as other similar institutes in a number of our republics play a leading role in this respect. The investigations conducted by these institutions help the state to work out its policy for the development of agricultural economy.

In order to speed up the growth of agricultural output and to achieve a higher labour productivity, the state carried out in the last 7 years a number of important measures on a country-wide scale.

We have completely abolished the system of obligatory deliveries and considerably raised the prices for agricultural products purchased by the state from collective farms.

The following table shows the dynamics of the state's purchase prices for farm products:

	(1952=100)		
	1953	1956	1958
Average price for all farm products	154	211	296
Grain	236	634	695
Sugar beet	144	229	219
Cotton	105	114	106
Fiber flax	139	213	239
Oil Seeds:			
Sunflower	528	928	774
Linseed	129	273	330
Potatoes	316	814	789
Grapes	110	167	153
Average prices for field products	132	207	203
Milk	202	334	404
Eggs	126	155	297
Wool	107	246	352
Pigs	453	976	1156
Sheep and goats	474	717	1382
Cattle	338	508	1147
Average prices for livestock products	214	371	546

The collective farms benefited much from this measure. It encouraged them to expand production and provided better possibilities for increasing their capital investment in agriculture.

We also changed the system of planning agricultural production, thereby giving more initiative to collective farms in organizational matters. Then we reorganised our machine-and-tractor stations and sold tractors and other farm implements directly to collective farms, which resulted in a better use of agricultural equipment and in a considerable rise in labour productivity. Besides, we undertook a number of measures of organizational and technical nature aimed at increasing the production of most important foodstuffs, such as grain, meat and milk.

All these measures undertaken by the Government yielded good results.

Now the Government advises collective farmers to develop further specialised production according to local, natural and economic conditions. The farmers are given freedom to decide the direction in which they will develop their specialised production. On the other hand, the Government plans to purchase larger amounts of certain crops in areas where its production cost is the lowest. This, in its turn, stimulates the development of specialised production and, hence, reduces the production cost of farm products which is a very important factor.

The most important problem of today, as I have already said, is to reduce the cost of production by raising productivity of labour.

The Seven-Year Plan envisages a sharp increase in the production of farm machinery and fertilizers which will help to achieve higher labour productivity.

There is not the slightest doubt that our plans will be successfully fulfilled.

I should also mention the fact that during recent years the Government made some improvements in the administrative machinery, making it more flexible and efficient. The Government called upon local authorities to render a more substantial help to collective farms, to have a deeper insight into their problems and to find better ways for their solution.

PRODUCTIVITY OF LABOUR

In establishing collective farm system in our agriculture we proceeded from the premise that it would ensure much greater productivity of labour than that provided by a small individual peasant farm. Rich experience gained from the working of this system fully justified our hopes in this respect.

By 1948 labour productivity in agriculture in the U.S.S.R. increased four-fold as compared to pre-revolutionary period; it increased 1.7 times as compared to 1940 and 1.5 times as compared to 1953.

The average amount of labour required to obtain a unit of output was reduced to a fraction of its former size. The figures given below will indicate the actual amount of man-hours spent in 1956-1957 to obtain one centner (1 centner = 220 lbs.) of agricultural produce.

Items of output	State Farms	Collective Farms
Grain	1.8	7.3
Potatoes	4.2	5.1
Sugar Beet	2.1	3.1
Raw Cotton	29.8	42.8
Milk	9.9	14.7
Increase in weight of livestock	52.0	112.0
Increase in weight of pigs	43.0	103.0

According to the latest estimate, the amount of labour spent to produce a unit of output has been noticeably reduced in collective farms during the last two or three years and in the state farms it is drawing nearer to this level.

It is on account of the extensive use of agricultural machinery and considerable increase in power capacity in general that we are in a position to reduce physical amount of labour required to obtain a unit of output. Here are the figures showing the extent of employment of agricultural machinery in the U.S.S.R.

FLEET OF TRACTORS, GRAIN-HARVESTER COMBINES AND TRUCKS IN AGRICULTURE OF THE U.S.S.R.

(At the end of the Year) (thousands)

Items	1928	1932	1940	1950	1958
Tractors					
(*a*) physical units	27	148	531	595	1001
(*b*) in terms of 15 h.p. units	18	148	684	933	1750
Grain-harvester combines	0.002	14	182	211	502
Trucks	0.7	14	228	283	700

Power capacity available at present for our agriculture increased more than 5.5 times. Moreover, its composition changed radically. Now, as much as 96 per cent of the whole power facilities accounts for motive power, draught animals supplying only four per cent. Today each worker engaged in agriculture is 9.5 times better off in respect of power facilities than what the individual peasant got before the Revolution.

POWER CAPACITY OF AGRICULTURE IN U.S.S.R.

(Million H.P.)

	1916	1940	1953	1958
Motive power	0.2	36.9	80.5	131.5
Power supplied by draught animals	23.7	10.6	7.3	5.5
Total Power capacity (in H.P.)	23.9	47.5	87.8	137.0
Power capacity available:				
(*a*) per worker	0.5	1.5	2.6	4.4
(*b*) per 100 acres of sown lands	8.0	13.0	21.0	27.0

INCREASED OUTPUT OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE

It is on account of the development of large-scale socialist farming, which permits the utilization of agricultural machinery and the fruits of agricultural science in the most effective way, that the Soviet agriculture has considerably increased the output of major agricultural products. This increase took place particularly in recent years when, as was stated earlier, the Communist Party and the Government of the U.S.S.R. undertook a number of radical measures to radically improve the situation in agriculture. Data on the dynamics of agricultural production in the U.S.S.R. are provided in the following two tables.[1]

INDICES OF GROSS AGRICULTURAL OUTPUT

(in Comparable Prices)

(1913)=100

Year	All Products	Field Products	Animal Products
1913	100	100	100
1921	60	55	67
1925	112	107	121
1930	117	126	100
1935	119	138	86
1940	141	155	114
1945	86	93	72
1950	140	151	118
1955	170	175	160
1958	218	227	205

HARVEST, YIELD AND PROCUREMENT OF GRAIN IN U.S.S.R.

Yearly averages	Harvest (mln tons)	Yield (tons per acre)	Purchases of grain by state (mln tons)
1909-1913	72.5	0.28	—
1928-1932	73.6	0.31	18.2
1933-1937	72.9	0.28	27.5
1938-1940	77.9	0.31	32.1
1949-1953	80.9	0.31	32.8
1954-1958	113·2	0.37	43·6
1959	124.8	—	46.6
1959-1960 (Target) ..	164-180	—	—

In 1959 we obtained as much as 4.7 million tons of raw cotton, 41.4 million tons of sugar-beet, 8.6 million tons of meat, 62 million tons of milk, 350 thousand tons of wool and 24.8 billion eggs.

By 1958 we achieved considerable progress in the per capita production of agricultural products. In the seven-year period of the current plan the gross volume of agricultural production is to increase 1.7 times as compared with that in 1958. Per capita production of foodstuffs will increase 1.4—2.0 times or even more.[2]

1. Data on output of major agricultural products in U.S.S.R. are published on page 246 of *The Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. XV, No. 1, January-March, 1960, Conference Number.

2. Data on per capita production of some agricultural products in U.S.S.R. are published on page 249 of *The Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. XV, No. 1., January-March, 1960.

CHANGING LIVING AND CULTURAL STANDARDS OF PEASANTRY

It goes without saying that radical changes have taken place in the living standards of peasantry since collective farm system was established in the U.S.S.R.

I would mention in the first place the gradual growth of cash income in our collective farms. The table below gives a clear idea in respect of this point.

CASH INCOME OF COLLECTIVE FARMS

(crores of roubles)

1940	1950	1953	1955	1956	1957	1958
2070	3420	4960	7560	9460	9520	13180

One may see that a particularly noticeable increase in the cash income of collective farms has been recorded for the last few years. Since 1953 their cash income has risen almost three-fold. No doubt, this effect should to a great extent be considered as a result of the economic measures undertaken in agriculture during last seven years by the Government.

With every passing year collective farms increase their bank deposits. This is illustrated by the following table.

CURRENT ACCOUNT OF COLLECTIVE FARMS WITH STATE BANK OF U.S.S.R.

(Carry-over at the end of the year)
(crores of roubles)

1940	1950	1953	1956	1957	1958
206	385	503	1190	1022	1170

Simultaneously, personal savings of collective farmers have been growing. A particularly rapid progress in respect of accumulation of personal savings has been recorded during recent years when productivity of labour in collective farms has considerably increased, the result being a constant rise in wages paid to collective farmers. The growth of savings of rural population can be judged from the following figures.

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS WITH RURAL POPULATION

	1927/28	1940	1956	1957	1958
Number of deposits (in units)	1.0	5.8	10.0	11.4	12.6
Total deposits (crores of roubles).. ..	3	149	1159	1646	1838
Average deposit per unit (roubles) ..	31	259	1173	1443	1454

It is evident from these figures that the savings of rural families in savings banks increased more than 12 times during last two decades, while the average deposit rose almost six-fold.

The data relating to the consumption of major foodstuffs is of great importance for the comprehensive appraisal of the living standards and well-being of collective farmers.

An idea of the living standards of collective farmers may be got more clearly if one studies the data relating to the consumption of major foodstuffs.

AVERAGE CONSUMPTION OF FOODSTUFFS PER HEAD OF COLLECTIVE FARMER'S FAMILY IN U.S.S.R.

(in percentage to 1940)

	1940	1953	1956	1957	1958
Grain products (in terms of flour)	100	98	99.8	98	98
Potatoes	100	157	140	139	125
Vegetables and melons	100	116	124	120	127
Meat & fat	100	110	163	180	187
Fish & Fish products (in terms of fish)	100	155	244	264	296
Milk and dairy products (in terms of milk)	100	110	148	154	164
Eggs	100	140	210	252	262
Sugar	100	288	438	499	575

It is clear from these figures that the consumption of foodstuffs by collective farms has increased considerably. Their diet also improved. The consumption of grain products has slightly gone down while consumption of products like sugar, eggs, milk, fish and meat has increased to a great extent.

The constant growth of cash income of collective farmers is accompanied by greater purchases of consumers' goods. This is borne out by the following table.

AVERAGE CASH EXPENDITURE ON CONSUMERS' GOODS PER HEAD OF COLLECTIVE FARMER'S FAMILY IN U.S.S.R.

(in percentage to 1940)

	1940	1953	1956	1957	1958
Clothes	100	103	221	256	258
Hosiery goods	100	132	264	317	350
Household utensils	100	157	295	326	346
Articles for cultural needs (books, papers, radio and T. V. sets, musical instruments, watches, bicycle, motorcycles, etc.)	100	304	892	1153	1050

Some people are apt to estimate the living standards of our peasantry only in terms of income obtained by collective farms. However, this indicator, though rather important, is not adequate in our socialist economy. The state provides to our peasantry various servicing facilities free of charge. I would mention in this context free medical services and free training in elementary and secondary as well as in special technical and high schools. Besides, the state covers rural areas with an extensive network of various cultural establishments, such as libraries, clubs, palaces of culture, cinema units, etc. It provides favourable credit for housing construction in rural areas. Rural population is benefited by low prices, partially subsidised by state, for some consumers' goods—text-books, medicines and others.

I shall give here figures which illustrate, to some extent, the increase in the amount of cultural facilities available in rural areas:

CULTURAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN RURAL AREAS

	1913	1928	1940	1953	1958
Libraries (thousands)	11.3	20.9	76.9	114.5	108.6
Volumes of books kept in libraries (crores)	0.44	2.54	6.42	21.11	38.39
Clubs (thousands)	0.1	30.0	108.0	112.6	115.6
Cinema units (thousands)	0.14	2.4	19.5	40.5	61.6

So far as medical establishments are concerned, I do not have separate statistical data for rural and urban areas. They are therefore given below in respect of both combined together.

NUMBER OF PHYSICIANS AND MEDICAL BEDS PER 10,000 POPULATION

	1913	1928	1958
Physicians.. ..	1	4	17
Medical Beds ..	13	16	73

The U.S.S.R. has also a wide network of sanatoriums. Their number has been tremendously raised during the years of Soviet power. Following figures will give an idea of their growth.

SANATORIUMS IN U.S.S.R.

	1913	1939	1958
Sanatoriums	60	1838	2060
Their accommodation capacity (thousand units)	3	240	305

At present about 3.5 million people receive treatment and take rest in sanatoriums every year. New developments made in the construction of sanatoriums are noteworthy. Many collective farms are in a position to allocate required sums for setting up their own sanatoriums and rest homes as their cash incomes from agriculture have increased considerably. At present there are many sanatoriums and rest homes which belong to collective farms.

The construction of houses in rural areas has in recent years been undertaken on a much greater speed. For instance, in 1959 about 850,000 houses have been built in villages. Housing construction in rural areas is being carried out according to special model schemes, providing not only houses with modern facilities, but also improvement in roads, water supply system, etc.

Nowadays our collective farms face new problems. It is natural because they are marching forward, gathering strength and are in no way stagnant. However, these problems will constitute a new subject which is beyond the scope of this paper.