

Contents/Sommaire

• **Paradigms**

L'édification d'une carrière ecclésiastique pendant la Première Guerre mondiale:
L'histoire d'un prélat orthodoxe de Transylvanie 3
Marius Eppel

Romania As Reflected in the Acts of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Empire: From the Outbreak of World War I Until the Conclusion of the Sazonov-Diamandy Agreement 18
Ion Gumenâi

Gheorghe Băgulescu (1890–1963): From the War Diary to the Historical Novel or the Offensive of Literature on the Battlefield of History 30
Rodica Frențiu

• **Transilvanica**

Die Überschwemmungen des Jahres 1771 in Siebenbürgen: Die Rolle des Zentrums und der Peripherie bei der Bewältigung der Katastrophe 43
Dorin-Ioan Rus

Patterns in Family Relationships in 19th Century Transylvania: Data from the Historical Population Database of Transylvania 63
Daniela Mârza

The Initiatives of ASTRA Meant to Improve the Lives of the Romanian Peasants in Transylvania (1900–1914) 71
Alexandru Nicolaescu

Transylvanian Echoes of a European Phenomenon: The Vatican and the National-Christian Movements in the Mid-1920s 84
Maria Ghitta

• **Tangencies**

New Interpretations of the Concepts Regarding Familiars and Possession in Angevin Hungary during the Early 14th Century 96
Mihai Safta

ROMANIAN ACADEMY

Chairman:
Academician **Ionel-Valentin Vlad**

CENTER FOR
TRANSYLVANIAN STUDIES
Director:
Academician **Ioan-Aurel Pop**

On the cover:
Postcard sent on 6 November 1915 from Mukačevo (Ukraine) to Cluj, by Lieutenant Béla Móricz, a patient in the mobile army hospital at Uzhgorod (Ukraine).
The postcard shows Austro-Hungarian, German, and Russian soldiers engaged in hand-to-hand combat. The caption says: "Resounding victory in Galicia: Allied troops storming the enemy positions."
Private collection of Balázs Soó-Zöld (Cluj-Napoca)

Gender, Race and Labor in America: How One Labor Union Confronted Racial and Gender Conflict during the Second World War 106
Timothy Borden

The Peasant Family in the Urals in the 1920s–1960s: Reconstruction Based on the Data of Budget Studies 119
Lyudmila Mazur
Oleg Gorbachev

• **Europe**

The European Union Faced with a New Systemic Challenge 136
Petru Filip

• **Book Reviews**

ION CĂRJA, ed., *Imperi e nazioni nell'Europa centro-orientale alla vigilia della Prima Guerra Mondiale* (reviewed by Robert-Marius Mihalache) 149

IOAN BOLOVAN, RUDOLF GRÄF, HARALD HEPPNER, and OANA MIHAELA TĂMAȘ, eds., *World War I—The Other Face of the War* (reviewed by Anamaria Pop) 154

ALBERTO BASCIANI, *L'illusione della modernità: Il Sud-est dell'Europa tra le due guerre mondiali* (reviewed by Ion Cârja) 155

IOAN BOLOVAN, *Primul Război Mondial și realitățile demografice din Transilvania: Familie, moralitate și raporturi de gen* (reviewed by Iuliu-Marius Morariu) 158

• **Contributors** 160

Publication indexed and abstracted in the Thomson Reuters Social Sciences Citation Index® and in Arts & Humanities Citation Index®, and included in EBSCO's and ELSEVIER's products.

ISSN 1221-1249

Printed in Romania by COLOR PRINT
66, 22 Decembrie 1989 St.,
Zalău 450031, Romania
Tel. (0040)260-660598



www.colorprint.ro

Transylvanian Review continues the tradition of **Revue de Transylvanie**, founded by Silviu Dragomir, which was published in Cluj and then in Sibiu between 1934 and 1944.

Transylvanian Review is published quarterly by the **Center for Transylvanian Studies** and the **Romanian Academy**.

EDITORIAL BOARD

CESARE ALZATI, Ph.D.

Facoltà di Scienze della Formazione, Istituto di Storia Moderna e Contemporanea, Università Cattolica, Milan, Italy

HORST FASSEL, Ph.D.

Institut für donauschwäbische Geschichte und Landeskunde, Tübingen, Germany

KONRAD GÜNDISCH, Ph.D.

Bundesinstitut für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa, Oldenburg, Germany

HARALD HEPPNER, Ph.D.

Institut für Geschichte, Graz, Austria

PAUL E. MICHELSON, Ph.D.

Huntington University, Indiana, USA

MOMČILO PAVLOVIĆ, Ph. D.

Director of the Institute of Contemporary History, Belgrade, Serbia

ALEXANDRU ZUB, Ph.D.

Academician, honorary director of A. D. Xenopol Institute of History, Iași, Romania

EDITORIAL STAFF

Ioan-Aurel Pop

Daniela Mârza

Ioan Bolovan

Robert-M. Mihalache

Raveca Divricean

Alexandru Simon

Maria Chitta

Florian D. Soporan

Rudolf Gräf

George State

Virgil Leon

Translated by

Bogdan Aldea—English

Liana Lăpădatu—French

Desktop Publishing

Edith Fogarasi

Cosmina Varga

Correspondence, manuscripts and books should be sent to: **Transylvanian Review, Centrul de Studii Transilvane** (Center for Transylvanian Studies) 12–14 Mihail Kogălniceanu St., Cluj-Napoca 400084, Romania.

All material copyright © 2017 by the Center for Transylvanian Studies and the Romanian Academy. Reproduction or use without written permission is prohibited.

cst@academia-cj.ro

www.centruldestudiiitransilvane.ro

The Peasant Family in the Urals in the 1920s–1960s Reconstruction Based on the Data of Budget Studies

LYUDMILA MAZUR
OLEG GORBACHEV

The “Soviet” model of demographic transition was typical of societies that entered the stage of modernization comparatively late and that chose forced economic and social restructuring in the course of their historical development.

Lyudmila Mazur

Professor at the Department of History, Ural Federal University, Ekaterinburg, Russian Federation.

Oleg Gorbachev

Professor at the Department of History, Ural Federal University, Ekaterinburg, Russian Federation.

THE PEASANT family was at the center of the Russian family structure in the early twentieth century and determined its demographic profile. In the ensuing years, under the impact of industrialization and urbanization, the peasant family gradually started to give way to other family types, but until the 1950s it had managed to preserve its role by shaping the standards of demographic behavior and family relationships among the vast majority of the population.

The traditional peasant family is an archetype, a heritage of the rural society, which relied on the concept of the family as a work unit. The household was at the core of the peasant family and determined its main characteristics: the gender and age division of labor and the involvement of all family members into household activities. The high fertility of peasant families was offset by high rates of infant and child mortality. Familial relationships

This research is supported by the grant of the Russian Science Foundation (project no. 16-18-10106, *The Early Soviet Society as a Social Project: Concepts, Mechanisms of Realization, and Results*).

were based on patriarchal principles underpinned by traditional values.¹ Another peculiarity of traditional families was their size and complex structure (undivided and/or multigenerational), although these features gradually started to transform in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. According to B. N. Mironov, the transition to the small (nuclear) family type started within the nobility and then the intelligentsia; by the late nineteenth century, this type had started to prevail in Russian cities and towns.²

In peasant communities, the traditional family was preserved longer than in other social groups but it still could not remain unaffected by the changes. In general, the demographic development of the peasant family in the twentieth century was influenced by a complex of factors: firstly, objective trends of the demographic transition which directed the family evolution towards the democratic nuclear model; secondly, the forced industrialization and urbanization of Soviet society; and, finally, several demographic disasters which undermined the demographic potential of the rural areas.

An additional factor which destroyed the remainder of the rural demographic potential was an enormous outflow of migrants from rural areas. The working population, especially young people, was fleeing from rural areas on a massive scale, which changed the balance between age and sex groups in the villages. The mortality rates exceeded fertility rates.

The major objective of this study is to demonstrate how the abovementioned factors affected the structure and functions of the peasant family and to describe the characteristics of the ‘Soviet model’ of the demographic transition. Geographically, our research covers the Middle Urals—the zone in the middle of the Ural ridge. As an administrative unit, this area belonged to the Ural region (1923–1933) and after 1934, to Sverdlovsk region. The Middle Urals is particularly interesting due to the fact that it allows us to trace back the demographic trends, which encompassed the whole of twentieth-century Russia. Sverdlovsk region had a developed mining, metallurgical and other industries, which resulted in a high level of urbanization, comparable to metropolitan areas. This intensified such processes as the steady decline in the peasant population, as well as familial and demographic transformations.

Budget Studies of Peasant Households in the 1920s and 1960s

BUDGET STATISTICS proved to be a valuable source due to the extreme scarcity of data on the peasant family.³ Historical family studies tend to rely on census results, that is, on generalized data.⁴ The primary census forms, which were particularly valuable for family studies, did not survive. For-

tunately, materials related to budget studies were preserved in regional archival funds and, most importantly, they contain comprehensive information about the family as a household unit.

In the collections of the State Archive of Sverdlovsk Region we found primary Forms of Budget Description of the Peasant Household, 1928/1929.⁵ In 1928, in the Urals there were 1,240,300 individual peasant households. 400 households (0.32%) were surveyed and 325 budget descriptions (81.24% of the sample size) are extant.

Overall, the Soviet budget studies covered approximately twenty thousand households.⁶ The program of the 1928–1929 budget studies comprised several sections: the population and their working hours; land and land use; cattle farming; poultry farming; fishery; income and expenditures; family diet; and so on. In the Form of Budget Description of the Peasant Household, a special place was given to the characteristics of peasant families, which included information about family members, their age, sex, kinship relations, nationality, literacy, occupations, temporary and permanent disabilities (the number of sick days). The forms also recorded all changes which happened in the family throughout the year (births, deaths, marriages). If we analyze the data about households in 1913 (the number of family members; the area of arable land; the number of horses and cows), we can identify the main trends in the development of peasant households from the early twentieth century to the late 1920s.

The form structure was later used to design databases, which comprised 44 fields, including the characteristics of the household's head (age, sex, nationality, literacy, affiliation with public organizations); data on the family size and structure; the age of family members; the number of minor children; the composition of the family in 1913; the year when the household was formed; its land and livestock (in 1913 and 1918); its income and expenditures. This database has allowed us to piece together the structure of the peasant family on the eve of collectivization.

Starting from 1932, in the USSR there was a massive reorganization of the system of budget studies: a permanent budgetary network was established, which covered 0.01% of all the families in the country. In 1963, 62,000 families were constantly monitored.⁷ In Sverdlovsk region in the 1960s, 2,000 families were surveyed, including 100 families of kolkhoz farmers, 1,000, of production workers, and 660 of white collar workers.

The budget studies of kolkhozniks in the period between the 1930s and 1960s were similar to those of the 1920s and included similar sections: family data; working hours; earned income (in a kolkhoz), enterprise or institution; the turnover of foodstuffs in the household; expenditures on the acquisition of industrial goods, on transport, housing, household services, on the payment of taxes and debts; food consumption patterns; the size and the structure of households.

All the information was recorded in statistical data forms: these were five in the 1930s, four of which were considered as primary and were filled on the basis of field inquiry and self-reporting. In the 1950s, the number of forms was reduced to three and in the 1960s, to two: Statistical Form 1 Family Budget and Statistical Form 2 Budget Statistician's Control Notebook, filled annually for each family. The second form was filled each month throughout the year to verify the completeness and accurateness of the data provided by the family during the interview.

Overall, in the State Archive of Sverdlovsk Region there are 221 control notebooks providing statistics for 1963 (55.25% of the original sample). The design of the database took into account the program of the 1929 budget survey to provide comparability of the data. Thus, the budget information from the two databases allowed us to study the dynamics of the peasant family in the Middle Urals.

Historiographical Aspects of Studying the Russian Peasant Family in the Period between the 1920s and the 1960s

THE RESEARCH on the peasant family in Russia follows a long-standing historiographical tradition, dating back to the surveys of *zemstvo* statisticians of the late nineteenth century, who found correlations between demographic trends in rural areas and the economic activities of peasant households.⁸ Therefore, the pre-Soviet stage in the history of the peasant family was thoroughly studied, not only from the demographic but also from the social and cultural point of view.⁹ In the 1920s, the peasant family aroused considerable scholarly interest¹⁰: Alexander Chayanov used the materials of budget studies to develop his domestic labor theory of a peasant household.¹¹

In the 1970s and 1980s, there was another revival of interest in historical demography. The greatest contribution was made by V. P. Danilov and his students, O. M. Verbitskaya and N. A. Aralovets. They continued their historical-demographic studies in the 2000s and conducted a comprehensive analysis of family relationships in Soviet rural and urban areas between the 1920s and 1950s.¹²

Attention to primary (nominative) sources, and in particular to materials of budget statistics, was a characteristic feature of the late Soviet historiography. Among the most significant works were those of Yu. P. Bokarev, who analyzed budget statistics of the 1920s as a historical source and showed the potential of this data for research on the peasant family structure in the late 1920s.¹³ The Vologda school of agricultural history used budget statistics of the 1930s–1960s to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the economic problems and demograph-

ic behavior of kolkhoz peasants in the Russian North.¹⁴ L. N. Mazur studied the budgets of Ural kolkhozniks of the 1960s to describe the structure and functions of the peasant family and the factors of its transformations in the final stage of the demographic transition.¹⁵

In general, the Russian historiography of the peasant family is characterized by the following: firstly, it relies on aggregated statistical sources; secondly, it focuses on the economic aspects of peasant life and on the material well-being of peasants. Primary nominative sources are used infrequently, which negatively affects the depth of historical reconstructions.

The Peasant Family in the Urals on the Eve of Collectivization (Based on the Results of Budget Studies of 1928–1929)

THE GENERAL statistical picture of the peasant family in the late 1920s and its structural and quantitative characteristics correspond to the common notions of a traditional peasant household. Out of the 325 families participating in the survey, 201 households (62.15%) had been formed before 1913, while the rest emerged in the 1920s. When asked about the current state of their households and the trends of its development, 32.0% of the families pointed out that their household had grown in comparison with the pre-revolutionary period; 41.54% said that nothing had changed, and 25.23% of respondents observed that their households were in decline due to the shortage of workers, high taxes, and the lack of plough cattle.

Our analysis of peasant families shows that those consisting of five to eight members prevailed. Moreover, by 1929 their percentage had risen from 50.00% to 65.23% (Table 1). Small families (from one to four family members) accounted for a little less than one-third and their number indicated a downward trend (from 32.67% to 28.00%). The percentage of large households (over eight members) decreased from 16.83% in 1913 to 6.46% in 1929. These fluctuations occurred due to natural causes—the life cycles in the evolution of families. Furthermore, it is important to take into consideration the impact of economic factors: on the one hand, the postwar crisis and the NEP policy stimulated family households to merge and consolidate; on the other hand, the Soviet taxation policy in 1928–1929 and the threat of *dekulakization* contributed to the splitting of households. In general, the data on the size of peasant families demonstrate that they preserved their traditional practices of functioning based on joint household ownership. On average, peasant families tended to grow smaller in size: in 1913 they comprised 6.10 people, while in 1929 only 5.52.

TABLE 1. DISTRIBUTION OF PEASANT FAMILIES
IN THE URALS ACCORDING TO THEIR SIZE IN 1913–1963

Number of household members	1913		1929		1963	
	Number of households	%	Number of households	%	Number of households	%
1	1	0.49	1	0.31	20	9.05
2	9	4.45	14	4.31	45	20.36
3	27	13.37	18	5.54	49	22.17
4	30	14.85	59	18.15	42	19.00
5	32	15.84	81	24.92	30	13.57
6	29	14.36	68	20.92	35	15.84
7	22	10.89	47	14.46		
8	18	8.91	16	4.92		
9	9	4.45	13	4.00		
10	10	4.95	5	1.54		
11	1	0.49	1	0.31		
12	5	2.47	1	0.31		
13	1	0.49	0	0.00		
14	4	1.98	1	0.31		
15	1	0.49	0	0.00		
16	1	0.49	0	0.00		
22	1	0.49	0	0.00		
No data	1	0.49	0	0.00		
TOTAL	202	100.00	325	100.00	221	100

The table is based on the calculations made by using the data of peasant budget studies in 1928–1929 and 1963.

However, if we compare these data with the materials of the All-Soviet Census of 1926, we see the difference: in the budget studies the average indicators are higher (Table 2).

TABLE 2. PEASANT HOUSEHOLDS IN THE URALS IN 1916–1926

Indicator	1916	1926
Number of households (thousands)	1,096	1,224
On average per household:		
People	5.2	4.7
Work horses	1.65	1.21
Cows	1.73	1.46
Arable land, <i>desyatinas</i>	4.34	4.00

SOURCE: S. A. Nefedov, *Agrarian and Demographic Outcomes of Stalin's Collectivization* (Tambov: Publishing House of Tambov State University n.a. G. R. Derzhavin, 2013), 81. The statistical data were recalculated for the Urals only, excluding the other regions.

The average family size, according to the 1926 census, is confirmed by the data of the All-Russia Party Census of 1922–1924. The families of communist peasants were small and predominantly consisted of two to four people, 48.57%; of five to eight people, 37.14%; and of over eight people, 7.62 %. Singles constituted a noticeably large share, 6.67 %. On average, the families of communist peasants consisted of 4.5 people.¹⁶

Different sources provide us with different data on the average size of peasant families due to the peculiarities of the sample chosen for budget studies. According to Yu. P. Bokarev, statistics agencies mostly focused on those family households that were systematically engaged in agricultural activities and used them as a source of income. Therefore, the budget studies tended to underestimate the share of fringe groups.¹⁷

In 1929, 96.82% of households were headed by men and only 3.08%, by women, predominantly widows with children. For peasant households the role of men was crucial. The head of the family and adult male members were mostly occupied with crop farming while women were responsible for such field work as harrowing, manuring and haymaking. The main female occupations were also poultry farming, gardening and cattle handling. It is interesting that the census of 1922 and of 1926 classified peasant women who performed household duties as dependents.

This was one of the main reasons why, after the loss of the breadwinner, widows sought to remarry. The budget studies describe several families in which the widow tried to solve the problem of labor shortage by entering into an unequal marriage: in one case, a 48-year-old woman married a 27-year-old man, who thus accepted a caregiving role in the family¹⁸; in another case, in a Tatar family, a 29-year-old man married a 41-year-old widow with four children.¹⁹ Widowers also sought to remarry, especially if they had to take care of small children.²⁰

Overall, the budget studies show that only 6.47% of families were single-parent, the rest were two-parent. It should be highlighted, however, that in that period Ural villages were still struggling to cope with the consequences of the demographic disaster of 1914–1923. In general, the share of single-parent families was much higher and reached 19.8% among Party members, in cities and towns—up to 30.5%.²¹

The grouping of peasant households according to the age of their heads corresponds to the normal distribution and reflects the natural alternation of generations (Table 3). In the later period the shifts were more noticeable, though. The budget studies of 1963 brought to light the ageing of the population, the declining number of young families, and the growing percentage of families aged 46 and above. The age-related imbalance, which resulted in the depopulation of Ural villages, was caused not only by World War Two but also by rural migration, which peaked in the 1950–1960s.

In 1929, over a half of the families in the sample (56.92%) were simple nuclear families, predominantly married couples with children. Three-generation families also made up a large proportion: they corresponded to the subtypes ‘extended upwards’ (21.85%) and ‘extended downwards’ (14.77%). These were the family categories which determined the general family structure of rural areas in the Urals.

TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION OF PEASANT HOUSEHOLDS IN THE URALS IN 1929–1963
ACCORDING TO THE AGE OF THE HOUSEHOLD’S HEAD

Household head’s age, years	1929		1963	
	Households	%	Households	%
under 25	17	5.23	6	2.71
26–30	51	15.69	18	8.14
31–35	48	14.77	25	11.31
36–40	61	18.77	38	17.19
41–45	36	11.08	26	11.76
46–50	35	10.77	38	17.19
51–55	30	9.23	29	13.12
56–60	27	8.31	25	11.31
61 and above	20	6.15	16	7.24
TOTAL	325	100.00	221	100.0

The table is based on the calculations made by using the data of peasant budget studies in 1928–1929 and 1963.

There were also different kinds of single-parent families (6.47%), half of which belonged to the simple nuclear type (Table 4). The shrinking diversity of demographic types and the increasing share of single-parent families constituted trends in family development.

TABLE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF PEASANT FAMILIES IN THE URALS IN 1929–1963
ACCORDING TO THEIR DEMOGRAPHIC TYPES

Laslett’s classification	Demographic family type	1929		1963	
		Number of households	%	Number of households	%
3a	Childless married couple (simple family)	11	3.38	23	10.41
3b	Nuclear family (married couple with children)	164	50.46	82	37.10
4a	Married couple with parents and children (extended upwards)	71	21.85	27	12.22
4b	Married couple with children and grandchildren (extended downwards)	48	14.77	0	0.00

Laslett's classification	Demographic family type	1929		1963	
		Number of households	%	Number of households	%
4c+4d	Childless married couple with parents and relatives (extended laterally)	8	2.46	5	2.26
5e	Laterally extended families (undivided)	1	0.31	0	0.00
3c+3d	Caregiver (father or mother) with children (simple family)	10	3.08	47	21.27
4a	Caregiver with parents and children (extended upwards)	1	0.31	17	7.69
4d	Caregiver with parents and relatives (extended upwards and laterally)	1	0.31	0	0.00
4d	Caregiver with relatives (extended laterally)	1	0.31	0	0.00
5c	Caregiver with children and grandchildren (extended downwards)	8	2.46	0	0.00
1a+1b	Singles	1	0.31	20	9.05
TOTAL		325	100.00	221	100.00

The table is based on the calculations made by using the data of peasant budget studies in 1928/1929 and 1963.

TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF PEASANT FAMILIES IN THE URALS IN 1929–1963
ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF MINOR CHILDREN

Minor children (under 18)	1929		1963	
	Households	%	Households	%
0	25	7.69	79	35.74
1	48	14.77	55	24.89
2	85	26.15	40	18.10
3	82	25.23	31	14.03
4	61	18.77	8	3.62
5	17	5.23	8	3.62
6	4	1.23		
7	3	0.92		
TOTAL	325	100.00	221	100.00

The table is based on the calculations made by using the data of peasant budget studies in 1928–1929 and 1963.

The peasant family is commonly expected to have high fertility rates. As Table 5 illustrates, over 70% of households had between two and four minor children while 7.4% had five and more. Families with no children or just one child accounted

for 22.46% of cases. Sometimes families had no children due to infertility but in 60% of cases they did have children but the children grew up and were statistically registered as adult family members. Thus, the indicator ‘the number of minor children’ does not fully reflect the fertility of peasant families but shows certain characteristics of their demographic behavior. As one peasant woman recollected, “on average families had four-five children, rarely three. Women used to give birth to many children but many of them died because nobody treated them: if they managed to survive, they lived. My mother had nine of us, but only three survived.”²²

Overall, in the late 1920s, despite all the social transformations, the peasant family preserved its traditional characteristics and was less affected by modernization processes than the urban family. The vast majority of peasant families (96.92%) were headed by men and only 3.07% by widows aged 35–60, usually with one child.

Peasant families followed the patriarchal pattern of relationships, which is supported by the evidence provided by oral history. For example, A. A. Markov (born in 1925) remembered the following: “As a child I lived in a large family. My grandfather was a severe man, sometimes he even bullied my father, let alone my grandmother and mother. We were afraid of him. He did all the decision-making, and his word was law. We used to hide when he was irritated. My father expressed his opinions and was unhappy with the grandfather. However, he couldn’t change this patriarchal way of life and built a place of his own on the edge of the village and this is where we lived with my mother, aunt and five children.”²³

The budgets record such family traditions as the payment of the bride price (*kalym*), which varied from twenty to seventy roubles.²⁴ These data are confirmed by peasants’ memories: “They negotiated the ‘request’ or the price of the bride,” tells A. S. Busygin. “Back in the day my mother was estimated at sixty roubles, which was a high price then. For comparison a cow cost thirty roubles. Anyway, they paid thirty roubles in cash and thirty roubles in gold.”²⁵

Although the state launched a full-scale anticlerical campaign, pushed the Church out of politics and declared that civil marriage took precedence over church marriage,²⁶ throughout the 1920s the authority of the Church remained high among the peasants.²⁷ In almost all families, including those of Party and Komsomol members, people followed religious rituals (this fact is confirmed by extensive factual evidence). There were cases when communists who participated in religious wedding ceremonies were expelled from the Party.²⁸ Therefore, religion and religious family rituals characterized peasant lifestyle until the late 1920s. In the 1930s, however, people who adhered to religious rituals could be persecuted since this supposedly showed their “disloyalty.” An additional factor contributing to secularization of everyday peasant life was the mass closure of churches (1929–1930).

In the 1920s, divorce became a new fact of village life. It was allowed by the decrees of the Soviet authorities, but it took some time before peasants grew accustomed to it and this new development contributed to the increasing instability of the family.²⁹ In one of the budget study forms it was written that a 40-year-old peasant from the village of Malye Luzhki in Perm district, Ural region, had left his wife and five minor children.³⁰ The expenditure section of the budgets often mentioned alimony payments.³¹ In the 1920s, in the rural areas of the USSR per every thousand marriages there were 100–150 divorces—almost half as many as in the urban areas.³² Thus, divorce started to be perceived as nothing out of the ordinary in familial relationships. 1.8% of budget forms recorded ‘family conflicts’ as the reason for the decline of the household. Despite the subordinate status of women, divorce was normally initiated by men.

Peasant Families in the Middle Urals in the 1930s–1950s

IN THE 1930s, collectivization, dekulakization and the creation of collective farms brought about considerable changes to the family structure of the Russian peasantry and its functions. The family transformations in this period were shaped by the three key factors: dekulakization and the breakup of large peasant households; the 1932 famine; and the purges. These negatively affected the peasantry,³³ inevitably influencing the average family composition and its structure. According to the 1939 census, the number of single people in the structure of the rural population of Sverdlovsk region accounted for 2.4%; the share of small families comprising two to four members, 64.3%. On the contrary, the share of large families decreased (for example, families consisting of five to seven people accounted for 32%; those of eight and more people were 3.7%). The average family composition was reduced to 4.03 people.³⁴

Despite collectivization, peasant/kolkhoz life still economically relied on private households, which changed their status to private garden plots and until the 1960s determined the families’ levels of income and consumption. Since the peasant family preserved its economic foundation, it also preserved its archaic characteristics such as the patriarchal nature of familial relationships, the traditions of age and gender labor division, and women’s subordination. Thus, in the family life of the peasantry social transformations preceded the demographic transformations. This gap shaped the peasant family’s demographic transition: even though it preserved its patriarchal characteristics throughout the whole given period, its demographic characteristics were radically transformed.

The next stage in the peasant family’s evolution was linked to World War Two, its demographic consequences and the postwar agrarian policy of the So-

viet government, which was openly anti-peasant. To reconstruct the country the government needed funds, which it drew out of kolkhoz production and through the heavy taxation of the rural population. The policy caused the famine of 1946 and 1947, which affected the most fertile areas of Ukraine and the Central Black Earth regions of Russia. According to M. Ellman, in 1946 and 1947 in the USSR, between 1 and 1.5 million people perished from starvation.³⁵ The pauperization of the peasantry, the severe conditions of life and work were conducive to migration: men of working age were the first to start leaving the country, and the women followed suit starting with the mid-1950s.

In this period the rural population plummeted (in the Urals in the period between 1941 and 1965 the population decreased by 41%).³⁶ There were also changes in its age and gender make-up and, as a result, in family structure. The rise in the number of single-parent families and the decline of birth rates were the outcomes of direct losses in the male population in the war years and the migration outflow in the postwar period. If we compare the average family size, we see the following trend: in 1939 it was 4.04 people while in 1965 it was only 3.6. The dynamics of the average family size in rural areas reflects the general transition from large extended peasant families to small nuclear ones.

According to the 1963 budget study, in the early 1960s, the peasant family structure was dominated by small families (less than three people) (51.6%). The share of singles (9.05%), mostly consisting of older women, was also significant. Families consisting of four members or more accounted for less than a half (48.4%), with a large share of families of six people or more, 15.6% (see Table 1). These statistics point to the fact that peasant communities still followed the traditional norms of reproductive behavior and were oriented towards creating large families, which was typical of the rural way of life and was considerably different from urban communities. For instance, in 1959 in the USSR families of workers that consisted of six people or more accounted for 6.9%, while in peasant communities such families accounted for 15.3%.³⁷

The distribution of peasant families according to their demographic type shows that in the Middle Urals nuclear families prevailed: ‘married couples with children’ made up 37.10% and a half of them had three or more children. 10.41% of families were “childless married couples.” These were generally the families that reached the final stage of their life cycle: the age of the family’s head was usually over 46 (86.8%) and only 13% of such families were comparatively young (36 to 45 years old). At the same time, the number of extended multi-generational families was falling (22.17%) and their structure tended to become more unified: they were mostly either “married couples with parents and children” or “the head of the household with children and parents.”

Up until the mid-1960s, almost every third family in Ural villages was a single-parent family (28.96%) and corresponded to the demographic types of

“mother (father) with children” or “mother (father) with children and parents” (see Table 4). Single-parent families were mostly headed by women who became widows in the war and postwar periods. This trend was also caused by the rising number of divorces in the 1960s, in both urban and rural areas. In 1958–1959 the divorce rate in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic was 6.5 divorces per one hundred families and in 1968–1977 this figure rose to 13.3, which means that it more than doubled.³⁸

By and large, the diversity of demographic types shrank considerably in comparison with 1929, which shows the unification of family processes in the course of the demographic transition.

Another trend was the ageing of the rural population in the Urals and the changes in family structure (see Table 3 and Table 5). In 1963, over 60.6% of families reached the final stage of their life cycle: in 28.95% of families the age of the head was 40–49 and in 31.67% of families the head was older than 51. It is remarkable that the head of every fifth surveyed family was retired. The group of young families, on the contrary, was extremely small—only 10.9%.

The fact that there was a large proportion of families in the final stage of their life cycle shows that the migration of grown-up children had disrupted the continuity of generations. Therefore, there were many single-person households and childless married couples (38.5%).

Fertility rates shaped the demographic situation in rural areas and determined the specific types of population reproduction. In the mid-1960s, peasant families tended to have fewer and fewer children: in 1963, in Ural villages, over a third of families (35.74%) had no minor children and 24.89% had only one child (see Table 5). On average, in Sverdlovsk region, in 1960, per 100 families of *kolkhozniks* there were 122 children under 16; 132 children in 1963; 123 in 1965.³⁹

A small group of families with many children (four or more) accounted for 7.24%. The head of the family was usually 31–50 years old, that is, these were families at the peak of their life cycle. Although in the given period the peasant population demonstrated a steady downward trend in its fertility rates, peasant families with many children twice outnumbered the urban ones.

The head of the family was still the main decision-maker and the principal caregiver. The budget studies show that men continued playing the key role in their families. In the vast majority of families, men were married and only in 2.7%, unmarried.

Women as family heads were found in 42.5% of families. As for their marital status, this category was different from male heads of families: women were generally single so these were single-parent families. Among female heads of families, women over 45 predominated (56.4%) and only 3.2% were under 30. A particularly interesting type of families comprised married couples (7.2%) in which the woman was identified as the head. This fact brings to light cer-

tain shifts in familial relationships and the changing status of women in society. Thus, two-parent families were mostly headed by men and, on the contrary, single-parent families mostly relied on older women.

The statistical analysis of the whole spectrum of family data leads us to the conclusion that small families prevailed in the Ural village and that most of them were at the final stage of their life cycle. This situation was to a great extent the result of the anti-peasant social policy. Low standards of living and poor working conditions provoked mass migration to the city and thus contributed to the ageing and decline of the rural population. Overall, in Sverdlovsk region, between 1960 and 1967 the rural population dropped from 926 thousand to 830 thousand people.⁴⁰

Therefore, in the given period, there were tumultuous shifts in the peasant family structure, which were determined by the demographic transition. These processes gradually encompassed all spheres of family life, actively modernizing production relations and the economic functions of the family. The demographic structure of the population is generally quite inert but it adjusts to the changing social conditions: peasant families grew smaller in size and they tended to have fewer children. These transformations show that by the mid-1960s, the demographic transition had been completed and the new patterns of reproduction had been established, which caused a demographic crisis in rural areas and the decline in rural population.

Conclusion

THE ANALYSIS of budget statistics has revealed the following characteristics of the demographic transition in the Russian village: the transformations of the family structure progressed rapidly (from the 1920s to the 1960s); they were accompanied by demographic disasters, which were caused not only by wars but also by political campaigns. The intensive rural migration of the 1950s and 1960s also turned into a major demographic disaster. As a result, the peasant family became unable to provide the agricultural economy with adequate population reproduction.

The “Soviet” model of demographic transition was typical of societies that entered the stage of modernization comparatively late and that chose forced economic and social restructuring in the course of their historical development.

Demographic trends in the Ural region were similar to those of the whole Soviet society: transition to the small nuclear family type, increase in the number of single people, and progressive ageing of the rural population. These changes gradually encompassed all spheres of family life. The demographic family struc-

ture, its functions and familial relations were modernized most actively. Nonetheless, the peasant family managed to preserve some of its patriarchal features, which were determined by their ownership of private households. In the 1970s, when the role of household plots started to diminish, the demographic transition entered its final stage: the family structure became more unified and the differences between rural/peasant and urban families all but disappeared. □

Notes

1. For more details, see M. S. Matskovsky, *Sociology of Family: Theory and Methodology* (Moscow, 1989), 48–49. Here and further, the original Russian titles are given in the English translation.
2. B. N. Mironov, *Social History of Russia (Eighteenth–Early Twentieth Centuries)* (St. Petersburg, 1999), 1: 266.
3. See L. Mazur and O. Gorbachev, “Primary Sources on the History of the Soviet Family in the Twentieth Century: Analytical Review,” *The History of the Family* 21, 1 (2016), Special Issue: *Three Centuries of Northern Population Censuses*, 101–120.
4. In Russia, the first population census was held in 1897; in the Soviet period, in 1926, 1937, 1939, 1959, 1970, 1979, and 1989.
5. State Archive of Sverdlovsk Region, fond 1812, op. 12, d. 39–60. The fiscal year began on 1 July 1928 and ended on 1 July 1929.
6. *Ibid.*, 55.
7. L. N. Mazur, “Budgets of *Kolkhozniks* as a Source of Data on the Social and Economic Structure of the Ural Peasantry in the First Half of the 1960s,” Ph.D. thesis in History, Ekaterinburg, Ural State University, 1992.
8. C. Mozel, *Materials of Geography and Statistics of Russia Collected by the Officers of the General Staff: Perm Guberniya* (St. Petersburg, 1864), Pt. 1; 1982. Pt. 2; A. I. Shingarev, *Position of Women in Peasant Communities* (Voronezh, 1899).
9. See, for example: B. N. Mironov, *The Russian Empire: from Tradition to Modernity*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 2014); V. A. Alexandrov, “Typology of the Russian Peasant Family in Feudalism,” *History of the USSR* 3 (1981): 78–96; N. A. Gorskaya, *Historical Demography of Russia in the Period of Feudalism (Research Results and Problems)* (Moscow, 1994); N. A. Minenko, *The Russian Peasant Family in Western Siberia (Eighteenth Century and the First Half of the Nineteenth Century)* (Novosibirsk, 1979).
10. R. Y. Vnukov, *Contradictions inside the Old Peasant Family* (Orel, 1929).
11. A. V. Chayanov, *Organization of a Peasant Household* (Moscow, 1925).
12. V. P. Danilov, *Soviet Village of the Pre-Kolkhoz Period: Population, Land Use, and Economy* (Moscow, 1978); O. M. Verbitskaya, *Peasant Family in the NEP Period//NEP: Economic, Political, Social and Cultural Aspects* (Moscow, 2006); *id.*, *Russian Peasant Family in 1897–1959* (Moscow–Tula, 2009); *id.*, “Main Trends in the Development of the Peasant Family in Russia in the Twentieth Century,” in *Collected Writings of the Institute*

- of *Russian History* 9, eds. A. N. Sakharov and E. N. Rudaya (Moscow–Tula, 2010), 332–353; N. A. Aralovets, *Urban Family in Russia, 1897–1926: Historical and Demographic Aspect* (Moscow, 2003); id., *Urban Family in Russia, 1927–1959* (Tula, 2009); id., “Marriage and Family in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic,” *Russian History* (2010): 55–62.
13. See, for example: Yu. P. Bokarev, *Budget Studies of Peasant Households in the 1920s as a Historical Source* (Moscow, 1981); id., “Peasant Household and Industrial Development of Soviet Russia in the mid–1920s,” *Mathematical Methods in Historical, Economical and Cultural Studies* (Moscow, 1977); id., “Methods of Studying Peasant Budgets of the 1920s,” *Source Studies of the History of Soviet Society* 3 (1978).
 14. See, for example: M. A. Beznin, *Peasant Household in Russian Non-Black Earth Belt in 1950–1965* (Moscow–Vologda, 1991); M. N. Glumnaya, “Individual Peasant Household in the European North of Russia in 1933–1937,” Abstract of Ph.D. thesis, 1994; O. V. Artemova, “Peasant Household in the European North (Second Half of the 1930s and the 1940s),” Abstract of Ph.D. thesis, Vologda, 1997.
 15. L. N. Mazur, “Peasant Household in the Middle Urals in the First Half of the 1960s (Based on the Materials of Budget Studies),” *ECM and Mathematical Methods in Historical Studies* (Moscow, 1993), 139–165; id., “Peasant Family in the Middle Urals in the First Half of the 1960s: Reconstruction Based on the Materials of Budget Studies of *Kolkhozniks*,” *Problems of Russian and International History, Theory and Methodology: Collected Papers* (Ekaterinburg: Ural State Pedagogical University, 2002), 130–144; id., *Russian Village in the Conditions of Urbanization: Regional Dimension (Second Half of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century)* (Ekaterinburg, 2012).
 16. The analysis relied on the database drawing on the 1922 Party Census information. Documentation Centre of Non-Governmental Organizations of Sverdlovsk Region, fond 76, op. 1, d. 557–574.
 17. Yu. P. Bokarev, *Budget Studies of Peasant Households in the 1920s as a Historical Source* (Moscow, 1981), 71.
 18. State Archive of Sverdlovsk Region, fond 1812, op. 2, d. 42, budget 58.
 19. Ibid., d. 43, budget 73.
 20. Ibid., d. 49, budget 40.
 21. See L. N. Mazur, “Communist Families in Ekaterinburg *Guberniya* (Based on the Materials of the All-Russia Party Census of 1922),” *Journal of the Ural Federal University* 2, Humanities, 3 (154), 18 (2016): 94.
 22. V. Berdinskikh, *Russian Village: Customs and Traditions* (Moscow, 2013), 178.
 23. Ibid., 148.
 24. State Archive of Sverdlovsk Region, fond 1812, op. 2, d. 59, budget 267; d. 58, budget 210.
 25. Berdinskikh, 165–166.
 26. ZAGS or the Civil Registry Office belonged to the structure of the Soviet government bodies.
 27. The Decree of the All-Russian Congresses of Soviets and the Council of People’s Commissariats “On Civil Marriage, Children and Keeping the Registry Books” of 18 (31) December 1917,” *Decrees of Soviet Power* 1, 25 October 1917–16 March 1918 (Moscow, 1957), 247.

28. Documentation Center of Non-Governmental Organizations of Sverdlovsk Region, fond 76, op. 1, d. 574, l. 192; d. 569, l. 145–154.
29. The Decree adopted by the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars "On Marriage Termination" (as of 16/29 December 1917)," *Decrees of Soviet Government* 1, 237–238.
30. State Archive of Sverdlovsk Region, fond 1812, op. 2, d. 48, budget 95.
31. State Archive of Sverdlovsk Region, fond 1812, op. 2, d. 60, budget 252; d. 47, budget 108; budget 96.
32. O. M. Verbitskaya, "Main Trends," 340.
33. Depeasantation was the dissolution of the peasant estate. Externally, this process was associated with the shrinking size of the peasant population, while internally it meant changes in lifestyle and demographic behaviour due to urbanization. This process also manifested itself through the changing criteria of social self-identification.
34. Calculated by using the data of the All-Soviet Census of 1939. Ural Region, compiled by V. P. Motrevich (Ekaterinburg, 2002), 289.
35. M. Ellman, "Famine of 1947 in the USSR," *Economic History: Overview*, ed. L. I. Borodkina, 10 (Moscow, 2005), 197–199.
36. *Ural Population: Twentieth Century* (Ekaterinburg, 1996), 137–139.
37. M. A. Beznin, *Financial Situation of Kolkhoz Farmers of Russian Non-Black Earth Belt in 1950–1965*, pt. 1 (Vologda, 1988), 15.
38. *Ibid.*, pt. 2 (Vologda, 1989), 13.
39. *Population of the USSR, 1987* (Moscow, 1988), 208.
40. Beznin, 19.

Abstract

The Peasant Family in the Urals in the 1920s–1960s:
Reconstruction Based on the Data of Budget Studies

The paper discusses the evolution of the peasant family in Russia in the twentieth century. We have studied the structure and dynamics of the Ural peasant family in the 1920s–1960s. In our comparative analysis we used the materials of the 1929 and 1936 budget studies of peasant households in the Urals. These data were supplemented by other sources: the Party Census of 1922, the population censuses of 1926 and 1939, and Soviet films of the period between the 1920s and 1970s. The analysis of budget statistics has brought to light the following characteristics of the demographic transition: the family structure was changing at an accelerated pace (from 1920 to the 1960s); the family transformation was affected by demographic disasters such as wars and political campaigns (collectivization, forced evictions of the population of small rural settlements). The intensive rural migration of the 1950s and 1960s turned into a major demographic disaster, too. As a result, the peasant family became unable to provide the agricultural economy with adequate population reproduction.

Keywords

peasant family, household, demographic transition, demographic type, family composition