
Valentina M. Moiseenko¹

Faculty of Economics of the Lomonosov Moscow State University,
1 Leninskie Gory, building 46,
Russian Federation, 119991, Moscow
<https://www.econ.msu.ru>

THE POLICY OF WORKERS RELOCATION TO REMOTE AREAS IN THE USSR IN THE 1920S AND EARLY 1930S

Abstract. After 1917, under the influence of new social conditions, the beginning of industrialization in the USSR and the policy of development of the outskirts, a new type of migration emerged, entitled in official documents of that time as “relocating workers to remote areas”. The systematization of legislative regulation of this type of migration in the absence of well-established statistical accounting is the purpose of the study, the results of which are presented in this article.

The 1920s became a noticeable frontier in the long history of Russia’s settlement of the eastern regions, but the costly practice of attracting specialists, developed in the mid-1920s in the framework of the departmental approach, can not be considered effective from the point of view of the formation of a stable population in these areas.

Key words: inter-district migration, migration policy, labor force, remote areas

JEL CODES : J00

Relocation of workers to remote areas as a kind of inter-district migration

The increasing scale of the permanent and seasonal relocations of the population to the urban areas from villages and, conversely, the seasonal outflow of a part of the townspeople who had land allotments to the village, the resettlement of peasants to the vast areas beyond the Urals, officially permitted trips abroad, etc. — all these movements are just a part of the rich palette of relocations during the “New Economic Policy” (NEP) period and the reconstruction of the national economy. At the same time, the main difficulties in studying migration are related to the state of accounting for this process. Essentially for the 1920s, we have data from the All-Union Population Census of 1926, data from departmental records

¹ Valentina Mikhaylovna Moiseenko, Doctor of Economics, Professor, Chief Researcher of the Laboratory of Population Economics and Demography of the Faculty of Economics of the Lomonosov Moscow State University. E-mail: mvm.msu@gmail.com

of peasants' withdrawal for earnings and resettlements of peasants, and the first materials of current migration statistics of a number of large cities of the USSR for 1927–1928.

Meanwhile, under the influence of the new social conditions after 1917, the tasks of organizing state administration were being resolved. A new stage of migration in the late 1920s and early 1930s was due to the industrialization of the country, which meant increased attention to the development of the country's suburbs. In official documents of the 1920s inter-district migration, mainly of skilled workers, was called "relocation of workers to remote areas" (hereinafter RA). Characteristically, under the conditions of the terminological confusion of the late 1920s and early 1930s, (business trips, transference, transfers, mobilization, etc.), the term "relocation of workers to remote areas" remains. Taking into account that part of the benefits for employees in relocated to RA was extended to the members of their families, it is about inter-district (inter-republican) migration.

The purpose of this article is to show the legislative basis for regulating the relocation of workers to RA. This approach is explained by the lack of statistical records, the organization of which was hampered by objective reasons — the high level of urban unemployment in the USSR in the 1920s, which required harder efforts from labor agencies, various sources of financing relocation to RA, the presence of relocating workers employed at secret departments, divisions, etc. The analysis of the relocation of workers is also limited by the state of regional labor statistics. The first data on the differentiation of the average salary of civil servants in the Union republics were analyzed in 1926–27 [I., 1928: 23]. The salaries of higher administrative and technical personnel for 1926-1928 were examined by A. G. Rashin [Rashin, 1929: 29-46]. Taking into account the severity of the specialists' shortage issue, personal registration of persons who graduated from higher and secondary technical, agricultural, veterinary and other educational institutions in the USSR, pre-revolutionary Russia and abroad, was organized in 1928 [Izvestia..., 1928, 34-35: 514]. The recording of specialists was repeated in 1930 [Izvestia..., 1930, 4: 67-73]. But the results of recording were not, apparently, published in the open sources.¹

The absence of statistical data on the relocation of workers to RA has had a negative impact on the quality of the laws adopted, determining the fluidity and variability of forms of lawmaking, the need for permanent additions and changes, and, most importantly, the impossibility of an objective assessment of the effectiveness of laws. The absence of publications containing independent judgments about the laws adopted in the late 1920s. should be added to this. At the

¹ Hypothetically, indirect data — housing reservation, the composition of students at higher and secondary special institutions — could be sources of information on the relocation of workers to RA.

same time, unabated attention to legislation leaves no doubt that the relocation of workers to RA, especially after 1927, were given increasing importance.

We define the term “workers’ relocations to RA” as state-organized inter-district (often inter-republican) migration of skilled personnel, the constituent elements of which — the number and composition of personnel, organization of relocation, areas of arrival and departure, benefits and incentives, obligations of the parties after early cessation or termination of employment contracts, etc. — were shaped by law.¹ It should be noted that the organization of relocation of workers to RA occurred under conditions of a high level of centralization of economic management. Adopted in 1927, the list of all-Union enterprises subordinated to the Supreme Economic Council of the USSR consisted of enterprises of the military industry, the leading enterprises of the metal, electrical, mining, fuel, timber, paper, chemical, food, textile industries, construction enterprises operating in different regions of the country [Deyev-Khomyakovsky, 1928: 59, 61].

Another no less important factor was the shortage of qualified specialists, formed as a result of mass emigration from Russia, large losses of the population during the wars and revolution, insufficient training of personnel and at the same time a high level of urban unemployment. Moscow and Leningrad accounted for up to 50% of all unemployed medical workers. “People seem to have grown to a big city and do not want to move... The centers are full of intellectual labour workers... There is incredible competition in finding work.” One of the reasons for the low mobility of educators was the substantial gap in the wages of this group of workers in Siberia and the Far East compared to the Ukraine and Belarus: in the inhabited areas it was higher [Deyev-Khomyakovsky, 1928. P. 59, 61].

In addition, under the monopoly of state as a mediator in employment, the labor exchange bureaus rarely handed over surplus labor and transferred their intermediary functions beyond “their” territories in the 1920s. Enterprises and institutions tended to avoid the material costs associated with the relocation of labor and preferred to hire local, often less skilled labor, without taking into account the effectiveness of attracting skilled labor from other regions. Consequently, relocation to RA could only take place with substantial state support.

The impact of the national-territorial construction of the USSR on the relocation to RA was contradictory in the 1920s.

In 1922–1932 seven Soviet republics were formed in the USSR.² In all the Soviet republics, except for the Transcaucasian republics, there were 16

¹ See Troitsky, 1928: 77-83; Avdeev et al, 1928: 79; Fradkin, 1928: 79; Kensky, 1928: 85; Code of laws..., 1925: 91.

² The RSFSR, the Ukrainian SSR, BSSR, ZFSFR, the Uzbek SSR, Turkmen SSR, and the Tajik SSR.

autonomous republics, 17 autonomous regions and 10 national districts, i.e. the total number of national units increased from 33 to 53. In addition, 240 national districts and 5300 national village councils were formed, in which, in the terminology of the 1920s, the apparatus was korenized (ethnically rooted) and the records were translated into the language of the main nationalities [Sulkevich, 1933: 22]. In parallel with korenization, “Ukrainization”, “Belarusization”, “Uzbekization”, etc. of the control apparatus were carried out.¹

At the same time, the national and territorial construction of the USSR included the creation of prerequisites for social and economic unity of the state and the formation of a command and administrative system, one of the conditions for which was the migration of qualified personnel.

The Fundamental Law (Constitution) of the USSR (1924) established a general plan for the national economy, a unified state budget, a single monetary system, included a provision on all-union legislation governing inter-republican relocations and the establishment of a resettlement fund. The most important labor laws were also administered by the supreme bodies of the USSR [The Fundamental Law..., 1957: 450-462].

The above mentioned conditions shaped the policy of the state regarding relocation of workers to RA. It consisted of increased legal and material guarantees in the form of benefits and privileges, which were established by law for workers moving to RA [Avdeev et al, 1928: 3-4]. It should be noted that a variety of support was the basement of the resettlement policy in Russia in the early 20th century. Later this policy of the state support was the core of stimulating the influx of people into the eastern regions of the RSFSR. It has not lost its significance in modern Russia.

The policy of relocation of workers to RA in the 1920s, in terms of legislation, was divided into two periods. During the first period (mid-1920s), the regulation of relocation was limited to the territory of the RSFSR, i.e. the migration of workers to RA was of an intra-republic nature. All-Union laws adopted in the second period — in the late 1920s — meant a significant increase in the scope of relocations, including inter-republican movements, as well as a crisis in the regulation of this relocation.

Relocation of workers to RA in the RSFSR in the mid-1920's

The initial prerequisites for regulating the relocation of workers to RA are found in the Labor Code of the RSFSR (1922). Here the procedure for travelers' transportation payment, the rules for admission and dismissal of employees, their relocation, etc. were defined. Article 9 of section II of the Labor Code of the RSFSR (1922) singled out a special group of employees who held positions that

¹ See more details in “Special rules on service in national areas” in: E.M. Danilova, 1929: 551-558.

required political confidence or special knowledge related to the person invited to work [Code of laws... 1922, 70: 1549].

Developing article 9 of section II of the Labor Code of the RSFSR (1922), the law of 1923 confirmed the right of all organizations, institutions and enterprises, state and private hiring of a special group of workers, bypassing the labor exchange, followed by its registration at the labor exchange [Code of laws, 1923. 13: 265-268].

The following positions were included in this group: A) administrative — heads of institutions and enterprises, directors, executives and their assistants, heads of districts, administrations, roads, port chiefs, oblast-level doctors, commanders of militia, including warders and tutors of places of detention, etc.; B) specialists — instructors, people with higher technical and agronomical education, medical specialists, scientists, etc.; C) posts associated with the storage, escort of property and valuables — treasurers, cashiers, commandants, etc.; D) posts requiring political confidence — employees of secret departments of state organizations, all employees, with some exceptions, were from state institutions, party and trade union organizations — the Central Executive Committee, SNK, STO, GPU, NKVD, the Central Committee of the RKSM, the Executive Committee of the Communist International, etc.

A special group of workers, as we see, was the “core” of the command and administrative system of the Soviet society. In the future, it was allocated in special lists attached to each law on the relocation of workers to RA, which gave persons included in such lists the right to additional benefits and compensations.

The law of 1923 established privileges for “facilitating the trips of workers and employees” to permanent work in remote areas of the RSFSR “¹. It spread to workers who were relocated in the order of transfer (that is, by the initiative and at the disposal of the employer) from non-remote to remote areas of the RSFSR.²

Benefits common to all those sent to RA were compensation for travel expenses, including family members, payment of a double wage rate during the first three months of work at the new place, allowances issued in case of injury, illness, death of the traveler, preferential right of the traveler for the occupied position in case of staff reduction, etc.

Additional privileges, in addition to the general ones, relied, as we have noted, on persons holding positions on the “special list”. Among additional benefits

¹ The terms «business trip» and «business traveler» were legally defined later. The duration of a trip was limited to 2 months.

² The term “remote area” was, apparently, borrowed from literature (see I.S. Turgenev - “places not so distant”). At present, the term “remote area” means a territory “located far from the center of the country, the capital” (The Big Academic Dictionary of Russian. M.- St. Petersburg. Science. 2010. Vol. 14. P.407, in Russian). It is this sense - the areas far from the center of the country, that was meant in the 1920s.

were payment of full three-month earnings after three years of work at RA, compensation for costs of relocation to any locality of the RSFSR after 6 years of work at a RA, the right of children to study at all educational institutions after 3 years of work at RA, payment of the cost of transportation to the place of study, a three-month vacation after 5 years of work at a RA, a scientific trip for certain groups of people after 5 years of work at a RA, etc.

The list of RA was formed according to the so-called list principle. It included autonomous republics of the RSFSR — Dagestan, Turkestan, Karelian (except from Petrozavodsk), Yakut, Bashkir and Kirghiz (except for Orenburg and Uralsk), autonomous regions — Mongolia-Buryatia, Komi (Zyryanska), Oirat, and most of the provinces of the North of the European part, Siberia and the Far East, except for provincial cities [Code of laws, 1923. 69: 1235-1238].

The strategic character of the law of 1923 confirmed the decree of 1923, extending the benefits established for employees of Soviet institutions and enterprises in RA, to the entire command and equivalent political composition of the military and naval departments of the USSR. In the resolution, the term “relocation to RA” was first supplemented by the distance of over 1000 versts (approximately equal to 1000 km) as a condition for receiving benefits [Code of laws, 1924. 17: 221-223]. Thus, “remote” relocation was “outlined” by distance. The magnitude of the distance reflected the conditions of the 1920s. — poor conditions of transport, roads, increased differences between the center and the periphery as a result of military and revolutionary disasters. At the same time, crossing the administrative border of the territory was a secondary factor: part of the relocations could occur within the province, the autonomous republic, etc.

But already in 1925 the “civil” law (1923) was abolished because of “formal and practical considerations” [Avdeev et al, 1928: 4]. The use of the term “business trip”, extended to a wide range of workers and employees, was recognized inaccurate in the law of 1923. Therefore, the law of 1925 limited the scope of workers sent to work to RA, state enterprises and institutions [Code of laws, 1925. 64: 781-784]. As to the 1925 law, the employees of private enterprises and public institutions were not included in the state support system, as well as “mass recruitment and transfer of labor», and individuals were sent to work in RA if the distance between the point of departure and destination was less than 200 versts. According to the instruction of the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the RSFSR, the right to benefits at RA was not available to persons who arrived at RA on a business trip, aimed at temporary and seasonal work, arriving at their own initiative in search of work, as part of the Workers’ and Peasants’ Red Army, etc. [Izvestiya..., 1927. 10: 156-157]. The introduction of restrictions indirectly recognized, on the one hand, the attractiveness of RA, and on the other, the undesirability of “excessive” population influx to RA.

The composition of positions included in the “special list” attached to the law of 1925 was significantly expanded in comparison with 1923. Judging by the

composition of positions included in such a list, we can conclude that migration played a significant role at this stage in the formation of government and social bodies in the autonomous republics and autonomous regions, and in the northern and eastern provinces of the RSFSR. It should be noted that the list of RA, according to the territorial and administrative division of the RSFSR that existed in 1925, included the territories of Central Asia — the Turkestan and Kirghiz (except for Orenburg and Uralsk) autonomous republics.

As we see, the laws of 1923 and 1925 established privileges and compensations for RA workers in a significant territory of the RSFSR. Relocation was seen as strictly departmental and closed for discussion, however, the first stage of its implementation the shortcomings were revealed. On the one hand, the attractiveness of RA had grown (apparently, not equally for different groups of specialists and districts). On the other hand, there was a need to limit the inflow of population to RA, possibly because of the strong pressure of “push” factors in exit areas (high unemployment, low wages, etc.). In the mid-1920s. there was a tendency to expand the list of positions that gave the right to additional benefits and privileges, which was a consequence of the agencies’ defining positions in drafting legislation. Personnel turnover at RA was in conflict with the substantial state costs for their relocation and the payment of benefits and compensations, although the laws of 1923 and 1925 provided for the return of part of the benefits to the enterprise or institution in case of the employee’s voluntary dismissal [Izvestiya..., 1926. 38: 8].¹ In order to stabilize the situation in 1927, state institutions and enterprises, as well as cooperative and public organizations of the RSFSR, were given the right to contract workers invited to RA for up to 3 years [Izvestiya..., 1927. 16: 248].

In the late 1920s and early 1930s. the role of relocation of workers to RA increased under the conditions of industrialization of the border regions and the ongoing territorial and administrative transformations in the country.

Laws on the relocation of workers to RA in the USSR in the late 1920s and early 1930s

From June 1, 1927, a new law on benefits for employees of state institutions and enterprises at RA came into force in the USSR [Code of laws..., 1927. 25: 527-529]. The All-Union law was considered “absolutely necessary” [Troitsky, 1928. 1: 72-73]. It applied to persons who started working in RA after the introduction

¹ Considering the features of the Far Eastern region, the law of 1923 [Code of laws, 1923. 69, Art. 693] was supplemented: 1) all workers and employees who were sent to work to the Far East and received benefits were required to work in the Far East for at least 1 year; 2) those who worked for less than 1 year were obliged to reimburse all additional expenses of institutions and enterprises on the benefits they used. [Kensky, 1928: 5].

of the law (June 1, 1927) and persons who worked in RA before the introduction of this law.¹ As a result, the need arose to harmonize the republican and all-union laws (1927), determine the rights of employees for certain benefits, work experience at RA, the conditions for transfer from one area to another, from one enterprise to another, etc., — issues often resolved in court.

The law of 1927 introduced significant changes in the policy of relocating workers to RA. The refined notion of a “remote area”, supplemented by the distance between the place of residence and the new place of work (over 1000 km of railway or 500 km of other routes), was thought to overcome the “shortcomings” of the list system.

Another innovation was the division of RA into two zones. The first included areas with particularly severe conditions of connection and communication with the center, severe climatic conditions and a particularly low cultural level. The second zone — the remaining RA. Note that the criterion of “low cultural level” is hardly correct in this case.

The 1st zone of RA included the regions of the Far North of the European and Asian part of the RSFSR, a number of territories in the Ural province, the Adaevsky district of the Kazakh ASSR, a significant number of districts of the Uzbek SSR, including the Tajik ASSR (except for a number of vilayets), and all areas of the Turkmen SSR.

The II zone of RA consisted of autonomous republics and autonomous regions of the RSFSR, the province of the North of European Russia, Siberia and the Far East, except for the territories included in the I zone, as well as the terrain of the ZFSSR and the Uzbek SSR, except for those included in the I zone and the city of Tashkent.

At the same time, according to paragraph 14 of the 1927 law, the Soviet republics were given the right to establish benefits to employees (transferred or newly invited to RA within their borders) regardless of the distance.

The notion of “remote area”, as defined by the law of 1927, reflected a new stage in the strengthening of the state offices. The list of RA by zones was approved by the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the USSR in agreement with the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the USSR and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions on the basis of the representations of the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the Soviet republics and *interested* (the italics are ours — V.M.) People’s Commissariats of the USSR. As a result, the territorial scope of the application of the 1927 law significantly expanded. The introduction of benefits and compensations for a number of groups of specialists meant that a large part of the territory of the USSR was given the status of “remote areas”.

¹ In the publications of the late 1920’s various conflicts are discussed, explanations are given, examples of judicial decisions are given on the issues of calculating the length of service at RA, benefits, etc.

At the same time, the principle of the “list system”, although supplemented by distance, did not take into account the problems of regionalization of the country that had been developing in parallel in those years. The “remaining part” of the country — the Ukrainian SSR, the Belorussian SSR and the greater part of the European part of the RSFSR — became a “donor” of qualified personnel for RAs. On the other hand, the increase in the territories that provided benefits and compensations to workers meant an increase in the scale and intensity of the relocation of workers to RA and within RA.

The law of 1927, as well as 1925, emphasized that it only covered employees who were sent to RA by state institutions and enterprises. In reality, the scope of “unregulated workers” arriving at RA expanded with individuals whose request for transfer was agreed by the enterprise or institution [Kensky, 1928: 25]. In addition, employees of co-operative, professional and public organizations were entitled to benefits if there was a written agreement of the employee with the employer.

The law of 1927 expanded the list of persons who did not have the right to privileges at RA. Besides persons listed in the law of 1925, the right to benefits at RA was not obtained by the self-employed in search of work, those invited to work in RA from abroad, those who arrived at RA before their Sovietization, etc. Thus, the continued policy of reducing “pressure” on RA was supplemented by increased political control over the composition of those arriving to RA.

We can not quantify the changes in benefits and compensations established by the law of 1927. Though the law of 1927 did reduce the size of certain types of benefits, such a reduction was fully compensated by the increase in other benefits [Troitsky, 1928: 82]. Contemporaries positively evaluated the law of 1927, the experience of which was used in the development of other laws that “stimulated” relocation of specialists.

At this period a new policy goal was set: “not only recruiting a skilled workforce for RA, but also “retaining it... for as long as possible”. In the fight with the “unhealthy phenomena”, the right to benefits was placed in dependence “not so much on the fact of moving, as on actually worked time” [Troitsky, 1928: 82]. Implementing this goal, the law of 1927 established percentage supplements to the salary received by the employee: in the amount of 10% after each year of work in the localities of the first zone, 10% after every three years of work in the localities of the second zone. At the same time, the total amount of supplements should not exceed 100% of the salary.

In comparison with the law of 1925, the list of the “special group” of officials, which granted the right to additional benefits, was again expanded.

The administrative group grew at the expense of the heads of the divisions (departments) of the commissariats of the union and autonomous republics, the heads of the statistical departments of the autonomous republics, their

deputies and assistants, regional, provincial and governorate inspectors of places of detention, heads of departments and heads of financial departments, etc.

For the first time, the category of industrial workers was included in the list of “special group” officials, which indicated increased attention to economic policy in RA [Izvestiya..., 1927. 21: 307-308].

In 1927 benefits for employees included in the ‘special list’ consisted of a three-month vacation (along with a regular vacation) provided for every three years of work in the first zone, and for every 5 years — in the second zone. Contemporaries noted the positive value in retaining qualified personnel in RA of a benefit such as admission to educational institutions of the children of the workers after 3 years of work as individuals of manual labor [Troitsky, 1928: 82-83]. By agreement of the parties, part of the employees of the “special group” was given a scientific trip.

The “privileged” subgroup of the special group, upon dismissal “through no fault of their own”, had the right to receive wages for the six months ahead. In addition, benefits for paying the tenant for the travel of children to the place of study could be provided before the expiration of 3 years of parents’ work at RA. The employee of this subgroup would keep his residential area at the former place of residence, if the family members of the employee who lived with him before departure remained there [Troitsky, 1928: 78-79]

After 1927, the list of officials entitled to additional privileges and the specification of the list of RA continued to expand [Izvestiya..., 1928. 34-35: 520-521 and others].

In 1928, amendments and additions were made to the privileges for employees of state institutions and enterprises at RA [Izvestiya..., 1928. 30-31: 450-451]. In particular, the rules for paying for travel to RA of different categories of employees — those transferred by the initiative of the administration, by personal request or newly appointed ones — were specified. In case of dismissal, in addition to the complete liquidation of the enterprise, employees were guaranteed payment of salary for the next 6 months. For workers of industrial and transport enterprises, their living space in the places of departure was reserved, if members of the employee’s family stayed there.

In the late 1920’s there was a further expansion of benefits and the range of specialists who had the right to benefits in RA. In the years 1928-1929, privileges were raised for workers in remote areas of the Far East [Izvestiya..., 1928. 30-31: 451-452; Izvestiya..., 1928. 34-35: 520; Izvestiya..., 1929. 17: 267]. Privileges were established for specialists of water management institutions in the republics of Central Asia, the Kazakh ASSR, and the ZFSFR [Izvestiya..., 1929. 7-8: 97], and for specialists of state-owned gold and platinum mining enterprises [Izvestiya..., 1928. 47-48: 721-723; Izvestiya..., 1930. 7: 136].

Significant changes in the policy of redistribution of the labor force, which took place in the country, also affected specialists. In 1927, special measures

were taken to attract specialists to work at state-owned industrial (and then transport) enterprises outside large urban settlements [Izvestiya..., 1927. 32-33: 466-467; Izvestiya..., 1928. 17: 258-259; Izvestiya..., 1928. 30-31: 457-459]. These decisions, as well as those regulating the relocation of workers to RA, included a list of benefits, positions and a list of localities. The privileges applied to specialists of industrial enterprises with a certain number of workers (at least one hundred people), and then specialists of transport enterprises. With the exception of the provincial and former provincial cities, the territories to which the privileges applied within the RSFSR included the Bashkir Autonomous Republic, the Vologda Region, the Votskaya Autonomous Region, the Vyatka Gubernia, the Karelian Autonomous Republic (the Olonets and Prionezhsky Districts), the city of Kasimov of the Ryazan Province, the Leningrad Region (the Lodejpol'sky and Cherepovets Districts), the Mari Autonomous Region, the city of Melekes of the Samara Province, the Podmoskovny Coal Basin near Moscow, the Prioksky Mountain District, the North Dvinskaya Gub, the Ural Region, the Chuvash autonomous republic, and others; within the USSR - Donbass, the Krivorozhsky District, and others [Izvestiya..., 1928. 17: 258-259].

Benefits were established for rural teachers, medical and agronomical workers, educators sent to work in the countryside, workers of Magnitstroy, the Magnitogorsk plant, industrial enterprises of the Shakhtinsk district, and others.

As we see, during a short period of time, legislation established benefits for specialists of various economic sectors in various regions over the country. Taking this into account, the resolution, which was introduced from October 1, 1930 and covered benefits for people working in RA of the USSR and outside large urban settlements, was intended to systematize the legislation on distribution of specialists, making some changes to it [Izvestiya..., 1930. 31-32: 664-665; Izvestiya..., 1930. 31-32: 665-679]. The 1930 Act provided for benefits for workers of all-Union enterprises and organizations, as well as for individuals who worked in mixed joint-stock companies, cooperative and public organizations; in the Far East region it covered also the private enterprise employees. In the Union republics, the right enabling the introduction of additional benefits for workers of republican and local institutions, enterprises and organizations operated.

It is hardly relevant to analyze here the voluminous 1930 Act in detail, therefore, we pay attention only to the provisions relating to the relocation of specialists to RA.

First of all, the range of specialists relying on privileges was again expanded. It included workers transferred by order of the administration, even if at their own request, as well as those invited to work again; mobilized for work by Soviet bodies, as well as by public organizations, and those distributed after graduation from higher school institutions. At the same time, in addition to the categories mentioned above, persons deprived of the right to vote (due to deportation and

exile) and persons “cleared from the apparatus in the first category” could not receive privileges.

The division of RA into two zones took into account the criteria of distance from the center and “hardships of working conditions”. For all the uncertainty of the last criterion, its introduction should have reflected, apparently, the needs of industry and construction in RA.

The law of 1930 divided employees into three groups in their right for benefits, pending on their qualifications and position. The list of positions and qualifications set the appropriate instructions for each group. For example, the first group included top administrative staff and specialists of higher and secondary qualifications, mainly engaged in material production, the second group consisted of heads of institutions and enterprises no lower than the district level, highly qualified specialists, and the third group included employees not classified by the previous two groups. It should be noted that the top administrative staff was not named in the published list of employees of the first group. The distance (no less than 1000 km of the railway track) as a condition for obtaining benefits was established only for the second and third groups of specialists.

The temporary stay of workers as a policy principle in RA, laid down in previous laws, was preserved in the law of 1930, although labor contracts with RA employees could be concluded for up to five years, which increased staff stability. At the same time, the workers of the first group received an additional privilege - the opportunity to pay for travel to RA for “preliminary acquaintance with the working conditions”. A dismissed employee had the right to severance pay, which under certain conditions could reach the value of a six-month salary.

The 10% supplement for wages in the localities of the 1st zone after each year of work remained unchanged, and in the localities of the second zone - after every 3 years of work. “Holiday” benefits were also made dependent on the duration of work in RA.

Upon admission and education at all educational institutions, the children of workers in the first and second groups were equated with the children of workers. Twice a year the employer would pay for their travel to an educational institution, and in some cases a scholarship to students as well.

Noticeable changes were made to housing benefits. The workers of the first and second groups retained their living space, regardless of whether the members of the employee’s family stayed there or moved to RA with them. For workers who arrived in the area of the 1st zone, the living space was preserved for 3 years, for those from the 2nd and 3rd zones - for two years from the date of departure. Therefore, the privileges for the preservation of housing became an important factor in staff stabilization.

For objective reasons, the 1930 law on benefits for people working in remote areas of the USSR and outside large urban settlements was the last one in the policy of moving workers to RA and the operation of the Labor Code (1922).

Evaluation of the effectiveness of this law, as well as of others previously adopted (1923, 1925, 1927), could not be carried out, as we have already noted, by analyzing the dynamics of the number and structure of specialists who arrived at RA, the forms of their hiring, their level of fluidity and stability, etc. In the late 1920s, this policy was replaced by the administrative methods of regulating the movement of specialists - mobilization and transfer of skilled labor.

It is known that the late 1920s and early 1930s demonstrated a sharp increase in tension in the labor market of the USSR, which manifested in the huge turnover of staff, their shortage, sectoral, territorial and professional imbalances in jobs and labor, etc. Sharp criticism of the situation in RA focused on the work of labor bodies and the state of labor legislation. According to one contemporary, the labor authorities “could not and did not know how to get thousands of skilled workers to stop being “confined” to towns on unemployment benefits and make them go to work even in relatively close places.” On the other hand, the drift of the labor force was viewed as an undesirable consequence of a huge number of announcements in central and local newspapers that invited people of various professions to work. The existing legislation was criticized for the constant expansion of the range of persons whose position gave them the right to benefits when moving to the periphery, a list of areas with increased benefits, and the right to receive benefits by persons who voluntarily arrived at RA [Ognev-Levenstern, 1931: 137, 139].

As we see, the assessment of the provision of the vast and diverse territory of the USSR, including its “remote areas”, by specialists, remained beyond attention. Meanwhile, moving the employee (often with the family) to these areas, although temporary, could not but cause great difficulties. Among such difficulties was obtaining reliable information on working and living conditions, adapting often to new natural conditions, etc. Apparently, one of the problems, given the exacerbated political situation in the country, was the growth of the population in RA, which did not receive benefits.

In search for new solutions, “new ideas” in the distribution of the labor force were found. According to the decree of the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the USSR and the Superior Soviet of the People’s Economy of the RSFSR of 1930 on additional measures to combat staff turnover and for the improvement of recruitment, the problem of staff turnover was proposed to be solved by recording the reasons for the dismissal of an employee in his/her work record cards. Labor exchanges were forbidden to register unemployed people who worked for hire without proper certificates of the reason for their dismissal [Izvestiya..., 1930. 26-27: 604-605]. By another decision of the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the RSFSR to intensify the struggle against the “flyers” and “economic deserters”, persons who left work unintentionally or obtained dismissal by violating labor discipline and internal regulations (i.e. flyers and deserters) were placed on

special account and were deprived of the right to work in industrial enterprises for 6 months [Izvestiya..., 1930. 34–35: 730].

Those “half measures” were soon radically replaced. The 1930 law established a new right of staff management for redistribution of labor - to “transfer” skilled workers and specialists used not in their specialty, to other branches of the national economy or elsewhere. Employment of the labor force, with the exception of certain categories of specialists, included in the “special list”, was forbidden [Code of laws..., 1930. 60: 1159-1261].

According to the 1930 law, personnel departments were also given the right to appoint to work by specialty beyond the place of permanent residence. Refusal of this assignment to a job was considered to be respectful in three cases - illness, non-provision of a living space at the place of destination, and the wife’s refusal of the appointment of her husband to work outside the place of residence. A simplified approach to “appointments to leave” without due legal protection of the interests of workers led to “a lot of completely unnecessary complications” [Ognev-Levenstern, 1931: 140].

The issues discussed above do not exhaust the topics related to the relocation of workers to RA. At the same time, it is obvious that the 1920s became a start of Russia’s long history of settling the eastern regions. In the framework of the departmental approach that emerged in the mid-1920s, an expensive approach to attracting specialists can not be considered effective from the point of view of forming a permanent population in these areas. Administrative methods of distribution of specialists in the late 1920s - early 1930s apparently reduced the efficiency of attracting qualified personnel to RA to an even greater extent.

References

1. Avdeev F. V., Voitsekovich M. V., Radishevsky A. A. 1928. Benefits for the service in remote areas. M. (in Russian).
2. Danilova E. M. 1929. Current labour legislation of the USSR and the Union republics. In 2 volumes. Vol.1. M. (in Russian).
3. Deyev-Khomyakovsky G. 1928. On involving intellectual labour workers in work in the province. Labour issues. 11. (in Russian).
4. I. 1928. Salary of employees of the institutions of the USSR in 1926-27. Labour statistics. 5. (in Russian).
5. Izvestia of the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1926. № 38. (in Russian).
6. Izvestia of the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1927. № 10. (in Russian).
7. Izvestia of the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1927. № 16. (in Russian).
8. Izvestia of the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1927. № 32–33. (in Russian).
9. Izvestia of the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1928. № 17. (in Russian).
10. Izvestia of the People’s Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1928. № 30-31. (in Russian).

11. Izvestia of the People's Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1928. № 34-35. (in Russian).
12. Izvestia of the People's Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1928. № 47-48. (in Russian).
13. Izvestia of the People's Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1929. № 7-8. (in Russian).
14. Izvestia of the People's Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1929. № 17. (in Russian).
15. Izvestia of the People's Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1930. № 4. (in Russian).
16. Izvestia of the People's Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1930. № 7. (in Russian).
17. Izvestia of the People's Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1930. № 26-27. (in Russian).
18. Izvestia of the People's Commissariat for Labour of the USSR, 1930. № 34-35. (in Russian).
19. Kensky S.I. 1928. Benefits for workers in remote areas of the USSR. Legislation and specifications up to August 1, 1928. With comments by I.E. Gvozdev. Khabarovsk-Blagoveshchensk. (in Russian).
20. Code of laws on payments and benefits for service members of the workers 'and peasants' red army and the workers 'and peasants' red fleet of the USSR and their families. Second Ed., M. 1925. (in Russian).
21. Ognev-Levenstern P. 1931. Controversial issues on hiring and denial of work. Labour Issues. 3-4. (in Russian).
22. The Fundamental Law (Constitution) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. 1957. In History of the Soviet Constitution (in the documents). 1917-1956. M. State publishing house of law literature. Section two. Chapter one. (in Russian).
23. Rashin A. G. 1929. Factory workers in the USSR. (Number, composition, wages.) From the pref. of A.G. Strumilin. «Labour issues in numbers» Library. Issue. VI. M. (in Russian).
24. Code of laws of the USSR, 1927. № 427. Art. 43. (in Russian).
25. Code of laws of the USSR. 1922. № 70. Art. 903. (in Russian).
26. Code of laws of the USSR. 1923. № 13. Art. 171. (in Russian).
27. Code of laws of the USSR. 1923. № 69. Art. 673. (in Russian).
28. Code of laws of the USSR. 1924. № 17. Art. 164. (in Russian).
29. Code of laws of the USSR. 1925. № 64. Art. 512. (in Russian).
30. Code of laws of the USSR. 1925. № 64. Art. 512. (in Russian).
31. Code of laws of the USSR. 1927. № 25. Art. 270. (in Russian).
32. Code of laws of the USSR. 1930. № 60. Art. 641. (in Russian).
33. Sulkevich S. 1933. National-territorial structure of the USSR. The introduction of A.S. Enukidze. M. (in Russian).
34. Troitsky I. 1928. Privileges for work in remote areas of the USSR. Labour issues. 1: 72-79; Labour issues. 1928. 2: 77-83. (in Russian).
35. Fradkin L. E. 1928. Official travel and relocation within the USSR. M. (in Russian).