

Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy

**PEASANT-CENTRIC DIMENSION  
OF THE SOCIO-CULTURAL SPACE  
OF UKRAINE DURING THE REVOLUTION  
OF 1917–1921**

**Collective monograph**

<sup>1256</sup>  
 <sup>1233</sup>  
**1996** Lviv-Toruń  
LIHA-PRES Liha-Pres  
2021

*Recommended for printing by the Academic Council of  
Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy  
(Minutes № 7 dated 24.06.2021)*

**Reviewers:**

*Morozov A., PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of the Department of Archeology and Auxiliary Sciences of History of the Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy;*

*Trygub O., PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of the Department International Relations and Foreign Policy of the Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University;*

*Fedkov O., PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor, Head of the Department Archival Science, Special Historical and Legal Disciplines of the Kamianets-Podilskiy Ivan Ohienko National University.*

**Group of authors:**

Kornovenko S. V., Telvak V. P., Lozovyi V. S., Kompaniets O. V., Ilnytskyi V. I., Hlibischuk M. V., Pasichna Yu. G.

The monograph contains the results of research conducted under a grant from the National Research Fund of Ukraine “Agrarianism: the Peasant-centric Phenomenon of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921” (registration number 2020.02/0120).

**Peasant-centric dimension of the socio-cultural space of Ukraine during the revolution of 1917–1921** : collective monograph / S. V. Kornovenko, V. P. Telvak, V. S. Lozovyi, etc. – Lviv-Toruń : Liha-Pres, 2021. – 128 p.

ISBN 978-966-397-236-7



Liha-Pres is an international publishing house which belongs to the category „C” according to the classification of Research School for Socio-Economic and Natural Sciences of the Environment (SENSE) [isn: 3943, 1705, 1704, 1703, 1702, 1701; prefixMetCode: 978966397]. Official website – [www.sense.nl](http://www.sense.nl).

ISBN 978-966-397-236-7

© Liha-Pres, 2021

# CONTENTS

FOREWORD .....	5
UKRAINIAN AGRARIANISM OF THE PERIOD OF THE UKRAINIAN REVOLUTION OF 1917–1921 IN INTELLECTUAL HERITAGE OF G. SIMANTSIV (Kornovenko S. V.).....	8
1. The essence of agrarianism .....	9
2. Socio-economic and philosophical components of agrarianism.....	13
3. Socio-legal model of agrarianism.....	16
4. Agrarianism and the peasant issue.....	17
5. Agrarianist state-building .....	20
6. The main features of agrarianism .....	25
AGRARIAN DISCOURSE OF MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY'S JOURNALISTIC HERITAGE: IDEOLOGY, ISSUES, RECEPTION (Telvak V. P.).....	29
1. At the turn of the century.....	30
2. Ukrainian War of Independence.....	39
PARTY-POLITICAL PEASANT-CENTRAL DISCOURSE IN THE DAY OF THE UKRAINIAN REVOLUTION 1917–1921: IDEOLOGICAL TYPES AND MOBILIZATION POSSIBILITIES (Lozovyi V. S.) .....	53
1. Left agrarianist peasant-centric discourse (USRP).....	55
2. Far-left agrarianist peasant-centric discourse (Makhnovist movement)....	60
3. Right agrarianist peasant-centric discourse (UDAP).....	65
AGRARIANISM IN BULGARIA AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA IN THE FIRST THIRD OF THE 20TH CENTURY: GENESIS, FEATURES OF DEVELOPMENT, INTELLECTUAL HERITAGE (Kompaniiets O. V.) .....	73
1. Agrarianism in Bulgaria .....	77
2. Agrarianism in Czechoslovakia.....	80
3. Bulgarian and Czechoslovak agrarianism in the context of the search for a “third way” in Central and Eastern Europe in the first third of the 20th century.....	83
POLITICAL LIFE AND THE AGRARIAN QUESTION IN THE COLUMNS OF THE UKRAINIAN CERENIST NEWSPAPER “KHLIBOROBKA PRAVDA” (THE SECOND HALF OF THE 1920S) (Ilnytskyi V. I., Hlibischuk M. V.).....	89
1. Political life in the newspaper .....	94
2. The agrarian question in the columns of the newspaper.....	98

PEASANT REVOLUTIONISM OF THE COUNTRIES  
OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE AND UKRAINE –  
THE CATALYST OF AGRARIANIST TRANSFORMATIONS  
(Pasichna Yu. G.)..... 105

1. Socio-economic situation of the peasantry of Central  
and Eastern Europe and Ukraine in the early 20th century ..... 106

2. Socio-political activity of the peasantry of Central-Eastern Europe  
and Ukraine in the early 20th century ..... 111

CONCLUSIONS..... 122

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS..... 127

## FOREWORD

The end of the first and beginning of the second decade of the twenty-first century in the contemporary world is accompanied by radical socio-cultural and geopolitical transformations. The world has once again faced the civilizational challenges, the answers to which will determine the future prospects of mankind. Careful analysis of world, in particular European history allows us to identify some similarities between modern events and those of century ago. The first and beginning of the second decade of the twentieth century also marked by global socio-political, socio-economic and semantic upheavals. In scientific and historical discourse, they are known as a civilizational shift. There is an obvious similarity, although not identical, between European and Ukrainian history in the first and the beginning of the second decade of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries which generates a natural interest of researchers to understand the latest realities, taking into account the experience of the past. Similar phenomena in the national history of the first and the beginning of the second decade of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, for example, are the revolutions in Ukraine, the severity of the agrarian issue, the search for the optimal national model of socio-political development and so on. In this context, the study of agrarianism in both Central and Eastern Europe and the peasant-centric phenomenon of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 is socio-politically, scientifically and practically significant.

In the domestic and foreign historical and scientific tradition of the last four decades the study of various aspects of agrarianism is devoted to the work of A. Noskova, K. Galushka, I. Fareniiy, T. Pikovska, O. Sukhushyna, O. Krapivin, G. Matveev, M. Shmigel, M. Sirna, A. Sampf, G. Bernstein, E. Finkel, V. Latin, T. Makovetska, T. Pokyvailova and other authors.

In the numerically smaller works of such Ukrainian historians as K. Galushko, P. Gai-Nyzhnyk, F. Turchenko, R. Vetrov and S. Zborets, V. Masnenko indirectly, in the context of studying the legacy of V. Lypynsky, some plots of “grain-grower ideology” are revealed as an option of Eastern European/Ukrainian agrarianism.

Thus, a generalized analysis of Ukrainian and foreign historiography shows that agrarianism, both Central and Eastern European and the peasant-centric phenomenon of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, is a promising subject of special research. Thus, in view of the above, the author’s team’s appeal to the study of the peasant-centric dimension of the sociocultural space of Ukraine during the revolution of 1917–1921, its comparative analysis with the peasant-centric dimension of the sociocultural space of Central and Eastern European countries during the socio-political upheavals of the early twentieth century is relevant.

The monograph reveals little-studied issues in recent domestic and foreign historiography concerning the content of agrarianism as a peasant-centred phenomenon of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 and the phenomenon of Central and Eastern European countries during the socio-political upheavals of the early twentieth century.

The conceptual and theoretical design of agrarianism during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 in the intellectual heritage of G. Simantsiv is discussed in the article by S. Kornovenko. He noted that G. Simantsiv rightly considered agrarianism a natural peasant ideology. Attention is drawn to the fact that G. Simantsiv correctly believed that for peasants the advantage of agrarianism as a peasant ideology among other socio-political analogues is that 1) it does not invent anything new, it is natural for the peasantry; 2) “abstract schemes, detached from life, not built”; 3) it avoids utopian goals and objectives; 4) is a systematized “spiritual treasures of the peasantry,... seeks to be... an expression of peasant interests .; 5) “organizer of peasant social activity”; 6) is closely and directly connected with the peasant socio-political self-awareness”.

The agrarianist discourse of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's journalistic heritage, his ideology, problems, reception are presented in the publication by V. Telvak. The researcher rightly remarked that M. Hrushevsky's views and writing were agrarianist in nature. He considered the Ukrainian peasant to be an active spokesman for his people, almost the only representative of Ukrainians.

V. Lozovy revealed the party-political peasant-centric discourse in the days of the Ukrainian revolution of 1917–21, its ideological types and mobilization possibilities. He thoroughly analysed the Ukrainian parties, organizations, movements that operated in Ukraine and whose political activities had a pronounced peasant-centric character. Types of party-political peasant-centric discourses are distinguished on the basis of the following criteria: 1. principles of solving the agrarian issue; 2. vision of the peasantry in the context of power and the state and the implementation of models of their construction.

O. Kompaniets' post is devoted to the comparative analysis of Bulgarian and Czechoslovak agrarianism. He thoroughly analysed the common and different in terms of formation and content of agrarianist ideology in Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, the intellectual agrarianist heritage of both countries, the peculiarities of the implementation of agrarianism in these countries. The researcher rightly noted that the popularity of agrarianism in Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia was due to similar reasons: 1) a series of agrarian crises of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; 2) agrarian overpopulation; 3) the threat of unemployment for agricultural workers, given the mechanization of the agricultural sector; 4) significant

lag of agriculture in the region compared to Western Europe; 5) the spread in the countries of Central and Eastern and South-Eastern Europe of universal suffrage after the World War I, which allowed the peasants to more significantly influence the political life of their countries.

The political life and agrarian issue in the columns of the Ukrainian-language tsaranist newspaper “Khlіborobska Pravda” in the second half of the 1920s were clarified in the material of V. Ilnytsky and M. Hlibishchuk. The authors rightly point out that the history of the twentieth century. was extremely rich in the existence of various socio-political and socio-economic models of development. One such historical alternative to liberal democracy and totalitarianism was agrarianism, which became widespread in Central and Eastern Europe in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. They revealed how political life and the agrarian issue were covered in the Ukrainian-language newspaper “Khlіborobska Pravda”, which was the official publication of the party of tsaranists – Romanian agrarianists.

The study of Y. Pasichna studied the socio-economic and socio-political situation of the peasantry in Central and Eastern Europe and Ukraine. A comparative analysis of the revolutionary actions of the peasantry of Ukraine and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. It has been reasonably proved that the revolutionary nature of the peasantry accelerated agrarianist transformations in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and Ukraine.

The book is designed for scientists, lecturers, students, as well as a wide range of readers, all who seek to better understand the history of Ukraine, Central and South-Eastern Europe in the first third of the twentieth century. The monograph was made in accordance with the grant of the National Research Fund of Ukraine “Agrarianism: the peasant-centric phenomenon of the Ukrainian revolution of 1917–1921”. (The registration number 2020.02 / 0120).

## UKRAINIAN AGRARIANISM OF THE PERIOD OF THE UKRAINIAN REVOLUTION OF 1917–1921 IN INTELLECTUAL HERITAGE OF G. SIMANTSIV

**Kornovenko S. V.**

### INTRODUCTION

One of the results of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 was the mass emigration of those who disagreed with the Soviet model of statehood. Ukrainian emigrants were dominated by representatives of intellectual and creative activity, public and political figures, the military and others – those who did not accept Soviet Ukraine. Interwar Europe became a refuge for such Ukrainians. The largest Ukrainian emigrant circles were concentrated in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. The fate of Ukrainian emigrants was different, it was largely determined by the country's domestic policy towards emigrants, their personal nature.

In the latest historiographical tradition, various issues on the history of Ukrainian emigration in the countries of Central-Eastern Europe of the interwar period are in the field of scientific attention. Researchers have elucidated the socio-cultural aspects of Ukrainian emigration to Czechoslovakia in the 1920s<sup>1</sup>, the activities of Ukrainian political emigration in European countries in the 1920s<sup>2</sup>; the number and social structure of Ukrainian emigration in European countries in the interwar period<sup>3</sup>; activity of Ukrainian emigration in European countries in the interwar period of the twentieth century<sup>4</sup>; composition, structure, socio-political practices of Ukrainian political emigration in Poland on the territory of Volyn Voivodeship<sup>5</sup>; establishment and activity of the Ukrainian Academy of

---

<sup>1</sup> Даниленко О. Українська еміграція в Чехословаччині. URL: <https://etic.history.univ.kiev.ua/data/2001/10/articles/6.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> Плазова Т. Українська політична еміграція у першій половині 20-х років ХХ ст. *Українська національна ідея: реалії та перспективи розвитку*. 2008. Вип. 20. С. 118–121.

<sup>3</sup> Плазова Т. Українська еміграція в країнах Європи в міжвоєнний період ХХ ст. *Науковий вісник ЛНУВМБТ імені С.Г. Гжицького*. 2010. Т. 12. № 2 (44). Ч. 5. С. 225–229.

<sup>4</sup> Плазова Т. Діяльність української еміграції в країнах Європи у міжвоєнний період ХХ ст. URL: <https://ena.lp.edu.ua>

<sup>5</sup> Давидюк Р. Українська політична еміграція в Польщі: склад, структура, громадсько-політичні практики на території Волинського воєводства : дис... док. іст. н. Львів, 2017. 704 с.



Economics in Czechoslovakia in 1922–1935<sup>6</sup>; artistic, cultural and social life of the Ukrainian emigration in interwar Czechoslovakia<sup>7</sup>, etc.

At the same time, in our opinion, it is important to study the intellectual Ukrainian product in exile. First of all, the further theoretical development of such a European peasant-centric phenomenon of the second half of the nineteenth century – 1930s, as agrarianism, represented, in particular, by Ukrainian agrarianism. In this context, it is scientifically sound to turn to the intellectual heritage of G. Simantsiv. It is about his speech “The Newest Agrarianism”, delivered in the Ukrainian Academic Community in Podebrady and in the Republican-Democratic Club in Prague in 1929.

The author of the article **aims** to explore the intellectual heritage of G. Simantsiv, presented in his report “The Newest Agrarianism”, to reveal the content of Ukrainian agrarianism of the interwar period.

### 1. The essence of agrarianism

Compositionally, the speech consists of three parts: sociological foundations; socio-political system; results. They set out the author’s understanding of modern Ukrainian agrarianism, its content and essence, the characteristic features that distinguish it from other socio-political ideologies and practices.

In the 1920’s and 1930’s in such European countries as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, etc., a common peasant-centric phenomenon, the state doctrine was agrarianism. He was represented by political parties and organizations, government circles. The ideas of agrarianism were the basis of agrarian reforms in these countries, their social basis was the peasantry – the largest number of agro-industrial countries in Central and South-Eastern Europe. At the same time, the ideas of socialism were no less popular in the socio-political life of Europe at that time. Between agrarianism and socialism, their theorists and supporters, there was competition, discussion, and so on. G. Simantsiv as a representative of Ukrainian agrarianism reasonably argued the separation of agrarianism from socialism. He emphasized that agrarianism and socialism were different political phenomena, as were the peasantry and the working class, which were the social basis of agrarianism and socialism, respectively<sup>8</sup>. In the

---

<sup>6</sup> Уткін О. Вища аграрна школа української еміграції (1922–1935 рр.). *Київські історичні студії*. 2018. № 1 (6). С. 94–102.

<sup>7</sup> Пеленська О. Україна поза Україною: Енциклопедичний словник мистецького, культурного і громадського життя в міжвоєнній Чехословаччині (1919–1939). Прага, 2019. 331 с.

<sup>8</sup> Центральний державний архів вищих органів влади і управління України (далі – ЦДАВОВУ), Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 2.

discourse proposed by G. Simantsiv we observe the longevity of the Ukrainian agrarian tradition, initiated by P. Kulish, which found a logical continuation in the agrarian ideas of M. Hrushevsky, P. Skoropadsky, V. Lypynsky, program provisions of some national political parties during the Ukrainian Revolution 1917–1921 years, regarding the separation of the city from the countryside.

At the same time, if the predecessors – P. Kulish, P. Struve – emphasized the open antagonism between city and countryside, G. Simantsiv offers a different approach. He appeals to the historical experience, especially the Soviet one, and notes: “... Socialism, after the failed practice of Russian Bolshevism... seeks in the peasantry a partner for itself rather than actively fighting it. Equally for the peasantry, workers’ socialism is the most natural ally on the path to progress”<sup>9</sup>. Thus, the author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, emphasizing the separation of agrarianism from socialism, sees no reason to oppose them. Considers peasants and workers allies in development. At the same time, the thinker clearly defines that along with socialism, “a new sociological force has grown: agrarianism”<sup>10</sup>.

We are impressed by such judgments. In fact, during the second half of the nineteenth century – in the 1930’s in Europe, in Ukraine, a qualitatively different peasant was formed. He became a peasant-ideoman – an active subject of history, the bearer of agrarian ideology. The fundamental difference between the peasantry and the working class in everyday life, culture, worldview, etc. has formed some separate ideological meanings of agrarianism and agriculture. socialism.

G. Simantsiv, operating on the achievements of the classics of European agrarian thought, such as M. Hodza, argued that the difference between agrarianism and socialism is that “socialism for a long time did not take into account the peasantry as a social factor”, it “was listed with only two human factors society: employer and employee”<sup>11</sup>. In fact, Marxism, and to a greater extent Bolshevism, leveled the role of the peasantry. According to the imperial tradition, the Bolsheviks considered him an inert, promonarchist force, an antagonist of the proletariat, expressing the interests of which they positioned themselves. They ignored the socio-cultural changes that took place among the peasantry, in particular the Ukrainian, during the second half of the nineteenth – early twentieth century. The Bolsheviks

---

<sup>9</sup> ЦДАБОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Там само.

<sup>11</sup> Там само. Арк. 3.

adopted the idea of peasant inferiority<sup>12, 13</sup>. They developed the concept of the peasantry as an ally of the proletariat in the struggle for a bright future. However, the proletariat was proclaimed the hegemon, which allegedly had nothing to lose but its own shackles<sup>14</sup>. Instead, the peasant was seen as a subject with a “dual psychology”.

In this way, only actors such as the bourgeoisie and the proletariat were active in Marxist/socialist/Bolshevik doctrine. An active subject such as the “grain-grower”, different from the “employer” and the “employee”, was overlooked. Its distinctiveness, according to G. Simantsiv, is that the farmer is not a bourgeois or a proletarian, he is “a new type of social production; ... The bearer of individualism, because he is both an entrepreneur and a producer, and equally comes as a fellow citizen, in which both factors – the employer and the entrepreneur – in one person”<sup>15</sup>.

This feature of the peasant, according to the thinker, determines the separation of agrarianism as a representative of peasant ideology from socialism – a representative of workers’ ideology. According to the author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, agrarianism “reflects in itself” “this peasant psychology and this peasant philosophy”<sup>16</sup>. For peasants, the advantage of agrarianism as a peasant ideology among other socio-political analogues, rightly believes G. Simantsiv, is that 1) it does not invent anything new, is natural for the peasantry; 2) “it does not build abstract schemes, detached from life”; 3) avoids utopian goals and objectives; 4) is a systematized “spiritual treasures of the peasantry,... seeks to be... an expression of peasant interests; 5) “organizer of peasant social activity”; 6) is closely and directly connected with the peasant socio-political self-awareness”<sup>17</sup>.

It is noteworthy that in substantiating his position G. Simantsiv takes into account the work of not only the classics of European agrarianism, but also Ukrainian socio-political thought, represented by the views of V. Lypynsky. For example, like the latter, the author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, uses such a concept as “grain-grower”. He uses it as a synonym for the peasantry. In his judgments, the thinker appeals to such a general agrarian category as “laws of the land”. It is about the struggle of two opposites: the “law of land” and the “law of capital”, that the classic of Ukrainian conservatism has repeatedly written. In particular, V. Lypynsky, in accordance with the

---

<sup>12</sup> Ленин В. Полное собрание сочинений. Москва, 1979. Т. 12. С. 362–366.

<sup>13</sup> Ленин В. Полное собрание сочинений. Москва, 1976. Т. 16. С. 235, 313, 325–326.

<sup>14</sup> Сафонов Д. Крестьянство как объект и субъект процесса модернизации. *Вісник Черкаського університету. Серія історичні науки*. 2012. № 35 (248). С. 15–18.

<sup>15</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 3.

<sup>16</sup> Там само.

<sup>17</sup> Там само. Арк. 7.

general principles of Eastern European agrarianism, clearly distinguished two worlds: the world of countryside and land and the world of city and capital. V. Lypynsky considered psychology to be the basis for distinguishing these worlds. He is convinced that the psychology of the farmer and the psychology of “stock exchange gesheftsmakers” are two opposites that do not intersect, even at an imaginary point. Their psychologies are fundamentally different in responsibility and values<sup>18</sup>. In V. Lypynsky’s interpretation, the “struggle not for life but for death” continues between them. He calls these worlds “laws”: “the laws of the earth and the laws of capital. The old civil law, based on the possession of land, and the new commercial law, based on the possession of capital<sup>19</sup>. This is a struggle, the classic of Ukrainian conservatism reasoned, a struggle between two irreconcilable worldviews. The fundamental difference between them, in our opinion, is a socio-cultural abyss caused by ways of life, values, and the meaning of life. At its core, this struggle is “a deadly battle between the countryside and the modern capitalist world. The state-economy and the state-exchange”<sup>20</sup>.

G. Simantsiv’s arguments about the moral and psychological aspects of agrarianism, in particular regarding “despair”, are original. Its author treats “The Newest Agrarianism”, as a source of deconstructive rebellion, hatred, distrust – all that leads to the degradation of both the individual and society, makes it impossible to construct an optimistic model of the future. Instead, agrarianism with its “law of the land”, not alluvial, but eternal life values – salvation from despair, the basis for building an optimistic perspective<sup>21</sup>. Such thoughts, in our opinion, are reasonable. Agrarianism really seems to be the middle ground between two irreconcilable antagonists: socialism and capitalism. This is the path of development of another, different from the industrial type of society – agrarian one, its culture and philosophy on the basis of the laws of nature, especially the “law of the land”. Similar views on the essence of agrarianism were expressed by D. Dragiev, one of the co-organizers and co-founders of the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union. In historiography, he is considered the main theorist of the program of the “third”, the peasant, not the capitalist and non-socialist path of social development<sup>22</sup>.

---

<sup>18</sup> Липинський В. Листи до братів-хліборобів. Київ ; Філадельфія, 1995. С. 33.

<sup>19</sup> Там само. С. 32.

<sup>20</sup> Там само. С. 33.

<sup>21</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 4.

<sup>22</sup> Крапивин А., Бычихин Ю. Аграризм Димитра Драгиева – вождя болгарских крестьян. *Вісник Донецького університету, Сер. Б: Гуманітарні наук.* 1998. Вип. 2. С. 69–70.

Developing his judgments about agrarianism, G. Simantsiv gave different versions of the interpretation of this concept: 1) agrarian program; 2) the ideology of agrarian movements; 3) agrarian socio-political system; 4) everything connected with the land, the manifestation of the power of the land over human; 5) unconscious sensual rationalism; 6) scientifically systematized scientific agrarianism – the antithesis of scientific socialism, liberalism, conservatism<sup>23</sup>. In his opinion, “the notion of agrarianism, such as the notion of law, socialism, etc., cannot be defined. Agrarianism can be described, understood and understood, but not defined, even common. This is a whole system of concepts, worldview. Agrarianism has its own fund of ideals, its own social philosophy and its own policy: economic, social, legal, cultural, etc.... The newest agrarianism is the peasant agrarianism<sup>24</sup>. Such an author’s approach in the interpretation of agrarianism corresponded to the level of development of that-time agrarianist and socio-political European thought in general. It does not cause fundamental objections in our vision either. At the same time, the thesis that “the concepts of agrarianism... cannot be defined” is debatable.

## **2. Socio-economic and philosophical components of agrarianism**

Having presented the author’s understanding of modern agrarianism, G. Simantsiv successfully revealed the essence of this phenomenon, the content of its socio-economic, philosophical and other components. In this we see the attempt of the author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, to systematize and generalize the previous both European and Ukrainian agrarian intellectual product, to give scientific coherence and integrity to the ideological concept. The social significance of agrarianism, according to the thinker, is that, unlike other socio-political ideologies, he treats the peasantry as “a separate social class of modern society”<sup>25</sup>. The social nature of the peasantry, according to the concept of modern agrarianism, is not identical with either the proletariat or the bourgeoisie. The phenomenon of the peasantry is that, unlike the working class, it has “its own middle peasants”, and unlike the capitalist, it “lives on the exploitation of its own power, not that of others”. The specificity of agricultural production also determined the social peculiarity of the peasantry: “it created from the peasant a kind of middle figure between two extreme, warring forces — the proletarian class

---

<sup>23</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 4.

<sup>24</sup> Там само.

<sup>25</sup> Там само. Арк. 7.

and the bourgeoisie class”<sup>26</sup>. In view of this, the peasantry is an independent, separate subject of history, – G. Simantsiv reasonably summarized.

Similar judgments about the essence of agrarianism were expressed by V. Madjara – one of the leaders of tsaranism, who has every reason to understand as a Romanian version of Eastern European agrarianism. For example, he emphasized that tsaranism was a “political movement of the peasant class against the whole system of exploitation and economic domination of capitalist society”<sup>27</sup>. The peasantry, according to the ideology of tsaranism, is a class that “plays a decisive and dominant role in Romanian agrarian society”. The Romanian countryside lives its own unique life, which goes beyond both capitalism and socialism<sup>28</sup>.

Agrarianism in the interpretation of the author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, understands social stratigraphy in the middle of the peasantry as a natural phenomenon. It is not considered, as with the Bolsheviks, the basis for the aggravation of social contradictions in the peasant environment. It is not the basis for “to see in the peasantry some differentiation of it into several classes with opposite interests”<sup>29</sup>. The theorist of modern agrarianism argued that the integrity of the peasantry, despite the social stratigraphy, is ensured by the commonality of its interests, rather than the degree of economic wealth. Thus, G. Simantsiv understands the peasantry as a community united by common values, interests, etc., as “one family”<sup>30</sup>. The complementary integrity of the peasantry is ensured by the following interests: 1) economic; 2) cultural; 3) political; 4) spiritual; social, etc.<sup>31</sup>. According to the author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, the range of common interests of the peasantry is wide, it concerns public life in all its diversity.

G. Simantsiv commented on the philosophy of agrarianism no less objectively. He defined it as anthropocentric and peasant-centric. Anthropocentrism is manifested in the following: 1) for agrarianism, each person – first of all a person and a goal in itself, despite the differences in origin, social status, etc.; 2) leaves a person the right of ideological choice: “...it does not call for a fight, neither with religion, nor against it, leaving

---

<sup>26</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 7.

<sup>27</sup> Носкова А.Ф. К вопросу об аграризме и крестьянском движении в странах Центральной и Юго-Восточной Европы в межвоенный период. *Советское славяноведение*. 1981. № 2. С. 52.

<sup>28</sup> Носкова А.Ф. К вопросу об аграризме и крестьянском движении в странах Центральной и Юго-Восточной Европы в межвоенный период. *Советское славяноведение*. 1981. № 2. С. 52.

<sup>29</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 8.

<sup>30</sup> Там само.

<sup>31</sup> Там само. Арк. 9.

everyone a free hand to occupy their position in it”<sup>32</sup>. Strategically, agrarianism, like other anthropocentric philosophical systems, strives for the universal ideal: “a perfect human in a perfectly organized society”<sup>33</sup>.

The philosophy of Newest agrarianism, despite the separation of meanings, is closely intertwined with other worldviews, is not detached from pan-European anthropocentric philosophical thought. The peculiarity of its methodology is that universal values are understood from the standpoint of peasant-centrism. G. Simantsiv, like other European agrarianists, believed that the peasantry as an active subject of history is able to create all the necessary conditions for the harmonious intellectual, physical and moral development of the individual<sup>34</sup>.

The ethical principles of agrarianism are based on the fact that it does not overestimate the moral qualities of the peasantry, while not adopting the moral codes of other classes. The ethical principles of the countryside and the moral structure of the countryside are an objective fact, which is perceived by agrarianism as a fact<sup>35</sup>. And in this, in our opinion, its peasant-centrism is clearly manifested.

The starting points in the socio-economic concept of agrarianism are purely sociological issues, – the author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, is convinced. Among the important and conceptual, he distinguishes the following: 1) the role and mission of man in society; 2) the dialectic of the relationship between the individual and society, individual social strata; 3) “how society should be organized in general and specifically in relation to the interests of the rural people”. The answers to these and other questions are based on the fundamental principle of peasant-centrism: “from the point of view of the peasant, his worldview and public interests. The needs of rural life, its imperatives – the main criterion for this”<sup>36</sup>.

According to G. Simantsiv, the peasantry played an important social and cultural role in the development of the nation and the state at that time. The author of “The Newest Agrarianism” substantiated his understanding of the role of the peasant as a builder of the state by the historical circumstances of the development of Ukrainians, first of all by the uniqueness of the peasantry in comparison with other national social strata. First of all, he took into account the unique mentality of the Ukrainian peasantry. G. Simantsiv stressed that “in the peasantry, which is closely connected with a certain territory and mentally lives a sense of spontaneous national unity, there are

---

<sup>32</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 9.

<sup>33</sup> Там само. Арк. 10.

<sup>34</sup> Там само. Арк. 11.

<sup>35</sup> Там само.

<sup>36</sup> Там само.

solid foundations for stability and endurance of national will in defense of their territory, their land”<sup>37</sup>. Like the classics of European and Ukrainian agrarianism, the thinker spoke of the peasantry as a state builder in view of the following two main, in his opinion, factors: 1) the peasantry is a talisman and embodiment of national values; 2) for the peasantry, the concept and feeling of the Motherland is not an abstraction, but a clear concreteness, nourished by the settlement and practice of management on the native land<sup>38</sup>.

In such judgments of the author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, we observe the reflection of Ukrainian agrarianist theory and practice of the early twentieth century, especially the period of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921. For example, M. Hrushevsky openly believed that, there will be a peasantry, and on it it is necessary to build it. In the long times of our worldly life, we kept repeating that the future of the Ukrainian revival and the future of Ukraine in general lay in the peasantry and only in the peasantry. For a whole century, Ukrainians and peasants became synonymous. Ever since all other strata have betrayed their nationality, all the material for nation-building has been drawn from it, and it has placed its hopes on it: and a force cut from Samson’s political and national consciousness. “It (the peasantry – S.K.) became the spring of our revolutionary movement”<sup>39</sup>. S. Efremov, analyzing the ethno-social processes in Ukraine in 1917, considered the peasantry to be the priority layer of state and national construction – the “working masses”. He defended the idea that “the basis, the ground for ideological construction among Ukrainians was still the working masses”<sup>40</sup>.

### 3. Socio-legal model of agrarianism

The socio-legal model of agrarianism in G. Simantsiv’s interpretation is of scientific interest. The author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, revealed its content by applying comparative studies. Following his previous view of agrarianism as the middle ground between capitalism and socialism, he first revealed the socio-legal model of the first two ideological systems, and then clarified the meaning of agrarian. He proposed consideration of the issue from the standpoint of law: the right of the individual and the law of society. According to him, in such a coordinate system, individualism, which is associated with liberalism through political economy, is “the soul of modern

---

<sup>37</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 11.

<sup>38</sup> Там само.

<sup>39</sup> Грушевський М. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Світ. 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 225–266. С. 252.

<sup>40</sup> Єфремов С. На партійні теми. *Нова Рада*. 1917. 9 квітня.



capitalism”<sup>41</sup>, which denies society the right to interfere in the relations of individuals and their voluntary associations. For the latter it leaves a free hand of action and initiative”<sup>42</sup>. Thus, individualism/capitalism/liberalism is the primacy of private law, limiting the role of society. Such a model, according to G. Simantsiv, is an extreme. The antithesis of individualism is collectivism, represented by socialist doctrine. It is another extreme that cultivates the dominance of society in organization and management, regardless of the interest of the individual or even individual social groups.

The author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, recognized collectivism as reactionarism and individualism. He was the first to accuse reactionism, given that he embodies the past historical stage in the development of mankind. The second saw it as a transitional, imperfect model that would soon give way to another – perfect. Given the insignificance of both, agrarianism sees no reason to defend their ideals, and at the same time does not refuse to cooperate with them, as it recognizes them as “those currents that lead to reform and improvement of modernity”<sup>43</sup>.

The optimal socio-legal model, which harmoniously combines private and public relations, according to G. Simantsiv, is agrarianism – “the third logically possible direction”, “the middle ground between the above two extreme directions”<sup>44</sup>. According to him, “society has the right and duty to manage and regulate social relations, but so that the initiative of individuals can be freely manifested. Society must not develop to the detriment and cost of killing the individual and his freedom, but equally the individual must not be completely unlimited in its effect to the detriment of society”<sup>45</sup>.

Thus, for G. Simantsiv, agrarianism is a balanced social and legal model in which private law correlates with public law. In our opinion, such a model largely corresponds to the categorical imperative of I. Kant: “Act so that the maxims (rules) that govern your will, could become the principles of general law”<sup>46</sup>.

#### **4. Agrarianism and the peasant issue**

Modern agrarianism departed from the local and purely class interests of the countryside, the algorithm that was characteristic of tsarist government circles (S. Witte, P. Stolypin), individual governments of the period of

---

<sup>41</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 12.

<sup>42</sup> Там само.

<sup>43</sup> Там само. Арк. 13.

<sup>44</sup> Там само. Арк. 12.

<sup>45</sup> Там само.

<sup>46</sup> Філософський енциклопедичний словник / В. І. Шинкарук. Київ : Інститут філософії імені Григорія Сковороди НАН України : Абрис, 2002. С. 272.

Ukrainian revolution 1917–1921 (General Secretariat, Council of Ministers). Their understanding was reduced to the consideration of the agrarian/peasant issue as local, economic. To solve it, purely economic tools were proposed to influence the improvement of the socio-economic situation of the peasantry. The latest agrarianism is characterized by a comprehensive approach to its understanding as a set of a number of issues “concerning the economic and cultural existence of the countryside in general and its fate in particular”<sup>47</sup>. The theorist believed that the reason lies much deeper – in the imperfection of the socio-political model, a numerical and important component of which is the peasantry. In this way, concludes the logic of his thoughts G. Simantsiv, the solution of the peasant issue – the improvement of social order in general: “These measures must be directed in the direction of improving and reforming all aspects of social relations. Public life is so complex and intertwined that every beat of its pulse in one way or another affects the peasantry, or at least touches it”<sup>48</sup>. Thus, according to the theorist of the newest agrarianism, the improvement of socio-economic and socio-political models in general will lead to the improvement of all aspects of peasant life. Given the numerical dominance of the peasantry in Central and Eastern European, especially Ukrainian, societies, the peasantry is an active subject of constructive transformations. This is due to its unique role in state- and nation-building.

Denying the importance of class antagonism, dictatorship, revolution as the locomotives of history, not accepting their meanings, agrarians proposed an alternative tool for improving society, in particular in the socio-economic and socio-political spheres. The main goal in the evolution of the social model, in accordance with the provisions of modern agrarianism, is “people and their good. This goal is common, and should be common to all sections of society”<sup>49</sup>. It can be achieved through the cooperation of “all social strata and units and their associations”<sup>50</sup>. Cooperation with G. Simantsiv was widely interpreted. In it he puts the following meanings: 1) “instead of class struggle – class cooperation”; 2) “instead of social struggles – mutual compromises and concessions for the common good”; 3) “cooperation of all living forces of the people”; 4) the harmonious development of “all components of society, and hence the individual”<sup>51</sup>. In fact, the author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, in our opinion, proposed an innovative for its time understanding of cooperation as a tool for implementing

---

<sup>47</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 15.

<sup>48</sup> Там само.

<sup>49</sup> Там само. Арк. 16.

<sup>50</sup> Там само.

<sup>51</sup> Там само. Арк. 17.

complementary socio-economic and socio-political models. Complementary society – a society of common values and ideals, development, prospects, comfort, harmonious combination of individual and collective principles.

The modern agrarianism saw the solution of such a component of the peasant issue as agrarian / land on the principles different from the previous ones. First of all, he understands it as a component of a holistic agrarian policy to solve the peasant question in general; secondly, its solution will take place on the basis of economic and legal programs of agrarianism, which provides for the existence of such an institution as the institution of private property<sup>52</sup>; third, it is a peaceful solution based on expediency and possible justice<sup>53</sup>. As an option, G. Simantsiv is reasonably relevant the use of such a tool as parcelling. In his favor, he puts forward the following arguments: 1) this is true, because the peasantry will receive land that previously belonged to them and which was alienated from them; 2) it is expedient, as it is a guarantee of preservation of social peace and “preservation of folk culture”<sup>54</sup>. The peasantry must clearly benefit from the solution of the agrarian/land issue: “The land must belong to the peasantry legally and in fact. There is no peasantry without land and without land. And that’s why there can be no problems here”<sup>55</sup>. In our opinion, such an idea of modern agrarianism was conditioned by the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the Ukrainian peasantry in 1917–1921, by peasant ideology. At the heart of this ideology of the peasantry during the Ukrainian Revolution was the original desire for “land and freedom”. These two concepts were closely intertwined in the minds of the peasants and had a sacred meaning for them. In this way we can state that the peasants understood and perceived all the complexity of socio-political relations, relations with the authorities through the prism of agrarian-natural existence<sup>56</sup>.

Prospects for the economic development of the peasantry by agrarianism were not identified with the development of large landholdings. G. Simantsiv noted that agrarianism is the antithesis of latifundism. His position is in solidarity with the Hetman’s 1918. On the future of Ukraine, the Ukrainian peasantry and agriculture, P. Skoropadsky wrote: “I am a supporter of small farms, particularly in Ukraine, and has repeatedly said

---

<sup>52</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 17.

<sup>53</sup> Там само.

<sup>54</sup> Там само.

<sup>55</sup> Там само. Арк. 29.

<sup>56</sup> Михайлюк О. Щодо «політичної програми» селянства України в період революції та громадянської війни. *Український селянин*. 2003. № 7. С. 103–106.

that my ideal is to see Ukraine covered only by small highly productive, private households...”<sup>57</sup>.

The solution of the agrarian/land issue on the basis of latifundism is unacceptable for agrarianism<sup>58</sup>. The option of solving the agrarian/land issue from the standpoint of black redistribution is ineffective for agrarianism. Under the conditions of that time, as under modern ones, land without capital is simply a natural resource that is not a market category. Land capitalization is no less important for peasants than land ownership. Guided by the “middle” way, modern agrarianism at the same time in the category of “capital” did not exhaust the complexity of all that “determines the welfare of the peasant”<sup>59</sup>. The combination of land and capital does not guarantee that the peasantry will receive the remuneration due to him for his work. Such a guarantor, according to the theorist of modern agrarianism, is the profitability of agriculture in general. It determines the fair wage of the peasant, not the size of land tenure / land use. In this way, the triad: land – capital – profitability – the formula for the formation of the wealthy peasantry – the socio-cultural basis of the nation and state.

We are impressed by such theoretical approaches of modern agrarianism to the solution of the agrarian issue. To a large extent, their origins originate in the program provisions of the agrarianist political parties of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, as well as certain agrarianist practices of that time in solving the agrarian question. For example, the political program of the Ukrainian Democratic Agrarian Party, the agrarian policy of the Hetmanate of 1918. In view of this, there is reason to talk about the longevity of the Ukrainian agrarian tradition in theoretical developments and practical measures.

### **5. Agrarianist state-building**

A special place in the theory of modern agrarianism is given to the state, the dialectic of individual-society-state relations, the principles of state building, and so on. The image of the agrarianist state is to a large extent a logical continuation of the previous principles of modern agrarianism. He avoided the absolutization/glorification of the state, as he avoids its denial, ie extremes in its interpretation. For him, the state is a form of “organization of society in the current state of human culture and civilization”<sup>60</sup>. In other words – the result of the natural evolution of society,

---

<sup>57</sup> Скоропадський П. Спогади. Київ ; Філадельфія, 1995. С. 137.

<sup>58</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 29.

<sup>59</sup> Там само. Арк. 30.

<sup>60</sup> Там само. Арк. 19.

nation, objective phenomenon. Accordingly, the understanding of its essence is different from other ideologies, such as Marxism. G. Simantsiv understands it as a state for society, as a means, not as an instrument of violence of those in power to retain power. In his opinion, the best is the form of the state, “which most certainly provides the conditions under which every citizen would be able to fully and comprehensively show their strength and materially ensure their existence”<sup>61</sup>.

Democracy is a fundamental principle of the agrarian state. It reflects its fundamental essence, purpose – “the good of all citizens”<sup>62</sup>. Such a state model, based on civil society, ensures “all adult citizens, regardless of status, family and property, complicity in the creation of state will”<sup>63</sup>. This complicity was realized by Ukrainian peasants during the peasant republic-building of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921. As a sociocultural, integral historical phenomenon, the peasant republic was the result of the peasant revolution, a manifestation of peasant revolutionism, peasant revolt<sup>64</sup>, realization of the political program of the peasantry, a form of socio-political and social self-organization of the peasantry, the embodiment of common peasant values and ideals. It convincingly testified to the appearance in the historical arena of that time of a new active subject of history – the peasant. The source of power in these formations were the peasantry, power was formed on an electoral democratic basis<sup>65</sup>.

In the complementary unity is the power of such a state. This is the fundamental difference between the agrarianist state and the class state. The latter delegates all power to one class to the detriment of the interests of other classes, – G. Simantsiv argued<sup>66</sup>. In accordance with this interpretation of the agrarian state, the concept of the model of its basis has been developed. It is fundamentally different from liberalism and collectivism. The latter are rejected by the latest agrarianism as one-sided, given the dominant in the first case of individual, in the second – collective. Taking this into account, the optimal for theorists of modern agrarianism is another “economic organizational principle”, which is due to the objectives of the

---

<sup>61</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 20.

<sup>62</sup> Там само.

<sup>63</sup> Там само.

<sup>64</sup> Корновенко С. Суб’єктний складник аграрного питання як одна з передумов Української революції 1917–1921 рр. *Український історичний журнал*. 2017. № 4. С. 83–94.

<sup>65</sup> Корновенко С., Берестовий А., Компанієць О., Пасічна Ю., П’явзін С., Щербаков М. Селянське республікотворення періоду Української революції 1917–1921 рр. Черкаси : Чабаненко Ю.А., 2019. 220 с.

<sup>66</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 20.

national economy. It is also determined by the ideal of “human and people, a people healthy, morally strong and educated, and at the same time a democratic people, all components of which are equal and where any supremacy of one or another stratum would be excluded”<sup>67</sup>. The guarantor of the realistic existence of such an ideal is the material security of people, their existence. Given this, farmers argue that the proper material security of man and society – the leading idea of economic policy, the main economic task<sup>68</sup>.

G. Simantsiv successfully polemized with the liberal school of political economy. He opposed the thesis of the liberal school of political economy that the highest productivity of economic goods, the cheapest supply of consumers – a priority of the economic complex. He substantiated other principles of agrarian political economy. According to them, the main thing is not so much the volume of production as their fair distribution “between individual economic entities”. Thus, the goal of the agrarianist model of the national economic complex is the profitability of “economic activity of an individual, still independently, at their own risk, working or working for hire”<sup>69</sup>, not only the production of material goods, but also their fair distribution.

The source of profitability is labour, its results. At the same time, the labour of the peasant, as well as the employee, is “threatened”<sup>70</sup>. The latest agrarianism under such conditions is, among other things, the system of labour protection in the countryside. The concept of “labour protection” is interpreted as measures of the agrarianist state, aimed at “providing the peasant with appropriate measures of agricultural policy, this profitability and supply...”<sup>71</sup>. The ultimate goal of such “labour protection” is an economically strong peasant – grain-grower, a successful state in general.

The agrarianist economic programme is a way of systematic, in accordance with the laws of evolution, restructuring of the social order on the basis of institutional complementarity – the original model of complementarity of economic institutions. Modern Japan, for example, is developing according to this model. This, in our opinion, is its difference from the then revolutionary socialism, liberalism, conservatism. In this context, G. Simantsiv wrote about economic and political cooperation of all social strata of society and the state. It is the responsibility of the latter to create the appropriate conditions under which the business entity can reach

---

<sup>67</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 20.

<sup>68</sup> Там само.

<sup>69</sup> Там само. Арк. 21.

<sup>70</sup> Там само.

<sup>71</sup> Там само. Арк. 22.

its full potential, “but without harming or exploiting others”<sup>72</sup>. A similar position was defended by Bulgarian agrarianists. For example, D. Dragiev also considered cooperation to be the optimal form of land management. He saw the main task of the government in the agricultural sector not to radically eliminate the already existing agrarian relations, but to provide conditions for the gradual growth of the welfare of the peasantry on the basis of cooperation<sup>73</sup>.

The legal program of agrarianism is based on the principle of private property right<sup>74</sup>. In this context, in our opinion, it fully reflects the national agrarianist tradition, in particular the period of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, presented in the “Letter to the whole Ukrainian people” of April 29, 1918. The Hetman’s document stated that the right of private property – the foundation of culture and civilization<sup>75</sup>. Substantiating this approach, the author of “The Newest Agrarianism”, reasonably stated: 1) only private property best provides a person with justice in the results of his work; 2) private property – the most powerful motivator of man “to economic activity, diligence, creativity and entrepreneurship”; 3) historical experience, in particular Ukrainian, convinces, “that only they who owns and has power, who owns the land, this basis of life”<sup>76</sup>.

According to the concept of the newest agrarianism as a “middle way”, private property is not only a right, it is also a duty. First of all, “to own means not only to have the right to dispose of this object indefinitely, possibly to manage it in such a way that it benefits not only the owner, but also the whole society”<sup>77</sup>. In this way, legal agrarianism is qualitatively different from capitalism and socialism. It does not accept the anti-cultural and anti-social tendencies of capitalism and denies the socialist ideology of abolishing the institution of private property, which is understood as a source of “human poverty”<sup>78</sup>.

Managing with the thesis that the meaning of human life lies in the possibility of improvement, the concept of modern agrarianism provides for an appropriate agrarianist social policy. In its content it is anthropo- and

---

<sup>72</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 23.

<sup>73</sup> Крапивин А., Бычихин Ю. Аграризм Димитра Драгиева – вождя болгарских крестьян. *Вісник Донецького університету, Сер. Б: Гуманітарні наук.* 1998. Вип. 2. С. 71.

<sup>74</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 24.

<sup>75</sup> Аграрне законодавство періоду Української революції (1917–1921 рр.): збірник документів і матеріалів / упоряд.: С.В. Корновенко, А.Г. Морозов, Ю.Г. Пасічна. Черкаси : Чабаненко Ю.А., 2019. С. 96.

<sup>76</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 25.

<sup>77</sup> Там само.

<sup>78</sup> Там само.

peasant-centric. Its task is to prevent natural disasters (hunger, cold, disease, mutilation, etc.) and to protect society from degradation or to mitigate the effects of such social deviations as moral depravity, crime, etc. Agrarianist social program is a socially complementary project. Its implementation is aimed at all segments of society, to eliminate class conflicts, to prevent natural, demographic, social cataclysms. The tool in the implementation of agricultural social policy are the relevant social institutions that are subordinated to the ideas of “socially healthy countryside and city”<sup>79</sup>.

Like other components of modern agrarianism, the cultural agrarianist program is an integral part of a holistic agrarianist approach to the evolutionary and natural improvement of society, the solution of the peasant issue in general. Without the cultural development of the countryside, agrarianists could not imagine an economic, political, social, etc. solution to the peasant issue<sup>80</sup>. G. Simantsiv understood culture as an important factor in the “progress of the countryside as a whole”<sup>81</sup>. His views on the fact that the political liberation of the Ukrainian peasantry from serfdom made him an equal member of society are correct, but “this did not make the peasant free; he is still far from true freedom, he is still burdened by the stern of spiritual darkness, superstitions, humiliation, unfounded fear of the “powerful” and all the other remnants of the old, feudal-serfdom times”<sup>82</sup>. On the basis of such an understanding of the situation in the cultural life of the peasantry with the latest agrarianism and formulated the task of agrarian cultural policy, designed to “bring a ray of light into this darkness, free the peasant from spiritual backwardness, make science and art available to him, beautify his life with cultural interests”<sup>83</sup>.

In this approach to cultural policy towards the peasantry, proposed by the latest agrarianism, we observe the longevity of traditions in Ukrainian agrarian thought. For example, P. Kulish’s reasoning in the hamlet philosophy was similar to the above. The uniqueness of peasant education, according to the thinker, is that it forms a harmonious personality that is intellectually developed, spiritually rich, with a non-lost identity. P. Kulish was in favor of the peasants reading, knowing, and being interested in what was “going on in the world”. He was convinced that “if you do not know the world of God widely, you will not know what is worthwhile”<sup>84</sup>.

---

<sup>79</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 25–26.

<sup>80</sup> Там само. Арк. 28.

<sup>81</sup> Там само. Арк. 27.

<sup>82</sup> Там само.

<sup>83</sup> Там само.

<sup>84</sup> Куліш П. Твори в 2 т. Київ, Дніпро, 1989. Т. 2. С. 244–280. С. 279.



## 6. The main features of agrarianism

Summarizing the essence of the newest agrarianism, G. Simantsiv identified the main, in his opinion, features/characteristics. First of all, the newest agrarianism is a new socio-political system, a holistic realistic worldview. Its appearance is due to “real objective circumstances and it understands this life and tries to influence it only on the basis of modern social relations and the means of veche abilities. Realism in ideas, realism in ranks”<sup>85</sup>. At the same time, agrarianism is the middle ground between collectivism and individualism. Its purpose is to create “the most favorable conditions for the peasantry for its existence and development”<sup>86</sup>. Thus, agrarianism is a peasant-centric phenomenon.

The second. A characteristic feature of the newest agrarianism is its historicism in the form of elasticity. It is not dogmatic, despite the fact that G. Simantsiv positioned it as a “peasant political religion”<sup>87</sup>. The newest agrarianism is gaining the meaning “given to it by the peasantry itself”. This does not deny that agrarianism is a holistic and natural phenomenon, because “the peasant worldview and psychology are generally common to all peoples and at all times. The laws of nature apply here, under which the peasantry and their own lands work over man, which are the same and unchanging in every country”<sup>88</sup>.

The third. One of the foundations of the latest agrarianism is its democracy. This is due to the fact that the nature of the peasantry is actually democratic. Democracy, according to the theorist of modern agrarianism, is an instrument of internal social complementarity. The latter is “the only reliable guarantee of social peace”<sup>89</sup>.

The fourth. The latest agrarianism systematically and consistently defends the understanding of the peasantry as a separate subject of history, as a “separate social class”. The peasantry is radically different from the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, it is a separate, “new social type – the agrarian”<sup>90</sup>. Separation primarily lies in the syntheticity of the peasantry, “because it carries the beginnings of collectivism and individualism”, it is all labour<sup>91</sup>.

---

<sup>85</sup> ЦДАВОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 32.

<sup>86</sup> Там само.

<sup>87</sup> Там само. Арк. 33.

<sup>88</sup> Там само.

<sup>89</sup> Там само. Арк. 34.

<sup>90</sup> Там само. Арк. 33.

<sup>91</sup> Там само. Арк. 33–34.

The fifth. The newest agrarianism is focused on the social protection of those “whose labour consequences are threatened”<sup>92</sup>. Social protection tools for different categories of society are different, taking into account the characteristics of social strata. They are special for the peasantry. Social protection of the peasantry by agrarianism is interpreted broadly – the social protection of the peasantry, the preservation of its political, professional, cultural and social institutions<sup>93</sup>.

The sixth. Agrarianism contrasts the modern city with the modern countryside. According to G. Simantsiv, these two worlds are mutually interested in each other. The countryside fed the city biologically. The newest agrarianism calls for the countryside to nourish the city also ideologically. In this, agrarianism sees the task of the peasantry – “to restore this balance and balance the extremes of modern society. The peasantry must bring to the modern city the primordial human goods lost by this city – nature and peace”<sup>94</sup>.

The seventh. Agrarianism does not exaggerate the role and importance of innovations, rapid and unexpected social transformations. It is careful about this, guided by psychological and material motives: do not rush and do not procrastinate. “New ideas must first of all mature well in the minds and souls of the people”<sup>95</sup>. Only after that it is necessary to implement them in practice. Priority should be given to the work and efforts aimed at the accumulation of national wealth, “appropriate management and fair distribution of the results of the national economy among members of the nation”<sup>96</sup>.

## CONCLUSIONS

Thus, summarizing, we state. G. Simantsiv’s speech “The Newest Agrarianism” is a Ukrainian intellectual product related to such a peasant-centric phenomenon of the second half of the nineteenth century – 1930s agrarianism. The report outlines the Ukrainian version of agrarianism as a socio-political ideology. Conceptually, the Simantsiv model of modern agrarianism is based on understanding not only European agrarianist theoretical thought, but also Ukrainian. The longevity of the Ukrainian intellectual agrarianist tradition, which is presented in the report, is obvious. G. Simantsiv managed to logically and consistently reveal the essence and content of modern agrarianism. He substantiates the principles and positions

---

<sup>92</sup> ЦДАБОВУ, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747, Арк. 37, Арк. 34.

<sup>93</sup> Там само. Арк. 34–35.

<sup>94</sup> Там само. Арк. 35.

<sup>95</sup> Там само.

<sup>96</sup> Там само.

of modern agrarianism, relating to the individuality of the peasantry, its mentality, the role of the peasantry as an active subject of state- and nation-building, and so on. In our opinion, the intellectual heritage of G. Simantsiv, presented in the report “The Newest Agrarianism”, is a generalization of European and Ukrainian agrarianist theoretical thought, a coherent and well-founded Ukrainian concept of agrarianism of that time.

#### REFERENCES

1. Аграрне законодавство періоду Української революції (1917–1921 рр.) : збірник документів і матеріалів / упоряд.: С.В. Корновенко, А.Г. Морозов, Ю.Г. Пасічна. Черкаси : Чабаненко Ю.А., 2019. 554 с.
2. Грушевський М. Твори: у 50 т. Львів : Світ. 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. 407 с.
3. Давидюк Р. Українська політична еміграція в Польщі: склад, структура, громадсько-політичні практики на території Волинського воєводства: дис. ... док. іст. н. Львів, 2017. 704 с.
4. Даниленко О. Українська еміграція в Чехословаччині. URL: [https:// ethnic.history.univ.kiev.ua/data/2001/10/articles/6.pdf](https://ethnic.history.univ.kiev.ua/data/2001/10/articles/6.pdf).
5. Єфремов С. На партійні теми. *Нова Рада*. 1917. 9 квітня.
6. Корновенко С. Суб’єктний складник аграрного питання як одна з передумов Української революції 1917–1921 рр. *Український історичний журнал*. 2017. № 4. С. 83–94.
7. Корновенко С., Берестовий А., Компанієць О., Пасічна Ю., П’янзін С., Щербаков М. Селянське республікотворення періоду Української революції 1917–1921 рр. Черкаси : Чабаненко Ю.А., 2019. 220 с.
8. Крапивин А., Бычихин Ю. Аграризм Димитра Драгиева – вождя болгарских крестьян. *Вісник Донецького університету, Сер. Б: Гуманітарні наук*. 1998. Вип. 2. С. 69–72.
9. Куліш П. Твори в 2 т. Київ : Дніпро, 1989. Т. 2. 354 с.
10. Ленин В. Полное собрание сочинений. Москва, 1976. Т. 16.
11. Ленин В. Полное собрание сочинений. Москва, 1979. Т. 12.
12. Липинський В. Листи до братів-хліборобів. Київ, Філадельфія, 1995. 470 с.
13. Михайлюк О. Щодо «політичної програми» селянства України в період революції та громадянської війни. *Український селянин*. 2003. № 7. С. 103–106.
14. Носкова А.Ф. К вопросу об аграризме и крестьянском движении в странах Центральной и Юго-Восточной Европы в межвоенный период. *Советское славяноведение*. 1981. № 2. С. 40–57.

15. Пеленська О. Україна поза Україною: Енциклопедичний словник мистецького, культурного і громадського життя в міжвоєнній Чехословаччині (1919–1939). Прага, 2019. 331 с.

16. Плазова Т. Діяльність української еміграції в країнах Європи у міжвоєнний період ХХ ст. URL: <https://ena.lp.edu.ua>.

17. Плазова Т. Українська еміграція в країнах Європи в міжвоєнний період ХХ ст. *Науковий вісник ЛНУВМБТ імені С.Г. Гжицького*. 2010. Т. 12. № 2 (44). Ч. 5. С. 225–229.

18. Плазова Т. Українська політична еміграція у першій половині 20-х років ХХ ст. *Українська національна ідея: реалії та перспективи розвитку*. 2008. Вип. 20. С. 118–121.

19. Сафонов Д. Крестьянство как объект и субъект процесса модернизации. *Вісник Черкаського університету. Серія: Історичні науки*. 2012. № 35 (248). С. 15–18.

20. Скоропадський П. Спогади. Київ, Філадельфія, 1995. 493 с.

21. Уткін О. Вища аграрна школа української еміграції (1922–1935 рр.). *Київські історичні студії*. 2018. № 1 (6). С. 94–102.

22. Філософський енциклопедичний словник / В.І. Шинкарук. Київ : Інститут філософії імені Григорія Сковороди НАН України : Абрис, 2002. 742 с.

23. Центральний державний архів вищих органів влади і управління України, Ф. 4465, Оп. 1, Спр. 747.

## **AGRARIAN DISCOURSE OF MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY'S JOURNALISTIC HERITAGE: IDEOLOGY, ISSUES, RECEPTION**

**Telvak V. P.**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Mykhailo Hrushevsky's journalistic legacy is a well-studied part of his diverse works to date, as evidenced by dissertations and monographs, as well as many article publications. However, while studying numerous aspects and problems of the scholar's journalistic work, researchers pay unjustifiably little attention to the conceptual dimension of the issue, i.e., to those leading worldview ideas that determined the semantic accents of Hrushevsky's texts. Perhaps the most prominent in this regard is the sobornost ideology of the historian's work which structured all his scientific and public activities.

Therefore, we want to clarify other ideological dominants of the national service of M. Hrushevsky. After careful processing of Hrushevsky's publications, we noticed scholar's significant interest in peasantry issues. The variety, topics and amount of these texts allow us to claim that Hrushevsky consciously constructed his agrarian model – a historiographical problem that has been unnoticed so far. The author of "History of Ukraine-Rus" was a leader in the Ukrainian movement, and his ideas gained exceptional popularity among a wide range of sympathisers and opponents. Therefore, studying this multifaceted problem will allow a holistic reconstruction of an essential component of the Great Ukrainian's intellectual heritage and, in general, of the ideological discussions of the defining period of the national revival.

The source basis of our research was the various journalistic works of M. Hrushevsky of the end of the XIX – the beginning of the XX century, that discuss peasantry-related issues. These texts have been republished and commented on in the first four volumes of Hrushevsky's academic collection. Among the most valuable historiographical studies we will mention the successful attempt of Vitaliy Masnenko to find out the peasant aspects of M. Hrushevsky's historiographical heritage<sup>1</sup>, research of Svitlana Pankova<sup>2</sup> and Vitaliy Telvak<sup>3</sup> on peasantry-related publishing projects of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Масненко В.В. Селянство в історичній концепції Михайла Грушевського. *Український селянин*. 2004. № 8. С. 47–50.

<sup>2</sup> Панькова С. Михайло Грушевський і народна газета «Село» у світлі мемуарних та епістолярних джерел. *Український історик*. 2004–2005. № 3-4/1. С. 25–46.

historian, as well as several special essays on the ideology and peculiarities of Great Ukrainian's journalism<sup>4</sup>. However, these and other studies, investigate this component of Hrushevsky's journalism superficially, which determines the relevance of our research.

### 1. At the turn of the century

At the source of M. Hrushevsky's interest in peasantry issues is Narodniks ideology that was popular among Ukrainian intellectuals of the XIX century. Mykola Kostomarov and Mykhailo Maksymovych, authoritative founders of Ukrainian academic studies, and Hrushevsky's Kyiv teachers Volodymyr Antonovych and Oleksandr Konysky were the creators of this ideology. In the end, the historian himself admitted that "when half a century later I dared to utter these theses completely to the last word [...] I only named the ideas, the views, the comparisons given by our first rector [M. Maksymovych]"<sup>5</sup>. Fully sharing the teachers' convictions, M. Hrushevsky emphasized in his inaugural lecture at Lviv University in early October 1894: "Our people connect them [periods of Ukrainian history] into one whole, and they are and must be the alpha and omega of historical research. Only the people, their ideas, challenges, struggles, haste, and mistakes are the hero of history. Our history aims to understand their economic, cultural and spiritual peculiarities, adventures, desires and aspirations"<sup>6</sup>.

M. Hrushevsky constructed historiographical discourse and his public work, particularly his journalism, following this historiosophical maxim. In its pages, the scholar has repeatedly stated that "peasantry" is the key to understanding the logic of the development of the modern Ukrainian movement. Thus, speaking on November 1, 1898, at the centenary of the revival of Ukrainian literature, M. Hrushevsky stressed that its primary goal

---

<sup>3</sup> Тельвак В. Культурна політика Михайла Грушевського як редактора селянських газет. *Український селянин*. 2018. Вип. 19. С. 127–133; Telvak V., Zhuravliov S. Mykhailo Hrushevsky's editorial projects for peasants: ideology, topics, perception. *Український селянин*. 2020. Вип. 23. С. 78–81.

<sup>4</sup> Верстюк В. Доба Центральної Ради в публіцистичній спадщині М. Грушевського. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво "Світ", 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. V–XVI. Панькова С. «...Ні хвилі не вважав себе емігрантом, тільки закордонним робітником на нашій національній ниві» (Публіцистика Михайла Грушевського доби еміграції: квітень 1919 р. – лютий 1924 р.). Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2013. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. V–XVIII.

<sup>5</sup> Грушевський М. «Малоросійські пісні» Максимовича і століття української наукової праці. *Український історик*. 1984. № 1–4. С. 138.

<sup>6</sup> Грушевський М. Вступний виклад з давньої історії Русі. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2002. Т. 1. С. 73.

was to show the Ukrainian peasant an active spokesman for their people. “When people,” explained the historian, “[...] instead of ethnographic studies [began] to try to focus on a Ukrainian peasant and let him speak for himself, the fate of Ukrainian literature was decided”<sup>7</sup>. Along with literature, focus on the interests of the peasantry also became a marker of the new Ukrainian historiography, a trend started by M. Kostomarov: “After wars and power struggles, the people are taking the lead, brought to the fore by the Narodniks as the bearer of the truth, the owner of priceless treasures of folk art”<sup>8</sup>.

To understand the phenomenon of the Ukrainian peasantry, M. Hrushevsky depicts its historical evolution from one of the social strata to the main representative group of Ukrainians. Following the historiosophical rhetoric of romanticism, M. Hrushevsky writes: “After the upper classes abandoned their roots, the peasantry became the basis in the concept of Ukrainian nationality”. The historian claims: “the needs and challenges of the Ukrainian peasantry are now the needs and challenges of all Ukrainians”<sup>9</sup>.

In Hrushevsky’s opinion, the most important event in the history of the peasantry of the XIX century was the liberation from serfdom. As M. Hrushevsky claims, for the Ukrainian nation, represented by millions of peasants with small groups of the semi-aware intelligentsia, the abolition of serfdom opened prospects for education, culture, universal and national interests that eventually led to significant conscious changes. The scholar emphasizes that without the emancipation of the peasantry, “the results of national development achieved in fifty years would be impossible”<sup>10</sup>.

Diagnosing the situation of the modern peasantry, M. Hrushevsky compares his life in the Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires. Despite the mental, religious and economic differences, the scholar notes similar problems that Ukrainian peasants on both sides of Zbruch faced daily. The peasant population mainly was landless, economically dependent on large landholdings and was under the oppression of bureaucratic power, privileged nobility and extensive landholdings. Thus, national persecution was

---

<sup>7</sup> Грушевський, М. Українсько-руське літературне відродження в історичнім розвої українсько-руського народу. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2002. Т. 1. С. 115.

<sup>8</sup> Грушевський, М. Українська історіографія і Микола Костомаров. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 2. С. 405.

<sup>9</sup> Грушевський М. Справа українських катедр і наші наукові потреби. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2002. Т. 1. С. 458.

<sup>10</sup> Грушевський М. Два ювілеї. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 2. С. 420.

exacerbated by economic and cultural oppression, and throughout the Ukrainian territory, the national problem was inextricably intertwined with socio-political and economic issues. Summing up his observations, M. Hrushevsky emphasizes: “The Ukrainian element is not only a separate nation, but also, to a large extent, a separate class – a class of small rural owners, that needs socio-political and economic reforms at least in order to implement those civic and national rights already recognized for them on paper”<sup>11</sup>.

To implement his beliefs into practice, M. Hrushevsky turns to journalism, opening a discussion about necessary reforms and justifying the need for immediate action. He started with initiatives concerning Galician lands. When Hrushevsky emigrated to the constitutional Austria-Hungary, he discovered a well-established Ukrainian public life. However, the scholar noted that the leaders of the Galician political circle did not pay enough attention to the needs of the peasantry. At that time, the peasantry accounted for, according to historians, 2,885,000 or 93.7% of all Ukrainians in the Danube monarchy. Galician leaders chose to neglect the interests of the peasantry as they were unwilling to exacerbate the conflict with the owners of the region, the Poles. Most of the land was in the hands of representatives of the Polish nobility. Thus, the agrarian issue inevitably acquired distinct features of interethnic struggle.

Having been particularly well versed in the problems of the genesis of the Polish-Ukrainian confrontation in Galicia, M. Hrushevsky defended the right of Ukrainians to equal governance with the Poles and proved the maturity of cultural and political demands of compatriots. Assessing the nature of Polish-Ukrainian relations, the scholar noted that in the environment of the constitutional state, Austria-Hungary, “Galicia became a touchstone for Polish-Ukrainian relations”. The system of governing Galicia, which developed in the XIX century, opposed the national interests of the Ukrainian population. After gaining the trust of the central Austrian government, the Polish aristocratic circles gained control and power. In his articles attributed to this problem, Hrushevsky identified three main issues that triggered the Polish-Ukrainian confrontation: the agrarian issue, electoral reform, the problem of the Ukrainization of public education. Those problems were not solved during the last decades of the 19th century. Without solving them, as the Lviv professor rightly noted, the full-fledged cultural and national development of the Ukrainians of Austria-Hungary was impossible.

---

<sup>11</sup> Грушевський М. Українці. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 90.



As a part of his solution to the agrarian issue, M. Hrushevsky initiated creating a state land fund by buying land from large landowners and sharing it with small farmers. According to his vision, this initiative should have improved welfare and significantly reduced interethnic antagonism in the region. The Ukrainian publicist also encouraged reforming the electoral legislation. He suggested introducing universal suffrage to replace voting curia. As M. Hrushevsky claimed, this reform would have allowed Ukrainians to finally become the real masters of their land due to a significant increase in representation in the local parliament. Reacting to the accusations of Polish publicists about the insufficient political culture of “Rus peasants”, the historian noted the considerable public consciousness of Ukrainian peasants. Carefully following their opposition to Polish domination, M. Hrushevsky stressed that “the struggle for universal and direct suffrage and parliamentary elections revealed among the peasantry firm political consciousness, strong organizational tact, vigorous public energy, unexpected until recently from an «ignorant rustic»”<sup>12</sup>.

According to the historian, the educational issue was especially relevant for the Ukrainian peasant. Analysing the current state of Galician schooling deteriorated by Polish ruling in all spheres of life, M. Hrushevsky appeals to the legal foundation of the Austrian state. He reminded his Polish opponents that paragraph 19 of the 1867 Constitution recognises the equality of all languages in education and guarantees every nationality the right to study in their native language<sup>13</sup>. However, the Polish political leadership adopted new amendments to national laws, which enforced the dominance of the Polish language and Poles in the educational sphere of Galicia. Among the shortcomings of this situation, M. Hrushevsky first notes the appointment of Polish teachers in rural schools with a predominant Ukrainian population, contrary to didactic requirements<sup>14</sup>. In such schools, the scientist argues, after analysing numerous facts, Polish teachers are engaged not so much in the education as in the denationalisation of the Ukrainian younger generation, resorting to completely non-pedagogical and often openly criminal acts.

M. Hrushevsky proposed a resolution of such a problematic situation by establishing private Ukrainian public schools, claiming that “we will never

---

<sup>12</sup> Грушевський М. Українці. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 117.

<sup>13</sup> Грушевський М. Листи з над Полтави. Лист третій. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2002. Т. 1. С. 165.

<sup>14</sup> Грушевський М. Шкільна справа в Галичині. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 393–394.

have too many of these schools”<sup>15</sup>. Calling on Galician citizens to donate to this noble cause, the scholar argued that “the creation of a national school is one of the strongest guarantees of national revival”<sup>16</sup>. The historian encouraged not just the formal nationalization of the public school with a mere introduction of the Ukrainian language of instruction but called for the adaptation of the entire curriculum to “the needs of Ukrainian society, its life, its challenges and circumstances”.

Polish observers of M. Hrushevsky’s public activity were unequivocally hostile to his proposals to make life easier for the Ukrainian peasant, as this should have happened at the expense of a significant restriction of the Polish “prawo posiadania”. The scholar was accused of political campaigning and even instigating resistance to the established Galician order. The Polish press did not hesitate to label the respected scholar a “political dilettante”, “leader of the scientific and political radicalism of the Galician Ruthenians”, “a socialist by conviction”, and even a “Haidamaks’ herald”<sup>17</sup>.

M. Hrushevsky also devoted his attentive and insightful journalism to understanding the life and challenges of a Dnipro peasant. As soon as the Russian Empire proclaimed constitutional freedoms, the scholar immediately plunged into political life, offering solutions to many pressing issues for Ukrainians. The focus of the historian’s journalism addressed to the Russian reader was the problems of the peasantry as the representative of Ukrainians. The problems became especially acute following the events of early 1906, after the elections to the First State Duma in Russia. The Ukrainian Parliamentary Community (UPC), comprised of 45 deputies, joined the first Duma. The UPC was composed of representatives of different political views and social statuses united by a desire to improve the situation in Ukraine. The majority of the UPC intelligentsia belonged to the Kadet Party, and many representatives of the peasantry belonged to the Trudovik faction. Therefore, it was not easy to consolidate such a diverse parliamentary community despite belonging to a common national platform, and M. Hrushevsky strived to unite such a diverse political group. The arrival of the historian in the Russian capital was crucial for the Ukrainian deputies of the First Duma. Dmytro Doroshenko, a witness and participant in those events, wrote: “We all viewed Hrushevsky as the leader of the Ukrainian national movement in Russia. His outstanding scientific and public merits, extraordinary organizational talent ensured his great authority and our deep respect. He was a symbol of all-Ukrainian unity, and his word was the

---

<sup>15</sup> Грушевський М. За рідну школу. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 78.

<sup>16</sup> Там само. С. 69.

<sup>17</sup> Тельвак В. Постаць Михайла Грушевського в польській історіографії (кінець XIX–XX ст.). *Український історичний журнал*. 2006. № 5. С. 67–82.

law for us at that time. He was in the prime of his life, full of energy and bold plans. With Hrushevsky's arrival in St. Petersburg, everyone obeyed him unconditionally, and he became the ideological leader of both the editorial board of the "Ukrainian Herald" and the Ukrainian parliamentary community"<sup>18</sup>.

As most UPC members were representatives of the peasantry, M. Hrushevsky focused on political counselling of newly elected parliamentarians. Following active communication, the scholar claimed that among them were "indeed very intelligent and conscious people, but most of them became ambassadors quite by accident and are only beginners in political education"<sup>19</sup>. M. Hrushevsky established effective communication with the peasantry. UPC meetings with the participation of a Lviv professor became a political school for them. Hrushevsky was delighted that many conscious Ukrainians among the peasant deputies were ready to defend national postulates. M. Hrushevsky noted with noticeable pride: "[...] The Ukrainian peasantry shows such an insightful – despite circumstances of their lives – judgement, political and social knowledge and civic education, that it should dispel any pessimistic ideas about the future of Russian Ukraine in better constitutional circumstances"<sup>20</sup>.

Given the dominance of peasants in the UPC, M. Hrushevsky prioritised the solution of the agrarian issue. No other people of the Romanov empire, the historian emphasized, was more interested in its solution than the Ukrainians. According to M. Hrushevsky, "the national motive is greatly linked to the motives of a general democratic nature"<sup>21</sup>. Most landless peasants were Ukrainians, and large landowners were Russians, Poles or Russified compatriots. Therefore, according to the scholar, a solution to the land issue alone "will give the Ukrainian people back what was stolen from it, will make amends for the inflicted damage, will become an act of historical justice for Ukrainians"<sup>22</sup>.

M. Hrushevsky traditionally connected the agrarian issue with the national one. According to the scientist, the solution should be implemented stage by stage. First, the Duma must adopt a general imperial law on forced expropriation, in the interests of farmers, of all kinds of land surpluses, whether for ransom or without it. Then these surpluses should have constituted a land fund that would distribute the land to the peasants. Local authorities should have

---

<sup>18</sup> Дорошенко Д. Мої спомини про давнє минуле 1901–1914. Вінніпег, Манітоба, 1949. С. 83.

<sup>19</sup> Грушевський М. У українських послів Російської Думи. *З біжучої хвилі*. Київ, 1907. С. 54.

<sup>20</sup> Там само. С. 55.

<sup>21</sup> Грушевський, М. Аграрне питання. *З біжучої хвилі*. Київ, 1907. С. 99.

<sup>22</sup> Там само. С. 101.

organised land committees. Their primary task would have been the organisation of land measuring, considering economic and ethnographic factors. At the same time, M. Hrushevsky warned: “We should prevent the creation of a general imperial land fund, because it will strengthen the centralisation of the state”<sup>23</sup>. He also drew attention to the fact that the agrarian issue should be resolved simultaneously with the decentralization of the state on the principles of regional and national-territorial autonomy. The scholar tried to convince the representatives of the peasantry that only the federal system will provide a fair solution to the agrarian issue. Despite the advantages of M. Hrushevsky’s agrarian project, it never became the subject of parliamentary debates of either the first or the next convocation, although Ivan Franko predicted that the project was likely to spark controversy because of its “radical principle and moderate [...] implementation”<sup>24</sup>.

The dissolution of the First Duma was a severe blow to all conscious Ukrainians as lawlessness once again reigned in the country. From the failures of the Ukrainian faction of the First Duma, M. Hrushevsky formulated “a self-evident axiom that purely political national work is almost impossible when it does not rely on cultural work. That without a well-organised press, popular and informational publications and systematic raising awareness about our challenges and tasks, purely political agitation is impossible, success is impossible neither in the organisation, nor in the fulfilment of political agenda [...] We will need better and stronger press, more educational and cultural organisations, and above all a stronger organisational spirit than before”<sup>25</sup>.

Substantiating the need for the Ukrainian mass press in the Dnipro region, M. Hrushevsky emphasised the importance of educational work in the countryside. Only the multi-million peasantry, in his opinion, was the reliable force that the activists of the Ukrainian national liberation movement could count on for support. However, in the early twentieth century, most of the peasantry remained nationally unconscious. M. Hrushevsky sought to awaken its national feelings with his publishing activity. He insisted: “We also need organisations for the distribution of Ukrainian books in the countryside, we need a friendly intelligentsia already accustomed to the Ukrainian literature in the villages. It would spread the Ukrainian literature and engage rural readers. Finally, it is necessary that Ukrainian literature answer vital political, social, economic, economic questions, which are

---

<sup>23</sup> Грушевський М. Вопрос дня. *Український вестник*. 1906. Вип. 2. С. 81.

<sup>24</sup> Франко І. Українська трибуна в Росії. *Літературно-науковий вісник*. 1906. Вип. 35. С. 337.

<sup>25</sup> Грушевський М. Після думи. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2002. Т. 1. С. 372.

already rising among the educated peasantry. With the further development of freedom and political life in Russia, they will speak up more and will be more powerful. Otherwise, the Ukrainian village will remain as far from the Ukrainian literary movement as the Russian village from the recent great Russian literature”, M. Hrushevsky claimed<sup>26</sup>. These lines reflect the main directions of historian’s public activity in relation to the peasantry, which he tried to implement.

The illustrated weekly “Village” (“Selo”), founded by M. Hrushevsky and published in September 1909, aimed at promoting educational work. The newly created newspaper had a clear pro-peasant and popularizing orientation. It provided information on events in Ukraine and abroad in an easy and accessible form. M. Hrushevsky emphasized that the “Village” is for people “who have neither the time nor the ability to read large daily newspapers,” and they “could learn from this small newspaper in short and simple words in their own language about everything important happening around them”<sup>27</sup>. The scholar involved selected literary activists from Ukraine to cooperate in the newspaper “Village”. Among the collaborators were V. Vynnychenko, A. Krymsky, V. Samylenko and others. During the existence of the newspaper, M. Hrushevsky himself published 84 articles in it. Mykhailo Kotsyubynsky praised the publication of the first issue of Village, noting in a letter to M. Hrushevsky: “I have just read the first issue of Village and I hasten to share my impressions with you. And they are the best. The issue is very interesting, the articles are easy to read, talentedly written and are an interesting read. Presentation and illustrations make the best impression. We have never had such a great newspaper for peasant audience. We congratulate you and everyone who cares about this great goal that was only a dream before (a good newspaper for peasant audience). Now it has finally come true.”<sup>28</sup> [Underline by M. Kotsyubynsky – author].

As expected, the authorities did not like the social and national message of the newspaper. The publication was under the watchful eye of censors. M. Hrushevsky’s close participation in the “Village” drew the attention of the Kyiv gendarmerie. The “Village”’s faced numerous challenges throughout its existence until February 1911. “Exactly a year and six months have passed since we began to publish this newspaper, wanting to do our best to educate and raise awareness among our people,” M. wrote in the final issue to readers. “We diligently did our work, but it became harder and harder to continue.

---

<sup>26</sup> Грушевський М. Українство і питання дня в Росії. *З біжучої хвилі*. Київ, 1907. С. 17.

<sup>27</sup> Грушевський М. До читальників. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 287.

<sup>28</sup> Гісцова Л., упор. Листи Михайла Коцюбинського до Михайла Грушевського. *Записки НТШ*. 1992. Т. ССXXIV. С. 292.

It is difficult now to publish independent press in general, and it is even harder to issue it in Ukrainian, and it is even more challenging to publish it for peasant audience”<sup>29</sup>. In these concluding lines, the scholar expressed his grief for the persecuted Ukrainian press. After the final closing of the newspaper, M. Hrushevsky once again expressed his sincere concern that “the loss of an organ that managed to gain a good reputation and trust of our peasant is truly unfortunate for our young and not yet rich national life”<sup>30</sup>.

Despite the arbitrariness of censorship, brutal harassment in the Russian chauvinist press, and annoying police surveillance, M. Hrushevsky did not stop publishing activities aimed at the peasant audience. He began to issue a new newspaper, “Zasiv”, published during 1911–1912. To reduce authorities’ oppression of the new newspaper, M. Hrushevsky handed over the editorial board to a group of Ukrainian writers. However, the change of board did not stop the fines and prohibitions newspaper suffered from since the first day. The issues of both publishing projects of the Lviv professor were quite similar. The authors of the newspapers urged their readers to solve their problems pro-actively, campaigned for native language education, explained the benefits of rural cooperation and the introduction of modern agricultural practices, and many more.

As was the case with Polish public commentators M. Hrushevsky, Russian publicists also treated it with caution. The agrarian initiatives of the historian aimed at transferring the lands of large owners to the Ukrainian peasantry caused an indignant uproar. The scholar was accused of propagating socialist ideas and inciting the peasantry to revolt<sup>31</sup>. M. Hrushevsky’s publishing projects faced even greater conflict on the part of the authorities. As one of the scholar’s assistants, Yuriy Tyshchenko-Siriy, wrote to Hrushevsky in Lviv: “In many places, the “Village” is considered an illegal newspaper. And the governor of Ekaterinoslav even asked the governor of Kiev whether “Village” is really allowed, or whether this newspaper is clandestine”<sup>32</sup>.

---

<sup>29</sup> Грушевський М. До наших читачів. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 280.

<sup>30</sup> Грушевський М. Недооцінюванне. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 2. С. 188.

<sup>31</sup> Тельвак В. «Ересиарх українського движенья» (рецепція творчої спадщини М. Грушевського в російському правомонархічному середовищі першої третини ХХ ст.). *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2010. Вип. 20. С. 131–154.

<sup>32</sup> Панькова С. Михайло Грушевський і народна газета «Село» у світлі мемуарних та епістолярних джерел. *Український історик*. 2004–2005. № 3-4/1. С. 42.

## 2. Ukrainian War of Independence

The outbreak of the First World War and subsequent revolutionary events made significant adjustments to the creative laboratory of Hrushevsky, a publicist. During 1917–1919 a historian constructed the ideology of the Ukrainians and tried to implement his proposals as events that dramatically changed the map of Europe unfolded. M. Hrushevsky chose journalistic speeches in periodicals as a critical tool for influencing the consciousness of contemporaries. The author compiled the most important and famous speeches in thematic brochures published in large numbers. It resulted in a significant prevalence and influence of the visions of the chairman of the Central Council.

The February Revolution broke out when M. Hrushevsky was in exile in Moscow. Despite being supervised by the police, he launched a rather rapid scientific, publishing, social and cultural work<sup>33</sup>. As the military and revolutionary events complicated the communication, the historian learned from newspapers about a coordination inter-party centre formed by Kyiv Ukrainians, named the Central Rada. Its creators unanimously approved the candidacy of M. Hrushevsky for the head of this public association. They relied on his extraordinary talents as an organizer and moderator in settling ideological disputes. Recalling the events of that time, Dmytro Doroshenko wrote: “Seeing how difficult it was to agree, listen and work together, both sides had high hopes for the arrival of prof. M. Hrushevsky, who was expected to arrive from day to day. The position of the chairman of the Central Council was reserved for him. His personal and public authority, respected in all Ukrainian circles, was hoped to reconcile all contradictions and unite everyone to work together for the public good”<sup>34</sup>.

Once in Ukraine, M. Hrushevsky expertly diagnosed the greatest threat to the Ukrainian movement at that time – the significant atomization of its leaders and members. Therefore, he rapidly developed a new unifying ideology for Ukrainians, which faced the relevant challenges and part ways with the old cultural slogans. At the same time, he, using solid pre-revolutionary experience<sup>35</sup>, did his best to build a network of Ukrainian media. Without them, it was not possible to spread the ideology of the new Ukrainians outside of Kyiv. In the pages of renewed and newly created journals (Nova Rada, Literary-Scientific Herald, News from the Ukrainian

---

<sup>33</sup> Пиріг Р.Я., Тельвак В.В. Михайло Грушевський : біографічний нарис. Київ : Либідь, 2016. С. 259–269.

<sup>34</sup> Дорошенко Д. Мої спомини про недавнє-минуле (1914–1920). Мюнхен, 1969. С. 86–87.

<sup>35</sup> Тельвак В. Культурна політика Михайла Грушевського як редактора селянських газет. *Український селянин*. 2018. Вип. 19. С. 127–133.

Central Rada in Kyiv), he shared his understanding of current challenges and offered solutions. M. Hrushevsky's journalism, published on the pages of Kyiv publications, was promptly circulated by provincial newspapers and actively shared by the Ukrainian foreign press.

Moreover, the most popular texts were reprinted in several famous pamphlets. Their demand is eloquently evidenced by the solid circulations as cited by the authoritative bibliographic journal "Knigar". The first edition of the brochure "What kind of autonomy and federation we want" was published in 20 thousand copies, the second one in 30 thousand. The first and second editions of the collection of articles "Who are Ukrainians and what do they want" had a circulation of 30,000 copies. The first and second editions of the book "Where did Ukraine come from and what is its goal" – 30 thousand copies. The brochure "Ukrainian Central Rada and its Universals: the First and the Second" was published with a circulation of 13.5 thousand copies<sup>36</sup>. Therefore, we have every reason to claim about the considerable demand and influence of the journalistic speeches of the Chairman of the Central Rada. Contemporaries of the scholar also wrote about their popularity, noting that among the activists of the Ukrainian parliament, "there was no shortage of educated people or historians, but none of them was equal to M. Hrushevsky in the ability to hone his historical worldview to current events"<sup>37</sup>. In our opinion, we should fully agree with V. Verstyuk's observation that the popularity of M. Hrushevsky's journalism at that time ensured by the fact that it performed two important functions at once: campaigning and propaganda as well as conceptual and ideological<sup>38</sup>.

Writing about the need to mobilise Ukrainians, the head of the Ukrainian parliament calls for conscious and dynamic self-organization of all groups. At the same time, he prioritises the consolidation of the peasantry as a quantitatively dominant stratum, which in his view, was the primary socio-cultural basis for the development of Ukrainian statehood. M. Hrushevsky convinced his readers that "[...] in the end, everything – freedom, and revolution, and the will of Ukraine, and the land – depends on what our people and especially peasantry will be like: a pile of sand scattered by a single gust of wind or a solid foundation that a free, autonomous people of Ukraine can rely on"<sup>39</sup>.

---

<sup>36</sup> Книгар. 1918. Ч. 5 (Січень). С. 246.

<sup>37</sup> Єремій М. За лаштунками Центральної Ради. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 103.

<sup>38</sup> Верстюк В. Доба Центральної Ради в публіцистичній спадщині М. Грушевського. С. VIII–IX.

<sup>39</sup> Грушевський М. Велике діло. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 35.



Therefore, the chairman of the Central Rada dedicated his journalism to raising the political awareness of the broad audience. His texts provided various recommendations on civil self-organization. In numerous texts, Hrushevsky tirelessly repeated – “in the village, an elected village council should rule all major decisions”<sup>40</sup>. Educational work became incredibly intensive with the appearance of the new daily peasant newspaper “People’s will” (“Narodna Volya”). In the first issue, M. Hrushevsky emotionally raised the importance of the appearance of a new media tribune for the broadest masses: “I am happy, my peasant brothers, that I can speak to you in the pages of a large, daily people’s newspaper. This has always been my dream, and it took a revolution for the tsarist government to fall, and all the violence associated with it for the opportunity to arise. Nothing terrified this tsarist government, or the old regime, as it is called, more than popular educational and political literature and the press (newspaper). It believed – and was right – that as soon as the Ukrainian printed word, science, education in a language understood by the Ukrainian people, reached wide Ukrainian circles, its domination in Ukraine will end”<sup>41</sup>.

M. Hrushevsky intended the new newspaper to become a kind of a “club” for peasant audience. Another more important task was to establish communication with other strata of Ukrainian society. He aimed at establishing a trusting dialogue between peasants and members of the intelligentsia. The tsarist administration had successfully destroyed this connection through a system of numerous prohibitions and the cultivation of many stereotypes about incompatibility between the intelligentsia and peasants. Despite these obstacles, M. Hrushevsky informed the reader that the intelligentsia never renounced its peasant roots, cultivating folk culture on any occasion. “Thus,” says the historian, “the ground was being prepared for a new Ukrainianness”<sup>42</sup>. Therefore, since the beginning of the revolution, when all prohibitions were finally lifted, Ukrainians faced the challenge to restore unity. “The opportunity has come to unite”, the chairman of the Central Rada emphasized, “to understand, organize and join the people – the peasantry, workers, soldiers and intellectuals - to bring good to their land and people”<sup>43</sup>.

---

<sup>40</sup> Грушевський М. Хто такі українці і чого вони хочуть. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 158.

<sup>41</sup> Грушевський М. Кінець старому лукавству. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 28.

<sup>42</sup> Грушевський М. Звідки пішло українство і до чого воно йде. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 172.

<sup>43</sup> Грушевський М. Кінець старому лукавству. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 29.

To achieve this goal, M. Hrushevsky dedicated meticulous attention to the work of the First All-Ukrainian Peasants' Congress in Kyiv in late May-early June 1917. The Congress united up to 2,500 delegates (1,500 with the right for a deciding vote, the rest – with an advisory). Together they represented all 9 Ukrainian provinces, as well as the Kuban and Don regions. In total, there were representatives from 73 counties and more than 1,000 parishes, mainly from peasant unions<sup>44</sup>. The chairman greeted the participants on behalf of the Central Council. He raised the importance of the organizational unity of the peasantry for the further progress of the Ukrainian revolution. As the historian emphasised, the delegates elected by the congress would enter the parliament, giving it the necessary legitimacy. As a result of his welcoming speech, M. Hrushevsky once again voiced his conviction about the peasant nature of Ukrainians: “We shouldn’t take offence in being called “the peasants’ nation”, on the contrary, let us take pride in it. As most of our people are peasants, we must pursue our national policy following the interests of the peasantry. Therefore, the peasantry needs to know that the Ukrainian intelligentsia and the Central Ukrainian Rada want to establish a system that would ensure the interests of the working people, and therefore the Central Rada must heed them achieve what our people need”<sup>45</sup>.

After this speech, the delegates applauded M. Hrushevsky as the honorary chairman of the peasant forum, which eloquently testified to the great authority of the scientist among the people. One of the important results of the congress was the election of the All-Ukrainian Council of Peasant Deputies. The council entered the Central Council as a representation of the Ukrainian peasantry. The last decision was personally supported by M. Hrushevsky, who arrived at the congress at the end of the election. He read a telegram from the chairman of the Ukrainian National Council in Petrograd Petro Stebnytsky, who informed about the refusal of the Provisional Government to issue an act on the autonomy of Ukraine<sup>46</sup>. The Speaker of the Parliament asked to speed up the elections so that the newly elected Council of Peasants’ Deputies would immediately take part in the emergency session of the Central Rada, which was postponed until the arrival of the representatives of the peasantry. Leaving the congress,

---

<sup>44</sup> Хміль І.В. Перший Всеукраїнський селянський з’їзд (28 травня – 2 червня 1917 р.). *Історичні зошити*. 1992. № 4.

<sup>45</sup> Грушевський М. [Промови на I Всеукраїнському селянському з’їзді у Києві...]. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво “Світ”, 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 33.

<sup>46</sup> Перший Всеукраїнський селянський з’їзд. *Нова рада*. 1917. 4 червня. № 55. С. 2

M. Hrushevsky stressed: “[...] I hope that you will soon finish the elections of the Council of Peasant Deputies and together with the Central Council your representatives will decide what to do next. We need the autonomy of Ukraine, it must be achieved...”<sup>47</sup>. Delegates greeted these words with loud applause and cheering: “Long live free Ukraine!”.

The evening meeting of the Central Council opened the same day at 6 p.m. The Council of Peasant Deputies was already present in its entirety. Welcoming them in the parliament, M. Hrushevsky stressed that together they would “be in charge of the peasant organization, land affairs and in general everything related to the affairs and interests of the peasantry”<sup>48</sup>. As is well known, the Central Rada, enriched by peasant representation, soon proclaimed the First Universal, thus initiating the formation of Ukrainian statehood. Somewhat later, recalling these events, M. Hrushevsky noted that the Peasants’ Congress “revealed pro-active political and national consciousness among the Ukrainian peasantry, contrary to the stereotype about the peasant “darkness”. It is about new solidarity and unshakable trust in our national representation, the Ukrainian Central Rada”<sup>49</sup>.

Some observers of Ukrainian life made harsh comments about the peasant movement being fabricated. They claimed that Ukrainian peasants were uneducated, inert and did not relate to slogans put forward by the ideologues of the Central Rada. M. Hrushevsky resolutely defended the people’s representatives who took the initiative to join the latest state formation. In numerous journalistic texts, he praised the considerable wisdom of Ukrainian peasants, their excellent understanding of the revolutionary situation and a deep awareness of responsibility for future generations. The chairman of the Central Rada emphasized: “Ukrainian peasants, who, in the first months of the revolution at various meetings and congresses discussing democratic republic, insisted that it should be a federal republic, were not echoing someone else’s ideas, as some believed. Long before that, they learned the ideas of political autonomy and the idea of the federation from popular Ukrainian literature”<sup>50</sup>.

---

<sup>47</sup> Грушевський М. [Промови на I Всеукраїнському селянському з’їзді у Києві...]. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 33.

<sup>48</sup> Грушевський М. Велике діло. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 35.

<sup>49</sup> Там само. С. 44.

<sup>50</sup> Грушевський М. Промова М.С.Грушевського від імені українських організацій, проголошена 10 вересня [1917 р. на з’їзді народів у Києві]. *Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 60.*

In a short time, the Central Rada started implementing the most needed solutions to issues peasants faced. On January 18, 1918, at the insistence of the Socialist-Revolutionary majority, the parliament passed the Provisional Land Law, which was quite radical. It was based on the principle of socialization of land, its separation from large farms. Such formulation of the law did not help stabilize the political situation in Ukraine. As researchers rightly point out, on the one hand, it strengthened the illusions of the poor part of the peasantry, fuelled anarchic sentiments, and on the other, provoked the outrage of large landowners and wealthy peasants who traditionally owned private property in Ukraine since Cossack times. The USDLP, UPSF and UPSI factions in the Central Rada insisted on revising the law. However, M. Hrushevsky, the informal leader of the Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionaries, supported the law and justified its expediency in several journalistic speeches<sup>51</sup>.

The implementation of land reform was far from perfect. During March-April 1918, a lot of estates and sugar plantations were transferred to the land committees. However, the distribution was slow, and many lands were left without owners. The peasantry did not have stock, seeds, and sometimes the desire to cultivate the land. Landowners were forbidden to sow in the spring. Accordingly, the future harvest and Ukraine's ability to meet its economic obligations to its military allies depended on spring fieldwork. As a result, the growing uncertainty in the commitments of the Ukrainian authorities turned the allies into occupiers. M. Hrushevsky himself perfectly understood the hopelessness of the Central Rada's situation, but he could only try to influence the peasantry with his journalism. Thus, at the Kyiv Peasant County Congress, which took place on April 7, 1918, he quite emotionally persuaded the delegates: "This may be the last time for us to prove our state wisdom. For if we do not establish power now, if we do not now establish a firm and good order, and our fields remain unsown, and we do not keep our state, we will be cursed by our descendants. But I hope that you will take all measures so that this does not happen, so that all the fields are sown; and there will be order everywhere on our land, drenched in blood and sprinkled with ashes"<sup>52</sup>.

Unfortunately, the circumstances were fatal for the Central Rada, as its authority was rapidly declining in the eyes of the public and recent allies.

---

<sup>51</sup> Грушевський М. «Святі права». *Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т.* Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 127–129.

<sup>52</sup> Грушевський М. Промова голови Центральної Ради проф. М.С. Грушевського, виголошена на Київському селянському повітовому з'їзді 7 квітня [1918 р.]. *Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т.* Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 130.

The parliament speaker increasingly criticized the comments about the failure of socialist governments to bring order to the state. Hrushevsky was hurt to learn about the Ukrainian activists of the conservative side asking the German command to change the current government. A few days before the hetman's coup, he wrote a warning article, "Old Story", in which he criticized the behaviour of his opponents, interpreted it as a betrayal of national ideals, the desire to protect their interests with the help of other people's bayonets. Anticipating a change of government, M. Hrushevsky predicted that it would lead to the destruction of the national project. Addressing the peasant reader, the historian compared the actions of these deputies with the actions of their predecessors during the Khmelnytsky Uprising: "Having achieved the proclamation and recognition of Ukrainian statehood with the help of peasants, they call on our government to turn its back on them and serve its landowners! Abolish the land reform and, relying on German bayonets, restore landlordism! This would be a letter-by-letter repetition of that grave, unforgettable shameful historical mistake that Ukraine paid for with 250 years of serfdom!"<sup>53</sup>.

M. Hrushevsky published his reflections about that period in "On the Threshold of the New Ukraine: Thoughts and Dreams". In the historiographical tradition, this work gained the status of the scientist's "political testament". M. Hrushevsky painted a portrait of the future state, and he paid particular attention to the prospects of the village – the "foundation of Great Ukraine". He expressed his worries that many Ukrainian politicians neglect peasant interests only because of the belief that the creator of the revolution should have been the proletariat. In agrarian Ukraine, the historian claims, its revival and further progress will be associated with the cultural achievements of the peasants for a long time to come. "I will say more, – emphasizes M. Hrushevsky, – I am deeply convinced that only those phenomena that are closely and sincerely tied to peasant masses, will stand the test of time"<sup>54</sup>. Therefore, the peasantry will long remain the foundation of national life. "Only those projects that keep peasants' best interests at heart will stand strong. And bad fate shall befall those movements, parties, plans and intentions that go against them – they will condemn themselves to extinction and fall apart one day once and for all", sums up the author<sup>55</sup>.

---

<sup>53</sup> Грушевський М. Стара історія. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 134.

<sup>54</sup> Грушевський М. На порозі Нової України: Гадки і мрії. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 253.

<sup>55</sup> Там само.

The Hetman's coup, ironically called by M. Hrushevsky an "ugly anecdote", knocked him out of active political life and prompted him to reflect deeply on the events of the Ukrainian revolution. The historian considered the role of the peasantry in those events. First and foremost, the former chairman of the Central Rada refuted the general accusations of mass support or even the organization of a hetman's coup. The historian argued that large landowners manipulated peasant rhetoric in their plans to eliminate the Central Rada's achievements and abolish the land law. On the contrary, he emphasizes, the peasants in the Directory's detachments restored the UPR. Therefore, M. Hrushevsky concluded that "and now, our peasantry, who liberated and restored Ukrainian Republic, must hold it firmly in their hands. They should keep order, harmony and unite their forces to protect it, so that, God forbid, a former Cossack officer or the current hetmans and Germans take their lands away"<sup>56</sup>.

Another critical problem was the growing apathy towards the Ukrainian movement in the peasant environment. After surviving the return of the old order under the Hetmanate, the peasants lost faith in the state as an institution that should guarantee their rights and freedoms. The historian emphasized in the article "Rehabilitation of public life" that the bodies of peasant self-government should be mobilized under such conditions. They must take over the functions of democratic institutions, which were lacking in the revived UPR<sup>57</sup>. The mentioned article became an ideological substantiation of further political steps of M. Hrushevsky and his political partners. They decided to convene the Peasant Congress of Kamenets Powiat, which took place on March 20–22, 1919.

Participation in this Congress was the last political action of M. Hrushevsky before emigrating. The forum united 106 delegates from the peasantry, two members of the All-Ukrainian Labour Congress from Podillya and two from Ekaterinoslav. The adopted resolution proclaimed the forum the Labour Congress of Kamenets Powiat. The delegates unanimously elected M. Hrushevsky as the honorary co-chairman of the Congress. He made a welcoming speech, urging the peasants to unite and work together: "There is nothing more dangerous than waiting for the leader, instructions, orders from the centre in such dangerous moments when the centre loses all influence on the current events and badly mismanages them. In these difficult circumstances, all salvation depends on the initiative of small organizations. We must be ready for a long period of revival of

---

<sup>56</sup> Грушевський М. Відродження Української Республіки. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 25.

<sup>57</sup> Там само. С. 31–32.

Ukrainian state life from these local groups. We must be ready and arm our people with appropriate means so that they emerge victorious. Let the current Peasants' Congress begin!"<sup>58</sup>. The forum elected the Kamyanets-Podilsky Labour Council, which became part of the Committee for the Protection of the Republic established in those days. The congress was widely covered in the pages of the newspaper "Life of Podillya", edited by M. Hrushevsky. However, this congress had no effect on the catastrophic political situation for Ukraine, and soon the co-chairman himself left Kamenets and went to Prague, not knowing that five years of emigration were waiting ahead.

Finally, a few words about the reception of M. Hrushevsky's journalism of the revolutionary era. We have mentioned the circulation of thousands of copies that reflect a great public demand. Ukrainian observers of the historian's journalism emphasized the significant need for such publications. Hrushevsky's articles offered a new worldview in different political conditions and concisely explained current national postulates<sup>59</sup>. The Literary-Scientific Herald, for example, stated: "The need for political literature is enormous, and it is not easy to satisfy. The oppressive circumstances of the past did not allow us to prepare in advance. Now we need to create that literature using some valuable bits from the previous work. [...] However, recognizing the great importance of this case, our intelligentsia found time for that job as well. Prof. Hrushevsky shows us an example by standing at the heart of our political life and taking the most active part in it. At the same time, he managed to make a valuable contribution to our new-born political literature, paving the way for the spiritual leaders of our people, organizing them and highlighting the needs and challenges of today"<sup>60</sup>.

As expected, observers from the camp of "the one and indivisible" were openly critical. Recalling their emotional reaction to his texts, M. Hrushevsky wrote: "The enemies of Ukraine, who had long been breathing hell on me, and who, in their blindness, considered me the creator of both the Ukrainian movement and the inventor of the Ukrainian language,

---

<sup>58</sup> Грушевський М.В. дванадцять годину. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 37.

<sup>59</sup> Див. докл.: Тельвак В. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття). Київ – Дрогобич : «Вимір», 2008. С. 184–201.

<sup>60</sup> Волох С. : Мих. Грушевський. Якої ми хочемо автономії і федерації. Вільна Україна, статті з останніх днів. Хто такі українці і чого вони хочуть. – звідки пішло українство і до чого воно йде... Київ, 1917. *Літературно-науковий вістник*. 1917. Т. LXVII. С. 155.

attack me with their curses and threats anew”<sup>61</sup>. Unfortunately, even former friends and defenders of the historian from Russian academic circles did not accept the new ideology of Ukrainians Hrushevsky expressed in journalism. They felt betrayed by their Ukrainian colleague after he headed the Central Rada. After all, in the pre-war period and especially in the years of his exile, liberal Russian intellectuals made considerable efforts to convince government officials of various levels (up to the President of the Academy of Sciences, Grand Duke Konstantin Romanov) in the purely cultural goal of M. Hrushevsky’s diverse work. The revolutionary events proved the fears of the enemies of Ukrainians correct. They had always emphasised the danger to the empire’s integrity in the Hrushevsky’s public activity. The epistolary of Hrushevsky’s former friend Oleksiy Shakhmatov, addressed to Russian colleagues during the revolutionary times, expressed his hurt feelings. In a letter to Anatoliy Koni, he wrote: “Like you, I am horrified by the betrayal of Ukrainians now led by Hrushevsky. This is the heaviest blow to Russia”<sup>62</sup>.

## CONCLUSIONS

In our conclusions, we emphasise the distinct peasant-centrism of M. Hrushevsky’s journalism. In his various texts (articles, speeches, appeals), the scientist acts as an insightful observer of all aspects of people’s lives on both sides of Zbruch. This comprehensive analysis from a sobornost perspective gave him arguments for numerous socio-cultural initiatives aimed at snatching the Ukrainian peasant from the vicious circle of patriarchal traditions and feudal prohibitions, nudging them in the direction of modernisation paved by the western neighbours. We will also point out the crucial functions that M. Hrushevsky’s journalism performed in the broad masses of the Ukrainian audience. His articles performed ideological-educational, informational and mobilising tasks. At the same time, the journalism had a serious tone, avoided inappropriate indulgences or didactics. On the contrary, M. Hrushevsky’s journalism was stylistically constructed in a dialogical manner. In his texts, he did not instruct the peasants but consulted with them as equal partners on numerous pressing issues of national existence. Due to such openness and dialogic narrative, the journalistic appeal of the author of the “History of Ukraine-Rus” had considerable resonance, contributing to the growth of political culture in

---

<sup>61</sup> Життя професора Михайла Грушевського від вибуху світової війни. *Земля і Воля*. 1920. № 25. С. 2.

<sup>62</sup> Цит. за: Робинсон М.А. Судьбы академической элиты: отечественное славяноведение (1917 – начало 1930-х годов). Москва: Издательство «Индрик», 2004. С. 21.



broad peasant circles. As a result, the agrarian ideas of M. Hrushevsky influenced the Ukrainian intellectual culture throughout the twentieth century.

#### REFERENCES

1. Верстюк В. Доба Центральної Ради в публіцистичній спадщині М. Грушевського. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. V–XVI.
2. Волох С.: Мих. Грушевський. Якої ми хочемо автономії і федерації. – Вільна Україна, статі з останніх днів. – Хто такі українці і чого вони хочуть. – звідки пішло українство і до чого воно йде... Київ, 1917. *Літературно-науковий вістник*. 1917. Т. LXVII. С. 155–156.
3. Гіцова Л., упор. Листи Михайла Коцюбинського до Михайла Грушевського. *Записки НТШ*. 1992. Т. ССXXIV. С. 283–294.
4. Грушевський М. Вопрос дня. *Украинский вестник*. 1906. Вип. 2. С. 79–81.
5. Грушевський М. [Промови на I Всеукраїнському селянському з'їзді у Києві...]. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 33.
6. Грушевський М. «Малоросійськія песни» Максимовича і століття української наукової праці. *Український історик*. 1984. № 1–4. С. 122–140.
7. Грушевський М. «Святі права». Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів: Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 127–129.
8. Грушевський М. В дванадцятю годину. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 37.
9. Грушевський М. Велике діло. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів: Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 35–36.
10. Грушевський М. Відродження Української Республіки. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 23–25.
11. Грушевський М. Два ювілеї. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 2. С. 420–423.
12. Грушевський М. До наших читачів. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 280–281.
13. Грушевський М. До читальників. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів: Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 287.
14. Грушевський М. За рідну школу. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів: Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 72–79.
15. Грушевський М. Звідки пішло українство і до чого воно йде. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 166–180.

16. Грушевський М. Кінець старому лукавству. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів: Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 28–30.
17. Грушевський М. Листи з над Полтви. Лист третій. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2002. Т. 1. С. 153–168.
18. Грушевський М. На порозі Нової України: Гадки і мрії. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 225–266.
19. Грушевський М. Наша школа. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 63–69.
20. Грушевський М. Недооцінюванне. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 2. С. 181–188.
21. Грушевський М. Оздоровлення громадського життя. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 31–32.
22. Грушевський М. Після думи. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2002. Т. 1. С. 371–372.
23. Грушевський М. Промова голови Центральної Ради проф. М. С. Грушевського, виголошена на Київському селянському повітовому з'їзді 7 квітня [1918 р.]. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 130–131.
24. Грушевський М. Промова М. С. Грушевського від імені українських організацій, проголошена 10 вересня [1917 р. на з'їзді народів у Києві]. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 60–64.
25. Грушевський М. Справа українських катедр і наші наукові потреби. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2002. Т. 1. С. 450–459.
26. Грушевський М. Стара історія. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 131–134.
27. Грушевський М. Треба ясніше! Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 44–47.
28. Грушевський М. В українських послів Російської Думи. *З біжучої хвилі*. Київ, 1907. С. 50–59.
29. Грушевський М. Українство і питання дня в Росії. *З біжучої хвилі*. Київ, 1907. С. 5–17.
30. Грушевський М. Українці. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 89–97.
31. Грушевський М. Хто такі українці і чого вони хочуть. Грушевський М. С. Твори : у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 152–165.

32. Грушевський М. Шкільна справа в Галичині. Грушевський М. С. Твори: у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 3. С. 393–394.
33. Грушевський М. Аграрне питання. *З біжучої хвилі*. Київ, 1907. С. 81–99.
34. Грушевський М. Вступний виклад з давньої історії Русі. Грушевський М. С. Твори: у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2002. Т. 1. С. 63–74.
35. Грушевський, М. Українська історіографія і Микола Костомаров. Грушевський М. С. Твори: у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2005. Т. 2. С. 380–409.
36. Грушевський, М. Українсько-руське літературне відродження в історичнім розвої українсько-руського народу. Грушевський М. С. Твори: у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2002. Т. 1. С. 109–117.
37. Дорошенко Д. Мої спомини про давнє минуле 1901–1914. Вінніпег, Манітоба, 1949. 543 с.
38. Єремійв М. За лаштунками Центральної Ради. Грушевський М. С. Твори: у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 94–104.
39. Життя професора Михайла Грушевського від вибуху світової війни. *Земля і Воля*. 1920. № 25. С. 2–3.
40. Масненко В.В. Селянство в історичній концепції Михайла Грушевського. *Український селянин*. 2004. № 8. С. 47–50.
41. Панькова С. «..Ні хвилі не вважав себе емігрантом, тільки закордонним робітником на нашій національній ниві» (Публіцистика Михайла Грушевського доби еміграції: квітень 1919 р. – лютий 1924 р.). Грушевський М. С. Твори: у 50 т. Львів : Видавництво «Світ», 2013. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. V–XVIII.
42. Панькова С. Михайло Грушевський і народна газета «Село» у світлі мемуарних та епістолярних джерел. *Український історик*. 2004–2005. № 3-4/1. С. 25–46.
43. Перший Всеукраїнський селянський з'їзд. *Нова рада*. 1917. 4 червня. № 55. С. 2.
44. Пиріг Р. Я., Тельвак В. В. Михайло Грушевський: біографічний нарис. Київ : Либідь, 2016. С. 576 с.
45. Робинсон М. А. Судьбы академической элиты: отечественное славяноведение (1917 – начало 1930-х годов). Москва : Издательство «Индрик», 2004. 432 с.
46. Тельвак В. «Єресарх українського руху» (рецепція творчої спадщини М. Грушевського в російському правомонархічному середовищі першої третини ХХ ст.). *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2010. Вип. 20. С. 131–154.

47. Тельвак В. Культурна політика Михайла Грушевського як редактора селянських газет. *Український селянин*. 2018. Вип. 19. С. 127–133.

48. Тельвак В. Постать Михайла Грушевського в польській історіографії (кінець XIX–XX ст.). *Український історичний журнал*. 2006. № 5. С. 67–82.

49. Тельвак В. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття). Київ – Дрогобич : «Вимір», 2008. 492 с.

50. Франко І. Українська трибуна в Росії. *Літературно-науковий вісник*. 1906. Вип. 35. С. 332–338.

51. Хміль І.В. Перший Всеукраїнський селянський з'їзд (28 травня – 2 червня 1917 р.). *Історичні зошити*. 1992. № 4. С. 15–25.

52. Telvak V., Zhuravliov S. Mykhailo Hrushevsky's editorial projects for peasants: ideology, topics, perception. *Український селянин*. 2020. Вип. 23. С. 78–81.

**PARTY-POLITICAL PEASANT-CENTRAL DISCOURSE  
IN THE DAY OF THE UKRAINIAN REVOLUTION 1917–1921:  
IDEOLOGICAL TYPES AND MOBILIZATION POSSIBILITIES**

**Lozovyi V. S.**

**INTRODUCTION**

At the beginning of the twentieth century, sub-Russian Ukraine was mostly an agrarian society, where the peasantry dominated the social structure and played a significant role in the economy. Thus, the urgency of this research problem is due to the attention of modern peasant studies to the formation of the political doctrine of agrarianism in Ukraine, its important component – the party-political discourse of the revolutionary period 1917–1921, which reflected in linguistic forms ideological and worldview aspects of interaction between peasantry and political forces and movements that were at the centre of state-building and socio-political processes.

The author aims to identify the party-political peasant-centric discourse that represented the ideological varieties of agrarianism. To do this, we need to solve the following tasks – to find out the types of discourses and identify their mobilization opportunities in the countryside during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921.

The peasant-centric aspect of this problem in the context of the study of the ideology of agrarianism was covered in the works of domestic historians. Considering the subjective factor of the agrarian issue as one of the preconditions of the revolutionary events of 1917–1921, S. Kornovenko concluded that a new active subject appeared on the forefront of history – the peasant-ideoman<sup>1</sup>. Highlighting the “hamlet philosophy” of P. Kulish, the author stated that it was consistent with the peasant consciousness and became the foundation of the semantic basis of Ukrainian agrarianism of the first third of the twentieth century<sup>2</sup>. The formation of Ukrainian agrarianism as a kind of Eastern European agrarianism was studied by S. Kornovenko and Y. Pasichna<sup>3</sup>. Examining the “grain grower ideology” of V. Lypynsky,

---

<sup>1</sup> Корновенко, С.В. Суб’єктний складник аграрного питання як одна з передумов Української революції 1917–1921 рр. *Український історичний журнал*. 2017. № 4. С. 83–94.

<sup>2</sup> Корновенко С. Хутірська філософія П. Куліша: біля джерел українського аграризму. *Український історичний журнал*. 2020. № 5. С. 64–76.

<sup>3</sup> Kornovenko S., Pasichna Y. Eastern european agrarianism. Ukrainian intellectual space in the late 19-th and early 20-th centuries. *Український селянин*. 2019. Вип. 22. С. 24–29.

K. Galushko came to the conclusion that the national varieties of agrarianism represent an attempt to solve a set of socio-political problems of agrarian society, which suffered from the effects of modernization<sup>4</sup>. However, in this aspect the author did not consider this topic.

The study examines Ukrainian parties, organizations, movements that operated in Ukraine and whose political activities had a pronounced peasant-centric character. In determining the types of party-political peasant-centric discourses, the following criteria are taken: 1) principles of solving the agrarian issue; 2) vision of the peasantry in the context of power and the state and the implementation of models of their construction.

By “discourse” we mean language (text), which contains a set of ideas, arguments and symbols used in practice by socio-political actors (parties, organizations, joint movements) during the revolutionary process.

We consider the party-political peasant-centric discourse in the context of the ideology of agrarianism. K. Galushko, defining the criteria for characterizing a certain doctrine as agrarianist, argues that agricultural ideology should emphasize the political “separatism” of the peasants and the separation of the peasant “third” way (outside of capitalism and communism)<sup>5</sup>. Since ideology is a discourse and is constructed by language, the means of such construction are linguistic elements, first of all supporting tokens, which represent the concepts of a certain ideological and worldview picture of the world. The study of party-political peasant-centric discourse is conducted mainly on the basis of analysis of programs of political parties, organizations and associations, statements and works of politicians, publications in the press, speeches at rallies and other meetings, congressional decisions, materials of parties and organizations. In covering and analysing the texts of various political parties and forces, we pay special attention to the so-called “manifestative vocabulary” (land, workers, grain growers, socialization, property, bourgeoisie, etc.), which is the main feature of a socially significant type of discourse and allows adequately assess political declarations and aspirations of individual political forces.

The party-political peasant-centric discourse of the revolutionary period of 1917–1921 is defined by us as a set of ideological slogans and socio-cultural values, worldviews, strategies and tactics, speech-semantic component of the revolutionary process, whose mental-linguistic dominants are the fundamental role of agrarian issue and peasantry as a social basis of socio-political movements and the formation of power structures of state-building.

---

<sup>4</sup> Галушко К. «Хліборобська ідеологія» В. Липинського у системі східно-європейського аграризму. *Український історичний збірник*. 2000. № 2. С. 164–200.

<sup>5</sup> Там само. С. 169, 178.

### **1. Left agrarianist peasant-centric discourse (USRP)**

An extremely important specific feature of the Ukrainian revolution was its pronounced peasant-agrarian factor. After the February Revolution of 1917, party building began in sub-Russian Ukraine. In an effort to strengthen their own social base, almost all political parties fought for the peasant, but above all – socialist-orientated parties. In April 1917, the Ukrainian Socialist-Revolutionary Party (USRP) was formed, which was significantly influenced by the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries. The USRP, noting that the national political movement has a peasant basis, declared itself the main defender of the interests of the peasants<sup>6</sup>.

The Ukrainian peasantry was impressed by the ideas of freedom, national self-government, equality, social justice, the priority of labour, and the abolition of landlordism. It is self-evident that the land was at the epicentre of all the aspirations of the peasants, and through the prism of solving the agrarian issue they looked at all other social problems. Thus, with the development of the revolution, the Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionaries tried to work out their own program, which would theoretically reflect the ideals and aspirations, and, consequently, the basic principles of peasant ideology. Without their own theoretical developments in the agrarian sphere, for some time they could not determine the socio-economic principles of agrarian reform, which would attract the attention of peasants to solve political issues.

We note the main theoretical developments of the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries, some of which became part of the ideology of the USRP, and some aspects (especially agrarian) were used by other parties and movements. The Socialist-Revolutionaries, following the populists, argued that the most harmonious conditions for the development of the human personality were created by agricultural labour and life, so, in view of this, the peasantry was the class best suited to the implementation of the socialist system. The basis of the SR ideology was the populist concept of a special path of Russia to socialism. This was due to the fact that in its development the country was between industrial and agrarian-colonial countries. They believed that in Russian capitalism, in contrast to the developed industrial countries, destructive tendencies prevailed, which were especially evident in agriculture. The class differentiation of society, according to Socialist-Revolutionary theorists, was determined by attitudes toward labour and sources of income. Therefore, in the labour, revolutionary camp, they included workers, peasants and intellectuals – people who live by their

---

<sup>6</sup> Бевз Т. Між романтизмом і реалізмом (сторінки історії УПСР). Київ. Інститут політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень НАН України. 1999. С. 25–31.

labour, without exploiting others. The peasantry was considered the main revolutionary force. At the same time, the duality of the social nature of this stratum was recognized, as the peasant is both a worker and an owner. The SRs substantiated the idea of the non-capitalist nature of the peasant economy by the alleged lack of exploitation of hired labour. The socialization of the land was one of the main goals of the revolution. It provided for the abolition of private ownership of land with a ban on buying and selling<sup>7</sup>. The land was to become a national property and was to be managed by people's self-government bodies. Equal labour use of land (provided that it is cultivated by one's own labour) and distribution according to consumer and labour norms were envisaged. The SRs believed that rural communities with their tradition of equal land use were tools for building socialism.

If we pay attention to the policy of the Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionaries, their line in solving the main agrarian problem for the peasantry is chaotic. In their periodicals, they declared an understanding of the fact that Ukrainian realities are different from Russian ones, because Ukrainians own mostly farmland and farmland, while the Great Russians are dominated by communal ones. However, at its Second Congress, the USRP took a course to socialize the land. M. Shapoval, a member of the USRP, wrote on this occasion: "The party did not have a separate project based on local Ukrainian data", but believed that the situation in Ukraine was similar to Russia's. Accordingly, "socialization is a modification of the Russian redistributive community"<sup>8</sup>. Not only the Ukrainian right, but also the left parties were critical of the agrarian program of the USRP, which was based on the program provisions of the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries without taking into account Ukrainian realities. The question was asked: how can the socialization of the land be realized in Ukraine, if there is no domination of the Russian "cell of socialism" – the redistributive community<sup>9</sup>.

Since land was the main determinant of rights and justice for the peasant, the theme of land was at the forefront of peasant meetings and congresses: "socialization and comparison are underway"<sup>10</sup>. At the same time, it was

---

<sup>7</sup> Программа партии социалистов-революционеров. [1906 г.]. Сборник программ политических партий в России. Под ред. В. Водовозова. Вып. 3. СПб., 1906. С. 14–27. URL: <http://docs.historyrussia.org/ru/nodes/74934-programma-partii-sotsialistov-revolutsionerov-1906-g>.

<sup>8</sup> Шаповал М.Ю. Революційний соціалізм на Україні: [книга 1]. Відень : Борітєся – Поборєте. 1921. С. 42–44.

<sup>9</sup> Винниченко В. Відродження нації: (Історія української революції [марець 1917 р. грудень 1919 р.]). [в 3 ч.]. Київ-Відень. [Дзвін]. 1920. Ч. 1. С. 182.

<sup>10</sup> Корреспонденции. *Черниговская земская газета*. 1917. 2–16 мая (№ 35–36). С. 9.



noted a certain individualism inherent in the Ukrainian national character, and that the community system inherent in the Russian is not to the liking of the Ukrainian. The SRs acknowledged that the difference between the Ukrainian provinces and the Russian ones in the greater development of the first institution of small private property.

The Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionaries carried out extensive propaganda and explanatory work among the population and tried to explain to the peasants the issues they did not know well: about the autonomy of Ukraine, about the Constituent Assembly, about the Land and Freedom Party, which defends the interests of the peasantry<sup>11</sup>. From the point of view of social psychology, the discourse of “Land and Freedom” was very important for the peasantry. The SRs called themselves the party of “Land and Freedom”, which has long been associated in the minds of peasants with the desire for a certain ideal way of social life. Therefore, a wide range of peasants, who did not read the party program, but were attracted by the well-known slogan of the populists “Land and Freedom – to the peasantry!”, became supporters of the SRs.

An important negative discourse was the discourse of the enemies of the peasants, the enemies of the revolution. It was stated that “they are landlords, capitalists, merchants” and that “enemies are united”, so the peasants must unite<sup>12</sup>. To ensure the influence of the masses of the peasantry on the initiative of the USRP created the Village Union, which was to become the only mass organization of the peasantry. The discourse “Village Union” was important for the peasants as a symbol of their unification, joint activity.

The revolution of 1917, sanctioning democracy, gave rise to a new political force – the will of the people. Therefore, in general democratic elections, power could be gained only by those political forces that would attract the peasantry to their side. From places wrote that “from whichever side you will start the organization of the county, you always come across peasants”<sup>13</sup>. The appeal to the masses, the legitimation of the revolutionary government and its decisions through democratic procedures, that is, through the “will of the people”, was actively used by Ukrainian and Russian parties and organizations. The countryside became a space of public political activity and was flooded with agitators and propaganda materials. To explain to the peasantry the situation in the national, educational, cultural sectors,

---

<sup>11</sup> Земельный вопрос. *Голос села*. Охтирка. 1917. 2 липня. (№ 1). С. 1.

<sup>12</sup> Що таке селоспілка? *Вільне слово*. 1917. 5 липня (№ 7). С. 1.

<sup>13</sup> Український національно-визвольний рух. Березень-листопад 1917 року. Документи і матеріали. Упоряд. : В. Верстюк (керівник) та ін. Київ : Видавництво імені Олени Теліги. 2003. С. 497.

socio-political, economic requirements and means of implementing the program of the USRP, literature, the press, demonstrations, rallies, various courses, and “Prosvita” societies were organized. The first mass and popular Ukrainian daily publication was the newspaper “Narodnya Volya”, the total circulation of which reached 200 thousand copies<sup>14</sup>.

As a result of powerful propaganda, the most influential socialist party in 1917 became the Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionaries, whose slogan of “socialization of agriculture” corresponded to the expectations of the poor peasantry, who were waiting for the “black redistribution” of landlord land. In the Central Rada, the Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionaries Party played one of the leading roles. In many towns and villages, the SRs were members of the Soviets and headed revolutionary self-government bodies. The number of the party grew (according to the newspaper “Borotba” of December 27 (14), 1918, the USRP had 375,000 members).

The priority of agrarian issues for the peasantry was also determined by the political dominance of the parties in the countryside, which declared a radical solution to the agrarian issue according to models acceptable to grain growers. The overwhelming majority of peasant congresses of various levels adopted the program of the Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionaries Party. It was stated that “this program can really unite our working peasantry, because it is very close to the peasants and corresponds to their worldview”<sup>15</sup>. Consideration of party policy through the prism of the agrarian issue led to the fact that the peasants did not accept other parties, which insisted on the transfer of land for ransom, because they believed that in fairness the land should pass to them for free.

The struggle for “land and freedom” had a certain influence on the formation of the political position, on the nature of socio-political activities of Ukrainian peasants. In anticipation of agrarian reform, they began to understand that the revolution did not give the peasants land, but only freedom and the right to vote, equal for all. Therefore, in order to get land, you need to vote for those who support the socialization program. Ukrainian parties and organizations explained to the peasants that in order for the people to receive “all the land and freedom”, it was necessary for the Constituent Assembly (which was to authorize agrarian reform) and local

---

<sup>14</sup> Ковалевський М. При джерелах боротьби: спомини, враження, рефлексії. Інсбрук. “Biblos”. 1960. С. 267–268.

<sup>15</sup> Український національно-визвольний рух. Березень-листопад 1917 року. Документи і матеріали. Упоряд. : В. Верстюк (керівник) та ін. Київ : Видавництво імені Олени Теліги. 2003. С. 394.

institutions to vote for their lists<sup>16</sup>. In Ukraine, in the elections to the All-Russian Constituent Assembly, 64% of the population voted for parties and organizations that represented the Ukrainian national liberation movement, had a majority in the Central Rada and defended the interests of the peasantry (especially the USRP with the Union). If we take the view that the results of the elections to the All-Russian Constituent Assembly reflected the schedule and the balance of political forces, the greatest influence in Ukraine at that time was enjoyed by the USRP. But later the party experienced an internal crisis caused by ideological differences, after which it split into several independent currents.

As for the construction of the state and power, the USRP in its program initially defended the idea of autonomy of Ukraine, but in 1918 it embarked on the path of independence. Ukrainian SRs understood how important it was for the peasant's consciousness to believe that only personal "labour" was the definition of a person's "social quality" as a master and legitimized any property. That is why they made the "labour principle" the cornerstone of their ideology and policy and based on it developed their state-political model. The Socialist-Revolutionaries demonstrated the construction of socialism on the basis of a "dictatorship of revolutionary democracy" or a "dictatorship of labour democracy"<sup>17</sup>. This meant "that power be exercised only by the working masses organized on the basis of democracy": peasants, workers and the working intelligentsia. The so-called non-working classes were not allowed to vote<sup>18</sup>. The peasants were in favour of the introduction of Soviets as local self-government bodies. Therefore, the basis for the formation of power from the bottom to the top the USRP identified "Councils": "Labour Councils" (former zemstvos) and the Council of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies. It was an ambivalent decision about the coexistence of general democratic and class authorities.

Legislatively, the "labour principle" of building power, according to which the working peasantry was to be the basis for the development of the Ukrainian state, was adopted in the period of the Directory of the UPR. This was explained by the fact that during the class democratic elections the representatives of the peasant majority would prevail in all power structures.

---

<sup>16</sup> Український національно-визвольний рух. Березень-листопад 1917 року. Документи і матеріали. Упоряд. : В. Верстюк (керівник) та ін. Київ : Видавництво імені Олени Теліги. 2003. С. 903–904.

<sup>17</sup> Багатопартійна українська держава на початку ХХ ст.: Програмні документи перших українських політичних партій. Упор. В.С. Журавський. Київ : Пошук. 1992. С. 17.

<sup>18</sup> Шаповал М. Велика революція і українська визвольна програма. Виклади в Америці. Прага : Вільна Спілка. 1927. С. 89.

In contrast to the “dictatorship of the proletariat”, where power was to be in the hands of the workers, and in fact of the Bolshevik state (the communist way), and of general democratic elections, when the bourgeoisie (the capitalist way) could be in power, the SRs seemed to propose a “third way” of development of society and the state, without communist nationalization and the negative impact of the elements of the market and the exploitation of workers. Thus, the predominance of peasants in the Ukrainian agrarian society determined the ideology of building a national statehood in the form of the Ukrainian People’s, i.e. Labour Republic (UPR) and the principles of class policy.

Thus, the main party-political discourses of the Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionaries were: “revolution”, “land and freedom”, “socialization”, “abolition of private property”, “working peasantry”, “village union”, “people’s will”, “democracy”, “dictatorship of labour democracy”, “victory of workers over the bourgeoisie”, “Council of Workers’ Peasants’ and Soldiers’ Deputies”, etc. The USRP was one of the main national political forces in Ukraine, which sought to resolve the agrarian issue in favour of the peasants, and made the peasantry the social foundation of state-building.

## **2. Far-left agrarianist peasant-centric discourse (Makhnovist movement)**

Left and far-left forces dominated the Ukrainian political space. After the February Revolution of 1917, N. Makhno expanded his activities in the south of Ukraine, which turned into a powerful peasant movement. At first, N. Makhno and his movement did not have their own political program. He was strongly influenced by anarchist ideas, but during the revolution an independent ideological search developed in N. Makhno his own system of views, a kind of symbiosis of anarchism, socialism and peasant pragmatism. N. Makhno understood that the correct slogans and practices for solving the agrarian issue would allow his political force to gain the support of the general peasantry. And although he considered himself an anarchist, he took the position of the Socialist-Revolutionary socialization of the land, because the land must belong to those who cultivate it. Unlike the Socialist-Revolutionaries, who proclaimed that the agrarian reform should be decided on a legitimate basis by the Constituent Assembly, Makhno argued that the peasants themselves should resolve the issue of land and proclaim it universal property without waiting for the decision of the “revolutionary government”<sup>19</sup>. The propaganda of this idea

---

<sup>19</sup> Махно Н. Русская революция на Украине (от марта 1917 г. по апрель 1918 год). Париж. Б-ка Махновцев: Федерация анархо-коммунист. групп Северной Америки и Канады. 1929. Кн. 1. 1929. С. 53–57.

was received with enthusiasm by the peasantry. At congresses and assemblies, resolutions were passed on the transfer of land to the working population without redemption and the inalienable right of the working peasantry to declare landed, monastic and state lands public property. N. Makhno destroyed land documents and called for the free distribution of land to the peasants, which won their ardent support.

N. Makhno advocated the creation of communes, which he considered the highest form of social justice. Those who did not want to go to the commune could remain individual masters, but without the use of hired labour. Instead, the Bolsheviks, who at times were allies of Makhno, insisted on a communist version of solution of the agrarian issue. In an attempt to divide the peasantry, they divided it into the poor (supporters of the proletariat) and the kulaks (supporters of the bourgeoisie). The Makhnovists denied such a division and, on the contrary, focused on a “cohesive” labour union.

The general principles of agrarian policy were decided at congresses of Soviets of Peasants, Workers, and Insurgents. The resolution on the agrarian question, adopted on February 15, 1919, proposed to solve the agrarian problem on an all-Ukrainian scale on the following grounds: “All land in favour of socialism and the struggle against the bourgeoisie must pass into the hands of the working peasantry. Based on the principle that “no man’s land” can be used only by those who cultivate it, the land should be used by the working peasantry of Ukraine free of charge according to the equal labour norm, i.e. it should provide the consumer norm on the basis of own labour”<sup>20</sup>.

Seeing the negative attitude of the peasantry to the Bolshevik policy in the countryside, the Makhnovists in 1919 called for the repeal of the Decree on the nationalization of land. They declared that all land confiscated from private owners should not come into the possession of the state, but into the possession and disposal of working peasants, who on the ground had to decide for themselves how to dispose of the land<sup>21</sup>. As can be seen, Makhno’s agrarian policy was largely based on the Socialist-Revolutionary theory of socialization. An important difference with the Socialist-Revolutionary approach was that the Makhnovists introduced into it a certain anarchic element, considered it legitimate for the peasants to actually redistribute the land, not waiting for certain orders or legal grounds from the

---

<sup>20</sup> Нестор Махно. Крестьянское движение на Украине. 1918–1921. Документы и материалы. [ред.-упоряд. В. Данилов, Т. Шанин]. Москва. (РОССПЭН). 2006. С. 90.

<sup>21</sup> Жбанова К. Земельна політика Нестора Махна (1917–1921 рр.). *Сіверянський літопис*. 2013. № 4–6. С. 99.

state. This position brought N. Makhno great popularity and support among the peasants.

Regarding the political system that N. Makhno intended to create. In our opinion, it is necessary to pay special attention to his appeals and declarations, which often had a “powerless and anarcho-communist” character and actually implemented projects of government building, which claim the formation of certain elements of state structures. N. Makhno called on the population to start building a new life on anarchic, powerless principles. At the same time, realizing that the Soviets were popular among the peasants, he relied on their formation. Councils and land committees were formed on the ground and began to function as bodies of revolutionary power.

At the end of 1918, the Makhnovists won the “Free District” in southern Ukraine, which was independent of any government. In this territory N. Makhno made an attempt to create his own political entity, an “anarchist republic”<sup>22</sup>.

The political ideal of the Makhnovists was a society in which coercive state power was replaced by a system of public power, which was to stop the construction of a new bureaucratic system. Power, based on local self-government and growing from it down to the mountain through congresses of Soviets, is the main principle of Makhnov’s concept of a “free Soviet system”. These councils were to become a kind of “socio-economic organizations” regulating production and social relations<sup>23</sup>. It is significant that the construction of local self-government bodies, like that of the SRs, was based on the “labour principle”, i.e., only the working class had the right to elect and be elected to government bodies. The Military Revolutionary Council was a permanent body of power. There were also general congresses of peasants, workers and insurgents of the “Free District”.

N. Makhno adhered to left-wing political pluralism. The principle of the political strategy of the Makhnovist movement, beginning in 1919, was the platform of the “united revolutionary front”, the union of “Soviet” parties. In addition to the anarchists (whose ideas were declared) there were organizations of the Left Socialist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and Bolsheviks. In general, N. Makhno adequately assessed the real influence of political parties on the peasant masses. His detachments consisted mainly of non-partisan peasants, who primarily sought land and complete

---

<sup>22</sup> Чоп В.М., Лиман І.І. Нащадки запорожців: Махновський рух у Північному Приазов’ї (1918–1921 рр.). Мелітополь. Видавничий будинок Мелітопольської міської друкарні. 2019. С. 5.

<sup>23</sup> Савченко В.А. Нестор Махно. Харків. Фоліо, 2019. С. 55.

independence from power and freedom of action. Unfamiliar with the theory of ideological anarchism, the peasant insurgents defended their own vision of a just system, which in some ways coincided with the declarations of anarcho-communism.

In the autumn of 1919, Makhno became disillusioned with the allies-Bolsheviks, who declared a monopoly on the revolution for their party and embodied the anti-peasant policy of the “dictatorship of the proletariat”. He put forward the idea of a “third social revolution” (after the first, the February (bourgeois) and the second, the October (communist) revolution. Its tasks were: the struggle against both the communist and the White Guard authorities and the development of self-government on the basis of non-partisan “free Soviets”<sup>24</sup>. The Makhnovists also declared the need to protect the countryside from exploitation and enslavement by the city. Makhno himself argued that cities were an anachronism in the lives of free people and were therefore doomed. He believed that the power that spread from the city was as hostile to the peasants as the power of the state that exploited their labour<sup>25</sup>.

N. Makhno and the peasant insurgents considered persons of the “bourgeois class” as well as “Soviet commissars, members of punitive detachments, and emergency commissions” to be enemies of the working people<sup>26</sup>. Modern researchers V. Verstyuk and V. Volkovynsky reduce the essence of the ideology of the Makhnovist movement to the peasantry’s search for a “third way” in the revolution<sup>27</sup>. The order that emerged in the territory controlled by N. Makhno was a real alternative to both the Bolshevik (Communism) and White Guard (Capitalism) authorities – and aimed at protecting the interests of working peasants.

The peasants of southern Ukraine massively supported the slogans of N. Makhno and the anarchists because most other political forces advocated organized and sanctioned by state bodies transformations in the agrarian and socio-political spheres. Instead, the Makhnovists advocated their immediate implementation by the peasants themselves, which gained widespread support among the masses. The peasant insurgents defended their own

---

<sup>24</sup> Нестор Иванович Махно: Воспоминания, материалы и документы. сост. В.Ф. Верстюк. Київ : Дзвін. 1991. С. 156–163

<sup>25</sup> Грицак Я.Й. Нариси історії України: формування модерної української нації XIX–XX ст. [навч.посібник]. Київ. Генеза. 1996. С. 149.

<sup>26</sup> Нестор Иванович Махно: Воспоминания, материалы и документы. сост. В.Ф. Верстюк. Київ : Дзвін. 1991. С. 154–155.

<sup>27</sup> Чоп В.М. Махновський рух в Україні 1917–1921 рр.: проблеми ідеології, суспільного та військового устрою : автореф. дис. ... кандидата історичних наук. Запоріжжя, 2002. С. 5.

interests in a just society, which in some ways coincided with certain principles of the doctrine of anarchism. The “free district” seemed to anarchist ideologues of the movement and peasant insurgents not only the ideal of the social order, but also, in a way, the practice of order in the territories occupied by the insurgents. The researcher of Makhnovism V. Chop notes that its ideology synthesized the ideas of theoretical anarchism, folk worldview and Zaporizhzhia traditions<sup>28</sup>.

The phenomenon of Makhnovism was best reflected in the following discourses: “socialization of the land”, “comrades peasants, working population”, “social revolution”, “kingdom of freedom and equality”, “anarchic commune”, “labour and capital”, “for exploited against exploiters”, “Decide your own destiny”, “life without parties and without state political power”, “freely elected workers ‘and peasants’ councils”, “away from the White Guards”, “for free councils without communists”, “away from the commune”, “the real Soviet system”.

Thus, the social base of Makhnovism was the Ukrainian peasantry. It was in the Makhnovist movement that the peasantry proved to be the subject of real politics. His socio-economic program reflected the peculiarities of the peasant mentality associated with free life and management of their own land, based on the traditions of the Ukrainian Cossacks. Therefore, the main requirements were: free peasant land use and elected councils as self-governing bodies without state intervention, i.e. the implementation of the slogan “land and freedom” in the form of a free labour community.

The Makhnovists declared a decisive clash between the idea of a free, powerless organization (they believed that this idea was already accepted by large masses of Ukraine) and the idea of political power (monarchical, communist or bourgeois-republican). In the end, this struggle ended in victory for the Bolsheviks, who embodied the idea of a strong state. At the same time, a kind of peasant republic, the so-called “Free District”, was not the embodiment of anarchist ideals of statelessness, and the socio-political practice of the Makhnovist movement gave rise to a quasi-state formation with its own system of government and political program. The ideas of anarchism about a stateless, powerless, free society did not correspond to the realities of life.

---

<sup>28</sup> Чоп В.М. Союз і змова: обставини підписання і розриву військово-політичної угоди РПАУ /махновців/ та УНР (вересень 1919 р.). *Наукові праці історичного факультету Запорізького державного університету*. Запоріжжя : Просвіта. 2005. Вип. XIX. С. 206.



### 3. Right agrarianist peasant-centric discourse (UDAP)

Beginning in the spring of 1917, left-wing and far-left parties dominated the Ukrainian political space. They called for agrarian socialization, the abolition of private ownership of land and the endowment of the landless peasantry, which led to the radicalization of the peasant masses and chaos in the countryside. At the same time, the Ukrainian agrarian society, along with the poor peasantry, was represented by a certain share of peasant owners and landowners.

To defend their interests, the pro-Ukrainian ownership in 1917 created the Ukrainian Democratic-Agrarian Party (UDAP), which was based on a peculiar, according to its founders, specific ideology of Ukrainian society, based on its own historical and spiritual heritage and powerful potential of the peasant-grain grower class. By their social affiliation, the party members were landowners, representatives of the wealthy and middle classes of the peasantry, and the intelligentsia. The “grain growers” discourse emphasized that the party would resist and reflect the interests of agricultural producers, especially landowners, peasants who work on their own land. In addition, often illiterate peasants perceived the party, looking at its name. And the very concept of “grain growers” had a positive association with them.

Some Ukrainian peasants and landowners believed that socialization would lead to socio-economic ruin. It was claimed to be in line with Russian realities and based on the psychology of a community where there was almost no private ownership of land. Insisting on this fundamental difference between land tenure in Ukraine and Russia, they tried to develop their own Ukrainian path of agrarian reform to ensure a policy of economic prosperity, social balance and stability. Since the land of the owners is the material basis of the agricultural political force, agrarianist transformations must be carried out on the basis of private property rights.

In the “Essay on the UDAP Program”, one of the leaders of the Democrats-agrarians, V. Lypynsky, outlined the principles of “grain grower ideology”, the program of actions and political tactics of the grain grower movement. At the heart of the ideology are the concepts of “grain grower”, “grain grower class”. Although V. Lypynsky later defined the concept of the grain grower class as “a group of families who own their own land and produce bread on their own land”<sup>29</sup>, already in 1917, the political discourse “grain grower” meant a significant part of agrarian society from the poor peasant to the landlord-landowner, i.e., all those who worked in agriculture

---

<sup>29</sup> Липинський В. Листи до братів-хліборобів про ідею і організацію українського монархізму. Київ-Філадельфія. Східноєвропейський дослідний інститут ім. В.К. Липинського. 1995. С. 72.

and belonged to one productive class. In contrast to the class approach of the left parties, this approach was marked by a consolidating spirit and a unifying approach of the general democratic social order. The grain grower class should become the basis of the new Ukrainian state and economic elite and combine “the young energy of the Ukrainian peasantry with the state wisdom of the descendants of the hetman’s and officers’ families”<sup>30</sup>.

The UDAP noted that land issue was the most important thing for Ukraine. Democrats-agrarians have developed their own version of agrarian reform. Given that Ukraine has its own peculiarities of agrarian development, its own national traditions of land use, different from the Russian-communal ones, they insisted that the agrarian question should not be decided by the Russian Constituent Assembly, but by the Sejm elected at the Ukrainian Constituent Assembly<sup>31</sup>.

The agrarian issue was proposed to be solved on the basis of preservation of private property, by recognizing and ensuring two forms of land tenure and land use - private and lease. The state had to create a national land fund, which would be replenished by appropriation for the purchase of land above a certain norm set by law. The land fund was to be divided into farms of the “working Ukrainian peasantry”, the size of which would correspond to the optimal economic norm for a certain area (these hamlets would be transferred to the peasants for life and hereditary lease without the right of division)<sup>32</sup>. The important concepts of “labour” and “hamlet” important for the peasant consciousness, which were associated with their own economy, independent of “master and city” and happy work in nature, were successfully involved in this discourse.

Peasant allotment land should become the full property of grain growers. At the same time, despite guaranteeing the inviolability of private land ownership, the state should warn against excessive concentration of land in one hand (so that huge landowners’ latifundia disappear), as well as prevent land speculation. The confiscation of large plots of land could provoke resistance, while their redemption by the peasants would give them a sense of ownership and eliminate the threat of social-class confrontation<sup>33</sup>.

---

<sup>30</sup> Липинський В.К. Нарис програми Української демократичної хліборобської партії. Матеріали до програми. Видання Української демократичної партії. Лубни. 1917. С. 6–7.

<sup>31</sup> Там само. С. 137.

<sup>32</sup> Українські політичні партії кінця XIX – початку XX століття: програмові і довідкові матеріали. Упоряд. В.Ф. Шевченко та ін. Київ. 1993. С. 137.

<sup>33</sup> Гай-Нижник П.П. В. Липинський та УДХП в теорії і практиці українського державотворення і політичного націонал-консерватизму (1900–1920 рр.). *Гілея. Науковий вісник*. 2018. Вип. 129. С. 310.

Ukrainian State must aim to accelerate the objective process of the transfer of landed estates to the hands of the peasantry and, at the same time, to develop organizational and legal principles for this process. As a result of agrarian transformations, “Free Grain Grower Ukraine” was to become a land of highly developed, intensive farming. At the same time, it was seen that the Ukrainian grain growers would be united into powerful cooperative societies.

The central place in the concept of the formation of Ukrainian statehood is given to the grain grower class, which should be the main subject of the political process. This is argued by the fact that the traditional peasant-grain grower is the bearer of the national-state and cultural experience of the Ukrainian people and to protect their land is interested in building an independent state. The agricultural class as an important productive class and the mainstay of the state and order can exist only on the basis of private ownership of land. Owners-grain growers, having an economic incentive, providing for themselves and society, should become a kind of “strong middle class” and a powerful foundation of state existence.

Taking into account that the peasantry dominates in the Ukrainian social structure and economy, V. Lypynsky and his associates argue that political power in Ukraine should belong primarily to the representatives of the Ukrainian peasantry. Outlining the socio-cultural contradiction between the Ukrainian countryside and the non-Ukrainian city, they note that the city should not “dictate its will to the Ukrainian countryside”. Finally, the all-encompassing peasant-centricity of the party-political discourse of the Democrats-agrarians contains the statement “Ukraine is a land of grain growers, and the Ukrainian state must become a state of grain growers”<sup>34</sup>.

Regarding the principles of state building and the formation of government bodies, the UDAP program outlines a democratic project of the state system, and focuses on the principle of sovereignty of the Ukrainian people. The party must defend the republic, in which the legislature will belong to the parliament (Sejm), and the executive – to the General Secretariat (Council of Ministers). Authorities were to be elected through democratic elections on the basis of equal, popular, secret, direct, proportional law without any restrictions on social, national or religious grounds. State laws that guarantee universal human rights must be based on democratic principles. The democratic elections of all power structures from top to bottom, given the significant predominance of the rural population,

---

<sup>34</sup> Українські політичні партії кінця XIX – початку XX століття: програмові і довідкові матеріали. Упоряд. В.Ф. Шевченко та ін. Київ : Консалтинг-Фенікс 1993. С. 133.

should provide political power in Ukraine to the Ukrainian peasantry. The SRs also called for the political domination of the peasantry, but according to their class approach they were to be poor and middle peasants, and the UDAP wanted them to be strong grain growers-landowners.

The movement of Democrats-agrarians also had a Cossack dimension. It began with Lubny district in Poltava region, where among landowners there was a significant percentage of descendants of settled free-spirited Cossacks who kept ancient traditions in self-government and everyday life. For the most part, in the same region, the party conducted its organizational, political and propaganda activities and attracted the largest number of agricultural activists to political life. Separate centres operated in the Kherson region, as well as in Kyiv, Katerynoslav, and Kharkiv. However, the UDAP failed to reach an all-Ukrainian scale, did not gain the proper mass, nor significant influence among the peasants. This is explained by the fact that on the ground most of the UDAP cells consisted of intellectuals (often peasants did not trust the intelligentsia), “which could not attract a real grain grower to the party and was in fact a typical Ukrainian organization of intellectuals”<sup>35</sup>.

In the future, the theoretical foundations of agricultural policy, developed by the UDAP, formed the basis of the achievements of agrarian reform of Hetman P. Skoropadsky. They provided for the preservation of private ownership of land, redemption of land from large landowners to endow smallholder peasants. However, the Hetman did not have time to carry out this reform<sup>36</sup>.

V. Lypynsky and Democrats-farmers at the same time spoke out against the harmful to the peasants “chaos of private capitalist economy”<sup>37</sup>, and against socialist transformations, which will take away from the peasant private ownership of land and destroy agricultural production. Thus, professing both anti-capitalism and anti-communism, their “third way” was moderate reforms that would create a large layer of landowners who would be a bulwark against the nationalization of communism and, on the other

---

<sup>35</sup> Україна ХХ ст.: суспільно-політичні моделі національної держави (державницька ідеологія та програмні засади провідних українських політичних партій і громадсько-політичних об'єднань). П.П. Гай-Нижник (керівник проекту, упоряд. і наук. ред.). Київ, 2018. С. 50.

<sup>36</sup> Корновенко С. В. Аграрна політика Гетьманату: теоретичний аспект. *Український селянин*. 2004. Вип. 8. С. 211–214.

<sup>37</sup> Липинський В. К. Нарис Української демократичної хліборобської партії. Матеріали до програми. Видання Української демократичної партії. Лубни, 1917. С. 19.

hand, will oppose the elements of the capitalist market, which will save peasant farms from capital exploitation and ruin.

Thus, the party-political peasant-centric discourse of the UDAP consisted of the following concepts: “grain growers”, “agrarian nation”, “Ukrainian peasantry”, “the land issue is most important for us”, “land ownership”, “fertile land”, “labour”, “hamlets”, “farming”, “powerful cooperative societies”, “tradition”, “Free grain grower Ukraine”, “the city should not dictate its will to the Ukrainian countryside”, “state of grain growers”, “democracy”.

In conditions of the dominance of left and far-left radical parties, the creation of the UDAP was caused by the need to represent in the Ukrainian political space non-socialist, national ownership forces of conservative orientation, which formed a certain part of Ukrainian agrarian society. The main subject and social basis of socio-political transformations was proclaimed the farming class – land workers, landowners who produced agricultural products and were interested in stability, maintenance of law and order and resisted the revolutionary chaos.

## CONCLUSIONS

Thus, from the point of view of ideological guidelines, strategies and tactics of realization of political goals, the party-political peasant-centric discourse of the revolutionary period of 1917–1921 in Ukraine was divided into the following main types:

**Socialist-Socialist-Revolutionary (USRP):** 1) resolution of the agrarian issue on the basis of socialization, abolition of private ownership of land, land confiscated from owners and transferred free of charge to peasants who were to authorize the All-Russian Constituent Assembly, according to state laws and regulations transformation; 2) the peasant – the main subject of state-building, the model of statehood – the power of the Soviets (Labour Councils, former zemstvos and the Council of Workers’ Peasants’ and Soldiers’ Deputies) embodies the class democracy of the working class, which based on suffrage enjoyed only by workers (peasants, workers), the working intelligentsia) the peasants must dominate most of the authorities, there must be a class struggle with the bourgeoisie and the landlords;

**anarchist-Makhnovist (Makhnovist movement):** 1) the agrarian issue is solved on the basis of socialization, abolition of private ownership of land, land is confiscated from owners and transferred free of charge to peasants who do not wait for the adoption of laws and orders of the government themselves divide the land; 2) the peasant is the main subject of social relations, the stateless and powerless model (“Free District”) is proclaimed, and the power of the Soviets (Soviets of Workers’, Peasants’, and Soldiers’ Deputies) is declared to be a contradiction. the rights enjoyed only by

workers (peasants, workers, labour intelligentsia), the peasants have a predominant influence on the government, the struggle must be waged both against the power of the bourgeoisie (White Guards) and the “dictatorship of the proletariat” (Bolsheviks);

**conservative-grain-grower (UDAP):** 1) agrarian reform with the preservation of private property, sanctioned by the Ukrainian Sejm, according to the developed laws, the land passes to the peasants for ransom, the creation of hamlet households (farms) as a kind of “middle class”; 2) the main subject of state-building – the grain grower class, which means all agricultural producers, the model of the state – democratic government based on universal suffrage, the formation of a new elite as a symbiosis of wealthy grain growers and descendants of the officers, the rule of law, class cooperation and social partnership.

The mobilization possibilities of these discourses in the countryside depended on the extent to which they resonated with the peasants’ mental guidelines and adapted to the changing socio-political situation of the time. Calls for the socialization of the land and the power of the workers, the power of the Soviets, were close to the peasant consciousness, so socialist-SR and anarchist-Makhnovist discourses were popular with the general peasantry and made him a supporter of these political forces. However, a significant difference in the ways of their implementation – legally through state authorities in the socialist-SR version, and the peasants themselves, without state influence, in the anarchist-Makhnovist, as practice shows, gave the latter much more opportunities to involve the peasantry in the implementation of their political ideas. Conservative grain grower discourse, based on private property and democracy, at that time corresponded to the level of consciousness of a small segment of the agricultural population and had limited mobilization opportunities in the countryside.

Each of these party-political peasant-centric discourses offered their “third” way of socio-political development, but due to the revolutionary realities of the time, it was not realized.

## REFERENCES

1. Багатопартійна українська держава на початку ХХ ст. : Програмні документи перших українських політичних партій. Упор. В.С. Журавський. Київ : Пошук, 1992. 96 с.

2. Бевз Т. Між романтизмом і реалізмом (сторінки історії УПСР). Київ : Інститут політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень НАН України. 1999. 272 с.

3. Винниченко В. Відродження нації: (Історія української революції [марець 1917 р. грудень 1919 р.]). [в 3 ч.]. Київ-Відень : [Дзвін]. 1920. Ч. 1. 348 с.

4. Гай-Нижник П.П. В. Липинський та УДХП в теорії і практиці українського державотворення і політичного націонал-консерватизму (1900–1920 рр.). *Гілея. Науковий вісник*. 2018. Вип. 129. № 2. С. 305–322.

5. Галушко К. «Хліборобська ідеологія» В. Липинського у системі східноєвропейського аграризму. *Український історичний збірник*. 2000. № 2. С. 164–200.

6. Грицак Я.Й. Нариси історії України: формування модерної української нації XIX–XX ст. [Навч. посібник]. Київ : Генеза. 1996. 360 с.

7. Жбанова К. Земельна політика Нестора Махна (1917–1921 рр.). *Сіверянський літопис*. 2013. № 4–6. С. 96–101.

8. Земельный вопрос. *Голос села*. Охтирка. 1917. 2 липня. (№ 1). С. 1.

9. Ковалевський М. При джерелах боротьби: спомини, враження, рефлексії. Інсбрук. “Biblos”. 1960. 720 с.

10. Корновенко С.В. Аграрна політика Гетьманату: теоретичний аспект. *Український селянин*. 2004. Вип. 8. С. 211–214.

11. Корновенко С.В. Суб'єктний складник аграрного питання як одна з передумов Української революції 1917–1921 рр. *Український історичний журнал*. 2017. № 4. С. 83–94.

12. Корновенко С. Хутірська філософія П. Куліша: біля джерел українського аграризму. *Український історичний журнал*. 2020. № 5. С. 64–76.

13. Kornovenko S., Pasichna Y. Eastern european agrarianism. Ukrainian intellectual space in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. *Український селянин*. 2019. Вип. 22. С. 24–29.

14. Корреспонденции. *Черниговская земская газета*. 1917. 2–16 мая (№ 35–36). С. 9.

15. Липинський В. Листи до братів-хліборобів про ідею і організацію українського монархізму. Київ – Філадельфія. Східноєвропейський дослідний інститут ім. В.К. Липинського. 1995. 470 с.

16. Липинський В.К. Нарис програми Української демократичної хліборобської партії. Матеріали до програми. Видання Української демократичної партії. Лубни, 1917. 31 с.

17. Махно Н. Русская революция на Украине (от марта 1917 г. по апрель 1918 год). Париж. Б-ка Махновцев : Федерация анархо-коммунист. групп Северной Америки и Канады. 1929. Кн. 1. 216 с.

18. Нестор Иванович Махно: Воспоминания, материалы и документы. сост. В.Ф. Верстюк. Київ : Дзвін. 1991. 192 с.

19. Нестор Махно. Крестьянское движение на Украине. 1918–1921. Документы и материалы. [ред.-упоряд. В. Данилов, Т. Шанин]. Москва. (РОССПЭН). 2006. 1000 с.

20. Програма партії соціалістів-революціонерів. [1906 г.]. Сборник программ политических партий в России. Под ред. В. Водовозова. Вып. 3. СПб., 1906. С. 14–27. URL: <http://docs.historyrussia.org/ru/nodes/74934-programma-partii-sotsialistov-revoljutsionerov-1906-g>.

21. Савченко В.А. Нестор Махно. Харків : Фоліо, 2019. 123 с.

22. Україна ХХ ст.: суспільно-політичні моделі національної держави (державницька ідеологія та програмні засади провідних українських політичних партій і громадсько-політичних об'єднань). П.П. Гай-Нижник (керівник проекту, упоряд. і наук. ред.). Київ, 2018. 705 с.

23. Український національно-визвольний рух. Березень-листопад 1917 року. Документи і матеріали. Упоряд. : В. Верстюк (керівник) та ін. Київ. Видавництво імені Олени Теліги. 2003. 1024 с.

24. Українські політичні партії кінця ХІХ – початку ХХ століття: програмові і довідкові матеріали. Упоряд. В.Ф. Шевченко та ін. Київ : Консалтинг-Фенікс. 1993. 336 с.

25. Чоп В.М., Лиман І.І. Нащадки запорожців: Махновський рух у Північному Приазов'ї (1918–1921 рр.). Мелітополь : Видавничий будинок Мелітопольської міської друкарні. 2019. 609 с.

26. Чоп В.М. Махновський рух в Україні 1917–1921 рр. : проблеми ідеології, суспільного та військового устрою : автореф. дис. ... канд. істор. наук. Запоріжжя, 2002. 20 с.

27. Чоп В.М. Союз і змова: обставини підписання і розриву військово-політичної угоди РПАУ /махновців/ та УНР (вересень 1919 р.). *Наукові праці історичного факультету Запорізького державного університету*. Запоріжжя : Просвіта. 2005. Вип. ХІХ. С. 206–221.

28. Шаповал М. Велика революція і українська визвольна програма. Випуски в Америці. Прага : Вільна Спілка. 1927. 324 с.

29. Шаповал М.Ю. Революційний соціалізм на Україні: [книга 1]. Відень. Борітеся – Поборете. 1921. Кн.1. 256 с.

30. Що таке селоспілка? *Вільне слово*. 1917. 5 липня (№ 7). С. 1.



**AGRARIANISM IN BULGARIA AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA  
IN THE FIRST THIRD OF THE 20TH CENTURY:  
GENESIS, FEATURES OF DEVELOPMENT,  
INTELLECTUAL HERITAGE**

**Kompaniets O. V.**

**INTRODUCTION**

In the first third of the 20th century the ideology of agrarianism reached the peak of its popularity in the countries of Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, which was marked by the genesis of its numerous national variants: Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Polish, Yugoslavian, Romanian, Ukrainian, Hungarian, German and Baltic.

The historical preconditions and circumstances for the spread of agrarian ideas in this region were defined by K. Galushko: “The ground for its [agrarianism] reception was created by the cheap American grain, that was imported to Europe at the turn of the XIX–XX centuries. Thus, it led to falling of prices for agricultural products and the impoverishment of a large number of peasants in Eastern Europe. In this agrarian region, the slogans of agrarianism were filled with new social and political content and became the doctrine of mass peasant parties, which were unknown in Western Europe”<sup>1</sup>.

The experience of agrarianism in Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia seems especially interesting and valuable. Developing in different political and socio-economic conditions, in many cases these regional options were at the forefront of the theory and practice of the agrarianism during the “golden age of the European peasantry” – the period between the world wars, when, according A. Toshkov, the peasantry became a political entity, understood its destiny, realized its purpose and self-organized to defend the “third way”, alternative to communism and capitalism<sup>2</sup>. At the same time, the historian J. Eellend defined the Bulgarian version as a negative, and the Czechoslovak as a constructive experience of agrarianism<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Галушко К. Гетьманська ідеологія В. Липинського 1920–1929 рр. : проблеми інтерпретації. *Студії з архівної справи та документознавства*. 1999. Т. 5. С. 67.

<sup>2</sup> Toshkov A. *Agrarianism as Modernity in 20th-Century Europe: The Golden Age of the Peasantry*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2019. P. 168.

<sup>3</sup> Eellend J. *Agrarianism and Modernization in Inter-War Eastern Europe. Societal change and ideological formation among the rural population of the Baltic area 1880–1939* / ed. by P. Wawrzyniuk. Huddinge, 2008. P. 40.

Historiography of the issue can be systematized into three problem-thematic areas. The first includes publications in which the phenomenon of agrarianism in Central and South-Eastern Europe is analyzed in general and the features of its national variants were identified. To the second and third – studies, which focuses on Czechoslovak and Bulgarian agrarianism and agrarian movements of the first third of the 20th century.

Recognized experts in the field of Central and South-Eastern European agrarianism are R. Holec<sup>4</sup>, J. Eellend<sup>5</sup>, Z. Hemmerling<sup>6</sup>, E. Kubů, T. Lorenz, U. Müller<sup>7</sup>, A. Lech<sup>8</sup>, J. Rychlik, L. Holeček, M. Pehr<sup>9</sup>, H. Schultz, A. Harre<sup>10</sup>, A. Toshkov<sup>11</sup>, B. Trencsenyi<sup>12</sup>, J. Wojnicki<sup>13</sup>. A special place belongs to the Soviet historiography of agrarianism and the closely related “Green International”, which is represented by the works of M. Goranovich<sup>14</sup> and A. Noskova<sup>15</sup>. Modern Ukrainian historians-

---

<sup>4</sup> Holec R. Ideove zdroje medzinarodneho agrarizmu a jeho narodnych špecifik. *Agrarni strana a její zajmove, družstevni a peněžni organizace*. Uherske Hradiště, 2010. Vol. 15. S. 51–72.

<sup>5</sup> Eellend J. (2008). Agrarianism and Modernization in Inter-War Eastern Europe. *Societal change and ideological formation among the rural population of the Baltic area 1880–1939*. Huddinge, Pp. 35–56.

<sup>6</sup> Hemmerling Z. Ruch ludowy w Polsce Bułgarii i Czechosłowacji, 1893–1930. Warszawa : Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1987. 456 p.

<sup>7</sup> Kubů E., Lorenz T., Müller U. Agrarismus und Agrareliten in Ostmitteleuropa. Berlin : Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2013. 686 p.

<sup>8</sup> Lech A. Agraryzm w ruchu ludowym państw słowiańskich (1918–1939). *Dzieje partii i stronnictw chłopskich w Europie. Narodziny i rozwój*. Pułtusk–Warszawa, 2007. T. 1. S. 33–42.

<sup>9</sup> Rychlik J., Holeček L., Pehr M. Agrarismus ve střední a východní Evropě 19. a 20. století. Praha : CEVRO Institut, 2015. 355 s.

<sup>10</sup> Schultz H., Harre A. Bauerngesellschaften auf dem Weg in die Moderne Agrarismus in Ostmitteleuropa 1880 bis 1960. Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010. 296 s.

<sup>11</sup> Toshkov A. Agrarianism as Modernity in 20th-Century Europe: The Golden Age of the Peasantry. Bloomsbury Academic, 2019. 240 p.

<sup>12</sup> Trencsenyi B. Transcending Modernity: Agrarian Populist Visions of Collective Regeneration in Interwar East Central Europe. *Regimes of Historicity in Southeastern and Northern Europe, 1890–1945*. London, 2014. P. 119–145.

<sup>13</sup> Wojnicki J. Restytucja i przekształcenia ugrupowań agrarnych w państwach Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej. *Wschód Europy Studia humanistyczno-społeczne*. T. 6(1). 2020. p. 31–52.

<sup>14</sup> Горанович М. Аграрный кризис и распад аграрного блока стран Восточной и Юго-Восточной Европы, 1930–1933. Москва : Наука, 1971. 221 с.; Горанович М. Крах Зеленого Интернационала (1921–1938). Москва : Наука, 1967. 284 с.

<sup>15</sup> Носкова А.Ф. К вопросу об аграризме и крестьянском движении в странах Центральной и Юго-Восточной Европы в межвоенный период. *Советское славяноведение*. 1981. № 2. С. 40–57.

researchers of the phenomenon of agrarianism are S. Kornovenko<sup>16</sup>, K. Galushko<sup>17</sup>, T. Pikovska<sup>18</sup>, O. Sukhushina<sup>19</sup>. They managed not only to “inscribe” Ukrainian agrarianism in the context of Central and South-Eastern Europe, but also to investigate the cooperation of the emigrant Ukrainian Agrarian Society in Podebrady with representatives of agrarian thought in Czechoslovakia. An article by M. Tomek is devoted to a similar issue<sup>20</sup>,

Well-known experts on Czechoslovak agrarianism are J. Cesar, B. Cerny<sup>21</sup>, J. Harna, V. Lacina<sup>22</sup>, M. Peknik<sup>23</sup>, O. Stepankova<sup>24</sup>, G. Matveev<sup>25</sup>.

Historiography of the Bulgarian variant of agrarianism is represented by works J. Bell<sup>26</sup>, N. Dimov<sup>27</sup>, N. Oren<sup>28</sup>, J. Rubaha<sup>29</sup>, A. Krapivin<sup>30</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup> Kornovenko S. The ideology of Eastern European agrarianism in the programmatic provisions of Czechoslovak and Ukrainian political parties (in the face of social and political turmoil of the early 20th century). *Acta historica Neosoliensia Vedecký časopis pre historické vedy*. 2019. Vol. 22, Issue 2. P. 4–23; Kornovenko S., Pasichna Y. Eastern european agrarianism. Ukrainian intellectual space in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. *Український селянин*. 2019. Вип. 22. С. 24–30; Kornovenko S., Zemzulina N. Ukrainian agrarianism as an option of eastern european agrarism in political programs of the ukrainian national parties of the period of the Ukrainian revolution. *Український селянин*. 2019. Вип. 21. С. 14–20.

<sup>17</sup> Галушко К. Гетьманська ідеологія В. Липинського 1920 – 1929 рр.: проблеми інтерпретації. *Студії з архівної справи та документознавства*. 1999. Т. 5. С. 64–70; Галушко К. «Хліборобська ідеологія» В. Липинського у системі східноєвропейського аграризму. *Український історичний збірник*. 2000. Вип. 2. С. 164–200.

<sup>18</sup> Піковська Т.В. Національні програми Чехословацької Республіканської (аграрної) партії (1899–1922 рр.). *Гілея: науковий вісник*. 2016. Вип. 115. С. 455–458.

<sup>19</sup> Сухушина О.В. Аграрні рухи в слов'янських країнах Центральної і Південно-Східної Європи та створення зеленого інтернаціоналу (1921–1924 рр.). *Український селянин: Зб. наук. пр.* Черкаси, 2008. Вип. 11. С. 337–341.

<sup>20</sup> Tomek M. Ukrajinska monarchisticka emigrace v CSR a organizace agrarni strany. *Regionalni zvláštosti politiky agrarni strany v období první Československe republiky. Studie Slovackeho Muzea* / ed. by J. Harna, B. Rašticova. 2012. Vol. 17. P. 183–192.

<sup>21</sup> Cesar J., Cerny B. O ideologii ceskoslovenskeho agrarizmu. *Ceskoslovensky casopis historicky*. 1959. No. 2. P. 263–285.

<sup>22</sup> Harna J., Lacina V. Politicke programy ceskeho a slovenskeho agrarniho hnuti, 1899–1938. Praha : Historicky ustav, 2007. 274 p.

<sup>23</sup> Peknik M. Milan Hodža a agrarne hnutie. Bratislava : Ustav politických vied SAV, 2008. 192 p.

<sup>24</sup> Stepankova O. O ideologii agrarizmu. *Sbornik praci Filozoficke fakulty brněnske univerzity*. 1961. Vol. 10, Iss. G 5. S. 60–69.

<sup>25</sup> Матвеев Г.Ф. «Третий путь»: Идеология аграризма в Чехословакии и Польше в межвоенный период. Москва : Издательство МГУ, 1992. 239 с.; Матвеев Г. Формирование идеологии чешских аграриев в конце XIX – 1914 г. *Вестник Московского университета*. Серия 8. «История». 1989. № 5. С. 42–55.

The popularity of agrarianism in Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia was due to similar reasons: 1) a series of agrarian crises of the late 19th – early 20th century; 2) agrarian overpopulation; 3) the threat of unemployment for agricultural workers, given the mechanization of the agricultural sector; 4) significant lag of agriculture in the region compared to Western Europe; 5) the spread in the countries of Central and Eastern and South-Eastern Europe of universal suffrage after the First World War, which allowed the peasants to more significantly influence the political life of their countries. In addition, according to A. Toshkov, the Bulgarian, Czech and Slovak agrarian parties, which before the First World War were on the margins of political life, after 1918 found themselves in a radically transformed socio-political landscape in which pre-war political forces and institutions have been discredited, severely weakened, or even expelled from the country. In his view, the autonomous peasant movements that emerged from the ashes of the First World War were represented by three alternatives that were articulated during the “golden age of the European peasantry”: agrarian radicalism in Bulgaria; the concept of the peasant nation in Yugoslavia (particularly in Croatia and Serbia) and centrist agrarianism as a guarantor of parliamentary stability in Czechoslovakia<sup>31</sup>. Such a socio-political atmosphere naturally created favorable conditions for the development of agrarianistic ideas.

In addition, we should note several important circumstances that, in our opinion, have influenced the national characteristics of agrarian movements. Thus, at the end of the First World War, the degree of resolution of the agrarian question in different countries was different: in Bulgaria it was extremely acute, in Czechoslovakia – partially resolved, and in Estonia and Latvia agrarian reform was implemented. Also, we can not underestimate the influence of religion on the mentality, worldview and economic ethics of the

---

<sup>26</sup> Bell J. *Peasants in Power: Alexander Stamboliski and the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union, 1899–1923*. Princeton University Press, 1977. 273 p.

<sup>27</sup> Димов Н. Ал. Стамболийски, аграрните движения в Европа и международната дейност на БЗНС. *Александър Стамболийски: живот, дело, завети*. София, 1980. С. 363–381.

<sup>28</sup> Oren N. *Revolution Administered: Agrarianism and Communism in Bulgaria*, Baltimore : Johns Hopkins UP, 1973. 224 p.

<sup>29</sup> Rubacha J. Ruch ludowy w Bułgarii w latach 1914–1944. *Studia z Dziejów Rosji i Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej*. 2011. Vol. 46. P. 63–84.

<sup>30</sup> Крапивин А., Бычихин Ю. Аграризм Димитра Драгиева – вождя болгарских крестьян. *Вісник Донецького університету. Серія Б: Гуманітарні науки*. 1998. Вип. 2. С. 69–72.

<sup>31</sup> Toshkov A. *Agrarianism as Modernity in 20th-Century Europe: The Golden Age of the Peasantry*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2019. P. 169.

predominantly Orthodox peasants of Bulgaria, mostly the Catholic peasants of Czechoslovakia and, for example, the Protestant peasants of Estonia and Latvia.

Let us dwell in more detail on the ideologues and the content of the ideology of agrarianism in Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia.

### 1. Agrarianism in Bulgaria

According to J. Ellend, the most influential agrarian party in Central and Eastern Europe was the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union (BANU)<sup>32</sup> – a party formed in 1899 on the basis of the peasant cooperative movement. A strong foundation of Bulgarian agrarianism in general and the ideology of BANU in particular were laid in the works of Alexander Stamboliyski “Farmer by profession and farmer by conviction” (in Bulg. «Земеделец по занятие и земеделец по убеждение», 1908), “Power, powerlessness and democracy” (in Bulg. «Власт. Безвластие. Народовластие», 1919), “Why farmers unite” (in Bulg. «Защо се сдружават земеделците», 1919), “The Agricultural Union and its enemies” (in Bulg. «Земеделският съюз и неговите врагове», 1919), “The principles of BANU” (in Bulg. «Принципите на БЗНС», 1919), “The difference between the Agrarian Union and the parties” (in Bulg. «Различието между Земеделския съюз и партиите», 1919) and of Dimitar Dragiev “Where is the salvation of Bulgarian farmers?” (in Bulg. «Где е спасението на българските земеделци?», 1908), “Association in the agricultural union” (in Bulg. «Объединението в Земеделския съюз», 1927).

The source of agrarian ideology in Bulgaria were the works of German agrarianists Albert Schaeffle and Gustav Ruhland, that were actively translated during the First World War. Another source were the works of Russian esers (members of the Socialist Revolutionary Party), popular for their large translations and close Bulgarian-Russian cultural and political ties. R. Holec claims that the obtained theoretical product acquired a peculiar and unique Bulgarian form, in which there were more one-sidedness, eclecticism, radical rhetoric, emotional rather than rational arguments. This is one of the reasons why the religious aspect in the Bulgarian version of agrarianism was especially relevant. Bulgarian agrariansists’ views on industrialization and urbanization were based not on a scientific analysis of socio-economic development trends, but on an unfounded belief that the

---

<sup>32</sup> Ellend J. Agrarianism and Modernization in Inter-War Eastern Europe. *Societal change and ideological formation among the rural population of the Baltic area 1880–1939* / ed. by P. Wawrzyniuk. Huddinge, 2008. P. 36.

“industrial epidemic” would disappear and the world would return to a rural way of life<sup>33</sup>.

Leaders of Bulgarian agrarians and, in particular, BANU, in the first quarter of the 20th century were Alexander Stamboliyski and Rayko Daskalov. In September-October 1918, the BANU distinguished itself by participating in the failed anti-government Vladai uprising. In August 1919, in the regular parliamentary elections, the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union received the largest number of votes – 28%, that brought for the party 85 out of 236 seats<sup>34</sup>. Without a decisive majority in parliament, BANU formed a coalition with populist forces and progressive liberals. Instead, members of the Agrarian Union immediately held key positions in the government and got 7 of the 10 ministerial portfolios in September 1919, including the post of prime minister, which became Alexander Stamboliyski (1919–1923). On May 20, 1920, a new Council of Ministers was formed, and all ten ministerial posts were won by representatives of the agrarian forces. Thus, in addition to the post of Prime Minister, Alexander Stamboliyski headed the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Military Affairs; Alexander Dimitrov became Minister of Internal Affairs; Tsanko Cherkovskiy – Minister of Public Affairs; Marko Turlakov – Minister of Finance; Rayko Daskalov – Minister of Trade; Alexander Radolov – Minister of Justice; Stoyan Omarchevsky – Minister of Education; Alexander Obbov – Minister of Agriculture; Nedyalko Atanasov – Minister of Transport, Posts and Telegraph<sup>35</sup>. Thus, Bulgarian Agrarian National Union went down in history as the only agrarian party in Europe that ever came to power with a majority government, not just as part of a coalition.

In his works, Alexander Stamboliyski revealed the image of Bulgaria, which it should become in 20 years of the BANU’s rule in Bulgaria. In the future, it was seen by Bulgarian farmers as an “exemplary agricultural state” that would be “free of urban dirt”, provided with healthy drinking water, numerous parks, telegraph, telephone and electricity. Alexander Stamboliyski predicted the existence of highly organized cooperatives in the country, an extensive railway network, the existence of storage facilities for grain and tobacco at each station. A House of Agrarian Democracy should be organized in each village, where professional and public discussions,

---

<sup>33</sup> Holec R. Ideove zdroje medzinarodneho agrarizmu a jeho narodnych špecifik. *Agrarni strana a její zajmové, družstevní a peněžní organizace*. Uherské Hradiště, 2010. Vol. 15. P. 53.

<sup>34</sup> Bell J. Peasants in Power: Alexander Stamboliski and the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union, 1899–1923. Princeton University Press, 1977. P. 143.

<sup>35</sup> Rubacha J. Ruch ludowy w Bułgarii w latach 1914–1944. *Studia z Dziejów Rosji i Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej*. 2011. Vol. 46. P. 70–72

lectures, art games and films would be shown, and farmers would be able to hear “the best speeches of the best speakers”. The old parties in Bulgaria were to leave the political arena and be replaced by a coalition formed by the BANU, which would represent the interests of all cooperatives and farmers in the country. Women were to be given the right to vote and play an appropriate role in political life<sup>36</sup>.

In practice, however, the primary task facing the new Bulgarian government was to stabilize the postwar situation in the country. All members of the Council of Ministers of the First World War period were arrested, as well as some deputies and journalists who in 1918 advocated the continuation of Bulgaria’s participation in the war. Among the economic and social reforms carried out during 1919–1923, the method of solving the agrarian question by Bulgarian agrarians attracts our attention the most. Agrarian reform was carried out in two stages. The first step was the creation of a state land fund through the parcelling of latifundias and large farms, the area of which exceeded 30 hectares for arable land, 20 hectares for forests and pastures, 50 hectares in mountainous areas<sup>37</sup>. The next step was the transfer of land to landless and landless peasants. The components of the agrarian policy of the BANU were the provision of agriculture with cheap loans, as well as the expansion of the network of primary schools.

According to J. Rubacha, the agrarian reform of the BANU was a serious step towards the democratization of land relations, but did not fulfill the expectations placed on it. On the one hand, Bulgaria did not have a large number of plots of land that could be parceled out (so the amount of land accumulated in the fund was relatively small), and on the other hand, its distribution was very slow. As of 1923, the authorities had managed to satisfy only a quarter of the applicants’ appeals<sup>38</sup>.

Thanks to its strong positions in parliament and government, the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union began to pursue an almost dictatorial rule, a harsh anti-city and anti-Semitic policy, until its leader, Alexander Stamboliyski, was assassinated in 1923 and power passed to the right. After the coup of 1923, the ideas of agrarianism developed mainly among the Bulgarian emigration. According to R. Holec, they acquired pronounced theoretical (if not utopian) forms: the cooperative line became the core; after 1923 coup d’état, Bulgarian agrarians began to speak more and more actively about the “liquidation of capitalist exploitation” and to justify

---

<sup>36</sup> Стамболийски Ал. Власт. Безвластие. Народовластие. София, 1919. С. 12–18; Стамболийски Ал. Защо се сдружават земеделците? София, 1919. С. 20–31.

<sup>37</sup> Rubacha J. Ruch ludowy w Bułgarii w latach 1914–1944. *Studia z Dziejów Rosji i Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej*. 2011. Vol. 46. S. 72.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid. S. 73.

cooperativeism as the basis of social order<sup>39</sup>. At the same time, the idea of a “cooperative society” or even a “cooperative state” as a new socio-economic system, a “third way”, an alternative to capitalism and socialism, was further developed among Bulgarian emigrants.

## 2. Agrarianism in Czechoslovakia

In Czechoslovakia, agrarianism was the core ideology of the political program of the Republican Party of Farmers and Peasants, which, according to O. Stepankova, was the most powerful party in Czechoslovakia in the Interwar period<sup>40</sup>. In contrast to the Bulgarian, Czechoslovak ideologues in their theoretical constructions relied on the work of French agrarianists, in particular Jules Melin. The political conditions in which Czechoslovak agrarianism existed in the interwar period can be considered unique to Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, because, in the words of contemporaries, Czechoslovakia was “an island of democracy in a sea of dictatorships”<sup>41</sup>. Czechoslovak agrarian parties maintained strong positions in parliament and government during the 1920’s and 1930’s, establishing themselves as reliable coalition partners.

The most influential representatives of Czechoslovak agrarianism were Antonín Švehla and Milan Hodža. A. Švehla headed the Republican Party of Farmers and Peasants from 1909 to 1933, and from 1922 to 1929 he was the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia. In 1925 he published a theoretical pamphlet “Three Reflections on Agrarianism”<sup>42</sup>. M. Hodža, who belonged to the same party as Švehla, held the post of Minister of Agriculture from 1922 to 1926 and 1932 to 1935, and Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia from 1935 to 1938. In 1930 he published a pamphlet “Agrarianism: a series of lectures “on the ideology of Czechoslovak political parties”»<sup>43</sup>, and a year later – organized a collection of articles, speeches and research “Ways of Central European Agrarian Democracy”<sup>44</sup>. M. Hodža’s views were once popular not only in Czechoslovakia, but also, for example, in Slovenia.

---

<sup>39</sup> Holec R. Ideove zdroje medzinarodneho agrarizmu a jeho narodnych špecifik. *Agrarni strana a její zajmové, družstevní a peněžní organizace*. Uherské Hradiště, 2010. Vol. 15. P. 54.

<sup>40</sup> Stepankova O. O ideologii agrarismu. *Sbornik prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity*. 1961. Vol. 10, Iss. G 5. S. 60.

<sup>41</sup> for more see: Miller D. Forging Political Compromise: Antonín Švehla and the Czechoslovak Republican Party, 1918–1933. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1999. 344 p.

<sup>42</sup> Švehla A. Tři uvahy o agrarismu. Praha : MAB, 1925. 19 s.

<sup>43</sup> Hodža M. Agrarism: Cyklus přednášek “o ideologii českoslov. politických stran”. Praha : ÚSČS, 1930. 16 s.

<sup>44</sup> Hodža M. Články, řeči, studie. Svazok IV, Cesty stredoevropskej agrarnej demokracie 1921–1931. Praha : Novina, 1931. 560 p.



In September 1924, he took part in the First All-Slavic Congress of Peasant Youth, held in Ljubljana, where he delivered a report "Agrarianism in Slovenia"<sup>45</sup>, that same year was published as a separate brochure.

In 1923, the Czech historian Otakar Frankenberger published "Agrarianism: The National Economy from the Perspective of the Rural Population"<sup>46</sup>, in which he recorded the attitude of the rural population to economic issues and proved the importance of strong and self-sufficient agriculture, which, according to the author, should be the basis of the state. In addition, the publication raised issues of production, distribution of pensions, insurance, implementation of agrarian reform, organizing of agricultural taxation and more. One of the chapters of the book was devoted to a review of the agrarian history of Europe. In 1931, under the influence of the World economic crisis of 1929, another book by O. Frankenberger, imbued with the ideas of agrarianism, was published – "Agrarian crisis and means of its solving"<sup>47</sup>. As a strategy for Czechoslovakia's exit from the economic crisis, O. Frankenberger proposed the idea of solidarity, as well as cooperation – the consolidation of agricultural enterprises for efficient mechanization without alienating small and medium-sized owners from land. Proponents of agrarianism tended to expand the functions of the state in the field of social and economic relations, including agriculture.

Also in 1931, another source for the history and philosophy of agrarianism was published in Prague – the work of Josef Kettner "Liberalism, Socialism and Agrarianism"<sup>48</sup>. According to the author, agrarianism during the 19th century developed along with socialism as opposed to liberalism. However, agrarianism wanted to avoid the mistakes of two competing ideological currents. First, unlike socialism, it does not set unattainable goals and is based on real life. Second, agrarianism has an ideal model: agrarian democracy, which, unlike socialism, is achieved through evolution and reform, not through revolutionary struggle. The meaning of agrarianism, according to J. Kettner, is social justice, ie equality of rights and responsibilities<sup>49</sup>.

---

<sup>45</sup> Hodža M. Agrarizem in Slovanstvo. Ljubljana : Kmetijska tiskovna zadruga, 1924. 16 s.

<sup>46</sup> Frankenberger O. Agrarismus : Narodní hospodařství se stanoviska venkovského lidu. Praha : A. Neubert, 1923. 416 p.

<sup>47</sup> Frankenberger O. Zemědělska krise a prostředky k jejímu řešení. Praha : Nákladem České národohospodářské společnosti, 1931. P. 37.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid. P. 60.

<sup>49</sup> Kettner J. Liberalismus, socialismus a agrarismus. Praha : Svobodné učení selské, 1931. P. 18.

Compared to other national variants of agrarianism, Czechoslovakia had the most extensive network of periodicals. The daily newspapers “The Village” (“Venkov”), “The Evening” (“Večer”), “The People’s Diary” (“Lidovy Denik”), “The Freedom” (“Svoboda”), “The Slovak Diary” (“Slovensky Denik”) and “The Slovak Politics” (“Slovenska Politika”) were agrarianistic in content and spirit. In addition to daily newspapers, the “Republican Party of Farmers and Peasants” published 9 weeklies, 3 monthly magazines, and 24 regional periodicals.

The generalization of the theoretical foundations of Czechoslovak agrarianism was undoubtedly a series of M. Hodža’s public lectures “Agrarianism”, with which he delivered in 1930, and later published<sup>50</sup>. In his works and speeches, M. Hodža argued that the peasantry and agriculture play a leading role in the society of Czechoslovakia. At the same time, he acknowledged that the main factor in the last quarter of the 19th century was the labor movement. The First World War, however, caused such changes that the most influential social factors, according to M. Hodža, became the agrarian aristocracy and agrarian democracy. These changes took place mainly in the countries of Central Europe, where M. Hodža discovered “a bloodless, quiet, but the deepest social revolution in world history”<sup>51</sup>. According to M. Hodža, this revolution took place in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece, the Baltic States and Finland. Therefore, these countries, in the socio-economic life of which farming played a significant role, according to M. Hodža, “were the most progressive factor against the weary civilization of the West, where factories and machines that mechanized people predominated, and against Russia, where the communist regime existed only through the killing of people”<sup>52</sup>. Finally, M. Hodža emphasized in every way that the energy of the labor force and the environment create in the farmer such characteristics that allow him to act as a “savior of society”. It is interesting that this thesis of the ideologue of Czechoslovak agrarianism is in many aspects consonant with the ideas of the Ukrainian economist, physician and philosopher S. Podolynsky (“Human Labor and the Unity of Physical Forces”, 1880).

Czechoslovak agrarians unanimously condemned large-scale feudal land tenure, considering it not only an anachronism but also a morally unjust phenomenon. Unlike Bulgarian agrarians, the idea of allotting land to the

---

<sup>50</sup> Hodža M. Agrarism: Cyklus přednášek «o ideologii českoslov. politických stran». Praha : ÚSČS, 1930. 16 P.; Hodža M. Članky, řeči, studie. Svázok IV, Cesty stredoevropskej agrarnej demokracie 1921–1931. Praha : Novina, 1931. 560 P.

<sup>51</sup> Hodža M. Agrarism: Cyklus přednášek «o ideologii českoslov. politických stran». Praha : ÚSČS, 1930. P. 4–5.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid. P. 9.

entire agricultural population has not become widespread in Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovak agrarianism was generally negative about the large industrial bourgeoisie. Private property was defined as a guarantee of economic, social and moral stability of society<sup>53</sup>. In the 1920's, the ideology of the “third way” became popular among Czechoslovak agrarians, in particular supporters of M. Hodža, according to which the state had the right to interfere into business activity, as well as to act as a social arbiter.

### **3. Bulgarian and Czechoslovak agrarianism in the context of the search for a “third way” in Central and Eastern Europe in the first third of the 20th century**

The fundamental difference between the ideologies of Czechoslovak and Bulgarian agrarianism lies in the moderate nature of the first and the radicalism of the second. Thus, Czechoslovak theorists of agrarianism were against any kind of dictatorship that was considered to degrade the social order and human dignity and contradict the democratic nature of the peasant. Because dictatorship is inextricably linked to the concentration of power, it makes it impossible to achieve social stability, which is one of the main tasks of agrarianism. Consequently, the dictatorship could not provide a representation of peasant interests and morals.

Agrarianism in Central and Eastern and South-Eastern Europe was a transnational phenomenon characterized by the relocation of centers, the intensive transfer of ideas that went beyond the region, and supranational institution building. The linguistic closeness of the Slavic nations facilitated the exchange of theoretical approaches between the representatives of agrarian thought in the region. Another aspect of intensive international relations among agrarianists were personal contacts. Examples of this are the visits of the leaders of the agrarian parties of neighboring countries to Bulgaria during 1919–1923, as well as the visit of A. Stamboliyski to Czechoslovakia.

The International Agrarian Bureau (the so-called Green International), established in 1921 in Prague, represented the ideas of agrarianism in the international arena. Its founders were agrarian parties from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Croatia and Poland. According to A. Toshkov, the Bureau was a counterweight to the International Peasants' Council, better known as the Peasant International (“Krestintern”), which emerged in Moscow in 1923<sup>54</sup>.

---

<sup>53</sup> Матвеев Г. Ф. «Третий путь?»: Идеология аграризма в Чехословакии и Польше в межвоенный период. Москва : Издательство МГУ, 1992. С. 18–20.

<sup>54</sup> Toshkov A. Agrarianism as Modernity in 20th-Century Europe: The Golden Age of the Peasantry. Bloomsbury Academic, 2019. P. 170.

The paradox of the Bulgarian version of agrarianism is that the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union, which was the most influential among the national parties of agrarian orientation, was the first in Central and Eastern and South-Eastern Europe that lost power, paving the way for the authoritarian regime (1923). After Bulgaria, agrarian forces suffered political defeat in Poland (1926), Yugoslavia (1929), Romania (1931), Estonia, and Latvia (1934). In Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, the Republican Party of Farmers and Peasants maintained its popularity and political weight until 1938 and its representation in government through various coalitions.

In the Interwar period, agrarianism acquired the most radical features (not by accident) in Bulgaria and Croatia, two agrarian countries of Southeastern Europe at the time. On the contrary, parliamentary-oriented and moderate agrarian movements emerged in countries with relatively developed industries, such as Czechoslovakia.

In the Central and Eastern European agrarianism, J. Eellend distinguishes two main types: progressive agrarianism, focused on farmers (Czechoslovakia) and traditionalist agrarianism, focused on small and medium-scale peasants (Bulgaria)<sup>55</sup>. In Soviet historiography, there was an opinion that the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union was the only party of the Green International that did not deny capitalism<sup>56</sup>. On the other hand, the further agrarianism expand the Eastern or Southeastern Europe, the more its ideology acquired anti-capitalist, patriarchal features, turning into a utopia. One of the brightest representatives of this variant of agrarianism, scientists consider the dictatorship of A. Stamboliyski in Bulgaria.

From the point of view of theoretical principles and political practice, the closest to the Czechoslovak variant of agrarianism were Latvian and Estonian. Instead, Bulgarian agrarianism seems to be the closest to the Croatian version.

## CONCLUSIONS

The uniqueness of the Bulgarian and Czechoslovak variants of agrarianism of the first third of the 20th century was due to a number of circumstances and facts.

Features of Bulgarian agrarianism: 1) the development of agrarian thought in Bulgaria was significantly influenced by German and Russian agrarianism; 2) Bulgarian Agrarian National Union – it is one of the oldest

---

<sup>55</sup> Eellend J. Agrarianism and Modernization in Inter-War Eastern Europe. *Societal change and ideological formation among the rural population of the Baltic area 1880–1939* / ed. by P. Wawrzenuk. Huddinge, 2008. P. 37.

<sup>56</sup> Горанович М. Крах Зеленого Интернационала (1921–1938). Москва : Наука, 1967. С. 7.

and most influential political parties of agrarian orientation in Central and Eastern and South-Eastern Europe; 3) the Bulgarian version is a striking example of the traditional version of agrarianism, focused on small and medium-scale peasants; 4) Bulgarian agrarianism was the most radical variant of the ideology of European agrarianism, which, in contrast to the democratic tactics, defended the idea of establishing a dictatorship; 5) the ideology of Bulgarian agrarianism in 1910's – 1920's had anti-urban, anti-Semitic and religious aspects; 6) Bulgarian agrarians were the first among the agrarian parties of Central and South-Eastern Europe that came to power (1919), but also lost it first (1923); 7) The Bulgarian Agrarian National Union became the only agrarian party in Interwar Europe that ever came to power with a majority government, not just as part of a coalition.

Features of Czechoslovak agrarianism: 1) it's genesis and development in Czechoslovakia was significantly influenced by French agrarianism; 2) Czechoslovakia had the most developed industry (after Germany) in Central and Eastern Europe, and relatively democratic political system, which created specific conditions for the development of agrarianism in the interwar period; 3) the agrarian parties of Czechoslovakia during the Interwar period maintained strong positions in parliament and government; 4) the popularity of agrarianism in Czechoslovakia persisted until the end of the 1930's, when in other countries of Central and Eastern and South-Eastern Europe it declined or disappeared at all; 5) Czechoslovak agrarianism of the Interwar period was represented by the widest network of periodicals in Europe; 6) the Czechoslovak organization was the most powerful in the International Agrarian Bureau; 7) focused on farming, the Czechoslovak variant was one of the most moderate and most progressive version of agrarianism; 8) at the turn of the 1920's and 1930's, active cooperation between Czechoslovak and Ukrainian agrarists occurred, the most notable center of which was the Ukrainian Agrarian Society in Podebrady.

Despite a number of differences and peculiarities of the program principles of the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union and the Republican Party of Farmers and Peasants (Czechoslovakia), their ideology was equally based on peasant centrism, as evidenced by the link between the political and socio-economic future of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia and the peasantry.

## REFERENCES

1. Галушко К. Гетьманська ідеологія В. Липинського 1920–1929 рр.: проблеми інтерпретації. *Студії з архівної справи та документознавства*. 1999. Т. 5. С. 64–70.
2. Галушко К. «Хліборобська ідеологія» В. Липинського у системі східноєвропейського аграризму. *Український історичний збірник*. 2000. Вип. 2. С. 164–200.
3. Горанович М. Аграрный кризис и распад аграрного блока стран Восточной и Юго-Восточной Европы, 1930–1933. Москва : Наука, 1971. 221 с.
4. Горанович М. Крах Зеленого Интернационала (1921–1938). Москва : Наука, 1967. 284 с.
5. Димов Н. Ал. Стамболийски, аграрните движения в Европа и международната дейност на БЗНС. *Александър Стамболийски: живот, дело, завети*. София, 1980. С. 363–381.
6. Крапивин А., Бычихин Ю. Аграризм Димитра Драгиева – вождя болгарских крестьян. *Вісник Донецького університету. Серія Б: Гуманітарні науки*. 1998. Вип. 2. С. 69–72.
7. Матвеев Г.Ф. «Третий путь?»: Идеология аграризма в Чехословакии и Польше в межвоенный период. Москва : Издательство МГУ, 1992. 239 с.
8. Матвеев Г. Формирование идеологии чешских аграриев в конце XIX – 1914 г. *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 8. «История»*. 1989. № 5. С. 42–55.
9. Носкова А.Ф. К вопросу об аграризме и крестьянском движении в странах Центральной и Юго-Восточной Европы в межвоенный период. *Советское славяноведение*. 1981. № 2. С. 40–57.
10. Піковська Т.В. Національні програми Чехословацької Республіканської (аграрної) партії (1899–1922 рр.). *Гілея: науковий вісник*. 2016. Вип. 115. С. 455–458.
11. Стамболийски Ал. Власт. Безвластие. Народовластие. София, 1919. С. 12–18.
12. Стамболийски Ал. Защо се сдружават земеделците? София, 1919. С. 20–31.
13. Сухушина О.В. Аграрні рухи в слов'янських країнах Центральної і Південно-Східної Європи та створення зеленого інтернаціоналу (1921–1924 рр.). *Український селянин : зб. наук. пр. Черкаси*, 2008. Вип. 11. С. 337–341.
14. Bell J. Peasants in Power: Alexander Stamboliski and the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union, 1899–1923. Princeton University Press, 1977. 273 p.

15. Cesar J., Cerny B. O ideologii ceskoslovenskeho agrarizmu. *Cesko-slovensky casopis historicky*. 1959. No. 2. P. 263–285.

16. Eellend J. Agrarianism and Modernization in Inter-War Eastern Europe. *Societal change and ideological formation among the rural population of the Baltic area 1880–1939* / ed. by P. Wawrzeniuk. Huddinge, 2008. P. 35–56.

17. Frankenberger O. Agrarismus : Narodní hospodařství se stanoviska venkovského lidu. Praha : A. Neubert, 1923. 416 s.

18. Frankenberger O. Zemědělska krise a prostředky k jejímu řešení. Praha : Nákladem České národohospodářské společnosti, 1931. 37 s.

19. Harna J., Lacina V. Politicke programy českého a slovenskeho agrarniho hnutí, 1899–1938. Praha : Historicky ustav, 2007. 274 p.

20. Hemmerling Z. Ruch ludowy w Polsce Bułgarii i Czechosłowacji, 1893–1930. Warszawa : Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1987. 456 s.

21. Hodža M. Agrarism: Cyklus přednášek “o ideologii českoslov. politických stran”. Praha : ÚŠČS, 1930. 16 p.

22. Hodža M. Agrarizem in Slovanstvo. Ljubljana : Kmetijska tiskovna združba, 1924. 16 p.

23. Hodža M. Članky, reči, štúdie. Sväzok IV, Cesty stredoevropskej agrarnej demokracie 1921–1931. Praha : Novina, 1931. 560 p.

24. Holec R. Ideove zdroje medzinarodneho agrarizmu a jeho narodnych špecifik. *Agrarni strana a její zajmy, družstevní a peněžní organizace*. Uherske Hradiště, 2010. Vol. 15. P. 51–72.

25. Kettner J. Liberalismus, socialismus a agrarismus. Praha : Svobodné učení selské, 1931. 60 p.

26. Kornovenko S. The ideology of Eastern European agrarianism in the programmatic provisions of Czechoslovak and Ukrainian political parties (in the face of social and political turmoil of the early 20th century). *Acta historica Neosoliensia Vedecký časopis pre historické vedy*. 2019. Vol. 22, Issue 2. P. 4–23.

27. Kornovenko S., Pasichna Y. Eastern european agrarianism. Ukrainian intellectual space in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. *Український селянин*. 2019. Вип. 22. С. 24–30.

28. Kornovenko S., Zemzulina N. Ukrainian agrarianism as an option of eastern european agrarism in political programs of the ukrainian national parties of the period of the Ukrainian revolution. *Український селянин*. 2019. Вип. 21. С. 14–20.

29. Kubů E., Lorenz T., Müller U. Agrarismus und Agrarreliten in Ostmitteleuropa. Berlin : Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2013. 686 p.

30. Lech A. Agraryzm w ruchu ludowym państw słowiańskich (1918–1939). *Dzieje partii i stronnictw chłopskich w Europie. Narodziny i rozwój*. Pułtusk–Warszawa, 2007. T. 1. S. 33–42.

31. Miller D. Forging Political Compromise: Antonín Svehla and the Czechoslovak Republican Party, 1918–1933. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1999. 344 p.
32. Oren N. Revolution Administered: Agrarianism and Communism in Bulgaria, Baltimore : Johns Hopkins UP, 1973. 224 p.
33. Pekník M. Milan Hodža a agrarne hnutie. Bratislava : Ustav politických vied SAV, 2008. 192 p.
34. Rubacha J. Ruch ludowy w Bułgarii w latach 1914–1944. *Studia z Dziejów Rosji i Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej*. 2011. Vol. 46. P. 63–84.
35. Rychlík J., Holeček L., Pehr M. Agrarismus ve střední a východní Evropě 19. a 20. století. Praha : CEVRO Institut, 2015. 355 p.
36. Schultz H., Harre A. Bauerngesellschaften auf dem Wege in die Moderne Agrarismus in Ostmitteleuropa 1880 bis 1960. Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010. 296 p.
37. Štepanková O. O ideologii agrarismu. *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity*. 1961. Vol. 10, Iss. G 5. P. 60–69.
38. Švehla A. Tři uvahy o agrarismu. Praha : MAB, 1925. 19 s.
39. Tomek M. Ukrajinská monarchistická emigrace v ČSR a organizace agrární strany. *Regionální zvláštnosti politiky agrární strany v období první Československé republiky. Studie Slovackého Muzea* / ed. by J. Harna, B. Rašticová. 2012. Vol. 17. P. 183–192.
40. Toshkov A. Agrarianism as Modernity in 20th-Century Europe: The Golden Age of the Peasantry. Bloomsbury Academic, 2019. 240 p.
41. Trencsenyi B. Transcending Modernity: Agrarian Populist Visions of Collective Regeneration in Interwar East Central Europe. *Regimes of Historicity in Southeastern and Northern Europe, 1890–1945*. London, 2014. P. 119–145.
42. Wojnicki J. Restytucja i przekształcenia ugrupowań agrarnych w państwach Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej. *Wschód Europy Studia humanistyczno-społeczne*. T. 6(1). 2020. P. 31–52.



**POLITICAL LIFE AND THE AGRARIAN QUESTION  
IN THE COLUMNS OF THE UKRAINIAN CERENIST  
NEWSPAPER “KHLIBOROBKA PRAVDA”  
(THE SECOND HALF OF THE 1920S)**

**Ilytskyi V. I., Hlibischuk M. V.**

**INTRODUCTION**

According to Western researcher Eric Hobsbawm, who is considered one of the most famous historians of the last century, the “short twentieth century” was an era of extremes, where liberal democracy was on one pole and totalitarianism on the other<sup>1</sup>. These two models of socio-political development, according to E. Hobsbawm, were the alternatives faced by human civilization in the twentieth century. Of course, the British scholar aptly noted one of the key features of the past historical epoch, but to say that there are only two ways to build the political, social and economic structure of states, in our opinion, is a significant simplification. After all, the history of the twentieth century. was extremely rich in the existence of various socio-political and socio-economic models of development.

One of the historical alternatives mentioned above was agrarianism, which became widespread in Central and Eastern Europe in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This political and socio-economic doctrine was especially popular in the countries of this region in the interwar period, when after the end of the Great War of 1914–1918 new countries were formed in the post-imperial space. Of course, we explain this influence of agrarianism not only by the agricultural specifics of these territories but also by the beliefs of the peasants at that time, who were the most numerous social community. As Joseph Rothschild rightly points out, the peasant’s travels and his trials as a mobilized soldier in World War I not only deprived him of naivety about material needs but also showed him how much power and the urban population depended on his cleverness and labour<sup>2</sup>. We should also not forget that the electoral systems of these newly created states, despite their shortcomings and imperfections, turned the peasants into the largest group of voters, on whose preferences depended on the political future of a particular regime.

---

<sup>1</sup> Гобсбаум Е. Вік екстремізму. Коротка історія XX віку. 1914–1991. Київ : Альтернатива, 2001. 544 с.

<sup>2</sup> Ротшильд Дж. Східно-Центральна Європа між двома світовими війнами. Київ : Мегатайп. С. 27.

The research aims to consider how political life and the agrarian issue were covered in the Ukrainian newspaper “Khliborobska Pravda”, which was the official publication of the Cerenist party in Northern Bukovina and Northern Bessarabia. The choice of this source is conditioned not only by the circumstances mentioned by us but also by the fact that during this period “Khliborobska Pravda” reflected the ideas of Ukrainian politicians who entered into a temporary unification agreement with the National Cerenist bloc. The views of Ukrainian and Romanian representatives of this political vector on agrarian, national and other important issues of the time created a certain ideological basis for cooperation. As for the chronological boundaries of our scientific article, they cover the second half of the 1920s. This author’s position is due to several considerations. The lower limit is in 1926 a manifesto on their unification was signed between the Cerenist and national parties, which at that time were considered one of the most important opposition political forces to the Romanian government, which led to the creation of a joint opposition camp to political authorities. Upper – with the beginning of the “Great Depression” of 1929–1933, which led to the revision of some ideological principles of this political bloc. In addition, it was during this period that the coalition of the above-mentioned parties won the parliamentary elections and formed a new government.

Briefly analyzing the coverage of this topic in the scientific works of historians, we note that researchers have briefly dealt with this issue. Some researchers have tried to characterize the agrarian question in interwar Romania by partially involving newspaper articles. In particular, some Soviet scholars as V. Malinskyi<sup>3</sup>, V. Litvinov<sup>4,5</sup>, S. Kobylyanskyi<sup>6</sup>. Foreign researchers also partially used the materials of the mentioned publication and other newspapers of that time. We see this in the works of historians such as A. Nicolaescu<sup>7</sup>. It should also be noted that some contemporary Ukrainian

---

<sup>3</sup> Малинский В. Аграрная реформа 1918–1924 гг. в Бессарабии. Кишинев, 1949. 144 с.

<sup>4</sup> Литвинов В.К. Становище селян Буковини в боярській Румунії (1918–1939). *Наукові записки ЧДУ. Серія історичних наук*. Львів : Вид-во Львів, держ. ун-ту, 1956. Т. 18. С. 55–68.

Литвинов В.К. Аграрная реформа на Буковине во время румынской оккупации 1921–1926. *Тезисы докладов XIII отчетной научной сессии профессорско-преподавательского состава*. Черновицкий государственный ун-т. Черновцы, 1957. С. 69–70.

<sup>5</sup> Там же.

<sup>6</sup> Кобилянський С. З історії проведення аграрної реформи на Північній Буковині під час окупації краю буржуазно-поміщицькою Румунією. *Минуле і сучасне Північної Буковини*. Київ : Наукова думка, 1972. Вип. 1. С. 40–51.

<sup>7</sup> Nicolaescu A. Evoluția editorială a gazetei Țărănismul în primii doi ani de existență (1925–1927) *Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis. Series Historica*. 2018. № 15. P. 173–199.

historians who study various aspects of the history of the Kingdom of Romania in the interwar period involve newspaper publications of “Khliborobska Pravda” in their works. These are the works of I. Pidubnyi<sup>8</sup> and O. Rusnak<sup>9</sup>. However, there are no separate scientific works devoted to the coverage of political upheavals and the agrarian question in Romania in the 1920s in the pages of the national-cerenist newspaper “Khliborobska Pravda”. Therefore, in this paper, we will try to analyze this issue briefly.

To understand the political turmoil in the Kingdom of Romania at the time better, we will briefly describe the process of uniting these parties into a single opposition union. It should be noted that the realization of the need to preserve democracy forced the Cerenians to turn to an alliance with the National Party, and on April 23, 1926, both leaders signed and a few days later issued a Manifesto to the Country criticizing the National Liberals and calling for a national Cerenist bloc. If we take into account the actions of the government, the number of parties (25), the price of victory of those parties that have crossed the 2% mark increases. Thus, among them the first was the People’s Party, which won 292 seats, 69 seats were won by the Cerenists, 16 – NLP and 10 – LNHZ. Alba (65.76%), Cahul (62.81%) and Fegerash (62.31%) cast the most votes for the Cerenists, thus electing a total of 69 deputies in 54 counties. Central Bank organizations in territories with national minorities have had their successes. The Cerenians’ idea that it was impossible to gain power solely by winning the parliamentary elections also became more stable, which forced them to make a final decision on merging with the National Party. It is worth noting that in the 1926 elections, the Ukrainians of Bukovina (representatives of the Ukrainian People’s Democratic Party) opposed the Cerenist Party, calling it “the most chauvinistic” and intolerant of Ukrainians. The evidence was the absence of representatives of national minorities on the party’s electoral list in Redeu County, which was considered the largest community of national minorities<sup>10</sup>.

The decision-making process took two months. The nationalists gained supremacy, while the Cerenists played secondary roles in the leadership. Yu. Maniu became the chairman, V. Madzharu the general secretary,

---

<sup>8</sup> Піддубний І. Партії, парламент, король та уряд. Розвиток і взаємодія елементів політичної системи Румунії у 1918–1940 рр. Чернівці : Друк Арт, 2019. 912 с.

<sup>9</sup> Руснак О. Реалізація положень румунської аграрної реформи в Північній Буковині та Хотинщині в міжвоєнний період. *Вісник Прикарпатського університету. Історія*. 2009. Вип. 16. С. 168–176.

<sup>10</sup> Піддубний І. Партії, парламент, король та уряд. Розвиток і взаємодія елементів політичної системи Румунії у 1918–1940 рр. Чернівці : Друк Арт, 2019. С. 238.

A. Vaida-Voevod, V. Breteshanu, I. Migalake, and Dr N. Lupu co-chairs. The candidacies of the heads of provincial and county organizations were also discussed.

At the same time, a meeting of the Permanent Delegation of the NP and the CEC of the Central Committee was held, which discussed the main provisions of the agreement, draft programs and statutes, and decided to hold party congresses on October 10, 1926, in Bucharest. At that time, the ceremonialist Dr N. Lupu, the nationalists N. Jorg, K. Argetoyan, and S. Popescu protested against the merger. Withdrawal from the party on the eve of the congress of taxi drivers, S. Popescu, and the Jorgists threatened the merger of the parties.

On October 10, 1926, the Congress of the National Party opened in the Transilvania Hall in Bucharest. In Maniu's speech, the history of the development of relations between the National and Cerenist parties was outlined, and the need for a merger was emphasized, as the party's forces were not sufficient to oppose the forces of the oligarchy. The party secretary read out the draft program and statute of the party and submitted a resolution to Congress in favour of the merger. After a brief discussion and reading of a letter from N. Jorga and a telegram from the county organization of Dolj opposing the merger, Congress approved the rapprochement of the National and Cerenist parties<sup>11</sup>.

A congress of the Cerenist Party took place in the Amiciția Hall in Bucharest, attended by CEC members, parliamentarians, and delegations from 59 county organizations. I. Migalake announced the results of the discussion conducted by the Cerenists with J. Maniu and read the CEC resolution of September 26, 1926, after which he spoke in favour of the merger. He noted that there was nothing in the NCP program that would contradict the program of the Cerenist Party and that the new party would follow the same path and act by the same means as the Cerenist Party. He emphasized the importance of uniting the parties for the peasantry. After the speech of the party chairman V. Madzharu, he read the drafts of the program and the charter of the new party. Dr N. Lupu's speech in support of the program played a role, delegates declined to speak, and Congress voted in favour of the merger. After that, the delegations communicated, and the Cerenists arrived at the Congress of Nationalists, which formally completed the merger<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> Піддубний І. Партії, парламент, король та уряд. Розвиток і взаємодія елементів політичної системи Румунії у 1918–1940 рр. Чернівці : Друк Арт, 2019. С. 238–239.

<sup>12</sup> Там само.

A few days after the congress, the Manifesto of the National Cerenist Party was issued, in which the association was explained by the will of many citizens and the need for time. They argued for the need to have a strong and independent government of representatives of people's and solidarity parties. They also analyzed the party's program and its charter.

The program of the new party should be assessed as almost a complete program of the Cerenist party because it is built on the main problems and tasks that this party set in previous years and included in the unification program in 1924. The first task was to solve the problem of the constitution, civil rights and freedoms. In the administrative issue, the task remained the decentralization of power, while in the field of justice – the creation of an independent judiciary with the unification of legislation. In the field of education, the main issue remained the elimination of illiteracy and the development of primary education, as well as improving the system of secondary and higher education and training. Concerning national minorities, the program was guided by the provisions of the Alba Iulia decision. Here the NCP was going to support both the Orthodox religion and other state-recognized cults. However, the church itself was to become autonomous and not interfere in politics. Freedom of faith was to be guaranteed<sup>13</sup>.

The economic program was based on the normalization of economic life, and agriculture, which was considered leading, refused to subordinate industry. The economic part of the program was practically divided into measures in agriculture, auxiliary agrarian reform, measures in industry, measures in commerce and cooperation. One of the highlights of the program, which was used for advocacy during the opposition period, was the provision to review the reform and determine the size of farms. Other industries close to agriculture were going to reform. In the financial sphere, they planned to stabilize the lei and introduce a balanced budget. The customs tariff policy also had to be revised. Improvements in rail transport, mail, telegraph, and telephone were also considered. Clause XI of the program provided for the use of foreign capital, which was to be equated in rights with the Romanian one<sup>14</sup>.

In labour policy, the program recommended recognizing unions as legal entities and “a means of communication between labour and capital”. They set tasks to implement labour protection, create a system of assistance to

---

<sup>13</sup> Піддубний І. Партії, парламент, король та уряд. Розвиток і взаємодія елементів політичної системи Румунії у 1918–1940 рр. Чернівці : Друк Арт, 2019. С. 239.

<sup>14</sup> Там само.

workers in old age, illness, disability, take measures against unemployment, set a minimum wage. Other social challenges included raising the level of health care. They considered it necessary to pursue a foreign peace policy, maintain existing alliances and act within the League of Nations<sup>15</sup>.

In 1926, a second large bourgeois party was formed, which continued its activities no longer in radical positions but did not relinquish its role as an opposition force. The NCP immediately launched a mass campaign demanding respect for and expansion of democratic rights and freedoms<sup>16</sup>.

### 1. Political life in the newspaper

Analyzing the topics related to political life, which were covered in the pages of “Khliborobaska Pravda” at that time, we note that a lot of attention was paid to the upcoming parliamentary elections. In particular, the article “The Great Time has Come” (April 18, 1926) stated that the next elections were decisive and the fate of the democratic system in the Romanian state would depend on their results. Here is how it was stated: “In the event of the victory of the liberal deputies of the Averiscans, our people will remain enslaved in the yoke they have borne for many years. If the farmers’ party wins, the era of true democracy will come to Romania, a time when all capitalists, lords who cannot live without lordly hands are afraid like the devil of sacred water”. It was also said that the ruling government regime used various means to fight against opposition forces representing the interests of peasants living in different regions of Romanian state of that time. As noted in the publication, “to weaken the forces of the Farmers’ Party, the gentlemen went to the services of enemies of the people, who want that of the millions that the gentlemen carve out of the blood and sweat of farmers fell and they have something and they go among the people only to confuse and deceive him”<sup>17</sup>.

Another topic that covered aspects of political life at the time was the process of merging the opposition forces of the Cerenist and National parties into a single entity, which we mentioned above. Indeed, the unification of these political structures was a challenge for the ruling government, as the union could potentially win a parliamentary majority in the future and form its cabinet. One issue of the newspaper “Khliborobaska Pravda” stated that “the day of the unification of the agricultural and national parties will become a new page in the history of Romania. The main point in the new

---

<sup>15</sup> Піддубний І. Партії, парламент, король та уряд. Розвиток і взаємодія елементів політичної системи Румунії у 1918–1940 рр. Чернівці : Друк Арт, 2019. С. 239.

<sup>16</sup> Там само.

<sup>17</sup> «Настав великий час». *Хліборобська правда*. 1926. № 7. 18 квітня. С. 1.

party program will be the revision of land reform. For the Ukrainian people, the main thing in their program is the rights of minorities. The merger of the two parties is a big step in the democratization of relations in Romania, and everyone urgently expects that relations in the country will improve in a short time”<sup>18</sup>. At the same time, not only the idea of revising agrarian reform was important for the leaders of these two parties, but also the preservation and development of democracy. The pages of the newspaper devoted to this political process stated that “the state can no longer tolerate the rule of a dictatorship. The best proof is the fact that instead of opening the parliament, the Averisculus government postponed it for a month”<sup>19</sup>. Of course, the words about the government’s dictatorship are an exaggeration, but there is no doubt that adherence to the principles of a democratic system was one of the key foundations for the coalition of these parties.

The columns of “Khliborobaska Pravda” actively covered important events in the political life of the Kingdom of Romania at that time. These include parliamentary discussions of bills on social or economic issues, government policy in one area or another, speeches by prominent politicians in the Romanian parliament, appointments to the executive branch, and so on. For example, the pages of the publication described in detail the situation around the formation of a multiparty government, which took place in the summer of 1927. Newspaper publications indicated that the change of most heads of various ministries was long overdue because they “kept the whole state under a heavy yoke”<sup>20</sup>. There were also criticisms of General Averescu’s former government, which was forced to resign. Note that the editors paid attention to this event not only to gain popularity by criticizing the previous Cabinet of Ministers but also because the representatives of the National Cerenist opposition camp joined the new government and headed some ministries. In particular, M. Popovych was appointed the new Minister of Finance, G. Yunin the Minister of Labor, N. Lupu the Minister of Education, and S. Dan State Secretary of Finance (*meaning the Treasury, which at that time functioned as a separate department – Author*)<sup>21</sup>. There were also calls for the Ukrainian population living in Romania to refrain from voting in the upcoming elections for political structures associated with the former regime and personally with General Averescu, as “the Ukrainian people have no reason to vote for the Averians. All their promises and oaths turned out to be lies”<sup>22</sup>.

---

<sup>18</sup> «Злука демократичних партій». *Хліборобська правда*. 1926. № 17. С. 1.

<sup>19</sup> Там само.

<sup>20</sup> «Зміна правительства». *Хліборобська правда*. 1927. № 3. 12 липня. С. 1.

<sup>21</sup> Там само.

<sup>22</sup> Там само.

Another aspect of political life that needs to be covered is the critique of ideological opponents. This component was given a lot of space in the newspaper. Interestingly, the key political competitors for the National Cerenist bloc were the Liberals and the Social Democrats. It should be noted that the criticism of liberal political forces was connected with the ruling regime of that time. After all, during the 1920s, most of the people in power in the executive branch belonged to this political camp. Therefore, it is not surprising why criticism of the Liberals was heard in the pages of all official publications of the national and Cerenist parties not only during this period but also in subsequent years. All miscalculations in domestic and foreign policy, shortcomings in the implementation of measures in the social or economic spheres were associated with liberal forces and their governments. Interestingly, in most cases, this criticism was also supported by the attitude of the Ukrainian population. It was usually pointed out that none of the ruling forces had been able to take into account the interests of Ukrainians in the agricultural field, in school education, language issues, and so on. These critical articles ended with a call for a future struggle and a reminder that the only party capable of defending the rights of Ukrainians in Bukovina and Bessarabia was the National Cerenist Union<sup>23</sup>.

Another political opponent was the Social Democrats. There was also a lot of criticism of these forces and their leaders, but it was due to other factors. It should be noted at once that the articles criticizing the ideological platform and actions of the Social Democrats did not divide the socialist and communist camps. The fact is that such a division was not carried out not only by the editors of “*Khliborobska Pravda*” but also by politicians of the National Cerenist Party. Although, as I. Piddubnyi, an expert on the political history of Romania in the interwar period, notes, the socialists and communists, although belonging to the left political camp and having a similar social base, were quite different in their ideological basis, organizational structure, and so on<sup>24</sup>.

Analyzing the criticism of the social-democratic forces, it should be divided into two components. The first is an ideological doctrine. It was she who caused a considerable number of critical remarks in the pages of this publication. Last but not least, these ideas were associated with actions in the political, socio-economic spheres, methods of combating political opponents, implemented by the Bolshevik government in the Soviet Union.

---

<sup>23</sup> «Зміна правительства». *Хліборобська правда*. 1926. № 6. С. 1.

<sup>24</sup> Піддубний І. Партії, парламент, король та уряд. Розвиток і взаємодія елементів політичної системи Румунії у 1918–1940 рр. Чернівці : Друк Арт, 2019. С. 316–438.



As noted in one of the newspaper publications devoted to the left parties, “the worst demagogues in our Bukovina are the Bolsheviks (*meaning communists – Ed.*) United around the “Borotba” (“*The Struggle*” – a periodical of the Communists), who are with the Social Democrats”. It was emphasized that they were all allies of the Bolsheviks and that their ideas, which were intended for an illiterate population, could not be put into practice. In addition, there were specific examples when the ideas and slogans of the Bolsheviks in the USSR never materialized. These are half-actions of the process of “Ukrainization”, problems in the field of agriculture, industry, etc.<sup>25</sup>

The second component of the criticism was the ethnic origin of the representatives of the social democratic forces. According to the National Cerenists, most members of both the Socialist and Communist parties were Jews. Such considerations were voiced not only in “Khliborobaska Pravda” but also in other official newspapers of the National Cerenist camp, which were published in the regions of the Kingdom of Romania. In newspaper articles of that period, such terms as “Jewish demagogues”, “Jewish liars”, “Jewish hirelings” were often used. On the one hand, such judgments were prompted by the conviction of nationalist activists that the socialist and communist movements in the Romanian state functioned through the financial income they received from the Soviet government. On the other hand, the level of anti-Semitism in Romania in the interwar period. Anti-Semitic sentiments were widespread at the time. However, it should not be forgotten that this phenomenon was characteristic not only of this country, but also of the whole of Central and Eastern Europe in the years between the two world wars. In our opinion, it is worth agreeing with the assessments of Western researchers R. Gerwarth and J. Horne that anti-Semitism after the First World War was associated with the idea of “Bolshevik threat” that prevailed in the minds of many people in the region. In the imagination of the people of that time, Bolshevism was associated with the destruction of human civilization. Fantastic fears about the Bolsheviks, who sought to seize power in other countries, had a significant impact on the political ideas of the Europeans of the time. Fantasies about the onset of powerful nihilistic forces became the basis for the inspiration of conservative and counter-revolutionary forces in continental Europe<sup>26</sup>.

Thus, the political vicissitudes in the Romanian state of the second half of the 1920s occupied an important place in the pages of the official

---

<sup>25</sup> «Брехня». *Хліборобська правда*. 1927. № 12. С. 1–2.

<sup>26</sup> Gerwarth R., Horne J. *War in Peace: Paramilitary Violence in Europe after the Great War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. 256 p.

newspaper of the National Cerenists, “Khliborobska Pravda”. These publications covered a wide range of issues, from intra-party processes within the national-cerenist coalition to criticism of the then ruling socio-political system, the government and the political forces that supported it.

## **2. The agrarian question in the columns of the newspaper**

Much attention was also paid to the agrarian question in the columns of this periodical, but it was a key element of their ideological platform for the national cerenists. As for the aspects of coverage of this issue, they were different.

It should be noted that in the period under consideration, many newspaper articles were devoted to the critique of agrarian reform, which was implemented in the Kingdom of Romania in the early 1920s. For better understanding, we will analyze the characteristics of changes in the agricultural sector. It should be noted that the discussion of the draft agrarian law took place in the conditions of struggle in both chambers of parliament and against the background of the development of revolutionary events. It is possible that the latest processes forced the government to hurry and submit on February 21, 1921, to the Senate to draft laws on agrarian reform. The reluctance to carry out “mechanical expropriation” was one of the reasons for the gradation of large landholdings, as well as determining the size of the land allotment of peasant farms and farms of colonists. The law established the conditions for the formation of the price of land and the terms of payment for it by peasants. Although the imperfection of the law took place, the adoption of the law on agrarian reform was one of the achievements of the government of A. Averescu, which was used in further political struggle. During the implementation of the agrarian reform, 1,829,046 hectares were expropriated and 357,015 peasants were used to provide land. The problem was the tax arrears, which amounted to more than 3.5 billion lei, most of which fell on farms up to 10 hectares. They tried to solve the problem with the help of the law on debt conversion, the introduction of which reduced debts to 1751 million lei<sup>27</sup>.

If we talk about the peculiarities of the implementation of agrarian reform in Bukovina and Bessarabia, it went through several stages: the establishment of institutions entrusted with the functions of expropriation of land from large landowners, churches, monasteries and foreign nationals and their transfer to landless or landless peasants; description of large estates and

---

<sup>27</sup> Піддубний І. Партії, парламент, король та уряд. Розвиток і взаємодія елементів політичної системи Румунії у 1918–1940 рр. Чернівці : Друк Арт, 2019. С. 705.

redemption of surplus land; compilation of registers of applicants for additional, complete, colonization plots and their acquisition of land ownership<sup>28</sup>.

Analyzing the criticism of the national ceremonials of agrarian reform, which was heard in the articles, we observe that one of the biggest shortcomings they considered was the unfair distribution of confiscated land among peasant farms. In some publications, they called on the peasants to address their complaints about the unequal division of power to the relevant authorities, the national-cerenist party structures, so that they could defend their rights and interests<sup>29</sup>.

The authors also paid attention to the reasons that forced the Romanian authorities to start the agrarian transformation. A special place in them was given to the events of the First World War and the revolutionary processes in Central and Eastern Europe. Thus, one of the articles in “*Khliborobska Pravda*” stated that “the year 1918 shook Eastern and Central Europe, revolutions broke out” and this was the reason why “the Romanian boyar authorities, surrounded by this, decided to give part of the land to the hungry peasantry. Only this circumstance was the reason that prompted the Romanian nobles to the so-called law of agrarian reforms”<sup>30</sup>. Of course, the unbalanced distribution of land was affected again, but the emphasis was on the fact that such a lack was caused not only by social reasons but also by ethnic origin, as other national communities – Hungarians, Jews and Ukrainians – lived in these lands of the Kingdom of Romania. For example, specific cases of such oppression were pointed out, and it was reiterated that Ukrainian peasants should only support nationalists, as they would be able to protect their interests<sup>31</sup>.

One of the topics that were actively raised in the pages of “*Khliborobska Pravda*” was the agrarian issue in Soviet Ukraine and the USSR in general. It aroused interest not only because the USSR and the Kingdom of Romania had a common border and the fact that Ukrainians in Bukovina and Bessarabia sought to learn more about life in Greater Ukraine. This interest was also caused by the fact that the national cerenists tried to comprehend the transformation in the agrarian sphere in the USSR, because, as we mentioned above, agrarian reform was a key component of the ideological

---

<sup>28</sup> Руснак О. Реалізація положень румунської аграрної реформи в Північній Буковині та Хотинщині в міжвоєнний період. *Вісник Прикарпатського університету. Історія*. 2009. Вип. 16. С. 169.

<sup>29</sup> «В справі аграрної реформи». *Хліборобська правда*. 1926. № 16. 2 травня. С. 1–2.

<sup>30</sup> «Все ще про земельну реформу». *Хліборобська правда*. 1928. № 18. С. 1.

<sup>31</sup> Там само.

platform of this political force. Fair changes in the agrarian sphere were considered by the national cerenists as a guarantee of successful development in the future. Therefore, such interest was quite understandable.

It should be noted that newspaper publications actively criticized the actions of the Bolsheviks in agricultural policy. It was pointed out that the ideological nature of the Bolshevik concept in this matter led to the fact that their measures did not find widespread support among the peasants. Without the support of the peasantry, the Soviet government would not have been able to retain power for long. Therefore, as it was rightly emphasized in the newspaper publications, “the Bolsheviks did not know how to satisfy the interests of the peasants and therefore the village in Russia and Ukraine remained a nest of dissatisfied people. And to satisfy the interests of the peasantry, the Bolshevik government renounced many of its radical reforms and put the agricultural question at the forefront of its domestic policy”<sup>32</sup>. Moreover, realizing the utopian nature of its plans, the Soviet government returned to market management methods. As noted in the newspaper’s columns, “the peasant question is the most important in today’s Russia. That is why the Bolshevik government changed its course, returning to the “bourgeois mistress”<sup>33</sup>. According to the authors of the articles, the greatest dissatisfaction of the peasants was caused by their unequal relations with the Bolshevik authorities, economic troubles, and artificial underestimation of prices for agricultural products. In addition, some publications were devoted to the struggle of Ukrainian peasants and other social groups against the Soviet leadership. Cases of peasant resistance to Bolshevik policy in various regions of Soviet Ukraine, repression of Ukrainians by the authorities, and so on were mentioned<sup>34</sup>.

The editors of “Khliborobaska Pravda” were also attracted by the Bolshevik measures taken to gain loyalty among the peasantry. Among such actions of the Bolshevik government, the policy of “Ukrainization” aroused interest. Such a political course of the Soviet government was to ensure the spread of communist ideas among Ukrainian peasants. This policy, as rightly emphasized in the pages of the publication, “was one of the means of communist propaganda among the Ukrainian peasantry”. However, even such steps by the Soviet leadership did not greatly increase the authority of the Ukrainian peasantry. After all, the Soviet government did not take into account the peculiarities of management on Ukrainian lands, which was formed over the centuries. In these territories, the collective form of

---

<sup>32</sup> «Хліборобське питання в Сов. Росії». *Хліборобська правда*. 1926. № 15. 8 серпня. С. 2.

<sup>33</sup> Там само.

<sup>34</sup> Боротьба проти советів на Україні. *Хліборобська правда*. 1927. № 1. С. 1.

agriculture, in contrast to Russia, was not so common. Therefore, communist ideas about the creation of collective farms in Soviet Ukraine were opposed by peasants. Thus, in one of the newspaper reviews of the situation in the USSR on this occasion it was stated: “In Ukraine, in the vast majority, an individual form of land tenure prevailed, which could not but affect the psychology of the peasants. This explains the disobedience of the Ukrainian peasantry to the communist idea. That is why the communists turned their energy to the struggle against the Ukrainian peasant and his hostility to communist forms of land use”<sup>35</sup>.

Of course, the agrarian policy of other states also aroused interest. For example, many articles covered measures to address the agrarian issue in the states that emerged in the vastness of continental empires after the First World War. This is not surprising, since, in the interwar period, these newly created nation-states carried out agrarian transformations to eliminate the former imperial relations that dominated the field until 1914. In addition, we should not forget that in the period between world wars the positions of political forces the interests of the peasantry were quite strong in all the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

It should be noted that an important place among the publications in “*Khliborobaska Pravda*” was given to agrarian reform in Czechoslovakia. At that time, the reform of this area, which began after 1918, was almost completed.

Analyzing newspaper articles on this issue, we emphasize that readers had the opportunity to get acquainted with the key components of agrarian reform in the Czechoslovak Republic. The importance of these changes was discussed not only for the Czechoslovak government, but also for other political regimes in the region, the principles according to which this reform was implemented, the algorithm for its implementation, and so on<sup>36</sup>. In particular, the characteristic features of each stage of these agrarian transformations were indicated, and the activities of the institutions responsible for the course of the reform were detailed. Of course, we paid attention to the shortcomings that occurred in the process of these changes. For example, the negative impact of the bureaucracy on this reform was mentioned, because due to some amendments during each stage of these changes, the reform plan, which began to work on after the end of World War 1914–1918<sup>37</sup>, changed significantly. Considerable criticism has been

---

<sup>35</sup> Банкротство комуністичної ідеї на Україні. *Хліборобська правда*. 1927. № 6. С. 2.

<sup>36</sup> Аграрна реформа в Чехословаччині. *Хліборобська правда*. 1928. № 23. С. 1.

<sup>37</sup> Аграрна реформа в Чехословаччині. *Хліборобська правда*. 1928. № 24. 17 червня. С. 1.

levelled at the distribution of vacant land among the peasantry, as the land standards agreed upon in the agrarian reform project were often not met in practice, which in turn caused dissatisfaction among the peasant community<sup>38</sup>. It was also emphasized the slow pace of transformation of this area, the failure to implement the idea of creating collective farms in rural areas, which insisted on the left political forces of Czechoslovakia, and so on<sup>39</sup>. Interestingly, the columns of the periodical mentioned the national component of agrarian reform, which also caused criticism. Thus, it was emphasized that the then Czechoslovak state was not monoethnic, because it was inhabited by other national communities – Slovaks, Germans, Poles, Ukrainians, Jews. However, preference was given to the Czechs in the distribution of land, although the above-mentioned ethnic minorities were able to manage the countryside no less productively<sup>40</sup>. In fairness, the authors tried to explain to readers such measures of the Czechoslovak government by the former oppression of the Czechs, which they suffered from the Germans and Hungarians during the existence of the Habsburg monarchy. As stated in one of the newspaper articles, “by carrying out land reform, they wanted to correct the wrongs done to the Czechs by the Germans and Hungarians several centuries ago<sup>41</sup>”.

Another issue that has been given a place in “*Khliborobskaya Pravda*” is related to the agrarian issue but in the dimension of Central and Eastern Europe. This is the creation of an international platform that combines and coordinates the activities of peasant parties. Thus, the pages of the newspaper covered the work on the creation of such an institution, the so-called “farming international”, as mentioned in the columns of the newspaper. This was the initiative of one of the most influential Czechoslovak politicians of the interwar period and leader of the Agrarian Party Antonin Schwegl (1873–1933). According to A. Schwegl, such a structure could in the future consolidate political forces in different regions of continental Europe, representing the interests of the peasantry, as well as allow to protect the rights of this social community at the global level. Such ideas attracted the support of Romanian nationalists. Publications on this subject stated: “The creation of the Farmers’ International is of great importance for all farmers. We can only warmly welcome its creation”<sup>42</sup>.

---

<sup>38</sup> Аграрна реформа в Чехословаччині. *Хліборобська правда*. 1928. № 24. 17 червня. С. 1.

<sup>39</sup> Там само.

<sup>40</sup> Там само. С. 1–2.

<sup>41</sup> Там само.

<sup>42</sup> «Хліборобський інтернаціонал». *Хліборобська правда*. 1928. № 17. 22 квітня. С. 1.

However, as rightly noted below, only parties operating in their nation-states can be members of such an organization. Therefore, for example, Ukrainian conservative forces (supporters of Hetman P. Skoropadskyi) could not participate in its activities<sup>43</sup>.

## CONCLUSIONS

Summing up, let's focus on some of our considerations. First, the subject of political life and the agrarian question occupied an important place in the publications of the Ukrainian edition of the national cerenists "Khliborobska Pravda". These topics, along with other current issues of the time (national, educational), aroused interest in the readership. Secondly, we believe that such thematic preferences were caused not only by the fact that the newspaper's editors focused more on the Ukrainians of Northern Bukovina and Northern Bessarabia, but also on their ideological and political convictions. After all, the same editorial policy is observed in other publications of this political force, which were published in other territories of the Kingdom of Romania at that time. Third, we can state that such an emphasis on the publishing activities of the national cerenists and their consideration of ethnic specificity was, on the one hand, evidence of their political ambitions and aspirations to form their government. On the other hand, it reflects the realities of the "short twentieth century", when the tools of "industrial civilization" (periodicals, radio, telegraph and other means of communication) were transformed into means of political struggle and the future of a political regime depended on their effective use.

## REFERENCES

1. Аграрна реформа в Чехословаччині. *Хліборобська правда*. 1928. № 24. 17 червня. С. 1–2.
2. Банкротство комуністичної ідеї на Україні. *Хліборобська правда*. 1927. № 6. С. 1–2.
3. Боротьба проти советів на Україні. *Хліборобська правда*. 1927. № 1. С. 1–2.
4. Брехня. *Хліборобська правда*. 1927. № 12. С. 1–2.
5. В справі аграрної реформи. *Хліборобська правда*. 1926. № 16. 2 травня. С. 1–2.
6. Все ще про земельну реформу. *Хліборобська правда*. 1928. № 18. С. 1–2.

---

<sup>43</sup> «Хліборобський інтернаціонал». *Хліборобська правда*. 1928. № 17. 22 квітня. С. 1.

7. Гобсбаум Е. Вік екстремізму. Коротка історія XX віку. 1914–1991. Київ : Альтернатива, 2001. 544 с.
8. Демагоги. *Хліборобська правда*. 1927. № 12. С. 1–2.
9. Злука демократичних партій. *Хліборобська правда*. 1926. № 17. С. 1–2.
10. Зміна правительства. *Хліборобська правда*. 1926. № 6. С. 1–2.
11. Кобилянський С.Д. З історії проведення аграрної реформи на Північній Буковині під час окупації краю буржуазно-поміщицькою Румунією. *Минуле і сучасне Північної Буковини*. Київ : Наукова думка, 1972. Вип. 1. С. 40–51.
12. Литвинов В.К. Аграрная реформа на Буковине во время румынской оккупации 1921–1926. *Тезисы докладов XIII отчетной научной сессии профессорско-преподавательского состава*. Черновицкий государственный ун-т. Черновцы, 1957. С. 69–70.
13. Литвинов В.К. Аграрная реформа на Буковине во время румынской оккупации 1921–1926. *Тезисы докладов XIII отчетной научной сессии профессорско-преподавательского состава*. Черновицкий государственный ун-т. Черновцы, 1957. С. 69–70.
14. Литвинов В.К. Становище селян Буковини в боярській Румунії (1918–1939). *Наукові записки ЧДУ. Серія історичних наук*. Львів : Вид-во Львів, держ. ун-ту, 1956. Т. 18. С. 55–68.
15. Малинський В. Аграрная реформа 1918–1924 гг. в Бессарабии. Кишинев, 1949. 144 с.
16. Настав великий час. *Хліборобська правда*. 1926. № 7. 18 квітня. С. 1–2.
17. Піддубний І. Партії, парламент, король та уряд. Розвиток і взаємодія елементів політичної системи Румунії у 1918–1940 рр. Чернівці : Друк Арт, 2019. 912 с.
18. Ротшильд Дж. Східно-Центральна Європа між двома світовими війнами. Київ : Мегатайп. 496 с.
19. Руснак О. Реалізація положень румунської аграрної реформи в Північній Буковині та Хотинщині в міжвоєнний період. *Вісник Прикарпатського університету. Історія*. 2009. Вип. 16. С. 168–176.
20. Хліборобське питання в Сов. Росії. *Хліборобська правда*. 1926. № 15. 8 серпня. С. 1–2.
21. Хліборобський інтернаціонал. *Хліборобська правда*. 1928. № 17. 22 квітня. С. 1.
22. Gerwarth R., Horne J. War in Peace: Paramilitary Violence in Europe after the Great War. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2012. 256 p.
23. Nicolaescu A. Evoluția editorială a gazetei Țărănismul în primii doi ani de existență (1925–1927) *Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis. Series Historica*. 2018. № 15. P. 173–199.



## PEASANT REVOLUTIONISM OF THE COUNTRIES OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE AND UKRAINE – THE CATALYST OF AGRARIANIST TRANSFORMATIONS

**Pasichna Yu. G.**

### INTRODUCTION

Early twentieth century marked by significant socio-economic, socio-political, ethno-national transformations in Central and Eastern European countries. The challenges that arose and needed to be addressed urgently were due to the influence of the World War I and internal conflicts. One of the urgent issues was agrarian one. The search for ways to solve it and agrarian changes have radically influenced the course of world history. In the context of these changes, it is appropriate to single out a new phenomenon – agrarianism. Ukrainian agrarianism was one of the variants of Eastern European agrarianism.

The purpose of the study is to study the socio-economic and socio-political situation of the peasantry in Central and Eastern Europe and Ukraine and a comparative analysis of the revolutionary actions of the peasantry of Ukraine and Central and Eastern Europe, which accelerated the agrarianist transformations of society.

The topic we raised already has a historiographical tradition of coverage. The questions are consonant with our chosen topic for study, have become the subject of research by scientists. In particular, V. Boechnko<sup>1</sup>, O. Sukhushyna<sup>2</sup>, S. Krapivin<sup>3</sup>, S. Kornovenko<sup>4</sup> and others applied to their study. However, not all of them are fully covered.

---

<sup>1</sup> Боечко В. Вирішення аграрного питання в Польщі (1918–1926 рр.). *Український селянин*. 2018. вип. 20. С. 5–9.

<sup>2</sup> Сухушина О. Аграрні рухи в слов'янських країнах Центральної та Південно-Східної Європи та створення Зеленого Інтернаціоналу (1921–1924 рр.). *Український селянин*. 2008. Вип. 11. С. 337–341.

<sup>3</sup> Крапивин С. Транспортные пути эмали и их клиническое значение: дис. ... канд. мед. Наук : 14.01.21; Донецкий гос. медицинский ун-т им. М. Горького. Донецк, 1995. 126 с.

<sup>4</sup> Корновенко С., Земзюліна Н. Революційні потрясіння початку ХХ ст.: аграрне законодавство країн Центральної та Південно-східної Європи. *Український селянин*. 2018. Вип. 19. С. 45–49.

## 1. Socio-economic situation of the peasantry of Central and Eastern Europe and Ukraine in the early 20th century

Agriculture formed the basis of the Bulgarian economy. The share of the rural population was 80.1%. In 1908, there were more than 225,000 owners in Bulgaria, who had 182,478 hectares at their disposal (the size of one land tenure was less than 2 hectares). At the same time, 215 owners owned 155,000 hectares (the size of each such household was over 300 hectares)<sup>5</sup>. The most numerous were households that can be called middle-peasants<sup>7</sup>. In 1908 the number of such households was 172 thousand, they had allotments ranging in size from 5 to 10 hectares<sup>6</sup>.

In the early twentieth century the peasantry of Bulgaria was in a difficult socio-economic situation: increased taxes, debts to the state and money-lenders, the problem of providing households by agricultural machinery, difficult rental conditions, and so on. The state placed the payment of foreign debts on the shoulders of the peasantry. The state tax doubled in 1911 compared with 1901. The peasant mortgage debt to banks and individuals in 1911 amounted to 38 million leva, compared with 11 million leva in 1901. The main agricultural tool of the landless peasantry and the poor was the ard. According to statistical estimates, in 1910 thousands of farms had an average of 849 ards, 231 plows, 2 seeders, 14 reapers, 2 threshers<sup>7</sup>. Most of all the peasantry in Bulgaria suffered from the conditions imposed by moneylenders. In many cases, the peasants were forced to give ½ of the harvest to the usurers for debts<sup>8</sup>.

Rental conditions were also difficult. Peasants who had plots of about 3 hectares and leased no more than 5 hectares often applied for rent. The most difficult was the natural lease, the conditions of which were that often half of the harvest or even 2/3 was taken by the landowner. In addition to in-kind rent, there was also a working one. It was approached by peasants who worked for export. Such households were provided with agricultural machinery and resorted to hiring labour<sup>9</sup>. We have confirmation of the difficult economic situation of the peasantry in the reports of agricultural inspectors: "The situation of our landowner... is in most cases critical. Peasants work from dawn to dusk, not getting for their work and the most necessary"<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> История Болгарии / ред. П.Н. Третьяков, С.А. Никитин, Л.Б. Валеv. Москва : Издательство Академии наук СССР. 1954. Т. 1. С. 451.

<sup>6</sup> Там же. С. 453.

<sup>7</sup> Там же. С. 451.

<sup>8</sup> Там же. С. 452.

<sup>9</sup> Там же. С. 453.

<sup>10</sup> Там же. С. 451–452.

Under such difficult socio-economic conditions, peasant households went bankrupt, and peasants were forced to seek work. Not only households with less than 2 hectares of land were ruined, but also households ranging in size from 5 to 10 hectares. From the social structure of the peasantry, agricultural workers were separated, who, due to the difficult situation in industry, were forced to go to work for the wealthy peasantry. The total number of agricultural workers in 1910 was 190 thousand, of whom 90 thousand – permanent workers<sup>11</sup>. Working conditions were extremely difficult: the working day lasted 14–16 hours, wages were meager, women's work was paid half as much.

About 65% of the population was employed in Polish agriculture<sup>12</sup>. The social structure of the rural population of Poland at the beginning of the twentieth century. was divided into affluent peasantry – 14.5 million (53.2%)<sup>13</sup>, middle peasants – 5.5 million (20.2%) and landless peasants – 7.2 million (26.4%). The basis was small households up to 5 hectares, which accounted for 2/3 of all households. The wealthy peasantry (over 100 hectares) owned 44.8% of all lands, middle-peasants' households owned 27.3% of the land, and the landless peasantry owned 11.2% of the land<sup>14</sup>. 1.3 million peasants did not have land holdings, i.e., were landless. The Catholic church was large landowner in Poland and had 229 thousand hectares (each allotment was more than 50 hectares)<sup>15</sup>.

The agrarian problems of the Polish peasantry were caused by the influence of the World War I, the use of obsolete equipment, low labour productivity, the non-use of fertilizers, and the outdated system of land cultivation<sup>16</sup>.

In Czechoslovakia's agriculture in the early twentieth century 39.57% of the population was employed<sup>17</sup>. Socially rural population of Czechoslovakia

---

<sup>11</sup> История Болгарии / ред. П.Н. Третьяков, С.А. Никитин, Л.Б. Валев. Москва : Издательство Академии наук СССР. 1954. Т. 1. С. 452.

<sup>12</sup> Краткая история Польши. Москва : Наука, 1933. С. 263.

<sup>13</sup> Зашкільняк Л., Крикун М. Історія Польщі. Від найдавніших часів до наших днів. Львів, 2002. С. 459.

<sup>14</sup> Боєчко В. Вирішення аграрного питання в Польщі (1918–1926 рр.). *Український селянин*. 2018. Вип. 20. С. 5.

<sup>15</sup> Краткая история Польши. Москва : Наука, 1933. С. 263.

<sup>16</sup> Зашкільняк Л., Крикун М. Історія Польщі. Від найдавніших часів до наших днів. Львів, 2002. С. 460.

<sup>17</sup> Сухушина О. Аграрні рухи в слов'янських країнах Центральної та Південно-Східної Європи та створення Зеленого Інтернаціоналу (1921–1924 рр.). *Український селянин*. 2008. Вип. 11. С. 338.

in the early twentieth century divided into small, medium and wealthy<sup>18</sup>. The agrarian problems facing the newly formed state were similar to those facing other Slavic countries: the effects of the World War I were compounded by insufficient food for both the rural and urban populations.

Czechoslovakia's agrarian problems did not become a new phenomenon for the newly formed state. Czech and Slovak lands at the turn of the nineteenth – twentieth centuries developed unevenly, including in the agricultural sector. By the end of the nineteenth century, Czech society managed to overcome the agrarian crisis and the rural population began to grow grain, potatoes, hops, and beets more actively<sup>19</sup>. However, the state was unable to control the uneven enrichment of the population and the number of hired rural workers, and hence the growth of smallholder and landless peasants. The total percentage of employees in cities and villages was 57% of the total population<sup>20</sup>.

In Slovakia at the turn of the nineteenth – twentieth centuries dominated by large land holdings, which territorially covered more than a third of all lands. Therefore, there were problems of land scarcity, ruin of peasant households and migration of the rural population to Hungary, Austria, USA and partly Russia, exploitation of the rural population in the form of various forms of work, various forms of lease of agricultural land that were unaffordable for the peasantry (for example, sharecropping arrangements, etc.)<sup>21</sup>. The unification of the Czech and Slovak lands did not contribute to the development of agriculture. During the first third of the twentieth century there is an enrichment of large landowners and the impoverishment of small peasant households in Slovakia, which were unable to withstand market competition from large Czech industrial centres<sup>22</sup>.

At the beginning of the twentieth century 2/3 of the rural population was employed in the agricultural sector of Dnieper Ukraine. For example, in 1917, out of 31,214.5 thousand inhabitants of the nine Dnieper Ukrainian provinces, 24,237.3 thousand were peasants (77.7%)<sup>23</sup>. According to estimates by Yu. Kotlyar, the peasants had 28 million dessiatins of land, or 64% of the total economic land area. In the regional division, each peasant household had: on the Right Bank – 5.4 des., on the Left Bank – 6.8 des., in

---

<sup>18</sup> Чехия и Словакия в XX веке: очерки истории: в 2 кн. / ред. В.В. Марьина. Москва : Наука, 2005. Кн. 1. С. 20.

<sup>19</sup> Там же. С. 18.

<sup>20</sup> Там же.

<sup>21</sup> Там же. С. 34.

<sup>22</sup> Там же. 453 с.

<sup>23</sup> Рибалка І. Великий жовтень і зміни соціальної структури селянства України (1917–1920 рр.). *Український історичний журнал*. 1987. № 11. С. 38.

the South – 8.5 des.<sup>24</sup> At the same time, the size of landed estates averaged 1,740 des. on the household<sup>25</sup>.

The peasantry of Dnieper Ukraine was also in a difficult socio-economic situation: 1) objective processes of establishing market relations in agriculture, for which the peasants were not ready; 2) the preservation of the remnants of serfdom, and especially the workings, which were quite sensitive for the peasants. The most common were working for land leased by peasants from landlords; 3) performance in favour of the landlords and the state of numerous in-kind and monetary duties. Redemption payments remained the most significant among them. Due to chronic insolvency, peasants from year to year underpaid 10, 20 percent or more of a certain amount of payment, which led to an increase in the amount of arrears; 4) poor harvest years, which were repeated in Russia with a frequency of 3–4 years<sup>26</sup>; 5) lack of labour in the countryside. About 4 million men of the countryside were mobilized for the army during the World War I; 6) by the spring of 1917, a third of the peasants' horses had been requisitioned for the needs of the army<sup>27</sup>. The peasants were also burdened with food requisitions for the needs of the army, legalized on November 29, 1916<sup>28</sup>; 7) a sharp decrease in the supply of the village with agricultural equipment, machinery, such simple, but necessary for the peasants, tools such as sickles and scythes. At the beginning of 1917, every second peasant household did not have arable tools, in addition, it was forced to hire working cattle, because they also did not have their own<sup>29</sup>. 88.46% of the poor and middle peasants did not have enough land, 88.1% – working cattle, 84.2% – cows, 44.9% – equipment<sup>30</sup>. If the landowner had 17 horses and 24 head of cattle, the poor – 1.2 horses and 1.5 head of cattle<sup>31</sup>. S. Maslov, one of the leaders of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, considered the reason for the peasants' actions to be the peasantry's scarcity of land: "The need for

---

<sup>24</sup> Котляр Ю. Селянство Півдня України в період економічної політики (1921–1929 рр.): дис... д-ра іст. наук: 07.00.01. Одеса, 2005.

<sup>25</sup> Малькін В. Земельне питання в Україні в умовах революції 1917–1920 рр. : дис. ... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01. Львів, 2009.

<sup>26</sup> Герасименко О. Селянський рух на Лівобережній Україні (1900 – лютий 1917 рр.): дис. ... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01. Чернігів, 2007. 285 с.

<sup>27</sup> Малькін В. Земельне питання в Україні в умовах революції 1917–1920 рр. : дис... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01. Львів, 2009.

<sup>28</sup> Мотенко Я. Селянський рух в Харківській губернії (1917–1921 рр.): дис. ... канд. істор. наук : спец. 07.00.01. Харків, 2005. 195 с.

<sup>29</sup> Там само.

<sup>30</sup> Куташев І. Селянський рух в Україні (березень 1917 р. – квітень 1918 р.): дис. ... канд. істор. наук : спец. 07.00.01. Київ, 2002. 236 с.

<sup>31</sup> Там само.

land is all over the country”<sup>32</sup>. According to K. Kononenko’s calculations, the smallholder and landless peasantry of Ukraine made up a total of 78%<sup>33</sup>.

Mobilization of the population, shortage of labour, tools, etc. have led to a sharp decline in productivity. For example, in Poltava region, in comparison with 1913, in 1917 the yield of rye in peasant farms decreased from 78 to 48 poods, winter wheat – from 97 to 37 poods, spring wheat – from 67 to 46 poods, barley – from 79 to 48, oats – from 80 to 52 poods, etc.<sup>34</sup>. However, despite the decrease in yields on the territory of Ukraine in peasant households, the export of fodder and food for the needs of the army only increased.

In addition, peasant farms had a low agricultural culture. Most of the land in peasant farms was cultivated by three-field and multi-field systems and so on<sup>35</sup>. Land yields in peasant households were half as low as in landlord and wealthy peasant households. Due to this, the peasants were forced to rent arable land. For example, in the Kharkiv province, the rental price in early 1917 was 20 rubles 20 kopecks per dessiatin<sup>36</sup>.

According to the research of Yu. Kotlyar, V. Malkin and I. Kutashev, the property differentiation of peasant households in 1917 was as follows:

**Peasant households of Ukraine (1917)<sup>37, 38, 39</sup>**

<b>Peasant households</b>	<b>according to Yu. Kotlyar</b>	<b>according to V. Malkin</b>	<b>according to I. Kutashev</b>
Without own sowing	700 thousand	625 thousand	633 thousand
With sowing up to 1 tithe	–	616 thousand	625 thousand
With sowing from 1 to 3 tithes	800 thousand	647 thousand	657 thousand

<sup>32</sup> Маслов С. Земельный вопрос. *Земля и воля*. 1917. № 4. С. 1–2.

<sup>33</sup> Кононенко К. Україна і Росія: Соціально-політичні підстави української національної ідеї 1917–1960. Мюнхен, 1965.

<sup>34</sup> Ревегук В. Полтавшина в добу Української революції 1917–1920 рр. Полтава, 2002. С. 93.

<sup>35</sup> Мотенко Я. Селянський рух в Харківській губернії (1917–1921 рр.): дис. ... канд. істор. наук : спец. 07.00.01. Харків, 2005. 195 с.

<sup>36</sup> Там само.

<sup>37</sup> Котляр Ю. Селянство Півдня України в період економічної політики (1921–1929 рр.): дис. ... д-ра іст. наук: 07.00.01. Одеса, 2005.

<sup>38</sup> Малькін В. Земельне питання в Україні в умовах революції 1917–1920 рр. : дис... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01. Львів, 2009.

<sup>39</sup> Куташев І. Селянський рух в Україні (березень 1917 р. – квітень 1918 р.) : дис. ... канд. істор. наук : спец. 07.00.01. Київ, 2002. 236 с.

Large landowners, who accounted for 0.8% of the population, owned 40% of the total land fund, while 57.6% of the low- and middle-income peasantry owned 11.5% of the land fund<sup>40</sup>.

At the beginning of 1917, during the World War I, we observed a contradictory social differentiation of peasant households. There were cases when wealthy peasants were redeemed from conscription to the army, while the poor were deprived of a single worker<sup>41</sup>. Therefore, the confrontation between different segments of the peasantry intensified. The situation was also aggravated by the fact that wealthy owners hired workers. In order to somehow improve their financial situation, the peasants combined work in agriculture with earnings in industry and renting land. The rent was too high for the peasant<sup>42</sup>. The peasantry of Ukraine leased 3.9 million dessiatins of landlord's land, for which he paid annually 60 million rubles<sup>43</sup>. This rental cost was half the value of the annual income. It is clear why not all households could afford to rent land. Therefore, poor and middle peasantry households were at risk of bankruptcy<sup>44</sup>. In addition, the number of farms increased, so there were not enough land plots to meet the needs of the entire rural population.

## **2. Socio-political activity of the peasantry of Central-Eastern Europe and Ukraine in the early 20th century**

The difficult agrarian situation of the peasantry in Central-Eastern Europe, according to most researchers, was the impetus for the unification of the peasantry into various organizations and movements to defend their rights. For example, in Czechoslovakia it was the Republican Party of the Countryside or the Agrarian Party, in Poland it was the Polish People's Party (PSP) "Piast", and in Bulgaria it was the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union (BANU)<sup>45</sup>. The political programs of these parties were based on the ideas of

---

<sup>40</sup> Мотенко Я. Селянський рух в Харківській губернії (1917–1921 рр.): дис. ... канд. істор. наук : спец. 07.00.01. Харків, 2005. 195 с.

<sup>41</sup> Мотенко Я., Шишкіна Є. Соціально-економічна характеристика селянства Харківської губернії напередодні Української революції 1917–1921 років. *Вісник НТУ «ХПИ»*. 2015. № 56 (1165). С. 48.

<sup>42</sup> Лозовий В. Ставлення селянства України до влади в добу Центральної Ради (березень 1917 р. – квітень 1918 р.): дис. ... д-ра іст. наук № 07.00.01, 2010. 466 с.

<sup>43</sup> Куташев І. Селянський рух в Україні (березень 1917 р. – квітень 1918 р.): дис. ... канд. істор. наук : спец. 07.00.01. Київ, 2002. 236 с.

<sup>44</sup> Щербатюк В. Селянський повстанський рух на Київщині 1917–1923 рр. : сучасна історіографія проблеми. *Український історичний журнал*. 2010. № 3. С. 187.

<sup>45</sup> Сухушина О. Аграрні рухи в слов'янських країнах Центральної та Південно-Східної Європи та створення Зеленого Інтернаціоналу (1921–1924 рр.). *Український селянин*. 2008. Вип. 11. С. 337–341. С. 338.

agrarianism. The ideas of Ukrainian agrarianism were represented in the programs of the Ukrainian People's Community, the All-Ukrainian Union of Agrarians-Owners, and the Ukrainian People's Party<sup>46</sup>.

The main provisions of the concept of agrarianism are as follows: the establishment of peasant private ownership of land, the opposition of urban and rural areas, the secondary role of the industrial sector, the idealization of the economic function of cooperation and more. These principles formed the basis of the so-called "third" – the peasant path of social development<sup>47</sup>. The "peasant cooperative republic" was considered the ideal future<sup>48</sup>.

In our opinion, the focus of politicians on the development of possible ways to solve agrarian issues has become relevant due to the active socio-political activity of the peasantry.

G. Matveyev, referring to the analysis of Czech and Polish agrarianism, called one of the founders of this concept A. Zhabko-Popovych<sup>49</sup>, who, in our opinion, aptly characterized the peasantry as an active participant in socio-economic life of the state: "... Agriculture and landowners a separate independent economic and spiritual world, which has an extremely strong influence on the state of economic, social, political, cultural and moral life of the whole people. The idea of agrarianism is realized when the interests and reasonable requirements of both rural production and the population employed in it are taken into account, as well as when this population is provided in the social, cultural and political life of the people with a place that "rightfully" belongs to it"<sup>50</sup>.

O. Frankenberger – one of the ideologues of Czechoslovak agrarianism – was convinced that the peasantry alone is not able to solve all their agrarian issues. He argued that only the active participation of the state in solving these processes can move the solution of agricultural issues. According to the scientist, this can be done by influencing the peasantry on the authorities to defend the interests of the peasantry, for example, by the agrarian party<sup>51</sup>.

---

<sup>46</sup> Kornovenko S., Pasichna, Yu. Intellectual Bases of Ukrainian Agrarianism of the Revolutionary Epoch: Vyacheslav Lypynsky. *Skhidnoieuropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk*. 2021. Вип. 19. С. 107–121. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.19.234292

<sup>47</sup> Носкова А. К вопросу об аграризме и крестьянском движении в странах Центральной и Юго-Восточной Европы в межвоенный период. *Советское славяноведие*. 1981. № 2. С. 45.

<sup>48</sup> Там же.

<sup>49</sup> Матвеев Г. «Третий путь?»: Идеология аграризма в Чехословакии и Польше в межвоенный период. Москва : Издательство МГУ, 1992. С. 54.

<sup>50</sup> Там же.

<sup>51</sup> Там же. С. 61.



Socio-political activity of the Polish peasantry intensified in the spring – summer of 1919<sup>52</sup>. The actions of the peasantry were caused largely by the desire of the land of the peasantry to solve agrarian issues by carrying out agrarian reform. Peasant demonstrations were characterized by spontaneous seizure of land and agricultural equipment<sup>53</sup>. Therefore, during July 3 – July 10, 1919, the government was forced to discuss agrarian changes in the state.

In the early 1930s, the pages of the Green Standard, the central Polish organ of the People's Party, stated: "The twelve years of the existence of independent Poland unequivocally say that no one will take care of the peasant and no one will raise him. Therefore, it is correct to say that the liberation of peasants from poverty and darkness should be a matter for the peasants themselves"<sup>54</sup>.

Before the unification of the Slovak and Czech lands, a wave of hunger riots swept across Slovakia, which the authorities were forced to use to suppress<sup>55</sup>. The Czechoslovak government faced another challenge in the agricultural sector that it was unprepared for: the unification of agrarian Slovakia with economically developed Czech lands led to a surplus of cheap labour in the countryside, which hindered the introduction of new agricultural machinery and advanced farming methods. In this situation, small households suffered, and the rich – got rich<sup>56</sup>. Peasant demonstrations engulfed Czechoslovakia as early as 1918. Peasants opposed the landlords. There were clashes between the peasantry and the police and army, which were involved in the suppression of peasant actions<sup>57</sup>.

Between 1918 and 1919, peasant uprisings took place in Bulgaria, catalysed by crop failures in the central and western regions of the country. During 1918 there was a migration of the Bulgarian population from these territories to the east. A new wave of peasant uprisings began in the spring of 1919. To understand not only the agrarian problems of the peasantry, but also the behaviour and motives of the Bulgarian peasantry in the struggle for their rights, we can give an example of the hunger riot in the village of Kilifarevo, Tarnovo region. The protest was suppressed by police, who used

---

<sup>52</sup> Краткая история Польши. Москва : Наука. 1993. С. 250.

<sup>53</sup> Там же.

<sup>54</sup> Матвеев Г. «Третий путь?»: Идеология аграризма в Чехословакии и Польше в межвоенный период. Москва : Издательство МГУ, 1992. С. 167.

<sup>55</sup> Чехия и Словакия в XX веке: очерки истории: в 2 кн. / ред. В.В. Марьина. Москва : Наука, 2005. Кн. 1. С. 97.

<sup>56</sup> Там же. С. 115.

<sup>57</sup> Горанович, М. *Крах зеленого интернационала: (1921–1938)*. Москва : Наука, 1967. 281 с.

weapons, were injured and killed<sup>58</sup>. During 1919, the socio-political activity of the peasantry intensified, but the peasantry in its actions significantly focused on the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union.

In their demands, the peasantry of Bulgaria stated the need to solve agricultural issues. For example, on December 15, 1918, the villagers of the village of Palazar in the Osman-Pazar district, in an appeal to O. Stamboliysky, stated: “We ask you to submit a proposal to the parliament and annul all drafted acts and writs of execution by law. We have claimed many casualties during the three-year war in the regions, and now fines. There is a case when two brothers died in one family in the war, and now a tax collector comes and demands a fine of 400–500 leva”<sup>59</sup>. Then the peasantry declared: “Our food prices are low, and our shoes and coats are very high, and two months ago Minister Dragiev promised us lower prices”<sup>60</sup>. In 1919 the political demands of the peasantry were added. In slogans to the authorities, the peasants declared: “Either act or go away”<sup>61</sup>.

In 1919, peasant demonstrations in Bulgaria became widespread and covered almost the entire territory of the state. The initiators of the peasant demonstrations in most cases were the peasants themselves, but in some situations the leadership of the Bulgarian Agricultural National Union called on the peasants to protest<sup>62</sup>. For example, in March 1919, on the initiative of O. Stamboliysky, mass gatherings of peasants were recorded<sup>63</sup>. In this way O. Stamboliysky tried to organize the peasantry. At one of these meetings on March 26, 1919, delegates from 38 “friendships” with a total number of 2.5 thousand members were present<sup>64</sup>. In this regard, P. Sorokin aptly noted that the socio-political activity of workers in continental Europe was replaced by peasant leaders and parties, which in some situations played a major role in the socio-political life of their countries<sup>65</sup>.

In Ukraine, the greatest socio-political activity of the peasantry gained in the autumn of 1917 in Kyiv, Volhynia and Podolia provinces. According to

---

<sup>58</sup> Крапивин С. Транспортные пути эмали и их клиническое значение: дис... канд. мед. наук: 14.01.21; Донецкий гос. медицинский ун-т им. М. Горького. Донецк, 1995. 126 с.

<sup>59</sup> Человек на Балканах. Особенности «новой» южнославянской государственности: Болгария, Сербия, Черногория, Королевство СХС в 1878–1920 гг. Москва: Институт славяноведения РАН, 2016. С. 131.

<sup>60</sup> Там же.

<sup>61</sup> Там же. С. 133.

<sup>62</sup> Там же. С. 139.

<sup>63</sup> Там же. С. 140.

<sup>64</sup> Там же.

<sup>65</sup> Там же. 408 с.

I. Kutashov's estimates, 849 peasant actions took place in September-October<sup>66</sup>. According to the research of Yu. Kotlyar, this figure is slightly lower: during July-October 1917 the number of agrarian actions reached 572<sup>67</sup>. During 1918–1919, the socio-political activity of the peasantry intensified. With the replacement of the Central Rada by Hetman Skoropadsky, and later with the coming to power of the Directory, peasant demonstrations did not stop. However, they became organized. In 1918 the peasants already had the experience of war. Yesterday's mobilized soldiers organized insurgent detachments around them, the ranks of which were replenished every day by people from the countryside<sup>68</sup>. In most cases, the rural poor joined such units<sup>69</sup>. If during 1917 the peasantry advocated only the solution of the agrarian issue, in 1918 the demands of the peasants acquired a political colour. The peasantry protested against the political regime<sup>70, 71</sup>.

By the end of 1920, the insurgent movement covered the entire territory of Ukraine. During 1918–1920, it was characterized by a variety of forms: from passive (criticism of the government, avoidance of mobilization) to active (pogroms, demonstrations, armed struggle)<sup>72</sup>. With the advent of Soviet power, the insurgent movement grew. The spontaneity of the insurgent units was replaced by their manoeuvrability and organization.

Peasant-insurgent actions of the 1920s were held under the slogans: “Down with the Bolsheviks”, “For independent Ukraine”<sup>73</sup>. The actions of

---

<sup>66</sup> Куташов І. Селянський рух в Україні (березень 1917 р. – квітень 1918 р.) : дис. ... канд. іст. наук : 07.00.01. Київ, 2002. 236 с.

<sup>67</sup> Котляр Ю. Регіональні аспекти повстанського руху селян 20-х рр. ХХ ст. *Проблеми історії України: факти, судження, пошуки*. 2005. Вип. 13. С. 183–201.

<sup>68</sup> Попов І. Повстанський рух селян на Чернігівщині за доби Директорії (грудень 1918 – січень 1919 рр.). *Сіверянський літопис*. 2010. № 1–2. С. 150–157.

<sup>69</sup> Верстюк В. Проблеми вивчення революційних аграрних перетворень на Україні. *Український історичний журнал*. 1983. № 10. С. 136–145.

<sup>70</sup> Антонішин А. Селянсько-повстанський рух на Поділлі (квітень – листопад 1918 року. *Історія*. 2009. URL: <http://politics.ellib.org.ua/pages-5233.html>.

<sup>71</sup> Еткіна І. Селянські повстання в Чернігівській губернії у 1918 р.: причини та спрямованість. *Сіверянський літопис*. 2018. № 1–2. С. 363–368.

<sup>72</sup> Резніков В. Селянський повстанський рух на Слобожанщині (1918–1923 рр.): дис. ... докт. іст. наук : 07.00.01. Харків, 2016. 237 с.

<sup>73</sup> Подкур Р. Збройний виступ як радикальна форма опору радянській владі в УСРР в 1920-ті – початку 1930 рр. (за матеріалами ВУЧК – ГПУ). URL: [http://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Podkur\\_Roman/Zbroinyi\\_vystup\\_iak\\_radykalna\\_forma\\_oporu\\_radianskii\\_vladi\\_v\\_USRR.pdf](http://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Podkur_Roman/Zbroinyi_vystup_iak_radykalna_forma_oporu_radianskii_vladi_v_USRR.pdf).

the peasantry during the first half of 1921 affected about 1.5 thousand people – supporters of Soviet power<sup>74</sup>.

Analysis of the socio-political activity of the peasantry in Central-Eastern Europe and Ukraine allows us to state that the peasantry played a decisive role in the early twentieth century. in the agricultural sector. In general, the socio-political activity of the peasantry in Central-Eastern Europe and Ukraine is characterized by radicalism and mass. Peasant demonstrations in Ukraine are marked by mass and radicalism. The peasantry of Czechoslovakia was the least active in protest activities, which is understandable, because the share of the rural population, compared to the countries we studied, was the smallest. The peasantry of Bulgaria and Ukraine showed political demands, the most active were large landowners in Poland.

Socio-political activity of the Polish peasantry became a catalyst for land reform. Land reform was regulated by the Seimas of 1919 and 1920. According to the land reform, the forced sale of land by large landowners in excess of the established maximum at a price of 50% of its market value was introduced. However, large landowners proved a violation of their private law, which led to the suspension of land reform and the strengthening of socio-economic issues of the peasantry<sup>75</sup>. V. Boechko argues that the Land Law of the Legislative Sejm of July 10, 1919 was a “preliminary program of future legislative changes”<sup>76</sup> and did not solve not only the issues of landless peasants, but also agrarian issues in general.

The Czechoslovak government began agrarian changes on November 9, 1918. The law prohibited the sale of large plots of land. The law of April 16, 1919 established the maximum size of land allotment – 150 hectares of arable land and 250 hectares of total land allotment. The prices of non-land plots were set at the prices of 1913–1915. Most of the lands were received by middle owners<sup>77</sup>. Agrarian changes continued in Czechoslovakia until the 1930s. In total, landowners received 66% of arable land and 44% of other lands, so there is a well-established opinion about the partial implementation of agrarian changes in Czechoslovakia<sup>78</sup>.

---

<sup>74</sup> Ганжа О. Українське село в період становлення тоталітарного режиму (1917–1927 рр.). Київ, 2000. 208 с.

<sup>75</sup> Зашкільняк Л., Крикун М. Історія Польщі. Від найдавніших часів до наших днів. Львів, 2002. 752 с. С. 460.

<sup>76</sup> Боєчко В. Вирішення аграрного питання в Польщі (1918–1926 рр.). *Український селянин*. 2018. вип. 20. С. 7.

<sup>77</sup> Чехия и Словакия в XX веке: очерки истории: в 2 кн. / ред. В.В. Марьина. Москва: Наука, 2005. Кн. 1. С. 109.

<sup>78</sup> Там же. С. 110.

It took a long time for the Bulgarian government to implement agrarian change. Despite peasant protests and demands for agrarian change, it was not until June 1919 that the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union decided at the XV Congress on the need for agrarian change in the state. The delay in agrarian reform was associated with the discussion and development of ways to implement it. On June 30, 1920, a bill was passed to increase the state land fund: land plots of more than 30 hectares were transferred to the state fund and were not cultivated by the owners<sup>79</sup>. In February 1921, a bill on labour land ownership was promulgated for discussion. The government sought to increase the land holdings of the landless peasantry by reducing the holdings of large landowners<sup>80</sup>. After discussion on April 25, 1921, the bill was passed. The bill set the maximum size of land ownership for those landowners who cultivated the land independently – 30 hectares. Landowners who did not work independently on land received: family – 10 hectares, single – 4 hectares. Land plots that exceeded the established norm were transferred to the fund of “labour land ownership”<sup>81</sup>. Uncultivated state lands, part of municipal lands, and monastery lands were transferred to this fund. Such lands were supposed to be distributed among landless and landless peasants, displaced persons and emigrants, rural workers, and so on<sup>82</sup>.

To carry out agrarian reform in Bulgaria, public commissions of labour land ownership were established, the activities of which were regulated by district commissions and the Directorate of Labour Land Ownership. The composition of the commissions was regulated by a separate law. The commission could deprive the owner of the right to receive a plot of land. The land was provided for redemption at the prices of 1905–1915 with a surcharge of 20% in favour of the state. The owner received a document of ownership of land only after payment of the full value of the land allotment<sup>83</sup>.

Agrarian reform provoked confrontation between large landowners and landless peasants. On September 2, 1921, certain changes were made to the law regarding the activities of the commission, but the changes strengthened the difficult socio-economic situation of the landless peasantry. The commission often committed corrupt practices in its work. This caused the intensification of the revolutionary activity of the Bulgarian peasantry. For example, the peasants of the village of Banitsa during a protest movement in

---

<sup>79</sup> История Болгарии / ред. П.Н. Третьяков, С.А. Никитин, Л.Б. Валев. Москва : Издательство Академии наук СССР. 1954. Т. 2. С. 67.

<sup>80</sup> Там же. С. 68.

<sup>81</sup> Там же.

<sup>82</sup> Там же.

<sup>83</sup> Там же.

1921 collected a resolution with 300 signatures against the work of the commission<sup>84</sup>.

In December 1922, the land bill changed: the amount of redemption for land increased, which was economically beneficial to the wealthy peasantry; the maximum size of the land allotment, which was not subject to alienation, was increased, and so on<sup>85</sup>.

By June 9, 1923, the Bulgarian government had received 110,611 applications for land acquisition, of which 79,527 had received a positive response<sup>86</sup>. The number of landless and landless peasants was, as noted above, much larger, but the peasantry did not have the funds to buy land on such terms.

In Ukraine, the revolutionary nature of the peasantry also became an impetus for the authorities to find solutions to the agrarian issue. The starting point is the beginning of changes in the agrarian legislation of the Central Council is the First All-Ukrainian Peasants' Congress, which took place May 28 – June 2, 1917. In general, the legislative activity of the Central Council agrarian issues of the peasantry<sup>87</sup>. An important bill of the Central Council was the “Provisional Land Law” of January 18, 1918. The law abolished private ownership of land. Rural communities, township, county and provincial land committees were given property rights within the law. The labour norm was set – the amount of land that would meet consumer needs. The size of the labour norm and the term of its validity were determined by the land committees. The former owners and tenants had at their disposal those lands that they could cultivate without hired labour. The primary allotment of land concerned smallholder and landless peasants, and so on<sup>88</sup>.

After the legislative activity of the Central Council, P. Skoropadsky on April 29, 1918 in the charter “To all the people” restored private ownership of land, purchase and sale of land, to replace the land committees formed land and land liquidation commissions<sup>89</sup>. According to the new land bill of P. Skoropadsky's government, the formation of a land fund and the sale of

---

<sup>84</sup> История Болгарии / ред. П.Н. Третьяков, С.А. Никитин, Л.Б. Валев. Москва : Издательство Академии наук СССР. 1954. Т. 2. С. 68–69.

<sup>85</sup> Там же. С. 69.

<sup>86</sup> Там же. С. 68.

<sup>87</sup> Берестовий А., Пасічна Ю. Аграрне законодавство Центральної Ради: вплив політичного чинника. *Український селянин*. 2018. Вип. 19. С. 8–14.

<sup>88</sup> Там само. С. 11.

<sup>89</sup> Аграрне законодавство періоду Української революції (1917–1921 рр.): збірник документів і матеріалів / упоряд.: С.В. Корновенко, А. Г. Морозов, Ю. Г. Пасічна. Черкаси : Чабаненко Ю. А., 2019. С. 96.

land to smallholder peasants and Cossacks was envisaged. Large plots of land were allowed to be sold only to the State Bank, and peasants were allowed to sell plots that did not exceed 25 dessiatins<sup>90</sup>.

The Government of the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic, which succeeded P. Skoropadsky's government, declared in a Declaration of December 26, 1918, that all small peasant farms remained in the use of the previous owners, while the rest of the lands were transferred to smallholder and landless peasants<sup>91</sup>. The Temporary Land Bill of the Directory of January 8, 1919 enshrined the abolition of private ownership of land, created land and state funds. Land plots of up to 15 tithes remained intact, and a labour norm of at least 5-6 tithes was established. Lands of national heritage passed into the disposal of labour unions and so on<sup>92</sup>.

## CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the countries that were the subject of our study had many common features: they were all agrarian, most of the rural population were landless or landless peasants, and the government was slow to solve agrarian issues. The intensification of the difficult agrarian situation was due to the influence of the World War I, low tillage crops, insufficient provision of agricultural machinery, and so on. Therefore, the strengthening of socio-political activity of the peasantry as an active participant in socio-economic and socio-political processes is quite understandable.

In the countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe, the agrarian issue was quite clear. This is quite understandable, as the countries were dominated by the rural population, except for Czechoslovakia. The agrarian problems of the peasantry were exacerbated by the effects of the World War I, political transformations, and exacerbated by the growing exploitation of the peasantry. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe were shaken by a wave of peasant riots. Agrarian parties tried to control the revolutionary nature of the peasantry, but the socio-political activity of the peasantry in Central and Eastern Europe and, to a greater extent, Ukraine, had its own course of events. The peasantry declared itself an active participant in socio-political life. It is the revolutionary nature of the peasantry, in our opinion, was one of the reasons for the emergence of such a phenomenon as agrarianism.

---

<sup>90</sup> Аграрне законодавство періоду Української революції (1917–1921 рр.): збірник документів і матеріалів / упоряд.: С.В. Корновенко, А.Г. Морозов, Ю.Г. Пасічна. Черкаси : Чабаненко Ю.А., 2019. С. 134–138.

<sup>91</sup> Там само. С. 188–194.

<sup>92</sup> Там само. С. 216–223.

## REFERENCES

1. Аграрне законодавство періоду Української революції (1917–1921 рр.): збірник документів і матеріалів / упоряд. : С.В. Корновенко, А.Г. Морозов, Ю.Г. Пасічна. Черкаси : Чабаненко Ю.А., 2019. 554 с.
2. Антонишин А. Селянсько-повстанський рух на Поділлі (квітень – листопад 1918 року). *Історія*. 2009. URL: <http://politics.ellib.org.ua/pages-5233.html>.
3. Берестовий А., Пасічна Ю. Аграрне законодавство Центральної Ради: вплив політичного чинника. *Український селянин*. 2018. Вип. 19. С. 8–14.
4. Босчко В. Вирішення аграрного питання в Польщі (1918–1926 рр.). *Український селянин*. 2018. вип. 20. С. 5–9.
5. Верстюк В. Проблеми вивчення революційних аграрних перетворень на Україні. *Український історичний журнал*. 1983. № 10. С. 136–145.
6. Ганжа О. Українське село в період становлення тоталітарного режиму (1917–1927 рр.). Київ, 2000. 208 с.
7. Герасименко О. Селянський рух на Лівобережній Україні (1900–лютий 1917 рр.) : дис. ... канд. іст. наук : 07.00.01. Чернігів, 2007. 285 с.
8. Горанович М. Крах зеленого інтернаціонала: (1921–1938). Москва : Наука, 1967. 281 с.
9. Еткіна І. Селянські повстання в Чернігівській губернії у 1918 р. : причини та спрямованість. *Сіверянський літопис*. 2018. № 1–2. С. 363–368.
10. Зашкільняк Л., Крикун М. Історія Польщі. Від найдавніших часів до наших днів. Львів, 2002. 752 с.
11. История Болгарии / ред. П.Н. Третьяков, С.А. Никитин, Л.Б. Валев. Москва : Издательство Академии наук СССР. 1954.
12. Кононенко К. Україна і Росія: Соціально-політичні підстави української національної ідеї 1917–1960. Мюнхен, 1965. 535 с.
13. Корновенко С., Земзюліна Н. Революційні потрясіння початку ХХ ст. : аграрне законодавство країн Центральної та Південно-східної Європи. *Український селянин*. 2018. Вип. 19. С. 45–49.
14. Котляр Ю. Селянство Півдня України в період економічної політики (1921–1929 рр.) : дис. ... д-ра іст. наук : 07.00.01. Одеса, 2005.
15. Крапивин С. Транспортные пути эмали и их клиническое значение : дис. ... канд. мед. наук : 14.01.21; Донецкий гос. медицинский ун-т им. М. Горького. Донецк, 1995. 126 с.
16. Краткая история Польши. Москва : Наука, 1933. 528 с.
17. Куташев І. Селянський рух в Україні (березень 1917 р. – квітень 1918 р.) : дис. ... канд. істор. наук : спец. 07.00.01. Київ, 2002. 236 с.



18. Лозовий В. Ставлення селянства України до влади в добу Центральної Ради (березень 1917 р. – квітень 1918 р.) : дис. ... д-ра іст. наук № 07.00.01, 2010. 466 с.

19. Малькін В. Земельне питання в Україні в умовах революції 1917–1920 рр. : дис... канд. іст. наук : 07.00.01. Львів, 2009.

20. Маслов С. Земельный вопрос. *Земля и воля*. 1917. № 4. С. 1–2.

21. Матвеев Г. «Третий путь?»: Идеология аграризма в Чехословакии и Польше в межвоенный период. Москва : Издательство МГУ, 1992. 239 с.

22. Мотенко Я. Селянський рух в Харківській губернії (1917–1921 рр.) : дис. ... канд. істор. наук : спец. 07.00.01. Харків, 2005. 195 с.

23. Носкова А. К вопросу об аграризме и крестьянском движении в странах Центральной и Юго-Восточной Европы в межвоенный период. *Советское славяноведие*. 1981. № 2. С. 40–58.

24. Подкур Р. Збройний виступ як радикальна форма опору радянській владі в УСРР в 1920-ті – початку 1930 рр. (за матеріалами ВУЧК – ГПУ). URL: [http://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Podkur\\_Roman/Zbroinyi\\_vystup\\_iak\\_radykalna\\_forma\\_oporu\\_radianskii\\_vladi\\_v\\_USRR.pdf](http://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Podkur_Roman/Zbroinyi_vystup_iak_radykalna_forma_oporu_radianskii_vladi_v_USRR.pdf).

25. Попов І. Повстанський рух селян на Чернігівщині за доби Директорії (грудень 1918 – січень 1919 рр.). *Сіверянський літопис*. 2010. № 1–2. С. 150–157.

26. Ревегук В. Полтавщина в добу Української революції 1917–1920 рр. Полтава, 2002. 386 с.

27. Резніков В. Селянський повстанський рух на Слобожанщині (1918–1923 рр.) : дис. ... докт. іст. наук : 07.00.01. Харків, 2016. 237 с.

28. Рибалка І. Великий жовтень і зміни соціальної структури селянства України (1917–1920 рр.). *Український історичний журнал*. 1987. № 11. С. 38–52.

29. Сухушина О. Аграрні рухи в слов'янських країнах Центральної та Південно-Східної Європи та створення Зеленого Інтернаціоналу (1921–1924 рр.). *Український селянин*. 2008. Вип. 11. С. 337–341.

30. Человек на Балканах. Особенности «новой» южнославянской государственности: Болгария, Сербия, Черногория, Королевство СХС в 1878–1920 гг. Москва : Институт славяноведения РАН, 2016. 408 с.

31. Чехия и Словакия в XX веке: очерки истории: в 2 кн. / ред. В.В. Марьина. Москва : Наука, 2005. Кн. 1. 465 с.

32. Щербатюк В. Селянський повстанський рух на Київщині 1917–1923 рр. : сучасна історіографія проблеми. *Український історичний журнал*. 2010. № 3. С. 186–204.

33. Kornovenko S., Pasichna, Yu. Intellectual Bases of Ukrainian Agrarianism of the Revolutionary Epoch: Vyacheslav Lypynsky. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk*. 2021. Bun. 19. С. 107–121. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.19.234292.

## CONCLUSIONS

In the first third of the twentieth century the ideology of agrarianism became especially popular in the countries of Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, which led to the design of its national versions: Ukrainian, Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Polish, Romanian, etc.

G. Simantsiv formulated the concept of the ideology of Ukrainian agrarianism, substantiated its differentiation from other contemporary ideologies: liberalism, totalitarianism. In particular, agrarianism and socialism are different political phenomena, as well as the peasantry and the working class, which are the social basis of agrarianism and socialism, respectively. In the discourse proposed by G. Simantsev we observe the longevity of the Ukrainian agrarian tradition, initiated by P. Kulish, which found a logical continuation in the agrarianist by their content ideas of M. Hrushevsky, P. Skoropadsky, V. Lypynsky, program provisions of individual national political parties of the Ukrainian revolution of 1917–1921, regarding the separation of the city from the countryside. For G. Simantsiv, agrarianism is a balanced social and legal model in which private law correlates with public law. The main provisions of Ukrainian agrarianism, formulated by G. Simantsiv, are as follows: 1) agrarianism – a new socio-political system, a holistic realistic worldview; the middle ground between collectivism and individualism. Its purpose is to create “the most favourable conditions for the peasantry for its existence and development”; 2) historicism in the form of elasticity. It is not dogmatic; it takes on the meaning “given to it by the peasantry itself”. This does not deny that agrarianism is a holistic and natural phenomenon; 3) democratism, due to the democratic nature of the peasantry. Democratism is an instrument of internal social complementarity. The latter is “the only reliable guarantee of social peace”; 4) systematically and consistently defends the understanding of the peasantry as a separate subject of history, as a “separate social class”. The peasantry is radically different from the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, it is a separate, “new social type – the agrarian”. Separation primarily lies in the syntheticity of the peasantry, “because it carries the beginnings of collectivism and individualism”, it all is labour; 5) focused on the social protection of the peasantry. Social protection of the peasantry is interpreted broadly – social protection of the peasantry, the preservation of its political, professional, cultural and social institutions; 6) does not exaggerate the role and importance of innovations, rapid and unexpected social transformations. He is careful about this, guided by psychological and material motives: do not rush and do not procrastinate.

Reflecting on the phenomenon of the Ukrainian peasantry, M. Hrushevsky, as the researcher belongs, first of all depicts its historical evolution from one of the social strata to almost the only representative of Ukraineness. In terms of resolving the agrarian issue, M. Hrushevsky initiated the creation of a state land fund by buying land from large landowners and giving it plots of land to smallholder peasants. This should, he rightly remarked, not only raise the welfare of the majority of the population, but also significantly reduce interethnic antagonism in the region. No less ripe for the Ukrainian publicist was the reform of the electoral legislation in the direction of the introduction of universal suffrage, which should replace the curial one. Its implementation, according to M. Hrushevsky, would finally allow Ukrainians to become the real masters of their land due to a significant increase in representation in the local parliament. M. Hrushevsky's journalism was stylistically constructed exclusively in a dialogical manner, so he, in fact, in his texts did not so much instruct the peasants as consult with them as equal partners on numerous pressing issues of national existence. Due to such openness and dialogicity, the journalistic appeals of the author of "History of Ukraine-Rus" had a considerable resonance, contributing to the growth of political culture in broad peasant circles.

From the point of view of ideological guidelines, strategies and tactics of realization of political goals, the party-political peasant-centric discourse of the revolutionary period of 1917–1921 in Ukraine was divided into the following main types:

Socialist-Socialist-Revolutionary (USR): 1) resolution of the agrarian issue on the basis of socialization, abolition of private ownership of land, land is confiscated from owners and transferred free of charge to peasants which was authorized the All-Russian Constituent Assembly, according to state laws and regulations transformation; 2) the peasant is the main subject of state-building, the model of statehood is the power of Soviets (Labour Councils, former zemstvos and Soviets of Workers' Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies), which embody the class democracy of the working classes, based on suffrage enjoyed only by workers (peasants, workers, labour intelligentsia) peasants must dominate most of the authorities, there must be a class struggle with the bourgeoisie and the landlords;

anarchist-Makhnovist (Makhnovist movement): 1) the agrarian issue is solved on the basis of socialization, the abolition of private property on land, the land is confiscated from the owners and transferred free of charge to the peasants, who, without waiting for the adoption of laws and orders of the state, themselves divide the land; 2) the peasant is the main subject of social relations, the stateless and powerless model ("Free District") is proclaimed, and as a contradiction to this the power of the Soviets (Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies) is declared, the class democracy of the

working classes is embodied, in which only workers (peasants, workers, labor intelligentsia) enjoy it on the basis of suffrage, the peasants have a predominant influence on the government, there must be a struggle both with the power of the bourgeoisie (White Guards) and the “dictatorship of the proletariat” (Bolsheviks);

conservative-grain grower (UDAP): 1) agrarian reform with the preservation of private property, sanctioned by the Ukrainian Sejm, according to the developed laws, the land passes to the peasants for ransom, the creation of hamlet households (farms) as a kind of “middle class”; 2) the main subject of state-building – the grain grower class, which means all agricultural producers, the model of the state – democratic government based on universal suffrage, the formation of a new elite as a symbiosis of wealthy grain growers and descendants of the cossack officers, the rule of law, class cooperation and social partnership.

The mobilization possibilities of these discourses in the countryside depended on the extent to which they resonated with the peasants’ mental guidelines and adapted to the changing socio-political situation of the time. Each of these party-political peasant-centric discourses offered its “third” way of socio-political development, but due to the revolutionary realities of the time, it was not realized.

From the point of view of theory and practice, there are sufficient grounds to consider the Bulgarian and Czechoslovak versions as two extreme forms of agrarianist ideology. If in the first case agrarianism arose in a poorly developed agrarian country and acquired radical and utopian features, in the second – in a country with strong industry, characterized by moderation and focus on public-parliamentary interaction. The social base of Bulgarian traditionalist agrarianism was the small and medium peasantry, while the progressive Czechoslovak version focused on farmers. The formation of agrarian thought in Bulgaria was significantly influenced by German and Russian agrarianism, while French agrarianism was crucial for the formation of the Czechoslovak version. The leading ideologues of agrarianism in Bulgaria were O. Stamboliysky and D. Dragiev; among the theorists and practitioners of agrarianism in Czechoslovakia are A. Schwegla, M. Hodza, O. Frankenberger, and J. Kettner.

Bulgarian agrarians were the first among the agrarian parties of Central and Southeastern Europe to come to power (1919), but they were also the first to lose it (1923). The BANU, one of the oldest and most influential agrarianist political parties in Europe, was the only agrarian party in the Old World to ever come to power with a majority government, not just as part of a coalition. Bulgarian agrarianism was the most radical variant of agrarian ideology, which, in contrast to the democratic tactics inherent in agrarianism, advocated the idea of establishing a dictatorship. The ideologies

of Bulgarian agrarianism were characterized by anti-urban, anti-Semitic and religious colours. Instead, Czechoslovak agrarianists maintained strong positions in parliament and government throughout the interwar period, and their organization was the strongest in the International Agrarian Bureau. Agrarianism remained popular in Czechoslovakia until the late 1930s, when in other countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe the movement declined or disappeared altogether.

Despite the polarity of the Bulgarian and Czechoslovak versions of agrarianism, they are based on similar ideas of peasant-centrism, which is to link the political and socio-economic future of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia with the peasantry, as well as the “third way” – a new socio-economic system cooperativeism, which was to become an alternative to capitalism and socialism.

The subject of political life and the agrarian issue occupied an important place in the articles of the Ukrainian-language edition of the “Khliborobska Pravda” party association of National-Tsaranists. As for newspaper articles about the political vicissitudes of the Kingdom of Romania at the time, they covered a wide range of issues, from intra-party processes within the National-Tsaranists coalition to criticism of the then ruling socio-political system, government and political forces that supported it. The articles on the agrarian issue analysed the policy of the Romanian government in the agrarian sector (implementation and consequences of the agrarian reform of the 1920s) and the governments of other states in Central and Eastern Europe (Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia). These topics, along with other current issues of the time (national, educational), aroused great interest among readers. We adhere to the point in view of the fact that these thematic preferences were caused not only by the fact that the editors of “Khliborobska Pravda” focused more on the Ukrainians of Northern Bukovina and Northern Bessarabia, but also on their ideological and political convictions. After all, the same editorial policy is observed in other publications of this political force, which were published in other territories of the Kingdom of Romania at that time. All the above gives us reason to believe that the edition “Hliborobska Pravda” with such a theme and a certain readership, fits into a broad regional context, because the similar newspapers of peasant party structures functioned in all Central and Eastern European countries.

The peasantry of Central and Eastern Europe and Ukraine in the early twentieth century was in a difficult socio-economic situation. Lack of land, lack of inventory, high rental prices, the performance of too burdensome duties in favour of landlords, payment to landlords and the state of natural and monetary duties, lack of labour – this is an incomplete list of reasons for increasing socio-political activity of the peasantry in the early twentieth century.

Agrarian parties tried to take control of the revolutionary nature of the peasantry, but the socio-political activity of the peasantry in Central and Eastern Europe and, to a greater extent, Ukraine shaped their own development. Analysis of the socio-political activity of the peasantry in Central and Eastern Europe and Ukraine allows us to state that the peasantry played a decisive role in the early twentieth century in the agricultural sector. In general, the socio-political activity of the peasantry in Central and Eastern Europe and Ukraine is characterized by radicalism and mass. Peasant demonstrations in Ukraine are marked by mass and radicalism. The peasantry of Czechoslovakia was the least active in the protest, which is quite understandable, because the share of the rural population, compared to the countries we studied, was the smallest. The peasantry of Bulgaria and Ukraine showed political demands, the most active were large landowners in Poland. The peasantry declared itself an active participant in socio-political life. It is the revolutionary nature of the peasantry, in our opinion, was one of the reasons for the emergence of such a phenomenon as agrarianism.

The ideas of agrarianism were the basis of agrarian reforms in these countries, their social basis was the peasantry – the largest stratum of agrarian-industrial countries in Central and South-Eastern Europe.

## INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS

### **Kornovenko S. V.**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor of Head of the Department of Intellectual Property and Civil Law Disciplines, Bogdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, 81, T. Shevchenko Boulevard, Cherkasy, Ukraine, postal code 18031 (s-kornovenko@ukr.net)*

### **Telvak V. P.**

*PhD (History), Assistant Professor, Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com)*

### **Lozovyi V. S.**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor, chief consultant, National Institute for Strategic Studies, 7-A Pyrohova Str., Kyiv, Ukraine, 01030 (lozovyi\_v@ukr.net)*

### **Kompaniiets O. V.**

*Postgraduate Student, Department of Archeology and Auxiliary Sciences of History, Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, 81 Shevchenko Boulevard, Cherkasy, Ukraine, postal code 18000 (oleksiy\_kompaniyets@ukr.net)*

### **Ilnytskyi V. I.**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of the Department of History of Ukraine, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Str., Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100; Associate Professor, Department of Mobilization, Personnel and Human Resources Management and Defense Planning, Hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi National Ground Forces Academy, 32 Heroyiv Maydana Str., Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79026 (vilnickiy@gmail.com)*

### **Hlibischuk M. V.**

*PhD (History), Assistant, Department of World History, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, 2 Kafedralna Str., Chernivtsi, Ukraine, postal code 58000 (m.hlibischuk@chnu.edu.ua)*

### **Pasichna Yu. G.**

*PhD (History), specialist of PhD department, Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, 81, T. Shevchenko Boulevard, Cherkasy, Ukraine, postal code 18031 (pasichna\_yulia@ukr.net)*

Publishing house “Liha-Pres”  
9 Kastelivka str., Lviv, 79012, Ukraine  
44 Lubicka str., Toruń, 87-100, Poland

---

Printed by the publishing house “Liha-Pres”  
Passed for printing: July 3, 2021.  
A run of 150 copies.