

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 “Khliborobska 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 “Khliborobska 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).