

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 “Khliborobskia 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 “Khliborobskia 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 “Hliborobskia 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.