

**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)**

SERHII KORNOVENKO

Bogdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, Ukraine

Abstract: Revolutionary upheavals in Europe in the early twentieth century radically influenced the socio-political life of European countries, led to the emergence of new subjects of international relations, previously unknown phenomena. First of all, considering the topic of the study, this concerns Czechoslovak and Ukrainian state-building, as well as such phenomenon as Eastern European agrarianism, represented in particular by Czechoslovak and Ukrainian variants. Political parties represented it on Czechoslovak and Ukrainian soil. In Czechoslovakia, the Czechoslovak Republican (Agrarian) Party (hereinafter referred to as the CRAP), in Ukraine – the Ukrainian Democratic-Agrarian Party (hereinafter referred to as UDAP), the Ukrainian People's Community (hereinafter – UPC), the All-Ukrainian Union of Agrarians-Owners (Peasants) (hereinafter – AUAO), Ukrainian People's Party (hereinafter – UPP). The author, on the basis of an analysis of the programmatic provisions of these parties, found that they were clearly agrarian. In spite of certain differences caused by the regional specificity of the countries, the course of historical events, peasant-centrism was at the heart of their state ideology. They connected the socio-political and socio-economic future of Czechoslovakia and Ukraine with the peasantry. They understood it as an active subject of history, of national state-building.

Keywords: Eastern European agrarianism, Czechoslovakia, Ukraine, political parties, peasantry.

Formulation of the issue. Among the factors behind the revolutionary upheavals in Europe in the early twentieth century one of the determinants was agrarian. The peasantry of Europe was dissatisfied with its socio-economic status, its legal status. Agriculture, as a leading sector of the economy of most Eastern European countries, needed an effective agrarian policy designed to significantly improve not only the peasants' material wealth, but also their legal status. Socio-political upheavals in Europe in the early twentieth century. They also led to the search for an alternative bourgeois-capitalist or Bolshevik-communist model of socio-political development. This option

became the "third path of development" represented by Eastern European agrarianism. Therefore, one of the phenomena of European history of the first third of the twentieth century. Eastern European agrarianism in general and Eastern European in particular, and the peasantry as an active subject in the domestic political life of Eastern European countries. Accordingly, agrarianism has become a priority political doctrine of Eastern European countries.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Questions consistent with the topic of our study were partially reflected in Ukrainian¹ and foreign² historiography. Researchers have mainly focused on aspects

¹ FARENİY, I.: The peasant revolution in theoretical views and political practice of Ulyanov-Lenin. In: *Schidnoevropejsyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 2019, 10, pp. 58 – 65; ФАРЕНІЙ, І. А.: Про правомірність концепції «Великої селянської революції» В.П. Данилова. In: *Український селянин*, 2014, Вип. 14, с. 162 – 166; KORNOVENKO, S. – ZEMZIULINA, 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. In: *Український селянин*, 2019, Вип. 21, с. 14 – 20; КОРНОВЕНКО, С. В. – ЗЕМЗЮЛІНА, Н. І.: Революційні потрясіння початку ХХ ст.: аграрне законодавство країн Центральної та Південно-східної Європи. In: *Український селянин*, 2018, Вип. 19, с. 45 – 49; ГАЛУШКО, К.: «Хліборобська ідеологія» В. Липинського у системі східноєвропейського аграризму. In: *Український історичний збірник*, 2000, № 2, с. 164 – 200; ГАЛУШКО, К.: *Консерватор на тлі доби: В'ячеслав Липинський і суспільна думка європейських «правих»*. Київ: Темпора, 2002. 288 с.; ПІКОВСЬКА, Т. В.: Національні програми Чехословацької Республіканської (аграрної) партії (1899 – 1922 рр.). In: *Гілея: науковий вісник*, 2016, Вип. 115, с. 455 – 458; СУХУШИНА, О. В.: Аграрні рухи в слов'янських країнах Центральної і Південно-Східної Європи та створення Зеленого Інтернаціоналу. In: *Український селянин*, 2008, Вип. 11, с. 337 – 341.

² ШМІГЕЛЬ, М. – СІРНИ, М.: Чехословацьчина в період національної та соціальної революції (1918 – 1919): суспільно-політичний аспект Словаччини. In: *Український селянин*, 2019, Вип. 21, с. 44 – 49; LACINA, V. – HARNA, J.: *Politické programy českého a slovenského agrárního hnutí 1899–1938*. Praha, 2002. 87s.; DOSTÁL, V.: *Agrární strana její rozmach a zánik*. Praha, 1997. 360 s.; HARNA, J.: *Republikánská strana*. In: MALÍŘ, J., PAVEL, M. a kol. *Politické strany. Vývoj politických stran a hnutí v českých zemích a Československu v letech 1861–2004. 1. Díl: 1861–1938*. Brno, 2005. 1024 s.; HOLEC, R.: *Agrárna demokracie ako pokus o tretiu cestu Stredoeurópskej transformácie*. In: *Historicky časopis*, 2011, roč. 59, č. 1, s. 3 – 32; BERNSTEIN, H.: The peasant problem in the Russia revolution(s), 1905 – 1929. In: *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 2018, 45 (5 – 6), pp. 1127 – 1150; SUMPF, A.: The Russian peasant revolution [les revolutions du paysan russe]. In: *Vingtieme Siecl: Revue d'Historie*, 2017, 135 (3), pp. 102 – 116; FINKEL, E. – GEHLBAH, S. – KOFANOV, D.: (Good) Land and Freedom (for Former Serfs): Determinants of Peasant Unrest in European Russia, March-October 1917. In: *Slavic*

related to the nature and content of Eastern European agrarianism, the realization in some Eastern European countries of the so-called "third" path, the unfolding of the peasant revolution in post-imperial European spaces, and so on. At the same time, given the phenomenality of Eastern European agrarianism, the emergence of Czechoslovak and Ukrainian statehood, the determining factor of which was peasantry, it is relevant to study the ideology of Eastern European agrarianism in the programmatic provisions of Czechoslovak and Ukrainian political parties under the conditions of social and political parties.

The author aims to investigate the ideology of Eastern European agrarianism of 1917 – 1921, represented in the political programs of Czechoslovak and Ukrainian political parties.

The subjects of the study were the political programs of those parties which referred to the peasantry as an active subject of national state-building, the social basis of Czechoslovak and Ukrainian statehoods. In agreement with K. Galushko's reasoning³, we were interested, first of all, in those political parties whose programs emphasized "on the political separatism" of the peasants and the particularity of the peasant "third way". In our opinion, such parties have every reason to count in Czechoslovakia – the Czechoslovak Republican (Agrarian) Party (hereinafter – the CRAP), in Ukraine – the Ukrainian Democratic-Agrarian Party (hereinafter – UDAP), the Ukrainian People's Community (hereinafter – UPC), the All-Ukrainian Union of Agrarians-Owners (peasants) (hereinafter – AUAO), Ukrainian People's Party (hereinafter – UPP).

Presenting of main material. Among the reasons for the emergence of agrarianism, researchers are unanimous in that it was due to the following factors: first, the agrarian nature of the economies of Eastern European countries; second, the severity of the agrarian issue in these countries; third, the numerical dominance of the peasantry over other segments of the population of Eastern European coun-

Review, 2017, 76 (3), pp. 710 – 721; МАТВЕЕВ Г. Ф.: «Третий путь»? Идеология аграризма в Чехословакии и Польше в межвоенный период. Москва: Изд-во Московского университета, 1991. 240 с.

³ ГАЛУШКО, К.: «Хліборобська ідеологія» В. Липинського..., с. 164 – 166.

tries; fourth, the increased public interest in agrarian issues in general and the peasantry in particular. This is emphasized by O. Sukhushina⁴, K. Galushko⁵, G. Matveev⁶ and other scholars.

In our opinion, in addition to the above, the causes of agrarianism were the following. First, the conflict between industrial and agrarian civilizations, which clearly began to manifest itself in the second half of the nineteenth - early twentieth centuries. In the conditions of modernization of agrarian-industrial countries and economies and their transformation into industrial-agrarian or approximated to them with corresponding value transformation. One example is the socio-economic and socio-political models of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires, which in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Have undergone similar upgrades. The orbits of the modernization processes were the Czechia, Slovakia, Poland, Ukraine, etc. – future independent entities of international law, countries representing Eastern European agrarianism, which at that time were part of the Romanov and Habsburg empires, respectively. We believe that the advancement of the industrial civilization of the Western sample to the Eastern European agrarian space has provoked a defensive reaction on the part of the largest social groups of Eastern European countries – the peasantry. It became East European agrarianism of the first third of the twentieth century presented with Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Romanian, Ukrainian, etc. options. Secondly, the development of political culture of the agrarian nations, which at that time were Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Romanian, Ukrainian, etc. The political cultures of Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Romanian, Ukrainian, etc. peasants have undergone a valuable modernization. In our opinion, there has been an essential socio-cultural shift in the collective and individual political culture and consciousness of the peasants – the transition from an indifferent political culture and consciousness to an active one.

⁴ СУХУШИНА, О. В.: Аграрні рухи в слов'янських країнах..., с. 338.

⁵ ГАЛУШКО, К. «Хліборобська ідеологія» В. Липинського..., с. 164 – 166.

⁶ МАТВЕЕВ, Г. Ф.: «Третий путь»? Идеология аграризма..., с. 3.

Third, the objective laws of the development of the agrarian civilization itself, the formation in its bowels of a qualitatively different peasantry. First of all, we refer to the peasantry as an active subject of history, national (Czechoslovak and Ukrainian) state-building. In scientific and historical discourse, agrarianism is understood differently. For example, T. Makovetska and T. Pokivaylova are convinced that agrarianism denied the union of the working class and the peasantry. They believe that all the provisions of agrarianism are subordinated to one end-goal – to substantiate the primary and independent role of the countryside in the socio-economic and political development of society⁷. O. Sukhushina is convinced that "the pivot in agrarianism was the idea of the peasant's uniqueness as a figure, combining the qualities of both the owner and the worker"⁸. T. Pikovska believes that the ideology of agrarianism is a doctrine that emphasizes the leading role of the peasantry in society⁹.

In our opinion, in the broad sense of the East European agrarianism of the first third of the twentieth century – a holistic socio-cultural phenomenon, the phenomenon of Eastern European history of the first third of the twentieth century., Caused by the objective-subjective-subjective factors that are the object of knowledge. In a narrow sense, East European agrarianism is a system of peasant-centric representations of different subjects of the socio-cultural space of Eastern Europe in the first third of the twentieth century and their practical implementation. Specifying a narrower understanding of Eastern European agrarianism in the first third of the twentieth century in the context of our object of study, we state that it is a system of political ideas about the peasantry as an active subject of history, a representative of the "third" way, the social basis of statehood.

⁷ МАКОВЕЦКАЯ, Т. Ф. – ПОКИВАЙЛОВА, Т. А.: Крестьянские партии в политической структуре Болгарии и Румынии в первой четверти XX в. In: *Балканские исследования. – Выпуск 9.: Вопросы социальной, политической и культурной истории Юго-Восточной Европы*. Москва, 1984. Online: <http://lib.sale/stran-evropy-i-istoriya/krestyanskie-partii-politicheskoy-strukture-37960.html>

⁸ СУХУШИНА, О. В.: Аграрні рухи в слов'янських країнах..., с. 338.

⁹ ПІКОВСЬКА, Т. В.: Національні програми..., с. 456.

One of the most influential political parties in the newly-formed in October 1918 Czechoslovakia was the Czechoslovak Republican (Agrarian) Party. The party gained its popularity in the early twentieth century. According to T. Pikovska's observations, after the 1908 elections, the agrarian party turned into a mass party with a high level of support from the population. Its representatives won 44 seats out of 166 in Parliament¹⁰. In December 1919, due to radical social and political changes, first of all the formation of Czechoslovakia, the party changed its name to the Republican Party of the Czechoslovak Countryside, adopting it in April 1919, a new political program of the party.

Positioning themselves as a nationwide political force, agrarians in the new political program, approved in April 1919, proposed the agrarianist ideology, broadening and deepening previous developments. First of all, the program¹¹ clearly outlined a number of important points regarding the Czechoslovak peasantry as an active subject of Czechoslovakian state-building. In particular, it was proclaimed that "it was here in the countryside that the first public organizations were formed, which stood at the origins of the formation of the state, which became the embodiment of the aspirations of our ancestors, farmers. The peasantry itself became the basis of the newly created state not only ideologically, but also numerically, because the peasantry is the majority of the population of the republic"¹². In this way, Czechoslovak agrarianists recognized the peasantry as a source of Czechoslovak state-building. In this, they were similar to Ukrainian agrarianists.

Czechoslovak agrarianists, in formulating the economic model of the Czechoslovak state, argued for the appropriateness of the principle of universal well-being as opposed to narrow-elitist. In fact, in our opinion, it was about denying large private capital and supporting the idea that "wealth is a moderate luxury for everyone", and,

¹⁰ Ibid, c. 456.

¹¹ The author is grateful to the cand. of hist. sc. T. V. Pikovska for translating the program of the Republican Party of the Czechoslovak Countryside into Ukrainian.

¹² HARNA, J. – DEYL, Z. – LACINA, V.: *Materiály k politickým, hospodárskym a sociálnym dějinám Československa v letech 1918-1929*. Praha: ÚČSD ČSAV, 1981, s. 101-108.

consequently, for its over-exploitation. The program stated: "Economic imperialism, open or hidden, should not determine our economic relations"¹³. The program stated that agrarianists would "make every effort to combat all the excesses of capitalism, including monopolies"¹⁴. In doing so, they defended the principle of private property and entrepreneurship, insisting on the elimination of all opportunities "for abuse of power or wealth"¹⁵. The implementation of all economic reforms was aimed at the economic enrichment of the state. Owners of large capital should also be involved in the formation of state wealth. In this way, they fulfilled their obligations to the state, ensuring its social character¹⁶. Taking into account the severity of the agrarian issue in the country, the peasantry as a socio-economic and socio-political basis of national statehood, Czechoslovakian agrarianists also proposed a model for its solution. Agrarian policy, like the reform, like the Ukrainian agrarianists, was widely understood. It was not only about the redistribution of land on the basis of peasant-centricity, but also about the increase of agriculture, state support for granting profitable loans to the peasantry, protection of agricultural cooperation, development of social infrastructure in the countryside, peasant self-government and more.

First of all, according to Czechoslovakian agrarianists, the state had to provide land to landless and landless peasants¹⁷. The agrarian reform had to obey the stated goal. The peasants, according to the party's program, received from the state the amount of land privately owned for competitive management. The instrument was the redistribution of land ownership between large landowners and peasants: "We believe that such land reform should be carried out, which will divide the land of large landowners between peasants who will directly work on this land. To this end, we consider it a paramount task to abolish legal norms that artificially protect the indivisibility of large land ownership"¹⁸.

¹³ Ibid, s. 107.

¹⁴ Ibid, s. 108.

¹⁵ Ibid, s. 104.

¹⁶ Ibid, s. 104.

¹⁷ Ibid, s. 102, 104.

¹⁸ Ibid, s. 104.

The distribution of large land tenure had to be based on economic principles and had a distinct peasant-centric character. The state guaranteed the peasants the creation of such conditions under which they could freely acquire the land of large latifundia. The same was true of the military servicemen who "helped establish Czechoslovakia's independence"¹⁹. Thus, according to the party members, a truly national basis of Czechoslovak statehood would be formed - a national peasant-owner, and internal colonization of Czechoslovak lands would take place by a patriotic peasantry. The peasants and the former military servicemen could buy land at the expense of interest-free loans from the state. In addition, it was envisaged that the state would facilitate the construction of housing for peasants who had acquired land²⁰.

The land itself is undoubtedly of all-state and national value. However, the development of agro-culture is equally important. It determines the degree of profitability, competitiveness of agriculture, and ultimately – the welfare of the peasant family. With this in mind, Czechoslovak agrarianists advocated the implementation of a nationwide program to improve agro-culture. Its components are: "land consolidation, improvement of the soil fertilization system, training of workers with new advanced tillage technologies, application of research in crop and livestock farming, mechanization of agriculture, its electrification and creation of new irrigation systems, insurance and public credit"²¹. In this way, in our opinion, a constructive dialogue was formed between the state and its base – the peasantry, the confrontation was avoided as much as possible.

The program also referred to the political status of the peasantry, its self-government, and the form of economic self-organization, and economic fortunes. The peasants proclaimed themselves equal citizens of Czechoslovak democratic republicanism. They were guaranteed equal political rights, social and professional protection, respect for social justice, and so on²². In particular, every citizen of Czecho-

¹⁹ Ibid, s. 105.

²⁰ Ibid, s. 104.

²¹ Ibid, s. 105.

²² Ibid, s. 106.

slovakia was guaranteed the right to work without exception. It was believed that the creation of trade unions for agricultural workers would improve their working conditions²³.

Taking into account the continuity of peasant self-government traditions, the high status of the peasantry in the Czechoslovak Republic, its greater effectiveness in solving regional problems, Czechoslovak agrarianists advocated the decentralization of state administration. They emphasized that rural communities should themselves take care of the socio-economic issues of which they are better aware of central government bodies. Strengthening peasant self-government, decentralization was considered an instrument of domestic policy. Its strategic goal is the "prosperity of the peasantry"²⁴.

The program envisaged the implementation of a new rural management order. According to the plan, the model of interaction between officials and peasants underwent dramatic changes. It was deprived of coercion against the peasantry, directed to a constructive dialogue between the authorities and the peasantry. The officials had to take care of the interests of the countryside and help solve its problems. "The bureaucracy should become a mentor to the landless and landless peasants, to improve their situation and to give them additional land"²⁵.

Czechoslovakian agrarianists argued for state protectionism for the rights of the landless peasantry. They defended the protection of it against oppression by the big capitalists. To this, they proposed adopting special trade rules for agricultural cooperatives specializing in products of their own production and marketing²⁶. Like the Ukrainian agrarianists, the Czechoslovakians favored the cooperation. For them, this was the optimal form of economic self-organization of the peasants. Most of them were attracted by the fact that cooperation was the most non-exploitative model of production of material goods.

²³ Ibid, s. 107.

²⁴ Ibid, s. 102.

²⁵ Ibid, s. 107.

²⁶ Ibid, s. 108.

Thus, the political program of the Republican Party of the Czechoslovakian Countryside was based on the ideology of Eastern European agrarianism. The cross-cutting idea of Czechoslovak agrarianists, in accordance with the program approved on April 29, 1918, was the idea of the peasantry as an active subject of Czechoslovak state-building, a source of national statehood, a full-fledged subject of that-time Czechoslovak socio-cultural space. The Czechoslovak peasantry was recognized as a program by the socio-economic and socio-political basis of the First Czechoslovak Republic. The program of Czechoslovak agrarianists had many similar provisions to those of that-time Ukrainian agrarianist parties.

Under the conditions of the revolutionary reality of 1917 – 1921 in Ukraine, Ukrainian agrarianism became ideologically, theoretically and structurally formed, as in Czechoslovakia, Czechoslovak agrarianism. Its representatives, in particular, were political parties. First of all, Ukrainian agrarianism have been presented in the Materials for the Program of the [Ukrainian Democratic Political Party] (hereinafter – the Materials) and in the “Outline on the Program of the Ukrainian Democratic Agrarian Party” (hereinafter – “the Outline”). Authorship of "Outline" belongs to V. Lypynsky²⁷²⁸. The Materials raised the question that political forces in the Ukrainian political life of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution clearly outlined neither socialist nor non-socialist tendencies. In fact, the organizing committee of the Ukrainian Democratic Party proclaimed a third political force, which positioned it itself²⁹.

V. Lypynsky's "Outline" describes not only the political priorities of the Ukrainian Democratic-Agrarian Party, but also prominently reproduces the leading social strata of the Ukrainian Democratic

²⁷ ТУРЧЕНКО, Ф. – ЗАЛІСЬКА, Н.: В'ячеслав Липинський – ідеолог Української демократичної хліборобської партії. Ін: *В'ячеслав Липинський. Історико-політологічна спадщина і сучасна Україна*. Київ – Філадельфія 1994, с. 171 – 181.

²⁸ ГАЙ-НИЖНИК, П. В.: Липинський та УДХП в теорії і практиці українського державотворення і політичного націонал-консерватизму (1900 – 1920 рр.). Ін: *Гілея: науковий вісник*, 2018, Вип. 129, с. 309.

²⁹ Матеріали до програми. Ін: ЛИПИНСЬКИЙ, В.: *Твори, архів, студії. Т. 1.: Студії. В'ячеслав Липинський: історико-політологічна спадщина і сучасна Україна*. Ред. Я. Пеленський. Київ – Філадельфія 1994, с. 253.

Republic. First of all, the name of this political force reflects its agrarian character, because "as an agrarian party, we will ensure that the agrarian part of Ukrainian democracy takes in the process of creating our free political life such a position that corresponds to its number (85% of all people) and power"³⁰. The author of the "Outline", and in fact, in our opinion, "The Peasant Manifesto" writes confidently that the political power in Ukraine "must primarily belong to the representatives of the Ukrainian peasantry, and the city must not dictate its will to the Ukrainian countryside. Ukraine is the land of agrarians, and the Ukrainian state must become a state of agrarians. Standing on this ground, our Party will use all means to increase the political, economic and cultural strength of the Ukrainian peasantry"³¹.

In this way, he clearly distinguishes two Ukrainian worlds: the village and the city. The village should become free from the dictates of the city and the social foundation of the Ukrainian state, which is peasant in nature. At the level of the program of the political party, the understanding of the peasantry is crystallized not only as the keeper of the cultural and spiritual values of the people, but as a full-fledged, active subject of history, national state-building. The understanding of the agrarian nature of Ukrainian society by V. Lypynsky is clear. We believe that this is a de facto reference to the Ukrainian peasant state and, accordingly, the Ukrainian peasant nation. Reasonable is the reasoning of R. Vetrov, S. Zborets about the fact that "Lypynsky views the peasant not as a farmer with his ethnocultural attributes, but as a conscious citizen of the state, the owner who produces the most important value for his good and independence – the bread"³².

The provisions of "Outline" relating to educational, cultural, economic spheres are also saturated by the agrarianism. The sections of the program document clearly state that "in the field of education

³⁰ ЛИПИНСЬКИЙ, В.: Нарис програми Української демократичної хліборобської партії. Ін: ЛИПИНСЬКИЙ, В.: *Твори, архів, студії*. Т. 1.: *Студії...*, с. 257.

³¹ Ibid, 257 – 258.

³² ВЕТРОВ, Р. – ЗБОРЕЦЬ, С.: Хліборобська ідеологія В. Липинського як одна з ознак українського консерватизму. Ін: *Питання аграрної історії України та Росії: Матеріали дев'ятих наукових читань, присвячених пам'яті Д.П. Пойди: зб. наук. пр.* Редкол.: В.В. Іваненко (відп. ред) та ін. Д.: ПФ Стандарт-Сервіс, 2012, с. 136.

and culture, our party as an agrarian party, in addition to general democratic demands, aims to spread education and culture in the countryside as much as possible ... In order to do so, we will seek to establish in villages all sorts of schools ... universities, specially designed for peasants. The work of a rural teacher in a free-flowing agricultural Ukraine must be surrounded by a special respect and his financial status must be provided so well as to attract the best of our intellectual forces to this magnificent and difficult work”³³. Similar provisions were made in the program of Czechoslovak agrarianists.

The economic model of the agrarian Ukraine as a state, from the perspective of the Ukrainian Democratic-Agrarian Party (hereinafter referred to as the UDAP), will have nothing to do with the chaos of the "private capitalist economy". It will be based on fundamentally different principles: "the interest of the private entrepreneur... should be limited... by the widest possible state control over the national economy, and from the bottom by the organization and association of the people-producing masses. Therefore, our party will stand for... the greatest development of the democratic cooperative movement in all its forms and options”³⁴. In this way, a third alternative to the economic model, the cooperative, was proposed. According to the party, it was the most suitable for the main producer of material goods – the peasantry. It harmoniously combined private and public interests; there was no excessive capitalist urge and socialist dissolution of the individual in the collective.

Regardless of the UDAP political program, there was no agrarian issue. However, understanding of its essence and ways of solution was based on principles other than those of other parties. First of all, the difference is that UDAP "Free agrarian Ukraine" is the "land of highly developed, intensive farmer agriculture”³⁵. Thus, they viewed the agrarian issue as a component of state pro-peasant agrarian policy, and the peasant – a citizen whose landed private property is the basis of the Ukrainian state. The party's vision of Ukrainian country-

³³ ЛИПИНСЬКИЙ, В.: Нарис програми Української демократичної хліборобської партії. Ін: ЛИПИНСЬКИЙ, В.: *Твори, архів, студії*. Т. 1.: *Студії...*, с. 259 – 260.

³⁴ Ibid, с. 261.

³⁵ Ibid, с. 262.

side prospects is the third way of development. It was understood as the placement throughout Ukraine of "the farms of the working Ukrainian peasantry, on which the Ukrainian agrarian, united in powerful cooperative communities, extracts from his native land by his and his family's work as much as it can give"³⁶.

The members of the UDAP in the "Outline" drew attention to another detail that favorably differentiated their vision of the nature and ways of solving the agrarian issue. For them, Ukraine "belongs to the lands of Western European agrarian culture". In view of this fact, the party members stressed that they would "fight against all Russian projects of agrarian reform, based on the alien primitive psychology of the "community" (all redistribution and allotments "per capita") and the extensive system of agriculture ("cutting" of the land to the triple peasant economy)"³⁷. In this way, representatives of the UDAP first of all saw the Ukrainian peasantry as the social basis of Ukrainian statehood; Secondly, they clearly understood that the Ukrainian peasant was a unique self-sufficient entity, qualitatively different from the Russian one; thirdly, the solution of the Ukrainian agrarian issue should be based on European-Ukrainian principles that contribute to the development of a high-tech industry while preserving the identity of the Ukrainian peasantry as an embodiment of cultural and national values. Other options based on other principles, according to the members of the UDAP, are "reactionary because they lead back to the lower stages of this development and threaten a great decline in productivity and fertility of land"³⁸.

Agrarianism also marked the political program of the Ukrainian People's Community (hereinafter – UPC). At the sources of its formation was P. Skoropadsky. V. N. Kochubey, M. Voronovych, V. Lyubynsky and others who actively cooperated with P. Skoropadsky on the 1st Ukrainian Corps were active party activists of the UPC. According to Doroshenko, at the heart of its activities, UPC "put a compromise on social issues, democratization of the state system within, harmless to the state power, and Ukrainization of Russified

³⁶ Ibid, c. 262.

³⁷ Ibid, c. 263.

³⁸ Ibid, c. 263.

cultural strata of Ukrainian citizenship, but by slowly attracting these strata to cultural and state Ukrainian work"³⁹. According to G. Papakin, quite rightly, it contained two basic components: "uniting all owners against socialist experiments and trying to avoid the extremes of "fierce capitalism""⁴⁰.

UPC's political program was clearly agrarian. The choose of the Third Way was declared by the 12th item of the political program of the party. It stated that neither the monarchy, which was unable to satisfy the diverse needs of the people, nor detached from the life of the theory of maximalists who had no reason in real life, was not acceptable to the UPC. State-building based on the will of the people, taking into account the historical experience of state-making, its historical and political traditions, is acceptable⁴¹. Thus, the source of power of the Ukrainian State was the people. Considering that 85% were peasants, they were understood to be the social basis of this state.

The Program also discussed the priorities of domestic policy. Its main purpose was to proclaim the proper conditions for the development of private initiative and enterprise, the expression and realization of the "creative forces of the people", above all the peasantry as the most numerous execution of Ukrainian society. The key to this was the guarantee by the state of "truly reasonable freedom". The latter refers to the protection of life, property, legal rights and interests of a person against oppression by both the state and unlawful encroachments of outsiders⁴².

UPC clearly defined the agricultural character of Ukraine in its programmatic provisions. By modern language it is an agrarian type of society. Accordingly, issues of land tenure / land use, land tenure, legal subjectivization of the peasantry, improvement of its material well-being were of paramount importance. Their decision was sub-

³⁹ ДОРОШЕНКО, Д.: *Історія України, 1917 – 1923. В 2-х т. Т. 2. Українська Гетьманська Держава 1918 року*. Київ: Видавництво «Темпора», 2002, с. 22 – 23.

⁴⁰ ПАПАКІН, Г.: Українська народна громада і Павло Скоропадський навесні 1918 р. Іп: *Наукові записки ІПіЕНД ім. І.Ф. Кураса НАНУ*, 2008, Вип. 39, с. 144.

⁴¹ ГЕРАЩЕНКО, Т. С.: Українська народна громада /Программа Украинской народной громады/. Іп: *Вісник Київського державного лінгвістичного університету. Серія «Історія, економіка, філософія»*, 2000, Вип. 4, с. 209.

⁴² Ibid, с. 209.

ordinated to the end goal – "for the benefit of the agricultural population of Ukraine". Subjectivization was interpreted as a guarantee of an inviolable property right, which "corresponds to the original and unchanged convictions of the Ukrainian-agrarian"⁴³. Taking care of the material well-being of the agrarian families, its improvement, the program envisaged measures aimed at clear legislative regulation of the sale and purchase of land, and elimination of speculation in this case. The agrarians and their families were to receive land in the size that would guarantee their safe life and sufficient use of their own labor. The priority in land acquisition belonged to the Cossacks and the disadvantaged, "who did not spare their lives, breast-shielded Ukraine from external and internal enemies"⁴⁴.

UPC members argued that any form of socio-economic self-organization of the peasantry should be supported by the state. In particular, the finance agency had to take special care of the development of cooperatives, mutual loan societies, loan and savings partnerships, etc. Cooperation with the UPC parties, as well as with the members of the UDAP, considered the basis of the economic model of the future Ukrainian state⁴⁵.

Therefore, the program of the agrarian changes and the social basis of the Ukrainian State was determined by the Ukrainian-agrarian. The above convinces the agrarian nature of the programmatic provisions of UPC, the agrarian content of the beliefs of P. Skoropadsky. The agrarian ideology was peculiar to both the All-Ukrainian Union of Agrarians-Owners (Peasants) (hereinafter – AUAO) and the Ukrainian People's Party.

In October 1918, AUAO was formed. It consists of part of the members of the Kyiv Regional Union of Landowners, headed by M. Kovalenko, who disagrees with the programmatic foundations of the All-Russian Union of Landowners (hereinafter referred to as the "AUL")⁴⁶. On October 20, 1918, their platform was presented in "The

⁴³ Ibid, с. 209 – 210.

⁴⁴ Ibid, с. 210.

⁴⁵ Ibid, с. 211.

⁴⁶ ЛЮБОВЕЦЬ, О. М.: Всеукраїнський союз хліборобів-власників (селян). Ін: *Українські партії революційної доби 1917 – 1920 рр.: Нариси історії та програмні документи*. Київ: Парламентське вид-во, 2018, с. 463.

Memorandum of the Agrarians-Owners and Cossacks of All Ukraine". The relatively short volume of the document clearly outlines the peasant-centric orientations of this political organization. The peasant-agrarian was proclaimed the sole and solid basis of Ukrainian statehood. The peasantry was guaranteed equal civil rights and freedoms. The principle of private property is inviolable. The ultimate goal of agrarian reform is to satisfy the socio-economic interests of the broader peasants-agrarians. Land tenure, despite inviolability of private property rights, is limited. Regulatory policy regarding land tenure is implemented by the state, represented by the Land Bank. The instrument of implementation of agrarian reform was the compulsory purchase of land from large landowners. The parceled land was transferred to the peasants who needed it for some payment through the Land Bank⁴⁷. Thus, in its program of state building, the AUL made a clear reference to the peasantry, the social basis of national statehood. The socio-political and socio-economic model of the state was peasant-centric, agrarian. In May 1919, the Ukrainian People's Party (hereafter – UPP) was formed. It was intended to include UDAP and AUAO. However, such a unification did not take place, and the newly formed party was formed only of the members of the AUL⁴⁸: M. Chudnov-Bohun, K. Krasiuk, M. Bayer, M. Arnaut and others. Its programmatic principles were based on the AUL provisions, in particular on agrarianism. At the same time, they were supplemented and expanded in "The Program of the Ukrainian People's Party" (hereinafter – the Program). Party members emphasized that nation-building should be based on the unity of all "economically sound and creative elements of the people". However, the "leading masses of small and medium peasantry" are leading in this process. In this regard, satisfaction of peasant interests and needs is a priority. This was subordinated to the financial and economic policy of the state. Among other things, its im-

⁴⁷ Ibid, s. 466 – Меморандум Хліборобів-власників і козаків усієї України.

⁴⁸ ЛЮБОВЕЦЬ, О. М.: Українська народна партія. Ін: *Українські партії революційної доби 1917 – 1920 рр.: Нариси історії та програмні документи*. Київ: Парламентське вид-во, 2018, с. 470.

plementation ensured the economic development of the country, its protection against the "exploitation by foreigners"⁴⁹.

In this way, the UPP rejected the exploitation, considering the non-exploitative model of the state. The agrarianist nature of the party's program provisions was contained in those parts of the party program that concerned the economy and tactics of party activity. In their opinion, they clearly state the content of the non-exploitative model of Ukrainian statehood, emphasize the agrarian nature of Ukrainian society and its economy. Cooperation is treated as an optimal socio-economic institute, which, on the one hand, provides the population with the necessary products, and on the other, minimizes the exploitation factor. In the context of Eastern European agrarianism, it was understood as a socio-economic institution that "strengthens the economic position of our people and makes it more organized in the fight against the exploitation by foreigners"⁵⁰. According to the Party members, the peasantry is "the main creative economic stratum in Ukraine; the main basis of the national economy is farming, the productivity of which is based on the average and small land ownership, with the help of associations and cooperatives of agricultural..."⁵¹ In "The Resolution of the Main Board of the Ukrainian People's Party" of September 7, 1919, the role of the peasantry in the nation state-building was outlined more clearly and more fully. The document stated that "the basis, the center of the creative forces in Ukraine, is the peasantry – the agrarians and national-industrial elements ... and only these elements can be a solid foundation for the future of the Ukrainian state and national idea, for the proletariat and the great bourgeoisie in Ukraine, from the point of view of national, foreign or indifferent to Ukrainian national-state competitions. ... And if the economic interests of this class are not connected with national and political interests, then the Ukrainian national affairs and statehood will be long suppressed by the hostile

⁴⁹ Ibid, c. 474 – 475: Програма Української народної партії.

⁵⁰ Ibid, c. 487.

⁵¹ Ibid, c. 475.

forces of the neighbors, who all have a clearly defined nationalist-imperialist color"⁵².

Given the agrarian nature of Ukrainian society, the relevance of the agrarian issue, the need to improve the socio-economic situation and socio-legal status of the peasantry, it was envisaged to implement agrarian reform. These improvements were supposed to be achieved by "raising of agro-culture, as well as the protection of national and state rights of the Ukrainian people, who are the owner of their land and the manager of their economy"⁵³.

According to UPP members, agrarian reform should be peasant-centric and based on the following principles:

1. Protection of small and medium-sized land ownership;
2. Abolition of large land tenure;
3. Forcible redemption by the state of over-land from large landowners and its transfer on preferential terms to the landless and landless peasantry for cultural economy. This approach was justified by the UPP members' financial interests of the state and the impossibility of social confrontation in the countryside⁵⁴;
4. Transfer of specific, treasury and monastery lands to the state fund;
5. Determination of the standard of land for sale in the amount of 25 des.;
6. By providing amelioration credit support to agricultural cooperatives;
7. State support for farms and agricultural cooperatives⁵⁵.

Therefore, there is sufficient reason to state that in the conditions of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 – 1921, Ukrainian agrarianism took place as a variant of Eastern European agrarianism. He was represented in the programmatic provisions of UDAP, UPC, UPP, AUAO. They referred to the peasantry as the state builder, social basis of statehood, the "third" path of development.

Conclusions. Summarizing, we note that the revolutionary upheavals in Europe in the early twentieth century radically influenced the socio-political life of European countries, led to the emergence of new subjects of international relations, previously unknown phe-

⁵² Ibid, c. 495.

⁵³ Ibid, c. 487.

⁵⁴ Ibid, c. 487.

⁵⁵ Ibid, c. 475 – 476.

nomena. First of all, considering the topic of the study, this concerns Czechoslovak and Ukrainian state-building, as well as such phenomenon as Eastern European agrarianism, represented in particular by Czechoslovak and Ukrainian variants. Political parties represented it on Czechoslovak and Ukrainian soil. In Czechoslovakia – the Czechoslovak Republican (Agrarian) Party, in Ukraine – the Ukrainian Agrarian Party, the Ukrainian People's Community, the All-Ukrainian Union of Agrarians-Owners (Peasants), the Ukrainian People's Party. These parties had a distinct agrarian character. Common in their programmatic provisions was the fact that peasant-centrism was at the heart of their state ideology. They connected the socio-political and socio-economic future of Czechoslovakia and Ukraine with the peasantry. They understood him as an active subject of history, a source of national state-building.

At the same time, there were some differences due to the regional specificity of the countries, the course of historical events. The main difference, in our opinion, was that the Czechoslovak agrarianists managed to put their ideology into practice by implementing Czechoslovakia's domestic politics in the interwar period. Unfortunately, Ukrainian farmers failed to implement the program provisions. The establishment of Soviet power in Ukraine at the end of the Ukrainian Revolution was the beginning of the formation of a proletarian state, in which the peasant majority was given a place on the margins of the Soviet model of statehood.

Zhrnutie

Ideológia východoeurópskeho agrarizmu v programových ustanoveniach československých a ukrajinských politických strán (v podmienkach sociálno-politických zvrátov začiatkom 20. storočia)

Revolučné otrasy v Európe začiatkom 20. storočia radikálne ovplyvnili sociálno-politický život európskych krajín, viedli k vzniku nových subjektov medzinárodno-právnych vzťahov, predtým neznámych javov. Predovšetkým – vzhľadom na tému štúdie – sa to týka československých a ukrajinských štátotvorných snáh a tiež takého

fenoménu ako východoeurópsky agrarizmus, prezentovaný hlavne československým a ukrajinským variantom. Jeho zástupcami v Československu a na Ukrajine boli politické strany. V Československu – Republikánska strana poľnohospodárskeho a maloroľníckeho ľudu, na Ukrajine – Ukrajinská roľnícka strana, Ukrajinské národné spoločenstvo, Všeukrajinská únia poľnohospodárov (roľníkov), Ukrajinská ľudová strana. Tieto strany mali výrazný agrárny charakter. Totožným v ich programových ustanoveniach bolo, že v centre ich štátnej ideológie bol agrarizmus (agrárnický centralizmus). Spoločensko-politická a sociálno-ekonomická budúcnosť Československa a Ukrajiny bola nimi spájaná s roľníctvom. Chápali ho ako aktívny subjekt histórie, zdroj národného štátotvorného úsilia. Zároveň sa vyskytovali aj určité odlišnosti, ktoré boli spôsobené regionálnou špecifickosťou krajín, historickým vývojom atď. Hlavný rozdiel – podľa mienky autora – bol v tom, že československým agrárnikom sa podarilo svoju ideológiu uviesť do praxe, zrealizovať v domácej politike Československa v medzivojnovom období. Ukrajinská agrárnikom sa bohužiaľ nepodarilo zrealizovať svoje programové ustanovenia. Zriadenie sovietskej moci na Ukrajine po skončení Ukrajinskej revolúcie bolo začiatkom formovania proletárskeho štátu, v ktorom roľnícka väčšina dostala miesto na okraji sovietskeho modelu štátnosti.