The changes in issue were the result of long-term systemic crises caused by the authorities’ inadequate response to modernization. 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 situation, its legal status. Agriculture, as a major sector of the economy, was characterized by vast disparities in the distribution of resources and income. The peasantry was a major source of labor and food production, yet its rights and conditions were often marginalized and exploited. The revolutionaries targeted the peasantry as a key component of their political programs, aiming to transform the social and political structure of society. The peasant movement played a crucial role in the development of revolutionary movements in various countries. The peasants in Eastern Europe, for example, were particularly active in the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921. The revolutionaries worked to mobilize the peasantry, not only to provide manpower for their armies but also to change the political landscape. The revolutionaries understood the importance of the peasantry in shaping the future of their nations. They sought to empower the peasantry and establish a new political order based on agricultural reform and social justice. The revolutionaries recognized the need for a new direction in agriculture, including the redistribution of land and the improvement of working conditions. They attempted to involve the peasantry in the political process, both through propaganda and the formation of peasant organizations. However, the revolutionaries faced significant challenges in mobilizing the peasantry. The peasants were characterized by their social and economic diversity, which made it difficult to gather wide support. The revolutionaries had to address the peasants’ concerns, such as land distribution and labor conditions, in order to gain their support. The revolutionaries also had to deal with the resistance of the established authorities, who viewed the peasant movement as a threat to their power. The revolutionaries had to find ways to align the peasantry with their political goals while also responding to the peasants’ needs. This required a nuanced approach, balancing the demands of the peasants with the revolutionary agenda. The revolutionaries’ success in mobilizing the peasantry was influenced by various factors, including the political climate, the effectiveness of their propaganda, and the degree of their support among peasants. Overall, the revolutionaries understood the importance of the peasantry in shaping the future of their nations. They worked to involve the peasants in the political process, acknowledging their vital role in the revolutionary upheavals. The revolutionaries’ efforts to mobilize the peasantry demonstrated the significance of their movement in transforming the social and political landscape of Eastern Europe.
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Research analysis. Questions consistent with the topic of our research are partially reflected in Ukrainian and foreign historiography [1–10]. Researchers have mainly focused on aspects relating to the nature and content of Eastern European agrarianism, the realization of the so-called “third” path in some Eastern European countries, the unfolding of the peasant revolution in the post-imperial Russian space, the formation of the agrarian’s ideology in V. Lypynsky’s works and its Eastern European agrarianist context. At the same time, taking into account the phenomenality of Eastern European agrarianism, the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 - 1921, the determining factor of which was peasant, it is relevant to study Ukrainian agrarianism of that period as an option of Eastern European agrarianism of the first third of the twentieth century.

Purpose. The authors aims to investigate the phenomenon of Ukrainian agrarianism during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 - 1921 as an option of Eastern European agrarianism presented in the political programs of the Ukrainian national 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 formation, the social basis of Ukrainian statehood. In agreement with K. Galushko’s reasoning, we were interested, first of all, in those political parties whose programs emphasized “on the political separatism” of the peasants and on the particularity of the peasant “third way”. In our opinion, apart from the UDAP, agrarianist programs of political parties such as UPC, AUAO, UPP.

The statement of the basic material. Contemporary historical and scientific literature has established the view that agrarianism originated in Germany in the works of G. Ruland, A. Schaeffle. Subsequently it spreads to the territory of France, represented by the concept of J. Melin. At the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries agrarianism spreads into Eastern Europe - Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Czechia and Slovakia (later Czechoslovakia) [8, 178]. Among the reasons for the emergence of agrarianism, researchers are unanimous in that it was driven by 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 countries; fourth, the increased public interest in agrarian issues in general and the peasantry in particular. This is emphasized by K. Galushko [8], G. Matveev [9, 3] and other scientists.

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 transformation of values. 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 modernizations. 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 samovars to the Eastern European agrarian space has provoked a defensive reaction on the part of the largest social strata 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 modernization of values. 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 effective one.

Third, the objective laws of the development of the agrarian civilization itself, the formation in its bowels of a qualitatively different peasantry. In the case of Ukraine - the peasant-ideoman – an active subject of history [11]. Ukrainian peasantry in the early twentieth century was qualitatively different from both the urban proletariat and the peasantry of previous centuries, formed under fundamentally new conditions of post-serfdom reality. The qualitative difference was the absence of serfdom not only as a legal status. First of all, there is an absence of serfdom as a way of being, doing business, thinking style, etc. It was a generation brought up under the conditions of capitalization of agriculture, industrialization, transformation of the rural community - all that is considered to be the modernization of the second half of the nineteenth - beginning of the twentieth centuries in the Russian Empire. The peasants began to gradually realize themselves as a separate community of the then socio-cultural imperial space. The unifying value was the “Idea of the Land”, its distribution on fair, in their understanding, principles. These considerations are in line with the position of other modern researchers [12]. We are also impressed by A. Gordon’s reasoning that the liquidation of serfdom made the peasant a “rational agent” in the interpretation of classical political economy and sober sense. The psychology of the peasant became more resilient to those new phenomena
that actively spread into peasant existence. It is difficult to disagree with V. Piskun in the fact that the liquidation of serfdom gave impetus to modernization, changed the consciousness of the peasant, strengthening in him the feelings of the owner [13].

Therefore, we state that the emergence of East European agrarianism was caused by objective-subjective-subjective factors. Their combination gave impetus to the formation of Eastern European agrarianism - the phenomenon of the first third of the twentieth century. Considering the area of its spreading, the territorial features and features of socio-economic and socio-political development of Eastern European countries, we can reasonably distinguish its options: Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Romanian, Ukrainian, etc.

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 which is the object of knowledge. In a narrow sense, Eastern 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.

There are all reasons to say that Ukrainian agrarianism became ideologically-theoretically and structurally formed phenomenon in Ukraine in the conditions of the revolutionary reality of 1917 - 1921. Its representatives, in particular, were political parties. We believe that Ukrainian agrarianism of that period reflected the agrarian nature of Ukrainian society. Its agrarian nature in no way is a basis for understanding Ukrainian society as less valuable, "underdeveloped", etc., compared to similar Eastern European, Western European or other societies. Ukrainian agrarianism during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 - 1921 witnessed the transition from the indifferent political culture and consciousness of the Ukrainian peasantry to the active, the agrarian nature of the Ukrainian nation.

First of all, the Ukrainian agrarianism is presented in the Materials for the Program [Ukrainian Democratic Political Party] (hereinafter - Materials) and in the Outline on the Program of the Ukrainian Democratic-Agrarian Party (hereinafter - Outline). Authorship of "Outlines" belongs to V. Lypynsky [14; 15]. 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, by which it positioned itself[16, 253].

V. Lypynsky’s “Outline” describes not only the political priorities of the Ukrainian Democratic-Agrarian Party, but also prominently reproduces the leading social leadership of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic. First of all, the name of this political force reflects its agrarian nature, because ‘as an agrarian party, we will ensure that the agrarian part of Ukrainian democracy, in the process of creating our free political life, has a position that corresponds to its number (85 per cent of all people) and strength’ [17, 257]. The author of the "Outline", and in fact, in our opinion, “The Peasant Manifesto” writes confidently that 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 the 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” [17, 257 – 258].

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, not as a social-economic factor, but as a conscious and intelligent force. 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. Zbroets 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 wealth and independence – the bread” [18, 136].

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 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… the universities, specially designed for peasants. The work of a rural teacher in a free agrarian Ukraine must be particularly honored, and his financial status must be so well-placed that the best of our intelligent forces will be attracted to this magnificent and difficult work” [17, 159 – 260].

The economic model of agrarian Ukraine as a state, from the point of view 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 below - 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” [17, 261]. In this way, a third alternative 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.

The agrarian issue wasn’t out of focus of the UDAP’s political program. However, understanding of
its essence and ways of solution was based on principles other than those of other parties. First of all, the difference was that for UDAP “Free agrarian Ukraine” was the “the land of highly developed, intensive farm agriculture” [17, 262]. Thus, they viewed the agrarian issue as a component of governmental pro-peasant agrarian policy, and the peasant - a citizen whose landed private property is the basis of the Ukrainian state. The party vision of Ukrainian village prospects was the third way of development. It was understood as the placement throughout Ukraine of “farms of the working Ukrainian peasantry, on which the Ukrainian agrarian, united in powerful cooperative societies, extracts from his native land his and his family’s work with the maximum that it can give” [17, 262].

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 agricultural culture”. In view of this fact, the party members stressed that they would “fight against all Russian projects of agrarian reforms based on the aim for us 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) [17, 263]. In this way, representatives of the UDAP first of all saw in the Ukrainian peasantry the social basis of Ukrainian statehood; secondly, they clearly understood that the Ukrainian peasant was a unique self-sufficient subject, qualitatively different from the Russian one; thirdly, the decision of the Ukrainian agrarian issue should be based on European-Ukrainian principles that contribute to the development of high-tech industry with preservation of the identity of the Ukrainian peasantry as the embodiment of cultural and national values. Other options based on other principles, according to UDAP members, are “reactionary, because they lead back to the lower stages of this development and threaten a large decline in productivity and crop capacity of the land” [17, 263].

Agrarianism also marked the political program of the Ukrainian People’s Community (hereinafter - UPC). The sources of its formation connected with P. Skoropadsky, who, according to his memoirs, wanted to lead a democratic party that “should have led to compromises between property and the poor, and between the Great Russians and Ukrainians” [18, 133]. By creating the party and developing its program, P. Skoropadsky and his associates aimed to substantiate that “the Ukrainian movement is not German propaganda, but living in the people ... that the party ... does not define the form of government, but clearly defends democracy and preservation of property” [18, 126]. Democracy, among other things, in the understanding of the party’s founder, is a “strong shift in the agrarian issue” [18, 126]. P. Skoropadsky connected with the peasantry the future of the Ukrainian State, being a supporter of the “third way”, and considered democratic reforms an instrument for achieving this goal. The future Hetman believed that “our Ukrainian is an individualist; he does not need any socialization. He is strongly against it. According to the hetman, among the slogans of the revolution, most understandable to the peasantry, is the idea of the land’ [18, 50]. He was aware that ‘it is necessary to carry out truly healthy democratic reforms, not socialist ones, but democratic ones. We do not have socialism in the people, and therefore, if there is one, then among the numerous, torn apart people group of intellectuals ... I have no doubt ... that any socialist experiments ... would immediately lead to the whole country during 6 weeks would be the prey of all-devouring Moloch-bolshevism. Bolshevism, by destroying the culture, would turn our beautiful country into a dried up plain, where capitalism would eventually settle ... the almighty God, in whose feet the people would wallow and crawl’ [18, 145 – 146].

V. 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 P. Doroshenko, at the basis of its activities, UPC “put a compromise on social issues, democratization of the state system within the limits harmless to the state power, and Ukrainization of Russified cultural strata of Ukrainian citizens, but by a slow involvement of these strata in cultural and state Ukrainian work” [19, 22 – 23]. In G. Papakin’s quite right opinion, it contained two basic components: “uniting all owners against social experiments and trying to avoid the extremes of “fierce capitalism” [20, 145].

The above considerations of P. Skoropadsky have been adequately reflected in the political program of UPC. In our opinion, it, like P. Skoropadsky’s views, was clearly agrarianist. With the future head of the Ukrainian State, O. Lupakov, B. Butenko, O. Paltov, A. Rzepetsky, I. Dusan and other Ukrainian intellectuals, who are not indifferent to the fate of their homeland, have been involved in the development of “The Program of the Ukrainian People’s Community” (hereinafter referred to as the Program). The choice 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 meet the diverse needs of the people, nor detached from the life theories of maximalists which had no reason in real life, was not acceptable to the UPC. But a state building was acceptable, based on the will of the people, taking into account the historical experience of state building, its historical-political traditions [21, 209]. Thus, the source of power of the Ukrainian State was announced the people. Considering that 85 per cent were peasants, they were understood to be the social basis of this state. The Program also described the priorities of domestic policy. Its main purpose was to ensure the proper conditions for the development of private initiative and entrepreneurship, the expression and realization of the “creative forces of the people”, above all the peasantry as the most numerous strata of Ukrainian society. The key to this was the guarantee by the state of “truly reasonable freedom”. The latter refers to the protection of the life, property, legal rights and interests of a person against oppression by both the state and unlawful interference by outsiders [21, 209].

UPC clearly defined the agricultural character of Ukraine in its programmatic provisions. By modern language – an agrarian type of society. Accordingly, issues of land tenure / land use, legal subjectivization of the peasantry, improvement of its material well-being were of paramount importance. Their decision was subordinated to the end goal - “for the benefit of the agricultural population of Ukraine”. Subjectivization was interpreted as guaranteeing the inviolable property right, which “corresponds to the original and unchanged convictions of the Ukrainian-
agrarian” [21, 209 – 210]. 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 lives and sufficient use of their own labor. The priority in land acquisition belonged to the Cossacks and the disadvantaged, who “who did not spare their lives, breast-shielded Ukraine from external and internal enemies” [21, 210].

UPC members argued that all forms 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 companies, loan and savings partnerships, etc. The cooperation of the UPC parties, as well as the members of the UDAP, considered the basis of the economic model of the future Ukrainian state [21, 211].

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 agrarianist nature of the programmatic provisions of UPC, the agrarianist content of the beliefs of P. Skoropadsky. The agrarianist 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 includes some 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”) [22, 463]. On 20 October 1918, their platform was presented in “The Memorandum of the Owners-Agrarians 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 stratum was proclaimed the sole and solid foundation 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 peasant-agrarian strata. 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 parcelled land was transferred to the peasants who needed it for some payment through the Land Bank [23, 466]. 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 unification did not take place and the newly formed party was formed only of the members of the AUL [240 – 470]: M. Chudnov-Bohun, K. Krsiu, M. Bayer, M. Arnaut and others. Its programmatic principles were based on the AUAO 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 national state-building should be based on the unity of all “economically healthy and creative elements of the people”. However, the “broad 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 implementation ensured the economic development of the country, its protection against the “exploitation by foreigners” [25, 474 – 475].

In that way, the UPP rejected the exploitation, considering the non-exploitative model of the state. The agrarianist nature of the party’s program provisions contained those parts of the party program that concerned the economy and tactics of party activity. In our opinion, they clearly state the content of the non-exploitative model of Ukrainian statehood, emphasize the agrarianist 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 institute that ‘strengthens the economic position of our people and makes it more organized in the fight against the exploitation by foreigners’ [25, 487].

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 agricultural cooperatives...’ [25, 475]. In the Resolution of the Main Board of the Ukrainian People’s Party of 7 September 1919, the role of the peasantry in the national state-building was outlined more clearly and 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 basis for the future of the Ukrainian state and national idea, because the proletariat and the great bourgeoisie in Ukraine, from the national point of view, are alien or indifferent to Ukrainian national-state competitions. ... And if the economic interests of this class are not linked to national-political interests, then Ukrainian national affairs and statehood will be long suppressed by hostile forces of neighbors, all of whom have a clearly defined nationalist-imperialist color’ [25, 485].

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 the agro-culture, as well as securing the national-industrial elements ... and only these elements can be a solid basis for the future of the Ukrainian state and national idea, because the proletariat and the great bourgeoisie in Ukraine, from the national point of view, are alien or indifferent to Ukrainian national-state competitions. ... And if the economic interests of this class are not linked to national-political interests, then Ukrainian national affairs and statehood will be long suppressed by hostile forces of neighbors, all of whom have a clearly defined nationalist-imperialist color’ [25, 487].
in the countryside; [25, 487] 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 acres; 6. By providing amelioration credit support to agricultural cooperatives; 7. State support for farms and agricultural cooperatives [25, 476].

**The conclusions.** Therefore, there is sufficient reason to state that in the conditions of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 - 1921, Ukrainian agrarianism took place as an option of Eastern European agrarianism. It was represented in the programmatic provisions of UDAP, UPC, UPP, AUO. They referred to the peasantry as the state builder, social basis of statehood, the “third” path of development. This combines Ukrainian agrarianism with Eastern Europe, which is evidence that the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 - 1921 had a distinct European context.
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УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ АГРАРИЗМ ЯК ВАРИАНТ СХІДНОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОГО АГРАРИЗМУ В ПОЛІТИЧНИХ ПРОГРАМАХ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИХ ПАРТІЙ ПЕРИОДУ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ РЕВОЛЮЦІЇ


Автори статті ставлять за мету дослідити феномен українського аграризму періоду Української революції 1917 – 1921 рр. як варіанту східноєвропейського аграризму, представленого в політичних програмах українських національних партій.

Основні результати дослідження. Появу східноєвропейського аграризму спричинили об’єктивно-суб’єктивно-суб’єктні чинники. Їх поєднання дала початок формуванню східноєвропейського аграризму – феномену першої третини ХХ ст. Зважаючи на ареал його поширення, за територіальною ознакою та особливостями соціально-економічного й суспільно-політичного розвитку східноєвропейських країн, з підстав розрізнити такий його варіант: польський, болгарський, чехословацький, румунський, український тощо.

Слід уважати, що у мовах революційної діяльності 1917 – 1921 рр. у ІДЖПС теоретично і структурно сформованим явищем став український аграризм. Його репрезентанти, зокрема, були політичні партії. Вважаємо, що український аграризм означеного періоду віддзеркалював аграрний характер українського суспільства. Його аграрність жодною мірою не є підставою для розуміння українського суспільства як меншовартісного, «недорозвиненого» тощо, порівняно з аналогічними східноєвропейськими, західноєвропейськими чи іншими соціумами. Український аграризм часів Української революції 1917 – 1921 рр. засвідчив перехід від індиферентної політичної культури до дієвої, аграрний характер української нації, що формувалась.

Висновки. В умовах Української революції 1917 – 1921 рр. мав місце український аграризм як варіант східноєвропейського аграризму. Він був представлений у програмних положеннях УДХП, УНП, УНГ, УНП, ВСХВ. У них йшлося про селянство як державного будівничого, соціальну основу державності, „третій” селянський шлях розвитку. Це поєднує український аграризм із східноєвропейським, є східним, що Українська революція 1917 – 1921 рр. мала виразний європейський контекст.

Ключові слова: східноєвропейський аграризм, український аграризм, селянська революція, Українська революція, селянство.