Based on the analysis of a wide range of sources, the article focuses on the reasons for the emergence of Eastern European agrarianism, and understanding of the “Eastern European agrarianism” concept in a broad and narrow sense. Considering the spread area of Eastern European agrarianism on the basis of territorial character and peculiarities of socio-economic and socio-political development of Eastern European countries, it is grounds to distinguish its variants: Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Romanian, Ukrainian, etc. Based on the analysis of the Ukrainian intellectual space in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it is reasonable to assume that there were the ideas of Eastern European agrarianism presented by its Ukrainian variant in it. In particular, it affirmed a peasant-centric view of Ukrainianness, the peasant character of the Ukrainian nation, the separateness of city and countryside, urban and rural worldviews and ways of being. The identification of such concepts as “Ukrainian peasantry”, “Ukrainian nation”, and “Ukrainian people” was considered axiomatic in the views of the representatives of the Ukrainian intellectual space in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The political future of the Ukrainian statehood was closely linked to the peasantry.
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Problem statement. The period of the late 19th and early 20th centuries is unique both in the life of Europe in general and of Eastern Europe in particular. In large part, it is the time of “awakening” of Eastern European nations, which would appear on the wreckage of continental empires in the early 20th century. A characteristic feature of the “awakening” was the formation of ideologies of Eastern European nations. Eastern European agrarianism became one of them in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Its ideology spread to Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Czechia and Slovakia (later Czechoslovakia), Ukraine.

In our opinion, the reasons for the emergence of agrarianism in general (Germany - G. Roland, A. Scheffle; in France - the concept of J. Melin) and Eastern European one in particular were as follows. First, the conflict between industrial and agrarian civilizations, which clearly began to manifest itself in the late 19th and early 20th 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 of the examples is the socio-economic and socio-political models of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires, which had similar modernizations in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The modernization processes had an influence in Czechia, Slovakia, Poland, Ukraine, etc. being the future independent entities of international law, the countries representing Eastern European agrarianism, which were a part of the Romanov and Habsburg empires, respectively, at that time. We believe that the advancement of the industrial civilization of the Western sample to the Eastern European agrarian space provoked a defensive reaction of the peasantry, the part of the largest social strata of Eastern European countries. It became Eastern European agrarianism represented by Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Romanian, Ukrainian and other variants.

Second, the development of political culture of agrarian nations, which in that time, were Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Romanian, Ukrainian, and so on. The political cultures of Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Romanian, Ukrainian, etc. peasants experienced the modernization of values. In our opinion, there was a significant socio-cultural shift in the collective and individual political culture and consciousness of the peasants in the form of the transition from an indifferent political culture and consciousness to an activist one.

Third, the objective laws of the development of the agrarian civilization itself, the formation of a qualitatively different peasantry in it. In Ukraine, it was the peasant-ideoman, the active subject of history [1]. In the early 20th century, the Ukrainian peasantry 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, it is the absence of serfdom as a way of being, keeping an economy, thinking style, etc. It was a generation brought up under the conditions of agricultural capitalization, industrialization, and transformation of the rural community considered to be the modernization of the late 19th and early 20th centuries in the Russian Empire. The peasants gradually became aware of themselves as a separate community of the socio-cultural imperial space of that time. The unifying value was the “Idea of Land”, its distribution on just principles in their understanding. Our considerations are in line with the position of other modern researchers [2]. We support A. Gordon’s reasoning that the abolition of serfdom turned the peasant into a “rational agent” in the interpretation of classical political economy and common sense. The psychology of the peasant became more resilient to those new phenomena that actively penetrated peasant
existence. It is difficult to disagree with V. Piskun in the fact that the abolition of serfdom gave impetus to modernization, changed the consciousness of the peasant, strengthening his feelings of the owner [3].

Therefore, we state that the emergence of both European and Eastern 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 20th century. Considering its spread area based on territorial character and features of socio-economic and socio-political development of Eastern European countries, we distinguish its variants: Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Romanian, Ukrainian, etc.

**Research analysis.** The problems related to the topic of our study were partially reflected in Ukrainian [4–11] and foreign historiography [12–19]. Researchers mainly focus on aspects relating to the nature and content of the Eastern European agrarianism, the realization of the so-called the “Third Way” in some Eastern European countries, the unfolding peasant revolution in the post-imperial Russian space, and the formation of the farmer’s ideology in V. Lypynsky’s works and its Eastern European agrarianist context. At the same time, considering the phenomenality of Eastern European agrarianism, it is relevant to study the formation of Ukrainian agrarianism as a variant of Eastern European one.

**The goal** of the research is to investigate the formation of ideas of Ukrainian agrarianism as a variant of Eastern European in the Ukrainian intellectual space of the early 19th and late 20th centuries. The object of the research is Ukrainian agrarianism as a variant of Eastern European one in the early 19th and late 20th centuries. The subject matter of the research is the ideas of Ukrainian agrarianism in the views of Ukrainian intellectuals of the early 19th and late 20th centuries.

**The statement of the basic material.** Eastern European Agrarianism as a formed ideology of Eastern European nations in the early 19th and late 20th centuries was represented by a multi-genre discourse. Its ideas were reflected in the works of G. Ruland, A. Scheffle, A. Schwegl, M. Godza, O. Frankenberg, A. Stamboliyski, the concept of J. Melin, etc., the programmatic provisions of the Bulgarian, Polish, Romanian, Czechoslovak political parties, etc. The analysis of the primary sources of Eastern European agrarianism and scientific papers allows us to determine the essence of this phenomenon and to distinguish its main ideologems.

In our view, Eastern European agrarianism is, in a broad sense, a holistic socio-cultural phenomenon, a phenomenon of Eastern European history caused by objective-subjective-subjective factors that are the object of cognition. Eastern European agrarianism in a narrow sense is a system of peasant-centric representations of different subjects of the socio-cultural space of Eastern Europe in the early 19th and late 20th centuries and their practical implementation. Specifying a narrower understanding of Eastern European agrarianism in the early 19th and late 20th centuries, we note that it is a system of ideas about peasants, peasants about themselves, about the peasantry as an active subject of history, capable of independent state-building: component of domestic economic policy aimed at solving the agrarian/peasant issue; as self-awareness of the peasants, as a peasant political culture and political consciousness, as a realization of peasant hopes in practice and ideas about their just future; component of social and party political thought.

The key ideologems of agrarianism are the following:

1) the uniqueness and indisputable value of the spiritual, moral, cultural and social properties inherent in the peasantry and its work, for humanity [16, 3–4];
2) recognition of the peasantry as a social stratum capable of playing an independent role in political life [20, 69];
3) not a capitalist, “separate” peasant way of social development, preservation of private property – small peasant property as the optimal regional option and the basis of social progress, as well as the idea of a peasant cooperative state [21];
4) the predominance of agriculture and rural lifestyles over industry and the city, as well as the peasantry over other social groups [22];
5) the peasantry being an agricultural stratum and a major focus of the basic positive values and qualities of the society, is the foundation of the stability of the state and the bearer of national identity, and the above virtues should determine its political power [8, 164].

Ukrainian intellectual space of the early 19th and late 20th centuries largely focused on the formation of modernist ideas about the peasantry; the Ukrainian intelligentsia was engaged in various forms of dialogue with this phenomenon. The result of such an intellectual assault was the acquisition of new practices in the understanding of the peasantry by the Ukrainian intelligentsia, the creation of a diversified image of the peasantry, the approaching of two parallel worlds in representations of each other. In our opinion, the Ukrainian intellectual space in the defined time boundaries by the common features of the images formed in it, the ideas of the peasantry, can be conditionally structured into the following discourses: literary-artistic, public-publicist, party-political. Each of these discourses presents different facets of the Ukrainian peasantry as an imaginary community, the result of an intellectual-creative process of its cognition by another subject-participant, Ukrainian intelligentsia. Peasant-centricity of reflections is common to the three components we have identified.

For example, the Ukrainian fiction of that time was thoroughly imbued and saturated by peasant theme. Examples include well-known masterpieces of classical Ukrainian literature, such as “One Hundred Thousand”, “Streetwalker”, “Do not Oxes Roar when Manger is Full?”, “Land”, “Intermezzo”, “Fata morgana”, etc. In our opinion, M. Kotsiubynsky’s works are eloquent in this context. The peasantry appeared in the center of creativity of this Ukrainian Impressionist, according to the proper comments of Y. Prysiazhnyuk and Y. Platmir. He “did not care about the details of everyday life”, but was concerned with the inner world of a man, focused on “psychological experiences of a hopeless social disaster”, creating images of agricultural rural people who slowly “moved” from traditional foundations to modern life forms. The writer was able to immerse himself in the picture of the world of the countryside, recreated it both in the context of real historical events and “beyond any plot” [23, 125, 131].

The image of the countryside of Bukovyna is filigree reflected in the works of O. Kobylianska. Like M. Kotsiubynsky and other masters of the literary Ukrainian word at that time, O. Kobylianska in “Land” addressed
to the reflection of the controversial peasant microcosm, to the social-psychological issues, to the understanding of the role and meaning of “the land” concept in the peasants’ life. In the work, land is a moral and spiritual imperative containing a life-affirming power, a category determining social status, a manipulation tool leading to personality degradation. Is the holiness of land the basis for the sin of fratricide? The writer responds to this question on the example of actual events in the village of Bukovyna using civilizational understanding of the peasant, his mental-psychological traits, transformations of his psychology, the traditional picture of the world under the influence of civilization. The civilizational conflict between the agrarian/traditional society and the industrial/modern one is represented in the images of brothers Michael and Sava.

In the early 19th and late 20th centuries, there were similar processes in Polish fiction. According to I. Franko’s observations, T. Lenartowicz “gave the Poles an image of the Polish nation for the first time ... he first showed the true, simple and colourful language of this nation ...” [24]. According to the Ukrainian Stonemason, “the Mazovian Field and Forest Singer” was the first one who enabled the Polish public through the lens of his crystal lyricism to look deeper into the soul of the Polish peasant, to look at the world through his eyes, to live his life and made the Polish people love this peasant and see a true, sincere and pure human soul in him ...” [24]. The peasant-centric themes were peculiar to the works of other Polish masters of the artistic word: M. Konopnicka, H. Sienkiewicz, B. Prus, and others. Their works are also characterized by social psychology, the creation of a romantic-idealistic image of the peasantry, a rethinking of the role and significance of the Polish peasant in national history.

Public-journalistic discourse was also marked by a peasant-centric orientation. Articles, explorations focused on the essence of the peasantry, its character, moral and ethical virtues, and inherent features were printed on the pages of various genre periodicals. The authors made various comparisons and identifications. According to the analysis of that public-journalistic discourse, the issues of peasant education and literacy, the spread of atheism, transformation in the attitude of peasant children to their parents, confrontation of rural and urban ways of being, peasants in the city, etc., were at the epicenter of its attention [25]. We support T. Portnova’s well-grounded arguments in her works [26; 27] and believe that the romantic perceptions of wealthy rural countryside by Ukrainian intellectuals were transformed into a more realistic image, more adequate to the objectively existing one in the public-journalistic discourse since 1870s.

The agrarian/peasant issue has been sounded in a new way in the public-journalistic discourse since early 20th century. The peasant revolution, started in 1902 by the peasants of Poltava and Kharkiv regions, determines changes in the understanding of the peasantry, the importance of solving the agrarian issue, orientation to the peasantry as a leading social stratum. The public-journalistic discourse of that time was a platform for the formation of a new look at the peasantry, its revolutionality, state agrarian policy, etc. The works of M. Tugan-Baranovsky [28], I. Strakhovsky [29], etc. are applied in this context.

The authors of public-journalistic discourse, e.g. M. Drahomanov, S. Podolyansky, B. Grinenko, I. Franko, O. Rusov, S. Yefremov, etc., were unanimous in terms of the outstanding role and importance of the peasantry in the history of Ukraine offering multicolourism and diversity of the peasant image, the controversion of some socio-cultural transformations within the peasant organism. They considered the peasantry to be the source of Ukrainianness, the preservation of the gene pool, the traditions of Ukrainianness, the basis of its future. In particular, S. Podolyansky has no doubt that Ukrainians are a peasant nation. For this reason, he believes that any Ukrainian movement, if it was without the participation of the peasantry, had no prospects. I. Franko had similar ideas. He wrote on this subject, “We, Rusyns, especially in Galicia, have long been a peasant nation” [30].

In the early 19th and late 20th centuries, the peasantry was considered to be not only an active subject of history, but also the social foundation of the state. Ukrainian public-journalistic discourse of the early 19th and late 20th centuries was marked by its agrarianist nature. M. Hrushevsky exactly characterized the Ukrainian intellectuals’ understanding of the peasantry role in Ukrainian state-building. In this regard, he noted that “the Ukrainian intelligentsia understood that only creating a proper social base would help them to achieve notable success in their national policies. In the near future, only peasants could become this base, because the labour proletariat was largely denationalized and influenced by the Russian Social Democrats, who were always hostile to national Ukrainian movements” [31, 210]. Supporting these ideas, M. Hrushevsky wrote that “all agriculture, with a small exception, was in the hands of foreigners, especially Russians and Poles: they were Russians and Poles rather by their education and anti-Ukrainian sentiment than by their origin. Large industry was monopolized by foreign or local capitalists, Russians, Poles, Jews, etc., but not Ukrainians. The authorities were also Russian or denationalized ... Only ... peasants ... kept national forms in their original state. Therefore, the peasants now make up 85% of the Ukrainian population of the country. … Thus, today, the Ukrainian population is 75% of the total population of the country. They are the peasants.” [31, 209]. Ukrainian intellectuals identified the Ukrainian peasantry as the state future of Ukraine. In the early 19th and late 20th centuries, Ukrainian intellectuals were at a crossroads regarding the peasantry: to educate or to love; with the approach of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 - 1921, their position became much clearer: to involve the peasantry in the national state-building. M. Hrushevsky, P. Skoropadsky, S. Yefremov, V. Lypynsky, and other figures of the early 20th century held peasant centrist positions of state-building.

M. Hrushevsky frankly believes that “the main foundation for this Great Ukraine for a long time, if not forever, will be the peasantry, and on which it will have to be built. In the long days of our existence, we kept saying that in the peasantry and only in the peasantry lies the future of the Ukrainian revival, and in general the future of Ukraine. Over the course of a century, Ukrainian and peasantry have become synonymous. When all other strata betrayed their nationality, all the material for national building was drawn from it [the peasantry], and they [Ukrainians] hoped for it [the peasantry]; Ukraine will be able to rise only when this titan deprived of its depth and unconsciousness, this Samson deprived of vision and power, his political and national
worldviews. In our opinion, the fundamental difference out that this is a struggle of two irreconcilable old civil law is relied on land, and the new commercial to life but to death” between them. He calls these worlds responsibility and values [37, 33]. 
opposites that do not intersect at all, even at an imaginary psychology of “stock exchange gesheftsmakers” are two convinced that the psychology of a farmer and the be the basis for distinguishing these worlds. He is [35], S. Zhydkov [36], and other researchers. The thinker, his views as agrarianist. In this context, we share term “agrarianism”, although there is every reason to However, the author of “The Letters” did not use the Farmers” (hereinafter - Letters) written in 1919 - 1920. of Ukrainian agrarianism as a variant of Eastern European subject of history in the Ukrainian life, and his concept views on the unique role of the peasantry as an active figure in social and political life in Ukraine in the early priority stratum of state-national construction. He supported the idea that “the basis for ideological construction among Ukrainians was still the working mass”[34]. 
According to V. Lypynsky, a farmer was a central figure in social and political life in Ukraine in the early 20th century, primarily in Ukrainian state-building. His views on the unique role of the peasantry as an active subject of history in the Ukrainian life, and his concept of Ukrainian agrarianism as a variant of Eastern European one, are presented in “The Letters to the Brothers-Farmers” (hereinafter - Letters) written in 1919 - 1920. However, the author of “The Letters” did not use the term “agrarianism”, although there is every reason to consider his views as agrarianist. In this context, we share the opinions of K. Galushko [8], R. Vetrov and S. Zborets [35], S. Zhydkov [36], and other researchers. The thinker, in accordance with the general principles of Eastern European agrarianism, clearly distinguishes between two worlds: the world of countryside and land, the world of city and capital. V. Lypynsky considers psychology to be the basis for distinguishing these worlds. He is convinced that the psychology of a farmer and the psychology of “stock exchange gesheftsmakers” are two opposites that do not intersect at all, even at an imaginary point. Their psychologies are fundamentally different in responsibility and values [37, 33]. 
According to V. Lypynsky, there is a “struggle not to life but to death” between them. He calls these worlds “laws”: “the laws of the land and the laws of capital. The old civil law is relied on land, and the new commercial law is relied on capital” [37, 32]. The philosopher points out that this is a struggle of two irreconcilable worldview. In our opinion, the fundamental difference between them is the socio-cultural gap, caused by ways of being, values, and meaning of life. This struggle is essentially “a deadly fight between the countryside and the modern capitalist world, state-economy and state-stock exchange” [37, 33]. 
V. Lypynsky’s hyperbolization of the farmers reaches its peak in the sentiments in which he substantiates the direct interconnection and interdependence between the farmer stratum and the nation-state. According to him, “the only class interested in the life, not the words, of the existence of its own, patriotic Ukrainian state, is the agricultural class, attached to the land and living from arable products not from politics” [37, 41]. The historian stresses that the unifying and organizing principle in the cause of national- and state-building in Ukraine is only the “Ukrainian class of farmers”. It is “the class which is the strongest in the Ukrainian Nation”, on which “the unification and organization of the whole Ukrainian Nation” depends [37, 72]. 
At the same time, the thinker did not idealize the farmers. He proposes concrete steps to “improve the farming class”. In his opinion, first of all, it is necessary to solve agrarian antagonisms that do not add unity to the social basis of the Ukrainian statehood and nation. The elimination of agrarian antagonisms will relieve farmers of parasites and speculators, “forcing richer farmers to be necessary and useful citizens ... depriving poorer farmers of landholding and hatred for “lords”...” [37, 74]. 
Thus, based on the analysis of the Ukrainian intellectual space of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, we reasonably claim that it had the ideas of Eastern European agrarianism, represented by its Ukrainian variant. In particular, it affirmed a peasant-centric view of Ukrainianness, the peasant character of the Ukrainian nation, the separateness of city and countryside, urban and rural worldviews and ways of being. The identification of such concepts as “Ukrainian peasantry”, “Ukrainian nation”, and “Ukrainian people” was considered axiomatic in the views of the representatives of the Ukrainian intellectual space of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The political future of Ukrainian statehood was closely linked to the peasantry.

The conclusions. Ukrainian intellectuals of the late 19th and early 20th centuries accepted the main ideologems of Eastern European agrarianism, adapting them to Ukrainian realities. Like their European colleagues, they argued for the uniqueness and undeniable value to humanity of the spiritual, moral, cultural and social attributes inherent in the peasantry and its work; recognized the peasantry as a social stratum capable of playing an independent role in political life; substantiated the expediency of a non-capitalist, “separate” peasant way of the society development, the preservation of private property, i.e. small peasant property as its optimal regional variant and the basis of social progress, as well as the idea of a peasant cooperative state; proved the superiority of agriculture and rural lifestyles over industry and the city, as well as the peasantry over other social groups; were convinced that the peasantry, the agricultural stratum, concentrated in the core positive values and qualities of society, was the foundation of the stability of the state and the bearer of national identity, and the above virtues should determine its political power.
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СХІДНОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИЙ АГРАРИЗМ.
УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ ІНТЕЛЕКТУАЛЬНИЙ ПРОСТІР ДРУГОЇ ПОЛОВINI XIX – ПОЧАТКУ XX ST.

Постановка проблеми. На підставі аналізу широкого кола джерел авторами зіставлено причини появи східноєвропейського аграризму, розкрито розуміння поняття «східноєвропейський аграризм» у широкому і вузькому значеннях. Зазначено на ареал поширення східноєвропейського аграризму, за територіальною ознакою та особливостями соціально-економічного й суспільно-політичного розвитку східноєвропейських країн, викріплено такої ієрархії визначних: польський, болгарський, чехословацький, румунський, український тощо.

Мета: дослідити формування ідей українського аграризму як варіанта східноєвропейського в українському інтелектуальному просторі другої половини XIX – початку XX ст.
Основні результати дослідження. На підставі аналізу українського інтелектуального простору другої половини XIX – початку XX ст. авторами обраних документу стосовно того, що у ньому мали місце ідеї східноєвропейського аграризму, представлени його українським варіантам. Зокрема, у ньому утвердився селеноцентричний погляд на українство, селянський характер української нації, на окреминість міста і села, міського та сільського світовизнання і способу буття. В увагі передані види українського інтелектуального простору другої половини XIX – початку XX ст. акцентовано відтікали від відношення різних національних дерев, як „українське селянство”, „українська нація”, „український народ”. Політичне майбутнє української державності місце пов'язувалося із селянством.

Висновки. Українські інтерпретатори другої половини XIX – початку XX ст. сприяли основні ідеологічні схеми східноєвропейського аграризму, пристосовуючи їх до українських реальностей. Як і їхні европейські колеги, вони обставляли унікальність та незагальних цінності для людства духовних, моральних, культурних і соціальних властивостей, притаманних селянству та його профізії; визнали селянство верствами, здатними відірватися самостійно від історичного життя; обґрунтовували допоміжність на капіталістичного, „рокового” селянського селянства суспільства, збереження приватної власності – дійсної селянської власності як оптимального регіонального її варіантів та підтримує соціального прогресу, а також ідею селянської кооперативної держави; доводили перехід землеробства і сільського способу життя над промисловим і містом, а також селянство над іншими соціальними групами; були переконані, що селянство – землеробська верста – зосереджує в собі основні антисоціальні цінності й якості суспільства, є фундаментом стабільності держави й носієм національної ідентичності, а вищевказаний чин стосується його політичної влади.

Ключові слова: східноєвропейський аграризм, український аграризм, український інтелектуальний простір, українське селянство, М. Грушевський, П. Скоропадський, В. Липинський.
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ПРАКТИКА БОРТОБІЗІЗ АЛКОГОЛІЗМОМ СЕРЕД СІЛЬСЬКОГО НАСЕЛЕННЯ ПІВДНЯ УКРАЇНИ (ДРУГА ПОЛОВИНА XIX – ПОЧАТОК XX СТ.)

У статті пропоновано особливості розвитку алкогольного виробництва під час реформ акційної системи та казенної винної монополії Російської імперії. Визначено вплив цих реформ на рівень алкоголізації сільського населення Півдня України. Висвітлено діяльність священиць і місцевих пікайців „Про народну твердість” у справі боротьби з алкоголізмом.

Ключові слова: селянство, алкоголізм, акція система, казенна винна монополія, духовенство, пікайця „Про народну твердість”.

Постановка проблеми. Алкоголізм – масштабна соціальна проблема, яка порушує соціально-економічну життєздатність суспільства і загрожує існуванню держави через високий рівень захворюваності, смертності, злочинності, пов’язаних із вживанням спиртних виробів, підтримує психічне здоров’я і життєздатність більш благополучного населення, сприяє розпаду сімей і бездоліжності дітей. Особливо велики розміри зростання алкоголізму спостерігаються в селян, головними причинами чому є безробіття і обмежені можливості проведення культурного дозвілля. У зв’язку з цими проблемами у суспільстві дедалі частіше порушується питання про боротьбу з алкоголізмом і тими виявами, до яких воно пригодить.

Для розробки сучасної концепції боротьби з алкоголізмом важливим є звернення до вже накопиченого в нашій країні досвіду боротьби з цим явищем у другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст. Актуальним також у цьому контексті є регіональний підхід, застосування якого дає можливість простежити реалізацію державної політики в цьому напрямі не лише в макроелемірій шляхів, а й на місцевому рівні.


Метою статті є вивчення діяльності уряду, громадськості, духовенства і місцевих пікайців „Про народну твердість” у сфері боротьби з алкоголізмом серед сільського населення Півдня України у визначений період.

Виклад основного матеріалу. Південноукраїнське селянство в умовах запровадження акційної системи

Початок 1860-х рр., ознаменований скасуванням кріпіцтва, зумовив різкий сплеск сільського пивцю. Оцінюючи ліквідацію кріпісного права, історики в основному акцентували увагу на сприятливих факторах цієї події для розвитку селянства. Після скасування кріпісного стану і загального поз’явлень політичного режиму, у сільських мешканців стало більше свободи. Але, на жаль, ця свобода була не тільки на благо. Втрата соціального контролю з боку поміщиків вела до зростання девіантної поведінки ворогів інших кріпаків [1, 422].