

## Історія аграризму

## History of agrarianism

UDC 94(477+437):[329.7:338.43.021.8]»192/193»(045)

DOI: 10.31651/2413-8142-2022-28-Kornovenko-Kompaniiets

**Serhii Kornovenko**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor, Director of the Research Institute of Peasant History and Agrarian History, Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, Cherkasy, Ukraine*  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6268-2321>  
e-mail: [s-kornovenko@ukr.net](mailto:s-kornovenko@ukr.net)

**Oleksiy Kompaniiets**

*post-graduate student of the Department of Archeology and Auxiliary sciences of history, Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, Cherkasy, Ukraine*  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6239-3039>  
e-mail: [oleksiy\\_kompaniyets@ukr.net](mailto:oleksiy_kompaniyets@ukr.net)

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Kornovenko, S. & Kompaniiets, O. (2022). Ukrainian-czechoslovak agrarianist discourse in 1920s - 1930s. *Ukrainskyi Selianyn. [Ukrainian peasant]*, 28, 14-26. (In English). doi: 10.31651/2413-8142-2022-28-Kornovenko-Kompaniiets

### UKRAINIAN-CZECHOSLOVAK AGRARIANIST DISCOURSE IN 1920s – 1930s

**Abstract. Purpose.** *The purpose is to investigate the Ukrainian-Czechoslovak agrarianist discourse of the 1920s and 1930s.*

**Conclusion.** *The authors found out that in the 1920s and 1930s, active cooperation developed between Czechoslovak and Ukrainian agrarianists, the most prominent centre of which was the Ukrainian Agrarian Society and the Ukrainian Academy of Economics in Podybrady. In the writings of Ukrainian and Czechoslovak agrarianists, the concept of «the newest agrarianism», together with criticism of liberalism, capitalism, socialism, communism and fascism, acquired a logical and systematic presentation. The ideological mutual influence regarding the defence of the economic and moral advantages of agriculture, small private ownership of land, cooperation, as well as state regulation of the economy is noticeable. The Ukrainian-Czechoslovak agrarianist discourse clearly emphasizes moderate reforms, which are understood as tools for the formation of a large class of grain-grower owners. The views of the theorist of Ukrainian agrarianism of the interwar period H. Simantsiv are related to the opinions of theorists and practitioners of Czechoslovak agrarianism – A. Svehla, M. Hodza, J. Kettner and others, whose works the author of «the newest agrarianism» became acquainted with during his activities in the Ukrainian Agrarian Society (UAS) and the Ukrainian Academy of Economics in Podybrady. In addition, the Symantsiv Ukrainian model of the newest agrarianism is based on the understanding of not only European, in particular Czechoslovakian, agrarianist theoretical thought, but also Ukrainian. The durability of the Ukrainian intellectual agrarianist tradition, such as the views of M. Hrushevsky and V. Lypynsky, is palpable, its distinct presence in the Symantsiv's Ukrainian concept of agrarianism. H. Simantsiv managed to logically and consistently reveal the essence and content of the newest agrarianism. He substantiates the principles and positions of modern agrarianism concerning the individuality of the peasantry, its mentality, the role of the peasantry as an active subject of state- and nation-building, etc. Thus, the intellectual heritage of H. Simantsiv is a self-sufficient Ukrainian concept of the newest agrarianism, which is consistent with the Czechoslovak agrarianist discourse.*

**Key words:** *agrarianism, «the newest agrarianism», Ukrainian-Czechoslovak agrarianist discourse, H. Simantsiv, A. Svehla, M. Hodza.*

**Сергій Корновенко**

доктор історичних наук, професор, директор Науково-дослідного інституту селянства та вивчення аграрної історії, Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького, м. Черкаси, Україна  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6268-2321>  
e-mail: [s-kornovenko@ukr.net](mailto:s-kornovenko@ukr.net)

**Олексій Компанієць**

аспірант кафедри археології та спеціальних галузей історичної науки, Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького, м. Черкаси, Україна  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6239-3039>  
e-mail: [oleksiy\\_kompaniyets@ukr.net](mailto:oleksiy_kompaniyets@ukr.net)

**Бібліографічний опис для цитування:** Корновенко С., Компанієць О. Українсько-чехословацький аграристський дискурс 1920-х – 1930-х рр. *Український селянин*. 2022. Вип. 28. С. 14-26. doi: 10.31651/2413-8142-2022-28-Kornovenko-Kompaniiets

## УКРАЇНСЬКО-ЧЕХОСЛОВАЦЬКИЙ АГРАРИСТСЬКИЙ ДИСКУРС 1920-Х – 1930-Х РР.

**Анотація.** *Мета* – дослідити українсько-чехословацький аграристський дискурс 1920-х – 1930-х рр. **Наукова новизна** дослідження полягає у тому, що авторами обґрунтовано самодостатність української концепції аграризму, її співзвучність із чехословацьким аграристським дискурсом.

**Висновки.** Авторами з'ясовано, що у 1920-х – 1930-х рр. між чехословацькими та українськими аграристами розгорнулася активна співпраця, найпомітнішим осередком якої були Українське аграрне товариство та Українська господарська академія в Подєбрадах. У працях українських та чехословацьких аграристів концепція «новітнього аграризму», разом із критикою лібералізму, капіталізму, соціалізму, комунізму і фашизму, набула логічного і системного викладу. Помітним є ідейний взаємовплив щодо відстоювання економічних та моральних переваг сільського господарства, дрібної приватної власності на землю, кооперації, а також державного регулювання економіки. Українсько-чехословацький аграристський дискурс чітко акцентує на поміркованих реформах, які розуміються інструментами формування чисельної верстви хліборобів-власників. Погляди теоретика українського аграризму міжвоєнного періоду Г. Сіманціва споріднені з думками теоретиків і практиків чехословацького аграризму – А. Швєгла, М. Годжі, Й. Кеттнера та інших, з працями яких автор «Новітнього аграризму» познайомився під час діяльності в Українському аграрному товаристві (УАТ) та Українській господарській академії в Подєбрадах. Поруч із тим, сіманцівська українська модель новітнього аграризму ґрунтується на осмисленні не лише європейської, зокрема чехословацької, аграристської теоретичної думки, а і української. Відчутною є тяглість української інтелектуальної аграристської традиції, наприклад поглядів М. Грушевського та В. Липинського, її виразна присутність у сіманцівській українській концепції аграризму. Г. Сіманціву вдалося логічно і послідовно розкрити сутність і зміст новітнього аграризму. Ним обґрунтовано принципові положення і позиції новітнього аграризму, що стосуються окремішності селянства, його ментальності, ролі селянства як активного суб'єкта державо- та націотворення тощо.

**Ключові слова:** український аграризм, чехословацький аграризм, Г. Сіманців, А. Швєгла, М. Годжі, Й. Кеттнер.

**Problem statement.** The first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century – a unique period of European history. Despite the fact that it is relatively short in time, it is extremely saturated with diverse socio-cultural transformations that fundamentally changed the political map of Europe and the world, and in many ways determined the course of world history in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These changes related not only to the revolutionary upheavals experienced by the European continent, but also to the appearance of previously unknown phenomena, new subjects of both international politics and the domestic political life of many European countries. One of the phenomena of European history of the first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in general and Central-South-Eastern European countries in particular, Central-South-Eastern European agrarianism became an active subject of the domestic

political life of Central-South-Eastern European countries – the peasantry. Central-South-Eastern European agrarianism is represented by Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Romanian, Ukrainian, etc. variants.

At the turn of the 1920s and 1930s, active cooperation developed between Czechoslovak and Ukrainian agrarianists, the most prominent centre of which was the Ukrainian Agrarian Society (UAS) and the Ukrainian Academy of Economics in Podebrady. Considering this, the analysis of the Ukrainian-Czechoslovak agrarianist discourse of the post-war period, represented by the intellectual work of H. Simantsiv, M. Hodza, A. Svehla and other agrarianism theorists, is relevant.

**Research analysis.** Some questions that resonate with our topic were reflected in foreign historiography in the publications of A. Bartlova<sup>1</sup>, S. Cambel<sup>2</sup>, M. Peknik<sup>3</sup>, E. Petrovičová<sup>4</sup> and other authors. They are also highlighted in the works of domestic researchers: articles by K. Galushka<sup>5</sup>, S. Kornovenko, Yu. Pasichna, O. Kompaniyets<sup>6</sup>, T. Pikovska<sup>7</sup> and other authors; collective monographs: “Peasant-Centric Phenomenon of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921: Agrarianism”<sup>8</sup>, “Peasant-Centric Dimension of the Socio-Cultural Space of Ukraine During the Revolution of 1917-1921”<sup>9</sup>, etc.

At the same time, the Ukrainian-Czechoslovak agrarianist discourse of the interwar period is poorly studied. Taking this into account, the authors of the article **aim** to investigate the

Ukrainian-Czechoslovak agrarianist discourse of the 1920s and 1930s.

**The statement of the basic material.** Czechoslovakia in the interwar period became a «second Motherland» for Ukrainians who did not recognize the establishment of Soviet power in Ukraine after the end of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921. The Czechoslovak authorities treated Ukrainian émigré intellectuals with respect and understanding, who initiated the creation of educational and scientific institutions in the country Ukrainian institutions. The rulers of Czechoslovakia did not prevent the establishment of the Ukrainian Agrarian Society (UAS) and the Ukrainian Academy of Economics in Podyebrady, which became one of the centres of Ukrainian agrarianist thought in emigration in the interwar period as well. They owe their status to H. Symantsiv, a Ukrainian agrarianism theoretician whose creative activity was closely connected with these institutions. At that time, a number of thorough works came out from his pen: «the newest agrarianism» (the typescript of which is kept in the funds of the Central State Archive of the Higher Authorities and Administration of Ukraine (TsDAVOU))<sup>10</sup> and «Our Political Parties and the Peasants». In April 1929, in a series of public speeches at the Ukrainian Academic Community in Podjebrady and at the Republican-Democratic Club in Prague, H. Simantsiv made public the main provisions of the newest Ukrainian agrarianism. The report had a positive public resonance, its text was published on its pages in 1929 by the «Tryzub» journal<sup>11</sup>,

1 Bartlova, A. (2000). Dr. Milan Hodža a mladá agrárna generácia. *Politická a stavovská zemědělská hnutí ve 20. století. Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference konané ve dnech 17.-18.5.2000*. Uherské Hradiště, Slováké muzeum v Uherské Hradišti, s. 68-77.

2 Cambel S. (2000). Slovenské agrárne hnutia a Milan Hodža. *Politická a stavovská zemědělská hnutí ve 20. století. Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference konané ve dnech 17.-18.5.2000*. Uherské Hradiště, Slováké muzeum v Uherské Hradišti, s. 57-67.

3 Peknik M. (2008). Milan Hodža a agrárne hnutie. Bratislava : Ustav politických vied SAV, 192 s.

4 Petrovičová E. (2009). Štátnik a politik Milan Hodža. *Ústav politických vied Slovenskej akadémie vied*. Issue 1, pp. 77-85

5 Галушко К. Консерватор на тлі доби: В'ячеслав Липинський і суспільна думка європейських «правих». Київ : Темпора. 2002. 288 с.; Галушко К. «Хліборобська ідеологія» В. Липинського у системі східноєвропейського аграризму. *Український історичний збірник*. 200. №2. С. 164–200.

6 Kornovenko S., Zemzulina 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. *Український селянин*. 2019. Вип. 21. С. 14–20. DOI: 10.31651/2413-8142-2019-21-14-20; Kornovenko S., Pasichna Y. Eastern european agrarianism. Ukrainian intellectual space in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. *Український селянин*. 2019. Вип. 22. С. 24–30. DOI: 10.31651/2413-8142-2019-22-24-30; Kornovenko S. 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). *Acta historica Neosoliensia Vedecký časopis pre historické vedy*. 2019. Vol. 22, Iss. 2, Pp. 4–23; Kornovenko S., Kompaniits O. Evolution of Milan Hodza Views on Theory of Agrarianism and Practices of «Agrarian Democracy». *Eminak*. 2022. Вип. 3 (39). Pp. 113 – 124. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2022.3\(39\).594](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2022.3(39).594)

7 Піковська Т. Національні програми Чехословацької Республіканської (аграрної) партії (1899 – 1922 рр.). *Гілея*. 2016. Вип. 115. С. 455–458.

8 Kornovenko S., Глібішук М., Ільницький В., Компанієць О., Лозовий В., Пасічна Ю., Тельвак В. Селяноцентричний феномен Української революції 1917 – 1921 рр.: аграризм. Черкаси, 2021. 244 с.

9 Peasant-centric dimension of the socio-cultural space of Ukraine during the revolution of 1917 – 1921: collective monograph / S.V. Komovenko, V.P. Telvak, V.S. Lozovyi, etc. Liha-Pres, 2021. 128 p.

10 Центральний державний архів вищих органів влади і управління України (далі – ЦДАВОВУ). Ф. 4465. Оп. 1. Спр. 747. Доповідь Г. Сіманціва «Новітній аграризм», прочитана в Українській академічній громаді в Подєбрадах та в Республікансько-Демократичному клубі в Празі. 1929 р. Арк. 1-37.

11 Сіманців Г. Новітній або селянський аграризм. *Тризуб*. 1929, Чис. 51-52

and the following year it was published in Paris as an individual brochure<sup>12</sup>. In addition, in 1930-1931, he published «Our Political Parties and the Peasantry»<sup>13</sup> on the pages of several issues of the journal «Selo». In this article, H. Simantsiv clarified the attitude of the CP(b)U, UPSR, USDRP, URDP, UHDS, OUN towards the Ukrainian peasantry.

In interwar Czechoslovakia, agrarianism was the core ideology of the political program of the most powerful Republican Party of Farmers and Small Peasants<sup>14</sup>. The political conditions in which Czechoslovak agrarianism existed at that time have every reason to be considered unique for Central-Southeastern Europe, taking into account the fact that the Czechoslovak state was an «island of democracy in a sea of dictatorships». During the 1920s and 1930s, the agrarian parties of Czechoslovakia maintained strong positions in the parliament and government, proving themselves to be reliable coalition partners.

The universally recognized ideologues of Czechoslovak agrarianism were A. Svehla and M. Hodza. In particular, A. Svehla headed the Republican Party of Farmers and Small Peasants from 1909 to 1933, and the Czechoslovak government from 1922 to 1929. A well-known pamphlet authored by him is «Three Thoughts on Agrarianism»<sup>15</sup>, published in 1925. No less authoritative was M. Hodza, a fellow party member of A. Svehla, who in 1922-1926 and 1932-1935 held the position of Minister of Agriculture, and in 1935 – 1938 – Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia. In 1930, he became the author of the brochure «Agrarianism: a Series of Lectures on the Ideology of Czechoslovak Political Parties»<sup>16</sup>, and a year later he edited the collection of articles, speeches and scientific studies «Paths of Central European Agrarian Democracy»<sup>17</sup>.

H. Simantsiv interprets «agrarianism» as a «theoretical expression of peasant movements», but notes that «the concept of agrarianism is defined differently by different authors. Agrarianism is an agrarian programme. Agrarianism is

the ideology of agrarian movements. Agrarianism is a grain-growers' socio-political system. Agrarianism is everything connected with the land, it is a manifestation of the power of the land over human»<sup>18</sup>.

As a representative of Ukrainian agrarianism, he reasonably argued the separation of agrarianism from socialism, emphasizing that agrarianism and socialism are separate political phenomena, just like peasantry and labour, which are the social basis of agrarianism and socialism, respectively<sup>19</sup>. Comparing socialism and agrarianism, H. Simantsiv substantiated that socialist models focus only on two actors – «employer and employee», instead, agrarianism focuses on «one more living being, which in its person unites both employer and employee – the grain-grower»<sup>20</sup>.

The views of the Czechoslovak thinker J. Kettner are consistent with the considerations of H. Simantsiv regarding the relationship between agrarianism and socialism. In the work «Liberalism, Socialism and Agrarianism»<sup>21</sup> he convincingly revealed that agrarianism during the 19<sup>th</sup> century developed alongside socialism as opposed to liberalism. However, agrarianism wanted to avoid the mistakes of two competing ideological currents. First, unlike socialism, it does not set unattainable goals and is based on real life. Secondly, agrarianism, according to J. Kettner's observation, constructs an ideal model – agrarian democracy, which, unlike socialism, is achieved through evolution and reforms, and not through revolutionary struggle. According to this thinker, the meaning of agrarianism is social justice, i.e., equality of rights and responsibilities<sup>22</sup>.

M. Hodza's position regarding the differences between agrarianism and socialism and liberalism is also consistent. He, like V. Lypynsky and H. Simantsiv, other theoreticians of agrarianism, spoke against the «chaos of private capitalist economy» harmful to the peasants, as well as against socialist transformations that would deprive the peasant of private owner-

12 Сіманців Г. Новітній або селянський аграризм. Париж : Imp[rimerie] de Navarre, 1930. 20 с.

13 Сіманц Г. Наші політичні партії та селянство. *Село*. Ч. 2. Прага, 1930, С. 29-34; Сіманц Г. Наші політичні партії та селянство. *Село*. Ч. 3. Прага, 1930, С. 27-41; Сіманц Г. Наші політичні партії та селянство. *Село*. Ч. 4. Прага, 1930, С. 23-29; Сіманц Г. Наші політичні партії та селянство. *Село*. Ч. 6. Прага, 1931, С. 30-47

14 Stepankova O. O ideologii agrarismu. Sbornik praci Filozofii cke fakulty brnënske university. 1961. Vol. 10. Iss. G5. Pp. 60.

15 Švehla A. Tři uvahy o agrarismu. Praha : MAB, 1925. 19 s.

16 Hodža M. Agrarism: Cyklus přednašek «o ideologii českoslov. politických stran». Praha : ÚSČS. 1930. 16 s.

17 Hodža M. Články, řeči, studie. Svázok IV, Cesty stredoevropskej agrarnej demokracie 1921 – 1931. Praha : Novina, 1931. 560 s.

18 ЦДАВОВУ. Ф. 4465. Оп. 1. Спр. 747. Арк. 37, Арк. 2-4.

19 Ibid. Арк. 2.

20 Ibid. Арк. 3.

21 Kettner J. Liberalismus, socialismus a agrarismus. Praha 1931

22 Ibid. Pp. 18.

ship of land and destroy agricultural production. Therefore, professing both anti-capitalism and anti-communism, M. Hodza advocated agrarianism – the «third way». The latter, in his opinion, consisted in moderate reforms that would create a significant class of agricultural owners, who would be a bulwark against the spread of communism, and on the other hand, would oppose the elements of the capitalist market, which would save peasant farms from exploitation by capital and ruin<sup>23</sup>.

At the same time, if the predecessors – P. Kulish, P. Struve – emphasized the open antagonism between the city and countryside, then H. Simantsiv offers a different approach. He appeals to historical experience, primarily Soviet, and notes: «... socialism after the failed practice of Russian Bolshevism ... looks for an accomplice in the peasantry rather than actively fighting with it. Equally for the peasantry, worker socialism is the most natural accomplice on the way to progress»<sup>24</sup>. In this way, the author of «The Newest Agrarianism», emphasizing the separation of agrarianism from socialism, sees no reason for their opposition. Considers peasants and workers partners in development. At the same time, the thinker clearly defines that next to socialism «a new sociological force has grown: agrarianism»<sup>25</sup>.

For the Ukrainian peasantry, modern agrarianism, according to H. Simantsiv, is the most favourable political and social formula<sup>26</sup>. The author's judgments about the role of the land and those who work on it are quite agrarian in nature: «salvation is in the land, in its laws, in those masses of the peasantry who work on the land and reflect in themselves these laws of the land, the laws of nature, its development and manifestations. According to this slogan, agrarianism builds its sociological and political-economic system. This is actually the main relevance of agrarianism in general and for Ukrainian socio-constructive thought in particular»<sup>27</sup>. Indeed, during the second half of the 19th century – in the 1930s in Central-South-Eastern Europe, in Ukraine, a qualitatively different peasantry was formed. They became an ideoman peasantry – an active subject of history, a bearer of agrarianist

ideology. The fundamental difference between the peasantry and the workers in everyday life, culture, worldview, etc. formed the separateness of the ideological meanings of agrarianism and socialism.

The thoughts of M. Hodza, in particular, about the unifying potential of agrarianist ideology, which is capable of uniting both the Slavic peoples in particular and Europe in general, are consonant with the originality of agrarianism. He emphasized that there is nothing but agrarianism that could unite the Slavic peoples with the main goal of ensuring and strengthening peace. «And I ask you – writes M. Hodza – what principle, what economic or social program could penetrate so deeply into all classes of Slavic peoples to unite them, to form a bridge not only between Slavic, but also non-Slavic peoples connected by the same interests»<sup>28</sup>. Neither nationalism, clericalism, nor socialism, according to A. Toshkov, were able to perform the work that M. Hodza called the consolidation of Europe<sup>29</sup>.

H. Simantsiv, using the works of the classics of European agrarianist thought, substantiated the difference between agrarianism and socialism. First of all, the fact that «socialism for a long time did not take into account the peasantry as a social factor». Such an effective subject as «grain-grower», which is different from «employer» and «employee», was overlooked. His distinctiveness, according to H. Simantsiv, is that the farmer is neither a bourgeois nor a proletarian. It is «a new type of social production; ... the bearer of individualism, because he is both an entrepreneur and a producer, and he also comes as a member of society, in which both factors – employer and entrepreneur – are in one person»<sup>30</sup>. The peasantry, which, unlike the proletariat, works on its own farm and directly experiences the results of such farming, according to H. Simantsiv, is an «economically self-employed stratum of society»<sup>31</sup>.

In this context, the position of the theorist of Ukrainian agrarianism echoes the Czechoslovak agrarian thought. For example, M. Hodza also considered that liberalism cannot be the ideology of agriculturalists, because for liberalism ag-

23 Звіт про науково-дослідну роботу за договором від 30.04.2021 № 81/02/0120 «Аграризм: селяноцентричний феномен Української революції 1917 – 1921 рр.». URL: [https://nrfu.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/2021.02.0120\\_kornovenko\\_81.2021\\_zz.pdf](https://nrfu.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/2021.02.0120_kornovenko_81.2021_zz.pdf)

24 ЦДАВОВУ. Ф. 4465. Оп. 1. Спр. 747. Арк. 2.

25 Ibid. Арк. 2.

26 Ibid. Арк. 36-37.

27 Ibid. 4.

28 Toshkov A. *Agrarianism as Modernity in 20th-Century Europe: The Golden Age of the Peasantry*. Bloomsbury Academic. 2019. Pp. 118.

29 Ibid. 118 – 119.

30 ЦДАВОВУ. Ф. 4465. Оп. 1. Спр. 747. Арк. 3.

31 Сіманц Г. *Наші політичні партії та селянство*. Село. Ч. 2. Прага, 1930, С. 32.

riculture is only a source of raw materials. Even after the disappearance of feudal relations, the peasantry did not get the opportunity to become an independent active subject of political life on a par with other estates<sup>32</sup>.

This feature of the peasant, according to the Ukrainian thinker, determines the separation of agrarianism as a representative of the peasant ideology from socialism - a representative of the workers' ideology. According to the author of «The Newest Agrarianism», agrarianism «reflects» «this peasant psychology and this peasant philosophy»<sup>33</sup>. For the peasants, the advantage of agrarianism as a peasant ideology among other socio-political analogues, rightly believes H. Simantsiv, lies in the fact that 1) it does not invent anything new, it is natural for the peasantry; 2) «he does not build abstract schemes, detached from life»; 3) avoids utopian goals and tasks; 4) represents the systematized «spiritual treasures of the peasantry, ... strives to be ... an expression of peasant interests.; 5) «organizer of peasant social activity»; 6) is closely and directly connected with peasant socio-political self-awareness»<sup>34</sup>.

A similar position about the unique role of the peasantry, in particular about its state-making potential, was defended by Czechoslovak agrarian theoreticians. Thus, speaking in 1919 at the congress of the agrarian party, M. Hodza stated: «Only thanks to the strength and unity of the peasantry, the Czechs and Slovaks were not assimilated by the Austrians and Hungarians. Therefore, the revived state must rely on the close interaction of Czech and Slovak peasants who share one idea – agrarianism»<sup>35</sup>.

It draws attention to the fact that in the interwar theory of agrarianism of H. Simantsiv there is not only a theoretical modification of the classics of European agrarianism, but also a distinct Ukrainian component, represented in particular by the views of V. Lypynsky. For example, like the last one, the author of «The Newest Agrarianism» uses such a concept as «grain-grower». He uses it as a synonym for the peasantry. In his judgments, the thinker also appeals to such a general agrarian category as «laws of the land». The classic of Ukrainian conservatism has repeatedly written about the struggle of two op-

posites: the «law of the land» and the «law of capital».

H. Simantsiv's reasoning about the moral and psychological aspects of agrarianism, in relation to such a category as «despair», are original. The author of «The Newest Agrarianism» interprets it as a source of deconstructive rebellion, hatred, mistrust – everything that leads to the degradation of both the individual and society, makes it impossible to construct an optimistic model of the future<sup>36</sup>. Instead, agrarianism with its «law of the land», not temporary, but eternal life values – salvation from despair, the basis for building an optimistic perspective. Such considerations, in our opinion, are reasonable. Agrarianism really appears to be a middle ground between two irreconcilable antagonists: socialism and capitalism. This is the way of development of another, different from the industrial type of society – agrarian, its culture and philosophy based on the laws of nature, primarily «the law of the land».

Developing his judgments about agrarianism, H. Simantsiv gives different versions of the interpretation of this concept: 1) agrarian programme; 2) ideology of agrarian movements; 3) agricultural socio-political system; 4) everything related to the earth is a manifestation of the power of the earth over man; 5) unconscious sensual rationalism; 6) scientifically systematized scientific agrarianism is the antithesis of scientific socialism, liberalism, and conservatism<sup>37</sup>. In his opinion, «the concept of agrarianism, like concepts such as rights, socialism, etc., cannot be defined. Agrarianism can be described, elucidated and understood, but not defined, even commonly. This is a whole system of concepts, a worldview. Agrarianism has its own fund of ideals, its own social philosophy and its own policy: economic, social, legal, cultural, etc. ... The newest agrarianism is peasant agrarianism»<sup>38</sup>. Such an author's approach to the interpretation of agrarianism corresponded to the level of development of the contemporary agrarianist and socio-political European thought in general. We do not have any fundamental objections to it. At the same time, the thesis that «the concept of agrarianism ... cannot be defined» is debatable.

32 Матвеев Г. «Третий путь?»: Идеология аграризма в Чехословакии и Польше в межвоенный период. Москва : Издательство МГУ. 1992. С. 64

33 ЦДАВОВУ. Ф. 4465. Оп. 1. Спр. 747. Арк. 3.

34 Ibid. Арк. 7.

35 Матвеев Г. «Третий путь?»: Идеология аграризма в Чехословакии и Польше в межвоенный период. Москва : Издательство МГУ. 1992. С. 24.

36 ЦДАВОВУ. Ф. 4465. Оп. 1. Спр. 747. Арк. 4.

37 Ibid. Арк. 4.

38 Ibid.

Having presented the author's understanding of the newest agrarianism, H. Simantsiv successfully revealed the essence of this phenomenon, its socio-economic, philosophical and other components. In this we see the attempt of the author of «The Newest Agrarianism» to systematize and generalize the previous European and Ukrainian agrarianist intellectual product, to give scientific coherence and integrity to the ideological concept. The social significance of agrarianism, according to the thinker, lies in the fact that, unlike other socio-political ideologies, he interprets the peasantry as a «separate social class of modern society»<sup>39</sup>. The social nature of the peasantry, according to the concept of modern agrarianism, is not identical with either the proletariat or the bourgeoisie. The phenomenon of the peasantry consists in the fact that, unlike the working class, it owns «its own middlemen of production», and unlike the capitalist, it «lives from the exploitation of their own, not someone else's, strength». The specificity of agricultural production determined the social specificity of the peasantry as well: «made the peasant a kind of middle figure between two extreme, warring forces – the class of the proletariat and the class of the bourgeoisie»<sup>40</sup>. Taking this into account, the peasantry is an independent, separate subject of history, – summarizes H. Simantsiv.

Agrarianism in the interpretation of the author of «The Newest Agrarianism» understands the social stratigraphy in the middle of the peasantry as a natural phenomenon. It is not considered, as among the Bolsheviks, a reason for the exacerbation of social contradictions in the peasant environment. It is not a basis for «seeing in the peasantry some differentiation of it into several classes with opposing interests»<sup>41</sup>. The theoretician of the newest Ukrainian agrarianism argues the opinion that the integrity of the peasantry, despite the social stratigraphy, is ensured by the commonality of its interests, and not by the degree of economic prosperity. Thus, H. Simantsiv understands the peasantry as a community united by common values, interests, etc., as «one family»<sup>42</sup>. Complementary integrity of the peasantry is ensured by its following interests: 1) economic; 2) cultural; 3) political; 4) spiritual; 5) social, etc.<sup>43</sup>. According to the au-

thor of «The Newest Agrarianism», the range of common interests of the peasantry is wide, it concerns social life in all its diversity.

The position of M. Hodza is also similar. He argued that neither workers led by communists, nor «patriots» with their nationalism, nor clerics with Catholic ideas were capable of becoming leaders of the Slavic movement after the World War I. M. Hodza contrasted the peasant with them as the embodiment of the moral strength of the people<sup>44</sup>. Since it was about the states of the Slavic peoples, whose economy in the interwar period remained largely agrarian, the ideology of agrarianism, according to M. Hodza, should have become a powerful unifying factor.

The philosophy of agrarianism was commented on by H. Simantsiv no less substantively. He defined it as anthropocentric and peasant-centric. Anthropocentrism manifests itself in the following: 1) for agrarianism, every person is primarily a person and an end in himself, despite differences in origin, social status, etc.; 2) leaves the right of worldview choice to a person: «... he does not call for a fight, neither with religion, nor against it, leaving everyone a free hand to take his position in relation to it»<sup>45</sup>. Strategically, agrarianism, like other anthropocentric philosophical systems, strives for the universal ideal: «a perfect person in a perfectly organized society»<sup>46</sup>.

The philosophy of modern Ukrainian agrarianism, despite the separate meanings, is closely intertwined with other worldview principles, and is not separated from the pan-European anthropocentric philosophical thought. The peculiarity of its methodology is that universal human values are interpreted from the position of peasant centrism. H. Simantsiv, like other European agrarianists, believed that the peasantry, as an active subject of history, is capable of creating all the necessary conditions for the harmonious intellectual, physical and moral development of the individual<sup>47</sup>.

The ethical principles of agrarianism are based on the fact that it does not overestimate the moral qualities of the peasantry, while at the same time it does not accept the moral codes of other classes. The ethical principles of the countryside and the moral order of the countryside are an

39 Ibid. Арк. 7.

40 Ibid.

41 Ibid. Арк. 8.

42 Ibid.

43 Ibid. Арк. 9.

44 Колейка Й. Славянские программы и идея славянской солидарности в XIX и XX веках. Прага: Statni ped. Nakl-vi. 1964. С. 122.

45 ЦДАВОВУ. Ф. 4465. Оп. 1. Спр. 747. Арк. 9

46 Ibid. Арк. 10.

47 Ibid. Арк. 11.

objective fact that is perceived by agrarianism as a fact<sup>48</sup>. And in this, we believe, his peasant-centrism is clearly revealed.

The starting points in the socio-economic concept of agrarianism are purely sociological questions, the author of «The Newest Agrarianism» is convinced. Among the important and conceptual ones, he distinguishes the following: 1) the role and mission of a person in society; 2) the dialectic of the relationship between the individual and society, individual social strata; 3) «how society should be organized in general and specifically with regard to the interests of rural people». The answers to these and other questions are based on the basic principle of peasant-centrism: «from the point of view of the peasant, his worldview and public interests. The needs of rural life, its imperatives are the main criteria for this»<sup>49</sup>.

For the contemporary development of the nation and the state, according to H. Simantsiv, the peasantry played an important social and cultural role. The author of «The Newest Agrarianism» substantiated his understanding of the role of the peasant as a builder of the state by the historical circumstances of the development of Ukraine, primarily by the uniqueness of the peasantry compared to other national social strata. First of all, he took into account the unique mentality of the Ukrainian peasantry. H. Simantsiv emphasized that «in the peasantry, which is closely connected with a certain territory with its entire being and mentally lives with a sense of spontaneous national unity, there are reliable foundations for the stability and endurance of the national will in the defence of its territory, its land»<sup>50</sup>.

Similar to the classics of European and Ukrainian agrarianism, the thinker spoke of the peasantry as a state builder in view of two main factors, in his opinion: 1) the peasantry is a bearer and personification of national values; 2) for the peasantry, the concept and feeling of the Motherland is not an abstraction, but a clear concreteness that is nourished by settlement and the practice of management on the native land<sup>51</sup>.

In the above judgments of the author of «The Newest Agrarianism», we observe a reflection of both European and Ukrainian agrarian

theory and practice of the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, primarily of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921. For example, M. Hrushevsky frankly believed that «the main basis of the Great Ukraine for a long time, if not always, there will be a peasantry, and it will have to be built on it. In the long times of our early life, we kept repeating that the future of Ukrainian revival and the future of Ukraine in general lies in the peasantry and only in the peasantry. For a whole century, Ukrainianness and peasantry became almost synonymous. From the time when all other strata betrayed their nationality, all the material for national building was drawn from it, and it placed its hopes on it: Ukraine will be able to stand up only when this titan thrown into the abyss of darkness and unconsciousness, this deprived of sight, rises anew and strength, Samson, cut off from his political and national consciousness. ... it (the peasantry – author) became the spring of our revolutionary movement»<sup>52</sup>.

In particular, in his lectures on the problems of agrarianism, M. Hodza also proved that the peasantry and agriculture play a leading role: «I am sure... that we will find in agriculture an important element of what humanity so badly needs – a new reassuring idea, a new psychology of democracy, the peace and self-discovery that today, ten years after the World War, humanity needs so much. When it is possible in almost all social strata to see the signs of a strong crisis, which indicates uncertainty, the threat of internal decomposition and revolution, the greater virtues are demonstrated by the agriculturalist who, in the midst of moral crisis and nihilism, embodies peace»<sup>53</sup>.

According to H. Simantsiv, the optimal socio-legal model in which private and public legal relations are harmoniously combined is agrarianism – «the third logically possible direction», «the golden mean between the two extreme directions mentioned above»<sup>54</sup>. According to him, «society has the right and duty to manage and regulate social relations, but in such a way that the initiative of individuals can freely manifest itself. Society does not dare to develop to the detriment and at the cost of killing the individual and his freedom, but equally, the individual does not dare to be completely unlimited in his valid-

48 Ibid. Арк. 9.

49 Ibid. Арк. 10.

50 Ibid. Арк. 11.

51 Ibid. Арк. 11.

52 Твори: у 50 т. М. С. Грушевський / ред. П. Сохань та ін. Львів: Світ. 2007. Т. 4. Кн. 1. С. 252.

53 Галушко К. Консерватор на тлі доби: В'ячеслав Липинський і суспільна думка європейських «правих». Київ: Темпора. 2002. С. 193.

54 ЦДАВОБУ. Ф. 4465. Оп. 1. Спр. 747. Арк. 12.



ity to the detriment of society»<sup>55</sup>. This approach is fully correlated with the views of Czechoslovak agrarianists, in particular, M. Hodza, who insisted on the right of the state to intervene in business activities, as well as to act as a social arbiter<sup>56</sup>.

Denying the importance of class antagonism, dictatorship, and revolution as locomotives of history, not perceiving their meanings, agrarians offer an alternative tool for improving society, particularly in the socio-economic and socio-political spheres. The fundamental goal in the evolution of the social model, according to the provisions of modern agrarianism, is «human and their good. This goal is common, eventually, or should be common to all social strata»<sup>57</sup>. This approach is common to both Ukrainian and Czechoslovak versions of agrarianism. A. Svehla, M. Hodza, H. Simantsiv were equally opposed to any type of dictatorship, which was considered to degrade the social order and human dignity and contradict the democratic nature of the peasant. Since dictatorship is inextricably linked with the concentration of power, it makes it impossible to achieve social stability, which is one of the main tasks of agrarianism. Therefore, according to Czechoslovak agrarianists, the dictatorship could not ensure the representation of peasant interests and morals.

H. Simantsiv, as well as M. Hodza, attached decisive importance to the economic emancipation of the peasantry, the tool of which both thinkers considered cooperation. Thus, implementing the ideology of agrarianism in practice, M. Hodza attached decisive importance to the economic emancipation of the peasantry, the tool of which he considered cooperation. He made significant efforts to create the Central Cooperative of Economy and Trade as the national headquarters of credit societies, which began operating in 1912 in Budapest. With the formation of Czechoslovakia, M. Hodza initiated the creation of a new Central Cooperative in 1919, which was later moved to Bratislava. As the Minister of Agriculture in 1924, M. Hodza managed to create a nationwide network of district credit cooperative societies, called «Roľnícke hňábhé pokladnice» (Farmers' Joint Treasuries).

The cooperation is also widely interpreted by H. Simantsiv. He puts the following meanings into it: 1) «class cooperation instead of class struggle»; 2) «instead of social battles – mutual compromises and concessions for the sake of the common good»; 3) «cooperation of all living forces of the people»; 4) harmonious development of «all constituent parts of society, and therefore of an individual»<sup>58</sup>. At the same time, the author of «The Newest Agrarianism», in our opinion, offered an innovative understanding of cooperation for his time as a tool for implementing complementary socio-economic and socio-political models. A complementary society is a society of common values and ideals, development, perspectives, comfort, harmonious combination of individual and collective principles.

Different from previous principles, modern agrarianism sees a solution to such a component of the peasant issue as agrarian/land. First of all, he understands it as a component of a holistic agrarian policy to solve the peasant issue in general; secondly, its solution will take place on the basis of national economic and legal programs of agrarianism, which provides for the existence of such an institution as the institution of private property<sup>59</sup>; thirdly, it is about a peaceful solution on the basis of expediency and possible justice<sup>60</sup>. As an option, H. Simantsiv justified the appropriateness of using such a tool as parcellation. He gives the following arguments in his favour: 1) it is fair, since the peasantry will receive the land that previously belonged to him and which was alienated from him; 2) it is expedient, as it is a guarantee of preserving social peace and «preserving ethnic culture»<sup>61</sup>. Undoubtedly, the peasantry should benefit from the solution of the agrarian/land issue: «The land must belong to the peasant legally and in fact. There is no peasantry without the land and without the land. And therefore, there can be no problems here»<sup>62</sup>.

The prospects for the economic development of the peasantry through agrarianism are not equated with the development of large landholdings. H. Simantsiv notes that agrarianism is the antithesis of latifundism. Solving the agrarian/land issue on the basis of latifundism is unacceptable for agrarianism<sup>63</sup>. Inefficient for agrarianism is solution option a land issue from the

55 Ibid.

56 Hodza M. Agrarismus. Praha, 1931. Pp. 9.

57 ЦДАБОВУ. Ф. 4465. Оп. 1. Спр. 747. Арк. 16.

58 Ibid. Арк. 17.

59 Ibid. Арк. 29.

60 Ibid. Арк. 17.

61 Ibid.

62 Ibid. Арк. 29.

63 Ibid.

point of view of black redistribution. Under the conditions of that time, as well as under modern conditions, land without capital is simply natural wealth, which is not a market category. Capitalization of land is no less important issue for peasants, as is the issue of land ownership. Guided by the «middle» path, modern agrarianism does not at the same time use the category of «capital» to exhaust the complexity of all that «determines peasant well-being»<sup>64</sup>. The combination of land and capital does not guarantee that the peasants will receive their due remuneration for their work. Such a guarantor, according to the theorist of modern agrarianism, is the profitability of agriculture in general. It determines the fair remuneration of the peasant, not the size of land ownership/land use. In this way, the triad: land – capital – profitability, is the formula for the formation of a wealthy peasantry – the socio-cultural basis of the nation and the state.

Similar to H. Simantsiv is the attitude of M. Hodža to large land ownership. Like most adherents of the Czechoslovak variant of agrarianism, he unequivocally condemned large feudal land ownership, considering it not only an anachronism, but also a morally unjust phenomenon<sup>65</sup>.

The basic principle of an agrarian state is democracy. It reflects its fundamental essence, its goal – «the good of all citizens»<sup>66</sup>. Such a state model, based on civil society, provides «all adult citizens, regardless of status, family and property, participation in the creation of state will»<sup>67</sup>. The power of such a state lies in complementary unity. This is the fundamental difference between an agrarianist state and a class state. The latter delegates all the power to one class to the detriment of the interests of other classes, H. Simantsiv argued<sup>68</sup>. In accordance with this interpretation of the agrarian state, the concept of the model of its basis was also developed. It is fundamentally different from liberalism and collectivism. The latter are rejected by modern agrarianism as one-sided, taking into account the dominance of the individual in the first case, and the collective in the second. Taking this into account, another «national economic organizational principle» that is determined by the tasks of the national economy is optimal for theorists

of modern agrarianism. It is also determined by the ideal of «a person and a people, a healthy, morally strong and educated people, and at the same time a democratic people, all of whose components are equal and where any supremacy of one or another stratum would be excluded»<sup>69</sup>. The guarantor of the realistic existence of such an ideal is the material security of a person, his existence. Taking this into account, agrarianists prove that the proper material support of man and society is the leading idea of the economic policy of the state, the main national economic task<sup>70</sup>.

The agrarianist economic program is a way of systematic, in accordance with the laws of evolution, restructuring of the social order on the basis of institutional complementarity – an original model of mutual complementarity of economic institutions. Modern Japan, for example, is developing according to this model. This, in our opinion, is its difference from contemporary revolutionary socialism, liberalism, and conservatism. In this context, H. Simantsiv writes about the economic and political cooperation of all social strata of society and the state. The duty of the latter is to create appropriate conditions under which the subject of economic activity can fully reveal its potential, «but without damage and exploitation of other persons»<sup>71</sup>.

The legal programme of agrarianism is based on the principle of private property rights. Justifying this approach, the author of «The Newest Agrarianism» reasonably states: 1) only private property best provides a person with justice in the results of his work; 2) private property is the most powerful motivator of a person «to economic activity, diligence, creativity and entrepreneurship»; 3) historical experience, in particular Ukrainian experience, convinces «that only the one who dominates and has power is the one who owns the land, this basis of life»<sup>72</sup>. According to the concept of modern agrarianism as a «middle way», private property is not only a right, it is also a duty. First of all, «owning does not mean only having the right to dispose of this object indefinitely, or to manage it in such a way that it benefits not only the owner, but also the entire society»<sup>73</sup>. In this way, legal agrarianism

64 Ibid. Арк. 30.

65 Hodža M. Agrarismus. Praha, 1931. Pp. 16.

66 ІЦДАБОВУ. Ф. 4465. Оп. 1. Спр. 747. Арк. 20.

67 Ibid.

68 Ibid.

69 Ibid.

70 Ibid.

71 Ibid. Арк. 23.

72 Ibid. Арк. 25.

73 Ibid.

is qualitatively different from capitalism and socialism. He does not accept the anti-cultural and anti-social tendencies of capitalism and denies the socialist ideology of abolishing the institution of private property, which is understood as the source of the «poverty of population»<sup>74</sup>.

Guided by the thesis that the meaning of human life lies in the possibility of improvement, the concept of modern agrarianism provides for the corresponding agrarian social policy. According to its content, it is anthropo- and peasant-centric. Its task is to prevent natural disasters (famine, cold, disease, mutilation, etc.) and to protect society from degradation or mitigate the consequences of such social deviations as moral depravity, criminality, etc. The agricultural social program is a socially complementary project. Its implementation is aimed at all layers of society excuses to level class contradictions, prevent natural, demographic, and social cataclysms. The tool in the implementation of agrarian social policy is the relevant social institutions subordinated to the idea of a «socially healthy countryside and city»<sup>75</sup>.

Like other components of the newest agrarianism, the cultural agrarianist program is an integral component of a holistic agrarianist approach to the evolutionary and natural improvement of society, solving the peasant issue in general. Without the cultural development of the village, agrarianists could not imagine an economic, political, social, etc. solution to the peasant issue<sup>76</sup>. Culture is understood by H. Simantsiv as an important factor in the «progress of the countryside as a whole»<sup>77</sup>. His opinions about the fact that the political liberation of the Ukrainian peasantry from serfdom made him an equal member of society are correct, but «this did not make the peasant free; he is still far from true freedom, he is still weighed down by the yoke of spiritual darkness, superstition, humiliation, groundless fear of «those in power» and all other remnants of the old, feudal-serfdom times»<sup>78</sup>. On the basis of such an understanding of the situation in the cultural life of the peasantry by modern agrarianism, the task of agrarianist cultural policy was formulated, which was called «to bring a ray of

light into this darkness, to free the peasant from the bonds of spiritual backwardness, to make science and art available to him, to decorate his life with cultural interests»<sup>79</sup>.

As we can see, Ukrainian modern agrarianism is a new socio-political system, a holistic realistic worldview. His appearance is determined by «real objective circumstances and he understand this life and tries to influence it only on the basis of modern social relations and means of eternal abilities. Realism in ideas, realism in actions»<sup>80</sup>. At the same time, agrarianism is a middle way between collectivism and individualism. Its goal is to create «the most favourable conditions for the peasantry for its existence and development»<sup>81</sup>. Thus, agrarianism is a peasant-centric phenomenon.

The Ukrainian and Czechoslovak versions of agrarianism equally support the understanding of the peasantry as a separate subject of history, as a «separate social class». The peasantry is fundamentally different from the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, it is a separate, «new social type – agrarian»<sup>82</sup>. Individuality primarily lies in the synthetic nature of the peasantry, «because it carries within itself the beginnings of collectivism and individualism», all of it is labour<sup>83</sup>. The peasantry as a whole, according to H. Simantsiv, is a «working class». Therefore, he considered the «division into «labour» and «non-labour» to be «objectively groundless», its use in science – a «misunderstanding», and in political life – a «tactical and campaigning technique»<sup>84</sup>.

Agrarianism opposes the modern city to the modern countryside. According to H. Simantsiv, these two worlds are mutually interested in each other. The village fed the city biologically. Modern agrarianism calls for the countryside to feed the city ideologically as well. In this, agrarianism sees the task of the peasantry – «to restore this balance and balance the extremes of modern society. To the modern city, the peasantry must bring the original human goods lost by this city – nature and peace»<sup>85</sup>.

**The conclusions.** So, summarizing the above, we state. In the writings of Ukrainian and Czechoslovak agrarians, the concept of «the

74 Ibid.

75 Ibid. Арк. 28.

76 Ibid.

77 Ibid. Арк. 27.

78 Ibid.

79 Ibid.

80 Ibid. Арк. 32.

81 Ibid.

82 Ibid. Арк. 33.

83 Ibid. Арк. 33-34.

84 Сіманц Г. Наші політичні партії та селянство. *Село*. Ч. 2. Прага, 1930, С. 31-32.

85 ЦДАВОВУ. Ф. 4465. Оп. 1. Спр. 747. Арк. 35.

newest agrarianism», together with criticism of liberalism, capitalism, socialism, communism and fascism, acquired a logical and systematic presentation. The ideological mutual influence regarding the defense of the economic and moral advantages of agriculture, small private ownership of land, cooperation, as well as state regulation of the economy is noticeable. The Ukrainian-Czechoslovak agrarianist discourse clearly emphasizes moderate reforms, which are understood as tools for the formation of a large class of grain-grower owners.

The views of the theorist of Ukrainian agrarianism of the interwar period H. Simantsiv are related to the opinions of theorists and practitioners of Czechoslovak agrarianism – A. Svehla, M. Hodza, J. Kettner and others, whose works the author of «the newest agrarianism» became acquainted with during his activities in the Ukrainian Agrarian Society (UAS) and the Ukrainian Academy of Economics in Podjebrady. In addition, the Symantsiv Ukrainian

model of modern agrarianism is based on the understanding of not only European, in particular Czechoslovakian, agrarian theoretical thought, but also Ukrainian. The durability of the Ukrainian intellectual agrarianist tradition, such as the views of M. Hrushevsky and V. Lypynsky, is palpable, its distinct presence in the Symantsiv's Ukrainian concept of agrarianism. H. Simantsiv managed to logically and consistently reveal the essence and content of the newest agrarianism. It substantiates the principles and positions of the newest agrarianism concerning the individuality of the peasantry, its mentality, the role of the peasantry as an active subject of state and nation-building, etc. Thus, the intellectual heritage of H. Simantsiv is a self-sufficient Ukrainian concept of the newest agrarianism, which is consistent with the Czechoslovak agrarianist discourse.

#### References:

1. Bartlova, A. (2000). Dr. Milan Hodža a mladá agrárna generácia. *Politická a stavovská zemědělská hnutí ve 20. století. Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference konané ve dnech 17.-18.5.2000*. Uherské Hradiště, Slováké muzeum v Uherské Hradišti. [in Czech].
2. Cambel, S. (2000). Slovenské agrárne hnutia a Milan Hodža. *Politická a stavovská zemědělská hnutí ve 20. století. Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference konané ve dnech 17.-18.5.2000*. Uherské Hradiště, Slováké muzeum v Uherské Hradišti. [in Czech].
3. Halushko, K. (2000). «Khliborobskia ideolohiia» V. Lypynskoho u systemi skhidnoievropeiskoho ahraryzmu. [“Agricultural ideology” V. Lypynsky in the system of Eastern European agrarianism]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zbirnyk*, 2, 164 – 200. [in Ukrainian].
4. Halushko, K. (2002). Konservator na tli doby: Viacheslav Lypynskyy i suspilna dumka yevropeiskykh «pravykh». [Conservative against the background of the day: Vyacheslav Lypynsky and public opinion of the European “right”]. Kyiv : Tempora. [in Ukrainian].
5. Hodža, M. (1930). Agrarism: Cyklus přednášek «o ideologii českoslov. politických stran». Praha : ÚSČS. [in Czech].
6. Hodža, M. (1931) Agrarismus. Praha. [in Czech].
7. Hodža, M. (1931). Članky, řeči, studie. Svázok IV, Cesty stredoevropskej agrarnej demokracie 1921 – 1931. Praha : Novina. [in Czech].
8. Kettner, J. (1931). Liberalismus, socialismus a agrarismus. Praha. [in English]
9. Koleyka, Y. (1964). Slavyanskiye programmy i ideya slavyanskoy solidarnosti v XIX i XX vekakh [Slavic programs and the idea of Slavic solidarity in the 19th and 20th centuries]. Praga: Statni ped. Naklvi [in Russian]
10. Kornovenko S., Hlibishchuk M. & Ilnytskyi V. et al. (2021). Selianotsentrychnyi fenomen Ukrainskoi revoliutsii 1917-1921rr.: ahraryzm [Peasant - centric phenomenon of Ukraine revolution 1917 - 1921: agrarianism]. Cherkasy [in Ukrainian].
11. Kornovenko, S, Telvak, V. & Lozovyi, V, etc. Peasant-centric dimension of the socio-cultural space of Ukraine during the revolution of 1917 – 1921. (2021). Liha-Pres. [in English]
12. Kornovenko, S. & Kompaniets, O. (2022). Evolution of Milan Hodza Views on Theory of Agrarianism and Practices of «Agrarian Democracy». *Eminak*, 3 (39), 113 – 124. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2022.3\(39\).594](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2022.3(39).594) [in English]

13. Kornovenko, S. & Pasichna, Y. (2019). Eastern european agrarianism. Ukrainian intellectual space in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. *Ukrainskyi Selianyn. [Ukrainian peasant]*, 22, 24–30. DOI: 10.31651/2413-8142-2019-22-24-30. [in English]
14. Kornovenko, S. & Zemzulina, N. (2019). Ukrainian agrarianism as an option of eastern european agrarism in political programs of the ukrainian national parties of the period of the Ukrainian revolution. *Ukrainskyi Selianyn. [Ukrainian peasant]*, 21, 14–20. DOI: 10.31651/2413-8142-2019-21-14-20. [in English]
15. Kornovenko, S. (2019). 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). *Acta historica Neosoliensia Vedecký časopis pre historické vedy*. 22, 2, 4–23. [in English]
16. Matveev, G. (1992). «Tretij put'»: Ideologiya agrarizma v CHEkhoslovakii i Pol'she v mezhvoennyj period [«The third way?»: The ideology of agrarianism in Czechoslovakia and Poland in the interwar period]. Moscow : Publishing house of Moscow State University [in Russian].
17. Peknik M. (2008). Milan Hodža a agrarne hnutie. Bratislava : Ustav politických vied SAV. [in Czech].
18. Petrovičová, E. (2009). Štátnik a politik Milan Hodža. *Ústav politických vied Slovenskej akadémie vied*, 1, 77-85. [in Czech].
19. Píkovska, T. V. (2016). Національні програми Чехословацької Республіканської (аграрної) партії (1899 – 1922 рр.) [National Programs of the Czechoslovak Republican (Agrarian) Party (1899 – 1922)]. *Hileia. [Hylaea]*, 115, 455–458 [in Ukrainian].
20. Simants, H. (1930). Nashi politychni partii ta selianstvo. [Our political parties and the peasantry]. Selo. [Village], 2. Praha. [in Ukrainian].
21. Simants, H. (1930). Nashi politychni partii ta selianstvo. [Our political parties and the peasantry]. Selo. [Village], 3. Praha. [in Ukrainian].
22. Simants, H. (1930). Nashi politychni partii ta selianstvo. [Our political parties and the peasantry]. Selo. [Village]Ch. 4. Praha. [in Ukrainian].
23. Simants, H. (1931). Nashi politychni partii ta selianstvo. [Our political parties and the peasantry]. Selo. [Village], 6. Praha. [in Ukrainian].
24. Simantsiv, H. (1929). Novitnii abo selianskyi ahrarizm. [Modern or peasant agrarianism]. Tryzub. [in Ukrainian].
25. Simantsiv, H. (1930). Novitnii abo selianskyi ahrarizm. [Modern or peasant agrarianism]. Paryzh : Imp[rimerie] de Navarre. [in Ukrainian].
26. Sokhan, P. (Ed). (2007). Tvory: u 50 t. M. S. Hrushevskyyi. [Works: in 50 volumes by M. S. Hrushevskyyi]. Lviv: Svit, 4, 1. [in Ukrainian].
27. Stepankova O. (1961). O ideologii agrarismu. Sbornik praci Filozofi cke fakulty brněnske university, 10, 5, 60. [in English]
28. Švehla, A. (1925). Tři uvahy o agrarismu. Praha : MAB. [in Czech].
29. Toshkov, A. (2019). Agrarianism as Modernity in 20th-Century Europe: The Golden Age of the Peasantry. Bloomsbury Academic. [in English]
30. Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchykh orhaniv vlady i upravlinnia Ukrainy. F. 4465. Op. 1. Spr. 747. [in Ukrainian].

Надійшла до редакції / Received: 19.08.2022

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 10.11.2022