The article proves that the object of the Soviet agrarian policy in Ukraine in the late 1920s and early 1930s was a peasant-ideoman of the period of the 1917-1921 Ukrainian Revolution. It substantiates that the agrarian policy of Soviet power in the Ukrainian countryside in the late 1920s - in the early 1930’s, wore an aggressive, “military-communist” character. It was not compliant with the peasantry. Its overarching goal was not to objectively improve the socio-economic status of the peasantry, its legal status, but to the destruction of the peasant-ideoman of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution, to achieve its own political objectives, which varied, depending on historical circumstances.
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The statement of the issue. The end of the 1920s - early 1930’s in the agrarian history of Ukraine is particularly tragic. The implementation of the Soviet agrarian policy as a component of a “great break” became a tragic first and foremost for the Ukrainian peasantry.

Research analysis. In domestic [1–6] and foreign [7–13] historiography, not one generation of historians disclosed various aspects of the “great break” in the countryside, “Stalinist revolution from above”. In particular, proper attention has been paid to conceptual categorical provision, the reasons for the implementation and consequences of the “great break” in the countryside, and so on.

At the same time, the study of Soviet agrarian policy in Ukraine in the late 1920s - early 1930s is promising in the context of the scientific concept of the 1902-1933 peasant revolution. The application of such a model for the reconstruction of the agrarian history of Ukraine of the first third of the 20th century will reveal those aspects that are still poorly understood. In our opinion, the first issue concerns the subject of agrarian policy in Ukraine in the late 1920s and early 1930s. We believe that the repressive and punitive nature of the Soviet agrarian policy in Ukraine in the late 1920s and early 1930s was also determined by the fact that its object was a peasant-ideoman of the period of the 1917 - 1921 Ukrainian Revolution.

The author of the article aims to investigate the object of the Soviet agrarian policy in Ukraine in the late 1920s - early 1930s.

The statement of the basic material. At the beginning of the 20th century in the Ukrainian countryside there were deep socio-cultural transformations. On the forefront of history, a new active subject, a peasant-ideoman, appeared. Dividing the thoughts of R. Conquest, E. Gopher and other foreign researchers [14], peasant-ideoman - a peasant, excited by ideas. The ideological field of a peasant-ideoman is the dominant “Idea of the Ground”. It was perceived and understood as the “only hope”. Consequently, a new peasant, a peasant of the era of revolution with radical slogans, came out on the forefront of history.

Peasantry at the beginning of the twentieth century was essentially different both from the urban proletariat and from the peasantry of the preceding centuries, formed under fundamentally new conditions of post-feudal reality. The essential difference was, first of all, in the absence of serfdom not only as a legal status. First of all, it refers to the absence of serfdom as a way of being, keeping a household, a style of thinking, and so on. It was a generation brought up in the conditions of agricultural capitalization, industrialization, transformation of the community - all that is considered to be the modernization of the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the Russian Empire.

Peasants perceived themselves as a separate community of the then socio-cultural imperial space. The unifying value was the “Idea of the Ground”, its division into the fair principles, in their understanding. The events of 1902 in the Poltava and Kharkiv guberniyas became the beginning of the 1902 - 1933 peasant revolution in Ukraine. The revolutionary activity of peasant-ideoman detonated a proletarian revolution in 1905-1907. Peasant revolutionism has become a catalyst for institutional changes of the then Russian imperial model in 1917 [15].

The peasantry came into the 1917 – 1921 Ukrainian revolution with considerable experience of the behavior of the active subject of history. The Ukrainian revolution was characterized by a distinct peasant character. The dominant driving force of the Ukrainian Revolution was the peasantry. No wonder practically all the political forces and regimes that fought for power in Ukraine during the Ukrainian Revolution, without exception, considered the peasantry to be the basis of a set of models of statehood they proposed. The peasantry during the Ukrainian Revolution had its own “political program”, offered its own version of the socio-economic and socio-political model acceptable to it. In the center of such an ideology of the peasantry, during the years of the Ukrainian Revolution, there was a primordial desire for “land and freedom”. These two concepts were closely interconnected in the minds of the peasants and had a sacred significance for them.

The peasants understood and perceived whole complexity of socio-political relations, the relationship with the power through the prism of agrarian-natural being. The attitude of peasants during the period of the Ukrainian Revolution to one or another power was not stable and unambiguous. Even within one guberniya, the political sentiments of the peasantry sometimes differed diametrically opposite. As a rule, much depended on the property homogeneity / diversity of the population of the district, the range of differences / similarities in land tenure and land use of peasants, activity / inactivity of the authorities, military behavior, relations with the landlords, etc.
The peasantry during the years of the Ukrainian Revolution demanded an “order” which would be set by the “owner”. In our opinion, to a certain extent, the wording “order, which will establish the owner” reflects the peasant ideal of power. In its interpretation, we agree with the position of colleagues that this ideal is “democratic in the field and authoritarian, even despotic in the center” [16, 163].

If the peasant ideal contrasted with the position of one or another political regime, a peasant revolt unfolded. One of the results of the peasant rebellion, the manifestation of peasant revolutionism was the formation of peasant republics [17]. The examples are Visunskaya and Bashkantska, Kholodnoyarska, Chigirinska, Gulyaipilska peasant republics etc. That is, the peasantry during the years of the 1917-1921 Ukrainian Revolution declared itself to be a self-sufficient, distinctive, active subject of socio-political, legal, and socio-economic life [18].

The cessation of large-scale hostilities during the period of the Ukrainian Revolution in the early 1920’s did not mean the cessation of confrontation between the city and the countryside, the proletariat and the peasantry, the Soviet authorities, and peasant social and political activity. Despite the decrease in peasant social and political activity in the years of the new economic policy, in comparison with the period of revolution, which is natural and regular, in the 1920’s new forms appeared. At that time, hundreds of armed formations that had a diverse political orientation acted on the territory of Ukraine. Peasant uprisings covered not only Ukraine but also other territories of the former Russian Empire: Tambov, Don, Kuban, Volga and Siberia. The peasants demanded changes in agrarian policy, the abandonment of the dictates of the RCP (b), the convening of Constituent Assembly on the basis of universal equal suffrage. Elimination of a broad peasant resistance to the predatory food policy of the Bolshevik leadership received from him the definition of “fighting political gangsterism”, and the rebel formations, respectively, were branded the status of bands [19].

The economic devastation and the famine of the early 1920s led to the fact that, despite all the efforts of the authorities, the insurgent movement continued in 1921-1926, and in the years to come. This was facilitated by the fact that even those peasants who did not take active part in it, favored the rebels. In fact, throughout the territory of Ukraine there was a stable stratum of the rural population, which continued to resist Bolshevism, which was manifested in various armed protest v. [20, 144] Thus, only in June-August 1923 in Cherkassy voiyost there were 3 insurgent detachments – Gryshchenko’s, Lunyev’s, Zinko Strigun’s. In the first half of 1926 there were about 25 peasant insurgent troops in the territory of Ukraine [20, 145]. They directed their activities to destroy the soviet state machine and disrupt the tax campaign. Most of the rebels were former active ranks of the parties of the Ukrainian Social-Revolutionists and Social-Democrats [21].

The dissatisfaction of the peasants was also caused by the pseudo-class attitude of the authorities to the peasantry, which, by declaring that it protects the poorest segments of the population, essentially often took under its wing the real idlers: “We, the peasant-laborers, middle peasants and poor people, were never bourgeois nor the speculators, nor the drunkards, nor the pocket thieves, nor the idlers-parasites, as the upper class, nor the lower one, for which you are now arguing and the life-altering state rebuilding which you now entrust. “... We, the peasants, the middle-laborers and the poor-working people, are turning to you and ask you not to take a job from us and to force the laity to work ...” [22].

In the late 1920s and early 1930s, the Ukrainian peasant-ideoman of the period of the 1917-1921 revolution continued to resist the state: from the latent to the open armed. The peasantry of Ukraine did not tolerate the regular communization of the countryside. According to A. Graziosi, the second phase (1928-1933) of the peasant war against the Bolsheviks continued [23, 5]. In our opinion, this was a manifestation of the peasant revolution. The peasant-Soviet confrontation was large-scale and hard-headed. A. Besançon, comparing it with the period of the revolution of 1917-1921, accurately noted: “... in its scope and danger to the Bolshevik authorities, the peasant war was more massive and popular than civil war” [24]. According to V. Tilyshchak, the peasant revolt against the agrarian policy of Soviet power in the Ukrainian countryside in the late 1920s and early 1930s widened in a geometric progression. In 1927 there were 173 of that-time terminology “terrorist attacks”, in 11 months of 1928 - 351, in 1929 - 1437, in 1930 - 4000 [25]. In some regions of Ukraine peasant partisan detachments continued to operate. The anti-Soviet peasant movement of resistance in a particular scale gained resistance in Eastern Volhynia and Podillya. As of the second half of March 1930, peasant riots covered the territory of the 16 districts of the border zone of the Ukrainian SSR. According to the observations of B. Patrylyak, the insurgent peasants of these territories managed to take control of some district centers [26].

Thus, the peasant ideman of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution in the late 1920s and early 1930s remained an active subject of the peasant revolution. The latter, having undergone changes in the forms of its expression, continued, in the definite period into the final stage of development.

An essential component that allows a thorough understanding of the content of the Soviet agrarian policy in Ukraine in the late 1920s and early 1930s, the object of its direction, is how the Bolsheviks understood the peasantry, the place and role of the latter in the Soviet model of statehood. The attitude of the Bolsheviks towards the peasantry, in general, and the Ukrainian one, was shaped by the influence of the socio-economic and socio-political practices of the tsarist second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the basic principles of Marxism. At that time, the Russian imperial establishment established ungrounded, in our opinion, an understanding of the peasantry as an inert, monarchically conscious, conservative thinking social stratum that cannot be self-sufficient, active subject of the historical process in the broadest sense of the word. It is obvious that the understanding of the peasantry as a defective participant in socio-political and socio-economic life was conditioned by the government’s protectionist policy regarding it in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In fact, the Bolsheviks did not differ much from the tsarist government in their understanding of the peasantry. They also, for their doctrinal principles, used the idea of peasant inferiority, taking it on arsenal [27,
The peasant, in accordance with Marxist interpretation, was regarded as a subject with “dual psychology”. V. Lenin wrote: “A peasant is a laborer, because he then extracts his bread with his blood, he is exploited by the landowners, capitalists, merchants. A peasant is a speculator, because he sells bread, an object of necessity, an item that, when it is absent, is worth to pay all the property. Hunger is not the aunt; for the bread they give and a thousand rubles, and as much as they want, even if all the property” [30], and not the proletariat - the bearer of power and statehood.

Culturally, politically, the peasantry, in the opinion of the Bolshevik leaders, was different from the proletariat, more backward, more archaic. At the path to a bright future, modeled by Marxist-Leninist, it needed a leader in the face of the Bolshevik Party and the proletariat as an ally on the road to communism. In this regard, V. Lenin clearly stated: “We need - in accordance with our worldview, our revolutionary experience for decades, the lessons of our revolution - to ask the question directly: the interests of these two classes are excellent, the small tiller does not want what the worker wants. We know that only a deal with the peasantry can save the socialist revolution in Russia until the revolution in other countries has come” [31].

The dialogue of the Bolsheviks / Soviet government with the peasantry was based on the principles of “military communism”, “communist assault,” and “socialist front in the countryside”. The peasantry of Ukraine did not tolerate the policy of “war communism”. It corresponded to the reciprocity of such an attitude on the part of Soviet power - the peasant anti-Soviet resistance movement. Thus, during the first two decades of July 1919, Ukraine registered 207 armed peasant protest against Soviet power. 111 of them took place in Kyiv region, 37 in Poltava, 20 in Volyn, 14 in Kherson region, 12 in Chernihiv region and Podillya [32].

Ukrainian countryside and peasantry was a source of food, human resources in building communism, and so on for the Bolsheviks / Soviet power in the first third of the twentieth century. Hence, as the tool for the consolidation and later strengthening of Soviet power, for the achievement of a bright communist goal. Only in this sense was it important to them. In itself, the peasantry doctrinaitically did not fit into the concept of the Soviet model of the state. In particular, in his speech on February 12, 1929, J. Stalin highly appreciated the state that was inherited from V. Lenin. He stated that “never in the history of peoples so large and powerful in its power, in its scope of the state as a proletarian dictatorship”. The prospect of the development of such a state, the secretary general described the disappearance of the state under communism in the original way in its interpretation: “... a completely unprecedented increase in the functions of the state in the face of the grassroots proletariat”. In another speech, the party leader was even more frank: “The extinction of the state in our country is preceded by a period of higher development of state power (the dictatorship of the proletariat), which is the most powerful and most powerful power of all existing state authorities that existed till now”. J. Stalin argued that only a strong state - the personification of the “grassroots proletariat” - could finally bring about the construction of communism [33]. As the above analysis and the content of other speeches and papers of the secretary general testify, the peasantry was not recognized as the basis of the proletarian dictatorship.

Such an approach in relations between the authorities and the peasantry could not but be conflictual, considering at least that the peasantry was numerically dominant in the structure of Ukrainian society. It is well-known that 82% of the Ukrainian population of the time was peasantry. Only in the Dnieper Ukraine, with 30 million total population, 25 million were peasants.

In view of the categorical rejection by the Soviet authorities of the peasant-ideoman of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution, he became the main object of the agrarian policy of Soviet power in Ukraine in the late 1920s - early 1930s. In parallel the Soviet leaders took measures to form a new entity, a peasant collective-farmer / state-farmer. In this regard, the agrarian policy of Soviet power in the Ukrainian countryside in the late 1920s - early 1930s was by its very nature the next stage in the socio-economic, socio-political, cultural, communist assault of the countryside with its radical, repressive and punitive peculiarities methods of realization, the “socialist front”. Its point was directed against the Ukrainian peasant-ideoman of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution and the achievements that the peasantry received during the peasant revolution. In fact, 1929-1933 became the final chord of the peasant revolution.

Under the influence of the Soviet agrarian policy in the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR in the countryside formed a new subject of the Ukrainian collective farm and state farm countryside, which, with state support, confidently displaces the peasant-ideoman of period of the Ukrainian Revolution. Socialism, according to Soviet leaders, was supposed to form another, the highest form of human. Starting from 1923-1924, in the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR there was the formation of a purposeful strategy, subordinated to the through idea - the education of a new human. A peculiar result of the search for ways of forming “superhuman” was the First All-Union Congress on the Study of Human Behavior (1930). Its participants proclaimed that a new socialist society needs new people; the creation of a new human from the old human material was declared impossible; the socialist reconstruction of human became a priority task of the Soviet science [1, 335].

The new active subject of the agrarian history of Soviet Ukraine is the collective farm - state farm peasant [34, 35]. Compared to the previous type, it was essentially another peasant-ideoman, formed in the new Soviet ideological and intellectual field. “The idea of the Ground” was perceived in a qualitatively different way, his consciousness reflected other priorities. First of all, it was devotion to the goals of the party, identification with the new proletarian public, the oblivion of their past [1, 332]. The Soviet Marxists regarded the peasants as raw material for the creation of a new mechanism. If V. Lenin was difficult to determine the final place of the
peasants in the dictatorship of the proletariat, then Stalin stepped forward considerably. He emphatically emphasized that the creation of “true peasants” is possible by bringing the latter to the party. Compulsion was considered a permissible means of re-education of the peasantry, the creation of a “new rural human”, “a new psychology of labor peasantry” [1, 357].

The city has defeated the village, the Bolsheviks - peasants. Elements of commodity-money relations were destroyed in the countryside, an administrative-command system of management of the collective-farm and state-farm peasantry was introduced. The policy of dekulakization was the policy of actual destruction of the peasant-owner, peasant-ideoman of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution. The establishment of total state control over the peasantry led to its transformation into a subject completely dependent on the state. In this context, attention is drawn to the transformation of the legal status of the Ukrainian peasantry in the early 1930’s. It is not an exaggeration to assert that in its content de facto and de jure the Resolution of the RNK of the Ukrainian SSR and the CC CP (b) U from April 9, 1933 “Temporary rules of order in collective farms” greatly limited the rights of peasants. In particular, one of the natural human rights - the right to mobility. Peasants were forbidden to leave villages. In addition, the state refused to issue passports to them. Taking into account these and other facts, we share the well-founded position of Ukrainian scientists (in particular, V. Marochko) who identify this legal status of the Ukrainian collective farm peasantry with serfdom.

Planting of the collective and state farms system, the formation of the collective farm and state ownership of land, the state policy of grain procurement, fiscal policy, the Holodomor of 1932-1933 - tools for implementing the “great break” in the countryside, suppression of the peasant revolution, the destruction of the peasant ideman during the period of the Ukrainian Revolution and the main the object of the Soviet agrarian policy in the late 1920’s - early 1930’s.

The conclusions. So, in fact, the agrarian policy of Soviet power in the Ukrainian countryside in the late 1920s - early 1930s was aggressive, “military-communist” in nature. It was not compliant with the peasantry. Its overarching goal was not to objectively improve the socio-economic position of the peasantry, its legal status, but to achieve its own political objectives, which varied, depending on historical circumstances. In the late 1920s and early 1930s Soviet totalitarianism, applying taxes, grain procurement, and the Holodomor of 1932-1933, forming a new type of Soviet peasant, was a peasant counter-revolution. Its purpose was clear and understandable - not only the physical but also the spiritual and cultural destruction of the peasant-ideoman of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution.
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СЕЛЯНИН-ІДЕОМАН ПЕРІОДУ УКРІНСЬКОЇ РЕВОЛЮЦІЇ (1917 – 1921 РР.) ЯК ОБ‘ЄКТ РАДЯНСЬКОЇ АГРАРНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ В УКРАЇНІ КІНЦЯ 1920-Х – ПОЧАТКУ 1930-Х РР.

Постановка проблеми. Кінець 1920-х – початок 1930-х рр. в аграрній історії України є особливо трагічним. Трагічне перехрестя для українського селянства стало реалізація радянської аграрної політики як структурного компонента «великого перелому». У вітчизняній і зарубіжній історіографії не одним поколінням істориків розкрито різні аспекти «великого перелому» на селі, «стилістичної революції згори». Зокрема, відомо, що прийняття нових законодавчих актів стимулювало інтенсивну діяльність радянської влади в селі.

Основні результати дослідження. Значної кількості наукових статей і доповідей, присвяченних проблемам радянської аграрної політики, є засновані на категоризації досліджуваних досліджень. Проте, незважаючи на інтенсивні дискусії щодо проблеми, її об’єктом залишається селянство.

С.В. Корнененко

Діяльність Платона Доманицького щодо подолання фінансової кризи в ощадно-позичковому товаристві С. Колодистого (1908-1910): спроба мікроаналізу

У статті досліджено діяльність колоніані Платона Доманицького, який на початку кооперативної кар’єри виконував роль голови Кооперативного ощадно-позичкового товариства. У контексті цього, автор спробує проаналізувати особливості діяльності колоніанів-кооперативом, які підтримували соціальні інтереси серед селянства.
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С. Колодистого (1908-1910): СПРОБА МІКРОАНАЛІЗУ