



International Science Group  
ISG-KONF.COM



**RESEARCH OF DEVELOPMENT TENDENCIES  
OF MODERN UKRAINIAN SOCIETY  
(HISTORICAL - PHILOSOPHICAL AND  
EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS)**

ISBN 979-8-88680-821-6

DOI 10.46299/979-8-88680-821-6

**Bogatchuk S., Mazylo I., Pikovska T., Makarov Z., Bielkin I.,  
Mangora V., Mangora T.**

**RESEARCH OF DEVELOPMENT TENDENCIES OF MODERN  
UKRAINIAN SOCIETY (HISTORICAL - PHILOSOPHICAL AND  
EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS)**

**Monograph**

**2022**

**UDC 93/94**

**Author's:**

Bogatchuk S., Mazylo I., Pikovska T., Makarov Z., Bielkin I.,  
Mangora V., Mangora T.

**Editor:**

**Igor Bielkin**, candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Doctor of Philosophy, Senior Lecturer of the Department of History of Ukraine and Philosophy. Vinnytsia National Agrarian University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine.

Bogatchuk S., Mazylo I., Pikovska T., Makarov Z., Bielkin I., Mangora V., Mangora T. Research of development tendencies of modern Ukrainian society (historical - philosophical and educational aspects). Monograph. – Primedia eLaunch, Boston, USA, 2022. – 291 p.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

ISBN – 979-8-88680-821-6

DOI – 10.46299/979-8-88680-821-6

All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, or stored in a data base or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the publisher. The content and reliability of the articles are the responsibility of the authors. When using and borrowing materials reference to the publication is required.

The collection of scientific articles published is the scientific and practical publication, which contains scientific articles of students, graduate students, Candidates and Doctors of Sciences, research workers and practitioners from Europe and Ukraine. The articles contain the study, reflecting the processes and changes in the structure of modern science.

**UDC 93/94**

**ISBN – 979-8-88680-821-6**

© Bogatchuk S., Mazylo I., Pikovska T.,  
Makarov Z., Bielkin I., Mangora V.,  
Mangora T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	<b>Bogatchuk S.<sup>1</sup></b>  <b>DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENCE AND EDUCATION IN THE RAILWAY INDUSTRY OF UKRAINE IN THE LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY - IN THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY</b>  <sup>1</sup> Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor Department History of Ukraine and Philosophy, Vinnytsia National Agrarian University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine	9
1.1	<b>WORLD EXPERIENCE IN THE FORMATION OF RAILWAY NETWORKS</b>	12
1.2	<b>SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT OF THE UKRAINIAN RAILWAY NETWORK</b>	16
1.3	<b>TRAINING FOR UKRAINIAN RAILWAYS</b>	24
1.4	<b>SCHOOLS FOR CHILDREN OF RAILWAY WORKERS</b>	37
2.	<b>Mazylo I.<sup>1</sup></b>  <b>RECONSTRUCTION OF RAILWAY TRANSPORT IN UKRAINE (1943-1948)</b>  <sup>1</sup> Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Department History of Ukraine and Philosophy, Vinnytsia National Agrarian University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine	53
3.	<b>Pikovska T.<sup>1</sup></b>  <b>POLITICAL PROGRAMS OF UKRAINIAN, HUNGARIAN, POLISH AND JEWISH PARTIES IN THE FIRST CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC (1918-1938)</b>  <sup>1</sup> Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor Department of Law, Vinnytsia National Agrarian University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine	70
3.1	<b>POLITICAL SYSTEM OF THE FIRST CZECHOSLOVAK SOCIALIST REPUBLIC (1918-1938)</b>	70
3.2	<b>THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN THE PROGRAMS OF RUTHENIAN POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE FIRST CZECHOSLOVAKIA</b>	77
3.3	<b>THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN THE PROGRAMS OF HUNGARIAN POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE FIRST CZECHOSLOVAKIA</b>	96
3.4	<b>NATIONAL PROGRAMS OF POLISH POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE FIRST CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC</b>	100
3.5	<b>THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN THE PROGRAMS OF THE JEWISH POLITICAL PARTIES OF INTERWAR CZECHOSLOVAKIA</b>	104

4.	<p>Makarov Z.<sup>1</sup></p> <p><b>SCIENTIFIC RATIONALITY AND DETERMINISM: OVERCOMING THE CLASSICS</b></p> <p><sup>1</sup> PhD of Philosophy, Senior Lecturer at Department History of Ukraine and Philosophy, Vinnytsia National Agrarian University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine</p>	109
4.1	INTRODUCTION	109
4.2	ESTABLISHING A CONNECTION BETWEEN CLASSICAL RATIONALITY AND DETERMINISM	113
4.3	TESTING RATIONALITY BY FREEDOM: DETERMINISM IN THE SUBJECT-OBJECT POSITION	116
4.4	DIFFERENTIATION OF CLASSICAL RATIONALITY IN GERMAN IDEALISM	121
4.5	PHILOSOPHICAL PREMISES OF THE PROBABILISTIC STYLE OF THINKING: LEVELS OF DETERMINATION	124
4.6	NON-CLASSICAL SUBJECT, OBJECT AND LANGUAGE OF SCIENTIFIC DESCRIPTION	129
4.7	NON-CLASSICAL CRISIS OF THE CRITERIA APPROACH TO SCIENTIFIC RATIONALITY	134
4.8	TESTS OF SCIENTIFIC RATIONALITY BY PROBABILISTIC TENDENCIES OF POST-LAPLACE DETERMINISM	141
4.9	FORMATION OF POST-NONCLASSICAL RATIONALITY: SYNTHESIS OF NATURAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES	145
4.10	POSTMODERN CRITIQUE OF CLASSICAL SCIENTIFIC RATIONALITY	150
4.11	RESOURCE OF SELF-REPRESENTATION IN MODERN SCIENTIFIC RATIONALITY	155
4.12	CONCLUSIONS	157
5.	<p>Bielkin I.<sup>1</sup></p> <p><b>PEDAGOGICAL ALGORITHM OF EFFECTIVE USE OF BUSINESS GAMES IN PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF MANAGERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS</b></p> <p><sup>1</sup> Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Doctor of Philosophy, Senior Lecturer at Department History of Ukraine and Philosophy, Vinnytsia National Agrarian University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine</p>	163
5.1	MODERNIZATION OF THE CONTENT OF TRAINING OF FUTURE MANAGERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE CURRENT NEEDS OF PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF MODERN PROFESSIONALS USING GAMING TECHNOLOGIES	163
5.2	IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNICATION COMFORT OF STUDENTS IN VOCATIONAL TRAINING IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN THE GAME ENVIRONMENT	171

RESEARCH OF DEVELOPMENT TENDENCIES OF MODERN UKRAINIAN SOCIETY  
(HISTORICAL - PHILOSOPHICAL AND EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS)

5.3	APPLICATION OF BUSINESS GAMES AS A METHOD OF INTERACTIVE LEARNING OF STUDENTS IN REAL INDUSTRIAL COMMUNICATION	181
6.	Mangora V. <sup>1</sup>  PECULIARITIES OF INFORMATION AND LEGAL SUPPORT OF LEGAL EDUCATION AT THE PRESENT STAGE IN UKRAINE  <sup>1</sup> Candidate of Pedagogic Sciences, Associate Professor, Department History of Ukraine and Philosophy, Vinnytsia National Agrarian University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine	193
6.1	INFORMATION AND LEGAL REGULATION OF LEGAL EDUCATION	193
6.2	INFORMATION COMPETENCE OF FUTURE LAWYERS	206
6.3	FEATURES OF DISTANCE LEGAL EDUCATION IN UKRAINE	215
7.	Mangora T. <sup>1</sup>  THE WAY OF LIFE AND THE FORMATION OF A. YAKOVLIV AS A LAWYER AND HISTORIAN OF LAW  <sup>1</sup> Candidate of Law Sciences, Associate Professor Department of Law, Vinnytsia National Agrarian University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine	224
7.1	FORMATION OF LEGAL VIEWS OF A. YAKOVLIV	224
7.2	STATE AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF A. YAKOVLIV DURING THE NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF 1917-1921	228
	REFERENCES	266

10.46299/979-8-88680-821-6.3

### **3. Political programs of Ukrainian, Hungarian, Polish and Jewish parties in the first Czechoslovak Republic (1918-1938)**

#### **3.1 Political system of the First Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (1918-1938)**

Political parties in the First Czechoslovak Republic have held a special place since its inception. No wonder contemporaries often called this state a republic of parties. It should be noted that the role of political parties in the First Czechoslovak Republic differed somewhat from the generally accepted understanding of the place of political parties in society in modern times. If at the present stage a political party, as a rule, performs the functions of a voluntary association of citizens, supporters of a certain national program of social development, which should contribute to the formation and expression of political will of citizens. Political parties influenced the daily lives of Czechoslovak citizens not only through their participation in government activities, but also through hundreds of professional, cooperative, youth, women's, sports, cultural, educational, and other organizations. In addition, the parties had a network of publishing houses and periodicals [112, p. 18]. As the Czech researcher D. Garn noted in this regard: "Parties accompanied human life from cradle to coffin" [115, p. 536].

In Czechoslovakia as of 1938. there were 60 parties. Only a quarter of them succeeded in the elections. The interaction of political parties with the state, as well as other elements of the political system and citizens is characterized by the institution of the party system. The party system is determined, firstly, by the number, nature and relationships of existing parties in the country, secondly, the special conditions of these parties, and thirdly, their actual role in the management of public affairs, especially in government [114, p. 20]

The party system of the First Czechoslovak Republic was characterized by multipartyism - the tendency to form a large number of parties [116, p. 39]. Its causes are the influence of several factors, the first of which is the diverse ethnic composition of the population.

The vast majority of the republic's nationalities even before the proclamation of its independence formed their own party-political spectrum, which was nationally isolated.

The exceptions were Marxist parties, which were built on an international basis. Within the national community, the parties were divided according to the interests of the social groups they represented (workers, peasants, entrepreneurs, intellectuals), which also contributed to the increase in the number of parties. At the same time, each of the national political camps had its own characteristics and was at different stages of development of the party-political structure at the time of joining the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic [117, p. 102].

The proportional electoral system was a factor in the growth of the number of parties. According to the French political scientist M. Duverger, the proportional electoral system is the main key to creating a multiparty system, because under its conditions the party's independent performance in the elections causes minimal damage, which does not contribute to the merger of ideologically similar parties. An example of such a phenomenon, the scientist calls the interwar Czechoslovakia [125, p.310].

The nature of the electoral system was not a determining factor in the formation of the party-political system of the Czechoslovak Republic. In addition, some political parties have shown a desire to unite, precisely in order to gain additional votes in the election. A striking example is the Polish and Hungarian political parties, whose unifying aspirations, however, were largely dictated from abroad. However, the proportional electoral system has become an additional factor that has strengthened the formation of multiparty politics in the Czechoslovak Republic [123, p. 41].

The multiparty system of the First Czechoslovak Socialist Republic was often criticized by supporters of liberal democracy, who believed that the number of parties in the state should be much smaller. This point of view was shared by T.G. Masaryk and his successor E. Benesh. They called for an end to conflicts between the parties, concerned about the unity of the people, in order to cooperate with all nationalities and



groups. Politicians believed that the most optimal option for a party system is a two- or three-party [123, p. 37].

In the first year of the Czechoslovak Republic there were about 20 parties, in the last - more than 60 [115, p. 64]. The leading role in the initial stage of the republic's existence was, of course, played by the Czech political camp, which underwent some modifications after the First World War. Thus, the youth camp in the new state was represented by the Czechoslovak National Democratic Party (CNDP). The National Socialist Party merged with some realists, progressives and anarcho-communists and emerged as the Czech Socialist Party, and from December 1919 as the Czechoslovak Socialist Party (CSP). The leading role in its activities was played by the National Socialist wing.

The unification process took place in a rather unconsolidated camp of political Catholicism, which resulted in the formation of the Czechoslovak People's Party (CPP). The Agrarian Party began its activities in the First Czechoslovak Republic as a strong and consolidated political party. In order to popularize the party among the population, it was renamed the Republican Party of the Czechoslovak Village (RPČS), after its unification with Slovak agrarians in 1922 [123, p. 43].

The Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party (CSDP) gained the most popularity in the first parliamentary elections (1920). turned into a nationwide party. After some time, the contradictions between the socialist-reformist and revolutionary wings intensified within the party. In 1921 there was a split in the middle of the party, supporters of the revolutionary wing founded the International Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPC) [123, p. 24].

The CPC is not the only example of the opposition wing leaving the party, but it is the only successful one. The rest of the opposition's attempts to establish its own powerful political force after leaving the party failed. Over time, such parties either disintegrated or became part of more influential political forces.

After the proclamation of Czechoslovakia's independence, a phase of differentiation and formation of Slovak political parties began in the Slovak political camp. The Slovak National Party (SNP) was going through a difficult stage of

separating from it certain political directions that were formed during the First World War. In particular, the Catholic camp, which formed the Slovak People's Party (SLP), as well as the agrarians, who became part of the ROCS, separated from the SNP [119, p.82].

At this time, attempts are being made to integrate Czech political parties into the Slovak party structure. They had two forms. The first is the unification of ideologically similar Czech and Slovak parties. Examples of such integration are Czechoslovak agrarians and the Social Democrats.

It should be noted that in neither of these cases the integration was complete, in both political parties there was a Slovak wing, which often disagreed with the decisions of the party leadership [123, p. 546].

An attempt to unite the Catholic parties was made by the pre-election alliance of the CHNP and the SLP in 1920, but immediately after the election, each party followed its own political path. The CHNP participated in government coalitions for a long time, while the SLP, after a short participation in the lordly coalition, finally switched to opposition positions [123, p. 546].

The second form of integration was the attempt of Czech political parties to build their own party structure in Slovakia. Czech parties without a Slovak component have received support only from Czech officials, teachers and workers who have been in the region to solve the staffing problem. The Slovak party structure was fragmentary and asymmetric, which significantly complicated the task of its full integration into the Czechoslovak state [120, p. 90].

After the proclamation of the independence of the Czechoslovak Republic, the situation of German political parties in the German territories that were part of it became much more complicated. If before 1918 in these territories there were large German parties organized throughout the state, then after the proclamation of new borders, the parties were forced to rebuild the party structure within the new state.

The most difficult test for German parties in the Czechoslovak Republic was their new status in the state: from privileged parties that took an active part in public

administration, they became a party of a national minority that categorically did not recognize the new state [120, p. 85].

Hungarian political parties, like German ones, disagreed with their new position in the state. Former privileged parties were forced to rebuild the party structure in the Czechoslovak Republic. The most influential Hungarian party in Czechoslovakia was the Zemsky Christian Socialist Party (ZHSP), which gained popularity not only among the Hungarian population of the republic, but also among Germans living in Slovakia. The second most popular was the Hungarian Zemsky Party of Farmers and Landless, which in 1925. was renamed the Hungarian National Party (UNP). The party was most popular among the peasantry, however, over time it managed to gain popularity among artisans and merchants [123, p. 49].

The socialist camp was represented by the Hungarian-German Social Democratic Party, which worked closely with the CSDP. Despite lengthy negotiations between the two political forces, their merger did not take place. Unification efforts in the Hungarian nationalist camp were successful only in 1936, when the Christian Socialists and Nationalists formed the Joint United Hungarian Party (UUP). Given the relatively low percentage of the Hungarian population in the republic (5.6%) in the proportional system, it could claim only a small representation in government [115, p. 31].

Polish political parties operating in the territory of Teszyn Silesia had little influence on the party-political structure of the republic. Due to the small size of the Polish minority, Polish parties did not have a high degree of differentiation. After resolving the dispute over the border between Czechoslovakia and Poland, the Polish Socialist Workers' Party (PWPP) began its political activities. Also quite popular among the Polish minority were the Union of Silesian Catholics (SSK) and the Polish People's Party (PNP) [115, p. 55].

One of the evidences of the democratic political system of the Czechoslovak Republic was the development of Jewish parties. The situation of the Jewish minority in Czechoslovakia was much better than in other Central European countries, and the government officially recognized Jews as a separate nationality. Among the Jewish

parties there were complex processes of division of spheres of influence, associated with the differentiation of Jewish parties not only by ideological but also by religious, national and cultural affiliation.

The greatest influence among the Jewish population of the republic was the Jewish Party (EP), which adhered to the Zionist orientation and actively cooperated with the Jewish international organization Poale Zion [126, p. 7].

The development of Ruthenian parties was complicated by the activities of a large number of parties of other nationalities in Subcarpathian Russia. In fact, Ruthenian parties were differentiated not only ideologically but also nationally and culturally.

The two most influential areas were: Ukrainophile and Russophile. Among the most popular Russophile parties were: the Autonomous Agricultural Union (AAU), the Carpatho-Russian Labor Party (KTLP), the Russian People's Party (RPP). Ukrainophile positions were lacking in the Russian Farmers '(Zemledilska) Party (RFP) and the Ukrainian Peasants' Party (UPP). It should be noted that the vast majority of Ruthenian political parties based their political program on the slogan of autonomy of Subcarpathian Russia. The demands of Ruthenian political parties, as well as parties of other minorities, became more radical after the aggravation of the economic crisis [128, p. 152].

An exception in the party-political structure of the first Czechoslovak Republic was the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPC), which was the only international party of the Czechoslovak Republic, which included representatives of all nationalities of the republic. It should be noted that the Communist International played a leading role in the leadership of the party [129].

There was a constant struggle between political parties, which eventually led to the establishment of new parties, which led to a significant increase in their number. It is difficult to establish the exact number of political parties of the First Czechoslovak Republic, because a significant part of political entities that called themselves political parties, in essence, did not correspond to this concept, but were other types of formations (political movement, political club). This question often criticizes the

political system of the First Czechoslovak Republic and casts doubt on the political maturity of Czechoslovak society, but a deeper analysis of the problem suggests that the political camp in Czechoslovakia was not as deep as it may seem. Among the political parties, there were five or six parties that were influential enough to claim to be part of the political system.

The degree of influence of a political party on the political system of the state is determined by two main indicators: the number of party members and those who sympathize with it and the role in governing the state [130]. The most objective indicator of the number of supporters of a political party is the election results, because the parties themselves, seeking to impress an influential political entity, often overestimated the data on their number.

Political parties, which are one of the most important parts of the electoral process, have not been regulated by any law in the Czechoslovak legal system. This phenomenon was not unique to interwar Czechoslovakia. Here are reflected two political traditions that dominated the European party-political systems during the nineteenth century. The first was the secondary role of the political party - the envoy was accountable first to his constituents and only then to the party to which he belonged. The second reason for the lack of legal regulation of political parties was the reluctance of political parties themselves to be regulated by law. The ruling parties did not need legislative support, the opposition parties did not want to pass such a law for fear of possible oppression by the authorities [135, p. 255].

The interaction of political parties with the state was to some extent determined by the constitution of 1920. in which it was about the proportional electoral system. However, the concept of "political party" was not mentioned in the basic law of the Czechoslovak Republic. The activities of the parties were indirectly regulated by the election legislation and the election councils, which operated with the concept of "election party". At the same time, the peculiarities of the party's functioning were not subject to control by law, so the parties had complete freedom in choosing candidates to participate in the election process. The concept of "electoral party" was defined as a temporary entity formed to participate in elections, which did not correspond to the

real nature of political parties of the republic, the vast majority of which were permanent political entities [136, p. 36].

### **3.2 The national question in the programs of Ruthenian political parties in the first Czechoslovakia**

One of the main features of the political life of Transcarpathia (Subcarpathian Russia) in the First Czechoslovakia was the presence of a significant number of different political parties and political organizations. In 1922 there were 18 political parties in the region, two years later their number reached 30 [137, p. 127]. Some of these parties were temporary political entities that either quickly ceased to exist or merged with more influential political parties. There were about 12-13 of them in the region. The democratic political system of the First Czechoslovak Socialist Republic contributed to the involvement of broad sections of the population in political life and, accordingly, contributed to the emergence of a large number of political parties. The socio-economic situation of the region had a significant impact on the nature of the political parties of Subcarpathian Russia. From the socio-economic point of view, Transcarpathia at the time of joining the Czechoslovak Republic was a backward agrarian region with a small number of intellectuals. The composition of the population, both national and religious, was extremely diverse. Accordingly, the ideological concepts of political parties were extremely diverse. Some of them were brought from the West through immigration.

The nature of political parties in Subcarpathian Russia had a number of differences compared to the nature of political parties in other regions of the republic. The first feature of the region's political parties was that almost all of them emerged after 1918, while the process of creating the vast majority of Czech and Slovak parties took place in the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. That is, these were new political parties that initially did not have a clear organizational structure. The population of the region, in the past apolitical, only gradually became accustomed to the role of parties in society. [123, p. 85].

The second characteristic feature of the political life of Transcarpathia was the presence of an extremely large number of different political trends and ideologies. It was caused primarily by the extraordinary ethnic and religious diversity of the population. According to the 1930 census, out of the total population of Subcarpathian Russia (709,129,000 people), 446,916 (63%) citizens belonged to the Ukrainian, Russian and Ruthenian nationalities. There were 109,472 Hungarians (15.4%), 91,255 Jews (12.8%) Jews, 33,961 Czechs and Slovaks (4.8%), 13,246 Germans (1.9%), and Romanians. 12,691 (1.8%). The religious composition of the population also differed significantly in heterogeneity: 359,167 (50%) Greek Catholics, 112,034 (15%) Orthodox, 102,542 (14.1%) Jews, 69,260 (9.4%) Roman Catholics [131]. Of course, the national and religious factor played a significant role in the political life of other regions of the country, but in Transcarpathia its effect was intensified by the residence of a large number of representatives of different nationalities in a small area [123, p. 86].

The Ruthenian population, which accounted for 63% of the population of Subcarpathian Russia, was not the only one in terms of nationality. In the Ruthenian environment there were three cultural and national trends: Russian, Ruthenian and Ukrainian. Belonging to one of these areas was a determining factor in the ideological orientation of the political parties of Subcarpathian Russia. The process of party formation took place in two ways: the spread of the activities of national parties in the region and the emergence of regional parties on national, religious, class and other principles.

A common feature of all local political parties was the presence in their political programs of the requirement to grant autonomy to Subcarpathian Russia, the settlement of the border with Slovakia, the convening of a local parliament. Since two thirds of the population of Transcarpathia were peasants, the vast majority of political parties had the character of peasants [138 p.42]. One such party was the Carpatho-Russian Labor Party (KTP), which was founded on July 12, 1920. under the leadership of A. Gagatko, I. Tsurkanovich, Y. Gadzhega. [125, p. 33].

The political program adopted on the day of the party's founding pointed to its bright Russophile orientation. It consisted of three sections. In the first chapter, entitled "Political Program", the party demanded the granting of autonomy to Subcarpathian Russia, the opening of the Diet, the introduction of Russian as the government language, the establishment of borders between Subcarpathian Russia and Slovakia on ethnic grounds. Also for other nationalities living in the territory of Subcarpathian Russia, the party demanded respect for the rights to free cultural and national development. In the second chapter, entitled "National Cultural" program, the party proclaimed its goal of achieving unity Russian people and the introduction of the Russian language in schools. This program remained unchanged during the existence of the party [127, p. 3-7].

From the content of the program it is clear that the inhabitants of Subcarpathian Russia were considered by the party's ideologues to be part of the "Great Russian people". This is confirmed by the repeated political statements of the leaders of the KTP, in which they spoke in favor of the inclusion of Transcarpathia in Russia, referring to Russia in the pre-October era [121, p. 30].

The party, which demanded the urgent introduction of autonomy, protested against the government's economic policies, remained generally loyal to the Czechoslovak government, and advocated the territorial integrity of the state.

A prominent position in the region was occupied by the pro-Ukrainian party - the Ruska Khliborobska (Zemledilska) Party (RH (Z) P) [130]. The idea of creating an autonomous political party arose among the Ukrainian political forces united around the society "Education" [130]. The direct initiators of its creation were A. Voloshin, M. Brashchaiko, Y. Brashchaiko, A. Stefan. A. Tovt was elected chairman of the party [119, p. 123].

The party was officially founded on July 15, 1920. The party program was adopted on the same day. It consisted of seven main sections. In the first chapter, entitled "In State and Legal Affairs", the party demanded "Unite all Ruthenians from Poprad to the Tisza", "give broad autonomy to Subcarpathian Russia" and "ensure peaceful coexistence of national minorities in Subcarpathian Russia" [128, p. 8]. The



party's position on the national question is also expressed in the third section "On Education". In it RH (Z) P demanded to introduce the local Ruthenian language in schools and state institutions by legislative means [129].

The remaining sections of the program focused on socio-economic and religious issues.

In general, the national issue in the program was presented quite moderately, the party leaders did not make any radical demands, limiting themselves to asking for the promised autonomy to Subcarpathian Russia. It should be noted that throughout its activities the party supported the policy of the Czechoslovak authorities. An influential political party in the region was the Subcarpathian Agricultural Union (PZS), which was founded on June 10, 1920. under the leadership of V. Ryzhak. The Constituent Congress of the party adopted a political program authored by J. Kaminsky [137, p. 306].

The national question was considered in the second section of the program, entitled "Political Requirements", which stated: "We demand the establishment of borders from Poprad to the White Tisza to unite all Ruthenians of the republic and immediate confirmation of autonomy with their Russian language" [138, p. 15]. In addition, the party demanded "full protection of the rights of national minorities provided by peace treaties" [130].

The party actively criticized the centralist policy of the Prague government. It was on her initiative on March 22, 1922. a joint statement of twelve political parties of Subcarpathian Russia was published, which disagreed with the policy of the authorities in the region. The statement stressed that the authorities are taking steps to improve the situation in Subcarpathian Russia in the economic, social and cultural spheres. However, it does not contribute to resolving the political crisis in the region, the essence of which is its under-representation in both the executive and the legislature. The statement called for autonomy, the convening of a local parliament, as well as resolving the issue of establishing borders between Subcarpathian Russia and Slovakia.

This statement was signed not only by representatives of Ruthenian political parties, but also by representatives of Hungarian and Jewish political parties operating

in the region, as well as two national parties - the HRC and a branch of the Agrarian Party in Subcarpathian Russia. Unfortunately, such a broad unification of all political forces in the region was short-lived. In fact, it was limited to the joint signing of this statement [125, p. 86].

As the authorities did not take any active steps to implement autonomy, four Ruthenian opposition parties PZS, KTP, RH (Z) P and the Agricultural Autonomous Party (ZAP) decided to begin organizational work to implement the party union. Created in early 1922. the united political party was renamed the Russian Agricultural Autonomous Party (RZAP). In February 1923. it announced a memorandum to the authorities, in which it set demands that it agree to withdraw from opposition policies and cooperate with the authorities. These were the traditional demands for elections to the Sejm of Subcarpathian Russia, the introduction of the promised autonomy, and the settlement of borders with Slovakia. Later, they were supplemented by requirements for the introduction of the local language in schools, assistance to the cultural and educational society "Education" [137, p. 87].

The RAZAP statement was supported by the Republican Agricultural Party (RAP), which was a branch of the Czechoslovak Republican Party (CRP). This was due to the fact that the Prime Minister A. Schwegl, who headed the CRP, saw the RAP as a basis for possible cooperation in the region. RZP agreed to cooperate in "all cultural, economic and political issues" with RZAP.

June 22, 1922 at the congress in Mukachevo, the RZP merged with the RZAP to form a new political party called the Carpatho-Russian Agricultural Republican Party (KARP). At the congress of party delegates on August 19, 1923. In his speech, the leader of the Slovak agrarians M. Hoxha called on the KZRP to join the ranks of Czechoslovak agrarians and support the government's policy. It was this proposal to join the CRP, as well as issues related to the appointment of the governor of Subcarpathian Russia, that caused a split within the party. At the end of 1923. CCD and ZAP left the association. Thus, the attempt to create a large united Ruthenian party, as well as the attempt of the pro-government CRP to gain political advantage in the region by attracting this party to its membership.

CCD and ZAP January 10, 1924. formed a new party, called the Autonomous Union of Zelerobsky (gas station). [120, p.74]. The party was headed by I. Kurtyak, who was replaced by A. Brody a few years later.

On January 26, 1924, a congress was held in Khust, at which the program of the party was approved, which consisted of three sections. The national question was covered in the third section of the program "Political Requirements". Its main provisions were as follows: convening the Seimas and holding parliamentary elections as soon as possible, as well as granting full power in matters to the governor of the region; freedom of thought and assembly; ensuring the rights of national minorities guaranteed by the peace treaty and promoting peaceful coexistence of peoples living in Subcarpathian Russia [122, p. 118].

It is worth noting that the party secretly cooperated with Hungarian political forces and regularly received financial support from Budapest. I. Kurtyak, who received a deputy mandate, actively called for the introduction of the autonomy of Subcarpathian Russia not only at the national but also at the international level. He was the author of several memoranda submitted to the League of Nations, in which he demanded the assistance of the international community in resolving the issue of autonomy of Subcarpathian Russia. In 1929 The gas station, together with the KTP and the Russian National Autonomous Party (RNAP), formed the Russian National Bloc. According to the results of the 1929 elections. The Russian National Bloc won 18.2% of the vote and was among the strongest Transcarpathian parties [116, p. 41]. However, immediately after the election, the union disintegrated due to internal conflicts.

The ideological differences between the parties, as well as the political ambitions of their leaders, were so great that they made it impossible to unite and cooperate. Particularly great misunderstandings existed between pro-Ukrainian and pro-Russian parties. The most pressing issues for the parties in these areas were the language and nationality of the local population. The development of relations between the parties was influenced by political events in neighboring countries, as well as the activities of Russian and Ukrainian emigrants in Czechoslovakia.

Not only Ruthenian parties were divided into Ukrainophile and Russophile, but also national parties sympathized with one direction or another. Pro-Ukrainian parties supported the CSDRP and the CHNP. The HRC in Subcarpathian Russia initially leaned towards a pro-Russian orientation [116, p. 41]. It should be noted that the Communists invariably enjoyed considerable popularity among the population of Subcarpathian Russia, as evidenced by the election results. Factors that contributed to the popularization of communist ideas among the population included: low level of political culture of the region, democracy and multiparty system of the state system, the urgency of social requirements in the newly revived society [117, p. 185].

In the mid-1920's, the Communists' views on the national question in Subcarpathian Russia changed. In 1924, the V Congress of the Comintern took place, which set the Communist Party the task of Bolshevism. The resolution of the V Congress of the Comintern on the national question contained a separate section on the Ukrainian question in Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia [119, p. 192].

Influenced by the adopted resolution, the VI Regional Conference of the Human Rights Committee took place in Mukachevo on September 6, 1925, at which special attention was paid to the cultural and national aspect, emphasizing the ethnic unity of the Ukrainian people.

Over the next two years, the issue of Transcarpathians' national affiliation with the Ukrainian people, their linguistic and cultural community became a priority in the HRC's regional committee: "We are part of the Ukrainian people, we speak the same language as the entire 40 million Ukrainian people." Thus, the Communists in Subcarpathian Russia joined the ranks of pro-Ukrainian political forces. However, as M. Barnovsky noted, unlike all other Ukrainophiles, the Communists were Soviet Ukrainophiles. They unequivocally stated that "only the Soviet social order" could finally resolve the national question [121, p. 194].

Pro-Russian parties were supported by the Czechoslovak National Socialists and some agrarians. The Czechoslovak authorities initially supported the Ukrainian political camp, distrusting pro-Russian parties. The Ruthenian political parties perceived the government most negatively. According to the Prague authorities, parties

in this direction were supporters of Hungarian irredentism. Pro-government parties have tried to expand their influence in the region by attracting pro-Russian parties. A clear example of this is the Republican Party's attempt to include a failed pro-Russian CPR.

In the late 1920's, the influence of pro-Ukrainian political parties in Subcarpathian Russia increased significantly. This was due to the growth of national self-consciousness of the local population in a democratic state, the activities of Ukrainian emigrants both abroad and in the Czechoslovak Republic, the transition to pro-Ukrainian positions of the HRC. It was during this period that the attitude of the Czechoslovak authorities towards the Ukrainian movement in Subcarpathian Russia changed. First of all, this was due to the formation of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) in 1929. The OUN established its branches in neighboring countries, which significantly increased the activity of Ukrainian emigrants.

The Czechoslovak authorities were concerned about the popularity of the HRC's regional committee, which was in constant opposition to the government, while taking a pro-Ukrainian stance. These factors contributed to the cooling of relations between the Prague authorities and pro-Ukrainian parties. It should be noted that the fears of the Czechoslovak authorities about the possible irredentism of pro-Ukrainian parties in the region were generally unfounded. In this regard, the Canadian historian P.R. Magochiy noted: "Still, it was wrong to characterize the Ukrainian movement in Subcarpathian Russia as irredentist and hostile to state unity.

With the exception of a few immigrant groups and the frivolous statements of a few leaders, most Ukrainophiles (eventually even communists) were in favor of Czechoslovakia's continued existence. If Russophile autonomists sought allegiance in Warsaw and Budapest, Ukrainophiles were mostly concerned with independence and autonomy - but within the Czechoslovak Republic "[123, p. 41]. Gradually, with the escalation of conflicts between pro-Ukrainian and pro-Russian parties, the authorities began to consider finding support in the region in political Rusynism. Unlike other areas, the Ruthenian had neither a clearly defined national ideology nor its own political party.

The main demand of the supporters of this trend was the introduction of the local Ruthenian language in the region. Political Rusynism did not have the support of the vast majority of the intelligentsia, but was popular among the peasantry, who made up the vast majority of the region's population. In addition, he was supported by a large part of the Greek Catholic clergy.

Since the early 1930's, the political situation in the region has gradually worsened. One of the main reasons for this aggravation was the lack of promised autonomy of Subcarpathian Russia. The Prague authorities attributed the delay in granting autonomy to the Ruthenians' unwillingness to govern themselves in both economic and political contexts.

In the mid-1930s, a new political party emerged that began to actively claim leadership among Russophile parties. This party was founded on March 3, 1935. in Khust under the name of the Russian National Autonomous Party (RNAP). S. Fentsyk was elected the leader of the party [131]. The party program was adopted on March 31, 1935. The first and third sections of the program contained the position of the RNAP on the national question.

In the first section, The Political and Legal Part, the party demanded broad autonomy for Subcarpathian Russia and the establishment of borders with Slovakia. At the same time, the section contained the vision of the party's ideologues of the future autonomous system of the region. In particular, the party demanded that all power in the region be handed over to the governor, that local elections be held to the Sejm of Subcarpathian Russia, and that local residents be appointed to official positions. The item "Establishing the correct borders with Slovakia" required establishing the western border of the region on the basis of historical, ethnographic and "statistical" data. [130]

The language issue was to be resolved by expanding the use of the Russian language in all spheres of public life. In particular, the need to keep records in public authorities, courts, schools and military units of Subcarpathian Russia in Russian, as well as the publication in Russian of laws for Subcarpathian Russia. In the third chapter, entitled "National and Cultural Part", the party demanded the expansion of

cultural rights of the region's population, the opening of theaters, libraries, its own Subcarpathian University and a radio station.

The section also contained a sharp protest against Czechization and denationalization and called on the local population to "strengthen their nationalism." At the same time, a friendly attitude to other nationalities was proclaimed [125, p. 35]. In general, the position of the RNAP on the national question did not differ significantly from other Russophile political parties. The only difference was the sharper, more radical nationalist expression of their views.

It should be noted that this position of the party was largely due to strong financial support from Hungarian and Polish political parties, which sought to use the RNAP to increase political instability in the region. A new political party also emerged in the pro-Ukrainian political camp in the mid-1930s, claiming to be the leader. It was the Ukrainian Peasant Party (USP), which was established on the initiative of the famous cultural and national figure of Presov I. Nevytska on April 7, 1935. in Uzhgorod [117, p. 962].

It was declared at the Constituent Assembly that the main reason for creating the party was the lack of a single national Ukrainian organization that would unite all Ukrainophile parties. It is this union that the party has declared its goal. Despite the courage of political statements, the party has failed to develop a coherent political program. The party described its political goals in several programmatic articles published in the weekly Narodna Sila. The party considered the solution of the national question possible by providing "true, full autonomy and elections to the Seimas, so that the people could elect their representatives" [128, p. 211].

In addition, the USP demanded that "all positions in Podkarpacie be held by true representatives, ie sons of the Ukrainian people." At the same time, officials of other nationalities working in local authorities had to pass an exam in the Ukrainian language. These program provisions did not differ significantly from the national requirements of other pro-Ukrainian parties in the region. It should be noted that the main tasks of the party changed in accordance with changes in the political situation in the region, which did not increase its popularity.

The unifying role of the USP has been widely criticized by both the region's population and pro-Ukrainian political organizations. First of all, the party's program provisions were criticized, which lacked the party's position on several important issues of socio-political life. In particular, it concerned the problems of the peasantry, which formed the basis of the population of the region [115, p. 139].

In the mid-1930's, changes took place in the political program of one of the most popular parties in Subcarpathian Russia, the HRC. At this time, the Communists were faced with strategically important issues of the time - the question of finding allies and the feasibility of demanding autonomy. One of the important factors that influenced the further actions of the HRC in Transcarpathia was the prospect of fascism in Europe. The members of the HRC Regional Committee hoped to lead the movement and, under its democratic slogans, to continue to pursue its programmatic goals and far-reaching goals, putting forward a generally accepted thesis about the threat of fascism and joining forces to combat it. Such a policy was the result of VII The Congress of the Comintern (1935) in its resolution explicitly emphasized that the union of political forces is possible if it is used for the effective implementation of the socialist coup [119, p. 248].

At the same time, the Communists changed the traditional program for all autonomous parties regarding the autonomy of the region. In the 1935 election campaign, they declared that "the slogan of autonomy is only a tool to deceive the workers, to separate them from the revolutionary struggle for bread, work and freedom". These slogans can be seen as a pre-election trick, an attempt to distance oneself from the rest of the autonomous parties in the context of the mobilization of pro-Hungarian autonomous political forces. The Communists later demanded that the government fulfill its commitments in matters of autonomy. In general, although the Communists were in opposition to the Czechoslovak government, they advocated the inviolability of borders and the democratic structure of the state. This was stated at a meeting with Prime Minister M. Godzha by the leader of the Transcarpathian Communists O. Borkanyuk [121, p. 256].



The Communists took a concrete and unchanging position on the issue of uniting all pro-Ukrainian political forces in the region. They were not going to form a bloc or an alliance with pro-Ukrainian forces, as they considered them bourgeois-landlord and clerical parties [121, p. 208].

The aggravation of the political situation in Transcarpathia forced the Prague authorities to pay attention to the problem of autonomy of Subcarpathian Russia. In November 1935, the constitutional committee of the parliament initiated the start of negotiations, but Prime Minister M. Godzha after negotiations with representatives of political parties in Slovakia and Subcarpathian Russia, seeing the incompatibility of their positions on the border, postponed negotiations for a year [128, p. 263].

However, this delay did not suit the party in Subcarpathian Russia. In August 1936, pro-Russian and pro-Ukrainian political parties were able to reach an agreement. In order to create a joint project of autonomy of Subcarpathian Russia, they resumed cooperation on the basis of the Central Russian People's Council (CRRC). The project created by CRNR was submitted on November 28, 1936. The main principle of the autonomy project was proclaimed the unity and indivisibility of the territory of the Czechoslovak Republic. In general, the autonomy project was based on the Treaty of Saint-Germain. The first step towards establishing autonomy was to convene the Sejm of Subcarpathian Russia. According to the draft, the Sejm had the right to exercise power in all spheres of socio-political and economic life of the region. At the same time, the Sejm had no right to withdraw Subcarpathian Russia from the Czechoslovak Republic.

An important issue, according to the authors of the project, was the formation of the boundaries of autonomy. The issue of borders with Romania, Poland and Hungary was generally clear: "The borders of Subcarpathian Russia with Poland, Romania and Hungary are identical to the borders of Czechoslovakia." The issue of the border with Slovakia was much more complicated. The border has been defined by the demarcation line since 1919, which did not have a definite official character, and therefore the question still remains open.

The border issue was to be resolved in the draft autonomy as follows: In determining the border line, the CRNR proposed to take into account "historical, ethnographic and statistical facts" [134, p. 145]

The project of autonomy became the basis for the negotiations of the CRNR with M. Godzha, which began on December 10, 1936. A. Voloshin and Y. Revai played a leading role in the negotiations on the part of Transcarpathian political parties. They disagreed with the fact that in Subcarpathian Russia the vast majority of administrative positions are held by Czechs, and the governor only symbolically represents Subcarpathian Russia, without having real powers. In addition, A. Voloshin demanded the annexation of part of the East Slavic territories from Poprad to Uzhhorod to Subcarpathian Russia. The latter demand caused a particularly sharp disagreement on the part of the Prime Minister, therefore, the negotiations were unsuccessful, the CRNR project, like previous projects of autonomy of Subcarpathian Russia, was rejected by the authorities [134, p. 147].

Negotiations on the autonomy of Subcarpathian Russia were resumed in February 1937. However, the draft law on the autonomy of the CRNR was no longer discussed. As a result of negotiations, the so-called "Provisional Law №172" was issued, which came into force in October 1937. This law was defined by the government as "the first stage of establishing autonomy." However, he was not granted autonomy again. The powers of the governor were partially increased, who became authorized to appoint some government officials, to have a voice in matters of denominations and languages, headed by the Zemsky government. But instead of an elected Diet, a council of 24 members was created, appointed by the governor [118, p. 106].

Thus, the Ruthenian national question in the Czechoslovak Republic was represented in the programs of numerous political parties operating in Subcarpathian Russia. The two most powerful ideological directions were Ukrainophilism and Russophilism. In addition, parties of other nationalities were very popular among the local population, due to the colorful ethnic map of the region. The leading role in the political life of the region was played by the problem of autonomy of Subcarpathian

Russia. Unresolved this issue has led to an aggravation of the political situation in the region, the radicalization of political programs of individual parties.

Land reform in Transcarpathia had a difficult and painful background. The concept of private ownership of land was underdeveloped in this area. The vast majority of land was owned by the nobility. Ruthenians (self-name of the local population) Transcarpathia to the XIV - XV centuries. engaged in nomadic pastoralism. Only in the middle of the fifteenth century. they settled on the lands of the Hungarian nobility and gradually became serfs. After the abolition of serfdom in 1848, a land reform was to be carried out, which provided for:

1. Separation of property of rural communities from the lord's land ownership.
2. Partial allocation of communal forests and pastures to private ownership.
3. Consolidation of fragmented areas [112, p. 108].

The issue of settlement of communal land tenure in Subcarpathian Russia, except for rare cases when landowners voluntarily provided land to the community for use, remained unresolved. In 1867, active Magyarization began, which was accompanied by the suppression of the rights and freedoms of national minorities in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The aggressive national policy of the Hungarian government caused poverty and ignorance of the local population.

Almost 3/4 of arable land was in the hands of large landowners. For example, the Earl of Schönborn owned 230,000 acres of land. Large land holdings were cultivated mainly for a part of the harvest in the amount of 1/3 or 1/2. A large number of peasants had their plots in mountainous areas where it was possible to grow only barley and potatoes, and in adverse weather conditions it was not possible to grow crops at all. It should be noted that on the eve of the First World War in Transcarpathia there were a number of overcrowded villages numbering from 5,000 to 10,000 people. This was due to the fact that some villages did not have drainage systems during floods, which so often affected the region. Peasants were forced to leave their small rural settlements and move to safer areas. Remote living from their land plots significantly complicated agriculture [124, p. 46].

The difficult situation of the peasantry in Transcarpathia eventually attracted the attention of the Hungarian government. On the eve of the First World War, the authorities sent a special commissioner from D. Egan to Transcarpathia in order to improve the productivity of agriculture in Transcarpathia. However, he could not significantly influence the situation of the peasantry. The first real steps were taken during the First Czechoslovak Republic.

At the time of the entry of Subcarpathian Russia into the republic, about half of the total land area (about 634 thousand hectares) belonged to small landowners, numbering 410,000 people who worked on 63,000 independent plots of land. If you subtract from this number of communal land holdings, according to the data census of 1921 per small landowner accounted for about 0, 67 hectares [117, p.54].

On April 16, 1919, the first so-called "confiscation law №215" on land reform was adopted in the Czechoslovak Republic. According to him, the calculation of the volume of large land holdings was carried out in order to streamline land ownership. The law also stipulated that all land suitable for agricultural cultivation with an area of more than 150 hectares or possession of a total area of more than 250 hectares are subject to alienation [119, p. 47].

The next law on land reform of June 11, 1919 № 330 created a special authorized body throughout the Czechoslovak Republic - the State Land Government (hereinafter - the Law) with headquarters in Prague. ZU was accountable to the Council of Ministers. The law is obliged to regulate all land issues except those referred to the courts or other authorities. According to the law, the law had to:

1. To keep records and enter in the register of all confiscated lands, to determine which objects are not subject to confiscation in accordance with the law.
2. Follow the procedure for managing confiscated but not yet registered property.
3. Give consent to the alienation, lease and division of confiscated property.
4. Establish the procedure for the transfer of seized property.
5. Determine the degree of suitability of agricultural equipment on confiscated land.
6. Notify persons whose property is subject to seizure.

7. Determine the amount of compensation for confiscated property, ensure compliance with the right to appeal.

8. Allocation of land ownership and transfer to persons in accordance with the law.

9. Ensure accessibility for use of residential and commercial premises on allocated lands.

10. Provide long-term loans to owners of land shares.

11. Supervise the property whose right to use is limited.

12. Facilitate the establishment and supervision of agricultural cooperatives.

13. Create district administrations or commissions [118, p. 109].

Later, in 1920, three more laws on land reform were passed. In particular, the Law “On Allocation” № 81 of 1920 defined those to whom allotments from withdrawn lands could be provided: these were, first of all, private individuals and partly cooperatives [122, p. 84].

The actual implementation of land reform began in early 1921. The Regional Chancellery of the State Land Government (hereinafter - DZU) in Uzhhorod was organized for the whole of Subcarpathian Russia. During the period of its work from 1921 to 1923, 7 mobile commissariats worked in the chancellery in Uzhhorod, Mukachevo, Beregovo, Svalyava and Sevlyush [112, p. 49].

The total area of land subject to confiscation was about 239,000 hectares. These lands belonged to large landowners, who owned 36,000 hectares in accordance with the law on land reform. Thus, land with an area of about 203,000 hectares was to be actually distributed. Territorially, these lands covered 230 districts of Subcarpathian Russia, ie were located in almost half of the villages of the region. As of June 1, 1930, 20,691 hectares of arable land were divided, 15,733 people bought small plots with an area of 13,635 hectares, 15 people - estates with an area of 1,680 hectares, 63 people - plots up to 68 hectares [122, p.49]. 15,000 hectares of pastures were transferred to state ownership. Some of them were handed over to farmers (pastures are located in the Borzhavska meadow). Also, the population of Subcarpathian Russia was able to get land for housing. Most of these sites were: Mukachevo (694) and Svalyava (110). By

nationality, the owners of building plots were distributed as follows: Ukrainians 86%, Hungarians 10%, Czechs and Slovaks 1.5%, Jews 1.4%, other nationalities 0.1% [122, p.50].

It should be noted that the implementation of land reform was carried out with significant difficulties, including: lack of understanding of land reform by the population, resistance of large landowners, inaccurate census data, insufficient financial support from the state.

Livestock also experienced bad times. The number of horses, cows, oxen and even pigs has been declining every year. And while the demand for meat and dairy products has been growing steadily, the supply of this industry has been bondage. The decline of the traditional industry in Transcarpathia was directly related to the decline of the peasant economy. Monopolies have managed to maintain in the region low prices not only for raw materials, but also for agricultural products, including livestock. Dealers bought cattle from peasants at very low prices, especially during the crisis, which led to further deterioration of food. In mountainous areas, the main foods were potatoes and cornmeal. In response to the manifestations of hunger, food actions were raised [119, p.110].

Such a difficult situation did not mean that the Czechoslovak authorities did not pay attention to Transcarpathian agriculture. Thus, 27 100 425, 95 kroons were spent on reclamation works.

In order to accelerate land reform, the Zemsky Economic Government and the National Grain Union were established. The main task of the newly created district office of the state land service was to establish land as an object of purchase and sale, and this led society to a market economy. One of the main tasks of agrarian reform was to overcome local land hunger. But the reform covered only 24 percent of the land fund, and therefore the conditions of land use were extremely unfavorable [119, p.99].

The state structures of Transcarpathia supported the development of cooperation, which was one of the means of penetrating financial capital into the small economy of Transcarpathia. Beginning in 1920, a variety of agricultural societies began to appear, uniting and assisting farmers, as well as developing various branches of agriculture.

With the permission of the Ministry of Agriculture and the National Civil Administration in Uzhgorod in 1920, a congress of delegates from various peasant unions. They formed the constituent assembly of the so-called "Peasant Master", which became the first central agricultural cooperative built on the basis of mutual assistance.

Organizational work has been going on for a long time, but unfortunately it has been slowed down due to bureaucratic reasons. Only in 1930, after the approval of the statute by the Ministry of Agriculture, a powerful agricultural cooperative emerged, supported by state and local budgets, called the "National Union of Professional Agricultural Societies" based in Mukachevo. The regional union has become a center for all CSOs. In order to properly perform the functions of CSOs, the National Union sent to each district a special commissioner - a consultant who took care not only of improving tillage techniques, but also engaged in cultural and educational work among the peasantry.

In the autumn of 1933, by order of the Ministry of Agriculture, the National Union was renamed the Agricultural Chamber of Subcarpathian Russia, which has since been an autonomous agricultural organization. The Chamber of Agriculture formed its program, which consisted of the following basic provisions:

1. Development of all branches of agriculture through the intensification of agriculture.
2. Expanding the sown area, increasing yields, improving the cultivation of fodder crops.
3. Organizing the economy on communal peasant lands.
4. Accelerate land reform.
5. Relocation of peasants from the Verkhovyna districts to more civilized villages.
6. Improving the social situation of the peasantry.
7. Cultural and educational work among the peasantry [118, p. 109].

The Agricultural Chamber has been active in Subcarpathian Russia. In 1936, the Agricultural Chamber owned 12 CSOs and 29 other peasant associations (for example, the pastoralists' association, the district gardeners' association, etc.). In total,

the organization had 30,000 members. Despite the active work and support of the government, the work carried out by the Agricultural Chamber was not enough to address the land issue in Transcarpathia [116, p. 39].

An important element of land reform was the so-called colonization - a state-organized settlement for national and political purposes of the dominant nation in the territory where minorities live, in this case - the Hungarians. In Czechoslovakia, colonization began in the summer of 1921. Military aspects also played a significant role in resettlement policy. The colonists were divided into three groups: volunteers - Czechs, Slovaks, Moravians, Ruthenian-Ukrainians living in the country; repatriates returning from abroad are Slovaks, Czechs and legionnaires. Legionnaires - soldiers who served in the Czech-Slovak troops and in the First World War fought on the side of the Entente [115, p. 114].

Such units were formed in France, Italy, and Russia. After returning home, Italian and French legionnaires played a significant role in the military occupation of Hungary's northern and northeastern counties; in January 1919, troops in Italian uniforms were brought to Uzhhorod. Legionnaires returning home could also become colonists.

Legionnaires' settlements were established near more or less important railway junctions along the borders of Trianon: they provided rail connections to the countries of the Lesser Entente and the protection of colonial settlements. Such legionary settlements in Transcarpathia were Tisasholomon (formerly Solomonovo) near Chop, Svoboda - near the railway junction in Batevo. The last settlement was the largest colony of legionnaires of the Czechoslovak state. To create it, 1,600 hectares of fertile land of the Lonyai family estate were confiscated. The first settlers arrived in September 1923, and construction began in December. According to 1931, 909 people lived in the village, including 405 Czechs, 7 Slovaks, and in the hamlets attached to the village - 184 Ruthenian-Ukrainians, 281 Hungarians and 1 Pole [116, p. 40].



### **3.3 The national question in the programs of Hungarian political parties in the First Czechoslovakia**

Citizens of the Czechoslovak Republic who belonged to the Hungarian nationality lived mainly in Slovakia and Subcarpathian Russia. According to the 1921 census, 744,622 Hungarians lived in the Czechoslovak Republic, making them a fairly large national minority.

Like the Germans, the Hungarians held a privileged position in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy before the creation of the Czechoslovak Republic. It is therefore not surprising that the Hungarian population reacted negatively to their new status as a national minority and did not seek cooperation with the Czechoslovak authorities. Hungarian politicians saw the way out of the situation in support of the idea of "Greater Hungary", ie the restoration of the unity of the Hungarian state within the former borders [117, p. 925].

Signing of the Treaty of Trianon on June 4, 1920, finally buried this idea. She was replaced by the idea of revising the Versailles system of peace treaties, the first step towards which, according to Hungarian politicians, was to expand the rights of the Hungarian minority in the state. It is an indisputable fact that the influence of the majority of Hungarian parties in the Czechoslovak Republic of Budapest, which used them to bring back to power Hungary's former territories [117, p.925].

The party-political system of the Hungarian minority was finally formed after the emergence of the republic. Hungarian political parties expressed their position on the new state at the first session of the parliament elected in 1920. On behalf of the Hungarian population, they protested against the entry of former Hungarian lands into the Czechoslovak Republic. This position became the basis of the national question in the political programs of Hungarian parties throughout the interwar period [123, p. 113].

The largest Hungarian party in the Czechoslovak Republic was the Zemsy Socialist Christian Party (ZSHP). It officially took place on November 23, 1919, in Kosice. Lawyer J. Leyele was elected chairman of the party. The party's program was

officially approved at a congress in Bratislava in 1920. According to the authors of the program, the solution of the national question is possible only with the granting of autonomy to Slovakia and the establishment of linguistic equality of citizens.

It should be noted that the national question has always played a leading role in the party's program, as the party has built its political line on all other issues of socio-political and economic nature. In the early 1920s, the Budapest-led party actively promoted the idea of revising the Versailles system, particularly on the southern borders with Slovakia and Hungary. From the second half of the 20's. focused on the protection of the rights of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia [115, p. 926].

The demands of autonomy in the party program were combined with a negative attitude towards the Czechoslovak Republic and the rejection of any cooperation with the government of this state. This position became the basis for the conclusion in 1921 bloc of opposition parties together with the Hungarian National Party and the Spiš German Party. It should be noted that for this association autonomy was not a goal, but a means of eliminating the Czechoslovak Republic [120, p. 85]. Nevertheless, the party had a small group of supporters of activist policy, led by party leader J. Leyle, who on the eve of the 1925 election. left the party.

The idea of cooperating with the Slovak GSLP was much more popular among the party, as both parties were united by the idea of autonomy. However, at this stage of its development, the GSLP demanded autonomy within the Czechoslovak state, which was inconsistent with the sharply negativist position of the ZSHP. In addition, negotiations between the two political forces were complicated by ethnic differences between Hungarians and Slovaks, as well as sharp statements by the ZSHP leadership in which Hungarians argued that Slovaks could not achieve autonomy without their support [120, p. 86].

On the eve of the election, a new program was adopted in connection with the crisis in the party due to the withdrawal of Leille's group. The program was based on the idea of Slovak autonomy, which was proclaimed the main goal of the party. ZSHP demanded the right to self-determination in the economic and cultural spheres for all

peoples of the Czechoslovak Republic, the creation of its own, Hungarian, Zemstvo and school councils [117, p. 927].

In the elections of 1925. the party won 98,000 votes (1.4%). Since the second half of the 1920s, the party has been intensifying Hungarian nationalism, which has contributed to the party's further rapprochement with the Hungarian National Party. In the next elections of 1929 and 1935, the party participated in a coalition with the UNP and the Spiš German Party [122, p. 254].

In the first half of the 1930's, there was a struggle within the party between two currents - supporters of irredentism and young party members who had already been educated in the new Czechoslovak state and believed that it was necessary to establish cooperation with the government. This crisis in the party, as well as the desire to create a common platform for the representation of the interests of the Hungarian minority, prompted it to unite with the UNP, which was officially formalized on June 23, 1936. resulting in the formation of the United Hungarian Party [137, p. 233].

The Hungarian National Party, which formed an alliance with the ZSHP, was the second most popular Hungarian party. It was formed on January 17, 1920. in the town of Komarno under the name of the Hungarian Zemstvo Party of Farmers and Landless. In 1925 after joining several small party formations, the party was renamed the Hungarian National Party. The party's program was divided into national and economic parts. In the national part, the party first of all sharply criticized the Czechoslovak authorities and pointed to discrimination against the Hungarian population. The main national demand of the party was the exercise of the right to self-determination by granting autonomy to Slovakia and Subcarpathian Russia [136, p. 39].

In terms of autonomy, the party was quite moderate, due to the influence of the opposition parties in Slovakia and Subcarpathian Russia. The program proclaimed the idea of self-government in the economic sphere (own chamber of commerce, financial institutions) and cultural (autonomy of school education), which would improve the situation of Hungarians within the Czechoslovak Republic.

It should be noted that until almost the end of the 1920s, the party did not reject the possibility of cooperation with the government, which, according to its leaders, could rebuild the Czechoslovak Republic on the Swiss model, which would ensure maximum development of the Hungarian people. Since the 30's. under the influence of Budapest, the party changed its political line towards sharp criticism of the Czechoslovak government and irredentism [117, p. 939].

Like the ZSHP, the UNP sought to cooperate with other political parties in order to represent the interests of the Hungarian people in the state. Finally, as noted above, in 1936. together with the Christian Socialists it formed the United Hungarian Party (UHP) [113, p. 235]. Determining the nature of this new political entity, it should first be noted that the party was completely under the control of the Hungarian revisionists. The PMO program was adopted in 1936. It was based on a compromise between the political programs of the ZSHP and UNP [126, p. 12].

The main national demand of the party was the proclamation of the autonomy of Slovakia and Subcarpathian Russia and the achievement of Hungarian national self-government within its framework. Self-government had to be enshrined in law. Any attempt to violate it or denationalize the Hungarian population was severely punished. Important steps to achieve self-government were to be economic self-government and self-government of school education [123, p. 82].

Although the program proclaimed allegiance to the ideals of democracy, the party's activities abroad were aimed at destroying the Czechoslovak state. The party adhered to this political line until its dissolution on November 28, 1938. Later, part of the party became part of the Budapest Parliament, where it formed a separate faction [114, p. 938]. In addition to the two leading parties in the Czechoslovak Republic, there were several dozen less popular parties. The Hungarian Social Democrats and Communists were not very popular among the Hungarian population of the republic.

The Hungarian-German Social Democratic Party emerged in 1918. The peculiarity of its political program, compared to other Hungarian parties, was the lack of autonomy. The Social Democrats limited themselves to the requirements of

Hungarian cultural self-government, which were to be enshrined in the state constitution. In 1927 the party became part of the CSDRP and formed its own section.

The Hungarian Communists joined the HRC almost immediately after its formation. In the Hungarian national question, the Communists opposed the idea of autonomy and, adhering to the party's political line, argued that the Hungarian national problem could be solved only by the introduction of a socialist system. Thus, the vast majority of Hungarian political parties considered it possible to resolve the Hungarian national question by gaining autonomy. For almost the entire period of the First Czechoslovak Republic, Hungarian parties were in a negativist position, and autonomy for them was only a means of destroying the state and returning to Hungarian rule.

### **3.4 National programs of Polish political parties in the First Czechoslovak Republic**

One of the few national minorities in the Czechoslovak Republic was the Polish minority. According to the 1921 census, there were 17,835,000 (0.56%) Poles in the country. The vast majority of the Polish minority considered the decision to transfer part of Teszyn Silesia to Czechoslovakia unfair. Therefore, any cooperation with the Czechoslovak government was considered by Polish political parties as a temporary phenomenon aimed at protecting the rights of the Polish population, until the possibility of unification with the Second Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth [134, p. 84].

The Polish national question in the Czechoslovak Republic was complicated by the unresolved Polish-Czechoslovak border. Apparently, this is why Warsaw did not ratify the agreement signed on November 29, 1920 with the Czechoslovak Republic, which addressed the issue of protection of national minorities. Warsaw carried out propaganda campaigns against the Czechoslovak Republic, supported Hungarian anti-Czechoslovak revisionism, and sought to prove to world public opinion the desire of the local population to unite with the Second Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This

led to political instability in Teszyn Silesia and the restriction by the Czechoslovak government of some of the constitutional rights of Polish citizens of Czechoslovakia.

It should be noted that the example of the Polish minority clearly illustrates the dependence of the national question in the Czechoslovak Republic on foreign policy factors. April 23, 1925 E. Benes and A. Skaszynski signed three agreements in Warsaw aimed at overcoming the Polish-Czechoslovak disputes. These were liquidation agreements, arbitration and trade agreements. The most important provisions of the liquidation agreement concerned ensuring full equality of the Polish minority in the Czechoslovak Republic and the Czech minority in Poland.

Since then, all Polish political parties have embarked on an activist political course, which they followed until 1933. Evidence of the strengthening of cooperation between Polish and Czech politicians was the fact that after the election a delegate from the Union of Silesian Catholics L. Wolf joined the Parliamentary Club of Czechoslovak Agrarians, and in 1929 Polish politicians J. Buzek and E. Hobot joined the Parliamentary Club of Czechoslovak Socialists. Democrats. During this period, even the most radical Polish political force, the Polish Communists, took part in cooperation with the government [115, p. 944].

The activist course of Polish parties declined with the onset of the economic crisis. The Polish parties finally refused to cooperate with the Czechoslovak government after signing it on January 26, 1934. non-aggression pact between Germany and Poland. Since then, Poland has taken an anti-Czechoslovak position in international politics, in which the Teszyn issue has played a leading role.

Four parties had the greatest support among the Polish minority: the HRC, the Union of Silesian Catholics (SSK) led by lawyer L. Wolf, the Polish People's Party (PNP), led by J. Berger and J. Buzek, and the Polish Socialist Party (PSP), headed by E. Hobot.

In the 1920s, the most popular among the Polish population of the republic was the International Human Rights Committee, which sharply criticized both the Prague authorities and Warsaw politicians. This popularity was due to both the international political tradition of the labor movement in the region and the active propaganda work

of local communists led by K. Slyvka. The party based its political conception on the Polish question on the need for political transformation in both countries. The vast majority of its voters were the proletarian population of the region.

One of the most popular Polish parties of the Polish minority was the Union of Silesian Catholics in Czechoslovakia (SSK (Č)). The party was founded on September 30, 1920. In its political program, the party demanded autonomy for Teszyn Silesia, protested against the closure of Polish schools and the transfer of Polish churches to the jurisdiction of the Czechoslovak Church. The main goal of the party was proclaimed - protection of national and religious interests of Polish Catholics [117, p. 945].

In 1925, the SSK (C) formed a pre-election union with the Polish National Workers' Union. According to the results of the election, L. Wolf received a deputy mandate. In the run-up to the 1928 local elections, the SSK (H) party formed a coalition with the Jewish Party, but as the union failed to win a single seat, the coalition quickly disintegrated.

Despite active protests against the national policy of the state and discrimination against the Polish population, which were repeatedly voiced by L. Wolf from the parliamentary rostrum, until 1933 the party continued to pursue an activist course. In 1937, the SSK (C) together with the rest of the Polish political parties joined a joint coalition. The program of the Polish People's Party (PNP) was more liberal on the national question. The party was founded in December 1922. It was headed by J. Buzek and J. Berger. In its program, the party advocated peaceful coexistence and cooperation of all nationalities in the country, as well as religious tolerance.

PNP September 10, 1937 merged with the Polish Social Democratic Party. After the unification of the PNP, it ceased to exist as an independent political party [133, p. 131]. The Social Democrats were quite popular among the Polish population of the republic. The final unification of Polish social democratic organizations into a single political party in the Czechoslovak Republic took place in January 1921. in Ostrava. The party was named the Polish Socialist Workers' Party in Czechoslovakia (PSPR (C)). A few months later, the party split. The party's left, led by party leader E. Hobot,

applied for membership, which was approved. It should be noted that E. Hobot returned to the Socialist Party a few years later and became its leader again [135, p. 220].

After the split, the party changed its name to the Polish Socialist Party (PSP). Unlike the vast majority of Polish political parties, the Socialists in their political program did not demand autonomy for Teszyn Silesia, but focused on criticism of Prague's national policy and the need to introduce a socialist system. Polish socialists called for cooperation with the Czechoslovak Social Democrats and promoted activism as an alternative to nationalism, for which the party was repeatedly sharply criticized by Polish nationalist organizations. [132, p. 246].

Since December 1934, under the influence of pressure from abroad, criticism of the PSP by non-socialist Polish parties has intensified. As a result, some of the party members separated from the Socialists, creating a new party called the Polish Social Democratic Party in Czechoslovakia (PSDP (C)). In September 1937, as noted above, this party merged with the PNP [123, p. 53].

After the 1935 elections, in which the party did not win a single seat, the PSP began active cooperation with the rest of the Polish non-socialist parties and became one of the initiators of a joint coalition of all Polish parties. Polish parties in the Czechoslovak Republic often joined pre-election alliances with each other, forming various coordinating committees to enter parliament. Thus, in September 1923. the National Bloc was created as a part of the Union of Silesian Catholics, the Polish People's Party and the Polish section of the Silesian People's Party. In the 1925 parliamentary elections, the union took part in the so-called Polish National Workers' Union. However, all these attempts to consolidate Polish political forces were ineffective. The Polish minority was virtually unrepresented in parliament. [123, p. 55].

The Polish consulate in Moravian Ostrava actively interfered in the political activities of Polish parties. At the end of 1934, the Polish consulate started publishing the Polish Diary newspaper, which sharply criticized the Czechoslovak national policy towards the Polish minority, and expressed the desire of Poles to unite with the Second Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth [115, p. 403].



It was on the initiative of the Polish consulate on March 28, 1938. in Český Těšín, a coalition of all the leading Polish parties called the Union of Poles in the Czechoslovak Republic was formed. Its focal point was the Main Council of Poles in Czechoslovakia, established in September 1935 in Cesky Tesin under the leadership of Polish Consul A. Klotz. The agitation activity carried out by the new political formation indicated its pronounced anti-Czechoslovak character.

After Munich, Polish political parties merged into the political structures of the Second Commonwealth. Thus, the Polish minority belonged to the small minorities of interwar Czechoslovakia and was hardly represented in the Czechoslovak parliament. The vast majority of the Polish population of the republic considered the decision of the Entente countries to join their region to the Czechoslovak Republic unfair. Therefore, most Polish political parties saw the solution of the Polish question in granting autonomy to Teszyn Silesia, which was later to promote the separation of the region from the Czechoslovak Republic and accession to the Second Commonwealth.

### **3.5 The national question in the programs of the Jewish political parties of interwar Czechoslovakia**

According to the 1921 census. the Jewish minority in Czechoslovakia numbered 350,000. At the same time, the Jewish population was unevenly distributed. In the Czech Republic, Moravia and Silesia, Jews accounted for 1.5% of the population, in Slovakia - 4.5%, and in Subcarpathian Russia about 15%. The differences between the Jewish population were not only in the density of the population, but also in social, mental and ideological differentiation, which directly influenced the participation of Jews in the political life of the Czechoslovak Republic. According to the Czech researcher M. Crgova, in terms of determining the nationality of the Jewish population in Czechoslovakia was divided into three groups: German Jews, Czechoslovak Jews and Zionists [117, p. 966].

Unlike other national minorities in the Czechoslovak Republic, belonging to the Jewish minority was not determined primarily by language. Jewish self-identification

had two options - national and religious, which influenced the commitment of the Jewish population to certain political forces [123, p. 68].

It is worth noting that there was a fairly loyal relationship between the government of the republic and the Jewish political forces. Anti-Semitic sentiments were much less prevalent in Czechoslovakia than in neighboring countries. In addition, the position of President T.G. Masaryk, who characterized Zionism as a "national liberation movement of great moral significance" [125, p. 72].

The largest Jewish political party in the Czechoslovak Republic was the United Jewish Party. The roots of this party go back to the Zionist movement. At the beginning of their activities in the Czechoslovak Republic, the Zionists began to establish their own political organizations to represent the Jewish minority in the state. October 31, 1918 in Prague, the Jewish National Council was established, representing "all nationally oriented Jews" in Czechoslovakia. The council was renamed the Czech Zionist Political Union. It was headed by L. Singer.

Representatives of the Czech and Moravian Jewish national and Zionist unions, trade unions and the Zionist Socialist Party were represented in the council [117, p. 980].

In November 1918. The Jewish National Council adopts a political program. First of all, it declared its commitment to the Czechoslovak state and stressed the need to unite the entire Jewish population on a national basis. Also, the main requirements of the program were: recognition of Jews as a separate nationality, granting the Jewish minority broad rights and cultural autonomy, equality of all citizens, democratization of society [125, p. 72].

It is worth noting that the requirement to recognize Jews as a separate nationality was met by the Czechoslovak government. In January 1919. The Jewish National Council convened a national congress of "national Jews in the Czechoslovak Republic." The main further task of the council was to create a single national organization on a national basis, which would represent Czechoslovak Jews [125, p. 91].

In March 1919. The People's Union of Jews of Slovakia was established in Bratislava, which was essentially the Slovak representation of the Prague Jewish National Council. On the eve of the 1920 election. these two organizations, as well as several other small Jewish political parties, form the United Jewish Party (UES) and adopt a joint political program [123, p. 78].

The SES program focused exclusively on the rights and interests of the Jewish minority and emphasized the party's intention to pursue an independent political line. First of all, the program emphasized the desire of Jews to cooperate with the government in the further democratic development of the state. The next items of the program included requirements for the equality of Jews in the socio-political and economic spheres, the free religion of Judaism and state support for all cultural and charitable Jewish organizations. In the following years there were no significant changes in the party's program, the focus was on the equality of the Jewish population, its social and cultural development, as well as the maintenance and development of peace within the Czechoslovak state [115, p. 981].

In the 1930s, the political activity of the SES, like that of other Jewish parties, declined significantly due to the rise of Nazi and anti-Semitic sentiment in the country.

The left wing of the political camp was represented by the Jewish Zionist Party (ESP). It was formed in the early 1920s. based on numerous small Zionist organizations. The chairman of the party was A. Spiegel. In its program, the ECP preached the ideas of Zionism, but its program provisions were close to the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Workers' Party and repeatedly cooperated with it [126, p. 14].

Like most Jewish parties, the ESP was loyal to the Czechoslovak government and did not make radical political demands. She focused on improving the socio-economic situation and free cultural development of the Jewish minority.

In the 1930s, the ECP was not active in politics, focusing on the internal problems of the Jewish minority. The party rejected a proposal by Hungarian political forces to co-operate, continuing to pursue a pro-government orientation. In 1935 the party decided not to run in the election on its own, but nominated its candidate on the

joint list of the CSDP. As a result, the ECJ for the first time won a seat in parliament, whose deputy was H. Kugel. Quite popular among the Jewish population was the Jewish Democratic Party, which emerged in 1922 under the leadership of K. Weiss and G. Reisman. In 1925 it was renamed the Jewish Orthodox Party (JEP) [115, p. 979].

The party's program testified to its orthodox and religious character. The main goal was proclaimed observance of the laws of Judaism in all spheres of life. The EOP expressed its support for the Czechoslovak Republic and its desire to cooperate with the government for the sake of further state-building. The party closely cooperated with Czechoslovak agrarians, thanks to which in the second half of the 1930s it began to grow in number [115, p. 980].

The Jewish Civic Party (EGP), led by G. Gutman and K. Shalam, acted on the principles of conservative clericalism. In its program, the party advocated economic and political consolidation of all Jews of the republic, proclaimed the need to create a single Jewish political party [135, p. 128].

The EGP did not show much activity in the political life of the Jewish minority. She did not run in the parliamentary elections, although she supported pro-government parties, including the agrarian party. The party did not try to compete with other Jewish parties, but on the contrary focused on the consolidation of the Jewish minority [135, p. 129].

In the late 1930's, there was a partial downturn in Jewish parties due to growing anti-Semitic sentiment in the country. The participation of Jews in the country's political life decreased significantly, although they remained loyal to the Czechoslovak authorities. Increasingly, Jewish political parties, and the Jewish population in general, have been criticized by Hungarian and German parties. That is why Jewish political parties tried to avoid participating in heated debates on controversial issues in Czechoslovak politics.

Thus, the national question in the programs of Jewish political parties in the Czechoslovak Republic was built on the principles of political tolerance and approval of the Czechoslovak Republic. Their political programs focused mainly on improving the socio-economic situation of the minority.

## Conclusions

Undoubtedly, the national question in the state of nationalities, which was the interwar Czechoslovak Republic, was one of the most important political issues. Therefore, it is not surprising that in the programs of the parties of national minorities of the Czechoslovak Republic it is presented more extensively than in the programs of the Czech parties. The national question in the programs of each of the political parties of national minorities had its own peculiarities. The most difficult, of course, were the issues of the former ruling nations - German and Hungarian. It is worth noting that although in some periods of the history of the First Czechoslovak Republic German and Hungarian political parties proclaimed in their programs loyalty to the state and the desire to cooperate, in fact, they saw activism as a way to gain power and pursue their own political goals. No wonder contemporaries called activism "marriage of convenience."

To a large extent, relations between the Czechs, Germans and Hungarians were complicated by the change in their political position in the new state. Formerly dominant nations have now acquired only the status of a national minority. In addition, Czech politicians have not always sought to establish sincere relations with Sudeten Germans and Hungarians, remembering centuries of oppression and discrimination.

Another important factor influencing the adoption of a political line on the national question was the influence of neighboring states. Hitler's Germany, Hungary, Poland, and the Soviet Union used political parties to achieve their own goals.

Significant radicalization of the national question in the programs of political parties is observed in periods of deteriorating economic situation, especially the economic crisis of 1930-1933. All these factors together contributed to the aggravation of the political crisis in the First Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in the late 1930s, which was largely due to unresolved national issues.