

# ***ЕКОНОМІЧНА ТЕОРІЯ***

---

UDCC 330.338.124.4

DOI: 10.31359/2411-5584-2019-36-1-11

## **A. A. GRYTSENKO**

Corresponding Member of the  
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine,  
Doctor of Economics, Professor,  
Deputy Director of the Institute for Economics  
and Forecasting of the National Academy  
of Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine, Kyiv  
e-mail: [agrytsenko@ief.ua](mailto:agrytsenko@ief.ua)  
ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5030-864X>



## **O. A. GRYTSENKO**

Doctor of Economic Sciences,  
Professor of the Economic Theory Department,  
Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University,  
Ukraine, Kharkiv  
e-mail: [grytsenkohelena@gmail.com](mailto:grytsenkohelena@gmail.com)  
ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9895-730X>



## **PECULIARITIES OF THE CURRENT CRISIS IN UKRAINE: A LOGICAL AND HISTORICAL APPROACH<sup>1</sup>**

The article discloses logical and historical grounds of the current crisis and peculiarities of its manifestation in Ukraine. The author substantiates basic approaches to finding a way out of the crisis and suggests directions for correcting tax, monetary, and credit policies, as well as overcoming structural deformations.

<sup>1</sup> © Grytsenko A. A., Grytsenko O. A., 2019. Article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons License – Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).  
Available at <http://econtlaw.nlu.edu.ua>.

**Key words:** crisis, logical and historical methodology, joint and divided relations, economic contradictions, structural deformations and reforms, tax system, monetary and credit policy.

**JEL Classification:** B41, E30.

**Problem setting.** The current crisis is the subject of considerable controversy in the world and domestic literature. Scientists discuss issues of reasons and the nature of the crisis, its factors and dynamics, implications and ways of overcoming. There is a wide range of the approaches: from defining the crisis as an implication of economic policy mistakes (when it will be overcome and things will go back to the way they have been before) to understanding the crisis as the beginning for reformatting the entire world order.

The systemic nature of the crisis in Ukraine implies that it combines not only own but also the global problems. These problems have resulted not just from failed actions of entities: they are the embodiment of objective controversies being inherent to historical logics of socio-economic development.

**Recent research and publication analysis.** In contemporary economic research, there is the prevalence of the empirical and functional methodology. It orients only towards empirical generalizations and ascertaining functional relations but does not aim at the revealing the essence of phenomena and processes, and its correlation with external forms of existence. Its goal: no matter what it is if we know how to behave around it and how to use it. Such methodology is effective when an object does not change significantly and its relations are stable. Nowadays, the world is very different and sufficiently changes. Therefore, such approach faces the failure. Hence, the logical and historical methodology actualizes. There has been a special discussion on a set of problems concerned with recovery from the crisis in the journal «Economy of Ukraine» (Halchynskyi, 2014; Heiets, 2013; Yeshchenko, 2013; Zvieriakov, 2013; Kisterskyi, 2014; Kovalchuk, 2014; Kolodko & Hzhhehozh, 2013; Moskalenko, 2014; Onyshchenko, 2014; Podliesna, 2014; Riazanov, 2014; Tarasevych, 2013; Unkovska & Demchuk, 2013). It is worth mentioning that methodological approaches are of considerable importance in the process of finding a way out of the crisis because the methodology stipulates results obtained. This raises the question of whether they direct a society towards the next papering over the cracks or towards searching for own trajectory of development, which, on the one hand, takes into account the global tendencies and finds own place within them, and, on the other hand, maximally develops the current potential of a society.

**Paper objective.** The article's objective consists in defining reference points of development of the Ukrainian economy in the present situation based on regularities underlying social development and peculiarities of applying these regularities

at the present stage. Therefore, the logical and historical methodology underpins such approach.

**Paper main body.** To adequately estimate the role and purpose of the current crisis in development of a society, it is necessary to understand general regularities of development of a system of economic relations, to ascertain the role and purpose of its basic structures in a general flow of economic changes, and to reveal the main contradictions of development of the system, their contemporary peculiarities, and forms of solving them. Taking into account the above-mentioned peculiarities and the integral nature of functioning of an economic system, economists may try to find a way out of the crisis.

Labour and ownership are the most fundamental elements of a socio-economic system. Changes of these factors depending on the technological progress stipulate general historical logics of development of socio-economic relations. Theoretical underpinnings and empirical evidences have proven that joint and divided labour is an initial economic relation (Gritsenko, 2014, pp. 263–266, 322–342). This leads to development of the division and isolation of various types of labour as well as to their cooperation and socialization. Further development occurs towards forming universal labour, in which a separate, divided and isolated, type of activity (for example, labour of a scientist) constitutes the cooperation of labour with his contemporaries as well as predecessors through the use of accumulated knowledge, ideas, and general experience in the process of scientific creativity.

The process of joint and divided labour leads to the occurrence of joint and divided appropriation, which also historically develops and embodies, on the part of the division, in private and, on the part of joining, in government (public) forms of ownership. Private and public ownership are only final forms of joint and divided appropriation rather than the independent basis for an economic system. A thesis on private ownership as the basis for a market system and its inviolability is a theoretical aberration and premise of a capitalistic society. In reality, joint and divided appropriation embodied in forms of private and government (public) ownership is the basis for contemporary economic systems.

Corporate ownership is embodied in a general integral technical and technological complex of means of production as well as in its value divided into shares, which can be sold. Thus, an owner has an opportunity to appropriate own part of the value. Hence, corporate ownership is inherently joint and divided. Further development occurs towards the formation of universal ownership of knowledge and capacities of a human. Appropriation of these resources by one person does not exclude appropriation of them by other humans. Furthermore, knowledge and capacities will become universal ownership only when all the humans appropriate

them. Knowledge and capacities gradually turn into the main source and the most fundamental form of wealth.

Interrelated development of the division of labour and private ownership embody in the market economy while development of processes related to socialization of labour and public ownership implies the growth of importance of a government in regulation of social processes. In the contemporary society, the interrelation between the market economy and a government constitutes a deepening contradiction. The market economy does not exist without legal institutions for guaranteeing the execution of contracts and a central bank, which emits money for ensuring commodity turnover and functioning of a banking system while a state does not exist without a tax system and state budget formed in the monetary form, etc.

A number of fundamental papers examine issues of a state as one of basic institutions of a society in relation to the market economy (Heiets, 2009; Grinberg, & Rubinshteyn, 2013; Dementev, 2012). However, it is necessary to highlight that, at the current stage of development, an issue of the interrelation between a state and market may not be considered in the context of greater or less participation of a state in the economy. In the contemporary society, the market economy and state perform own indispensable complementary functions. This enables to enhance the significance of the state in the economy and to develop market relations simultaneously. A slogan «More government and more market» should substitute a liberal slogan («The less participation of a government in the economy is, the better economic conjuncture is») and a socialistic principle of socialization of the economy. At the same time, each performs its own functions: a market advances private interests when a government represents interests of a society.

A process of strengthening of complementarity of a market and state occurs through development of various forms of public-private partnership being a contemporary institutional way for solving contradictions of joint and divided labour and ownership owing to the compromise.

At the same time, universal labour and universal ownership as institutional and socio-economic basics of a society can be fully established together with forming the information and network economy, in which accumulating information owing to socialization of labour and a method of appropriation becomes the main way of wealth creation. The contemporary society is in the process of transition from the prevalence of relations of the division to the prevalence of relations of socialization, from the industrial and market to information and network economy, and from accumulating capital as the economic basis for development to accumulating information.

Internal contradictions are inherent to this process of transformation. Firstly, such contradictions imply a contradiction between relations of socialization (glo-

balization) manifesting themselves within information and network, as well as financial mechanisms and relations of division manifesting themselves in spatial and geographical localization of material and labour resources being not able to move in space at the speed of financial flows. Global conflicts are implications of expansion of this contradiction.

Secondly, such contradictions imply a contradiction between industrial and market systems and information and network ones. Information and network systems are grounded on dramatically different laws compared with industrial and market ones. For instance, appropriation of an information good by one entity does not exclude appropriation of this good by others. In contrast, material goods cannot be appropriated simultaneously by several entities. Forming the information and network economy within the industrial and market one leads to a situation when studied laws applies alongside with other unstudied and unknown laws, which grow in importance. For example, it is not possible to determine aggregate demand of the economy, in which half goods are normal and the other are network, using the former model. It will not adequately express the reality. Economic activity ceases to conform to knowledge acquired owing to former experience. Therefore, the decrease of governability of a society and strengthening of the chaotic nature of socio-economic and political processes are results of expansion of this contradiction. Thirdly, such contradictions imply a contradiction between accumulation of capital leading to the growth of economic inequality and requirements of universality of access to goods and their fair distribution under conditions of forming an information and network society. Social protests and revolutions are implications of such contradictions.

Conflict forms of manifestation of contradictions between financial globalization stipulated by information and technological transformations and spatial and geographical localization include: deep financial and economic crises in countries with the relatively weak economy within integration units; attempts of certain territorial units to gain independence; requirements of deeper regionalization; tackling intensification of integration of countries into the EU on the part of a set of political forces; armed conflicts in countries where economic and geopolitical interests of transnational corporations and countries of their origin are concentrated.

The growth of importance of transnational corporations constitutes an institutional form of entrenchment. The growth of importance of organizational and economic entities based on a certain territory and weakening of the role of territorial units, which may be qualified as a crisis of nation states, constitute an institutional form of entrenchment of localization.

Transnational corporations have significant advantages over national manufacturers at the expense of the economy of scale, opportunities of using results of the scientific and technological progress, etc. Hence, their presence in the markets of

less-developed countries leads to weakening national production. Nation countries hinder such process owing to a protectionist policy. Since transnational corporations are supported by countries of their origin, these conflicts frequently become international.

Thus, in the process of historical development, relations of socialization go beyond boundaries of a particular country and begin to encompass the global economic space through transnational corporations relying on support of their parent countries. Emergence and development of international economic unions are implications of such process. At the same time, interacting with the above-mentioned process, an opposite process of localization also develops. This process runs through a national system of market relations, spatial localization of economic entities, promoting the interests of national manufacturers in particular and a country in general under conditions of expansion of transnational corporations and countries, which keep globalization going.

A contradiction of this process contemplates that, on the one hand, transnational corporations gradually grow stronger and their power exceeds power of countries in certain respects and, on the other hand, citizens and economic entities become more and more independent from nation countries. A human may obtain education in one country but work in others. This human faces issues concerned with expenses for education (if education has been obtained free of charge, i. e. at the expense of a government), retirement payments, etc. Universities also frequently teach students and hire lecturers from various countries, and get funding from independent non-government sources. Such universities are more concerned about local self-governing, absence of local facilities, and reliable work of communal services rather than about relations with a government. Development of the information and network economy will strengthen such tendencies. The importance of nation countries will decrease whereas the importance of local self-governing and autonomization will increase.

If transnational corporations launch their business in less-developed countries, where labour productivity is lower and resource intensity is higher, they devastate national manufacturers. Such devastation is accompanied with the following consequences: the decrease of growth rate; the growth of unemployment, budget deficit, and trade deficit; the increase of an inflation rate; devaluation of national currency, etc. Thus, less-developed countries have undertaken a protectionist policy in such cases. Nevertheless, development of globalization and support of it by international economic organizations restrict opportunities of opportunistic behaviour of national economies even if they suffer considerable losses.

Liberalism, which has proven advantages of a free market, is an ideological basis of such policy. These advantages really exist when it comes to economically

equal partners proving their advantages in free rivalry. However, if one participant is significantly stronger than another, such rivalry turns into simple strangulation. It would be like a fight between heavyweight and lightweight boxers in the ring. An outcome is predetermined and has no alternative.

Such situation has emerged in Ukraine. In Ukraine, there is significantly lower productivity of labour and considerably higher resource intensity. Expanding of transnational corporations, which keep pace with technological developments, and use the economy of scale and other advantages, into the Ukrainian market leads to degradation of the national economy. To avoid such situation, there is a need to make serious effort directed towards reequipping manufacturing facilities, the growth of labour productivity, the decrease of energy intensity, improving technical standards, enhancing investment climate, etc. Liberalization of international trade should keep pace with these processes. Otherwise, serious negative consequences are inevitable.

Contradictions between globalization and territorial localization are solved through the movement towards two opposite directions: a) external one for countries: the formation of integration unions (e. g. the EU) and b) internal one: deep regionalization, development of local self-governing, or splitting of larger countries into smaller ones (e. g. the breakup of the USSR, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia). The movement towards opposite directions of solving contradictions between globalization and territorial localization eventually leads to the same result: to maximum localization of socio-economic entities, which are directly (not through government or other institutional units) connected to the entire world and, therefore, are maximally globalized. Inter-country integration, deep decentralization, and regionalization of power, as well as financial and organizational autonomization of non-commercial entities constitute contemporary forms of solving this contradiction.

A logical and historical process of development of labour, property, a market, and a state, globalization and localization constitute a framework of the socio-economic progress as a complicated interrelated process rather than the mechanical motion. Various countries move along own path at different speeds and with different results. Unevenness of economic development together with globalization, strengthening, and deepening interrelations between countries leads to the formation of an inverse type of transformational processes. Under conditions of globalization, less-developed countries cannot repeat a classic type of development (to form own internal market and balanced structure of the economy, and then to improve it through integration processes). Not having formed own balanced internal market, they are forced to join economies of various countries as their supplement (raw, energetic, agrarian, etc.) from the outset. Consequently, a classical procedure for forming market systems considerably changes and turns into the opposite one. This

leads to emergence of deep internal distortions, which cannot be corrected by a market. There is a need to use force of a government as a representor of common interests of a society.

In Ukraine, specific circumstances being stipulated partially by previous history and partially by subjective factors supplement and escalate these contradictions. Controversies between globalization and localization of production in Ukraine are intensified due to distinctions in directions of integration of various parts of Ukraine (because of historically stipulated structure of the economy). These orientations are embodied in subjective aspirations.

The author suggests two basic variants, liberal and dirigiste, for reformation of the Ukrainian economy and finding a way out of the crisis, not excluding a set of interim forms. The liberal variant for overcoming the crisis minimizing government participation in economic processes implies the following consequences:

- maximum liberalization and deregulation of the economy;
- a free economic zone with the EU;
- devastation of all uncompetitive manufactures;
- the dramatic reduction of the population due to the accelerated natural population decline, low fertility, and mass emigration;
- the decrease of a technological level of production and a population's level of education;
- protection and technical reequipping primary productions (crops, metal, etc.);
- breaking of large transnational corporations into all the sectors of the economy;
- limited existence of highly technological types of activity in the emerging information economy.

Under conditions of an inverse type of transformation and structural imbalance, a policy grounded on standards of liberalism and aimed at global strengthening a regime of saving may lead to an economic collapse.

Ukraine needs the dirigiste variant of reforms rather than the liberal one. This variant simultaneously frees up market forces through liberalization and deregulation of the economy and maximally uses a government influence for correcting major structural distortions and ensuring the dynamically developing and structurally balanced economy.

Conducting activities oriented towards correcting transformation processes, the government should take into account the integral nature of the economic system. Therefore, it must draw on laws and principles of architectonics intended to express harmony in relation to a whole.

Drawing on law of architectonics (the golden mean or golden middle and the golden ration or golden section), economists can determine rules for achieving dynamic equilibrium of an economic system:



- all the measures of government influence on an economy should orient towards attaining long-term equilibrium, should not initiate and support processes leading to the formation of tendencies, which do not correspond to equilibrium trends;
- the equilibrium state of the system is achieved when parameters of an economic process equal average values;
  - deviations within 5.6% from average values of a trend is a way of implementing the trend and does not need any interference or corrections;
  - deviations within 5.6–14.6% need thorough analysis and ascertainment of reasons;
  - deviations within the range exceeding 14.6% of average values require corrections because they create risks of destabilization of the system;
  - corrections of complicated economic processes, which include a number of flows, should be carried out according to the following rule: a greater deviation of the process from a general trend is, a more significant correction it needs.

Thus, an interval from 5.6% to 14.6% is a zone of transition from stable existence of a whole to risks of destabilization of its state. All the measures related to correction of economic processes should occur within the mentioned interval. They can change the course of economic processes, not destabilizing them.

A budgetary and tax, as well as monetary and credit policy should primarily aim at overcoming structural deformations emerged owing to combining an inverse type of market transformations and globalization. The basic destruction has emerged because Ukraine has not created own basic complex of internal socio-economic development, has not formed own internal market, has not created corresponding consumer and production demand and supply, has not met basic needs of a population, but has promptly adopted to fragments of an external market as a substitute for secondary production in other countries. This basic destruction manifests in a wide range of other produced structural deformations and constitutes a factor for further disproportional development.

Under such conditions, the economic growth based on market mechanisms means deterioration of the structure of the Ukrainian economy (the increase of a share of primary production) and the approach of a more deep crisis. Ukraine is affected by the reduction of external demand more than other countries because GDP fluctuates due to changes of global prices for metals rather than in response to an economic policy of the government.

Hence, it is necessary to find a way for overcoming basic and derivative destructions of the economy of Ukraine (Hrytsenko, 2014). The main goal of structural reformation consists in *the creation of a basic economic complex of internal development and corresponding institutional architectonics* in Ukraine. They would become the basis for development of the internal market, changing rules of the game in the economy and society, solving social problems, and the growth of export

potential on the health structural basis rather than the destructed one. Such complex cannot be created only on the basis of market principles (they direct development of the structure towards an already formed source of raw materials) and requires a purposeful government economic policy.

There are the following three interrelated goals being prior in this structural reformation:

- a) solving basic problems of reproduction of human activity (nutrition, shelter, and health);
- b) development of facilities (roads, transport, and communication);
- c) creating conditions for innovative development (education, science, and innovations).

### **Conclusion of the research.**

1. Adequate understanding reasons, the nature, and peculiarities of the contemporary crisis and finding a way out of it are impossible in case of using empirical and functional approaches and requires the application of the logical and historical methodology, which includes: a) disclosure of a general logical and historical line of development of economic phenomena and processes leading to the crisis; b) taking into consideration the historical specificity of structural changes of an economic system in inverse types of transformational processes, which significantly determine the content of crisis phenomena; c) applying principles and laws of architectonics to development of practical recommendations in regard to ways for overcoming the crisis;

2. Applying the logical and historical methodology shows that the crisis in Ukraine is an outcome of processes encouraged by the Ukrainian specificity as well as the manifestation of the global tendencies and controversies. It encompasses contradictions of socio-economic, political, and spiritual development being universal, peculiar, and inherent only to Ukraine.

3. The universal contradictions are contradictions between globalization and territorial localization of material and labour resources, which manifests in problems of integration of Ukraine into international economic unions and regionalization, and contradictions between the current industrial and market system and the formation of the information and network economy. The information and network economy manifests in fragmentation of a human and society, the growth of uncertainty and risks of expansion of crisis processes, as well as global conflicts.

1. Contradictions encouraged by combining processes of globalization and the inverse nature of market transformation are peculiar and inherent to countries with developing markets, which actively integrate with developed countries. Existence of such contradictions in Ukraine has resulted in the formation of the basic destruction (implying that a country has adjusted to certain fragments of the global

economy as a substitute for secondary production in other countries, not having had created its own internal market and solved basic problems of reproduction of human activity) and derivative disproportions.

2. There are specific contradictions in Ukraine, which are concerned with the distinction in directions of integration of various parts of Ukraine (because of historically stipulated structure of the economy). This contradiction is embodied in corresponding subjective ideological, mental, and political aspirations being represented in behaviour of various groups and strata of the population.

3. International integration, deep decentralization, and regionalization of power as well as financial and organizational autonomization of non-commercial entities are contemporary forms of solving these contradictions.

4. Compromise forms for solving the contradictions of joint and divided relations and building a socio-economic system, which imply simultaneous freeing up market forces provided by liberalization and deregulation of the economy and the maximum use of a government influence for correcting major structural distortions and creating institutional architectonics for the dynamically developing and structurally balanced economy, contain concrete ways for overcoming the crisis. This contemplates a tax reform, correcting monetary and credit policy, and structural reforms of all the basic components of the socio-economic system.

## REFERENCES

- Dementev, V. V. (2012). *Instituty, povedeniye, vlast [Institutions, behavior, power]*. Donetsk: GVUZ «Donetskiy natsionalniy tehnicheskiy universitet» [in Ukrainian].
- Grinberg, R. S., & Rubinshteyn, A. Ya. (2013). *Individuum & gosudarstvo: ekonomicheskaya dilemma [Individual & State: Economic Dilemma]*. Moskva: Ves mir [in Russian].
- Gritsenko, A. (2014). *Institutsionalnaya politicheskaya ekonomiya: predmet, metodologiya, sodержanie [Institutional political economy: subject, methodology, content]*. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing [in Russian].
- Gritsenko, A. A. (Ed.). (2008). *Institutsionalnaya arhitektonika i dinamika ekonomicheskikh preobrazovaniy [Institutional Architectonics and Dynamics of Economic Transformations]*. Harkov: Fort [in Russian].
- Gritsenko, A. A. (Ed.). (2013). *Ierarhiya i seti v institutsionalnoy arhitektonike ekonomicheskikh system [Hierarchy and networks in the institutional architectonics of economic systems]*. Kiev, NAN Ukrainyi, In-t ekon. i prognozirov. [in Russian].
- Halchynskiy, A. S. (2014). Konverhentnyi rynek – metodolohiia perspektyvy [Convergent Market – Perspectives Methodology]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine, 1*, 4–20 [in Ukrainian].
- Heiets, V. M. (2009). *Suspilstvo, derzhava, ekonomika: fenomenolohiia vzaємodii ta rozvytku [Society, state, economics: phenomenology of interaction and development]*. Kyiv: NAN Ukrainyi; In-t ekon. ta prohnozuv [in Ukrainian].
- Heiets, V. M. (2013). Yake maibutnie u sotsialnoi derzhavy? [What is the future of a social state?]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine, 7*, 4–20 [in Ukrainian].

- Heiets, V. M., & Hrytsenko, A. A. (2013). Vykhid z kryzy (rozдумы nad aktualnym u zviazku z prochytanym) [Out of the crisis (reflection on the actual in connection with the read)]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 6, 4–19 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrytsenko, A. (2014). Systemna kryza yak naslidok bazovoi destrukttsii ekonomiky Ukrainy i shliakhy yii podolannia [Systemic crisis as a consequence of the basic destruction of Ukraine's economy and ways to overcome it]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho banku Ukrainy – Bulletin of the National Bank of Ukraine*, 5 (219) [in Ukrainian].
- Kisterskyi, L. L. (2014). U poshukakh vykhodu z kryzy: Bibliia ochyma ekonomista [In search of a way out of the crisis: The Bible in the eyes of an economist]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 1, 21–32 [in Ukrainian].
- Kolodko, Hzhhezh V. (2013). Novyi Prahmatyzm, abo ekonomika pomirnosti [New Pragmatism, or Economy of Moderation]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 11, 4–12 [in Ukrainian].
- Kovalchuk, T. T. (2014). SOS – v Ukraini neokolonialna model valiutnoi polityky [SOS – a neocolonial model of currency policy in Ukraine]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 10, 4–13 [in Ukrainian].
- Krychevska, T. O. (2014). Mozhyvosti pidvyshchennia efektyvnosti hroshovo-kredytnoho stymuliuвання ekonomiky (dosvid Brazyl'skoho banku rozvytku) [Possibilities of increasing the efficiency of monetary and economic stimulation of the economy (experience of the Brazilian Development Bank)]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 3, 4–19 [in Ukrainian].
- Moskalenko, O. M. (2014). Vyperedzhaiuchy ekonomichnyi rozvytok: teoretyko-instytutsionalni zasady i problemy realizatsii v Ukraini [Advancing economic development: theoretical and institutional principles and problems of realization in Ukraine]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 8, 4–18 [in Ukrainian].
- Nort, D., Uollis, D., & Vayngast, B. (2011). Nasiliye i sotsialnyye poryadki. Kontseptualnyye ramki dlya interpretatsii pismennoy istorii chelovechestva [Violence and social order. Conceptual framework for the interpretation of the written history of mankind]. Moskva: Izd-vo Instituta Gaydara [in Russian].
- Onyshchenko, V. P. (2014). Ontolohichni kontekst ekonomichnoi kryzy [The Ontological Context of the Economic Crisis]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 4, 4–17 [in Ukrainian].
- Podliesna, V. H. (2014). Tsyklichnist u rozghortanni ta podolanni ekonomichnykh kryz [Cycle in the Deployment and Overcoming of Economic Crises]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 9, 4–18 [in Ukrainian].
- Riazanov, V. T. (2014). Ekonomichna polityka pislia kryzy: chy stane vona znovu keinsianskoiu? [Economic policy after the crisis: will it become Keynesian again?]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 5, 4–27 [in Ukrainian].
- Sharov, O. M. (2014). Vykhid z kryzy: uroky «planu Marshalla» ta perspektyvy dlia Ukrainy [Out of the crisis: Lessons from the «Marshall Plan» and Perspectives for Ukraine]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 12 [in Ukrainian].
- Tarasevych, V. M. (2013). Pro oriientyry i napriamy vykhodu z kryzy [About the landmarks and directions of the crisis]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 9, 4–17 [in Ukrainian].

- U poshukakh vykhodu na traiektoriiu staloho ekonomichnoho zrostantia (materialy kolektivnoho obhovorennia) [In search of a trajectory of sustainable economic growth (materials of collective discussion)]. (2014). *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 7, 4–26 [in Ukrainian].
- Unkovska, T. Ye., & Demchuk, N. I. (2013). Chy mozhlyve ekonomichne dyvo v Ukraini? [Is there an economic miracle in Ukraine?]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 12, 4–21 [in Ukrainian].
- Yarenko, O. L., & Dmytrenko, O. V. (2014). Instytutsiini efekty netradytsiinoi hrshovo-kredytnoi polityky: postupova adaptatsiia abo finansova synhuliarnist? [Institutional Effects of Non-traditional Monetary Policy: Gradual Adaptation or Financial Singularity?]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 2, 4–15 [in Ukrainian].
- Yeshchenko, P. S. (2013). Ekonomichne zrostantia bez rozvytku: prychny i shliakhy innovatsiinoho peretvorennia ekonomiky [Economic growth without development: causes and ways of innovative transformation of economy]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 10, 4–20 [in Ukrainian].
- Yeshchenko, P. S. (2014). Svitu potriben novyi vektor rozvytku: vid bubbleeconomics – do ekonomiky liudyny [The world needs a new vector of development: from bubbleeconomics – to the human economy]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 6, 4–22 [in Ukrainian].
- Zvieriakov, M. I. (2013). U poshukakh vykhodu z kryzy [In search of a way out of the crisis]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy – Economy of Ukraine*, 8, 4–21 [in Ukrainian].

Article details:

Received: 24 December 2018

Revised: 23 January 2019

Accepted: 18 February 2019

### **А. А. ГРИЦЕНКО**

член-корреспондент НАН Украины, доктор экономических наук, профессор, заместитель директора Института экономики и прогнозирования НАН Украины, Украина, г. Киев

### **Е. А. ГРИЦЕНКО**

доктор экономических наук, профессор, профессор кафедры экономической теории Национального юридического университета имени Ярослава Мудрого, Украина, г. Харьков

## **ОСОБЕННОСТИ СОВРЕМЕННОГО КРИЗИСА В УКРАИНЕ: ЛОГИКО-ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЙ ПОДХОД**

В статье раскрыты логико-исторические основания современного кризиса и особенности его проявления в Украине, обоснованы базовые подходы к поиску путей выхода из кризиса и намечены направления коррекций налоговой, денежно-кредитной политики и преодоления структурных деформаций.

**Ключевые слова:** кризис, логико-историческая методология, совместно-разделенные отношения, экономические противоречия, структурные деформации и реформы, налоговая система, денежно-кредитная политика.

**А. А. ГРИЦЕНКО**

член-корреспондент НАН України, доктор економічних наук, професор, заступник директора Інституту економіки та прогнозування НАН України, Україна, м. Київ

**О. А. ГРИЦЕНКО**

доктор економічних наук, професор, професор кафедри економічної теорії Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого, Україна, м. Харків

## **ОСОБЛИВОСТІ СУЧАСНОЇ КРИЗИ В УКРАЇНІ: ЛОГІКО-ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ПІДХІД**

**Постановка проблеми.** Криза в Україні має системний характер і концентрує в собі як власні, так і світові проблеми. Широке коло економістів обговорюють проблеми причин і природи кризи, його факторів і динаміки, наслідків і шляхів подолання.

**Аналіз останніх досліджень і публікацій.** У сучасних дослідженнях панує емпірично-функціональна методологія, яка орієнтується на зовнішні функціональні форми. Останнім часом дедалі більше вчених розуміють необхідність використання методологічних підходів, спрямованих на поняття глибинних суперечностей сучасного світу, що знайшло своє відображення в широкомасштабній дискусії на сторінках журналу «Економіка України».

**Формулювання цілей.** Метою статті є визначення орієнтирів розвитку України в сучасних умовах на основі розуміння об'єктивних закономірностей суспільного розвитку. Фундаментом такого підходу стає логіко-історична методологія.

**Виклад основного матеріалу.** В основі соціально-економічного розвитку знаходиться спільно-розподілена діяльність (спільно-розподілене привласнення), суперечність якої визначає вектор та характер існування суспільства. Процес трансформації суспільних відносин характеризується сукупністю внутрішніх суперечностей. По-перше, це суперечності між відносинами загальності (глобалізація), що знаходять у собі адекватну форму реалізації в інформаційно-мережових і фінансових механізмах, і відносинами роздільності, що реалізуються в просторовій (між країнами) локалізації матеріальних і трудових ресурсів, які можуть переміщатися в просторі зі швидкістю фінансових потоків. Результатом розгортання цих суперечностей є глобальна конфліктність. По-друге, це суперечність між індустріально-ринковими і інформаційно-мережовими системами. Інформаційно-мережові системи засновані на принципово інших законах порівняно з індустріально-ринковими.

В Україні ці суперечності доповнюються і загострюються специфічними обставинами, зумовленими частково попередньою історією, частково суб'єктивними факторами. Зокрема, суперечності між глобалізацією і локалізацією виробництва в Україні посилюється тією обставиною, що різні частини України в силу історично сформованої структури економіки об'єктивно зацікавлені в різних напрямках інтеграції, що виявляється в суб'єктивних устремліннях.

**Висновки.** 1. Адекватне розуміння причин, природи, особливостей сучасної кризи і шляхів виходу з нього неможливе на базі емпірико-функціональних підходів, а вимагає застосування логіко-історичної методології, яка включає: а) розкриття загальної логіко-історичної лінії розвитку економічних явищ і процесів, що призвели до кризи; б) облік історичної специфіки структурних змін економічної системи в інверсійних типах трансформаційних процесів.

2. Застосування логіко-історичної методології показує, що криза в Україні є результатом не тільки тих процесів, які породжені українською специфікою, але є вираженням загальносвітових тенденцій і суперечностей. Вона поєднує в собі загальні, особливі і властиві тільки Україні суперечності соціально-економічного, політичного і духовного розвитку.

3. Загальними є суперечності між глобалізацією і державно-територіальною локалізацією матеріальних і трудових ресурсів, які проявляються в проблемах інтеграції України в міждержавні економічні об'єднання та регіоналізації, і суперечності між існуючою індустріально-ринковою системою і формуванням інформаційно-мережевої економіки, які проявляються у фрагментації людини і суспільства, зростанні невизначеності, ризиків розгортання кризових процесів і глобальних конфліктів.

4. Особливими, характерними для країн з ринками, що формуються, але активно інтегруються з розвиненими державами, є суперечності, породжені з'єднанням процесів глобалізації та інверсійного характеру ринкових трансформацій, що призвело в Україні до формування базової деструкції, яка полягає в тому, що країна, не створивши свого внутрішнього ринку і, не вирішивши базових проблем відтворення людської життєдіяльності, пристосувалася до окремих фрагментів світової економіки як сировинного придатка і похідні від цього диспропорції.

5. Сучасними формами вирішення цих суперечностей є міждержавна інтеграція, глибока децентралізація, регіоналізація влади і фінансово-організаційна автономізація структур некомерційного сектору.

6. Конкретні шляхи виходу з кризи необхідно шукати в компромісних формах розв'язання суперечностей спільно-розподілених відносин і вибудовування соціально-економічної системи на основі одночасного вивільнення за допомогою лібералізації та дерегуляції економіки ринкових сил і максимального використання сили держави для виправлення базових структурних деформацій і створення інституцій збалансованої економіки. Це передбачає податкову реформу, корекцію грошово-

кредитної політики і структурні реформи всіх базових складових соціально-економічної системи.

**Коротка анотація статті**

**Анотація.** В статті розкрито логіко-історичні основи сучасної кризи та її особливості в Україні, обґрунтовані базові підходи до пошуку виходу з кризи й окреслені напрями корекції податкової, грошово-кредитної політики та подолання структурних деформацій.

**Ключові слова:** криза, логіко-історична методологія, спільно-розподілені відносини, економічні суперечності, структурі деформації і реформи, податкова система, грошово-кредитна політика.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 24.12.2018 р.

Стаття пройшла рецензування 23.01.2019 р.

Стаття рекомендована до опублікування 18.02.2019 р.

**Рекомендоване цитування:** Гриценко А. А., Гриценко О. А. Особливості сучасної кризи в Україні: логіко-історичний підхід. *Економічна теорія та право*. 2019. № 1 (36). С. 11–26. DOI: 10.31359/2411-5584-2019-36-1-11.

**Suggested Citation:** Grytsenko A. A. & Grytsenko O. A. (2019). Osoblyvosti suchasnoi kryzy v Ukraini: lohiko-istorychnyi pidkhid [Peculiarities of the current crisis in Ukraine: a logical and historical approach]. *Ekonomichna teoriia ta pravo – Economic Theory and Law*, 1 (36), 11–26. DOI: 10.31359/2411-5584-2019-36-1-11.