

Hrytsenko A.A., *Corresponding Member, NAS of Ukraine*
Deputy Director
Institute for Economics and Forecasting
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

THE ECONOMY OF UKRAINE ON THE PATH TO INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT

On the basis of logico-historical methodology, the article reveals the peculiar features Ukraine's economic development since gaining independence. It is shown that the major historical collisions are determined by the logic of jointly-divided labor, which manifests itself in different historical relationship (market and state, capitalization and socialization, liberalism and socialism, globalization and localization), and at present takes the form of the problem of inclusion of certain elements of socio-economic system in the overall process of social development.

The author specifies the factors that caused the peculiarities the market oriented transformation of Ukraine's economy, its inversion nature and basis distortions. Separated the systemic and fragmentary inclusivity, whose reverse side is the social exclusivity that emerges from precarisation. The author justifies the necessity to fill the idea of independence with positive achievements in the context of revealing and realizing this country's internal potential and transition to inclusive development.

Key words: independence, commonly divided labour, overall historical logic, market transformations of inverted type, economic sovereignty, competitiveness, fragmented and systemic inclusivity, social exclusion, degradation, inclusive development.

JEL: A13

25 years of independent Ukraine can be viewed as an instant from the perspective of the history of mankind with epochs changing and states and civilizations coming and disappearing. It can also be seen as a rather respectable length of time from the standpoint of a lifetime of a man or a generation. In this period an economy can grow more than 15 times, as is the case with China, or it can fell more than one third, as it happened with Ukraine. Ukraine's economy has demonstrated a real "economic miracle" in a reverse sense. There has never been in history a development, when a country that was among the first ten most industrialized nations has lost in twenty five years a large portion of its industrial potential and more than a third of its GDP, has exhibited one of the record worst economic dynamics globally and joined the ranks of the poorest countries in Europe. How has it happened? These "achievements" need to be studied to avoid their repetition elsewhere.

In Ukraine, to our chagrin, there is no popular demand for theoretical constructs explaining what has happened in it. No demand, that is, for learning more than the sequence of events, for finding those responsible and the culprits, and no demand for understanding the whole process. The lack of this demand from the public also requires clarification.

It is only possible to comprehend the logic of historical movement of the society in Ukraine through the methodology of historical logic. This methodology seems

relevant, because it comprises reviewing the general logic of the development of society. Secondly, it reviews specific aspects of historical period in which events took place, and thirdly, specific aspects of concrete historical period or instance. Only an amalgamation of these three junctures enables one to restore specific logic of a specific subject, which in this research is Ukraine during the period of its independence.

In the format Ukraine had existed before its independence that republic was a product of world history. Not only from the developmental perspective of all fragments in space and time, but also because all the substantial requisites of Ukraine were the fruits of the struggle along the central axis of history. This axis started with the division of labour as an initial economic requisite (shaping out a person as a social individual and society as a collective of people) and went on through the process of their historical development¹. Then this line of historical development splits. It goes into a separating new line that results in the division of labour and individual professions and bears market economy. The line of coalescence develops through coordination and governance into an institution of the state (the line of the market economy and the state). Each line after the split excludes its opposite aspect. The more labour is divided, the more its private nature is clear, the more its socialization. And the more the institution of the state is developed, the better it epitomizes the interests of people (the line of society and state). These two lines (market economy – state and society – state) through one additional section form a triangle "society – state – economy". Each side of this triangle impacts the other, but the foundation of the triangle is the economy that by the division of labour gives birth to the development of both the society and state. These interrelations are a subject of our research through which we are trying to respond to modern challenges [3,4]. At the beginning of XX century the division of labour reached a level, where materialized and accumulated labour embodied in private property started antagonizing the socialized labour that didn't have its adequate expression in the form of public property. This turned into antagonism of the subjects of capital and hired labour and classes of capitalists and hired working people. It was realized and resolved through attaining a new level. All fundamental antagonisms are resolved like this. For instance, K.Marx in his analysis of the endogenous controversies of merchandise wrote that "development of merchandise does not remove these controversies, but creates a form for their movement. This is a method of tackling real controversies. For example, there is a controversy in the fact that one subject falling on the other is constantly moving away from it. Ellipsis is one of the forms of movement in which this controversy occurs and gets solved at the same time" [5].

¹This instance has been proven in theory and in practice. Children, who are born blind, mute and deaf usually do not develop human intelligence, psyche and faculties. They do not become part of humanity. But the experiments done by O.Meshcheriacov and I.Socoliansky and analyzed by E.Iliencov discovered that through jointly divided activities these children are capable of developing human consciousness and intelligence [1]. Their students even became scientists and won doctorates. This is a proof of jointly divided activities as a kind of formation of a human. In this case though there is a teacher possessing all human abilities, who brings infants into the world humans using jointly divided activities. There have been no subjects in human history who commanded already formed human faculties. These faculties appeared along with the subjects engaged in jointly divided labour that historically was an initial form of jointly divided activity [2].

Creative discussions on systemic problems of social development

Inherent controversy of jointly divided labour the top of which was at the beginning of XX century a controversy between private property (dividing line) and socialized labour (coalescing line) intrinsic to capital (capitalist type of economy) reached a new level. It turned into the opposition of two global systems, capitalism and socialism. The first is viewed by us as an embodiment of division, of private principles, the second as an embodiment of joint, social principles. It is clear that some principles of one system did not preclude, but included the opposing relations, but in a dependent form. Thus under capitalism founded on principles of private ownership, socialization of economy developed (pension systems, social security, concepts of popular relations in management, etc.). Socialism, founded on social principles, saw the development of monetary and trade relations that personify the principles of division and separation.

All the history of XX century unfolded along the line of the struggle of the two systems that went on in different political, economic, scientific, military and other forms and affected each of the two. Capitalism involved more and more socialization, and socialism more and more monetary and commercial exchanges leading to capitalism. This process came to a yet higher level at the boundary between XX and XXI centuries. Contrast between capitalization and socialization became an internal problem of the global system with the break-up of the USSR and socialist system. The role of a leading controversy has passed to a contradiction between globalization and localization. The first unfolds along the line of coalescence and is materializing primarily through financial, economic and IT domains, the second develops divisively and materializes in the notions of space and territory. The growing role of trans-national corporations institutionalizes globalization, and increasing role of territorial organizational and economic structures enhances localization. The weakening of territorial state entities can be viewed as the crises of nation-states.

Ukraine had her historical trajectory in this overall logic of global development. After a socialist state (in the USSR) was created, industrialization became its key priority. New social order could not be preserved without doing it. Predominantly agrarian area could only be industrialized in short time with reliance on agriculture. Ukraine was transformed into one of the key areas of industrial development. This has become a heroic story of industrialization on one hand, and a tragic story of losses of lives and famine on the other. Both stories are parts of one and the same history that gets incomprehensible, if you separate one from the other.

Subsequent economic development and transformation of Ukraine into one the most heavily industrialized areas was also related to the struggle between the two systems. That was the reason for a large share of defence sector in the economy of Ukraine.

The dissolution of the USSR and of socialist system has also resulted in a de-facto revision of the results of the Second World War. Entire states disappeared (USSR, GDR, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia) along with the equilibrium and legal foundation resulting from the outcome of the Second World War. It was clear that these breaking lines had the tendency to spread, and that appeared to happen. This process might

not have ended yet, because it would not be logical, if Ukraine that was all the time at a forefront of world history would not feel intrinsic problems of these developments. In modern time Ukraine once again came to the forefront of European and Eurasian integration. This trend has had a strong impact on its existence.

That was the sequence and logic of historical events that Ukraine, having proclaimed its independence, had to resolve its problems. The notion of independence has its inherent dialectics. It is adequate and plays an important role only at an initial stage. Afterwards it turns into something abstract veiling a distorted image of reality. Independence was a first denial of dependence from which it spun off, used it as jump board, but continued to have its aspects and features. In other words, independence itself depends on dependence.

This is not a purely logical proposition. It reflects upon a structure of reality and practice. Ukrainian specificity expresses itself first of all through denial in economics, in politics, in ideology and culture (of a common economic space of the USSR by destroying of many critically important economic links, political structure, ideological views and cultural stereotypes of the Soviet Union by abandoning them). This is a needed initial transitional stage in the movement to new society.

If we dawdle at this stage, we might lose positive momentum and convert independence into a formal slogan hiding another reality. Regrettably, Ukraine is bogged down in this stage. It has not built its basic and balanced economy integrated as an equal into global economic space on a footing of equivalent commercial exchanges. It has adapted to global economy as an appendage for commodity supplies, it has not built political system or global vision adequate to its social situation. Industrial structure of its economy has significantly deteriorated in the last 25 years, its society has become stratified by incomes and properties, public consciousness has fragmented and repugnance penetrated all areas of life. Instead of deploying its potential in economics and society Ukraine has stressed its priority of independence. It is not for nothing that a book entitled "The Ukraine Is Not Russia" became a bestseller. Why wasn't it a book with a title "What Is Ukraine?" or "How Do We See Ukraine?" or "The New Ukraine". It could seem a non-important historical nuance. But such nuances reflect the subconscious that manages behavior more thoroughly than the conscious.

It might seem that dramatic changes have taken place in Ukrainian politics, as allocation of authority, the Parliament, President, Government, multi-party system, democratic election etc. differ political system of Ukraine significantly as compared to the former Soviet Union or its Ukrainian Republic. Viewed formally, they do. But if you analyze how the authority is discharged in practice (and not according to formal procedures), we can understand that its hidden structure is absolutely different. Does Ukrainian Parliament promulgate some decisions that were not developed by its MPs, but by a small circle of powers that be (in some of whom formal authority has not even been vested)? And does it really differ from the decision making process of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU? Some of their decisions were also informal and did not deal with the party matters only, but with all spheres of life of Soviet society. They differed, but formally rather than in essence.

Ukrainian independence in today's circumstances cannot be a foundation for a nation, it only is one of the scopes of transitional period. Independence that emerges from a mere denial of dependence remains formal and devoid of substance. Only another denial of dependence, the second one, signifies passing to liberty. Ukrainian Liberty becomes dependent, but dependent externally, not domestically. It becomes dependent on its intrinsic substance and demands, on the need to discover and fulfill the potential of Ukrainian society and its citizens. Such liberty means responsibility for the actions of the Ukrainians and for the results of these actions. That is why liberty in all its manifestations (economic, political, legal, moral, etc.) may and must become a reliable basis for our nation.

Interplay between dependence and independence is dialectic and complicated. Individual and society both are shaped out by the relations of mutual dependence in the process of divided labour. Wherever people's mutual dependence disappears, society also vanishes. What can independence of a child from his parents may mean? Independence of a society at large? Death or existence of an animal. When one thinks for the first time about one's freedom, one's thoughts are expressed in a specific language. This child is a child of his specific parents and he or she has specific assets and faculties. Nobody asked that child whether he or she wanted to be born or not. The child did not fulfill free choice of his/her parents.

Even when ancient people hunted, they were dependent on each other's roles for herding and killing the game. All progress of mankind goes through the division of labour and collaboration, in other terms, it goes through stronger dependence of people of each other. Globalization exacerbates this process. Not only people are mutually dependent, but all their associations, nations, economic, political and other entities. This dependence constitutes an element of their well-being and development. Considering these circumstances, independence can only make sense as necessary stage of transition to genuine liberty.

Economic sovereignty is quintessential manifestation of economic liberty. It has been explored in the world literature for a long time now, and this issue becomes ever more topical [6]. It is actively discussed in Ukraine too [7]. Economic sovereignty issues gain traction in economic and political spheres within the realms of Ukraine's eurointegration, its relations with the US, Russia, international economic organizations. They are signal for the economic domain of national security, national control of banking sector, etc.

Sovereignty conjoins naturally with subjecting and intends setting of priorities and decision-making capacity. But some decisions can be forced upon and taken under pressure, denying sovereignty right away. And sovereignty has traits of supremacy and should be beyond control. Decisions therefore should be founded on free choice from amongst alternative variants. Lack of alternative means that the sovereignty of choice is either lacking or is latent, not manifesting itself.

But sovereignty is not enough for Ukraine. Sovereign decision must manifest the subject's own interests. The government can for various reasons (poor understanding, interests of the officials themselves, etc.) can make decisions that are not indicative of the interests of society and of the government as its representative. In this case

subject's (government of Ukraine's) decisions do not present its own interests. They are not therefore sovereign. Sovereignty combines subject's interest and purpose. The purpose is to fulfill one's own interest. One's actions are driven by it, and because of that it is an object of these actions. The object's movement and the subject's activity combine in this process. This is an important indicator of sovereignty.

The issue of one's interest is complex. It is not explicit and obvious. A subject might not acknowledge his/her own interest or have a distorted understanding of it. School pupil's best interest is to study as best he/she can, but a pupil is not aware of it at all times. To answer a question of what Ukraine's best interests are one needs to know what is Ukraine, how it was created, how it was developing, what were its specific aspects. One should also understand what place does it have in natural, social and cultural realms, what are the tendencies of its development and objective prospects vis-à-vis global trends, and how can it realize its interest in the entirety of these circumstances. Only Ukrainian society's elite is capable of determining this task. And economic elite alone can do this in terms of Ukraine's economy. Therefore the sovereignty of the state cannot be accomplished without elite.

One can imagine of course a Ukraine that does not exist in real life and then work persistently for the fulfillment of interests of that erroneously imagined Ukraine. Thus the most sincere wishes and most loyal actions can cause Ukraine more damage than the acts of its open opponents. There have been similar instances in Ukraine's history.

Making sovereign decision and implementing it signifies merely formal sovereignty. Real sovereignty includes merging the wishes and practical steps. Implementation of an approach that includes interdependence of the countries, the subject's own interest, non-prejudiced options of its fulfillment in given historical and institutional conditions dialectically personifies the implementation of the tasks of improvement of the Ukraine's economy competitiveness. The higher is Ukraine's competitiveness, the better can its economic sovereignty be attained.

The link between sovereignty and national competitiveness of Ukrainians were expounded by Y.Zhalylo and D.Pokryshca. They once wrote that "priorities of practical achievement of state sovereignty are strengthening of national competitiveness and economic security of the state in conditions of growing openness of economy" [7]. Index of global competitiveness includes an array of aspects that reflect economic development, status of public and social institutions, infrastructure, health care, education, etc. This is in essence a holistic assessment of the level of socio-economic development of one country in comparison with the others. It shows the real prospects of a country, and thus the boundaries of its sovereignty. Regrettably, competitiveness of Ukraine's economy is very low. It now is in the 79th place among 140 countries included into the global index of competitiveness. It is in the 130 place by its institutional development, 134 by its macroeconomic environment, 121 by level of development of its financial market. The level of development of its labour market is better, 56 place, health care and primary education 45, higher education 34 place, but this is mainly past achievements rather than results of its modern development.

How then did it happen that sovereign, independent, democratic, social state with the rule of law was to be constructed according to the Constitution of Ukraine, and the result was absolutely opposite? The country that emerges in twenty five years depends politically, financially and economically on overseas. This country is oligarchic, with deep social inequality, corrupt court system and the weaker strata of its population totally legally defenceless.

At the beginning of its independence Ukraine's situation was difficult, and it was not adequately acknowledged. Overall difficulty was that our country was deeply integrated into the economic complex of the USSR, which was to a significant extent militarized. Ukraine's rupture of economic ties with Russia was a result of an attempt by each republic of the Union to build an economy of its own. Ukraine's situation turned out to be more difficult than that of many other republics. This break-up process coincided in time with the transition to market economy. At that time both in Russia and in Ukraine liberal approaches prevailed, endorsed by international institutions. Russia liberalized prices and this caused hyperinflation. Ukraine could not withstand that. There were no specialists having knowledge and experience of work under market economy conditions. The ways of thinking of politicians, of subjects of economic activities and citizenry had been formed in the directive and planning economy, were mainly linear in their approaches and were not in a position to absorb complexity and mainly non-linear substance of the processes of economic transition.

Lack of understanding of the fact that transition to market economy was transforming not only economic mechanism, but also dislocating production assets. This was perhaps one of the key circumstances that determined prolonged transformational crisis in Ukraine (for not less than a decade). Under market economy manufactures, towns and villages are often created in places different than those that are typical for directive and planning economy. That's why a lot of directors of enterprises, who initially were glad to take part in privatization and enjoyed their independence, discovered quite soon that their factories in the towns and cities where they were located, were not needed in the new market economy at all. A lot of time was needed to harmonize the location of material assets and human resources with imperatives of the market economy laws.

One more, and not less important circumstance is that Ukraine's transition was not classic, but inversion in its nature. We do not yet understand and taken it into consideration. In the classic variant formation of market economy took place alongside industrial development. It proceeded from small private property to the big and from free competition to monopolies and variety of market entities, from free setting of prices to public regulation of prices. Everything is reverted in the inversion market transformation (industrial development was based on already existing planning economic system, and market economy did not exist at that time). Market system was formed through transition from predominantly public property to the private and various other forms, from directive planning to competition, from public regulation of prices to free formation of them. The order, and subsequently the essence of economic transformations in classic and inversion types of market transformation were en-

tirely different. Foreign experts were visiting Ukraine and were giving recommendations of classic type, and we were supposed to stick to them invariably. But if these suggestions proceeded from one type of market transformations and real transformations went on in opposite direction, what could their result be? Naturally the opposite to what was expected. And that was what's happened.

Inversion type of market transformation and domination of liberal approaches oriented towards self-regulation of market economy conjoined with globalization. This was happening under the conditions of much lower level of Ukraine's economic development (its labour productivity lags behind that of the developed countries and the level of resource consumption by the economy of Ukraine is several times higher than in developed economies). These aspects invariably make Ukraine adapt to various components of world economy merely as both industrial and agricultural commodities supplier (main exports are metals, chemical products, grain and technical crops). Even Ukraine's domestic market remains non-structured, and its enlargement based on importation of more technologically advanced products and growing exportation of commodities means only extensive recreation of already existing disproportions. Ukrainian economy is being ruined and this process is perpetuated on larger and larger scale. In these conditions economic growth reinforces the already formed disproportions that inevitably ends with crises initiated as a rule by current account deficits, as is demonstrated by all of the crises that have already happened in Ukraine. The main prerequisite for a crisis is growing deficit of the balance of trade and of current account, which during a period of economic growth can be offset for some time by the funds deriving from capital and finance operations. These funds have faster turnover and shrink drastically at critical moments.

Couldn't Ukrainian governments, having noticed these tendencies, influence them by removing those key disproportions? The whole arsenal of tools was at their disposal. They certainly could. But to do that they should have represented the interests of the whole society as single entity, have experienced and qualified experts capable to analyze the situation and to suggest adequate decisions. They did not have any of that. Voucher privatization was based not on the accumulation of property resulting from reproductive processes, but on property re-distribution. Thus economic power concentrated in the hands of a limited number of individuals, who have been using it to get control of political power and have turned into the oligarchs, parasitizing on the system "property-authority". The other part of society ended up deprived of property, powerless, with low incomes and generally unable to exert any influence on this situation.

The state becomes under such conditions an instrument in the hands of the groups of oligarchs implementing their own interests using the apparatus of the government and struggling constantly with other groups for assets and control of financial flows. The state turns to be privatized and democracy (in the absence of middle class representing majority of the population) becomes a tool for grabbing power by those, who is in possession of financial, organizational and information resources. As a result there are in Ukraine conspicuous wealth epitomized by opu-

lent castles near large towns, super-expensive automobiles and luxurious life of the oligarchs along poverty, impossibility to provide even normal subsistence for a large part of the population. Ukraine was in 2012 leading the world by the number of billionaires per 100 bln US dollars of GDP. It had more billionaires than both the countries with balanced social structure (almost two times more than Switzerland, more than three times more than in the UK and twice as much as the USA), and the countries with significant social stratification (for example, more than two times more than Brazil and India, 15% more than Russia) [8].

It is only natural that in these conditions the government cannot regulate the economy in the interests of society. There is a gusher of reformist rhetoric, piles of plans and political shows that are politicians' and populace's favorite means of letting out the vapor and mutual accusations. If the situation gets out of hand completely, there is "Majdan", an organizationally and financially rehearsed means of channeling of people's discontent, aspirations to better life and finally outright anger along the riverbed that is, strange as it may seem, useful to oligarchs. Struggle among the oligarchs continues even during "boiling peaks". It goes on for influence over Majdan and its energy, for streaming it into needed direction sometimes leading to a loss of control over the situation.

Newly established through the process of negative selection pseudo-elite is incapable of overcoming its "original sin" and transit to usual ways of doing business and politics that seem to it dull and ineffective. The pseudo-elite itself comprise those, who aimed to enrich themselves at any cost, who played out of the field ignoring or violating laws, buying positions and power and finally got to the top. This elite, representing successful people, naturally becomes a beacon for the other people striving to become rich and prosperous. The habits and customs of pseudo-elite are eagerly picked up by the others (including first of all young Ukrainians). Those who try to abide by law and do their business honestly remain at the margins of economic life or have to look for better life abroad.

This logic of degradation determines in one way or another the movement of all the components of a system. Education, for instance, is limited to teaching functional aspects showing what to do in standard situations, but not to think. But situation in Ukraine's economy is changing significantly and to understand it one needs not only a set of knowledge and information but ability to distinguish between the visible exterior aspect of things and reality, to see essence beyond external forms, to recreate an object in its entirety rather than its mere fragments. But that is not taught. Therefore feelings, opinions, emotions, stereotypes, superstitions prevail over the analysis along with individual advantages and points of view determined by the "environment". A cone, as is known, looks like a circle from underneath, but like a triangle from other sides, so any point of view can be soundly substantiated depending on standpoint. But not the standpoints are needed by Ukraine, it needs to discern a true form of a subject in motion, transformation and development.

So, the developments in Ukraine have their own, rather rigid logic. It was always possible to indicate ways and means of evading negative developments. And suggestions to that end were plentiful. The author of this pointed to the inversion

nature of economic transformations yet at the beginning of 1990s [9]. It was mentioned at the conferences, where the President of Ukraine was taking part. Economists more than once pointed to the negative effects of the method, in which privatization was done, and to many other negative instances. In general, there were a lot of sound ideas and suggestions, but it appeared at all times that there were no subjects interested in their implementation and capable of doing it. On the contrary, there were those who opposed these suggestions.

The elite has a special role in these critical situations. It is a brain of society's organism and its role in determining the paths to social development is decisive. Ukrainian elite appeared in the Soviet times split. Its larger part integrated into the Soviet political system and played significant role in economic, social and cultural development of society, including society of Ukraine. There was a small part that was in opposition, but it could not do it openly. This opposition was aimed against everything that was Soviet or Russian, taking them for a main source of oppression of Ukraine. It appears insufficient to Ukrainians in the conditions of globalization to make them able to find solutions to the modern contradictions and transformations. So when Ukraine's status was changed, members of former Ukrainian opposition of the Soviet period could not change track and offer solutions for development of Ukrainian society adequate to Ukrainian realities of social development. And growing competition intensified Ukrainian radicalism.

To change Ukraine's current status the understanding of the events in Ukraine is needed first of all. Then someone genuinely interested in transformation is needed, the one having sufficient means to implement them. And last, but not least, knowledge should be combined with transformational strength. Regrettably, none of these conditions are present in Ukrainian society. That is why reforms proceed haphazardly and their results are controversial and negative as a whole.

Fundamental problems of humankind are becoming ever more topical at today's phase of development of Ukrainian society. Primitive tribesmen valued more than anything their inclusion into a community. Expulsion from community was equal to a death penalty. More complicated relations were not subjectified by identity and differentiation. Joint labour only meant that each person did only some part of work. And vice versa. Later in history the notions of joint and separate were subjectified by other transformed requisites, like balance between the state and the market, capitalization and socialization, liberalism and socialism, globalization and localization. Nowadays return to primordial relations on the new foundation is taking place (the law of repudiation of repudiation). People's inclusion along with businesses and nations into global social relations becomes pressing issue, and for Ukraine also. One recent example is of a man who graduated from a university in France, got his doctorate, and having his French citizenship, worked in Japan, later in Canada and in the UK. His career overseas has lasted 15 years now. His job, earnings, residence depend on whether he is incorporated into global academic community. There are issues of his medical insurance, pension, etc. It is obvious that a nation state cannot deal with all these problems all by itself. Globalized approach is needed. These approaches are being formed nowadays in Europe.

Similar situation is relevant not only for individuals but for organizations too. Students and faculty from all over the world are now in all modern universities. These universities are funded from various sources and nation states' share is insignificant. What is most important for these universities? To be a part of global ties and good infrastructure that is in the hands of local governments. The role of public funding gradually weakens.

What is important for Ukrainian gastarbeiters working in Europe, in Russia and other parts of the world? Undoubtedly their inclusion into international economic ties providing them with employment, earnings for them and their families, etc. It is likewise important for Ukrainian IT specialists, who earn good incomes without leaving Ukraine. The difference is in the low technological level of inclusivity in the first scenario and high level in the second.

Inclusion into world economic ties is also important for the countries. Dynamics of Ukrainian economy directly depends on the dynamics of prices of commodities across the world and on the balance between imports and exports. Ukraine's inclusion into global economy quantitatively determine its dynamics. Low technological level of its inclusion and lack of diversification are its negative features, but the inclusion itself is natural and irreversible.

This inclusion is, as the above examples exhibit, intrinsically flawed, as it excludes other components. I want to say by this that this fragmented inclusion is another side of exclusion of some subjects from overall social ties. It is now in the focus of attention of Ukrainian society. A notion of social exclusion has formed in Ukraine, meaning usually "inability of an individual or a group to participate in social, economic and cultural life of society in the spheres of civil rights, labour market, social and private services and social networks. Among socially excluded categories in Ukraine there are orphaned children, homeless, drug-dependent, mentally unstable, paupers and other categories" [10]. The process that denies inclusion I call "precarityzation" (from English "precarious" and Latin "precarium" – given as alms). It describes labour relations that can be broken by the employer at any moment. Deregulation of labour relations is defective and social and legal guarantee of employment is jammed. This phenomenon has involved many hired labourers and this created a point of view that the instead of the term "proletariat" a new term came, "precariat" [11]. This term was put in circulation by Pierre Bourdieu. Modern understanding of this term is that of "social class that is in the bottom rung of social ladder; characterized by the lack of social guarantees, single source of income lack of social protection of the members of that class. Life and work of immigrants in any country can be an example" [12].

Therefore fragmentary inclusion has its own bottom side, which is social exclusion. "Precarityzation" is a transition of from inclusion to exclusion that breaks natural cohesion of compatibility and division that forms all social ties. This break naturally signifies the loss of social substance.

Therefore, not fragmentary, but holistic inclusion should become a priority for Ukraine. Each element should be included into general system and tap into its potential. This is the venue, in which the notion of inclusion develops. Inclusion is

a modern form of implementation of joint-divided relations. It directly binds the divided, partial and private with the joint, general and public. This form was discovered not theoretically, but empirically. The notion of inclusion proceeded from individual cases, for instance the need to adapt the education system to the children with special needs [13]. It went on to solution of social problems like inclusion of marginal strata of population regardless of their age, gender, nation, sexual orientation, aptness and economic status [14]. This outlook later expanded to tackling economic inequality both on the local and global scales. The World Bank published its "Growth Report: Strategies For Sustained Growth And Inclusive Development" [15]. International fora have been dedicated to this problem. It made the foundation of the strategies of further development of the nations. The idea of inclusion is gaining more comprehensive systemic meaning. One of the meetings of the Boia Asian Forum (BAF) had a slogan "Inclusive Development: General Programme And New Challenges". The interpretation of the definition of inclusive development was reviewed at that forum along with the main provisions of the five year plan of socio-economic development of China. It was pointed out that "inclusive development ... allows all countries and regions of the world to use the results of globalization, economic integration and growth. Inclusive development enables any country to maximize the prospects of development and employment thanks to the high rate of gradual economic development. It also gives access to welfare system to the citizens and enables them to take part in all spheres of life" [16].

The concept of inclusive development was viewed as "quite successful effort to consider global priority as a foundation for fruitful and fair development of the countries that despite numerous differences are the elements of human civilization. This approach to globalization has been adopted by the BRICS countries", who in their Declaration made in the Chinese town of Sanya proclaimed that "XXI century must be a century of peace, harmony, cooperation and development put on a scientific basis" [17].

The problem of inclusion is a part of the OECD initiative "The New Approaches To Economic Challenges", of the UN Millennium Development Goals, in other important documents. In its comprehensive sense inclusive development means development of the countries in global economic environment that makes it possible to include and realize potential of all parts of socio-economic system of a country and balance it. This comprehensive interpretation of inclusive development is adequate to the idea. All ideas in Ukraine initially emerge in specific fields and later gain broader general significance. This is true of legal tender, of capital, rent, genome, cell and any other category. But this is an overall rule in evolution of ideas.

This systemic inclusion is needed in Ukraine. And we mean such inclusion of our nation into global economic ties that can make all its natural, social and cultural advantages untapped, establish its stable and balanced development, raise the quality of life and well-being of the citizens. This is a real confirmation of Ukraine's independence not as an abstract image but as specific comprehension and endorsement of its policy that includes solution of today's problems into an overall logic of economic development of the world.

Under today's circumstances Ukraine may be inclusive or precarious. There are no alternatives. For Ukraine to become precarious one needn't do anything. It will happen naturally. But to make it inclusive you need to work for a long time, and work intensely, persistently and creatively. Ways of achieving this goal depend on the path already made. It is not worthwhile to do today what was to be done twenty five years ago. Not even five years ago. What is needed is to accomplish a dictum of a combination of comprehensive logic of development and peculiarities of today's situation. Fragmented inclusion has regrettably developed a lot in Ukraine and it is strengthening. This process cannot be stopped. The other side of this process is intensifying precariousness. Ukraine is going to be on the verge of social conflict for the next decade. The task of Ukrainian authorities under the circumstances is to make inclusive those strata of the populace that would inevitably fall out of the process of public recreation and to develop economic relations with other nations so that Ukrainian nation's inherent potency and equilibrium inside Ukrainian society could be achieved.

Structural policy is a key tool in performing this task. Finance, innovation, loans and other areas of Ukrainian government's policy ought to be subordinated to it. Its main venues should be economic diversification and balancing of its disproportions. Not only market economy approaches should be applied, but those that are not equivalent to the market. The government of Ukraine must perform three sets of tasks. First, it must start tackling the task of providing daily necessities to the population (provisions, housing, health care. This task has not been carried out due to the inversion type of Ukrainian market transformation. The second task is development of infrastructure (transportation, roads, communications). The third is to create pre-requisites of innovative development (education, science, innovations). Suggestions exist as to how to carry out these tasks. But as always, there is no real subject in Ukraine really interested in doing all these things, neither have the Ukrainians any political will. That is why inclusion should start in Ukraine from consolidation of Ukrainian society on ideological platform, establishment of social movement and political force. This can be a basis for establishment of a political subject that can return to Ukrainians their privatized state and express overall popular interests rather than private interests or those of the oligarchs. This movement is liberal-socialist in its nature and constitutes a form of attainment of common and fragmented relations in modern day Ukraine. This movement already has its manifesto [18].

Further affirmation of Ukraine's independence lies on the road of its inclusive development.

References

1. Il'enkov, Je.V. (1984). What is personality. Retrieved from: <http://www.bellabs.ru/Books/Person/Um-2.html> [in Russian].
2. Hrytsenko, A. (2014). Institutional economics: the subject, methodology, content. Saarbrücken/Deutschland: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing [in Russian].
3. Heyets, V.M. (2009). Society, state, economy, phenomenology cooperation and development. Kyiv: Institute for Economics and Forecasting, NAS of Ukraine [in Ukrainian].

4. Grinberg, R.S., Rubinshtejn, A.Ja. (2013). The individual & state: economic dilemma. Moscow: Ves' mir [in Russian].
5. Marks, K. (1960). Capital, 1. In Jengel's, F., Marks, K. *Writing* (2nd edition), 23 (pp. 113–114). Moscow [in Russian].
6. Molchanov, K.V. (2009). Systemic understanding of economic sovereignty in modern political economy. In *Economic sovereignty and sovereign economy* (p. 159). Moscow: MAK Press [in Russian].
7. Zhalilo, Ya.A., Pokryshka, D.S. (2011). The economic principles of state sovereignty in a globalized world. In *The independence of Ukraine in a globalized world: the vectors of the twentieth century*. Kyiv: NISD [in Ukrainian].
8. Zveriaikov, M.I. (2015). Change of model of economic development. *Ekonomika Ukrainy*, 6, 44 [in Ukrainian].
9. Hrytsenko, A. (12 November, 1994). Inversion economy, laws and policies. *Uriadovi kurier*, 175 [in Ukrainian].
10. Foundation for Promotion of health protection and social justice named Andrew Rylkova. Retrieved from: <http://rylkov-fond.org/blog/novosti/confa/> [in Ukrainian].
11. Precarious work. Retrieved from: <https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Прекаризация> [in Russian].
12. What is the "precariat". Retrieved from: http://znajkino.ru/chto_takoe_prekariat.htm [in Russian].
13. Inclusive education. Retrieved from: https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Инклюзивное_образование [in Russian].
14. Research Center for International Development Assistance. Retrieved from: <http://www.rcid.org/glossary/inclusive-development/> [in Russian].
15. The Growth Report. Strategies for Sustained Growth and Inclusive Development (2009). Published for the World Bank. Moscow: Ves' Mir [in Russian].
16. Newspaper russian.people. Retrieved from: <http://russian.people.com.cn/31518/7346801.html> [in Russian].
17. Birjukov, A. (2011). Inclusive development in the context of global revolutions. *Ekonomicheskie strategii*, 12, 80–81 [in Russian].
18. Hrytsenko, A. (11 March, 2016). The manifesto of the liberal-socialist movement. *Dzerkalo tyzhnia. Ukraine*.

The Editorial Office received the article 01.06.2016