

Viktor Melnyk ¹

**The principles of formation of the Ukrainian version of capitalism
in the context of traditional economic system**

Selected topic of our study is of interdisciplinary nature. Its importance in the context of those events that are now taking place in Ukraine, is explained by urgent need for comprehensive search for perspectives and alternative ways of Ukrainian social and political development. The economic system is a basic and fundamental component of public life and social evolution. That is why we have decided to make an attempt of social-philosophical analysis of the formation of modern Ukrainian economic system. Based on this analysis, we will try to reflect the major, universal problems for our society that hinder the implementation of any reforms. Describing them, we will again draw on socio-psychological, ethno-psychological, political arguments. It should be noted that our social-philosophical analysis is based on a psychological approach to the interpretation of the said issue.

Therefore, the aim of our study: to analyze psychological contexts of perception and reproduction of a capitalistic model by the Ukrainian society; formulate a definition of modern Ukrainian economic system; draw a chronological structure of the formation of Ukrainian version of capitalism. Object of study: Ukrainian society in the dynamics of its transformation during 1990-2015. Subject of this study: basic principles of the formation of the Ukrainian version of capitalism.

The main method of study is social and psychological etis-approach. It is about maximum researcher's deepening in the object of study (social or ethnic group, mood and behavioral system within that group). According to this method, such deepening in the studied community is done from psychological positions and reflects first of all a subjective side of perception of the author.

The concept of "Ukrainian version of capitalism", which was suggested in this study is an attempt to describe almost 25-year way of Ukrainian political and economic system in the direction of our modern crisis. This "crisis" was finally established by a forceful change of oligarchic elite during Kiev revolutionary events in 2013-2014. Its inner essence, in our opinion, is determined by an extremely broad, but historically inevitable complex of problems that gradually covered all fields of public relations, including economic relations, between 1989 and 2015. This complexity (as the main methodological pre-condition to understand the Ukrainian situation by the Europeans) is expressed by a wide range of industrial crisis, including: financial and economic crisis, the crisis of state and legal institutions, the crisis of the "state" as an institution in the collective consciousness

¹ Ukrainian politologist, anthropologist, journalist. Member of National Union of Journalists of Ukraine. Author of the book "Essays on the Theory of Social and Cultural Anthropology" (2013, 2015).

of Ukrainian people, the crisis of judicial administration and justice in general, the crisis of ethno-national identity. It should be noted that the last industrial crisis in many ways was a necessary precondition for the emergence of a series of military-political, ethno-political, clannish and territorial conflicts in 2014.

In the aforementioned context, the main task of Ukrainian young scientists, experienced researchers, is the research and deep study of already traditional for our historical process of deepening of Ukrainian society under the conditions of short-term periods of its state (“statised”) existence into endless crises and phenomena. To our mind, we can talk about determined by historical process permanent collective psychological crisis of consciousness, serving as the most stimulating factor in the efforts to reorganize the state mechanism, political and economic systems.

Through studying the past we learn ways of both individual and social development in the future. This is an axiom of historical science. Within an integrative approach that is dominant today, it can be applied to the whole social, socio-humanitarian science sector. This especially concerns economic history, which at the same time can be studied in political, legal, public management, cultural, psychological perspectives, not so much in the theoretical sense but to focus on the practical perspective. The study of such significant for the current condition of the state body or for the condition of social consciousness aspects of the past becomes really important only upon condition of practical application of obtained scientific results. That is why, in our opinion, the study of economic history in conjunction with the whole social and humanitarian cognition methodology, transforms under modern Ukrainian conditions into indeed a matter of national importance.

Economic thinking of real national level can not take into account the mistakes of the past. Literacy, which transforms separate structures of state administration into a real system of state management lies in the ability to foresee the future opportunities in relation to the realities of modern time, which are recognized by a direct result of the historical process.

Economic thinking takes into account and foresees relying on the resource basis. The resource basis represents a complex of not only various industry-specific capital, but also facts, events, things, phenomena that depending on natural geographic, geopolitical, ethno-political motives can also be transformed into resources.

Thus, to identify ways to overcome the Ukrainian complex crisis of social relations, the society and state apparatus should first of all learn to think economically. However, in order to think economically it is necessary at the level of collective structure of consciousness to consolidate axiomatically the understanding of integrative nature of social life, to realize the necessity to implement clear “rules of the game” by improving justice and law-making.

Law is a means of interaction between social psychology with the system of public administration, which serves as the only legitimate and only capable of acquiring such legitimacy by the way of joint civil-state control over constant, permanent competition for resources, which is a legitimate part of human nature in an evolutionary context. In fact, the law establishes all certain rules of the game, allowing to minimize the negative consequences for social psychology in terms of endless competition for resources, that turns out to be politics.

No doubt that there is no need to explain such things as “law” and “rules of the game” to European audience. However, when it comes to the Ukrainian society and the whole Ukrainian state body, the biggest mistake of the European expert community is indisputable interpretation of Ukrainian events, socio-political and even historical processes in terms of presence “here” of similar “Western” justice, legal primacy over illegal. The fundamental mistake in terms of assessment and analysis of Ukrainian reality - search for “rules of the game” that operate on the Ukrainian territory. They are tried to be found, systemized, detailed, turned in any particular methodology suitable for easy understanding. In fact, in the Ukrainian crisis reality for the past 25 years, no rules of the game, even at the psychological, even at the subconscious level, have been established. On the contrary, the format of competition for resources during 1990-2015 completely destroyed any rules of the game, including party-Soviet (“nomenclature”), and state and governmental.

The biggest phenomenon, a peculiar incident in this context, to our mind, appears even “disorganization of corruption”. Systemological opinion on social processes offers us to consider all phenomena from the standpoint of systematicity. However, Ukrainian corruption during the last quarter of a century has passed the stage of decay. Post-Soviet corruption system could not take the shape of a unified organism, connected with the state power and financial and economic structures. It broke up and was atomized according to the dominant in the society principle “everyone is a corruptive person of himself”. There is no doubt, that Ukrainian corruption, as well as any similar system is clannish, it has its own hierarchy and logical sequences that allow referring to it almost as a kind of institution. However, its institutional nature has passed the stage of “decentralization”, from powerful-party character with a clear hierarchy “from bottom to top” to full independence of hundreds of provincial clannish organisms, which in their turn experience internal decay nowadays. Corruption was reorganized into the underground of philosophy of Ukrainian national life. All Ukrainians are involved in corruption processes at various levels and at different extent. At the same time, we are talking not so much about the phenomenon of “bribe” but about the national recognition of the primacy of shadow economy over open, psychological rejection by the Ukrainian

people of need to interact with state institutions, nationwide concealment of income by the Ukrainian people as from public institutions and from each other.

The fight against “corruption” in its turn completely discredits the Ukrainian power itself in the situation when salary for the officials of Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine - the legislative body of the state, is given “in envelopes”. Officially, an expert on economic and financial issues in the Ukrainian parliament receives only 40-55% of that amount which he actually receives. This case, though anecdotal, but, in our opinion, is the most demonstrative. It demonstrates all absurdity of declared by the authorities “fight against corruption”, shows a complete ideological weakness of state institutions available today.

So when we speak about “Ukrainian version of capitalism”, we must understand above all that we mean “Ukrainian approach to the introduction of capitalism” which is characterized by exclusively declarativity, unjustified use of Western economic terminology, inclination for continuous external imitation of Western models with complete preservation of the transformed into a real tradition (into a real element of collective psychological conservatism) of corruption basis of social consciousness. In our opinion, the point is about the Ukrainian quasi-capitalism, which existence is based exclusively upon external signs of capitalistic nature borrowed during the 1990s in Western economic models, but with complete consent of the society and state-powerful apparatus preserved all historically and ethnopolitically determined traditional elements of Ukrainian economic life, and corruption became the most branched and integrated into all areas of human life. It was the kind of traditional, social and psychological foundation on the basis of which Ukrainian quasi-capitalism was founded.

Thus, under the term “traditional economic system” in the Ukrainian case, we understand an appropriate traditional socio-psychological basis that is the tradition in its conservative socio-cultural and economic meanings. Any tradition is a conglomerate of appropriate, including economic, customs that have developed historically and were consolidated in the collective (social, ethnic, etc.) psychology. In one of our previous scientific papers, we also noted that the tradition can traditionally evolve both in positive and in a negative sense for the society². From the standpoint of such traditionalistic approach it is much easier to analyze, including also Ukrainian corruption as the basis of Ukrainian quasi-capitalism. “Ukrainian corruptive tradition” is called “tradition” because it reflects the historically formed and reflected psychologically already for many centuries, a compulsory element and factor of Ukrainian life, Ukrainian state-political or economic development.

²Viktor Melnyk, Tradition and nation in political anthropology (Ukrainian ethno-historical context), Politicized Society or How Much Politics Do We Need?, CGS Studies, volume 5, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015

However, at the same time in modern economic theory there are quite fundamental definitions of traditional economic system, compared with, for example, market economic system, command economic system, mixed economic system. Thus, famous Russian researchers Balikoyev V.Z. and Kovalov V.A., say: “Traditional economy is an economic system that is based on observance of historically established customs, religion canons and traditions that define the technology and means of production, exchange, distribution and consumption of economic benefits. The role of economic agents in the economic system is greatly determined by heredity of economic relations and society division into classes. Economic problems - what to produce, how to produce and for whom to produce - are determined mostly by traditions formed for centuries”³. Moscow Academic School gives us the following definition of traditional economic system: “Traditional economy is an economic system in which traditions, customs define a wide use of limited natural resources”⁴.

In its turn, Ukrainian economists give us the following definition: “The most characteristic features of traditional economic systems is that the prevalence of natural-communal forms of economic system and multistructurality of economy is typical for these systems, production, distribution and exchange are carried out on the basis of customs, traditions and religious rituals, which are initial in comparison with new forms of economic activity. Production of tangible and intangible benefits is made by using primitive technology with wide application of manual unskilled labor with the simplest forms of its organization and with the presence of underdeveloped infrastructure. The consequence of this state of main components of the traditional economic system is a socio-economic stagnation, poverty and impoverishment of main part of population ... In the current conditions the countries with significant remnants of the traditional economy are developing under the influence of foreign capital, they are suppliers of raw materials for the world economy, and they serve as markets for finished products of economically developed countries”⁵.

There is quite a natural question: can we analyze Ukrainian socio-economic, political and economic reality in the above named contexts? In our opinion, the post-Soviet theoretical definitions of economic systems suffer from a certain schematism typical for the entire set of borrowed “from the west” ideas, methodologies, “external facades”. Speaking about Ukraine, we can not reject the fact that our country until recently positioned itself as a “developing country”, however, the real situation allows speaking about the presence of serious “traditional”, even “traditionalistic” basis in the Ukrainian economic system. For example, the Ukrainian economy in

3Balikoev V.Z., Kovalev V.A., Semenikhina V.A., Course of general economic theory, Novosibirsk University, 1993, p. 37

4Rayzberg B.A. et al., Modern Economic dictionary, Moscow, 1999, p.479

5Fedorenko V.G., Political economy, Kyiv, 2008, p.487

the collective psychology of the Ukrainian society is in constant confrontation with the state and statehood. The Ukrainians at a collective psychological level recognize and cultivate the primacy of private property over any other form of property. Thus, private property is recognized not only that legally recognized as such, and all that is related to the profits of any person (“owner”). For the Western perception, such Ukrainian custom (ethno-psychological custom) seems to be extremely distorted. However, for an average Ukrainian citizen things can not be otherwise. And it is even hard to call “negative traditionalism” because the Ukrainians do not see anything criminal in these informal, not legally sanctioned relationships between an “individual” and “property”. In the society at a deep subconscious level positive is treated as “right” but not “legal”. The rules of customary law in Ukrainian social life continue to remain at quite strong positions. Under the conditions when the state apparatus and the society lived different lives (beginning from 1990), government managers have lost their “managerial role” in the society, and hence in its traditions. The “State” and “society” became polarized, but also achieved a certain psychological informal consensus not to introduce any “rules of the game”. Under these conditions, decentralization of the society took place even not at the level of class structures or local communities, but at an individual level. The authority of state institutions completely disappeared in the mass public consciousness and the authority of political and cultural elites also disappeared. For 25 years the life was based on “each authority is for itself”. That led to self-destruction of the Ukrainian industrial potential, which was inherited from the Soviet Union in 1992, until complete levelling of the role of “production” in domestic economic relations, which, however, only intensified the constant struggle of all against all for resources.

The Ukrainian society has become a very serious “disease” of socio-psychological nature. It lost faith in authority and possibilities of authority, completely exhausted trust to each other. The only unifying element, in our opinion, is the belief in the tradition. However, under the conditions of subconscious lack of “self-confidence”, “belief in tradition” also transforms into a phenomenon with a more negative sense. Negativism, which dominates in modern Ukrainian society forms natural processes of self-destruction that can be stopped only by introducing specialized, legitimate “rules of the game” on internal and domestic economic fields.

Thus, the Ukrainian society, nowadays polarized by all possible features is united by only strong domination in social psychology of the tendency to conservatism, as expressed by the inclination for the traditionalism in any activity. Ukrainian economic system is a mixed body with external capitalistic, market facade and domestic traditional stuffing. Ukrainian economy is the economy of shadow markets governed by specific transformed hybrid of customary law and political process.

However, based on the methodology of Hernando de Soto, which he stated in his book “*Second way*”, modern traditional economic system is a “wide range of primitive informal economy that prospers in many developing countries”⁶. Accordingly, the Ukrainian economic system can be fairly called traditional, if we use approach of E. de Soto.

Besides, the reasons to recognize the Ukrainian economic system as traditional are well analyzed by the well-known Ukrainian scientist I. Danylyuk in his fundamental study “*Ethnic psychology as a field of scientific knowledge: historical and theoretical dimension*”⁷.

We must characterize the Ukrainian economic system as capitalistic foreign and traditional, fully unformalized internally. In terms of development of quasi-capitalism domestic model there occurred complete “commodification” of social life as such.

The capitalistic model of socio-economic development provides for three main resources: “capital”, “freedom”, “professionalism”. It is the interaction between the categories of “capital” and “freedom” that allows to maintain macroeconomic stability of the system, while the creation by the state of a successful mechanism to ensure “freedom” and “professionalism” serves as the basis for social stability. Thus, for the continued support of these two “groups of stability” (macroeconomic and social), the capitalistic model has to constantly develop in an accelerated pace according to the growing needs and capabilities of the members of this system. That is the country with a capitalistic approach to social and economic complex of relationship is depending on the permanent struggle for the preservation of what we nowadays call “high living standards” (typical European examples: Austria, Germany, Sweden).

High living standards are determined by a democratic political system and an appropriate level of liberal economic performance. Certainly, this pattern is only theoretical reflection of many, mostly national experiences of social development. However, we should clearly understand that high performance liberal economic predetermined constant search for innovation, government support of high technology businesses with the full release of unjustified public pressure. It is a “self-investment” in the IT market, biotechnology, high-tech production with simultaneous involvement in the ideological component of the process of civil society. Liberal performance without broad social activity can not be called liberal.

Certainly, this regularity is only a theoretical reflection of many, mostly national experiences of social development. However, we should clearly understand that high performance of liberal

⁶Hernando de Soto, *The Other Path: The Invisible Revolution in the Third World*, Moscow, Catallaxy, 1995, 320 p.

⁷“Ethnic psychology as a field of scientific knowledge: historical and theoretical dimension”, Kyiv, 2010, p. 21-47

economic performance is predetermined by constant search for innovations, government support of high technologies with the full release of entrepreneurs from unjustified public pressure. This refers to “self-investment” in IT market, biotechnologies, high-tech production with simultaneous involvement of civil society into the ideological component of this process. Liberal performance without broad social activity can not be called liberal.

However, the Ukrainian version of capitalism is exactly characterized by the absence of social activity combined with a complete lack of understanding of the extraordinary role of production and cultivation of high technologies in the process of country building with high living standards. This problem, in many respects, lies not so much in post-soviet inertia of legislative plan, not much in the oligarchization of political process as in human behavior, human psychology. The Ukrainians prefer customary law in contraposition to formal law; the Ukrainians subconsciously always choose the traditional type of problem solving. We are inclined to “conservation” of traditions. This means that the answers to all complexes of existing problems should be found exactly in the plane of social psychology.

Producing a traditional nature of the economic system, collective psychology rejects the possibilities of change as “dangerous” for public order. Historically, this is what helped the Ukrainians to survive. Today, however, this situation transforms into methodologically defined by us phenomenon of “negative traditionalism”. Neither in the state apparatus nor in the society there are any active forces that would support the need for “self-investment” in a person, in a citizen through the full support of science and technological development. Despite the huge number of qualified specialists in the branch of exact sciences, software developers, cyberneticists, the Ukrainian government with full indifference of the society, refuses to support national programs on the development of high technologies. In its turn, for the state-government bodies it is much easier to interact in this context with foreign products, that allows maintaining and increasing corruption schemes.

Only realized by the state apparatus and supported by the civil society need to invest and attract investments in “science”, followed by the creation of conditions to produce competent professionals in their branches, will start moving towards the “high standard of living”. Investment in science and education is an investment in a specific person, creating for her/him conditions and establishing the future for the society.

However, the Ukrainian version of capitalism choose the easiest way – to adopt the “commodity” nature of relations in the Western capitalistic relations without saturation of these relationships with relevant content. For example, if “higher education” has turned into a commodity that constantly goes up in price, its meaningfulness and effectiveness (necessary for the production of skilled professionals) rapidly fall down. That is, Ukrainian attempt to create a capitalistic model

turned into commodification of all possible things and institutions in the context when the quality of this product does not meet the overestimated price policy.

So in Ukraine for 25 years everything has been developing according to Karl Polanyi logic, who noted that in circumstances where “nature and man” turns into commodity – this is “definitely leads to their degradation”. So, we can note that major resources of capitalistic system (capital, freedom, professionalism) are also now commodity. Thus, commodification of category “freedom” took place against the background of oligarchization of phenomenal Ukrainian quasi-capitalism over the past 15 years⁸.

“Commodification of public relations” in Ukraine is a direct consequence of that chronologically sequential oligarchization of political and economic system, the culmination of which we can observe today.

Chronicle of the formation of modern Ukrainian quasi-capitalism has the following structure:

I stage (1989-1991) is the period of serious activation of socio-economic contradictions within the Soviet political system, which “lifted up” so-called “red directors, Komsomol organization men, shadow economy operators” and armed the closest to the economic resources people with a new idea - the idea to strengthen big capital. The Ukrainian researcher Volodymyr Chemerys gives quite a demonstrative fact in this view: “frames of old system became too tight to implement their interests. The biography of Sergiy Tigipko, a member of the Central Committee of Leninist Young Communist League of Ukraine (youth organization of “Lenin Komsomol” – V.M.), the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, later – a private banker and now Vice-Prime Minister of the Ukrainian government (the article was written in 2011 – V.M.)”⁹ illustrates well the evolution of those social groups of the Soviet system into new bourgeoisie.

II stage (1991-1996) is the period of “first wave of reforms”, when after Ukraine gained independence, “red directors”, armed with the idea of capital strengthening used those opportunities that were opened before them due to “privatization”. Instead of real privatization there was concentration of all resources and all property, which in the legal field were called “national” in the hands of a few dozen groups of former Soviet party nomenclature. However, those groups faced opposition from many hundreds of criminal organizations. In the process of struggle between “red directors” and “bandits” there was blending of two forces that naturally led to the creation of a “new political class”. Strengthening of this “class” happened by way of expropriation of finances and property in people and (later) in each other

⁸Merezhko A. The development of capitalism in Ukraine, the scientific journal "Skepticism", November 30, 2014, № 6, p. 18-31

⁹Chemerys V., “How capitalism was born?”, “Ukrainian Pravda”, 26.07.2011

III stage (1996-2004) is the period of “socio-political stability” under the President Leonid Kuchma, which in an economic context turned into completion of the Ukrainian quasi-capitalism through monopolization of all spheres of economy by regional financial and economic groups – “Dnipropetrovsk group”, “Donetsk group”, “Lviv group”.

IV stage (2005-2010) is the period of oligarchic monopolization of the socio-political sphere of public relations. Oligarchization of Ukrainian politics finally took place after the “Orange Revolution”. According to Ukrainian researcher Oleksandr Merezhko, the main phenomenon that testified about the completion of usurpation process of political process by oligarchic groups became absolute commodification of state-legal field. Judgments or parliamentary laws now can also be defined as commodity. In addition, informal dismantling of “social state” in Ukraine (still formalised in the constitutional order) was completed. This was due to the final commercialization of all those spheres of social life that have not been distributed during the second stage of the formation of Ukrainian quasi-capitalism. Those spheres were: education, medicine, public transportation, utilities. In context when these social spheres became completely commercialized and the political process became the chess board for oligarchic groups, complete monopolization of all existing in Ukraine market sectors was over.

V stage (2010-2013) is another stabilization of socio-political and partly social and economic spheres in the process of making attempts by the President Viktor Yanukovich to build a clear vertical system of state power. The stage began as the monopolization of social spheres by Donetsk financial and economic group, but during 2012-2013 there was reformatting of clan-oligarchic system in Ukraine, when the system of three oligarchic territorial clans gave place to dozens of provincial financial and economic groups. This process was supported by the authorities in power and led to severe social and political crisis in late 2013. the Ukrainian quasi-capitalism finally turned in the international area into a so-called “peripheral capitalism” when the relationships in the system of coordinates “Ukraine-world-economy” were completely formalized according to the well-known theory of the French historian Fernand Braudel (when a model of capitalism dynamic development – “world-economy” always has its own “pole”, “center” and “periphery”)¹⁰.

VI stage (started in 2014) is the period of present time in Ukraine, characterized above all by a crisis of oligarchic monopolism in all spheres of public relations at constant attempts of oligarchic elements, integrated into the system of state administration, to usurp power. The decay of dozens of controlled regional oligarchic groups into hundreds of uncontrolled militarized groups takes place against the background of the crisis of national identity within the Ukrainian society and terrible armed conflict in the eastern Ukraine¹¹.

¹⁰Lanovyj V., Oligarchic capitalism: background collapse, “Economic Pravda”, October 2, 2014

Conclusions. At present time, in the process of another attempt of the Ukrainian quasi-capitalism to deepen the integration in the system of global capitalism, continues the formation of hierarchical relations in coordinates “center-periphery”. This only deepens the internal socio-economic crisis and a serious crisis of the collective consciousness. In fact, the Ukrainian problems today, as noted above, have a profound psychological nature. It is necessary to struggle with these problems psychologically, often ideologically. However, many levers of pressure on the current situation in Ukraine are also in the hands of the world capitalistic system, for example, in such instruments of external regulation for Ukrainian quasi-capitalism as the International Monetary Fund. Monetary policy, which is usually a condition for the International Monetary Fund to grant loans in relation to the countries of capitalistic periphery, has no positive results. In our opinion, due to forced monetary policy, in modern Ukrainian conditions, nothing else can happen but total cheapening of labour power and reduction of social benefits. The Ukrainian experts also agree V. Lanovyi, O. Merezhko, V. Chemerys also agree to this point of view. The latter, in particular, fairly notes: “As for the undeveloped countries, which include Ukraine, monetary policy has repeatedly demonstrated its destructive power. Exactly monetary policy led to December revolution in 2001 in Argentina or to social protests in Greece. Instead, policy to stimulate production by stimulating demand, including through social payments showed positive results in many developing countries. In general, central capitalism, in the countries of which global capital is focused, does not tend to develop the periphery and is often interested in maintaining backward social relations there, up to feudal. Often this coincides with the interests of the ruling elite of fringe countries: both use profits from the exploitation of peripheral aboriginals ”

Thus, the Ukrainian version of capitalism - oligarchic in its inner essence and peripheral for its international value. It was formed on the basis of traditional economic system, headed by managers, brought up in the Soviet administrative-command style of leadership. These managers, for a quarter of century, with full support of the society borrowed maximally external signs of Western capitalistic models, but the system internally did not cease to depend on such traditions as corruption, family interests, prevalence of informal custom over formalized law. All this led to a complex crisis of the collective consciousness, total commodification of public relations, instead of the required identification of top-priority tendencies of investment for the society (e.g., science is the basis for high technologies).

In our opinion, the biggest mistake of the society is the absence of “rules of the game” introduced from the very beginning and supported by the authority of the state. Today, to establish

11Viktor Melnyk, Russian Eurasianism, information warfare and oligarchic conspiracy, “Korrespondent-magazine”, March 15, 2015

such rules, we need to immediately restore the authority of the state as an institution, to restore public confidence in law enforcement institutions, including public justice. Thus, in order to ensure macroeconomic stability and social stability at the current stage, we must be involved in ideological struggle, the struggle for the minds of the Ukrainian society. And yet, unfortunately, there are no guarantees that this struggle can stop the deepening of the Ukrainian social-psychological crisis in the nearest future.

References

1. Баликоев В. З., Ковалев В. А., Семенихина В. А., Курс общей экономической теории, Новосибирский университет, 1993, с. 37. / Balikoev V.Z., Kovalev V.A., Semenikhina V.A. (1993), *Course of general economic theory*, Novosibirsk University, Novosibirsk.
2. Данилюк І., Етнічна психологія як галузь наукового знання: історико-теоретичний вимір, Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, 2010, с. 21-47. / Danyliuk I. (2010), *Ethnic psychology as a field of scientific knowledge: historical and theoretical dimension*”, Kyiv.
3. Лановий В., Олігархічний капіталізм: передумови розвалу, Економічна правда, 2 жовтня 2014 року. / Lanovuj V. (2014), *Oligarchic capitalism: background collapse*, “Economic Pravda”, October 2.
4. Viktor Melnyk (2015), *Tradition and nation in political anthropology (Ukrainian ethno-historical context)*, Politicized Society or How Much Politics Do We Need?, CGS Studies, volume 5, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
5. Мельник В. М., Російське євразійство, інформаційна війна та олігархічна змова; журнал «Кореспондент», 15 березня 2014 року. / Viktor Melnyk (2015), *Russian Eurasianism, information warfare and oligarchic conspiracy*, “Korrespondent-magazine”, March 15, 2015.
6. Мережко А., Развитие капитализма в Украине, Научный журнал «Скепсис», 30 ноября 2014 года, № 6, с. 18-31. / Merezko A. (2011), *The development of capitalism in Ukraine*, the scientific journal "Skepticism", November 30, № 6.
7. Райзберг Б. А. и др., Современный экономический словарь, Москва, Московский государственный университет имени Ломоносова, 1999, 479 с. / Rayzberg B.A. et al. (1999), *Modern Economic dictionary*, Moscow State University, Moscow.
8. Сото, (Эрнандо де Сото), Иной путь: Невидимая революция в третьем мире, Москва, Catallaxy, 1995, 320 с. / Hernando de Soto (1995), *The Other Path: The Invisible Revolution in the Third World*, Moscow, Catallaxy.

9. Федоренко В. Г., Політична економія, Київ, Економічний факультет Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка, 2008, 487 с. / Fedorenko V.G. (2008), *Political economy*, Kyiv National University named after Taras Shevchenko, Kyiv.
10. Чемерис В., «Як народжувався капіталізм?», «Українська правда», 26.07.2011. / Chemerys V. (2011), *“How capitalism was born?”*, “Ukrainian Pravda”, 26.07.