

Anisimov V.M.

junior research assistant

The State Institution «Institute of Environmental Economics
and Sustainable Development NAS of Ukraine», Kyiv

NATIONAL REFORM FEATURES OF ECONOMIC SYSTEMS

Now for a number of countries, whose aim is to reach a new level of social progress, on the agenda there is a question of reforming their national economies. The reference point is the level existing in the most developed countries with modern market economies which have developed core financial and credit mechanisms.

However, the reform process for certain countries as proves accumulated experience in the world can have mixed outcome. Thus, post-socialist European countries, in contrast to the post-Soviet, have achieved notable success in the transformation of their national economies from central planning to a modern market system. Striking difference in the results of economic reforms is between post-colonial countries of Asia and the Persian Gulf and post-colonial African countries.

The above makes the need for comparative analysis of economic reforms in different countries to determine the causes of this and determine effective methods of achieving positive results. Overall, it was proved the failure of economic reforms in a number of postcolonial countries occurred when the reforms are carried out by the actual mechanical transfer to the local ground of economic models existing in developed countries [1]. In those countries where modern economic mechanisms have been adapted and organically embedded in existing national economy (especially East Asian countries: Japan, South Korea and others.) The reforms have been very successful.

In fact, in the last case it comes to the successful convergence of the two economies — the modern market, for which financial and monetary mechanisms are essential and self-contained elements, and the traditional market, which retains features of economic systems pre-industrial societies with functioning of the market mechanisms within the social organization of the certain societies. Thus these two economies have been restructured for the purpose of the mutual adaptation.

In general, the traditional system of economy as it has been proven on the basis of economic anthropology [2], despite of its archaic, has quite

complicated structure and its elements are in more developed economies. Thus, the relative failure of the market reforms in post-Soviet countries can be explained not only because of the legacy of the central planning economic system, but also because of the influence of the traditional institutions and organizations of economy. And the value of these institutions have been paradoxically increased in these countries in the process of market reforms. For example, the personal farm in Ukraine today plays an important role in the provision of employment and production of certain types of agricultural products. Of course, traditional forms of management are not able to provide properly intensive economic development. However, they are based on existing successful experience of convergence of modern and traditional economies and they can be the basis for development of a competitive innovative market economy.

Thus, the comparisons of economic reform processes in different countries make the conclusion that the mechanisms that represent modern market economy are universal, but their use in a particular country should take into account the existing particular features in its traditional economic system. In fact it comes to the convergence of traditional and modern economic systems, and this requires the need of attention to the study of the latest features for each country.

References

1. *Murdal G.* (1968) *Asian drama: An Inquiry into the Poverty of Nation* (Vol. 1), Pantheon book, N.Y., US.
2. *Polanyi K.* (2001). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, 2nd ed., Beacon Press, Boston, US.

Janusz Wdźięczak
University of Lodz
Faculty of Economics and Sociology

PRIVATISATION IN POLAND AND RUSSIA. A LESSON OF TRANSFORMATION

Many scientists (A. Aslund, J. Gaidar) have drawn attention to the influence of social and historical factors on the process of economic transformation. The aim of this paper is to show the differences between