

9. Українська економіка може впасти на щонайменше 10 % цього рік через війну, Економічна правда, 14 березня 2022 року, <https://www.epravda.com.ua/news/2022/03/14/684017/>.

10. Ghosh I. «The Shape of Economic Recovery, According to CEOs», World Economic Forum, no. 22 September 2020, available at: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/09/covid19-recovery-shape-economy-ceo/> (Accessed 12 October 2021).

11. Oleksandra Moskalenko, «How is the post-pandemic economy transforming into a post-war economy in Ukraine: challenges for economic policy and society?» Bezpieczny Bank, Nr 1(86) 2022, pp. 9–32.

12. EU leaders plan to agree on the establishment of the Solidarity Fund with Ukraine, *Ukrainian Pravda*, URL: <https://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2022/03/22/7333581/>.

13. Experts have calculated the previous damage to infrastructure from the war in Ukraine. 17.03.2022. DW. URL: https://www.dw.com/uk/eksperty-pidtrahuvaly-poperedni-zbytky-infrastruktury-vid-viiny-v-ukraini/a-61165782_.

14. «Про внесення змін до Податкового кодексу України та інших законодавчих актів України щодо чинності норм на період воєнного стану»: Закон України від 15.03.2022 № 2120-IX.

УДК 339.9

Andrii Grytsenko

*Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine,
Deputy Director SI «Institute of Economics and Forecasting
of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine»*

MODERN SOCIO-ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATIONS AS FORMS OF MOVEMENT AND RESOLUTION OF CONTRADICTIONS OF GLOBALIZATION AND LOCALIZATION

Abstract. *It is shown that the contradictions of globalization and localization are the result of the historical development of internal differences of joint-divided work, which gave rise to man and society and all social phenomena and processes. The jointly has reached the level of globalization, and divided — the localization. The main contradiction of modernity is the contradiction between globalization, which develops due to information and financial technologies, and the localization of material and labor resources that are unable to move in space with the speed of information and financial flows. Changes in world order are key points in the movement and resolution of the contradictions of globalization and localization. They begin with wars and end with peace treaties, among which are: the Peace of Westphalia (1648), the Congress of Vienna (September 1814 — June 1815), the Treaty of Versailles (1919), the Yalta and Potsdam*

Conferences (1945). Now the world has entered the process of forming a new world order, in which diverse and multilevel transformations are united into a single hybrid revolutionary-transformational process that require rethinking the basic relationship between man and society and the formation of a new system of social relations.

The era of globalization is in crisis. This is manifested in all fundamental processes and is recognized by the world community. Evaluating the Davos Forum in 2022, J. Stiglitz noted «that a forum traditionally committed to championing globalisation was primarily concerned with globalisation's failures: broken supply chains, food- and energy-price inflation and an intellectual-property (IP) regime that left billions without Covid-19 vaccines just so that a few drug companies could earn billions in extra profits» [1]. But a thorough understanding of the present has not taken place, because «most of the business and political leaders at Davos resorted to platitudes. There was little soul-searching about how and why things had gone so wrong or about the flawed, hyper-optimistic reasoning that prevailed during globalisation's heyday» [1]. There is a lot of research to be done to find out the causes and forms of modern globalization collisions. The aim of this work is to reveal modern forms of movement and resolve socio-economic contradictions of globalization and localization as a historical result of the development of jointly-divided labor.

The socio-economic history of mankind begins with the jointly-divided labor, from which historically develop, from the side of dividness — man, division of labor and market, and from the side of jointness — society, cooperation of labor and the state. As a result of development, jointness achieves the highest historical result in globalization, and dividness — in localization. The contradiction between globalization and localization is a historical form of development of differences in joint-divided labor.

Contradiction has its natural stages of development, which are most thoroughly revealed by Hegel. It all starts with *differences* in the middle of identity. Then the differences disintegrate and turn into *different independent formations*, which then become *opposites* that mutually anticipate and exclude each other, turning into a *procedural contradiction*. Hegel summed up the development of contradiction as follows: «*Difference* in general contains both sides as *moments*; in *completed distinction* they *indifferently* disintegrate; in *oppositeness*, as such, they are parties to the difference, defined only by one another, and therefore only by moments; but they are also defined in

themselves, indifferent to each other and exclude each other: they are *independent reflective definitions* ... Independent reflective definition is, therefore, a *contradiction*» [2, p. 55].

In joint-divided labor, jointness and dividness are only the differences of the same labor. The development of the division of labor turns difference into completed distinction. On the other hand, the development of jointness is embodied in the state, which represents the interests of all members of society. The market and the state have become different incarnations of joint and divided labor. But the division of labor goes beyond nation-states and forms a global market, and states always remain national, and in this sense local entities, limited to certain territories, material and human resources. *The main contradiction of modernity is the contradiction between globalization, which is developing due to information and financial technologies, and the localization of material and labor resources that are unable to move in space with the speed of information and financial flows.*

These contradictions move and are resolved in various forms and spheres. Subjectively, they are most acute in the contradictions between transnational, international corporations and nation states, between the unipolar and multipolar world, between globalization and regionalization, between man as a biological being localized in space and time, and a social being unlimited space and time (Aristotle, Smith, Ricardo, Marx, for example, are participants in modern philosophical and economic discourses, although physically and biologically they no longer exist).

The focal points for resolving the contradictions of globalization and localization are changes in world order, which always begin with wars, as a sharp manifestation of conflicts of interstate and regional interests, and end with peace, which for some time resolves these contradictions and restores global mutual relationships.

At the level of formation of new world orders concerning territorial division and regulation of relations of the leading countries, it is possible to allocate:

The Peace of Westphalia (1648), which after the Thirty Years' War, which affected almost all countries of the European continent, formed a new order in Europe and a corresponding system of international relations based on the concept of state sovereignty [3].

The Congress of Vienna (September 1814 — June 1815), which was attended by more than two hundred diplomats from almost all countries of the European continent and which redrawn the political map of Europe and turned it into a community of legitimate monarchies [4], providing peace and tranquility for a while.

The Treaty of Versailles (1919), which formalized the results of the First World War and after a separate agreement between the United States and Germany (1921), which virtually repeated the Treaty of Versailles, but had no articles on the League of Nations and on Germany's responsibility for outbreak of war, became a shaky foundation of interstate relations [5], due to significant contradictions between countries, the revolution in Russia and the general instability of the situation.

The Yalta and Potsdam Conferences (1945), which summed up World War II and shaped the postwar world order, including changes in state borders, denazification, demilitarization, democratization and decartelization of Germany, and decisions on the principles of UN formation and operation. The collapse of the USSR started a crisis of the post-war world order, which went through a number of stages and has now reached its highest point of destruction.

The Peace of Westphalia laid the foundations of the modern world order, where there are sovereign nation-states operating on the principles of international law. The events that unfolded after the collapse of the Soviet Union, culminated in Russia's war against Ukraine and the confrontation of the world's most powerful players, virtually called into question the basic principles of international law, including property rights and sovereignty. This means the destruction not only of specific forms of historical embodiment of the world order, but also of its fundamental foundations laid by the Westphalian system.

The world is on the verge of a fundamentally new world order, where the leading players are not only states (whose sovereignty is being eroded and de-actualized), but also international corporations, primarily information-digital ones, which are now more powerful than many states and have a jointly-divided property and power in different countries in the global space; where economic relations are moving mainly into the virtual space, and digital currencies are crowding out national monetary units; where the rules and norms of people's life activity are formed mainly in global networks, and interstate relations recede into the background, giving way to direct relations between people and their various associations as subjects of the global space.

The peculiarity of the modern formation of the new world order is its global character, which means combining diverse and multilevel transformations into a single hybrid revolutionary-transformational process. The main components of this hybrid process are the relationship between global and local, war and peace, technological and human in all its forms.

If earlier the local was synonymous with the isolated and unrelated to another, and the global, on the contrary, meant integral and connected with everything, now *the local has become a moment of the whole, a form of existence of the global, and the global has become the living environment of the local*. For example, an ordinary buyer (local formation) of any product, firstly, is always included as the end point in the chain of producers of this product, which, as a rule, are scattered around the world (global connection), and secondly, if he uses a payment card, it is automatically included in the global settlement system. The war on the territory of Ukraine is localized in physical space, but in fact, thanks to the supply of weapons, diplomatic, economic, financial and informational support from the US and the EU, it is global in nature. This is a local embodiment of a global conflict.

Previously, war and peace were localized in time and space. Now the war has become interspersed with peaceful existence, and the latter includes local armed conflicts. Since the end of World War II, more than 30 major wars and more than 250 military conflicts have taken place in the world, involving at least 60 countries [7]. *War and peace have become hydride phenomena, mutually penetrating each other. A hybrid peace-war system has been formed.*

Previously, the results of hostilities were determined by the ratio of military forces, equipment, skills and experience, now the information component is added and penetrated into all components. Information and digital technologies are components of military equipment, intelligence, training of the military, and the information war is acquiring a global character and is becoming an essential component of military confrontation. Information technologies have turned a person, his psychology and consciousness into an integral part of military equipment, and the latter has included a human component. The war is increasingly and in more complex forms turning into a war of cyborgs, in which *the technical and biological existence of a hybrid human-robot complex is mixed*.

There have always been trade wars. They were a form of manifestation of economic warfare, sometimes supplemented by non-commercial economic measures (indemnities, appropriation of territories with their resources, etc.). But the introduction of sanctions by developed countries against the Russian Federation after its invasion of Ukraine was unprecedented and affected almost all components of trade, economy, finance, logistics and technology. *This is a real economic war. Together with the informational, ideological war, the confrontation of values and cultures, it has become an*

important component of the hybrid war as a form of changing the world order.

Thus, the entire history of mankind is the deployment of the inconsistency of jointly-divided relations and the ways of its movement and solution by finding various forms of isolation and unification of human communities. Now this historical process has reached the highest point of its contradictory development, when the very existence of mankind is put on the scales. Either mankind will find a way of existence of a divided-jointly world adequate to modernity, or the historical contradiction will be resolved by the disappearance of the most contradictory object, which has happened more than once both in nature and in history. Ukraine, as a spatial localization of the most acute manifestation of this global contradiction, bears historical responsibility for the development of events.

One of the most important tasks of post-war development is the adjustment of the economic mechanism of Ukraine for the restoration and reconstruction of the economy, in which the action of destabilizing factors of various origins will continue [8]. The solution of such a problem cannot be based in its pure form either on neoclassical (they focus on the release of market forces and non-intervention of the state in the economy, on stimulating aggregate supply), or on Keynesian approaches (they focus on the use of monetary and budgetary policies to stimulate aggregate demand, which will entail the economy).

The application of these approaches in their classical form in the context of post-war reconstruction will largely continue to reproduce the structural imbalances that have developed as a result of the war and will increase market imbalances. New approaches are needed that do not deny the existing ones, but consider them as certain components, applied in conditions adequate to them and combined with others, giving positive results in other circumstances. Such approaches should focus on assessing the relationship between real economic needs and resources, and not just supply and demand as derived market categories. The market does not see real needs if they are not monetized. This is the basis for increasing imbalances in an unbalanced economy.

There is a need for a transition to a planned-market mechanism for combining supply and demand, needs and resources.

This approach to the formation of the economic mechanism must take into account the need [8, p. 340–345]:

1. It is necessary to proceed from an assessment of the real needs (not demand) of the population, business entities and the state, on the one hand, material and labor resources, on the other.

2. Ensure appropriate monetization of these needs (demand formation) and the movement of resources to meet them (supply formation), which implies a change in the paradigm and mechanisms of monetary and fiscal policy.

3. Should focus on solving three priority tasks:

1) solving the basic problems of the reproduction of people's vital activity (nutrition, housing, health);

2) infrastructure development (roads, transport, communications);

3) creation of conditions for innovative development (education, science, innovations).

From the point of view of reconstruction mechanisms, the complementary use of the power of the state and the market is important. Not a single country has emerged from crises and wars relying only on liberal approaches and market mechanisms. International financial assistance itself is essentially non-market in nature, although it is provided in monetary or commodity form.

The center of application of the forces of the country must be a *structural policy* aimed at creating an economic architectonics capable of providing a modern design for socio-economic development. Structural policy should be tied to all other types of policies, primarily *fiscal, monetary and investment*.

References

1. Stiglitz Joseph. Getting deglobalisation right. URL: <https://socialeurope.eu/getting-deglobalisation-right> (дата звернення 12.06.2022).

2. Гегель Г. Наука логики. Т. 2. М.: Мысль, 1971. 248 с.

3. Дмитрієв А. І. Вестфальський мир 1648 року і сучасне міжнародне право: монографія. Київ: Ін-т держави і права ім. В. М. Корецького НАН України; Київський університет права, 2001. 426 с.

4. Віденська система міжнародних відносин. URL: <https://jak.waykun.com/articles/videnska-sistema-mizhnarodnih-vidnosin.html> (дата звернення: 26.04.2022).

5. Версальсько-Вашингтонська система. URL: https://osvita.ua/vnz/reports/world_history/4804/ (дата звернення: 26.04.2022).

6. Потсдам. Конференція, яка перекроїла повоєнну Європу. URL: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-politics/3073599-potsdam-konferencia-aka-perekroila-povoennu-evropu.html> (дата звернення: 26.04.2022).

7. 5 історій економічного успіху після війни: світовий досвід для України. URL: https://lb.ua/economics/2022/04/13/513199_5_istoriy_ekonomichnogo_uspihu_pislya.html (дата звернення: 29.04.2022).

8. Геєць В. М. Феномен нестабільності — виклик економічному розвитку: монографія. Київ: Академперіодика, 2020. 454 с.

9. Гриценко А. А. Економіко-інформаційний імператив нової статистичної парадигми. К.: НАН України, ДУ «Ін-т екон. та прогноз. НАН України». 2020. 436 с.

UDK 330.366 : 330.5

Włodymyr Studinski

Naukowo-badawczy edukacyjne centrum «PrincepS», Dr. Hab.

**INICJATYWA TRÓJMORZA W KONTEKŚCIE
INTEGRACJI EUROPEJSKIEJ NA TLE WOJNY
ROSYJSKO-UKRAIŃSKIEJ 2014–2022**

**ІНІЦІАТИВА ТРЬОХ МОРІВ У КОНТЕКСТІ ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОЇ
ІНТЕГРАЦІЇ НА ТЛІ РОСІЙСЬКО-УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ
ВІЙНИ 2014–2022 РР.**

**THE THREE SEAS INITIATIVE IN THE CONTEXT
OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION AGAINST THE BACKGROUND
OF THE RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN WAR 2014–2022**

Abstract. *In today's conditions, which have developed as a result of the full-scale aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine, the role of the international association Three Seas Initiative, which includes 12 European countries, is called to play a major role. First of all, this is connected with the creation of powerful logistic communications, transport links in the triangle of the Baltic, Adriatic and Black seas. The accession of Ukraine to this Initiative only strengthens the role and importance of this region in the system of European development. At the same time, the Three Seas Initiative can provide important assistance in reviving the Ukrainian economy after the war and solving current problems, in particular the export of Ukrainian grain.*

Conclusion. *Ukraine and the Three Seas Initiative are expected to play a powerful role in the future in the development of the European logistics system and the development of routes in the world trade system. Also to weaken Europe's dependence on Russian energy resources.*

Biorąc pod uwagę początek agresywnych działań Rosji przeciwko Ukrainie w lutym 2014 r., postawiła ona przed Europą szereg wyzwań w sferze politycznej, humanitarnej, gospodarczej i wojskowej. Przede wszystkim dotyczyło to kwestii bezpieczeństwa ekonomicznego Unii Europejskiej. Zakrojone na pełną skalę działania wojskowe Federacji Rosyjskiej przeciwko Ukrainie, które rozpoczęły się 24 lutego 2022 r., zaostrzyły problem do tego stopnia, że przesądziły losy nie tylko