

UDC 330.341

DOI: 10.31891/2307-5740-2018-262-5(1)-19-23

SKORYK H.,
BARINOV V.,
LYNNYK O.

Lviv National Polytechnic University

THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF POST-INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT IN UKRAINE

The aim of the research is to analyze the concept of the development of post-industrial society, to identify its advantages and disadvantages and practical value for the further socio-economic development of Ukraine. It is determined that the main factors that influenced transformation processes in Ukraine towards the post-industrial society were isolation from the rest of the world and industrial development in its socialist version, priority of financing the military-industrial complex, treating of the market as the blow up element aimed to destroy the totalitarian society, incorrespondence of «Soviet man» to the type of personality that could contribute to the formation of a post-industrial society. After gaining state independence in August 1991, Ukraine faced a difficult problem of further development since had to fit into the new world and its tendencies and respond to modern «challenges». The realities in Ukraine at the end of the twentieth century with a monopoly of information, ideological control and total oversight by the competent authorities made society's change impossible. A brake factor is the depressed growth model, which is satisfied with a minimum of aging technologies, has no need for science, is aimed at raw rents, generating monopolies, unemployment and poverty. The disruption effect was that at the beginning of liberal reforms in the 90's there was a strong belief that the society should not be afraid of the deindustrialization. As the result with the following IMF tight monetary policy, which included limiting the money flow into the economy, inflation, debt and budget deficits, taxes and tariffs grew with the corresponding reduction in financing the investments in science and education. Nowadays Ukraine must implement the new innovative mechanisms of development in order to become one of the developed post-industrial countries. Ukraine still owns sufficient intellectual potential who can transform the trajectory of its prosperity. In order to reach those goals, the government have to increase the investment in research and development and to set the efficient mechanism for the development of intellectual property market, knowledge society and technology.

Key words: postindustrial society, value system, science, informatization, educational level, intellectual potential.

СКОРИК Г. І.,
БАРИНОВ В. В.,
ЛИННИК О. О.

Національний університет «Львівська політехніка»

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ЗАСАДИ І ПРАКТИКА РОЗБУДОВИ ПОСТІНДУСТРІАЛЬНОГО СУСПІЛЬСТВА В УКРАЇНІ

Розглянуто передумови виникнення, засади та особливості виникнення постіндустріального суспільства, його суперечності. Визначено основні чинники, які вплинули на трансформаційні процеси в Україні в напрямку постіндустріального суспільства. Пріоритетною для постіндустріального суспільства є сфера інформаційного обміну. Реалії України кінця ХХ ст. з монополією влади на інформацію, ідеологічним контролем і тотальним наглядом з боку компетентних органів унеможливили зміни суспільства. Гальмуючим чинником стала модель депресивного зростання, яке задовольняється мінімумом старіючих технологій, не має потреби в науці, націлене на сировинну ренту, породжуючи монополії, безробіття й бідність.

Ключові слова: постіндустріальне суспільство, система цінностей, наука, інформатизація, рівень освіти, інтелектуальний потенціал.

Recent processes in Ukraine have pushed backwards the public awareness of the understanding of the essence of postindustrial modernization in the country, which requires concentration of joint efforts on such crucial areas: any possible improvement in living conditions and human activity, since the main resource of the postindustrial society is human capital; comprehensive development of science and the widest possible implementation of its achievements in various spheres of life; diversification of ownership forms and organization of their productive cooperation on the basis of a socially oriented market economy; complete technical and technological re-equipment of the economy with its simultaneous structural adjustment in accordance with the requirements of the postindustrial type of production.

In modern economic literature there are many approaches to the definition of «post-industrial» and «post-economic» society, which complicates economic research and makes their conclusions ambiguous.

Many publications by foreign and domestic scholars such as D. Bell, A. Toffler, J. Galbraith, A. Giddens, F. Webster, I. Yu. Alekseyeva, G.O. Androshchuk, M.S. Demkova, T.A. Bereza, V.A. Kopylova, A.V. Kolodyuk, I.V. Kakhno, S. Korablin, A.A. Streltsova, Yu.M. Bazhal, M.G. Delyagin, T.V. Ershova et al. are devoted to the study of post-industrial society.

The concept of post-industrial society is the further development of the popular in the 1960's theories of the industrial society by Raymond Aron and the stages of economic growth by Walt Rostow. The term «post-

industrialism» was introduced in the scientific circle at the beginning of the XX century by A. Kumaraswamy, the author of a number of works on the industrial development of Asian countries. The term «post-industrial society» was introduced into the scientific circle by American sociologist D. Riesman in 1958, became widely spread and got the contemporary significance thanks to another American sociologist and publicist D. Bell (1919–2011), who in his work «The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting» (1973) thoroughly described the appearing society in United States of America.

At the heart of the concept of post-industrial society there is the division of all social development into three stages:

- agrarian society, where the agricultural sphere was the key, and the main structures were the church, the army;
- industrial society. Here the core industry was the manufacturing, and the main structures – corporation, firm;
- post-industrial society, where the theoretical knowledge is the determining element, and the main structure is the university, as the place of its production and accumulation.

According to the scientist, society reaches the industrial stage of development, when the bases of its production activity are being transformed, when, instead of the sphere of material agricultural and industrial production, under the influence of scientific and technological progress, the sphere of information exchange and the wide provision of various services become a priority. By placing the information factor at the centre of the concept, the author emphasizes: «The term «post-industrial society» emphasizes the central role of theoretical knowledge as the axis around which new technology, economic growth and a new stratification of society are built up. It is quite obvious that a post-industrial society is a knowledge society in a dual sense: first, the source of innovation is increasingly becoming research and development, and secondly, the progress of society, measured by the growing share of GDP and the growing share of labour force are more and more clearly determined by successes in the field of knowledge» [1, p. 185].

Sociologist A. Toffler [2] called the period in the history of mankind, which began approximately in the second half of the 1970's, «future shock», that is, such a state of consciousness, when it does not have time to adapt to the instantaneous speed of radical change.

Scientists-researchers of the modern period of society development, supporters of the post-industrial theory, distinguish the following reasons for the appearance of a post-industrial economy:

- automation of production, which led to a decrease in the number of workers engaged in material labour;
- changes in the system of values – a sharp increase in welfare, due to which creative abilities and high professional skills have come to the fore;
- changes in the modern economy characterized by the need for a high level of education in the population.

The peculiarities of post-industrial society include:

1. The sharp drop in the value of capital. In industrial society, mass production was only possible if there was sufficient capital investment. Today, in conditions of global competition, monetary means are not a guarantee of the success in the business. An original idea becomes more important, and innovation can attract the necessary capital for the implementation of the idea.

2. The value of man as the most important resource is labour. In a new society, the creativity and the high skills of an employee comes to replace physical labour. Costs for personnel training significantly increase: its education, the growth of professional skills, and since experience and qualifications are the priority only of a person, the role of the latter in the post-industrial society is significantly increasing.

A new society is a society of professionals, which greatly reduces the need for unskilled workers, and for most people the motivation is not the material wealth, but self-realization. In the opinion of the supporters of this theory, relations within the «subordinate-chief» fade out, acquire forms of partnership, opening up opportunities for the autonomy of the employee.

In general, post-industrialism of the 1960's is a technocratic prediction by D. Bell about the prospects of American society, in which he emphasizes the priority of science and scientific activities, predicts a change in the industrial structure and tendency to expand the service sector. He made the concept of a new social stratification and the domination of a class of professionals – scientific, technological, administrative and cultural over civil society. However, events in the global world are not based on the scenario of D. Bell. The facts of the world economy and politics are not in line with the predictions of the American futurologist [3].

We find interesting conclusions, for example, in the writings of the well-known American sociologist, former professor of public policy at the University of George Mason (1996–2000), RAND's Permanent Consultant in Washington, DC, and editor-in-chief of the Journal of Democracy Francis Fukuyama. In 1997, in Oxford, he had a series of lectures, which for the first time drew attention to dangerous trends in the development of leading democratic countries that threatened democracy itself.

In the lectures that later became the book «The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order», Fukuyama emphasized that the period, from about the mid of 60's to the early 90's, was also marked by a deterioration of social conditions in most of the industrial world. The level of crime and social disorganization has grown. The decline of family ties has accelerated sharply: the birth rate was so low that it (in the absence of

immigration) foreshadows the absolute decline in the population of Japan and Europe. Every third child in the US was born out of wedlock. This also applies to more than half of the children in Scandinavia. Finally, trust in socio-political institutions is experiencing a deep decline that has been going on for more than forty years. In the late 1950's, most US and European populations expressed confidence in their government and their compatriots, but only a small minority did so in the early 90's [4].

In the past twenty years, the situation has not changed: according to one recent poll conducted in the United States, 70 % of Americans do not trust the authorities of their country, and 29 % would even support a coup if it happened in America. Fukuyama has fairly gained the fame of modern classic, which is largely linked to the book «The Great Disruption», where he united such vague theories as «information society», «social capital», or «moral decay» with the concept of «crisis of confidence».

The crisis of confidence – this is the growth of crime, and the fall of fertility, and the passivity of voters. The crisis of confidence means that, for some reason, people in the modern industrial or post-industrial society no longer have any reason to trust each other. If only bad governments, over-intensive migration, or corruption were the reasons, then each of these problems would have long ago been studied and eliminated by attentive Western elites. But, as can be seen from Fukuyama's book, the changes that created the «The Great Disruption» in social values are too dramatic, large-scale, and non-typical, in order to be bold in asserting that the causes of the illness are known and there is the understanding of how to treat it. Take at least such an aspect of the «The Great Disruption» as the contradiction between the need for increasingly complex knowledge which is objectively inherent in the post-industrial world aiming to satisfy the interests of its self-preservation and development, and the phenomenon of escape from knowledge, which contradicts even the instinct of survival. Symptomically, escape from knowledge is characteristic not only for the marginal bottoms. This phenomenon can be considered as a completely dubious property of people of all kinds and conditions of men. Note that the ideas of the alienation of personality under capitalism, the negative influence of modernization on consciousness and human behaviour, were analyzed (under the influence of the theoretical ideas of E. Fromm, especially in the field of concepts of social nature) in the «The Lonely Crowd» of Riesman and had a noticeable influence on contemporary sociological thought [5]. In this paper, the scientist talks about three types of characters that correspond to three types of society.

The first type is conservative, conformal, oriented on traditions, established models of behaviour in the clan, caste, state. This type is inherent in preindustrial society.

The second type of character was defined by Riesman as an «inwardly oriented» subject, inherent in the period of development of the early industrial society with weakened traditions, missing or undeveloped media, weak control of the primary groups. The person who is the «bearer» of this type of character, is strong, enthusiastic, enterprising, inclined to innovations and changes. At the same time, the role of traditional norms and values still remains.

The third type of character is accumulated in the transition to a consumer, that is, a developed industrial society, and is called «an outwardly oriented personality». The behaviour of a person with this type of character is due to the influence of the bureaucracy, the media, the fashion, the prevailing system of ties and relations, but in no case traditions and principles, adopted norms and values. This is a standardized, faceless figure, an object of manipulation, the consequence of alienation. In a person of this type there is a desire for truly human manifestations (love, passion, truthfulness, honesty, etc.), and the whole system of external influence impedes them in this. This personality type is «oriented to others». Personality of this type does not have sustainable goals and ideals, but first of all seeks to «harmony with others», trying to be «like everyone». This Human-conformist is so exposed to external influence, that it does not even know what its own self is.

After gaining state independence in August 1991, Ukraine faced a difficult problem of further development. And in the modern world it is impossible to live and be free from the tendencies that are in it. It is not possible to isolate, not to respond to modern «challenges». However, the Ukrainian elite was convinced that the Ukrainian republic is a strong and rich resource having been sucked by the Soviet empire. It is enough to throw off the «colonial yoke», and in the morning people will awaken in a new prosperous, civilized, happy country. However, the reality was much more severe. Ukraine has entered a deep systemic crisis in all spheres of life.

Ukraine has largely undergone an industrial stage of development in its socialist version. In the early 90's of the last century, first in the USSR, and then as a separate state, it faced several transformational processes and, accordingly, crises associated with them. The first was the crisis of industrial society. In the developed countries of the world it was in the 1970's. They succeeded in overcoming it thanks to the structural reorganization of the economy based on information technology and the increase in the scope of services. The emergence of this crisis by developed countries was a complex transition (due to stagnation, inflation and other disadvantages) to post-industrialism.

For the countries of the former USSR (including Ukraine), the structural crisis dates back to the 1990's (the postponement was largely due to isolation from the rest of the world). One cannot deny that in the Soviet Union great importance was attached to the development of science. However, the best scientific forces and virtually all the resources of the country were sent to service the military-industrial complex, which could not be considered cost-effective. The needs of the population were funded by the residual principle. The «blow up element» for a totalitarian society was considered a market, so everything that was associated with it, of course, could not act. For

decades, the authorities created a «new man». Contrary to its proclaimed benefits, in fact, the «Soviet man» did not correspond to the type of personality that could contribute to the formation of a post-industrial society. The communist system collapsed as a result of interaction for many reasons. Among them was the failure to fit into the realities of the new world.

The basis for the transition to a new stage of development was not so much the economy, technology or a high percentage of population coverage by the education system. The main thing is the change of the person himself, finding a new motivation for him, which makes it possible to determine the activities of the post-industrial type, according to D. Bell, as a «game between people». It also requires profound behavioural changes. Consumption restraint, hard work, continuous learning, and self-development are important. But such changes take generations, not a year.

In the conditions of the Soviet system with a monopoly of power on information, ideological control and total oversight by the competent authorities, such changes were excluded, since pluralism of thoughts, free circulation and freedom of access to information were not allowed which is the necessary conditions for a new, informational society.

Independence enabled Ukraine to overcome the above-mentioned obstacles and actively move forward. Why, a quarter of a century of life in a free society did not live up to expectations and did not give the expected results?

Recent history, all modern practice show that a post-industrial society cannot be built. The only way of its formation is evolutionary development based on the maximum realization of the personal potential of people who have attained a high level of material well-being.

The beginning of liberal reforms in the 90's of the last century occurred under the slogans that society should not be afraid of the destruction of production. After all, we can buy almost everything in the global market. Then the IMF came to the country with a tight monetary policy, which included limiting the money flow into the economy, which «provokes inflation and budget deficits». Taxes and tariffs grew, but it turned out that there is still a lack of money for the reconstruction of the housing and communal complex. This was accompanied by talks of leaders about innovative development, which for some reason was accompanied by a reduction in investments in science and education. A global trend of premature deindustrialization that began in Ukraine nearly thirty years ago failed to facilitate development. The deindustrialization is coupled with a decline of engineering and vocational education.

Budget expenditures for science during the years of independence decreased by ten times and until 2004 did not rise above 0,4 % of GDP. From 2004, they reached 1,7 %, in 2016 they again did not exceed 0,3 % of GDP. For comparison: similar expenses in the USA make up 3,8 %, in Sweden – 3,6 %, in Germany – 3,5 %, in Finland – 3,4 %, in Iceland – 3,1 % of their GDP, which is much bigger than Ukrainian. The expenditures on innovation in Ukraine are as scanty as: in 2005, they accounted for 0,95 % of GDP, and now they do not exceed 1 % of GDP [6].

As a result, for more than a quarter of a century after the country's reforms began, the country does not produce enough, the economy lacks a core capital; our cities and villages are often on the brink of civilized existence. In the first decade of «market transformation», Ukraine has not limited itself to dumping unwanted or surplus production. Many enterprises and entire industries were stopped, and often simply destroyed, without which the national economy cannot effectively develop. The liberal elite admired the tales of the post-industrial era. The unprecedented freedom of import for hundreds of thousands of players and the high prices for raw materials in the early 2000's supported the illusion that we should not miss the lost production. Economic growth before the crisis of 2008 largely occurred in non-industrial sectors of the economy – construction, trade, communications, real estate and financial services, while the industry grew at a moderate pace.

The explanation is: the post-industrial euphoria covered the whole world. A rather modest renewal of fixed capital is a characteristic feature for the whole of the West both in the 1990's and 2000's. However, if you turn to the facts, then it turns out that the post-industrial nature of the economy of the leading old, as well as some new industrial states does not mean their deindustrialization. The growing sector of services and industries that are not related to the physical handling of objects and the production of useful goods is mainly based on a powerful and diversified industrial foundation. The post-industrial world has allegedly questioned the role of the person who produces, and, therefore, labor and capital as the basis of any economy. However, the post-industrial superstructure, where a large proportion of the population works in the non-productive sector, remains a highly volatile element of economic activity that is unable to fully provide the country, its stability and wealth, and often even support a civilized standard of living.

That is why the post-industrial world is possible only in those countries, which, firstly, have accumulated a powerful industrial capital and, secondly, are working on updating it. The United States of America, which is the centre of the post-industrial world after the crisis, carry out an active renewal of capital.

The phenomenon of ideological obedience of countries that have failed in world competition, arose in the modern era. Ukraine is one of the examples. During the years of Ukraine's independence, its real GDP fell by 35 %. According to the World Bank, this is the worst result in the world over the past 24 years. Domestic production «went to the bottom» in the 90's. Due to its annual contraction in the first 9 years of independence, Ukraine lost almost 60 %. From this shock, the Ukrainian economy, in essence, never recovered. As the deputy director of the

Institute of Economics and Forecasting of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Serhiy Korablin noted, Ukraine is moving along the model of depressed growth, which is satisfied with the minimum of aging technologies, does not need a science, is aimed at raw rents, generating monopolies, unemployment and poverty.

Ukraine is investing too little to achieve breakthrough economic growth. According to the World Bank, Ukraine invests 15 % of its GDP compared to China, which enjoyed thirty years of 10 % annual growth and invests 45 % of its GDP. A study carried out by the European Business Association had shown that the primary obstacles to investing in Ukraine remain corruption, insecurity of property rights, and by a large margin the war in the east. In 2018, all three obstacles will persist, if not intensify. Then comes pre-election populism, which would increase the budget deficit and inflation [7].

Viewing the development element in this model is extremely difficult. It does not imply an independent economic policy – it has been replaced by an external price of raw materials. For the overwhelming majority of the population and business, this model is unattractive. For the rest – it is unacceptable, as evidenced by a steady outflow of labour and capital from the country [7].

Ukraine needs a new industrial policy that will inevitably emerge after the change of power and economic course.

Conclusions. The fate of Ukraine depends on the acquisition of innovative mechanisms of development: will it move in the direction of becoming one of the developed post-industrial countries, whether it will remain a stagnant country on the sidelines of scientific and technological and social progress. Innovation is not only the key to dynamic development, well-being, personal success, but also a means to ensure the country's sovereignty, its competitiveness in a modern, super-complex world.

Ukraine still retains sufficient intellectual potential that is capable of generating world-class scientific ideas. The role of the state in the development of the Ukrainian intellectual property market remains to be emphasized, the priorities to be set, and the costs of research and development to be increased, and the organizational and economic mechanism for the functioning of the intellectual property market to be set up in order to build a knowledge society and a new technological mode of production.

References

1. Bell D. (1999) Gryadushcheye postindustrialnoye obshchestvo: Opyt sotsialnogo prognozirovaniya. M.: Academia [in Russian].
2. Toffler E. (1999) Tretia volna. M.: AST. [in Russian].
3. Korablin S. Velyka depresiia. Ukraina. Access mode: https://dt.ua/macrolevel/velika-depresiia-ukrayina_.html
4. Fukuyama F. (2004) Velikiy razryv. Ed. by A.V. Aleksandrovoy. M.: OOO «Izdatelstvo ACT»: ZAO NPP «Ermak». [in Russian].
5. Riesman D. et. al. (1955) The Lonely Crowd. N. Y.
6. Innovatsiina Ukraina 2020: natsionalna dopovid (2015). Ed. by V.M. Heyets et. al. K.: NAN Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].
7. Sheremeta P. When Will We See a Breakthrough in Ukraine? Access mode: <http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/ukrainealert/when-will-we-see-a-breakthrough-in-ukraine>

Peer review : 28.09.2018 Printed : 30.10.2018
Reviewer: Doctor of Economics, Professor Poplavska J.