

Postmodern Openings

ISSN: 2068-0236 | e-ISSN: 2069-9387

Covered in: Web of Science (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/ROMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2022, Volume 13, Issue 1Sup1, pages: 317-330 | <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.1Sup1/429>

Submitted: September 23rd, 2021 | Accepted for publication: January 11th, 2022

The Concept of Oligarchy in the Ukrainian Economy in the Context of Postmodernism

Nataliya PAVLENKO¹,
Tetiana LARINA²,
Natalia BOBRO³,
Viktoriia FURSA⁴,
Ganna PLIEKHOVA⁵

¹ Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs, Kharkiv, Ukraine, panavi2015@gmail.com

² Kharkiv Petro Vasilenko National Technical University of Agriculture, Kharkiv, Ukraine, ltf-2010@ukr.net

³ Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs, Kharkiv, Ukraine, Natashabobro73@gmail.com

⁴ Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs, Kharkiv, Ukraine, irbisa@ukr.net

⁵ Kharkiv National Automobile and Highway University, Kharkiv, Ukraine, plehovaanna11@gmail.com

Abstract: The article aims to determine socio-economic causes of the emergence of an oligarchy and its functions in the Ukrainian economy in the context of postmodernism.

The essence of postmodernism is worldview-philosophical, economic and political systems collapse. This is a kind of opposition to modernism. As for the economy during postmodernism, namely its formation, the changes relate to the view of social relations and human activity. So, oligarchic Ukraine is trying to solve its problems personally. However, a holistic view on the concept of oligarchy is falling apart, since the dominance of financial and industrial groups in the economy of Ukraine monopolizes entire economic sectors, and authorities of different levels in different ways protect not so much the interest of the Ukrainian people, but the interest of its richest layer. Most Ukrainian oligarchs were able to earn their capital in the 1990s, using any opportunity. It was quite cheap redistribution of state property, friendship with the authorities, seizure of someone else's property (raiding). At the same time, oligarchs successfully used imperfect legislation. They simply rewritten it "for themselves", repeatedly using "substitute" politicians.

It is concluded that at the present stage of Ukraine's development, the oligarchy has not only ceased to fulfill its stabilizing function, but also turned into the main obstacle to modernization processes. Therefore, the current civilization choice of Ukraine, in particular, is important paradigm of comprehension and strategy of action.

Keywords: *oligarchy, postmodernism, limited access order, extractive institutions, rent, property rights.*

How to cite: Pavlenko, N., Larina, T., Bobro, N., Fursa, V., & Pliekhova, G. (2022). The Concept of Oligarchy in the Ukrainian Economy in the Context of Postmodernism. *Postmodern Openings*, 13(1Sup1), 317-330.

<https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.1Sup1/429>

1. Introduction

The relevance of the oligarchic system that we have is not interested in large, significant changes. In the event that these changes occur, oligarchic financial and industrial groups will not be able to earn what they have today. They are to some extent a brake for general progress. Indeed, in Ukraine there are many oligarchic groups that have their own media and political parties depend on them. It looks like a closed circle, which is really quite difficult to break through. Here is an example: periodic attempts to conduct market economic reforms in Ukraine for more than a quarter of a century have led to, at first glance, an unexpected result – the formation of oligarchic clans that monopolized the Ukrainian economy and tightly grew with political power. This result does not coincide with the declared Constitution of Ukraine goal of social development – the creation of a democratic, social, legal state. The predominant part of Ukrainian society considers oligarchy perhaps the greatest evil of today and the cause of all the troubles of our country. Therefore, it is not surprising that one of the main slogans of the revolution of 2014 was deoligarchization of business. However, the continuous demonization of the oligarchy sometimes significantly prevents understanding its role and place in the social system that has developed in recent years in Ukraine. Without understanding it, it is difficult to develop effective measures in the field of deoligarchization of large businesses that would change the system of public relations, and not limited only to the next rotation of oligarchs in power.

The phenomenon of oligarchy during postmodernism was formed as the birth of a new group of the richest layer. The concept is understood as a cultural and political formation that copies the form of the original sample. The history of the formation and development of the oligarchic system in Ukraine has as many years as the restored Ukrainian statehood.

In the article the ways of deoligarchization of public relations, including deregulation, increasing transparency and efficiency of the Antimonopoly Committee of Ukraine and the National Commission, which carries out state regulation in the spheres of energy and utilities, changes in the tax system and management system of state enterprises, reforms the public administration system and the judicial one, change the rules of the political game governing the electoral process and activities of political parties and deputies, depriving oligarchs of influence on the media by establishing a ban on media owners to engage in other types of business. This is not only overcoming the destructive social and political richest layer's behavior of postmodern Ukraine, but also the oligarch's manifestation of the

postmodernism period in the most unexpected way. In order for the situation to be stable, it is necessary to mobilize the subject, to show the ability to adapt to the changing conditions that the oligarch cannot, since he has no ideological illusion, can't change, comprehend and systematize the world. The following is important: for a postmodern oligarch, the event always outstrips the theory, and reality is formed by experimenting with artificial reality. The richest layer of postmodern Ukraine focuses on the "mass" and the "elite" of society.

2. Economic preconditions for oligarchization in postmodernism

Ukraine is an example of the order of restricted access, so the formation of the oligarchic class is presented as a completely natural process. The economic prerequisite of oligarchization during postmodernism was the concentration of capital resulting from the realized model of the initial accumulation of capital. The analysis of the genesis of postmodernist oligarchy allowed to highlight the main economic reasons for its institutionalization in Ukraine, including the lack of clear specification of property rights, the lack of legitimacy of privatized property, the search for monopoly rent through the system of extractive economic institutions. This is a simple reflection of reality during postmodernism, which indicates its disguise and distortion. oligarchic layer. Due to the disclosure of the essence of stabilizing and constructive functions, the role of oligarchy in the development of the economy of Ukraine is shown. And this is a pretended reality. So it manifests itself simulacrum. But the stabilizing function includes the control of violence through the system of patron-client relations and the preservation of the industries in which the rent is formed; and constructive - the formation of extractive institutions, as well as simulacral institutes, allowing the society to reproduce the order of limited access, preserve the system of power relations and the economy structure, hindering innovative development, as well as structural changes, which are a potential threat to the redistribution of economic and political power. It is already a simulacrum, which is no longer relevant to reality at all and is looped on itself.

The phenomenon of oligarchy is not a new study subject in a historical perspective in world economic theory. It has been studied since the days of K. Marx and R. Hilferding mainly in the framework of imperialist theory. A new outbreak of interest in this topic occurred in the early 2000s, when the books by Chrystia Freeland (2000) and David Hoffman (2002) were published (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2013), analyzing the process of oligarchy formation in Russia. At the same time, attempts of similar studies are starting in Ukraine. Most of the works on this problem

had a political, sociological, philosophical character, and only a few who published (Aslund, 2005; Paskhaver et al., 2004; Paschaver et al., 2007) considered the economic side of the problem.

To date, only Vladimir Lanovyi (2020) remains an active researcher in this field (among Ukrainian economists). His works are mostly publicistic. He exposes the oligarchic system to fair crushing criticism, but leaves unnoticed the question of the objective causes and functions of the oligarchy as a phenomenon of economic life of Ukraine.

The purpose of the presented research is to find out the socio-economic causes of oligarchy and its functions in the economy of Ukraine during postmodernism.

The implementation of this goal requires taking into account the peculiarities of the institutional organization of the Ukrainian society. Therefore, in our opinion, the most acceptable methodological basis for economic analysis of oligarchy can be institutional theory, namely the theory of social orders. It most adequately explains the essence and logic of institutional transformations in general and individual institutions in particular and is presented in the works of North et al. (2009).

Considering the phenomenon of oligarchy, one should not ignore another important institutional effect of its existence, that is the emergence of simulacra institutions. Therefore, the research methodology is supplemented by the postmodern concept of social philosophy, one of the key concepts is the simulacrum.

In economic research, the concept of simulacrum was mainly used in the microeconomic analysis (Buzgalin & Kolganov, 2020). However, the authors of the article believe that its potential is much wider and propose to use this concept to analyze the features of the institutional structure of the Ukrainian economy. Since the economic theory has not yet developed a generally accepted interpretation of simulacra institutions, they should be considered as the external images devoid of internal similarity (Deleuze, 2015; Kaletnik et al., 2011; Nerubasska & Maksymchuk, 2020; Nerubasska et al., 2020).

As a rule, the oligarchy is understood as the management of a narrow group of people, which, based on economic power, captures political power. Thus, the oligarchy is based on a symbiosis of power and property, politics and economics, as well as a strong integration of political and economic elites.

The origin of the oligarchy may seem like an accidental or side effect of transformational processes only if its emergence is considered from the point of view of the neoclassical theories that were the basis of the

economic strategy developed for Ukraine by Western experts. From the point of institutionalism view, however, this is a quite logical consequence of the development of the limited access order that existed and continues to exist in Ukraine.

North et al. (2009) note that the main characteristics of such a social order are the slowly growing economy, undemocratic political regime, the predominance of social relations based on personal relations, the lack of the rule of law for everyone and weakly protected property rights. To address the problem of control over the violence (which is a prerequisite for economic development), the wielders of power in such societies conclude social agreements on the distribution of valuable economic resources and activities between them, as well as on the restriction of access to them by others. The “dominant coalition” created in this way, withdraws the rent and redistributes it, both among its members and between the elites and the rest of society.

One can observe similar features in the political and economic system in Ukraine today. However, it should be noted that they were established long before the country became independent and were inherited from the Soviet era. The socialist society, despite all its external dissimilarities with the current one, also belonged to the limited access systems, although it had quite other economic, political and ideological foundations. In the late 1980s, as a result of a variety of internal and external factors, the conditions of a social contract on the distribution of rent, both within the dominant coalition, and between it and the rest of society, were violated (Bandurka & Dziuba, 2003). This led to the disintegration and atomization of society and, ultimately, the destruction of its economic, political and values-based subsystems. The elites did not manage to quickly agree and offer a new social contract for society. Moreover, they lost control over the use of violence that led to the emergence of armed conflicts in several post-Soviet states.

Ukraine in postmodernism, managed to avoid violence in the form of a military conflict. However, it was fully manifested in the comprehensive criminalization of social relations. In the context of the weakness of state institutions and, above all, the law enforcement system, the competition between the old and the new elites for the distribution of state assets and spheres of influence became the character of criminal wars. Gradually, in this struggle, all against all there were formed some winners and powerful centers of economic power, namely, informal financial and industrial groups that subsequently turned into authentic oligarchic clans based on the patron-client relations.

This type of relationship is characteristic of restricted societies. The elites at the top of its steps are included in the relationship between the cartridge and the client, spreading from top to bottom to the rest of society, forming specific networks. As Kaufman (1974) notes, the main characteristics of patron-client relations are that they occur between actors of unequal social status and level of power, are based on the reciprocity principle of a particularist and private nature, only partially based on public law or social norms.

In the face of post-socialist transformation chaos, patron-client relationships have had great appeal to a significant part of society, for at least two reasons. First, they are quite understandable to people who in Soviet times have formed stable stereotypes of paternalistic behavior. Secondly, the economic and social losses of the transformation period are not sufficiently compensated by the public social security system, which forces people to seek support in private space.

By uniting people in the struggle for limited resources, cartridge client networks performed an important integration function in society, which underwent a significant transformation. They arose, first of all, in order to find rental advantages. Their processes of formation, collection and distribution of rents helped to reduce the violence level and its structure.

As noted by North et al. (2009), systematic creation of rent through restricted access is not just a way to fill the members' pockets of the dominant coalition; it is also the most important means of controlling violence. This opinion finds confirmation in the latest history of Ukraine and explains the outbreak of violence that has not left our society since 2014: it was the result of a balance violation between individual oligarchic clans within the dominant coalition, which arose from an attempt by one of them to usurp power and remove the rest from the sources of the formation of rent.

3. The phenomenon of oligarchy in the economy of Ukraine in the postmodern period

The analysis of the genesis of oligarchy during postmodernism in Ukraine shows that the economic prerequisite for its emergence was the concentration of capital, which occurred due to the initial capital accumulation. Large-scale redistribution processes, which covered the domestic economy in the 90s of the last century, formed significant wealth. They were consolidated in the hands of a small number of business groups in the fuel and energy sector, metallurgy, agriculture and other areas where rent income is traditional. According to Aslund (2005), this is what saved the

industry, the profitability of which is ensured primarily due to the production scale from destruction.

However, the direct cause of the business oligarchization in Ukraine was the unspecified property rights and their insufficient legitimization in the opinion of a large part of society because of the privatization method that was implemented in the national economy under the objectives of the initial accumulation of the capital. The certified privatization has created many minority shareholders, who received their shares on a royalty-free basis, did not invest in their enterprises and did not participate in their management. Thus, the majority shareholders, whereby they did not need to have a controlling stake because of the scattered rights of joint-stock property, received the actual power. A similar situation also arose at enterprises with state corporate rights. By tacit consent of the competent state authorities, the actual power in such enterprises was usurped by private individuals, who in some cases did not even have a controlling stake.

Thus, the transformation of public property during postmodernism did not end with a clear specification of property rights, and a significant area of the symbiosis of the classical state and private property was formed in the corporate sector of Ukraine's economy, which did not completely separate. In this zone of symbiosis, the movement of financial flows is organized in such a way that the nominal owner, on the one hand, does not have a guarantee of obtaining full benefits from the resources that formally belong to him. On the other hand, the owner does not always bear all the costs that arise during the operation of assets. In fact, the existing institutional structure of the economy causes the presence of multilayer flows of costs and benefits. Moreover, for an individual owner, the balance of flows decisively depends on the relations with the authorities.

The above-mentioned features of the property institution development in Ukraine have turned it into the simulacrum institution. The latter exists only formally as an empty form, which masks the fact of its real absence. Being the basic institution of the economy, the property must provide incentives for efficient use of resources, which is possible only if the rights to them are specified. Given that this condition is absent in Ukraine during postmodernism, the property institution only outwardly resembles similar institutions in other market economies, does not perform its most important function and distorts the motivation of economic activity.

The need to protect property rights under the conditions of weakness and vulnerability of the legal system through postmodernism has prompted the representatives of big business to seize political power. In the early 2000s, it was possible to observe their penetration into politics by

financing political parties, the arbitrary struggle for the deputy mandates and the purchase of loyalty of officials and judges. The power acquired in this way later became capitalized in political rent. As a result, there emerged new perspectives for lobbying their business interests, creating the barriers to enter the market of competitors and obtaining of preferences, which more and more distorted the market environment and became the basis for obtaining a monopoly rent.

The wide opportunities for rent extraction have contributed to the rooting of business incentive rent, which was based on the axiological principle of simple utilitarianism, that is the desire of the economic entity to increase its usefulness without dealing with productive activities but through the access to scarce resources. All this explains active investment in strengthening the political power of the economic elite but not into innovation activity. To consolidate the political situation, big business groups gained control over media resources that were used as an instrument of influence on public consciousness. Thus, in postmodernism the most influential part of the big business gradually turned into the oligarchy, joining political power to its economic power.

During the period of postmodernism, the corruption has become an important condition and the mechanism of rent creation. Moreover, the most socially dangerous kind of corruption, i.e. the capture of the state, was formed. In Ukraine, this capture takes place in the following three directions (Yablonovskyi, & Zakharov, 2017):

- the capture of regulators of monopolistic markets, which allows raising prices for consumers and restricting access for new players to the market;
- the capture of state-owned enterprises to appropriate their financial resources;
- the capture of budget flows, which is realized through the implementation of public procurement at inflated prices.

As a result of the seizure of the state, elites form specific institutions that constitute the core of limited access. According to Acemoglu and Robinson (2013), such institutions were called extractive since they were intended to assign the elite maximum income from the exploitation of the rest of society. In the economic system of Ukraine through the postmodernism, it is, for example, an opaque system of public procurement, which makes possible the shadow appropriation of budget funds at all levels; an opaque system of tariffs for housing and communal services that provides shadow subsidies to energy companies at the expense of the

population; unjustified tax breaks and subsidies to certain sectors of the economy; corrupted “taxation” of small and middle business by the controlling agencies; artificial restrictions for entry into the markets created by the terms of tenders, investment and privatization tenders, as well as the licensing system; the systems of a state guarantee of credits and refinancing of troubled banks under the conditions of weakness control over the return of credit funds used for their misappropriation.

The dominance of extractive institutions aimed at redistributing the already established value, rather than obtaining innovative profits, destroys during postmodernism incentives for economic and technological development, as well as preserves the procedure of limited access.

A particular social danger is their influence on the innovative sphere, namely, the leader of the current stage of development of the world economy. It is important to note that innovations by their very nature during postmodernism are the process of creative destruction and involve technological, organizational and structural changes. In turn, structural changes are considered by the subjects of the oligarchy as a factor of danger, the risk of redistribution of power and, accordingly, ownership through the emergence of alternative centers of power. The bulk of the wealth of the oligarchic elites in Ukraine in postmodern is concentrated in the raw materials sectors, which are the easiest to extract the rent. This preserves the raw material specialization of the national economy and deprives it of its perspectives for the development within science-intensive sectors, where innovations are the basis for profits. As a result, the phenomenon of oligarchy in the Ukraine economy during the postmodern period formed the so-called postmodernist consciousness (mentality), the main feature of which is doubt and an alternative to choose. That’s how the postmodern mentality changes the benchmark in assessment, considers the constant opposition as equal components of the formula of life.

Extractive institutions in postmodern have the same negative influence on the further institutional development of Ukraine’s economic system. By concentrating political power, the oligarchs did not use it to improve the market institutions, did not eliminate simulacra institutions and did not specify property rights. Instead, they learned how to use the weaknesses of the institutional system in their favour. As a result, the so-called equilibrium of partial reform is created, when the elites receive the maximum benefits from the initiated reforms, transforming social losses from them to the rest of society (Hellman, 1998). It seems that the reforms themselves are becoming a simulacrum. Indeed, when mainly the pressure drives reforms from international financial organizations, they often turn into a simulation.

Their purpose in postmodern becomes to obtain financial assets, which are subsequently appropriated through numerous illegal financial schemes for capturing budget flows. Still, the institutions, which were introduced in exchange for financial assistance formally, meet international standards or hide such congenital defects that distort the very essence of these institutions or do not have reliable tools for the implementation. Thus, the oligarchy at the present stage has become a real obstacle to the modernization of the Ukrainian society, therefore postmodern is characterized as a world of universal values.

4. Conclusions

Always in society and among political elites there are moral guidelines, guidelines, ideals as components of value life. It is a kind of progress engine or regression that contributes to the rise or decline of political institutions. The emergence of the oligarchy in Ukraine is quite a natural process in terms of the functioning of limited access. A prerequisite for oligarchization in Ukraine was the concentration of the capital as a result of the implemented model of initial accumulation of the capital. The economic reasons for the rooting of the oligarchy are the unspecified property rights, the lack of legitimacy of privatized property and the search for monopoly rent through the system of extractive economic institutions.

Given the new concepts emergence of modernity interpretation and revision of postpostmodern definitions, the use of the term “postmodern” in the framework of the political reality study is justified, emphasis is placed on its connection with other spheres of society. It is likely that postmodernism in a constantly transforming world will be rethinking more than once, but the political content of the problem itself expands and adds new aspects to the understanding of political phenomena and processes. Therefore, the prospect of postmodern research in politics on the phenomenon of oligarchy is a further systematic analysis of changes in modernity, axiological systems of transitional societies, as well as their impact not only on the functioning of political regimes, but also the formation of challenges of constructive political values for Ukraine.

The oligarchy as an element of the institutional environment is in constant interaction with other institutions. As a result of “the coupling effect” and embedding in the general system of norms, it modifies structural elements and target guidelines of the institutional system as a whole to maintain its viability. Those institutions do not meet its need for self-preservation are transformed into simulacra in such a way that they strengthen the position of the dominant coalition. Such simulacra institutions include the

basic institution of economics, namely, the institution of property, whose main peculiarity in the Ukrainian reality is the lack of specified property rights. In turn, it destroys the incentives for efficient use of resources. Property as a simulacrum ensures and enhances the influence of extractive institutions, creating suboptimal motivational mechanisms.

Analysis of postmodern in the political context of the richest layer of Ukrainian society, distinguishing factors, features and conditions of its dissemination argue the interdependence of awareness of the value component of the political life of oligarchs, demonstrating the formation of postmodern policy, namely its understanding as a sphere of human activity, which can be decisively influenced by the mediation of such components of values as norms, ideals, morals, attitudes, orientations and so on. The phenomenon of oligarchy in the economy of Ukraine through the prism of postmodernism helps to comprehend the thesis on the ambivalence of political values determined by the dominant moral and ethical norms of a certain carrier community.

The oligarchy as a limited access actor performs at least two important functions:

- stabilizing the violence through the system of the patron-client relations by monitoring and ensuring the preservation of the sectors, where the rent is formed;
- constructing extractive institutions and simulacra institutions that allow reproducing the limited access in the society, preserving the system of power relations and the structure of the economy, hindering innovative development, as well as structural changes, which are a potential threat to the redistribution of economic and political power.

The paradox of the situation is that these functions have the opposite effect on the development of society. On the one hand, the oligarchy ensures its stability, which is an important condition for development. On the other hand, it also impedes the necessary progressive changes, destroying the chances of improving the socio-economic position of non-elite groups of the population. Therefore, the problem of transformation of oligarchs values in postmodern conditions as a complex of various changes within political and social and consciousness, which was influenced by economic, social, interpersonal relations, is considered, social structure under the influence of globalization, pluralism, individualism and simultaneous expansion of human rights and freedoms, expressed by humanity and pacifism against the background of global environmental, economic and political crises. The author's definition of postmodern political values is also proposed. They are

the most objective, superpersonal, expressing the neutral nature of socio-political phenomena that have found their embodiment in ideas, norms, ideals, needs that reign in the field of politics. They have ambivalent character. They acquire appropriate destructive or constructive potential depending on the moral norms of their carrier. This is how the political life of society is formed under postmodernism.

The analysis of the current economic and political situation in Ukraine demonstrates that the oligarchy ceased to cope with its stabilizing function that would justify its existence. The members of the dominant coalition cannot agree on the distribution of rent, and the society continues to suffer from periodic outbreaks of the violence. Given the growing public demand for stabilization of the political and economic situation, there is a significant chance that the oligarchic elite will be replaced by another one, which most likely will come from the security sector. In turn, it means the creation of an authoritarian system. Unfortunately, such a change will not radically rectify the situation for most of the society: under the slogans of deoligarchization only another rotation will take place in the personal composition of the dominant coalition, and the extractive institutions will receive new beneficiaries. Therefore, the struggle with the oligarchy during postmodernism should mean both the prosecution of personalities and the gradual but steady transformation of the institutions, including eliminating their simulacrum-related features, which underly their power over society. Thus, the main feature of postmodernism is expressed, namely, the predominance of the rationalist approach, the development of rationalism itself into logocentrism (a tendency of unreasonable support), the identification of the human spirit, the essence of the person himself with the mind's functioning. It is a kind of so-called "modernist project".

Several important legislative steps in the area during postmodernism of corporate administration and public procurement have already been made on the path to deoligarchization. They need to be supplemented by the deregulation, the increased transparency and the efficiency of the Antimonopoly Committee of Ukraine and the National Committee Implementing State Regulation within the Energy and Utilities Sectors; by the changes in the tax system and the system of management of state enterprises; by the reforms in the system of public administration and the judicial system, which would minimize administrative corruption and risks of the illegal takeover; by devalued political power as a mean of protecting property rights. This is also the manifestation of postmodern simulacrum for the richest layer in contemporary Ukraine. Therefore, not only the business environment but also political rules regulating the electoral process and the activities of political

parties and deputies should undergo the reformation. This is a modernist interpretation of simulacrum. It is also important to make oligarchs unable to influence the mass media by imposing a ban on media owners from being involved in other types of business. That's how the absence of reality is masked. All this will make it possible to renew the political elites and bring to power those political forces that can implement the initiated reforms and transform the oligarchs into ordinary businessmen. And this is a pretended reality. Many Ukrainian oligarchs are not ready for war or European standards for doing business. Ukrainian oligarchs have not yet learned to work without violating the law. The problem of the phenomenon of oligarchy during postmodernism is as follows - instead of paying the tax in full, it is hidden in offshore. Most owners of financial and industrial and media groups can't honestly develop their own production, protecting first of all the social rights of their employees. Therefore, the contradiction of civilization orientations in society led to the relevance of the new civilization choice of Ukraine, in particular, the choice of lifestyle and values. As for the model of behavior of postmodern oligarchs, for them the actual civilization project of contemporary Ukraine, in particular, their worthy self-realization.

Acknowledgement

We confirm that the contribution of each of the authors (Nataliya Pavlenko, Tetiana Larina, Natalia Bobro, Viktoriia Fursa, Ganna Pliekhova) in the study is equivalent in the following areas: documentation, data collection, data processing, written text, other activities related to the study.

References

- Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2013). *Why nations fail: the origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Profile Books.
- Åslund, A. (2005). Sravnitelnaia oligarkhiia: Rossiia, Ukraina i SShA [Comparative oligarchy: Russia, Ukraine and the USA]. *Otechestvennyie zapiski*, 1(22).
<http://www.strana-oz.ru/2005/1/sravnitelnaya-oligarhiya-rossiya-ukraina-i-ssha>
- Bandurka, O. M., & Dziuba, N. V. (2003). *Pervisne nabromadzhennia kapitalu v ekonomitsi Ukrainy* [Initial accumulation of capital in the economy of Ukraine]. Publishing House of the University of Internal Affairs
- Buzgalin, A. V., & Kolganov, A. I. (2020). Ryinok, gosudarstvo i sobstvennost v evraziyskom prostranstve (O knige «Perehod k ryinochnoy ekonomike i strukturnyie reformyi v gosudarstvah - chlenah Evraziyskogo ekonomicheskogo soyuza» pod red. I. V. Pilipenko) [Market, state and ownership in Eurasian space (On the book "The transition to a market

- economy and structural reforms in the member-states of Eurasian Economic Union” edited by I. V. Pilipenko). *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, (10), 154-160. <https://doi.org/10.32609/0042-8736-2020-10-154-160>
- Deleuze, G. (2015). *Différence et Répétition* [Difference and Repetition]. Presses Universitaires de France.
- Freeland, C. (2000). *Sale of the century: Russia's wild ride from communism to capitalism*. Crown Business.
- Hellman, J. (1998). Winners take all: the politics of partial reforms in postcommunist transitions. *World Politics*, 50(2), 203-234. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887100008091>
- Hoffman, D. (2002). *The oligarchs: wealth and power in the new Russia*. Public Affairs.
- Kaletnik, G. M., Zabolotnyi, G. M., & Kozlovskiy, S. V. (2011). Innovative models of strategic management economic potential within contemporary economic systems. *Actual Problems of Economics*, 4(118), 3-11. <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=27838283>
- Kaufman, R. (1974). The patron-client concept and macro-politics: prospects and problems. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 16(3), 284-308. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/178267?seq=1>
- Lanovyi, V. (2020, June 2). *Znyknennia derzhavy chy kinets epokhy olibarkhonomiky* [The disappearance of the state or the end of the oligarchonomic age]. Censor.net. https://censor.net/ru/blogs/3199626/znyknennya_derjavi_chi_knets_epohi_olgarhonomki
- Nerubasska, A., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). The Demarkation of Creativity, Talent and Genius in Humans: a Systemic Aspect. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(2), 240-255. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.2/172>
- Nerubasska, A., Palshkov, K., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). A Systemic Philosophical Analysis of the Contemporary Society and the Human: New Potential. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(4), 275-292. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.4/235>
- North, D. C., Wallis, J. J., & Weingast, B. R. (2009). *Violence and social orders: a conceptual framework for interpreting recorded human history*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511575839>
- Paskhaver, O. I., Verkhovodova, L. T., & Suplin, L. Z. (2004). *Formuvannia velykoho pryvatnoho kapitalu v Ukraini* [Creating the great private capital in Ukraine]. Milenium. <http://c-e-d.info/img/pdf/FG.pdf>
- Paskhaver, O. I., Verkhovodova, L. T., & Ageeva, K. M. (2007). *Velykyi ukrainskyi kapital: vzaiemovidnosyny z vladoiu i suspilstvom* [The great Ukrainian capital: relationships with government and community]. Dukh i Litera.
- Yablonskyi, D., & Zakharov, A. (2017). *Zvilnyty zakhopleni derzhavu Ukrainu* [To release the captured state of Ukraine]. Tsentr ekonomichnoho rozvytku. <https://ces.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Zvilnyty-zakhopleni-derzhavu-Ukraina.pdf>