

UDK 328.16.001.76

**Tetiana Poiarkova**

PhD (Politics), Senior Lecturer,  
Sumy State A. S. Makarenko Pedagogical University, Ukraine  
87 Romenska St., Sumy, 40002, Ukraine  
poiarkovatk@ukr.net



## EUROMAIDAN IS A PHASE OF CRISIS SYNDROME OF MODERNIZATION INTENSIFICATION

**Abstract. Introduction.** Distinguishing of crisis processes regularities has difficulties due to their complex nature, namely the presence of: 1) latent period to collect features that cause gradual loss of system function; 2) period of aggravation; 3) post-crisis state. **Purpose.** Search of regularities of appearance and course of Euromaidan. **Methods.** To solve the raised problem the notion «crisis syndrome of modernization» was used. Taking into account evolution transformations of crisis syndrome of modernization let to overcome the considerations of negative attitude to that notion: the difficulty in distinguishing of crisis manifestations «before» modernization and «after» it. Modernization is a feature inherent to capitalism, where creating of crises and their overcoming are the terms of capitalist development. Recognition of this gives the modernization a broader content than the transition from agrarian phase of development to the industrial one – modernizing as the system renewal. The recognition of necessity to take into consideration the regularities of each phase of political crisis development is of same importance for understanding of the «crisis syndrome of modernization» notion. **Results.** Within the author's version of «crisis syndrome of modernization» the Euromaidan events were analyzed considering the latest attempt to modernize the USSR – perestroika (reconstruction). The post-perestroika process was recognized as a gradating one by the indications of gradual accumulation of dysfunction features that became apparent in: 1) unity of political elite; 2) stage of social coherence; 3) openness and trend of political infrastructure (communication canals between political elite and society – social lifts and mass media). Transition from dysfunction to political crisis was connected with the appearance of political system overdependence symptom caused by geopolitical environment. **Conclusion.** Thus, Euromaidan was recognized as the phase of intensification of post-modernization chronic state, because the characteristic features of the phenomenon had the following changes: 1) identification of Ukrainian community – transformation of youth into political subject; gaining of new type of social connection on the basis of future's (youth's) defense; 2) loss of legality of governing stratum due to force actions against peaceful protests; 3) changes in participation format – transition from actions supporting representatives of governing power or its actions to self-organization forms: self-defense, self-sufficiency; 4) extension – seizure of power in regions and renewal of self-governing; 5) re-distribution – transformation of opposition with some parts of governing strata into the means of strikers' demands articulation. As the author thinks, the future of Ukrainian political system is strictly stipulated by the following aspects: political elite proposes the effective modernization strategy as a way to overcome the dysfunctional features of political system, or political system will be hard reformatted by means of civil war, because of the lack of resources for another scenarios of system behavior. **Keywords:** Ukraine; Euromaidan; crisis syndrome of modernization; dysfunction.

**Т. К. Пояркова**

кандидат політичних наук, доцент кафедри соціально-гуманітарних дисциплін,  
Сумський державний педагогічний університет імені А. С. Макаренка, Україна

### ЄВРОМАЙДАН – ФАЗА ЗАГОСТРЕННЯ КРИЗОВОГО СИНДРОМУ МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЇ

**Анотація.** Статтю присвячено аналізу феномену Євромайдану в контексті поняття «кризовий синдром модернізації». Перевагою запропонованого підходу є теоретична можливість урахування латентної стадії накопичення дисфункціональних рис, фази загострення та посткризового періоду. Автором визначено основні кризові параметри «постперебудовного» двадцятиріччя, які зумовили закономірну появу Євромайдану в Україні.

**Ключові слова:** Україна, Євромайдан, кризовий синдром модернізації, дисфункціональність.

**Т. К. Пояркова**

кандидат политических наук, доцент кафедры социально-гуманитарных дисциплин,  
Сумский государственный педагогический университет имени А. С. Макаренка, Украина

### ЕВРОМАЙДАН – ФАЗА ОБОСТРЕНИЯ КРИЗИСНОГО СИНДРОМА МОДЕРНИЗАЦИИ

**Аннотация.** Статья посвящена анализу феномена Евромайдана в контексте понятия «кризисный синдром модернизации». Преимуществом предложенного подхода является теоретическая возможность учета латентной стадии накопления дисфункциональных черт, фазы обострения и посткризисного периода. В статье определены основные кризисные параметры «постперестроечного» двадцатилетия, обусловившие закономерное появление Евромайдана в Украине.

**Ключевые слова:** Украина, Евромайдан, кризисный синдром модернизации, дисфункциональность.

**Introduction.** «Euromaidan» – events at the end of 2013 and the beginning of 2014 – is unanimously perceived not only by scientists but by general social community as a political crisis. As to the reasons of this phenomenon – everything is much more difficult. It predominates the conviction in the fact that the actions of Ukrainian power became the catalytic agent of political crisis, namely – the decisions to hold up the signing of a treaty about association between Ukraine and EU after so long propaganda campaign and adoption by Parliament necessary law documents. But the opinion concerning interests of geopolitical environment in the destabilization of internal situation in Ukraine as in Syria, Libya and Yugoslavia is expanding. At the

same time there is something common for all the versions, such as to predict the reaction of social community and the actions of power and opposition concerning the way out of the crisis.

However, it is well known that any contingency secrets regularity. So, the aim of this article is to explain the regularities which not only stipulated the phenomenon of Euromaidan, but determined such a sequence of events.

During the investigation it was clarified that modern political science has limited methodological proposals to investigate political crises. The fact is explained by the nature of this phenomenon that is (usually) diagnosed after the phase of intensi-

fication, not taking into account contentious (often latent) process of crisis substratum accumulation.

**Brief Literature Review.** The notion-exception, that encloses the state of political system «before» the peak of political crisis and «after» the phase of intensification, is the crisis syndrome of modernization. Mentioned above characteristics of this notion appeared as a result of prolonged evolution beginning from the first interpretation given by S. Verba (1971) crisis syndrome of modernization was determined as the set of problem zones (identity, legality, participation, extension/penetration and distribution), which in the result of modernization (standard process with successive stages) can transform into political crises [1, p. 299].

This proposition, on the one hand, was sharply criticized C. Tilly (1975) [2], and R. Grew (1977) [3]. On the other hand, it led to transformation of the notion on the basis of necessity to recognize: 1) the investigation of regularities in every stage of crisis process (Almond, 1973 [4], Flanagan, 1973 [5]); 2) the extension of content of modernization (from understanding of it as a transformation of agrarian society into industrial production up to recognition of modernization as system renewal determined by the nature of capitalism (Wallerstein, 2001 [6], Habermas, 1976) [7]). (We remark that at post-Soviet scientific expanse they used to operate with a bit changed initial version of crisis syndrome of modernization, that led it to the consequences of «secondary» modernization, where non-conformity with western examples turned to crisis making (Gorbatenko, 1999) [8, p. 109-133].

Taking into consideration all mentioned above the stated modern determination of crisis syndrome of modernization includes: 1) the phase of crisis substratum accumulation; 2) strictly modernization as an attempt to cope with existing drawbacks of the system; 3) the period of post modernization as a phase of reproduction of unrepressed crisis phenomena (Eisenstadt, 1973 [9], Svensson, 1986 [10], Banuri, 1990 [11]). So, to investigate crisis phenomena of a political system it is necessary to clarify the reasons of crisis and therefore the processes of acquirement of the dysfunction features by a political system.

In political science they most frequently point out at the fact that dysfunction of political system is connected with the state of political elite, because its system role is in conceptualization of the sense of system existence and preservation of its survival experience. K. Mannheim (1994) connected the dysfunctions with: 1) increase in quantity of elite groups and further weakening of their strength; 2) ruining of reticence of elite groups; 3) change in selection principles of these elites; 4) changes in inner composition of these elites [12, p. 314].

Dysfunction of political system may be generated by community. The reason of this phenomenon is in break of social unity, which is diagnosed by the lost of social confidence among social agents to each (Fukuyama, 2003) [13, p. 74].

**Results.** In our opinion, the break in social unity is stipulated by the advent of marginal groups and social strata (or transformation into them), the ideas and activity of which destroy the existing social hierarchy, because they correlate themselves with other system extend (civilized, more equitable, etc.) and other time (more modern, newer).

An important diagnose parameter of dysfunction state may be the dimension of «system infrastructure» as an index of connection between community and power as the direction/control of mass media and channel of elite strata reinforcement by recruits from other social layers («social lifts»).

The absence of such a connectedness causes inadequate reactions of system on system threats: 1) from suppression till disability to identify it; 2) too active reactions (where excessiveness testifies the lack of system governing); 3) reaction on wrong signals (to pose a desirable fact as a real one).

The boundary of transition from dysfunction to crisis process is the combination of separate parameters that becomes apparent in symptom of overdependence from geopolitical environment, because at this phase political system loses its ability not only to realize its own interests but to resist to other political subjects.

Disability to overcome the phase of intensification with sighs of multiple crisis symptoms (identification, legality, participation, spreading and distribution) by means of modernization leads crisis processes to pathologic state, which has a limited quantity of scenarios: 1) lock-up (reproduction of the selfsame drawbacks); 2) degradation; 3) breaking. The fact that scenario choice takes place on the basis of system memory as the generalization of previous experience of survival is of principle importance.

Corresponding to all mentioned above we think it will be logical to propose that the events of Euromaidan are delayed inheritance of «perestroika» as the last modernization attempt, which led to deployment of degradation scenario for political system existence.

Afterwards the substratum of Ukrainian political system crisis is the qualitative transformation of soviet nomenclature into ruling class, in which «acquirement of subjectivity for subject-loss state property» is accompanied by reproduction of «substance constant» – elite tactics of self-preservation (Kotchoubey, 2009) [14, p. 107]. So the grounds for elite unity are a bit transformed soviet filters, where a permission to occupy a post were added by a permission to have a property, filter of self-devotion took a confirmation in community of territorial origin and ideological factor was abolished (Shulga, 2011) [15, p. 29].

Twenty years of Ukrainian political elite existence are divided into two periods. During the first period privileged class was gradually formed, the survival conditions for it became property, guaranteed by political activity. This phenomenon explains the appearance of oligarchs that at the same time are political and economical subjects.

The second phase concurred with Yanukovich's presidency and was characterized by: 1) returning to the Constitution of 1996 that gave an opportunity to president's post to concentrate much more power than it was stipulated by the last elections of president; 2) building up of power vertical by submission of judicial branch, power administrations, strengthening of prosecution; 3) controllability of Parliament, where the majority was formed in the result of misrepresentation of electoral law: transfer from party system to mixed one and merely technological manipulations, when voting was filed but counting of votes wasn't filmed.

All these circumstances led to the concentration of power at the circle of persons in attendance to the «family», abatement of political weight of Ukrainian oligarchs (transition from plays to sponsors of Party of Regions) and increase of mass media dependence from the power in force.

Post-perestroika period testified the fact of traumatizing of social texture. These breaks are numerous and are out of stereotype differentiation of countries into West, East and Crimea, because it doesn't take into consideration that social strata are forced out not only in different dimensional but in different time coordinates. Thus pensioners and country people found themselves in postwar devastation. Ukrainian business reproduces the strategies of the ninetieth, fighting as «partisans» against fiscal state government officials. Representatives of enforcers and budget sphere orient themselves on the criteria of stagnant years, when the power could make to demonstrate the «right» political orientation by paying wages and giving posts.

Such uneasy circumstances influence the formation of young generation, which having reproduced all those breaks, found itself among «marginal persons» because of the lack of social development because of unemployment and dramatic inadequacy of education to existing reality. Moreover the youth is not homogeneous. Thus at one pole there is the part of it that sees its future in emigration and becomes the source of radical groups reinforcement. Other groups of young people are ready for any kind of work to get money, so in such a way professional strikers are formed. (This phenomenon in Ukrainian political extension is called «titushky».)

Transformation of political infrastructure during the post-perestroika times has also two periods. As long as at the first phase the extracting of «facade» democracy attributes took place,

then when the Party of Regions came to power the legal canals of social development reduced because of restrictions in conducting of private business, increasing of tax pressure loading. Fast loss of public character in adoption of political decisions and making the motives secret stimulated the revelry of corruption, which became the only way to solve social problems. Gradually the degradation process determined re-orientation of the state on satisfaction of limited interests of ruling stratum on account of reduction in its social function.

The extant of functional downfall became apparent in misrepresentation of «modernization» notion (the main slogan not only of presidential campaign, but of pre-election agitation of Party of Regions), the synonym of which the word «improvement» became. Pension, tax and educational reforms – on condition that media space was under control (except the territory of internet) – turned onto political phantoms, which covered up the creation of neo-feudal hierarchy, where the governing posts were mainly occupied by representatives of western region (with the majority of former Donetsk residents). All those were complemented by the strengthening of enforcers (Ministry of Internal Affairs, public prosecution, Security Service of Ukraine) on account of army ruining and increase of internal-security troops up to complete impunity.

Structurization of prevailed military stratum (troops of special purpose such as Bercut, Gryfon, Omega, etc.), the main professional purpose of which became the defense of ruling class, proved the end of building of a strict power hierarchy. This means that in the nearest future the existence of elite stratum is being provided by certain dissociation from community, in far future – by the control over enforcers.

It is clear that the natural payment for the power retention is the lost of geopolitical influence, when geopolitical subject is recreated into the subject of tender and the instrument of economic problems overcoming. This testifies the constriction of the whole country's future aim to choose the way of integration with EU or with Russia that enables the looking for money to calm the society.

Looking at the mentioned above, Euromaidan is the sharp phase of a prolonged crisis process. One of the characteristics of this period is the rapid identification development of Ukrainian society. Firstly it is the transformation of youth into a separate political force with serious mobilization potential based on modern communication technologies.

Force dispersal of protesting students 13 November, 2013 gave a different meaning to those actions: transition from EU-integration slogans to claims, in which they demanded from the power to answer for such actions. Mass actions against the power received the new quality – understanding of necessity to socially guard students from the power that at one moment united the population for organized and durable resistance.

The theme of justice united different strata. In resent history the Tax Maidan as the mass action of businessmen and mass actions of separate social groups (for example veterans of Afghan war) didn't find total support. So beating of people, as the fall of the last bastion of justice, overcame the ancient breaks of Ukrainian society in accordance with territorial, civilization and language indications.

Force actions against community helped to ruin the basis of governing power legality because of the unbalance of power actions and the problems that had appeared before the power. The tactics of ignoring of mass social actions convinces that the elite doesn't know the realities when the community under conditions of social sphere dismantling (medical care, education, construction, collapse of housing and communal services) has got the skills of self-survival.

Attempts of the governing stratum gave the pseudo-legal character to personal inadequate actions (through making answerable as defendants those people who suffered from Euromaidan dispersal) inevitably made radical moods not only in community but in opposition that began to articulate certain demands of strikers.

Maidan demonstrated the qualitative transformation of political participation concept as the whole and ability of average Ukrainians to strategically resist the governing power in particu-

lar. So, at the beginning phase the peaceful action, organized mainly by youth, was gradually recreated into powerful self-organized movement of different population strata, which was incarnated in creation of different functional structures: self-sufficiency, guard, propaganda, financing and giving of medical help.

Further events in the shape of open force pressure on strikers (shooting by traumatic rounds, abduction of activists all over the country, intimidation of journalists and torture of arrested and wounded people) led only to active resistance all over the country, usurpation by strikers of president administration's buildings in regions and buildings of subordinate local self-government.

The next indication of a sharp phase of crisis syndrome of modernization is the extension of opposition all over the country.

At first, it takes place as the result of parasitism on disruption of Ukrainian community: for example, the same maidans are formed on regions, where the choice of foreign policy vector is the boundary of division into «our people» and «foreign ones». Organized by governing party meetings to support the existing president, where representatives of budget sphere are made to participate in them and «titushky» are invited, strengthened radical moods in society with the help of system memory engagement: such actions lead to separatism between citizens of different regions and inevitably to conflicts among young people, such a division into «our» and «foreign» is artificially made by the power depending on geopolitical guidelines and the salary received from the governing circles.

At second, real unwillingness to respond to foreign environment's reactions at the events on Maidan, neglect by people's rights to let to survive the governing circle led to the fact that Euromaidan was used as an argument to get a loan. It is demonstrative that governing circles directed the «Russian help» to bribe the enforcers and such actions, in their turn, strengthened the opposition.

The last driving force of the sharp phase of crisis syndrome of modernization is the re-distribution of inner-system extend. Regional movement against governing power, caused by unwillingness of governing circle to be inferior to strikers' demands of resignation of the Government or the Minister of Internal Affairs, means the mass character is not an argument. This testifies that the perspective is more important than even the victory on presidential elections in 2015.

Further actions: delay of talks with opposition and representatives of Maidan, adoption of laws of the 16 January, 2014 (in a hurry with all possible breaches of democratic procedures) that in fact legalized the whole impunity of enforcers' actions (special defense was given to judges and their relatives); legitimating of lack of rights for average Ukrainians (in fact all kinds of civil resistance were forbidden); return to the practice of censorship and implementation of penalty for slender – testified that the force variant of solution of the sharp phase of crisis process led, in fact, to the armed conflict between governing power and society.

This is the stage of disintegration, during which some vectors of existing power vertical are formed (regional disintegration becomes powerful, movement of self-governing institutes is separated) and quantity of political subjects – pretenders to power increases. For example, «titushky» gradually come out of control and «Berkut» troops turn into predatory detachments definitely undermining the governing power. The interests of a part of Ukrainian oligarchs, interested in sympathy of world economic society, are separated: elements of disobedience to main line of president family's policy are demonstrated.

**Conclusions.** Firstly, Euromaidan phenomenon is the result of durable scenario, the natural display of which is the creation of a new feudal hierarchy with corresponding closing of all infrastructure canals of articulation between community and governing power.

Secondly, Euromaidan is the crisis aggravation with characteristic succession of manifestations, deployment of which justified that the initiative concerning proposals of antirecessionary measures passed to society.

Thus, Euromaidan is the phase of political system transformation, where in confrontation the following events take place: 1) the articulation of community demands to the governing power, which constantly transform the opposition (as a part of governing class); 2) separation of a new type of social unity Ukrainian community around the idea of Ukraine's future; 3) the formation of self-organization habits of society.

At third, such vectors of community changes justify actual reformation, in fact, of the political system. So non-conformity of political elite to the displacements taking place becomes its historical judgment. It is clear that survival of existing political elite will directly depend on its readiness to reproduce function of political institutes, thus to return to the principles of democratic selection of political elite, distribution of power, public adoption of decisions.

In the case when «Euromaidan», as a sharp phase, isn't incarnated in modernization as the strategy of brining up to date the collapse of existing political system, as the result of social opposition and partially or whole lost of sovereignty, will become a reality because scenarios of «lock-up» and «degradation» are hardly probable due to the exhausted post-soviet resources.

### References

- Verba, S. (1971). *Sequences and Development in Crises of Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 283-316.
- Tilly, Ch. (1975). Western State-Making and Theories of Political Transformation. *The Formation of National States in Western Europe Charles* (pp. 601-638). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Grew, R. (1977). Modernization and Its Discontents. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 21(2), 289-312.
- Almond, G. A. (1973). Approaches to Developmental Causation. *Crisis, Choice, and Change: Historical Studies of Political Development* (pp. 1-42). In G. A. Almond, S. C. Flanagan, & R. Mundt (Eds.). Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Flanagan, S. C. (1973). Models and Methods of Analysis. *Crisis, Choice, and Change: Historical Studies of Political Development* (pp. 43-102). In G. Almond, S. Flanagan, & R. Mundt (Eds.). Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Wallerstein, I. (2001). *The analysis of world systems and the situation in the modern world*. St. Petersburg: University Book (in Russ.).
- Habermas, J. (1976). *Legitimation Crisis*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Gorbatenko, V. P. (1999). *The strategy of modernizing society at the turn of the millennium Ukraine*. Kyiv: Akademia (in Ukr.).
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1973). *Tradition, Change and Modernity*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. Retrieved from [www.worldcat.org/.../tradition-change-and-mo...?](http://www.worldcat.org/.../tradition-change-and-mo...?)
- Svensson, P. (1986). Stability, Crisis and Breakdown: Some Notes on the Concept of Crisis in Political Analysis. *Scandinavian Political Studies, Bind 9*. Retrieved from <https://tidsskrift.dk/index.../political.../24659?>
- Banuri, T. (1990). *Modernization and its discontents: a cultural perspective on the theories of development in Dominating Knowledge: Development, Culture, and Resistance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mannheim, K. (1994). *Diagnosis of Our Time* (Trans. from Germ., Eng.). Moscow: Lawyer (in Russ.).
- Fukuyama, F. (2003). *The Great Disruption* (Trans. from Eng.). Moscow: Publisher AST (in Russ.).
- Kotchoubey, L. O. (2009). The political elite and the political class: the classical concept of foreign. *Suchasna ukrainska polityka. Polityky i politolohy pro nei (Modern Ukrainian Policy and Political Scientists about it)*, 17, 96-107 (in Ukr.).
- Shulga, N. (2011). *Drift by the wayside. Twenty years of social change in Ukraine*. Kyiv: Biznespoligraf (in Russ.). Retrieved from [i-soc.com.ua/institute/shulga\\_dreyf.pdf](http://i-soc.com.ua/institute/shulga_dreyf.pdf)

Received 25.11.2013

(Updated during preparation for publication)

### References (in language original)

- Verba S. Sequences and Development / Sidney Verba // Crises and Sequences in Political Development ; Ed. by L. Binder. – Princeton, New Jersey : Princeton University Press, 1971. – P. 283–316.
- Tilly C. Western State-Making and Theories of Political Transformation / Charls Tilly // The Formation of National States in Western Europe. – Princeton : Princeton University Press, 1975. – Ch. IX. – P. 601–638.
- Grew R. Modernization and Its Discontents / Raymond Grew // American Behavioral Scientist. – 1977. – Vol. 21. – No 2. – P. 289–312.
- Almond G. A. Approaches to Developmental Causation / G. A. Almond // Crisis, Choice, and Change: Historical Studies of Political Development ; Eds. by G. Almond, S. Flanagan and R. Mundt. – Boston : Little, Brown & Co, 1973. – P. 1–42.
- Flanagan S. C. Models and Methods of Analysis / Flanagan S. C. // Crisis, Choice, and Change: Historical Studies of Political Development ; Eds. by G. Almond, S. Flanagan and R. Mundt. – Boston : Little, Brown & Co, 1973. – P. 43–102.
- Валлерстайн И. Анализ мировых систем и ситуация в современном мире / Иммануил Валлерстайн. – СПб. : Университетская книга, 2001. – 416 с.
- Habermas J. Legitimation Crisis / Jurgen Habermas. – London : Heinemann Educational Books Ltd, 1973. – 164 p.
- Горбатенко В. П. Стратегія модернізації суспільства: Україна на зламі тисячоліть : монографія / В. П. Горбатенко. – К. : Академія, 1999. – 240 с.
- Eisenstadt S. N. Tradition, Change and Modernity [Electronic resource] / S. N. Eisenstadt. – New York : John Wiley&Sons, 1973. – P. 47–72. – Access mode : [www.worldcat.org/.../tradition-change-and-mo...?](http://www.worldcat.org/.../tradition-change-and-mo...?)
- Svensson P. Stability, Crisis and Breakdown: Some Notes on the Concept of Crisis in Political Analysis [Electronic resource] / Palle Svensson // Scandinavian Political Studies. – 1986. – Bind 9. – Access mode : <https://tidsskrift.dk/index.../political.../24659?>
- Banuri T. Modernization and Its Discontents: A Cultural Perspective on the Theories of Development / Tarig Banuri // Dominating Knowledge: Development, Culture, and Resistance. – Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1990. – P. 73–101.
- Манхейм К. Диагноз нашего времени / Карл Манхейм ; пер. с нем. и англ. – М. : Юрист, 1994. – 700 с.
- Фукуяма Ф. Великий разрыв / Фрэнсис Фукуяма ; пер. с англ. А. Александровой. – М. : АСТ, 2003. – 474 с.
- Кочубей Л. О. Політична еліта та політичний клас: класичні зарубіжні концепції / Л. О. Кочубей // Сучасна українська політика. Політики і політологи про неї. – Київ-Миколаїв : Український центр політичного менеджменту, 2009. – Вип. 17. – С. 96–107.
- Шульга Н. Дрейф на обочину. Двадцять лет общественных изменений в Украине [Электронный ресурс] / Николай Шульга. – К. : Бизнес-полиграф, 2011. – Режим доступа : [i-soc.com.ua/institute/shulga\\_dreyf.pdf](http://i-soc.com.ua/institute/shulga_dreyf.pdf)

Стаття надійшла до редакції 25.11.2013  
(Оновлена у процесі підготовки до друку)

Dear Colleagues!

The «Economic Annals-XXI» Journal is indexed in  
SciVerse Scopus.

Publishing your articles in the «Economic Annals-XXI» Journal  
is your advance in the international research space  
and prospect of career development!

«Improving research results through analytical power» (Scopus)

<http://soskin.info/ea/>