

The Problems of Forming the Economic Policy Methodological Paradigm in the Global Transformations and Industry 4.0 Process

Yurii Zaitsev¹ Oleksandra Moskalenko^{1*} Olga Shkurupii² Tetiana Deyneka³

¹*Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman, Kyiv 03057, Ukraine*

²*Poltava University of Economics and Trade, Poltava 36014, Ukraine*

³*Poltava State Agrarian Academy, Poltava 36003, Ukraine*

* *Corresponding author. Email: oleksandra.moskalenko@kneu.edu.ua*

ABSTRACT

The article addresses the problems of concord of objectively existing processes occurring in the modes of manufacture of the modern globalised society and subjective perceptions of scientists, politics, state regarding uses of their results in the interest of the business, the person and the humanity. Key findings: Peculiarities of functioning and development of the modern economy and society connected with quality changes in movers, value orientations and motivations under the globalisation and Industry 4.0 have been substantiated. The methodological paradigm of the economic policy in the conditions of the global transformations has been identified. Contradictions of the neoliberalism as the methodological paradigm of the economic policy have been revealed. It has been found that the approaches and principles of the economic policy based on neoliberalism will result (and they do result, on an increasing scale) in exacerbation of inequality and hence the polarization of society, unemployment and transformation of the part of the active population to the precariat. It has been reasoned that the post-neoliberal paradigm of the economic policy development in the countries of the world is being formed as an alternative to the neoliberal paradigm and it focuses on governments' change in attitude to the poor, on the development of the social consensus based on the principles of the economic growth requirements as well as on the sensitivity to the challenges of the poverty and society. Conclusions: the authors have reasoned and proven that the actions of the scientists, business and politics relating to the methodological paradigm of the economic policy of the development in the conditions of the global transformations and the Industry 4.0 should be grounded on the following principles and tasks: considering the dynamics of the transformation of the strategic goals and architectonics of the world economy and the society in the 21st century; achieving dominance build on the Industry 4.0 opportunities, as well as on the human-centric values of economic development intrinsic to human civilisation; limitation of excessively subjective beliefs of politicians and government officials regarding the contents of such a development which are often based in such features as low or insufficient education, knowledge, competencies, lack of significant experience, and, therefore, organisation capital and strategic thinking — which is dangerous as may generate chaos and entropy processes; therefore, the key principle of the conscious scientific way of forming the modern economic policy models should be overcoming the inertia of the paradigmatic thinking based on the absolutization of neoliberal paradigm; promoting the genesis of the post-neoliberal type of thinking with all the subjects of economic life.

Keywords: *Industry 4.0, economic policy of development, human-centric and transhumanistic development paradigms, neoliberalism, post-neoliberalism, inequality*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the conditions when the countries and the people of the world join into unified whole, where every component, every element of the globalised economic and social system directly depend on another one and impacts on the

possibilities of the other element, the need in reflection and considering of the value orientation philosophy, strategic goals and key focuses and forms of economic and social development is not just relevant but urgent. Indeed, to form the conceptual theoretical economic policy model in conditions of the multi-polar world and pluralistic economy, it is necessary, first, to understand the

substantial basics and trends of those qualitative changes occurring in all areas of the public life based on the principles of the Industry 4.0, and, secondly, to perform the political and economic analysis of the values and instruments of the economic policy in the institutional field, of both human-centric and transhumanistic paradigm of development from the perspective of the opportunities of further existence and self-development of the human and the human civilisation.

The problem of formation of the methodological paradigm of the economic policy remains an actual issue of the agenda at the level of the global partnership. Particularly, when analysing the challenges of the new industrial revolution productive potential use, the founder and president of the World Economic Forum in Davos (Switzerland) Klaus Schwab stresses on two factors “of concern”: *First*, he believes, “current level of management and realising of the running changes in all the areas is extremely low compared to the need in the rethinking of economic, social and political systems to meet the challenges of the fourth industrial revolution”; *secondly*, as K. Schwab underlines, “the global-level consecutive, positive and unified concept which could identify the opportunities and challenges of the fourth industrial revolution and which is of crucial significance for various strata and communities to be involved into the process as well as for prevention of the negative reaction of society for the occurring dramatic shift is also absent” [19].

In fact, K. Schwab speaks of the necessity to form a qualitatively new theoretical outlook at the nature of social and economic processes in the globalised society on the basis of which the modern methodological paradigm of the economic theory as such, the methodological paradigm of the economic policy and the prospective paradigm of outlining the social and economic principles and purposes for the future could be formulated.

Dramatic qualitative changes occurring in the technological method of manufacturing and in the modern organisational and economical architectonics of the world, economic, social and civilisational development based on marginal overload of the planet resources and environment, individualisation and atomisation of the intellectual labour, hectic robotization of the whole social reproduction cycle — all this require a new philosophic and paradigmatic comprehension of prospects and possible variants of further existence of the human, humanity, society. Deep comprehension of peculiarities of functioning and development of the modern economy and society associated with the qualitative changes in the movers, goals, value orientations and motivations under the globalisation and the fourth industrial revolution, being mirrored in the qualitatively new institutional structuring of their architectonics, without doubt, will promote such tasks solution.

At the same time, exploring the contradictions accompanying the global transformation process, ways of their impact on the formulation of first priority tasks and focal points of the economic policy is an important component of this economic policy methodologic paradigm analysis.

1.1. Problem statement

The first practical step to forming a new theoretical view at the nature and possible ways of development of processes occurring in the globalised society economy, on the basis of the modern political economy should be, in our opinion, *recognition and considering the reality of existing interdependence* between the level of economic theory development, quality of politicians’ scientifically substantiated political and economical way of thinking and level of productive capacity of certain national economic, social and political system in general.

As Milton Friedman marked in his work “The Methodology of Positive Economics”, “A fundamental hypothesis of science is that appearances are deceptive and that there is a way of looking at or interpreting or organizing the evidence that will reveal superficially disconnected and diverse phenomena to be manifestations of a more fundamental and relatively simple structure.” [17]. These “*deceptive appearances*” and “*simplicity*” of the everyday public life problems (that large majority of politicians and economic agents take for the essence of the phenomena, processes, interests and trends and build certain political, economic, social concepts and economic policy models on the basis of such superficial, distorted picture of the reality) evoke constantly growing need in economic theory relevant to the demand of the time, and, therefore, in a new paradigm of research and perception of the constantly changing world, beyond which paradigm it is practically impossible to understand and use for the good of society a real fundamental nature and synergy of phenomena and processes.

1.2. Related work

The following features of the reality existing in the globally transformed economy and social life define the relevant focuses of scientific research: 1) the most powerful technological revolution in the history mankind, by creating the makings for meeting all the urgent essential needs of the subjects of economic and social life on the planet, simultaneously forms principally new opportunities and means of influence on the processes of managing the very life of human beings, their state of mind, wishes, emotions, etc.; 2) change of living conditions under influence of the Industry 4.0 is an extremely actual challenge and a threat for the existence of both a separate individual and the society in whole in the field of our civilisation value orientations. Namely, these were the focal points where the most prominent theorists ramped up their investigations into the causes and ways of possibly avoiding these challenges and threats. In particular, Klaus Schwab [19], Klaus Schwab and Nicholas Davis [20], Eric Drexler [5], Eric S. Reinert [13], John Markoff [9], Tew Blummart [2], Martin Ford [16], John Brokman [18] and other contemporary researchers have explored the topic of the technical and economic paradigm formation and use with a sufficient depth. However, this is obviously insufficient for comprehension of persistent problems and ways of further development of the globalised society in the long run. Since, *first, the global economy* under the

Industry 4.0 is not only concentration of humankind's opportunities on the basis of joining efforts, new quality of interoperation of national economies and societies, forming of philosophy and real basics of pluralistic economy, but also a new philosophy of value orientations, methods and forms of economic development, key exclusive factor of world-view paradigm shift of the scientists, politicians, government officials. It requires dramatic changes from the society, separate social groups and people of the planet, beyond which the civilisational resonance is impossible, that is a systemic balance between the needs and possibilities of further mankind existence as a certain institutionalised social and socialised form of life. *Secondly*, the deployment of inter-related in the time and space processes of the Industry 4.0 and a globalised economy is complicated not only by subjective perception of changes occurring at the planet but also by the depth of those potential opportunities, real challenges and contradictions which accompany these changes creating mega threats to preservation of fundamental values of existing human civilisation owing to erroneous idea of marginally possible bounds of those values transformation, even under limitless resources of nanotechnological revolution and economic, political, spiritual, ethical freedom engendered by this revolution. *Thirdly*, as E. S. Reinert marks, "in the era of a paradigm shift society falls into a state of confusion. A similar situation is relevant for modern science: we have a significant number of researches and conclusions, and some of them refute the other ones". Meanwhile, as the quoted scientist marks, "a combination of various paradigms may lead us to begin choosing driven by our own interests — national or any other ones. If it is to our advantage, we shall say that the world is round, and if it is not, we shall say that it is flat" [13].

1.3. Goals of research

The goals of the research are: first, substantiating in the methodological bounds of the global political economy and institutional theory of new philosophical and paradigmatic comprehension of prospects and possible variants of further existence of an individual, mankind, society; secondly, presentation of the new world picture, particularly, peculiarities of functioning and development of modern economy and society relating to qualitative changes in movers, goals, value orientations, and motivations in conditions of the globalisation and fourth industrial revolution being mirrored in a qualitatively new institutional structuring of their architectonics; thirdly, the identification of economic policy methodological paradigm under the global transformations, specifically Industry 4.0.

2. BACKGROUND. METHODOLOGICAL PARADIGM OF ECONOMIC POLICY OF DEVELOPMENT

2.1. What is a paradigm?

Understanding the role and functions of the methodological paradigm of research as a certain scientific principle and an approach to the existing problems analysis is especially relevant relating to the economic policy. The paradigm after T. Kuhn is: "Universal achievements that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners" [21].

For the purposes of the given article, we support the definition given by E. V. Ksenchuk: "It is the concept uniting the practitioners in community and, vice versa, the community of scientific practitioners consists of the people accepting a certain paradigm" [8]. This scientist underlines: "If people speak different languages they discover it at the moment when the conversation starts. If people are in different paradigms toward the subject of their interest, they may spend months and years before they understand what is the reason of their failure to understand each other and of the absence of progress in their business" [8].

A known modern philosopher A. Selivanov formulates the key principle of the modern paradigm of research as follows: The world as an existing material and ideal being that manifests in the form of an infinite number of objects remaining in a constant movement. The movement is a category meaning the aggregate of the specific processes of movement. The movement as a characteristic of the universe (world building) existence is attributive in the sense that it is intrinsic to every object of reality and, respectively, to all their aggregate (to everything that exists), i.e. *there are no objects without movement, there is no movement without the object (emphasis is ours)*. And further: "The movement as a category incorporates two types of processes — the processes of interoperation and processes of state change (the very processuality). Interoperations and change of states which are attributive to the objects: a) if the object exists then it changes its states: *there are no unchangeable states and no objects in unchangeable states*; b) *if the object exists, it interoperates, if the object does not interoperate with some other object of the material world, it does not exist for this world; absolutely closed (locked) objects do not exist (does not exist in the given world and for the given world)*" [15] (emphasis our own — the authors).

2.2. Human-centric and transhumanistic paradigms

Understanding of philosophic and methodologic bases of transformation of modern economy value orientations should be, in our opinion, focused on deepening investigation of direct interdependence between the level

of concord of key economy agents (in national and regional bounds, in global commercial field), level of worker's development and public production as well as the level of society's needs realisation in respect of the culture, spirituality, ethic norms, and, first of all, in the field of intellectual labour and business in the intellectual field. Those are the factors forming one or another quality of the value orientations system of economy, individual or society in general and identify their human-centric or transhumanistic focus.

Only recently the economic science has formulated the essence of the human-centric paradigm of socio-economic development, for which the underlying principles are comprehension of the following points: *first*, "the mover of the historical development... consists in the methods of harmonic self-accommodation of activities of freely acting humanitarian beings"; *secondly*, "new philosophy of the history, serving as universal civilisational non-ethnic, non-class ideology of humanity self-becoming, does not have historic bounds"; *thirdly*, "the value of life lies in the embodying of fundamental social constants, humanitarian absolutes in it"; *fourthly*, "decent promotion to material and spiritual freedom, full self-actualisation through social and existential progress, ascension to humanitarian heights form the axis of life" [7].

Unfortunately, the above-cited philosophical principles of comprehension the essence of human-centric paradigm regarding the orientation for growth of a modern socio-economic system, which once have been worded by world-renowned philosopher V. V. Ilyin, do not remove contradictions stemming from the very nature of the human being characterised as follows: "*the paradoxicality of a human being lies in the duality of nature: he is the ego designing the world and he is the object existing in the world*" (emphasis our own) [7]. Under these circumstances, we deem appropriate to actualise exploration of the interrelation of the well-known human-centric paradigm of economic development and of the *transhumanistic paradigm*.

The essential characteristics of the *transhumanistic paradigm* are directly connected with specific views of a major group of scientists, politicians and businessmen regarding the nature, capacities and functions of a human being in the technologically united globalised society. Particularly, the representatives of this school of thought, as the problem researchers, specifically D. A. Anikin, mention, "refuse from any dogmatic treatment of human existence (first of all, religious ones); they understand the scientific knowledge development as a pre-requisite for technological and biological improvement of human; they perceive a human individual not as a final evolution product but as a transition stage on the way from biological individual to the clot of information and cybernetic fields and supreme intelligence". In the quoted opinion of D. A. Anikin, virtually, the transhumanism is a strive to overcome the limitation of human by his physiological features, a perception of the individual as an essence potentially unlimited in its development" [3].

In the same time, the other categorically minded researchers of the essence of the transhumanistic paradigm

of the globalised society social and economic development under the Industry 4.0 speak out even more frankly, at this highlighting that they draw from the experts' opinion. They assert that "*the very realisation of the eugenic idea: to create a 'superhuman' by means of 'enhancement' of a nowadays human in fact is the main goal of all the technological activities, whereas the rest is just a cover-up*" (emphasis our own) [12]. Under these conditions, without understanding of the dialectic of evolution patterns of system of motivation towards intellectual labour and working ethics in the process of transformation of economic and social systems in the context of regional and universal civilisation, it is practically impossible to identify not only distant but also the nearest trends in forming the paradigm and models of effective use of intellectual potential of hired workers, entrepreneurs, successful functioning of national states and supranational institutions under the fourth industrial revolution and globalised society.

2.3. Economic policy vs interests

The economic policy of any state is being formed in first turn by the political forces that are currently in power. The interests and power of various civil society structures, social groups, national traditions and lifestyles, after all, ambitions of separate politicians make a significant impact on such policies and the means of its realisation. However, all the above mentioned active subjects that influence the shaping of one or another economic policy goals, as well as the means of their realisation, should, if they really wish to satisfy their needs and interests, base their plans on recognition and accounting for political and economical realities emerging in the country and in the world. These are political and economic realities which define the starting opportunity level for outlining the system of strategic and tactical goals, making decisions on these matters, as well as the level and scope of compromises which the politicians, ruling establishment of state and the society have to reach for the best use of available resources and potential opportunities of the economy in meeting the interests of the stakeholder groups and population strata. Disregard of such politic and economic realities and needs, an erroneous paradigm of the goal setting and means to achieve them, will, under any conditions, result not only in loss of control over the situation but also in emergence of entropy and chaos signs in the economic and social system of the state, region, etc.

The results of the economic policy of Ukraine in the 90s of the 20th century (as well as at the beginning of the 21st century) can serve as a bright example that confirms such our opinions and conclusions. *First*, the transitional state of society of the post-socialist countries, including Ukraine, required particularly careful analysis of political and economic legacy which they had received after the collapse of the socialist economic system, i. the collapse of the USSR. This is because this very legacy had mainly defined that political, economic and social realities, on the basis of which, in fact, the paradigm of independent economic policy for future economic and social

development might have been shaped, without backing on paradigmatic principles of the “Washington consensus”. *Secondly*, in a political sense, coming-into-being of Ukraine’s independence meant, in the first turn, escape from under the all-powerful hand of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with its monopolistic dictate regarding how to live, what to do and for whom. Now dozens of political parties united into various pre-election blocks and fronts are taking part in the elections to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. But can we affirm that such an element of adverse political legacy as a political monopoly, strive for a sole power is a thing of the past? Unfortunately, there no grounds for drawing such a conclusion.

2.4. Paradigmatic thinking inertia

At the same time, it should be emphasised that the paradigmatic thinking inertia, protraction of the process of reevaluation of a real paradigmatic efficiency of the theory which serves as a basis for identification of patterns, trends and directions for economic and social development of the society under dynamic globalisation and fourth industrial revolution, namely neoliberalism, are dangerous in the scientific environment to the same degree as the inertia of Keynesianism and the neoKeynesianism in the struggle of scientific schools in the former period. Such an inertia in the community of scientific practitioners who perceive and evaluate in the sufficiently realistic way all the broadness, complexity and deepness of changes occurring in economic, social, political, spiritual life of individual countries and regions under the society globalisation, but do not notice the limitations of neoliberal theory with its principles of automation and atomisation of an individual as an economic agent, reasoning his existence based exclusively on the grounds of purely market economy, asociality, etc., which, in fact, closes the prospect for shaping of efficient economic and social policy of development in the era of globalism based on the unified humanistic principles.

2.5. Key principles of the economic policy for the development

The essential among those principles, in our opinion, should be the following ones: 1) shaping the economy of outrunning, and thus, innovative kind of development; 2) use of such (innovative) kind of development in order to provide conditions and needs for self-development of an individual and the society; 3) ensuring conditions for the world ecological system self-reproduction; 4) creation of real mechanisms for ensuring not only the market equity but also the social fairness about which some economic theorists say that it does not exist in the nature of economic and social relations.

At the same time, it should be appropriate to recall that it was Charles de Gaulle, prominent politician of the 20th century who worded the principles of the economic development policy for Europe which, we believe, are defining under the economic globalisation based on the fourth industrial

revolution: *first*, he treated the progress as public ownership. Particularly, when speaking before the German youth in 1962, the politician advanced the slogan: Progress for Europe is for everyone! Ch. De Gaulle believed that the economic progress should not fall to the share of few. *Secondly*, the leader of France asserted, society needs a strong Europe.

It is worth noting that for some time after the second world war the basis of the paradigm of wording of economic policy of development, particularly in European states, consisted of theoretical recommendations of economic science, specifically, from such schools as the neoKeynesianism, with its vision of the state’s role and functions in the economic life of society, and the ordoliberalism, a kind of neoliberalism with a focus on search of ways for solving social contradictions between major subjects of economic life on the grounds of dialectic combination of market fairness and social fairness. However, with the increasing dynamics of the processes of scientific and technological progress combining and formation of a new, post-industrial, informational type of technological mode of manufacturing increases, a paradoxical situation has occurred: real technical and technological opportunities to solve the social and economic contradictions in the society was growing bigger, but the results in the elimination of such contradictions were growing fewer [1,11]. In our opinion, one of the key reasons for this paradox is the paradigmatic orientation of theoretical economic research toward the principles of the neoliberalism.

3. NEOLIBERALISM AND POST-NEOLIBERALISM: CONTRADICTIONS OF THE ECONOMIC POLICY PARADIGM

3.1. The limitations of the neoliberalism as the economic policy paradigm

As we have already marked in our previous publications, the basis for the paradigm of research of an individual’s economic behaviour within the object field of the neoliberalism, i.e., the mainstream, consists of the principles ensuring revealing of the most rational forms and instruments of such behaviour in the economic activity from the perspective of getting the maximum benefit.

These principles, in modern critics’ opinion, are founded on the correspondent value orientations, in particular, such as: an “uncontrolled market” is the only way to express one’s own “small selfish interests”, “the state has to be small”, financial speculations are benefits, inequity is also a benefit; humanity in its natural state represents a handful of relentless individuals competing with each other”. “The main message of neoliberalism”, as J. Markoff believes, is that “there is no alternative to it” [9].

Such paradigmatic orientation of the neoliberalism has started to define — and continues to define nowadays — the paradigmatic basis for the economic policy of the leading states of the world, which principles, in conditions

of swift globalisation, are disseminated and accepted by the politicians of the majority of countries, including post-socialist countries and emerging economies.

Unfortunately, now (in 2019) some members of the new President of Ukraine's team have started to actively promote the ideas of libertarianism which one of the leading modern theorists, Jeffrey Sachs named an "extremist philosophy" because, in his opinion, it proclaims that "the only moral value is liberty, which means the right of everyone for non-interference in his personal life from the side of others and of the state". The scientist highlights: "in that philosophy, known as *libertarianism*, the individuals": 1) "have absolutely no responsibility other than to respect the liberty and property of others"; 2) "America should be governed not by social responsibilities but by free-market forces and voluntary private contracts", 3) Taxes should be slashed to the minimum" as "taxation almost does not differ from the state harassment". Jeffrey Sachs, reasoning his position, states the following: "Libertarians aim to absolve the rich of any social responsibilities toward the rest of society". At the same time, as the scientist is sure, "We also know from experience and moral tradition, that although liberty is indeed an important value, it's not the only one that counts", and, "When libertarians deride the idea of social fairness as just one more nuisance, they unleash greed. J. Sachs draws the essential conclusion: "The kind of unconstrained greed that is now loose in America is leading not to real liberty but to corporate criminality and deceit; not to democracy but to politics dominated by special interests. This unconstrained greed is leading not to prosperity but to income stagnation for much of the population and to untold riches at the very top" [14].

Perhaps our young politicians should first make a detailed acquaintance of the world theory and practice as well as of the libertarianism role in generating and deepening of economic and social contradictions in the modern society, and after that to decide whether it is expedient to speak out the support to this odious and politicised concept. After all, the country even has not started to recover yet from the Ukrainian libertarianism model which acted in 2014-2019. This is a clear illustration of direct dependency (unfortunately, not always positive) between the economic theory quality, its relevance toward needs and requirements of the mankind development in the given historical period of its existence, the quality of subjective thinking, quality, i.e., relevance, of strategic goals they formulate, as well as of the economic policy instruments and the level of meeting the interests of all social groups in separate countries and in globalised society as a whole. In fact, a situation has arisen when the leading scientific school of modern economic theory — liberalism — has proceeded from performing purely cognitive and conceptual functions to explicitly political ones, thus sanctifying the paradigm of the economic policy based on exclusively rational behaviour in the interest of separate social groups or separate groups of countries with "scientific arguments" [10].

3.2. Post-neoliberal economic policy paradigm and its social principles

The paradigmatic neoliberalism principles noted above, in our opinion, have a key essential weakness: the proponents of this theory formulate them by analysing only the current institutional state of economy and society, albeit dominating at present. However, the systemic-philosophical, interdisciplinary approaches, etc. imply the need, when researching any phenomena or processes, "to see the tree for the forest", i.e. to follow the principle "no detail is too small", to forecast future states, relations, changes. Such comprehension of the research principles requires to regard the economy not as a set, static state of value orientations shaped by neoliberals but also as a complex variety of possible contradictions that lead to the destruction of the mainstream model principles of market economic system functioning. After all, the substantial basis of the economic policy founded on the neoliberalism principles will entail (and does entail on an increasing scale) the inequality deepening and, consequently, society polarisation, unemployment growth and transformation of part of active population into "precariat" — a new dangerous class [22], and, in the end, lead to the need in even harsher intervention of the state into economic development regulation processes in order to prevent a systemic entropy.

Perhaps, this is the reason why in some countries a post-neoliberal economic policy paradigm is quickly formed with a focus on the change of authority's stance to the poor, on building a social consensus which respects the requirements of growth and business interest and is sensitive to the challenges of poverty and society [4].

4. GROWTH OF ECONOMY CAPACITIES AND GROWTH OF SOCIAL INEQUALITY: WHY DOES THIS PARADOX EXIST?

4.1. Growth of Inequality and Unfairness Under the Industry 4.0: why?

Among the other reasons of the paradox of disparity between the growth of real capacities of economy and growth dynamics of social inequality and social unfairness already in the 21st century, the researchers point out the following ones: globalisation, technological changes (including those in the field of information and communication technologies), financial service sector growth, change of labour remuneration standards, diminishing of the trade unions role, rolling back of the policy of income redistribution by means of the system of tax and transfers [1]. Some of the stated inequality growth reasons such as technological changes and globalisation, at least, at the given historical stage of their deployment, set at the gaze, as they, in our opinion, due to growing need in

intellectual production and intellectual labour, agricultural sector products, etc. might be beneficial for reducing social unfairness and social inequality creating a new field of opportunities both for specific countries and for an individuals. Thereby, to ascribe technological changes and globalisation to the reasons of aggravations of such contradictions means, to the best of our belief, to recognise the unfairness of the very socio-economic set-up, both within separate countries and in a whole globalised society.

By the way, it is worth noting that Antony Atkinson, a respected authority in research of revenue and wealth distribution problems, the one of few Western researchers who when analysing problems and reasons of inequality growth in the globalised 21st-century society does recognise existing of the problem of limitation of traditional for the modern economic theory arguments characterising the reasons of inequality growth and unfairness in the modern capitalist society. In his recent monograph (*Inequality—What Can Be Done*, 2018) A. Atkinson poses the question: Why is it possible, and how to get rid of it? A certain outline of the answer can be seen in his reflections regarding the reasons of revenue inequality reduction “in a range of European countries” “in first post-WWII decades” and of its precipitous growth in the last decade of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century [1].

4.2. The Commitment of the Economic Policy of Development to a Human-centric Paradigm as a Requirement in Overcoming Inequality

Among these reasons, the scientist points out, in the first turn, the following ones: in Atkins’ opinion, in the first case, the dominating after second world war economic policy paradigm based on the concepts of the social market economy and a welfare state favoured to the reduction of inequality. Respectively, as the researcher marks, in this period, a common welfare state developed and the social security system, which have been financed albeit partially at the expense of progressive revenue taxation” [1]. Besides, as the researcher believes, “distribution of such components of income as wage and capital income became less unequal” [1]. Meanwhile, as the quoted author states, “As the size of the dependent population increased, so the distribution of market incomes (earnings, self-employment income, rent, dividends, interest, and private pensions and other private transfers) became more unequal” [1]. For this reason, starting from the 80s, of the 20th century, the state has lost a capability to “fight” with expanding inequality of market incomes, often “as a result of political decisions aiming to reduce the allowances as well as the portion of the population entitled to them” [1]. At this particular time, the u-turn occurs toward shaping the principles and paradigm of economic policy on the basis of neoliberalism. If in the first case we can see an increasing role of the state in support of market economy orientation toward a human-centric paradigm whereas in the second one orientation is towards the freedom of an individual, although we can rather speak of collective

individuals like corporations, etc. The state has been partially removed from ensuring the economic development orientation on the basis of the human-centric paradigm and partly voluntarily transferred its social functions to the private capital — large corporations. These were the conditions under which the thesis regarding the social responsibility of business had been shaped and is also being actively utilised nowadays. However, in private business much depends on market conditions, on risks arising from the competitive fighting. Thus, a business cannot, even if it wishes to, bear full-fledged social responsibilities which, on the top of it, should be permanent. In our opinion, this should be a prerogative of such systemic institutions as state and society.

Thus, the global transformations under the Industry 4.0 relating the choice of the methodological paradigm of economic development policy, should be based on the following principles and tasks [6]:

- consider the peculiarities of global processes transformation resulting from the fourth industrial revolution when defining the economic policy of national states development;
- recognition by the governments and politicians of the unavoidability of changes concerning the Economy Model 4.0 and, respectively, tuning the economic policy of the state to adaptation and considering of segmental interests of society, an individual and business groups, to the social stabilisation and consensus;
- finding the mechanisms minimising the influence of subjective beliefs of politicians and government officials on the choice and shaping of the development economic policy in the matters of ensuring the scientific substantiation of such policy instead of accommodating to the dominating theoretical paradigm of the neoliberal economy;
- finding the concordance between increasing capacities of the Economy 4.0 and controversial influence of the fourth industrial revolution upon the individual and society;
- ensuring the correspondence between rising economy capabilities and human-centric and transhumanistic values of the society, prevention of social and economic inequality deepening and of wealth divide through revealing of additional opportunities and modern socio-economic instruments of policy;
- prevention of individual’s subjugation by technology, and, inversely, the liberation of human from excessive work, creation of conditions for creative evolution of an individual, full unlocking of an individual’s intellectual and creative potential;
- mitigating the contradictions between financial and industrial capital, and therefore between a corporate individual with neoliberal management logic and a person (citizen, worker); prevention of deepening asymmetry in the process of concordance of interests of key economy agents towards the interest of financial and industrial capital, market interest;
- ensuring realisation of an objective logic and human-centric values of economic development under the Industry 4.0 instead of subjective judgements of politicians, power holders, government officials regarding content of such

development, based on the level of their knowledge and education, subjective experience which may be and is dangerous, creates chaos and entropy processes; consequently overcoming the inertia of their paradigmatic thinking;

- facilitating the development of post-neoliberal thinking of politicians and government officials and all the subjects of economic life;
- recognition of advantages of differences and diversity, pluralism of thoughts and approaches in the economy;

5. CONCLUSION

It is worth noting that namely pragmatic, purely economic approach to search of solutions for the problems becoming acute both for poor and rich countries of the world (which constitutes a limitation of neoliberalism as a basis for shaping the modern paradigm of economic science research and paradigm of modern economic policy) called into being the process of re-actualisation of the modern political economy. The latter one, when analysing socio-economic problems and contradictions of the globalised world, offers a qualitatively new paradigm which basic principles are: *first*, revealing at the categorical, conceptual and institutional levels of main principles and laws of movement of economic systems, national and global economies (in certain societal and institutional forms of their manifestation), and, *secondly*, identifying the nature of key factors forming beliefs of a specific individual — subject of economic relationship, practitioner, society regarding the nature of substantial fundamentals of dialectics of economic systems movement. Solving such kind of tasks presumes a substantiation of objective nature and forms of manifestation of dialectics of interdependence of the general and the specific (in the given case this refers to the society and market, etc.) on the one hand, and of dialectics of coming into being and development of entire range of paradigms in the philosophical approaches to the principles of interaction and mutual influence of the society and economy, particularly of the modern society and modern market economy, on the other hand [6]. The basis of such a paradigm of the laws of functioning of the modern economy and society from the perspective of ensuring of their systemic dialectical unity is formed, as we believe, by the objectively key principles of its value orientation: intellectualisation, morality, spirituality, responsibility, social unity of subjects of economic and public life, focus on ensuring optimal balance of market and social fairness at micro- and macrolevel and so on.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by scientific school of KNEU named after Vadym Hetman

- prevention of abuse and speculations in decision making regarding the economic policy which should contribute to the development of all groups of interest, business, individual and state and not to obstruct it.
- implementation of the human-centric and transhumanistic paradigm of the economic policy of development into real life based on the primacy of human-centricity.

"Contemporary Political Economy" and All-Ukrainian Association of Political Economy.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Atkinson, *Inequality: How to deal with it?* trans. from Eng. O. Levchenko; under the scientific ed. M. Dobryakova, Publishing House "Delo", RANH and GS, Moscow, 2018, 536 p., pp. 119–121, 148.
- [2] T. Bloommart, Stefan van den Brook, *Fourth Industrial Revolution and Business: How to Compete and Develop in an Era of Singularity*, trans. from English, Alpina Publisher, Moscow, 2019, 204 p.
- [3] D. A. Anikin *Transhumanism as an alternative project of social memory*, in: *Global Future 2045: Anthropological crisis. Converged Technologies. Transhumanist projects: Materials of the First All-Russian Conference*, Belgorod, April 11 - 12, 2013, Ed. D. I. Dubrovsky, S.M. Klimova, "Canon +" ROOI "Rehabilitation", Moscow, 2014, pp. 96–106.
- [4] Ch. Wylde, *Twenty-first century developmental states? Argentina under the Kirchners*, *Journal Third World Quarterly*, Volume 39, 2018, Issue 6: Special issue: Developmental states beyond East Asia, pp.1115-1132. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2017.1333418>.
- [5] E. Drexler, *Radical Abundance: How a Revolution in Nanotechnology Will Change Civilization* Kindle Edition; trans. from English Y. Kapturevsky; under the scientific. Ed. S. Lurie, Publishing house of the Gaidar Institute, Moscow, 2014, 504 p.
- [6] Yu. K. Zaitsev., O. M. Moskalenko, *Contemporary political economy as a theoretical basis of economic development of society: in 2 books, Book I. Philosophical and methodological foundations of the architecture of the subject of contemporary political economy*. KNEU, Kyiv, 2018, 397 p.

- [7] V. V. Ilyin, *The philosophy of history*, Publishing House of Moscow University, 2003, 380 p., pp. 27,40–41.
- [8] E. V. Ksenchuk, *Systemic thinking. The boundaries of mental models and systemic vision of the world*, Publishing house "Delo", RANEPa, Moscow, 2011, pp. 201, 210, 207.
- [9] J. Markoff, *Homo Roboticus? People and machines in search of mutual understanding*, trans. from English, Alpina non-fiction, Moscow, 2017, 406 p., pp. 10.
- [10] P. Mason, *Postcapitalism: a guide to our future*, Ad Marginem Press, Moscow, 2016, 416 p., pp. 10.
- [11] Th. Picketty, *Capital in the 21st Century*, Hell Margin Press, Moscow, 2015, 592 p.
- [12] *The problem of human development (in the light of new technologies): Transhumanism and the problem of social risks. Reductionism as the temptation of human sciences. On the idols and ideals of human biotechnological self-invention. How is a perfect person possible? / Responsible ed. G. L. Belkina; Ed. M. I. Frolova. Foreword S. N. Korsakova*, LENAND, Moscow, 2016, 272 p.
- [13] E. S. Reinert, *Spontaneous Chaos – Economics in a Time of Wolves*; trans. from nor. A.V. Naumova, Political Encyclopedia, Moscow, 2017, 190 p.
- [14] J. Sachs, *The Price of Civilization*, trans. from English A. Kalinina; ed. V. Yu. Grigorieva, Publishing House of the Gaidar Institute, Moscow, 2012, 352 p, pp. 53–56.
- [15] A. Selivanov, *Development of objects. Science of future management*, Algorithm LLC, Moscow, 2016, 848 p., pp. 143–144.
- [16] M. Ford, *Rise of the Robots: Technology and Threat of Jobless Future*, trans. from English, Alpina non-fiction, Moscow, 2016, 430 p.
- [17] M. Friedman, *The methodology of positive economics*, THESIS, 1994, no. 4, pp. 20–52, p.43.
- [18] J. Brockman, *What to Think About Machines That Think: Today's Leading Thinkers on the Age of Machine Intelligence (Edge Question Series)*, trans. from English, Alpina non-fiction, Moscow, 2017, 549 p.
- [19] K. Schwab, *Fourth Industrial Revolution*, trans. from English, Publishing House "E", Moscow, 2018, 208 p., pp. 17–18.
- [20] K. Schwab, N. Davis, *Technology of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*, trans. from English, Eksmo, Moscow, 2018, 320 p., (Top Business Awards).
- [21] Th. S. Kuhn. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions: 50th Anniversary Edition. (with an introduction by Ian Hacking)* Univ. Chicago Press, 2012, 264 pp.
- [22] G. Standing, *Precariat: a new dangerous class*, Ad Marginem Press LLC, 2014, IRIS Art Foundation.