

## РАЗВИТИЕ ЭЛЕМЕНТОВ ОБЩЕСТВЕННОЙ СВЯЗИ В УСЛОВИЯХ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ КОНКУРЕНЦИИ

**SUKHOVA T.L.**

*Senior Lecturer,*

*Department of General Economic Theory and Economic Policy,*

*Odessa National Economic University,*

*Odessa, Ukraine*

In the conditions of crisis and post-crisis instability, the “narrow” places of the theoretical foundations of economic policy are especially acute. Thus, in the modern conditions of a global deficit of aggregate demand, the problem of the economic rationality of producers becomes especially urgent.

It is known that the level of rationality is determined, first of all, by the degree of awareness of producers about the nature and structure of social needs. And in this connection, the current state of the economy reveals the inadequacy of the neoclassical postulate of complete rationality of economic subjects. In essence, this state indicates that the rationality of economic entities is far from the ideal model and information about the needs of society reaches the producers very distortedly, incompletely, at the wrong time, etc.

The problem of rationality, in essence, is a subjective expression of the social mode of communication between production and consumption. Thus, the problem of the social mode of communication between production and consumption is revealed in its entirety. And this problem manifests itself, primarily, through the problems of economic forms that are formed in modern conditions. The article discusses the main features of one of these forms - marketing. It is shown that marketing is a transitional form, and also - with necessity - a transformed form. Particular attention is paid to the problems of marketing as a form of economic connection between production and consumption in the conditions of the modern Ukrainian economy [9, p.117.].

The urgency of marketing problems is determined by the fact that its development in Ukraine is much slower than that required by the participation of domestic producers in the international division of labor. Marketing is an essential element of the modern connection between production and consumption; therefore, its immaturity is a significant impediment to the development of the Ukrainian economy and increasing the efficiency of its functioning. The immaturity of marketing in domestic enterprises, the unresolved many of the economic, psychological and organizational problems of its development, the formality of its application causes a keen interest in marketing issues.

The article considers the main features of marketing as a form of economic connection. It is shown that marketing is necessarily a transformed form. The problems of marketing in the conditions of the modern Ukrainian economy are considered.

The purpose of this study is to study the form taken by the elements of communication production and consumption, arising in the current conditions. In addition, it is very important to find out how objectively necessary and historically inevitable this form is. Are there alternative, alternative historical ways of developing elements of social communication between production and consumption?

To assess the degree of development FORM connection production and consumption, let us first turn to the surface of the phenomena of economic life of Soviet society. At this level of analysis, which does not pretend to be deeper, the planned economy stands, first of all, as a resource-limited system, opposite to the demandedlimited system, characteristic of a market economy. The criterion for delimiting these two types is the limiter or regulator of production growth. According to this criterion, J. Cornei, as is known, delimited these two types of economic systems [2, p.117.].

In the demanded system of production growth is constantly limited to demand. This means that the scale of the expansion of production by its regulator has a demand in the market, which in turn expresses the volume and structure of public needs.

Thus, in this case, the expansion of production is carried out in the form of cash and constantly changing social needs. These needs may be unknown in advance, but may be well-known. This means that the concept of demand-limited system is wider than the concept of commodity production.

The latter involves an unknown market. In this case, the connection between production and consumption, which is mediated by this unknown market, is established.

However, the development of marketing, study and regulation of social needs, the formation of regulatory elements by themselves do not abolish the demand-limited nature of the economic system. It remains demand limited, despite the fact that the relationship between production and consumption begins to be set differently. Demand, and consequently, the social needs behind it continue to determine the limits of production growth. Moreover, its effect on production through marketing becomes more direct. It is carried out not by retrograde, after the end of the production process, but a priori, even before the production is completed. Therefore, marketing as a form of formation of social communication contributes to improving the efficiency of the functioning and development of production.

Thanks to marketing, production gets rid of many obstacles that hindered its development on the basis of the spontaneous market mechanism of free competition [7, p.117.].

But this is not the case. Thanks to modern marketing, producers get an opportunity not only passively adapt to existing demand, but also actively form it. This aspect of the functioning of the modern economy is most clearly reflected in J. Galbraith, who counts the sector of large corporations is not market, and a planning system that actively influences the consumer [1, p. 214].

But the active action of producers to demand through marketing does not eliminate the demand still-limited character of the modern economy. After all, the solvent need remains a limiting factor in the growth of production, even if demand is not only studied, but is also the subject of active action by producers. True, since the producer influences demand, based on the resources available to him, there are

already beginning to appear elements of resource constraints, but they are not found directly, but indirectly - through the mediation of demand restraint.

Thus, to the extent that the modern producer is no longer just studying demand, but also actively regulating it, the demandedlimited nature of the modern economic system acts as a form on which elements of resource constraints begin to emerge[10, P. 45-61].

We see, however, that the emergence of elements of resource constraints, taking place with the development of the marketing action of producers for the consumption of their products, somewhat lags behind the process of undermining commodity production.

Since commodity production involves an unknown market, marketing research of social needs, even if they are not accompanied by active action on demand, indicate that the commodity communication includes regulatory elements.

However, in this case, as we have seen above, hidden elements of resource constraints do not arise yet. They appear only when marketing research goes into the active action of producers to consume their products.

Here is the difference between the concepts of demanded limited system and commodity production, which was discussed above. Of course, the main difference is that they relate to absolutely different levels of analysis of the economic structure of society.

The category of commodity production characterizes the profound level of industrial relations, which determines the whole way of life of the economic system of a given society.

The concept of the demanded limited system reflects only a few aspects of the mechanism of operation and development of production. Therefore, these concepts are generally qualitatively incommensurate, since they relate to different levels of economic analysis. However, between them is visible certain connection, since demand constraint acts as one of the characteristics of the functioning and development of commodity production.

But even here there is some fundamentally important difference between these concepts, the difference is already more quantitative than the qualitative nature, that is, the difference in the degree of coverage of historical phenomena. It consists in the fact that the concept of a demand-limited system covers not only classical commodity or commodity-capitalist production, but also commodity production, which is at that stage of development, when the market is already becoming more or less known in advance, but not yet becoming the object of massive active actions by the manufacturer. Only with the deployment of this action there is an opportunity to talk about the emergence of elements of resource constraints, hiding behind the demand limitation.

Demand-limited economy is a highly flexible, constantly rebuilding industrial system that changes its structure relatively quickly with changes in social needs. But it is elastic in the sense that it has the ability to function effectively and to develop not only in the conditions of commodity or commodity-capitalist production, but also when commodity production is already complemented by the development of elements of conscious regulation. Moreover, its efficiency as it complements has a tendency to increase.

In the opposite to it, resource-limited system of scale expansion of production is related directly to the availability of resources, especially material, as well as - labor.

This means that the limiter of production in this case is not a need, but as a production itself: the more produced by the product, the more resources are needed for its further expansion, and so on. In other words, in the resource-limited system, the connection of production and consumption is not formed with social needs, but with the result of the production process itself and, above all, with its magnitude. Changing needs, in particular, their structure, is not entirely necessary for relevant changes in production[11, P. 135-138].

Moreover, such a change is objectively undesirable and even devastating for a production system adapted to work with data from existing resources. Therefore, the resource-limited system is, in principle, extremely "rigid".

Its functioning is determined by the nature and structure of available resources, and development is carried out in a strictly defined direction. Therefore, it is characterized by a specific goal of functioning and development: expansion of production to increase the amount of resources as a means of even greater growth in production. This is the specific embodiment of the non-commodity principle of "production for the sake of production". [6, p.68].

This built-in resource-limited system, the mechanism of "production for the sake of production" has led to a natural pursuit of the "shaft", that is, the focus on the predominantly quantitative growth. However, the main scourge of the demanded system was its inherent general, chronic, self-replicating, intense deficits.

J. Kornai's famous "Deficit" work was aimed at showing that the deficit in the command economy is not a kind of superficial, purely market-related phenomenon, due to the stiffness of the government's planned prices. Kornai criticizes above all those Western economists who explained the chronic shortage in the command economy with the help of neoclassical curves of market demand and supply, the intersection of which shows the level of equilibrium price [10, P. 45-61].

If the target price is set below the equilibrium level, then this scheme shows the appearance of the gap between demand and supply. Market economy, due to competition, has the ability to quickly eliminate significant market price deviations from equilibrium prices. Therefore, a chronic deficit in principle is impossible here.

On the contrary, the command and administrative system does not have such a mechanism. The planned price here due to its rigidity can for a long time be reproduced at a level below the price of equilibrium, thus causing the chronically reproducible excess of demand over the proposal, which creates a deficit [110, P. 345-361].

The disadvantage of this neoclassical explanation for the deficit, despite its elegance, seems to be the complete neglect of the processes taking place in the depths of production. In contrast to the simplified neoclassical interpretation of the deficit, J. Kornai sought to show that the action of the command system is not limited to the sphere of treatment that it "sprout" into the depths of production changes its

character, determines even the intra-industrial relations, which are formed within the framework of enterprises.

In essence, J. Kornai opposed the neoclassical principle of the primacy of the treatment of production of the scientific principle of the primacy of production in relation to the treatment. He showed that the emergence and constant reproduction of the deficit in all spheres of the economy [and not only on the final products, but above all - on many types of resources] is determined by the very nature of the system, which he called resource-limited [2, p.312-318]

Historical experience of the functioning and development of the Soviet economy shows: emerging as a system that claims the most rational use of all resources, it led eventually to their less rational use than the demanded limited system.

J. Kornai showed that this paradoxical result is a consequence of the embedded in the resource-limited system of mechanism: every factor in the growth of production, "tuned" by the criterion of maximizing the use of resources, leads in the end to the appearance and deepening of the shortage of resources. In turn, the shortage of resources inevitably generates a shortage of consumer goods, which manifests itself not only in the lack of products necessary to meet the needs of the population, but also in the associated negative social consequences, as a special system of distribution of goods, queues, various privileges, abuse, corruption, and so on

Resource-bound system gave rise to "seller's market". Conditions of unsatisfied constantly maintained demand allowed the manufacturer to ignore the requirements of consumers, be it the enterprise as a consumer of means of production, or the end user. This gave consumers the opportunity to "stay afloat," not caring about quality, using the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution, and so on.

But the main thing - the manufacturer did not interest the consumer at all. If the consumer was an enterprise, then his study was reduced to putting pressure on him and to sell unnecessary products to him. If it was a matter of personal consumption, then the manufacturer had no business at all to the consumer of his products. He

directly dealt only with wholesale companies, and signals about social needs reached him very indirectly.

As a result, the Soviet economy essentially worked for an unknown consumer. Thus, she constantly reproduced one of the weakest, vulnerable features of spontaneous capitalist production - the consumer's ignorance. The historical paradox, however, was that this feature was reproduced on a planned basis, that is, on the basis directly opposite to the commodity-capitalist organization of the economy.

As you know, the essence of commodity production is to work on an unknown market. The initial relation of commodity-capitalist production stands, therefore, the indirect method of communication between production and consumption is mediated by an unknown market. That is why the development of elements of regulation that converts an unknown market partially known, understood, one that is segmented and adjustable, acts as the development of deep foundation - the initial ratio of commodity production, and, consequently, the capitalist mode of production based on it.

An unknown market means that the manufacturer has a very rough idea of the volume and structure of social needs, and therefore works blindly. Consequently, ignorance of the market is a lack of knowledge of the consumer. But ignorance of the consumer is characteristic not only for the spontaneous market organization of the economy, but also for the planned economy of the Soviet type, which has a pronounced resource-limited character.

Moreover, in practice, the uncertainty, not studied by the consumer to a much greater extent, was characteristic of a centrally-controlled production, than for modern capitalism, in which, through the development of marketing, the process of forming new elements of the social communication of production and consumption was under way. Consequently, the Soviet economy was characterized by a generally lower level of adjustment of production to consumption, than for the so-called market economy, which in the twentieth century has essentially ceased to be a market economy.



One of the manifestations of this in the Soviet economy was a bizarre combination of a commodity deficit with excessive things that were not realized, no less significant in their volumes, than the deficit itself.

Soviet shops were filled with clothes, footwear, fabrics, haberdashery, and so on, but it was difficult to find the consumer's desired goods because of the discrepancy of the style, color, lag behind the fashion, not to mention the low quality of the products being sold.

For many of their species, the annual sales volume did not exceed 30%, and sometimes 10% of revenues during this time. If the light industry was able to produce products, at least closer to the real structure of public demand, even with a slight increase in quality, the turnover would accelerate in 2-2,5 times. [3, p.7]. Even in food supply, where production is more easily adapted to demand, and its dissatisfaction is felt to be particularly acute, the deficit also coexisted with the excess of poor quality or overproduced products.

The main reason for the low level of development of new forms of communication between production and consumption in the Soviet economy was that the transformation of property rights was not accompanied by adequate changes in its economic content.

The delineation of these two sides is the most important methodological element of strictly scientific analysis of the economy.

On the one hand, property rights are voluntary, political and legal relations and in general are outside the subject of economic theory. On the other hand, the economic content of property, which is identical to the system of material production relations, is precisely the subject of economic theory. Their objective character means independence from the will and consciousness of people, which makes industrial relations directly opposite in its nature volitional, political-legal relations and allocates them (production relations) from the whole mass of social relations, turning into the basis of society.

The clarification of the economic content of property means considering it not as a special independent relation in the system of production relations, namely as the

very system itself, that is, as the economic structure of society, covering the relations of production, distribution, exchange and consumption. Of course, property relations, which are considered as a whole, cover various aspects of social relations - both economic and ideological, and volitional social relations.

And if we tried to investigate the property relations as a special element in the system of social relations, then inevitably would not be able to distinguish, abstract what is in these economic relations, from the fact that they have an ideological one.

Consideration of property as an independent element would be based essentially on the study of property as a legal relationship, as property rights, that is, to determine who owns, who owns and disposes of what, who uses it, and so on - in other words, to the establishment of certain relations between the subject and the object, which are not economic, but legal or volitional [4, p.8-10].

Therefore, when it is said that ownership in economic theory can not be regarded as a special, independent relationship that exists along with the relations of production, distribution, exchange and consumption, then it means the impossibility of ascertaining the economic content of property outside and independently of analysis of the totality of production relations. There is no other reason to define property as a set of economic relations.

An example of the application of this approach to the study of the Soviet economy is the delineation of nationalization or nationalization of means of production, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the socialization of production in practice [8, p.118-110].

This system in the Soviet society has never been created. Instead, there was a Resource-limited system that was based on an unheard-of disregard for public needs and worked blindly to an unknown consumer while other countries began to develop elements of study and demand formation.

Thus, judging by the nature and degree of development of the economic connection of production and consumption, the Soviet economy serves as a specific kind of state capitalism, coupled with pre-capitalist relations of non-economic coercion and functions as a resource-limited system.

This circumstance was one of the most important factors determining the objective need for economic reform of the Soviet system and one of the most important reasons for its collapse.

Thanks, first of all, to the high level of development of marketing in Western society, the behavior of business entities here is much closer to a model of complete rationality than the behavior of subjects of the Ukrainian economy, therefore the measure of objectively necessary state intervention in the functioning of the Ukrainian economy is significantly different from the optimal measure of state regulation of a highly developed economy.

In the first case, this measure is objectively much higher than in the second one, since under relatively poorly developed marketing in Ukraine, the low level of awareness and rationality of economic entities does not provide sufficiently effective self-regulation of the economy through market forces. Therefore, the correlation between regulation and self-regulation in the post-Soviet economy can not be the same as in the highly developed.

Only with the development of modern industrial capital and marketing as an element of its reproduction, objective conditions are created to change the correlation between regulation and self-regulation. It follows that this ratio should be smoothly and consistently changed throughout the transition period, rather than immediately, by jerk, as it happened in practice in the 1990s.

In this gradual shift, the relationship between state regulation and market self-regulation should consist of an evolutionary transition from the command-administrative to the market economy, which takes place without revolutionary upheaval. It is in this natural-historical movement that the objective economic necessity, which is designed to fix economic theory, lies.

Whether this objective necessity will be realized in practice or further development of society along the path fraught with shocks will depend on the chosen concept of transition to a market that determines the economic policy of the state. [5, p.73-107]

Of course, the development of practical recommendations on specific areas of economic policy in Ukraine goes beyond the scope of this work. However, the concept of transition to a regulated market as a transformed form of mature commodity relations serves as the theoretical basis for further research.

#### Reference:

1. Galbraith JK Economic theories and goals of society. - Moscow: Progress, 1973.-432c.
2. Kornai J. Deficiency. - M.: Progress, 1990. - 392c.
3. Pichchei A. Human qualities. - M.: Progress, 1980.- 302p.
4. Pokrytan A.K. On the nature of industrial relations of modern Ukraine // Economy of Ukraine, 1997, No. 10. - P. 12-18.
5. Pokrytan A.K. Transition economics, its content and features // Economy of Ukraine. - 1996.- No. 11.- P. 17-29.
6. Chamberlin E.H. The theory of monopolistic competition. - Moscow: The Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1959. - 411s.
7. Evans J., Berman B. Marketing. - M.: Sirin, 2002.-308s.
8. Yatskii L.O. Economics and economic relations. - K.: Technique. 2006.- 229pp.
9. Zveryakov M.I. Theoretical problems of the formation of a national economic system: monograph / M.I. Zveryakov. - O.: Astroprint, 2012. - 349c.
10. Papava V. State, Public Sector and Theoretical Prerequisites to a Model of an “Economy Without Taxes” // International Journal of Social Economics. 2000. Vol. 27. No. 1-2. P. 45-61.
11. Olson M. Power and prosperity: Outgrowing communist and capitalist dictatorships. M.: New Publishing, 2012 – 212 p.