

## DISCUSSION CLUB

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.12958/1817-3772-2024-4\(78\)-200-207](https://doi.org/10.12958/1817-3772-2024-4(78)-200-207)

UDC 331.5+331.24+338.23

**V. Stolyarov,**

*DrHab (Economics), Professor,*  
ORCID 0000-0002-4399-7117,  
e-mail: stolyarovvf@ukr.net,

**O. Shinkaryuk,**

*PhD (Economics),*  
ORCID 0000-0002-3004-0404,

**V. Stolyarova,**

*PhD (Economics),*  
ORCID 0000-0002-9483-5126,

*Institute of Physical Economy named after S. A. Podolynskyi, Kyiv,*

**S. Vorobey,**

*PhD student,*  
ORCID 0009-0008-3711-9407,

*Kharkiv National Economic University named after Semyon Kuznets*

### CYCLICALITY OF HUMAN-CENTERED DEVELOPMENT OF UKRAINE IN THE SYSTEM OF PRINCIPLES OF STATE STRATEGIC PLANNING

**Introduction.** In accordance with the state socio-economic policy, state strategic planning of human-centered development is the basis for the implementation of the constitutional provisions of a united, sovereign and independent Ukraine. The input conditions of state strategic planning are the presence of a long-term demographic forecast and a forecast of the country's innovative, technological and scientific and technical development.

The main condition for achieving proper effectiveness of state strategic planning is, first of all, the unity and adequacy of real affairs with management decisions for the long-term (more than 10-15 years) perspective of different levels of management. The motto "Unity of words and deeds" becomes a criterion for purposeful, stable and planned-sustainable human-centered development of the country.

The set of principles of state strategic planning forms a complex of scientific and practical knowledge of the systemic methodology for preparing, adopting and monitoring the implementation of local management decisions in accordance with the requirements of their integration as a single whole.

The systematic methodology of state strategic planning should include processes and procedures for harmonizing social relations based on the social responsibility of subjects and management bodies in accordance with the social division of labor.

Social responsibility is defined by specialists and scientists of the Institute of Industrial Economics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Donetsk – Kyiv) as “an expression of will, conditioned by appropriate behavior in compliance with perceived restrictions and social norms, guarantees security and progressive development, and ensures the coherence of interests of subjects involved in public relations and their management” [1, p. 42].

An expert survey in 2012 on obstacles to Ukraine's implementation of international commitments on sustainable development showed a lack of focus of state and regional management systems on their implementation (65.2% of experts indicated this reason) [1, p. 44].

Therefore, the development of development strategies for Ukraine at the national and regional levels of government based on the principles of state strategic planning should be based on social responsibility, taking into account:

- International standards of social responsibility ISO 2600;
- ISO 9001:2000;
- ISO 14000 standard in the field of environmental management systems;
- GRI- recommendations for reporting in the field of sustainable development.



© Publisher Institute of Industrial Economy of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 2024

© Publisher State Higher Education Institution "Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University", 2024

In accordance with international standards, social responsibility in Ukraine should be considered as the responsibility of the state for a decent standard of living of current and future generations with the definition of the best ways to achieve stable and planned sustainable human-centered development.

The former, unopposed head of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko (speaking at the 70th anniversary session of the UN General Assembly on September 25, 2015, which adopted the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for the period up to 2030) noted that in order to achieve them at the national level, Ukraine will implement new programs and projects that will practically ensure macroeconomic stability, environmental balance and social cohesion. The SDGs will serve as a common basis for further transformations in Ukraine as an independent, sovereign, social, legal and unitary state.

Unfortunately, in 2016-2020, this intention was not implemented either by the Government of Ukraine or by Petro Poroshenko's Solidarity Bloc in Parliament. In the elections to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine of the 9th convocation, the election programs "Ukrainian Government: Yesterday and Today", "European Solidarity" and "V. Groysman's Ukrainian Strategy" did not contain any provisions regarding these intentions, not to mention the relevant project justifications and planning and forecast calculations.

The State Target Program for the Restoration and Building of Peace in the Eastern Regions of Ukraine (December 2017 [2]) noted that during its implementation the provisions of the National Report "Sustainable Development Goals: Ukraine 2030" would be taken into account. On the contrary, the provisions of this National Report should have become the basis of this program. That is, the increase in the social responsibility of the Government of Ukraine for program decisions in the future did not occur.

The 6th President of the «Republic of UKRAINE», Mr. Zelensky, who was elected in turn, was among the first to adopt the Decree of September 20, 2019 No. 713 "On Urgent Measures to Ensure Evolutionary Growth, Stimulate the Development of Regions and Prevent Corruption", in which he obliged the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine to ensure the development and approval of the State Strategy for Regional Development for 2021-2027 by January 1, 2020.

The development of this strategy was started by the Ministry of Regional Development of UKRAINE ahead of schedule – from April 1, 2019. According to the current regulatory and methodological instructions, the strategy should have been approved by July 1, 2020 (6 months from the start of its implementation – January 1, 2021). But, despite the instructions of the 6th President, the State Strategy for Regional Development for 2021-2027 was approved by the Government on August 5, 2020, that is, 7 months later. Public information on the status of implementation of the Presidential Decree of September 20, 2019. No. 713

should have been provided by October 15, 2019 and January 20, 2020. In the legal framework of UKRAINE, there is no social, administrative and criminal liability for failure to meet reporting deadlines.

President of UKRAINE Zelensky, by his decree of September 30, 2019 No. 722 "On the Sustainable Development Goals of Ukraine for the period up to 2030", decided to ensure compliance with and publication of the implemented effective system for monitoring their implementation annually by March 1 of the year following the reporting year. But information on the implementation of the 7 national Sustainable Development Goals adapted for UKRAINE, starting from 2019, is not publicly available. First of all, there is no information on the implementation of the First Goal – "Eliminate poverty".

The aforementioned Decree of the President of UKRAINE dated September 30, 2019 No. 722 recommends that scientific institutions take into account the national objectives of the Sustainable Development Goals of UKRAINE when determining the areas of scientific research.

But why are the goals and key objectives of the Strategic Plans of the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine for 2020-2024 and for 2022-2024 not aimed at organizing and mobilizing the implementation of national tasks of priority SDGs for the period until 2030 (with target values for 2015, 2020, 2025 and 2030)?:

- Goal 1. Poverty eradication (3 objectives, 5 indicators);

- Goal 2. Hunger eradication, agricultural development (2 objectives, 4 indicators);

- Goal 3. Good health and well-being (8 tasks, 15 indicators);

- Goal 4. Quality education (3 tasks, 5 indicators).

In this regard, it is absolutely appropriate, by analogy with the Action Plan for the Implementation of State Regional Development Strategies for the Period Until 2020 and for 2021-2027, to reform the Strategic Action Plans of the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine into Action Plans for Organizational and Mobilization Activities to Achieve National SDG Tasks for the Relevant Periods: Until 2020, 2025 and 2030.

That is, there is an urgent need to develop and adopt the Planning Code of Ukraine, which should regulate the time and content of the stages of preparation and adoption of the Addresses of the President of Ukraine to the People and the Verkhovna Rada, the Work Plans of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and the Central Executive Authorities (CEAs) of the socio-economic sphere, etc. Specialists of the S. A. Podolinsky Institute of Physical Economics have been proposing the development of a Planning Code of Ukraine for the past 10 years [3, p. 35].

However, the recommendations and proposals of scientists and specialists of domestic economic science (even of an applied nature) remain beyond the attention of the state leadership, people's deputies and Ukrainian

officials. The main reason lies in the material stimulation of officials at the expense of financial funds from technical assistance from overseas donors.

The implementation of domestic initiative developments is not included in the plans of overseas "overseers" - beneficiaries of the Ukrainian crisis. The Planning Code of Ukraine should be based on the Law of Ukraine "On State Strategic Planning", and its development – on the reference matrix of systemic analysis and design of components of a fundamentally new state-building.

The urgent need to adopt the Planning Code of Ukraine is due to the violation of the deadlines for the development, adoption and delivery to the executors of state planning decisions: The Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Economy for 2020-2022 was adopted in August 2020 (on the 8th month after the start of its implementation), and for 2022-2024 – in November 2021 (in 45 days, as was the case in the practice of a planned economy).

**Problem statement and purpose of the article.** The mechanisms of post-war development of the national economy should be based on the need to strengthen its statehood by clarifying the strategic directions of socio-economic development and tactical levers of state regulation using direct and feedback links in the hierarchy of state formation.

According to the Constitution of Ukraine, the construction of a new economy of a renewed state should be focused on strengthening the centripetalism of planning decisions of subjects of different levels of the system during the purposeful implementation of a single state socio-economic policy.

Currently, it is planned to expand the use of program-target and project methods of substantiating new planning decisions with simultaneous clarification of strategic goals that have not been achieved over the past 7-10 years with adjustment of their budgeting for the nearest medium-term perspective of 3-5 years.

**The purpose of the article** is to conduct an epistemological analysis of the essence and content of the principles of strategic planning of the socio-economic development of Ukraine, which were provided for by the draft laws of 2011 and 2017. It is advisable to orient public consciousness towards increasing social responsibility for public compliance with the principles of strategic planning of the socio-economic development of the state based on the methodology and ideas of anthropocentrism.

The working hypothesis of the article examines the signs and causes of social tension in Ukrainian society during the transition from an administrative-command planned economy to an Anglo-Saxon model of a corporate-type market economy, focused on generating income in the context of globalization through geopolitical wars of transnational corporations.

**Presentation of the main materials of the study.** The draft law of Ukraine No. 9407 "On State Strategic Planning" was submitted to the Verkhovna Rada by the

Cabinet of Ministers on November 3, 2011, signed by Prime Minister Mykola Azarov. The Verkhovna Rada adopted the law as a whole on December 22, 2011: 249 MPs voted "in favor" (out of the minimum required 226).

Draft Law No. 9407 defined the following principles of state strategic planning: 1. Integrity; 2. Internal balance; 3. Scientific validity; 4. Transparency; 5. Effectiveness; 6. Compliance with national interests; 7. Equality; 8. Continuity and completeness of decision-making; 9. Partnership; 10. Responsibilities of participants in state strategic planning.

The sixth principle deserves special attention, the essence of which is the development by the Ministries and other central executive bodies, local executive bodies and local self-government bodies and the Verkhovna Rada of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea of state strategic planning documents, based on the need to ensure the implementation of the national socio-economic policy. The effectiveness of the functioning of the state strategic planning system lies in the fact that the choice of means and methods for achieving the country's development goals should ensure the achievement of planned results with the least expenditure of resources, and the assessment of the achievement of goals depends on the results obtained.

In 2011, the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of UKRAINE, for the first time in the years of independence, created a unique state document on the forecast of the comprehensive development of the national economy and the social sphere. But serious remarks by the President of UKRAINE Viktor Yanukovich regarding the prompt adjustment of the state budget of UKRAINE for 2012 in connection with the organization of the European Football Championship "EURO-2012" did not provide the necessary financing for the tasks of implementing the state program of economic and social development of UKRAINE for 2012.

The draft law "On State Strategic Planning for 2017" signed by the President of UKRAINE Petro Poroshenko already included 11 principles of state strategic planning: 1. Goal-setting; 2. Unity and comprehensiveness; 3. Integrity; 4. Scientific validity; 5. Publicity and transparency; 6. Measurability; 7. Efficiency; 8. Effectiveness; 9. Systematicity, continuity, consistency and succession; 10. Flexibility; 11. Responsibility.

But a comparative analysis of the principles of state strategic planning of the draft laws of 2011 and 2017 indicates that the draft law of 2017 violates the conceptual provisions of the Constitution of Ukraine (1996). The formation of strategic plans for the socio-economic development of UKRAINE on the basis of the draft law of 2017 did not provide for the implementation of a holistic socio-economic policy for the state without observing national interests.

Due to the absence of the Law of Ukraine "On State Strategic Planning", the strategic socio-economic

development of the state and regions was envisaged on the basis of the Law of Ukraine "On State Forecasting and Development of Programs for the Economic and Social Development of Ukraine" (dated 03/23/2000 No. 1602-III with clarifications on 05/17/2012 and 10/16/2012) for the following periods:

1) for 11 years – in 2001-2002, the strategic forecast for 2004-2015 is presented by the Strategy for the Economic and Social Development of Ukraine "On the Path of European Integration" (the main forecast macroeconomic indicators of Ukraine's development were considered at an expanded meeting of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine on 03/12/2004);

2) for 9 years – in 2006, in the State Strategy for Regional Development for the period until 2015 (Government Resolution No. 1001 of 21.07.2006). This is the only Strategy that defined priority areas, tasks and measures for the development of each administrative region, the city of Kyiv and the city of Sevastopol, with the definition of a system of 24 indicators for coordinating the activities of central and local executive bodies and local self-government bodies regarding the socio-economic development of the state and regions.

In the State Strategy for Regional Development for the period until 2015, ensuring the development of human resources as a strategic task was supposed to be monitored and evaluated by a single criterion - the Human Development Index. The following system of indicators was defined as additional indicators: the level of education of the population; the average monthly income per capita; the number of registered crimes (offenses, including among adolescents).

The state strategy identified priority areas and measures for human resources development:

- ensuring high standards of training available to employees throughout the entire period of their production activity;
- intensifying cooperation in the field of education and science;
- ensuring full employment of the working population;

3) for 6 years – in 2014, in the State and Regional Development Strategies for the period up to 2020 (Government Resolution No. 385 of 06.08.2014);

4) for 6 years – in 2015, in the Sustainable Development Strategy "Ukraine-2020" (approved by Decree of the President of Ukraine of 15.01.2015 No. 5). In the Strategy, the 17th indicator out of 25 was defined as follows: "In 2020, the share of local budgets will be at least 65% in the Consolidated State Budget";

5) for 7 years – in 2019, in the State and Regional Development Strategies for 2021-2027 (Government Resolution No. 695 of 05.08.2020).

The achievement of strategic objectives was envisaged by tactical measures for 3 years, which were contained in the Action Plans for 2015-2017, 2018-2020 and 2021-2023 with the implementation of the State and

Regional Development Strategies for the periods until 2020 and 2027.

The Action Plan for 2015-2017 was approved by Government Resolution No. 821 of 07.10.2015 (i.e., 14 months after the approval of the Strategy). Indicators for assessing the effectiveness of the implementation of measures were given taking into account their forecast values as of 01.01.2017 (only for 2016).

The list and level of annual indicators for 2014-2020 of the Action Plan for 2018-2020 was approved by Government Resolution No. 1089 of 20.12.2017 (10 days before the start of the implementation of measures from 01.01.2018, but at the end of the third of the six years of implementation of the Strategy).

The Action Plan for 2018-2020 was approved by Government Resolution No. 733 of 12.09.2018 (8 months after the start of their implementation).

Action Plan for 2021-2023 on the implementation of the State Strategy for Regional Development for 2021-2027 was approved by Government Order No. 497-r. dated May 12, 2021 (8 months after the approval of the Strategy) with the establishment of the deadline for the development of Regional Development Strategies for 2021-2027 - by October 1, 2021 (The Ministry and other central government bodies, when preparing their activity plans for 2021-2023, provided funds for the implementation of the Action Plan within the limits of the expenditures provided for in the state budget for the relevant budget year. But why was the role of local budgets and their ratio to the state budget funds not taken into account?).

The lack of planning discipline for substantiation, approval and delivery to executors and control of measures for the implementation of medium-term strategies and development plans for the state and regions is due to the absence of the Planning Code of Ukraine (of the same order of importance as the Civil, Budget and Tax Codes of Ukraine) [4, p. 35].

The information and analytical materials of the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine for 2022-2024 reported that the new draft law "On State Forecasting and Strategic Planning of Economic and Social Development" was sent to the Government on February 28, 2022. The basis for the development of the draft of this law was the 2nd task of the second goal of the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine for 2022-2024 - Strategy for Reforming the Public Finance Management System for 2022-2025. (approved by Government Resolution No. 1805-r dated 29.12.2021).

The Strategy for Reforming the Public Finance Management System for 2022-2025 identifies problems that are due to the absence of the Law of Ukraine "On State Strategic Planning".

The following were identified as the most relevant among them:

- lack of a holistic strategic planning system, weak connection between strategic planning, budget planning and public investment planning;



- lack of full-fledged implementation of medium-term budget planning;
- lack of a clear division of powers between executive authorities and local self-government bodies;
- insufficient transparency and accountability regarding the use of local budget funds;
- limited human resources capacity to implement the reform at the central and local levels.

The result of the introduction of the ideology of economic liberalism through the application of the Anglo-Saxon model of an open market economy (i.e., with minimal state intervention in socio-economic development) was anti-constitutional changes in the basis and superstructure of Ukrainian society (compared to the planned model of state formation of an independent, sovereign and united Ukraine).

**Results of the study of the cyclicity of regional human development in Ukraine 2009-2017.** Based on the purpose and working hypothesis of the analytical study, it is appropriate to define the following as the initial, leading components of the methodological support for measuring the Regional Human Development Index (RHDI) in Ukraine:

1. According to the 2001 Methodology – the aspect "Demographic development of regions of Ukraine" [3];
2. According to the 2012 Methodology – the block "Population reproduction" [5].

The first aspect of measuring the RHDI "Demographic development of regions of Ukraine" was determined by 8 indicators:

1. Infant mortality rate, %;
2. Prenatal mortality rate, %;
3. Average life expectancy at birth (without differentiation by sex), years;
4. Average life expectancy at age 15 (without gender differentiation), years;
5. Average life expectancy at age 45 (without gender differentiation), years;
6. Average life expectancy at age 65 (without gender differentiation), years;
7. Migration balance, thousand people;
8. Migration intensity coefficient, %.

The second block of the RHDI measurement "Population reproduction" was characterized by 5 indicators:

1. Total fertility rate (development stimulator);
2. Infant mortality of children under 5 years of age, % (disincentive);
3. Average life expectancy at birth, years (stimulator);
4. Probability of men to live from 20 to 65 years (stimulator);
5. Probability of women to live from 20 to 65 years (stimulator).

The national methodology for measuring the RHDI in 2012 provided for monitoring and assessing the impact of indicators on human development by considering them as statistical characteristics: first, indicators of stimulants and disincentives of human

development; second, determining and highlighting their standardized values; third, clarifying the weight in the structure of all components.

Rating assessments of the aspect "Demographic development of regions of Ukraine" RHDI in 1999-2011. show that the following administrative regions are included in the top 10 places (except for Kyiv, which has always taken first place in the republic): No. 1. Ternopil, No. 2. Lviv, No. 3. Chernivtsi, No. 4. Ivano-Frankivsk, No. 5. Vinnytsia, No. 6. Volyn, No. 7. Poltava, No. 8. Khmelnytsky, No. 9. Kharkiv, No. 10. Cherkasy.

Results of the rating assessment of the block "Population reproduction" of the RHDI in 2004-2011. determine the first 10 places from 24 administrative regions as follows (since 2014 - 22 regions, excluding Donetsk and Luhansk regions): No. 1. Ternopil, No. 2. Lviv, No. 3. Chernivtsi, No. 4. Ivano-Frankivsk, No. 5. Vinnytsia, No. 6. Volyn, No. 7. Poltava, No. 8. Khmelnytsky, No. 9. Kharkiv, No. 10. Cherkasy.

There are reasons to state that the ahead ratings of the above administrative regions in comparison with other regions in the aspect of "Demographic development of regions of Ukraine" in 1999-2011 and the block "Population reproduction" in 2004-2017. the RHDI measurement determined the future dynamics of the RHDI rating estimates of the first ten administrative regions of Ukraine as a whole.

That is, the cyclicity of the activation of human development in the first 10 regions of Ukraine in 2012-2017 was formed by positive trends in the indicators of demographic development and population reproduction in the regions in 1999-2011.

On the contrary, low indicators of demographic development of the regions and population reproduction in 1999-2017 were: 1. Donetsk, 2. Luhansk, 3. Zhytomyr, 4. Kirovohrad, 5. Kherson regions. This, in the rating estimates of the RHDI, led to their location in the last 5 places out of 27 administrative-territorial entities of Ukraine: 24 administrative regions, the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, the city of Kyiv, the city of Sevastopol.

In Donetsk region, due to the unfavorable ecological situation and the state of the environment, there was a reduction in life expectancy and high infant and prenatal mortality, which became the main problems of demographic development and population reproduction. In addition, high population density was superimposed on low housing provision and its comfort, a lack of hospital beds and ambulance stations.

The Luhansk region was characterized by the annual statistical bulletins "Regional Human Development" throughout their entire period of publication (2000-2017) with "unsatisfactory indicators of the living conditions of the population – equipped housing, road density and telephone coverage. The low education index was influenced by the low level of children's coverage of primary and basic secondary education".

In addition, the region had an unsatisfactory demographic situation: negative migration indicators and low average life expectancy. But, instead of increasing the independence of local authorities by introducing budgetary federalism not only for these regions of the Ukrainian Donbas, but also for the rest of the administrative regions of the state, its unprofessional and irresponsible leadership contributed to the emergence of social tension among the population of the Luhansk and Donetsk regions and an immediate civil-armed conflict between the local population and the Center.

The reasons for the emergence of social tension between the population of the Ukrainian Donbas and the Center were not only the state leadership's ignoring of substantiated proposals from administrative districts and regions to increase the regional and financial independence of local authorities in the field of socio-economic (including human) development, but also the loss of jobs by the local population in the coal and mining industries due to the mass closure of mines and the growth of shift labor migration to the mines of the Russian Donbas in the Rostov region.

The post-war implementation in Ukraine of the advanced development of human potential in the socio-economic space of the state should ensure the prevention of depopulation of the nation, when the mortality rate of the population will exceed the birth rate of infants, and, instead, should contribute to an increase in the average lifespan of humans.

The strategic term of such anticipation should be equal to 20-25 years from the birth of a person (as a living Sovereign of Ukraine) to the terms of his formation as a citizen of a united, sovereign and independent state. In November 1991, a meeting of deputies of councils of various levels from the Eastern and Southern regions of Ukraine was held in the city of Donetsk with the participation of the State Minister for Economy Volodymyr Gladush [6].

The meeting considered issues of federal-state self-government based on the experience of Germany on regional independence without the right to secede from Ukraine, which were accumulated in the draft Program of Denationalization in Ukraine. The draft Program of New Regionalization of the Ukrainian Donbas was also based on the experience of the United States in 1933, when President Franklin Roosevelt adopted the Act on Federal Management of the Tennessee River Valley, as well as a number of American programs of recent decades for areas with industrial decline.

The meeting adopted the appeal of the People's Deputies of USSR to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR and the Council of Ministers of Ukraine with a draft Program for the creation of federal structures in the East Ukrainian Economic Region. The participants of the meeting noted the lack of prospects for the development of cities and regions based on the provisions of the concept of regional self-financing, which was recognized as inappropriate in the conditions

of the transition of the national economy to a market economy.

The program of denationalization in Ukraine considered regions as a complex of administrative areas related to geopolitical, historical, industrial and other features of the interaction of its components.

In November 1992, in Ukraine, as an already united, sovereign and independent republic-state, a scientific and practical conference "Current Problems of Territorial Management in Ukraine" was held (the conference materials include the abstracts of the report by Yu. E. Burykh on the topic "Prospects for a Federal-Territorial System") [7].

As the deputy chairman of the Gorlovka City Council of People's Deputies and the chairman of the Coordination Council of the Association of Mining Sites of Donbas, in his report at the conference Yu. E. Burykh announced proposals for territorial-territorial delimitation and granting lands partial state powers. First of all, in the sphere of legislative activity: at the same time, it was not about national-state, but about territorial federalism.

Support for the federal-territorial principle of the state system of Ukraine was provided by the local population: among 2,050 surveyed residents of the Donetsk region, 86.6% supported the federal-territorial system; in the rural Slavyanskyi district of the region, among 642 respondents, 89%; in the city of Donetsk, among 1,700 respondents, 97%.

In his speech Yu. Burykh emphasized that "We are talking about real democratization of state life in autonomous regions, about independent management, about changing the style of managing territories – to move away from central firefighting, occasional treatment of the problems of the region to permanent, systematic, secured by law and finances, regional and local management. History, traditions, natural environment, economy, ecology, social life — all this is specific to each region. Therefore, how to manage, what forms of management to use, what problems to give priority - all this should be decided by the region itself" [7, p. 60].

Unfortunately, neither the ideas of the November 1991 and 1992 Meetings and Conferences, nor the subsequent conceptual provisions and constructive proposals of domestic scientists of social and economic science regarding territorial federalism (and since 2012 – budgetary federalism) were realized by people's deputies of all levels and heads of various branches of government and did not become the basis of Ukrainian statehood.

Despite the constitutional definitions of Ukrainian land and subsoil as the property of the Ukrainian people, in modern historical conditions in a sovereign and independent republic, a Ukrainian land market for foreign corporations has been introduced according to the Anglo-Saxon model of an open market economy. The nationwide referendum promised by the 6th President of Ukraine regarding the introduction of

commodity-monetary relations in the implementation of land reform with the recognition of a free land market did not take place.

Today, a totalitarian-centralized system of dictatorial, oligarchic-feudal governance has been formed in Ukraine, which did not take into account the recommendations and proposals of domestic economic science and local authorities, but was oriented towards meeting the requirements of foreign consultants from the G7 countries (Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Canada, France, Japan, led by the USA).

On the contrary, the use of recommendations and proposals of domestic scientists of social and economic science and local authorities on the restructuring of territorial governance in the context of the transition of the national economy to market relations in the early 90s of the last century could in the future ensure the avoidance of social outbreaks in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, Donetsk and Luhansk regions.

The main reason for the emergence of a disappointing deadlocked historical cycle of the socio-economic development of Ukraine was the deliberate ignoring and discrediting of domestic experience in directive-planned management of the national economy.

The implementation of the Anglo-Saxon model of an open market economy with the active participation of domestic agents of influence also did not provide for the timely adoption of the laws of Ukraine "On the administrative-territorial structure of Ukraine" and "On state strategic planning".

In November 2013 - February 2014, in Kyiv and some regional cities of Ukraine, socially active citizens took part in demonstrations against their own structures

of the Center and the Regions, led, as a rule, by representatives of the Party of Regions.

In 2014, a ten-year historical cycle arose (after the Orange Revolution of 2004) of the completion of the irrational transition of consciousness and social status of the Ukrainian people from the era of developed state socialism of the late 80s of the last century according to the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR to the feudal-oligarchic system of capitalist management, from a directive-planned to a clan-corrupted market economy.

But the material basis of the socio-economic (including human) development of the state should be the national economy of Ukraine in the world economic system, which was designed to facilitate the implementation of the constitutional provisions of socio-economic policy, measures of state-wide and regional strategies and programs stipulated by the Constitution of Ukraine of 1996 [8].

In the post-war period, in the conditions of reforming local self-government bodies and territorial organization of power, when justifying a new regional map of the state, the procedures and results of a comprehensive rating assessment of the components and the overall IRLD can become arguments for reformatting the socio-economic space and the administrative-territorial structure of the state.

The average value of the IRLD in the variants of grouping regions when reformatting the socio-economic and territorial space of Ukraine can become an additional criterion for forming a new regional map of the state in accordance with the requirements of the economic and statistical principles of the EU.

## References

1. Novikova, O., Deich, M., Pankova, O. et al. (2014). Diagnostika sostoyaniya i perspektivy razvitiya sotsial'noy otvetstvennosti v Ukraine (ekspertnyye otsenki) [Diagnostics of the state and prospects for the development of social responsibility in Ukraine (expert assessments)]. Donetsk, IIE of NAS of Ukraine. 320 p. [in Russian].
2. Pro zatverdzhennia derzhavnoi tsilovoi prohramy vidnovlennia ta rozbudovy myru v shkidnykh rehionakh Ukrainy: Postanova Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy vid 13 hrudnia 2017 r. № 1071/2017 [On the approval of the state military program for the restoration and development of peace in the remote regions of Ukraine: Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated December 13, 2017 No. 1071/2017.]. Retrieved from <http://iplex.com.ua/doc.php?code=1071-2017-%D0%BF&red=1000030c14c37ae5ac b6c2ceff7f6b955fedd9&d=5&st=0> [in Ukrainian].
3. Metodyka vymyriuvannia liudskoho rozvytku rehioniv Ukrainy. Dodatok do Postanovy «Pro metodolohichni zasady vymyriuvannia liudskoho rozvytku dlia rehioniv Ukrainy» Kolehii Derzhkomstatu Ukrainy №182/76 vid 05.04.2001 r. ta Prezydii NAN Ukrainy 14.03.2001 r. [Methodology for measuring human development in regions of Ukraine. Appendix to the Resolution "On methodological principles for measuring human development for regions of Ukraine" of the Board of the State Statistics Committee of Ukraine No. 182/76 of 05.04.2001 and the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine of 14.03.2001]. Retrieved from [https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/rada/show/v\\_182202-01](https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/rada/show/v_182202-01) [in Ukrainian].
4. Stoliarova, V. V. (2021). Kontseptualno-analitychne zabezpechennia stratehichnoho planuvannia sotsialnoekonomichnoho rozvytku derzhavy i rehioniv [Conceptual and analytical support for strategic planning of socioeconomic development of the state and regions]. *Visnyk ekonomichnoi nauky Ukrainy*, 2 (41), pp. 33-49. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.37405/1729-7206.2021.2\(41\).33-49](https://doi.org/10.37405/1729-7206.2021.2(41).33-49) [in Ukrainian].
5. Metodyka vymyriuvannia rehionalnoho liudskoho rozvytku: Rishennia Prezydii NAN Ukrainy ta kolehii Derzhavnoi sluzhby statystyky Ukrainy vid 13.06.2012 r. № 123-m [Methodology for measuring regional human development: Decision of the Presidium of the NAS of Ukraine and the Board of the State Statistics Service of Ukraine dated June 13, 2012 No. 123-m]. Retrieved from [http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/druk/publicat/kat\\_u/2018/zb/09/zb\\_rlr2017\\_pdf.pdf](http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/druk/publicat/kat_u/2018/zb/09/zb_rlr2017_pdf.pdf) [in Ukrainian].
6. Razghosudarstvlenye na Ukraine: odna yz prohramm [Nationalization in Ukraine: one of the programs]. (1990). *Yezhenedel'nik «OriyentiR DiP» – Weekly "OriyentiR DiP"*, No. 40 [in Russian].
7. Burykh, Yu. E. (1993). Perspektivy za federativno-zemelnyim ustoroistvom [Prospects for a federal-land system]. Aktualni problemy upravlinnia terytoriiamy v Ukraini [Actual problems of territorial management in Ukraine]: Proceedings of the Scientific and Practical Conference. (pp. 58-62). Kyiv [in Russian].

8. Stolyarov, V., Ostrovetskyi, V., Stolyarova, V. (2024). Natsionalna metrolohiia tsyklichnosti rehionalnoho liudskoho rozvytku v Ukraini (1999-2017 rr.) [National Metrology of the Cyclicity of Regional Human Development in Ukraine (1999-2017)]. *Ekonomichnyi Visnyk Donbasu – Economic Herald of the Donbas*, 3 (77), pp. 169-179. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.129 58/1817-3772-2024-3\(77\)-169-179](https://doi.org/10.129 58/1817-3772-2024-3(77)-169-179) [in Ukrainian].

**Столяров В., Шинкарьук О., Столярова В., Воробей С. Циклічність людиноцентричного розвитку України в системі принципів державного стратегічного планування**

В статті розглянуті концептуальні положення підвищення соціальної відповідальності центральних органів й законодавчої і виконавчої влади України за підготовку, прийняття і виконання загальнодержавних рішень. Наведені приклади порушення встановлених термінів доведення рішень до регіональних і місцевих органів влади.

Розгляд принципів державного і стратегічного планування законопроектів 2011 і 2017 років, як системо утворюючих підстав державотворення, забезпечив виявлення першопричин порушення Конституції 1996 року як соборної, суверенної і незалежної держави.

З'ясовані управлінські помилки на довгострокову перспективу та тактичні промахи в державотворенні. Головною причиною виникнення циклічності людського розвитку регіонів визнано невміння центральних органів влади стратегічно управляти українським суспільством.

Доведена необхідність формування планового кодексу України як комплексу стратегічних і тактичних загальнодержавних рішень та базису підвищення соціальної відповідальності органів влади різних рівнів.

Побудова нової економіки оновленої держави орієнтована на забезпечення доцентрованості планових рішень суб'єктів держави в ході цілеспрямованого впровадження єдиної загальнодержавної соціально-економічної політики.

**Ключові слова:** циклічність, принципи, людиноцентриський розвиток, доцентрованість, державотворення, регіональний людський розвиток, державне стратегічне планування.

**Stolyarov V., Shinkaryuk O., Stolyarova V., Vorobey S. Cyclicity of Human-Centered Development of Ukraine in the System of Principles of State Strategic Planning**

The article considers the conceptual provisions of increasing the social responsibility of central bodies and legislative and executive authorities of Ukraine for the preparation, adoption and implementation of national decisions. Examples of violation of the established deadlines for bringing decisions to regional and local authorities are given.

Consideration of the principles of state and strategic planning of draft laws of 2011 and 2017, as system-forming foundations of statehood, ensured the identification of the root causes of the violation of the 1996 Constitution as a united, sovereign and independent state.

Long-term management errors and tactical blunders in statehood were identified. The main reason for the cyclical nature of human development in the regions is recognized as the inability of central authorities to strategically manage Ukrainian society.

The need for the formation of the Planning Code of Ukraine as a complex of strategic and tactical national decisions and the basis for increasing the social responsibility of authorities of different levels is proven.

The construction of a new economy of a renewed state is focused on ensuring the centrality of planning decisions of state entities in the course of the purposeful implementation of a single nationwide socio-economic policy.

**Keywords:** cyclicity, principles, human-centered development, centrality, state-building, regional human development, state strategic planning.

Received by the editors: 21.11.2024

Reviewed: 09.12.2024