Finally, the policies described above would maximize the total economic benefits for natives from immigration. While I have addressed how to maximize the total wealth of natives, I have not addressed the distribution of that wealth among natives. Immigration not only expands wealth, but also can have important distributive effects. Those natives who must compete with immigrants in the labor market may find that immigration reduces their real income.

We must emphasize that from the policy perspective these issues cannot be fully addressed within a purely economic framework. In this paper we noted the paradox of diversity. Economic theory suggests that the economic benefits of opening up borders to trade or immigration are at their largest, the more different the countries are. In addition, greater labour mobility helps to facilitate trade and increases the cross-border demand for domestic output. As noted earlier, some even argue that from the perspective of trade, economic assimilation of immigrants is not as desirable as the nurturing of cultural diversity. From the social perspective, however, it has become clear that social cohesion and the accumulation of social capital are not natural outcomes in increasingly diverse societies, but require resources to be allocated to the promotion of desirable social outcomes. Thus, the social evaluation of greater cross-border mobility resulting from greater international economic integration must go hand in hand with the economic assessment.
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The process of globalization that covered the system of global economic relations fundamentally changed the balance between external and internal factors of national economies in favor of the former. In today’s globalized world no country is able to efficiently create and implement its macroeconomic policies without considering priorities and norms of behavior of the other participants in the world economic activity. This equally applies to the field of taxation.

Considering the global factors that affect national tax policy and determine the direction of national tax system modifications, it is necessary to point out economic factors that underlie in the modern world of economic development.

To the list of the most important global economic factors we can include, first of all, the globalization of the system of global economic relations. Those essential from a tax point of view are the following aspects related to globalization:

- globalization of business;
- external transparency of national financial and tax systems;
- financial globalization;
- information globalization;
- erosion of nation states and decline in economic activity of the government;
- economic integration.

Secondly, income growth, as a result of the transition to intensive model of economic development, mixes ownership and the emergence of many small shareholders.

Thirdly, demographic changes in the world economy especially the process of depopulation (reduction of population growth) of the so-called «Northern civilization».

Fourth, the global environmental consequences of economic activity, prompting the international community back in the 1990s when the principle of sustainable development has been proclaimed.

Finally, system instability factors of economic relations as a result of terrorist acts, natural disasters, epidemics from fatal diseases, computer viruses and other destructive events impact from which is difficult to predict, but their consequences in the XXI century become truly global.

Globalization system of economic relations is manifested primarily through globalization of business, currently the major part of the income from legal entities (companies) and individuals (individual taxpayers) is formed abroad. Therefore, any state whose residents are involved in foreign economic activity (FEA), seeks to pay tax on their global income principle (principle of residency).

Countries — sources of income, in turn, tend to fund the national budget through taxation of foreign residents who receive income on their territory and then transfer these revenues to their jurisdiction or invest profits into third countries. Such cases are also known as conflict of tax residences. Thus, globalization of the business strengthens the coordination of tax policies to address the problem of international double taxation.

Financial globalization finds its reflection in the tax area through increasing external transparency of both national financial and tax systems of the countries. This means that information about national tax system, the principles underlying its operation, types and forms of taxes, tax rates, order of payment of taxes and government reports on spending of collected through the mechanism of tax funds, should be open and understood by all taxpayers, both residents and non-residents of tax jurisdiction. Otherwise, the tax climate of the country may be unattractive in terms of the tax principles (tax technology) for foreign investors, and domestic business entities will therefore choose another country-base where taxation system is more transparent.

National tax system in the context of globalization must be transparent in terms of fight against shadow economy: exposure of national tax authorities towards exchanging information with similar government units of other countries as well as clear requirements to keep financial and tax reporting by the taxpayers have a positive impact on the image of the country and retain its possible involvement in international criminal operations.

Another consequence of financial globalization is the international monetary and financial crises which are very common nowadays (see Figure 1).

As the result of these crises national tax reserves are shrinking and foreign investors massively leave countries with emerging economies.

Information globalization from the tax point of view finds itself primarily in the emergence of the virtual tax jurisdiction — in the Internet, as well as in the new technologies for financial transactions and tax administration (for example, the widespread introduction of electronic of taxes). Internet technologies at the same time facilitate and bring more complexity into many activities of national tax administrations, and therefore significantly impact on national tax policy.
Virtuality of transactions in the Internet, difficulties in determining the jurisdiction of remote buyers’ locations and sellers of digital products, first of all, led to the matter that entire global industry business (e-commerce) was outside the scope of the former old tax rules. Only as a result of coordinated efforts by all countries introduction of universal principles of taxation was possible in the virtual economy, same valid for accounting and control of virtual taxpayers. This shows the necessity of introduction of state tax regulation of e-commerce transactions.

Ongoing major changes are also happening in the policies of national tax administrations in the field of accounting and control of taxpayers. Currently, national tax authorities are available as never before: online tax administrations are able to consult on the procedure for the payment of taxes, and some countries in droves introduce electronic tax payment system via the Internet. Thus, the US Inland Revenue Service as part of the “electronic government” system introduced online tax payment according to which every American can make regular tax payment and verify the correctness of payment of past taxes.

Moreover, in the wake of the international fight against corruption and terrorism that began at the turn of XX–XXI centuries, desire to create “electronic government” that controls electronic financial flows fully in the interests of national governments became very common around the world. In this case, the criminal economy that wants to operate by uncontrollable state institutions of cash money is the only subject of economic relations, which is losing from the implementation of total electronic control of the government over the activities of taxpayers engaged in foreign economic operations.
An integral manifestation of globalization is the erosion of the nation state and the decline in economic activity of the government.

In the tax area erosion of nation states can be observed in two ways. First, countries that for any reasons will lose its competitive edge in their appeal to taxpayers — subjects FEA, lose some of their tax revenues. This weakens the financial capacity of the state, reducing the possibility of social programs and investment in the national economy.

Second, optimizing their function and their property, the state thus minimizes budget expenditures in relative terms, allowing you to gradually reduce the level of tax burden on individuals and businesses.

Single economic space that derives from the integration of national economies into regional trade union, common market, economic and monetary union, have resulted in closer coordination of economic policies, the introduction of the general principles of regulation of foreign trade and investment. In the tax area it is reflected in the coordination and harmonization of rules of taxation of business entities operating in the single economic space, and in the harmonization of taxes (their types, values, rules of collection) between member countries of the integration group.

Abolishment of the tax barriers between the countries in terms of the goods, capital and human resources flows — one of the key objectives of regional economic integration. But at the same time, one of the greatest challenges in creating a common market in the space of common economic interest, as required efforts of all member states of the integration group for mutual coordination of taxation principles underlying national tax systems.

In turn, those countries that are not members of these particular regional economic alliances, but support close economic ties with those that are in, their internal taxation also should consider the nature of the change in the level of direct and indirect taxes of the member countries of integration groups.

The greatest progress in tax harmonization had been achieved in European Union (EU), where taxes play not only a critical role in the regulation of economic and social policies of member countries, but also support coordination of Europe-wide economic policy: through tax deductions from each member state of EU common budget of integration community is formed and at the same time structural, scientific and technological programs are implemented. Value added tax (VAT) — one of the most popular taxes nowadays is under the influence of EU. This tax was introduced in many countries around the world based on the EU experience. This was EU that initiated the introduction of VAT in the area of e-commerce transactions, insisted on the principles of unification of VAT in the global computer network.

Rising incomes, another important global economic process, which increasingly affects national tax systems and tax policies of both developed and developing countries. In terms of national tax systems, the trend of income growth has been steadily increasing the role of the individual income tax (IIT). And if at the beginning of the XX century in the leading countries the main state revenues were formed from indirect taxes and income taxes on companies, in the second half of the XX century the priority has been given to IIT and social contributions that depend on the salary being the second largest tax in selected countries after IIT. This is especially true in particular for Ukraine where according to the size of the budget revenue (2015) single social contribution was second (185,7 billion UAH) and income tax — third (91,25 billion UAH) [7].

In addition, the structure of personal income is steadily increasing proportion of income derived from foreign sources as additional income (interest, dividends, royalties, material gain from the sale of property), which requires mutual contacts of national tax administrations to avoid double taxation of resident individuals.

Demographic processes observed in the present global economy, forced to think seriously about the prospects of national tax systems and tax policies in the countries that traditionally attributed to the “Northern civilization”. The problem is that, along with the general growth of world population countries of “Northern civilization” are effects by the reverse process — depopulation due to falling birth rates and ageing of the population that threatens in the nearest future by significant reduction in state tax revenues in almost all these countries.

Reduction of the tax revenue into the state budget in line with the growth of the funds from expenditure items (pensions and healthcare of the population) brought the problem of the budget deficit of the country to a qualitatively new level.

The impact of demographic factors on the national tax system will manifest itself primarily in the long-term growth of the tax burden in countries due to the inability to stop the process of depopulation. However, national tax policy must strive itself for a positive impact on the process. For example, country can use tax incentives to increase the birth rates: exempt IIT for parents who have at least three children (especially in France, Swit-
zerland, for Ukraine — two children), compensation and assistance packages in connection with the birth of each additional child in the family are introduced in all European countries (including Ukraine), but they are not paid in the USA and Japan [3]. It should also actively develop via tax benefits private pension schemes that are designed to reduce the pension liabilities of the state.

Today one of the most important problems that attract the attention of national governments and international organizations is global environmental impacts of economic activities of mankind, because growing needs of national economies led to large-scale pollution in the world and, consequently, climate change and significant increase of natural disaster risks (hurricanes, tornados, floods). Environment was the main topic of the Conference of the United Nations (UN) on Sustainable Development “Rio+20” in 2012 and the Summit on Sustainable Development, held in New York (USA) in autumn 2015 during which 17 global goals and 169 objectives of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) for the period after 2015 were approved.

Since the state is the only public institution endowed with the appropriate rights for the regulation of the environment, national tax policy should control economic activity by using environmental taxes, income from which should be directed to the environmental activities of the government.

The realities of modern economic development are such that countries with the most stringent laws in the environmental field and the highest environmental taxes are major polluters of the global ecosystem. Industrialized countries produce 60% of hydrocarbon emission into the atmosphere, 25% of which belong to the United States. Thus, the largest polluters — industrialized countries have a privileged tax regime, while those with modern technologies to minimize environmental damage from a tax point of view, are in a less favorable position.

However, the introduction of an international tax on emissions of carbon derivatives is a matter that is currently under the study on the level of international organizations that promote the concept of sustainable development and on the level of nation states interested in reducing carbon emissions.

Large-scale transformation of economic relationships in the world led to geopolitical shifts caused by annexation of Crimea and support of terrorist groups in Donbass from the Russian Federation side.

Through the use of military means unacceptable in the civilized world a priority factor deterring Russian aggression and security in the European space becomes economic. Reality suggests that during the hybrid wars economy becomes a highly precision weapon, and the role of economic factors in these conflicts only improve.

The decision, approved by European Council on 17 March 2014, on the adoption of restrictive measures against actions that undermine or threaten the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine [2], actually started the process of legislative restrictions on economic relations between the EU and Russia. Currently the broad international coalition of more than 40 countries actively participates in economic sanctions against Russia.

Thus, in 2014 new regulations implementing international economic relations were formed; this has led to reformattting of trade flows. It is also expected that effects from economic sanctions will be feasible in the European economy only in the medium term, at the moment they are more unascertainable.

Under the influence of the conflict in Ukraine at the September Summit in 2014 recommendatory decision on increasing by Member States in military spending up to 2% of gross domestic product (GDP) over the next 10 years was adopted. Currently, only two of the 28 NATO states have military spending’s level that meets or exceeds the one specified: US and Estonia. Thus, member countries of NATO military expenditures of which do not meet this criterion, with high probability will be forced to revise their budgets toward increasing defense spending.

It is also clear that the threat of new terrorist attacks and the need for preventive actions against extremists will increase in the medium and long term budgets of security organizations and spending of national ministries of defense. The Pentagon request for 2017 is $83 billion USD (2016–400 billion USD) and increased funding of Defense budget compared to 2016 is expected at the level of 35 percent. After the terrorist attacks in Paris the EU also said that it is ready to spend in addition 10 billion EUR for security yearly.

Russian aggression has caused a significant increase in government expenditures on defense in Ukraine: in 2014 compared to 2013 by 84.4% or 12.6 billion UAH, in 2015 up to 86 billion UAH and in 2016 will be about 100 billion UAH [1; 5; 6].

Thus, the tax systems and tax policies of each member country of anti-terrorist coalition were influenced by the factor of international terrorism.

Another factor that characterizes instability of the system of global economic relations is global epidemic of recent fatal diseases such as AIDS, Ebola, Zika. According to the International Labor Organization during the
period of 2004 to 2015 around 74 million economically active people in the world died from AIDS [4]. It burdens the international community to take urgent measures to combat the deadly virus that would increase allocations for program development of vaccines and the treatment of victims of global epidemics. Thus, the report of the Joint UN Program on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) in July 2015 stated that the cost of the fight against HIV/AIDS is about 22 billion USD per year, which should increase up to 8,12 billion USD and gradually to 2020 reach an annual amount of 31,9 billion USD [8].

In addition, the UN calls on developed countries to transfer 1% of their GDP to the least developed countries that are most acutely feel the effects of epidemics, which should help national budgets latter. It is clear that this level of tax burden in donor countries will tend to increase, as well as increasing the tax burden in all states whose nationals are receiving expensive anti-virus treatment, and the economy suffers losses due to the influence of the fatal disease.

Considering the above mentioned facts and circumstances, national governments have to radically restructure their tax policies to adapt to the realities of the global world and the world of information technology.

To point out, earlier national state strictly controlled both internal operations and external operations of economic entities, but in the global system of economic relations it must gain the trust and loyalty of individuals and entities, and methods of accounting and control of total taxpayers are unacceptable. And if earlier, referring to the international competitiveness of the national economy, it was meant mainly competitiveness of domestic manufacturing companies, now the image of the state and its government plays a greater role.

Within the frames of the business study conducted in different regions of the world from 2006 to 2016 the World Bank Group recorded 2499 reforms. Data for the last 12 years indicate convergence aimed at the approach to best practices, as well as countries with low income over time giving effect greater number of reforms than those with high income.

The study “Doing Business 2016: evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of regulations” [9] states that in the period from June 2014 to June 2015 189 countries conducted 231 reforms, 71% of which were aimed at simplifying and reducing legal norms related to business activities, and 29% were reforms aimed at strengthening legal institutions.

Table 1. – Rating of the countries by the number of reforms carried out in the 2006–2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rating,%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company registration</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining permits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property registration</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property registration</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International trade</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of contracts</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(quality of justice)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table compiled from data [9].

At the same time, 85 developing countries, as a whole had 169 reforms on business regulation compared to 154 reforms undertaken in the previous year, and countries with high income had 62 reforms. In addition, the region of Sub-Saharan Africa accounts for 30% of total regulatory reforms aimed at improving business environment, followed by Europe and Central Asia, while the countries of the Middle East and North Africa have shown less successful results.

The report also points out the increasing use of the Internet for business communication with regulatory authorities in all areas of business activity, indicating the potential economic benefits of electronic services. By 2015 fifty reforms were aimed at the introduction or improvement of existing online systems for tax, handling documents related to export and import, registration and real estate, and so on.

In the global rankings, which are presented in Table 1, Singapore maintains a leadership position, followed by ten countries with the most favorable conditions for business: New Zealand (2); Denmark (3); South Korea (4); Hong Kong (5); United Kingdom (6); United States (7); Sweden (8); Norway (9) and Finland (10).

Analysis of the Economy of Ukraine indicates the presence of a number of vulnerabilities in the fiscal sector, so that it faces serious challenges.

According to the World Bank estimates, the growing needs of public infrastructure (including its repair due to depreciation) in 2006–2015 amounted at 100 billion USD [10]. Given the type of necessary basic infrastructure is a need to increase the current level of spending on public infrastructure, at least three times.

Due to the limited competition in all sectors that slows down the process of implementation and modernization of technology, the country failed over the last decade to renew its technological base and it got stuck on the way to extensive growth, increasing instability and limited productivity growth. The main competitors quickly took the lead towards export diversification and improvement of products, leaving Ukraine behind. This vicious cycle hinders the restructuring of the economy and prevents the achievement of higher levels of per capita income and living standards of citizens of Ukraine.

Unreformed pension system and Ukraine's ageing population (over 14 million people of retirement age) threaten the short fiscal sustainability (financing them becomes more difficult) and long-term stability (till 2020 on every taxpayer there will be one retiree, and with the time the ratio will get even worse).

These trends also affect the education system that is going through the process of reduction in the ranks of students. It is necessary to improve the quality of education in order to improve the knowledge and skills required by the economy, but without spending additional resources on it.
Due to large fiscal deficits national and guaranteed by the government debt continues to grow. Therefore, all above mentioned requirements must meet with a gradual parallel decrease in state intervention in the economy and creation of conditions for wider private sector.

Ukraine currently seems to be caught in the trap of prolonged stagnation caused by high barriers to entry, little competition, weak incentives for the introduction of technology, low level of diversification and improving exports, high level of price sensitivity on raw materials and concerns of officials in respect of their own revenues that tend to reduce, and this situation pushes them to preserve the barriers for entry. Thus, distrust related to bad governance and corruption is the main obstacles on the way of attracting of direct foreign investments.

On the way of capital flows are macroeconomic imbalances and fears associated primarily with fiscal policy. Marginal rates for direct taxes are high. While the average tax burden is not significantly higher than in other European countries, it is high compared to countries with the same level of income, and other countries in transition. For the taxpayers costs for tax compliance are also quite high (including frequent and onerous checks).

Existing fiscal model in Ukraine has proven as unacceptable and the one which requires reforms with immediate effect.

In the short term fiscal measures and reforms should be directed to perform the following tasks: ensuring fiscal stability that will enable investors to return to the country; address the backlog of VAT refund to support the export sector; creation of fiscal space for public investment, which should enhance employment and economic growth.

In the medium term, the aim of the revenues should be reducing the tax burden through lower marginal rates on direct taxes, especially payroll taxes (insurance premiums). This should be also accompanied by significant reforms simplifying tax system that destroys all common tax base, and measures to improve tax compliance.

In terms of expenditure side of the budget this is the redistribution of resources from the sphere of consumption and further transfer in productive infrastructure costs. Subsidies in the economic sector, pensions, tariffs for housing and utility, better targeting of social assistance are currently in the center of the necessary fiscal reforms.

It is also a redistribution of resources within social services (such as education and health), thus financing costs for quality improvement should increase by savings achieved as a result of more efficient use of inputs.

Reform must be strong enough to withstand a significant redistribution of resources for public infrastructure spending (especially in the transport and energy sectors).

In the third year of reforms Ukraine should spend on the state infrastructure around 4–5% of GDP and maintain this level over the next 10 years.

References:

State regulation of global car industry

Abstract: Global state regulation of car industry as well as countries’ interests and targets have been viewed in the article. State targets’ pyramid has been structured and presented by the author. The structure of the state support based on the successful practice in the world has been researched. The author has proposed significant steps needed to be done by Ukrainian government in order to make car industry mover of the national economy. In contrary car producers have to get obligations to fulfill action plans mutually developed by the government.

Keywords: Globalization, economy, car production, state, car industry.

Савич Александр Петрович
кандидат экономических наук,
Доцент кафедры маркетинга
ГВУУ «КНЭУ имени Вадима Гетьмана»
E-mail: saval78@mail.ru

Государственное регулирование глобальной автомобильной промышленности

Аннотация: Государственное регулирование глобальной автомобильной промышленности, а также интересы стран и их цели на рынке автомобилей рассмотрены в статье. Пирамида государственных целей структурирована и представлена автором. Была исследована и изучена успешная практика государственной поддержки автомобильной промышленности в мире. Автор предложил важнейшие шаги, которые необходимо сделать украинскому правительству с целью создания автомобильной промышленности как двигателя национальной экономики. В свою очередь необходимо определить обязательства производителей автомобилей по выполнению совместно разработанного с правительством плана действий.

Ключевые слова: Глобализация, экономика, производство автомобилей, государство, автомобильная промышленность.

Автомобильная промышленность имеет большое влияние на экономику каждой страны, где локализовано автомобильное производство. Она обеспечивает работой почти 9 миллионов человек в мире. Это больше, чем 5% от всего занятого населения в мировой промышленности.

При таких показателях, продажа и производство легковых автомобилей влияет на экономику страны, занятость, поступление налоговых платежей, валютную выручку страны. Поэтому государство должно должным образом регулировать автомобильную промышленность страны и стимулировать ее развитие.

Государство заинтересовано в автомобильной отрасли, поскольку ей необходимо иметь:

• большого работодателя;
• налогоплательщика;
• донора валютной выручки;
• динамически растущее предприятие-гигант;
• двигатель создания смежных предприятий и производств, для получения вышеназванных выгод;