

***Review and Bibliography***

Anatoliy TYBIN

**NOBELOLOGY:
TRANSFORMATION
OF THE ECONOMIC SCIENCE'S PARADIGM**

Teaching in Ukraine disciplines that make up the block «economic theory» is going through difficult phase of its transformation. Soviet Union political economy, based on the dogmatic Karl Marx's perception of capitalism and the numerous ideological postulates of Marxism-Leninism went to the past. At the turn of XX–XXI century's domestic economics has adopted the neoclassical methods of analysis that include the world's university science and education. However, the dynamics of globalization in the economic transformation, the complexity and contradictions of economic processes of recent decades, non-possibility of explanation by orthodox methods of analysis are increasingly attracting attention of scientists to the methodology of economic science, which enables scientists to explain efficiently the formation of objective knowledge of reality.

In October 2009 in Kiev was held the Scientific Conference named «Methodological Problems of Economic Science». Drastic qualitative changes in the principles of the functioning of economic systems in post-socialist countries encourage scientists and academic staff to improve the methodological approaches in research and teaching process. Informed recommendations were adopted. In particular, the problems of the real economy expand the horizons of the theoretical research; stimulate the emergence of schools, movements, and branches of economic science. Economic reality requires new knowledge, without which it is impossible to enter a new orbit of development. At the same time, economic crises are often the most powerful source of progress in science as a factor of economic growth. Under these conditions, the use of the theoretical achievements of Nobel Laureates in the development of theoretical models of

© Anatoliy Tybin, 2009.

Tybin Anatoliy, Cand. of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor, Ternopil National Economic University, Ukraine.

stabilizing the national economy requires their critical thinking for the development of methodology for Economic Research. There should be organized a special course on these issues for master degree and postgraduate students.

I have recollected the specified above mentioned scientific conference while getting acquainted with the monograph of Doctor of Economic Sciences, Prof. Dovbenko, which was called «Economic Crisis is not a Crisis of Science»¹; scientific problems discussed on the conference were very consonant with the latter. Moreover, as the continuation of peer recommendations were his thoughts and suggestions for lecturers. However, before talking about them, I have to emphasize the innovative aspect of this publication. It should be mentioned that it differs significantly from the published counterparts in Ukraine. Firstly, the peculiarities of society's development at the turn of the second and third millenniums are revealed there. Secondly, the unusual fundamental understanding of the crisis phenomena in the emergence of scientific knowledge is discussed. There is also a quite logical demonstration of liberal circles of the accumulation of knowledge. Thirdly, based on deep analysis of monographs and innovative papers of Nobel laureates, the problematic field of modern economic science is displayed. It is shown how in economic science over the last several decades (despite the constant change of some of its achievements for others; and available sound disagreements between scientists on many key issues) crucial theoretical knowledge was transforming. Everything is represented in the dynamics, so the reading of this paper is really interesting and exciting.

At the same time, I was encouraged to do more research by that part of the peer-reviewed monograph, which concerns the economic problems of higher education. Do you disagree with Prof. Dovbenko that «Educational content especially, the higher one in particular, does not keep up with rapidly changing technologies and intellectual needs of the new strategy of social development, based on dynamic knowledge and high technology» (p. 253); «Economists must learn how to better promote their achievements and the basic principles of the science to the society. The value of this cannot be overstated now – during the exacerbation of the economic crisis. Such activity is particularly relevant in today's world of instant change» (p. 259); «The distinction between the curricula of bachelor, master and postgraduate courses is needed. For example, the course of economic theory in the master degree programs should be a direct continuation of the bachelor degree program. The contents of postgraduate course should include a large set of new economic ideas and research» (p. 261).

I am convinced that fellow academic staff supports the position of the author in this reviewed monograph, «To meet the challenges, high school should review the content of the disciplines that are studied by the future economists or managers. This applies not only to methods of training of students, because diminishing the effectiveness of economic education only to improved methods of teaching and learning means trying to overcome the problem based on the old subject» (p.

¹ Довбенко М. Криза економіки – не криза науки : монографія / Михайло Довбенко. – К. : ВЦ «Академія», 2009. – 304 с.

259); «In view of this mechanism, based on continuous updating of training programs, there could be the introduction in universities a new fundamental course of economic theory – economic nobelology» (p. 265). Moreover, in some universities a special course with the following topic is already taught. Prepared by M. Dovbenko textbook «Modern Economic Theory» (Economic nobelology) – K.: Publishing Center «Academiya», 2005 and, written in co-authorship with S. Mochernyy, the textbook «History of Economic Doctrines» (Modern Economical Opinion) – Lviv: Novyi Svit – 2000, 2004), and «Economic Theory» – K.: Publishing Center «Academiya», 2004 – is a good basis for this course.

With this in mind, you can say about the emergence of a new paradigm of modern economic science. Dare to point out that this position coincides with the recommendations of the mentioned above scientific conference, where was noted: «The basic principles of a new paradigm of political-economic research should include: the abandonment of the economism, economic determinism, and their ideas; overcoming of the non-subjective analysis of economic processes and events, targeting at the creation of the people-oriented economic mechanism, the ability to perceive the variety and complexity of economic life, socio-economic development, the definition of the principle of methodological pluralism, overcoming of the substantive and methodological autarchy in the study of nature and economic phenomena and processes. This approach emphasizes the importance of changes in educational programs».

I prefer to use the term «emergence» because the new paradigm is not forming instantly. It is a long creative process. Indeed, as Nobel laureate Prof. Krugman writes, «Some argue that our economic problems are structural. That is why quick cure will not be possible to achieve. But I believe that the only important structural obstacles on the way towards the world's prosperity are outdated doctrines that restrict people's thinking»². Considering the fact that formation of the new thinking is a continuous process, we have to start moving towards that goal now.

M. Dovbenko demonstrates this thought through his new and innovative view. Learning the truth goes through disputes, discussions, and creative question. In this search for truth no one is forbidden to teach and more honestly and conscientiously review their position, even if at some point it includes outdated views. Therefore, the claims to those scholars who seek a fresh look at the problems of science, and economic ones in particular, can hardly be justified. Importantly, this approach will greatly strengthen the intellectual foundation for scientific research.

In the new socio-economic conditions it is important to deprive of many old habits. I think that this includes the ignoring of the scientific research on the economic nobelology and its teaching in higher schools. This approach creates a methodology that in principle can be applied to all economic sciences (not only to economic theory). While developing the educational and professional stan-

² Кругман П. Возвращение Великой депрессии? Мировой кризис глазами нобелевского лауреата / Пол Кругман; [пер. с англ. В. Н. Егорова, под ред. Л. А. Амелехина]. – М.: Эксмо, 2009. – С. 296.

dards of higher economic education, it would be appropriate to apply the disciplinary matrix of Economic Education, which is based on the principles of methodological unity and which allows rationalizing the structural elements of the educational programs. In particular, these actions include managing of the logical structure of economic sciences, identifying opportunities to introduce new scientific achievements in educational programs, harmonizing of the structure of the categorical apparatus in economic education. The opportunity to formally integrate innovative achievements in the general theoretical structure appears.

Another interesting innovation in M. Dovbenko's monograph is worth mentioning. I mean the historical description of the characteristics of our economic thought and its Nobel prospects. Actually, nowadays it is essential to direct scientific research on solving the key issues of historical and economic science, which is systematizing economic knowledge, overcoming its partial perspective by studying the role and functions of the respective schools, movements, concepts, taking into account the interference of the dialectics of economic history and the history of economic thought. The problem is not even the Nobel prospects (although we need to think about it), but the absence of the image of an Ukrainian scientist-economist formed in global information networks.

Even the manner in which M. Dovbenko represents the issue, is forcing to think about a possible reassessment of the scientific achievements of foreign specialists and underestimation of the fundamental theoretical developments of domestic scientists. That is why one of the functions of historical and economic science should be the creation a positive image of an Ukrainian scientist-economist. Such names as I. Vernadskyy, M. Bunge, M. Tugan-Baranowskyy, E. Slutskyy cannot be replaced with the names of their Western followers. However, in general this part is quite interesting to read. In addition, current thinking and debates deliberately or inadvertently, but rather because of historical traditions, seem to revive them in a new round of history. It also should be mentioned that innovation in this case requires the author's presentation of the facts, which are the characteristics of major researches of modern domestic economists. However, it would require minor editorial amendments, closer and more logical connection with their content analysis of the economic theories, referred to in previous chapters.

Concluding observations about innovations in teaching Economics, I have to note that the most important was and is an independent hard work of students for learning the compulsory subjects, as well as a large number of specialized ones. The monograph by M. Dovbenko has another positive quality: despite the enormous scope of material, it is quite compact, generally well structured; without much revision it could be easily used by students and teachers. Its stylistic coloring is oriented on rationalism, which provides primarily brevity and clarity. That is why this book by a well-known alumnus of Ternopil National Economic University is definitely praiseworthy.