

УДК 330.8

**FAILURE OF ECONOMIC SCIENCE IN THE FORMAT OF TRANSITION
TO MODERN SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
НЕСОСТОЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОЙ НАУКИ В ФОРМАТЕ ПЕРЕХОДА К
СОВРЕМЕННОМУ СОЦИАЛЬНО ОТВЕТСТВЕННОМУ ХОЗЯЙСТВЕННОМУ
РАЗВИТИЮ**

Moskvina A.O. / Москвина А.О.

c.e.s, Ph.D., as.prof. / к.э.н., доц.

ORCID: 0000-0001-8391-7647

*O.M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv, Kharkiv,
Marshal Bazhanov 17, 61002*

*Харьковский национальный университет городского хозяйства
имени А.Н. Бекетова, Харьков, Маршала Бажанова 17, 61002*

Pravnik Iu.O. / Правник Ю.О.

lecturer / преподаватель

*V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Kharkiv, Svobody Sq. 4, 61022
Харьковский национальный университет имени В.Н. Каразина, Харьков,
пл. Свободы 4, 61022*

Annotation. *The work reveals the problem of the insufficiency of economic science under the modern conditions of the necessary transition to a socially responsible economic development. Recommendations are given for choosing a priority direction for the development of economic science and building a socially useful model of economic management on its basis.*

Keywords: *economic theory, socially responsible economic development, value-rational model of economic management, economics of reason, spiritual values.*

Аннотация. *В работе раскрывается проблема несостоятельности экономической науки в современных условиях необходимости перехода к социально ответственному хозяйственному развитию. Даны рекомендации по выбору приоритетного направления развития экономической науки и построения на ее основе общественно полезной модели ведения хозяйства.*

Ключевые слова: *экономическая теория, социально ответственное хозяйственное развитие, ценностно-рациональная модель ведения хозяйства, экономика разума, духовные ценности.*

Introduction.

Humanity has entered the path of uncertainty. Modern economic theory does not keep pace with the changes in economic reality, disintegrating into separate autonomous parts that come into conflict with each other, loses its internal unity [5]. The crisis of economic science occurs not only because it cannot keep up with the rapidly changing reality, but also because evidence is emerging that it does not work

at all. Historically established scientific schools of economic theory are untenable in solving practical problems of socially useful management of the economy of states and the world economy as a whole [6].

New trends in the economy also lead to new approaches to its theoretical foundation. There is a need for new concepts that require a change in the very course of social thought. We are already talking about reassessing oneself and life around, about overcoming the intrahuman crisis, as a prerequisite for overcoming the global crisis.

Main text.

Scientists' statements about the insolvency of economic science have existed for a long time, but this problem has become so acute right now, when there are no laws that could guide the conduct of economic activity. Many scientists such as M. Blaug, A. A. Bogdanov, A. B. Buzgalin, V. I. Vernadsky, G. A. Goltz, L. N. Gumilev, J. Galbraith, G. V. Zadorozhny, A. I. Kolganov, N. D. Kondratyev, A. S. Panarin, E. E. Slutskiy, J. E. Stiglitz, P. Ulrikh, M. M. Khaikin, N. A. Chukanov, Yu. G. Shvetsov and others argued the need to revise the existing ideas about the world in their works.

New views on economic theory have shown that many of the central provisions of the standard models are unreliable and do not work in practice. The real world is different; it is much asymmetrical than A. Smith presented it. It is impossible to adequately model the interaction of economic agents, where each agent is considered to be uniform. The pyramids of needs have crumbled, and demand has gone beyond the needs. And rational behavior is not at all rational: there are systemic deviations from rationality at the macroeconomic level, which have yet to be investigated and taken into account. Modern economic science ignores questions about the content of the value of goods and labor, does not define the functions of the owner, etc. Keynes's theory, economic dirigisme and «pumping up demand» through increasing budget spending are untenable. In addition, the liberal-monetary direction in economics is just as false as the previous ones. In no country in the world has the

following liberal-monetary ideology led to positive results. Despite these results, this ideology is still being imposed on many countries [6].

The achievements of Western scholars should not be copied. Western economic science, represented by market-centric Economics, has long occupied a dominant place in economic science, although neoclassical theory does not comprehensively investigate even the market system, not to mention the non-market one, does not disclose «causal connections that characterize the problems of macroeconomic dynamics» [7], does not consider the essence and the influence of engineering and technology on economic life, does not take into account the contradictions of the ecological order, is largely mathematized and asocial, overloaded with graphs, formulas, abstract reasoning. The advance of «market fundamentalism», also called «economic imperialism», has occurred, where the logic of the market turns into the main principle of social structure, and as a result, the emergence of economism (according to P. Ulrich: «...this is the belief of economic rationality only in itself and nothing else» [4]) as a definite dogma prevailing in the entire economic science. As a result, a person was replaced by the abstract concept of a rational economic individual, the main goal of which is distorted, «it is replaced by means of life, which itself takes ugly forms – the accumulation of wealth for the sake of accumulation» [2], reduces relations between people to exchange relations. Such goal-setting does not reveal the essence of a person, and as a result, it prevents understanding of his key role in global economic processes. As M. Blaug states: «having limited the subject of economic theory, neoclassicists openly admitted their incompetence beyond the boundaries set by them and, thus, excluded not only a number of conclusions at the level of common sense, but also several valuable ideas» [8]. As noted by G. V. Zadorozhny: «neoclassical theory is very far from the semantic comprehension of modern economic realities, which also testifies to its initially set methodological limitations in the development of modern economic knowledge» [2]. Therefore, the neoclassical direction cannot explain the features of the transformations of the modern economy, does not allow the study of transition processes, states of instability. All this can lead to the danger of excessive

formalization and the degeneration of economic theory as an objective science not suitable for analyzing the global economy.

Breaking paradigms is not an easy thing, too much has been invested in faulty models, but a complete change is needed.

The task of economic theory at the present stage is to substantiate the contours of the corresponding optimal trend of the development of the economic system, to distinguish it among alternative models, to reveal the patterns of movement towards it, to formulate the «rules of the game», to warn against possible mistakes and negative social consequences.

The economic development of countries is also at a crossroads, since there is no corresponding theory that could be guided in building models of effective management.

With the modern management system of the world economy, the theoretical levers of economic theory remain theoretical and do not work in the modern world. Supranational policy does not allow countries to decide their destiny, subjecting them not only to manipulative implantation of alien cultures, changing the consciousness of the masses, destruction of national ideas, but also to physical destruction in the course of achieving personal monetary-oriented interests of a narrow circle of people [3]. According to G. A. Goltz, the laws of the real economy are inexorable, and as soon as any country fully enters the world economic community, it must comply with the rules of the game of monetary-oriented social psychology. Combining a secure culture with a money culture is a problem that no society has been able to solve. To change the rules of the game, psychology, to carry the realities of value-rational life through the means of information attack is the number one task of modern society [1]. The importance of value factors in economic development for today's critical immoral degradation situation in the world turns it into one of the main tasks of human survival. This circumstance entails a revision of the values and goals of the economic system from traditional – the growing provision of human biological needs – to new, more urgent ones – an increase in the duration of the life cycle of mankind, harmony of coexistence on Earth, and the development of a human personality.

It is necessary to develop and implement theoretical concepts of economics that work in real life. Theories based on irrationality and value-oriented theories of the behavior of business entities are gaining momentum with the aim of socially responsible economic management. However, the theories have not been finalized, the more successful ones have not been tested and in reality are not applicable due to the imperfect management of the world economic system. The «double stopper» in the development of modern economic science is: 1) there is no theory that could be guided to create a model of rational management; 2) there is no mechanism for the implementation of the model in view of the existence of a global pressure policy pursued by the world's leading states and international organizations under the leadership of national clan-oligarchic structures.

Scientists of our time are not able to create an economic theory corresponding to the current reality due to their prevailing stereotype of thinking. It is not easy to bring human consciousness beyond the framework of adaptive behavior; it is necessary to correct it in the direction of value-rational guidelines for life. Values of a spiritual and moral order should, in terms of their importance, dominate over material values. To create a theory that explains the current state of affairs and gives really effective practical recommendations, you need a person with a new type of thinking, who operates with other categories and is not limited by anything in his work except social responsibility, which could be formed from future generations with a certain change in the methods of education, because only with the help of science and education, as well as a change in the foundation of knowledge, it is possible to change the worldview, reformat thinking, correct people's consciousness in the direction of value-rational being.

Conclusion and inferences.

The imposition of pseudo-market relations in modern society has brought it to the brink of disaster. A complete transformation of the notions of housekeeping is required. The way out of the modern socio-economic crisis is seen in the transition to an economy focused on the growth of responsibility for their actions, in the rejection

of the consumer rush attitude to the world around them and replacing it with an economy of self-awareness and an economy of reason.

It is necessary to create an economic ideology that differs from the Western one with entering the field of spiritual and value factors in order to achieve such a state of the economy and society, which is adjusted taking into account the sociocultural needs of people, to change the environment in the value-rational direction of its functioning. To create an economic theory of a new time adequate to reality, meeting the challenges facing humanity. And, on its basis, create a model of spiritual and value development based on the spiritual and moral values of economic management with socially responsible stabilization attitudes.

Literature:

1. Гольц Г. А. Культура и экономика: поиски взаимосвязей. *Общественные науки и современность*. 2000, №1. С. 26.

2. Задорожный Г. В. Иначе возможное как со-творчество человечности (размышления о главном в связи с кризисом экономической науки). Полтава: Скайтек, 2011. 259 с.

3. Москвина А. О. Проблемы создания и реализации модели ценностно-рационального ведения хозяйства. *Развитие современной России: проблемы воспроизводства и созидания: сборник научных трудов* / под ред. Р. М. Нуреева, М. Л. Альпидовской. Москва: Финансовый университет, 2015. С. 480-490. URL: <http://elib.fa.ru/fbook/alpidovskaya.pdf> (accessed August 24, 2020)

4. Ульрих П. Критика экономизма: пер. с нем. Москва: Вузовская книга, 2004. 120 с.

5. Хайкин М. М. Эволюция экономической теории как науки: вызовы времени. *Экономический портал*. 2014. URL: <http://institutiones.com/general/2374-evolyuciya-ekonomicheskoy-teorii-kak-nauki.html> (accessed August 24, 2020)

6. Чуканов Н. А. Несостоятельность экономической науки URL: <http://nichukanov.narod.ru/nesostojat.htm> (accessed August 24, 2020)

7. Швецов Ю. Г. Научная несостоятельность современной экономической теории. *Проблемы современной экономики*. 2015, № 2 (54). С. 53–57. URL: <http://www.m-economy.ru/art.php?nArtId=5363> (accessed August 24, 2020)

8. Blaug M., Vane H.R. Who's who in economics. Fourth Edition. Cheltenham, UK Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2003. ISBN 978-1-84064-992-5.

References:

1. Gol'c G.A. Kul'tura i ekonomika: poiski vzaimosvyazej. *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost'*. 2000, №1. S. 26.

2. Zadorozhnyj G. V. Inache vozmozhnoe kak so-tvorchestvo chelovechnosti (razmyshleniya o glavnom v svyazi s krizisom ekonomicheskoy nauki). Poltava: Skajtek, 2011. 259 s.

3. Moskvina A. O. Problemy sozdaniya i realizacii modeli cennostno-racional'nogo vedeniya hozyajstva. *Razvitie sovremennoj Rossii: problemy vosproizvodstva i sozidaniya: sbornik nauchnyh trudov / pod red. R. M. Nureeva, M. L. Al'pidovskoj*. Moskva: Finansovyj universitet, 2015. S. 480-490. URL: <http://elib.fa.ru/fbook/alpidovskaya.pdf> (accessed August 24, 2020)

4. Ul'rih P. Kritika ekonomizma: per. s nem. Moskva: Vuzovskaya kniga, 2004. 120 s.

5. Hajkin M. M. Evolyuciya ekonomicheskoy teorii kak nauki: vyzovy vremeni. *Ekonomicheskij portal*. 2014. URL: <http://institutiones.com/general/2374-evolyuciya-ekonomicheskoy-teorii-kak-nauki.html> (accessed August 24, 2020)

6. Chukanov N. A. Nesostoyatel'nost' ekonomicheskoy nauki URL: <http://nichukanov.narod.ru/nesostojat.htm> (accessed August 24, 2020)

7. Shvecov Yu. G. Nauchnaya nesostoyatel'nost' sovremennoj ekonomicheskoy teorii. *Problemy sovremennoj ekonomiki*. 2015, № 2 (54). S. 53–57. URL: <http://www.m-economy.ru/art.php?nArtId=5363> (accessed August 24, 2020)

8. Blaug M., Vane H.R. Who's who in economics. Fourth Edition. Cheltenham, UK Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2003. ISBN 978-1-84064-992-5.