

CONTEMPORARY RESEARCHERS ON NON-PERFECTION OF THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL BASE OF ECONOMICS

© 2011 D.G. Zagulyaev*

Keywords: theoretical and methodological base, economics and labor area, contemporary economic theory.

Positions of contemporary Russian and foreign researchers are provided regarding the condition of economics and labor area, and economic theory in general. It has been defined that according to most researches, existing theoretical and methodological approaches presently used to manage social and labor area, can not handle tasks they are assigned.

The status of contemporary labor economics, as well as problems associated with this status, are caused by theoretical and methodological solutions used in contemporary economics. It is not a coincidence that, as believed by a number of researchers, it is impossible to explain and control, through the use of theoretical and methodological base of contemporary economics, many economics phenomena of real life; application of provisions of this base prevents effective management of national economics.

Academician N.P. Fedorenko mentions inability of existing economic theory to resolve practical problems efficiently: "It should be acknowledged that, as many people know, there are many scientific schools and stand-alone scientific materials, recommendations and suggestions in economic science, but there are pathetically few fundamental results, that is the results that can really radically change the routine of economic life, make production cheaper and eliminate poverty. The situation is way worse in economics with summarization of actual data and publications. Oceans of data have been collected, numbers, facts and words are in abundance, however, there is no good music pleasant to the heart yet". Then he writes: "Over the last several decades, the human factor in economics became subject to close attention of economics researchers, however, by and large, they viewed it in demographic, psychological, technical and other aspects, where a human was presented in various aspects, including population unit, work force element, generator of scientific and technical advancements, consumer etc.; one way or the other, he was viewed as a part of economic mechanism, as a means to economic ends".

Academician S.Y. Glaziev thinks that "The contemporary economic science apparently neglects the importance of moral values in formation of eco-

nomical behavior. In the paradigm of currently dominating market equilibrium there is an assumption regarding rational behavior of economic agents driven only by profit maximization motive. Significance of all other motives of economic behavior and its moral limitations is ignored".

V.N. Belkin and N.A. Belkina emphasize the absence of adequate methodological support of contemporary theoretical research in economics: "Many shortcomings in development of theoretical labor issues and labor relationships stem from imperfection of methodical support of economic research". Authors mention that many unresolved problems in labor area do exist: "Many notions and laws of labor development have been clarified and are actively used in practice. Nevertheless, there are still many unresolved labor problems. This can be explained, on one hand, by the fact that many problems have not been drawing attention of social and natural sciences involved in labor studies. On the other hand - by the fact that labor - is perpetually developing and most complex psychological and physiological phenomenon. In its development, it is as inexhaustible as human that creates it".

A.G. Gryaznova and N.N. Dumnaya solidarize with V.N. Belkin and N.A. Belkina by sharing their position regarding weak methodological foundation of contemporary economics: "Russian economic reality had cast a challenge to theory: efforts to reform our economics have faced serious barriers unseen by other countries, and, therefore, theoretical explanations by foreign theoreticians. Unfortunately, currently Russia had lost most of methodological foundation of economic analysis, more to say, they are not practically discussed. In dissertations and dissertation summaries they repeat the same hackneyed phrases regarding complex and system approaches by authors to selected problems. Researchers of specific economic problems

* Denis G. Zagulyaev, PhD in Economics, associate Professor of Votkinskiy subsidiary of Izhevskiy State Technical University. E-mail: dzagulyaev@threatreduction.net.

in Russian economics do not care at all to determine their methodological positions”.

V.K. Nusratullin puts forward an opinion regarding weakness of contemporary economic theory and its inability to resolve practical economic tasks: “At present the situation in economic theory is such that it in all of its areas does not satisfy the public not only limited to theoretical economists and practitioners, but in general all those, one way or another, involved in economics. Certainly, such situation becomes intolerable. And we should more actively depart from classical set-in-concrete, and from the height of present experience, sometimes false tenets, that ferociously hamper the development of economic theory in the spirit of present time”.

A.I. Demin notes the mismatch of contemporary economic theory to the needs of economic practice “Profound economic changes going on in the second half of 20th century in the developed countries and their social implications related to scientific and technical revolution have shown complete weakness of contemporary economic science. Neither western economic thought, nor Marxist political economics, previously professed in our country, not only were unable to predict the flow of economic processes, but also to explain the events that have already taken place. Never-ending rises and falls in economics, perpetual unemployment, prices escalation, utterly non-controlled inflation - all this remains an enigma for economics economic science is referred to in the West. The theory of political economics of socialism turned out to be a “soap bubble” that had exploded at the first serious trial. Having lost its foundation, economics gradually turned into “economy” in the original sense of the word, i.e. list of tasks necessary to run one’s own home (the ancient Greek term). It began to support not national economics as a system, but needs of enterprises and firms. Hence, perpetual drive of “economics” towards bringing all diversity of economic processes to “supply and demand problem”. Even in this issue, theoreticians suffered a fiasco because they were unable to learn the “mysteries” of pricing. Perhaps only in the talented work of J.M. Keynes “General theory of employment, interest and money” the effort was made to come back to economics as a system. But although J.M. Keynes made a number of system solutions, without understanding of cost relationships in economics he was unable to create a strict economic concept”.

K.A. Kirsanov, V.P. Buyanov, L.M. Mikhailov agree that the tools for labor analysis have become significantly obsolete: “From the scientific standpoint, the problems of labor are not sufficiently studied. This phenomenon of functioning intellect is, of course, not beyond the focus of attention, but still this level of attention is not apparently enough for it. As a rule, labor is mostly defined as oriented towards viewpoints of political economists of the nineteenth century, and this, in many ways, obsolete base, is used to address current problems”.

According to E.E. Rumyantseva, the subject of research of economic science hampers its future development: “Division of sciences contributed to the fact that many problems faced by not only Russia but the entire humanity, have not been resolved in a complex way. As it applies to economics, it is expressed by the fact that it has turned into science dealing with making money, having transferred the study of human nature to moral philosophy, ethics, psychology, theology and sociology. But without human involvement and caring for people, no economic problems can be resolved. Results of anti-moral development of economics - mass mismatch of knowledge, skills, mind, public effect and labor compensation, which leads, on one hand, to distorted, biased social inequality, and on the other hand, to the growth of non-professionalism of personnel and, finally, inferior living conditions in Russia vs. many countries in the world”.

Y.N. Lachinov expresses his position that, in fact, there is no general economic theory at this phase of science and practice development: “Applying unified, universal signs and requirements regarding sciences, one can say with confidence that general economic theory does not exist. The entire set of knowledge is limited to the totality of bases and details of analysis of many phenomena, whose cruxes have not been resolved or poorly presented”.

S.E. Lutkov comes to the same conclusion: “And disintegrated variety of theoretical schools not united with one idea in economics even more weakens economics as a science, fundamental notions of which do not allow to unite them with one theory of economics, probably, due to complexity of extrapolation of contemporary economic methods of analysis of space and their objects to analysis of economics”.

M. Trudoliubov, in a foreword to S.Guriev’s book “Myths of economics” notes that existing approaches and methods in economics do not pro-

vide predictability to this science: "Economics considered to be the most exact of social sciences. It is not that exact as "real" natural sciences - probably, due to its relative youngness and vastness of the subject of research. Economist is not a prophet and not an oracle, which we had a chance to see, as economic crisis developed".

Y.I. Mukhin expresses opinion about insufficient use of methods of information collection in contemporary economic practice: "At some point of time an American economist "indeed" Vasily Vasilievich Leontiev ... was trying to turn attention of scientists of other fields of knowledge to the fact that economics is flooded with "theoreticians" not only ignorant of real households, but also not trying to learn anything about them. In the introduction to his book "Economic essay" he writes that economics is a real applied science: one can not be an economist outside economics, one can not create theories without receiving data from specific companies, deals, cash and merchandise flows. Greatest majority of luminaries in economics work for themselves - for their scientific knowledge, - and their work is a pure play of mind that nobody needs and that does not give anything. Their "genial illuminations" obtained from looking at the ceiling for a long time, - is a useless fun, dangerous for those politicians and practitioners who would try to use them".

Henry Ford mentioned the following theoretical problem with approach to definition of level of employees' compensation: "The old theory still popular with some business circles states that the level of compensation depends upon the ability of worker to haggle over the highest wage for himself from monopolistic employer. When applying this theory, both parties are worse off. It causes scandals and war. Weapons used by parties are boycott and lockout. Both of these implications are, to sufficient extend, saying that the theory is wrong. Nevertheless, a whole bunch of inferior entrepreneurs and workers just stick to it. And both are wrong". As we can see, now that a century has gone by, this wrong approach criticized by Henry Ford is still used in economics.

Another foreign researcher, U. Deming, challenges methodological truth of using the principle of competition in running business and suggests an alternative solution: "We have grown in competition. Economists have taught us that competition will resolve all our problems. In reality, competition, as we can see now, is destructive. It would have

been much better if we all worked as one system for everybody's victory. It requires cooperation and new management style".

Most researches believe that existing theoretical and methodological approaches presently used to manage social and labor area, can not handle tasked they are assigned.

Changes going on in real economics, emergence of new economic phenomena need generalization of accumulated experience, theoretical and methodological problems of economic theory, one of which can be the generation of other conceptual theoretical and methodological approaches.

Belkin V.N., Belkina N.A. Economic theory of labor. Ekaterinburg, 2007.

Introduction into institutional economics: Manual / Edited by D.S. Lvov. M., 2005.

In search of a new theory: Economic theory reader with case studies: Manual / Edited by A.G. Gryaznova and N.N. Dymnaya. M., 2004.

Demin, A. I. Information theory of economics: Macromodel. Revision 2, stereotype. M., 2007.

Lachinov Y. N. New economic theory - new classics: Revolutionary breakthrough in all ideas on crux of economics. M., 2008.

Lutkov S.E. The theory of harmonious space (new geometry). Strategic games in economic space. Archangelsk, 2002.

Myths of economics: Delusions and stereotypes disseminated by mass media and politicians / S. Guriev. 2nd revision. amended and revised. M., 2009.

New economics / U. Edward Deming [translated from English by T. Guresh]. M., 2008.

Nusratullin V.K. Non-equilibrium economics. 2nd edition, amended. M., 2006.

Russia on the brink of centuries / N.P. Fedorenko. M., 2003.

Rumyantseva E.E. Moral laws of economics. M., 2009.

Stalin - the master of the USSR / Y.I. Mukhin. M., 2008.

The theory of labor: Manual / K.A. Kirsanov, V.P. Buyanov, L.M. Mikhailov. M., 2003.

Fedorenko N.P. Humanistic economics. M., 2006.

Ford H. My life, my achievements / Henry Ford; Foreword by prof. N.S. Lavrov, 1924; Translation from English managed by engineer V.A. Zorgenfrei. Today and tomorrow / Henry Ford; Foreword by D.I. Zaslavskiy, 1927; Translation from English managed by engineer I.B. Mandelshtam. Pyatigorsk, 2008.

Economics and public environment: unrealized mutual influence. Scientific notes and sketches / Research project manager, scientific editor O.T. Bogomolov. M., 2008.

Elements of reforms theory / V.M. Polterovich. M., 2007.

Received for publication on 24.01.2011