

S. Petrukha

Ph.D. (Economics), Associate Professor,

ORCID: 0000-0002-8859-0724

Kyiv National University of Construction and Architecture, Kyiv, Ukraine

PARADIGM OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE AGRARIAN AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF WAR

The theme of the extreme abstractness of the models of the comprehensive economic theory of the development of the agro-construction cluster, its excessive simplification and isolation from socio-economic reality, which occurs, in particular, during wartime, has been a key issue in the methodology of rural and construction economies for more than a decade. The main blame for this state of affairs is laid on the mathematical sophistication and extreme formalization of economic theory – this is the result of the fact that, after the marginalist revolution at the beginning of the 20th century, economic theory has changed its name from “political economy” to “economics”, it has been producing its development along the path of transformation into a “pure”, deductive science of the natural science type, creating the effect of a theoretical “vacuum” in substantiating the need for the development of agrarian construction clusters.

In the literature [1–4; 8], this problem is examined from different angles, taking into account historical, epistemological, disciplinary and institutional aspects, based on different positions and approaches to the integration of rural and construction economies in the name of achieving Sustainable Development Goals [4–5]. However, in the end, the discussion of the issue of excessive abstractness and simplification of economic theory rests on two fundamental problems: ontological and institutional. Methodological reflection on these two fundamental problems is heterogeneous. On the first hand, the refusal of the existing paradigm from big theories is widely accepted, and then the complete rejection of any theoretical constructions in the framework of the so-called “empirical turn” and in connection with attempts to redefine the subject of economics as a “tool box” for solving any social problems in countryside is widely accepted too.

On the other hand, the largely positivist and neo-positivist oriented methodology of economics, as well as some modern methodological approaches, try to get away from the problem of ontology by translating the key question of the realism of models into an epistemological or pragmatic plane and, particularly, reduces it to a discussion of whether what makes models useful, persuasive, what cognitive functions they actually perform,

whether false models explain, and how they explain. This approach implicitly assumes that there is no problem with ontology, it has somehow already been solved in the mainstream of economic theory. But the question remains, where, how and why the need for the development of agrarian construction clusters justify methodologically?

The discussion on this range of problems sharply escalated against the backdrop of the global financial crisis of 2008–2009, gained inertia during the global pandemic of coronavirus infection (COVID-19), sparkling with new colors after the full-scale military invasion of the Russian Federation into the territory of Ukraine. At that time, many scientific papers and journalistic articles were published on the limitations of economic theory, its explanatory and predictive failures, to the point that its orthodox appearance forms the Leviathan, who personifies the Russian Federation for the entire democratic world community, which, along with the energy crisis, the crisis of the financial sector, threatens the physical survival of the population (primarily disadvantaged groups and groups below the poverty line) of the net exporters of Ukrainian agricultural raw materials, food and building materials for the implementation of rural construction projects [9].

The study of how economic knowledge is produced and reproduced, how deeply it penetrates into the development of the agro-construction cluster in general and the institutions of rural and agrarian economies in particular obtains broad answers to these questions. [1; 4; 8]. What is the role of the academic sphere in this, and what is the role of other social spheres – such as the state, business and mass media, which take on the role of a relay of knowledge and shape our everyday ideas about the economy, economic policy, and also largely determine the way of economic thoughts of rural population, its mentality in the coordinates of the “military” development of agrarian construction clusters.

Despite the fact that the invasion of the Russian Federation into the territory of Ukraine has exacerbated the controversy about the need to develop agro-construction clusters (as an institutional root cause for the implementation of large-scale village-preserving projects) to the limit and generated a lot of efforts to reform the economic way of thinking, as well as the movement for pluralism in rural and construction economy, after more than 100 days, we can see that the situation has changed a bit and in fact remained the same. At the same time, a remarkable shift took place in the self-reflection of economists - they proceeded to establish their discipline not as a science of economics, but as an art of modeling, aimed at creating a universal scientific toolkit for solving any social problems. Thus, the European Parliament in the document “Economic repercussions of Russia’s war on Ukraine – Weekly Digest” [7] (as in its previous iterations, from

February 24, 2022) builds a model relationship between the variables “sanctions – the Russian economy – the war in Ukraine”, as a comprehensive benefit of the stability of the Eurozone economy, which counteracts the military buildup of the Russian Federation and the post-war restoration of Ukraine, clothed in the Marshall Plan for it. Here a logical question arises – who is the Marshall Plan really addressed to and is there a place in it for institutions for the development of agrarian construction clusters? The answer to this question must be sought not in the wartime economic paradigm itself, but in an analysis of how it actually functions as a social institution that unites the rural and construction economies in the institutional guise of agrarian construction clusters.

We believe that the instrumentalist tilt of the guise of the forms of development of agrarian construction clusters is not only theoretically impoverished, but also the new paradigm of the economic development of an agrarian construction cluster in a state of war goes beyond the science of modeling, without removing the problem of ontology, and this also applies to the ontology behind specific models of the functioning of the rural and construction economy, and in general, the ontologies of the rural way of life, which describes the economic reality that underlies the new paradigm of economic development of the agro-construction cluster, as one of the directions of the Marshall Plan for Ukraine, for which National Recovery Council was created [6].

The instrumental vector and horizontal progress in the new paradigm of post-war recovery and development of the agrarian-construction cluster, in fact, means the transformation of the cluster, which integrates the institutions of the rural and construction economy into a kind of “architect” or social technologist, bulging SDGs goal-orientators to the fore. Meanwhile, such a trajectory of the Marshall Plan for Ukraine allows agricultural and construction clusters to fit into the ongoing transformation of the economic paradigm, which, under the influence of capitalization processes, implies the transformation of such a cluster not only into a source of global food security, but also into a new scaling of rural construction development institutions.

References:

1. Аксельрод Р.Б., Трач Р.В., Чернишев Д.О., Рижаков Д.А., Петруха С.В., Хоменко О.М. Інноваційні напрями оновлення операційних систем будівельних підприємств в умовах нестабільного бізнес-середовища проекту. Київ, 2021. *Управління розвитком складних систем*. № 48. С. 102–113. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.32347/2412-9933.2021.48.102-113>.
2. Гасанов С., Петруха С., Петруха Н. Онтогенез теоретичних концепцій інтеграції. *Економіст*. 2015. № 1. С. 15–21.

3. Забловський А., Петруха С. Актуальні проблеми розвитку сільського господарства та сільських територій у контексті реформування системи оцінки ефективності державної підтримки. *Економіст*. 2015. № 5. С. 1–5.

4. Петруха С.В. Ринкова трансформація аграрного сектору економіки України: від аграрної кризи до формування підвалин реалізації Глобальних Цілей Сталого Розвитку. *Агросвіт*. 2017. № 18. С. 3–46.

5. Петруха С.В., Стахов Б.В. Імперативи та детермінанти сталого розвитку аграрного сектору економіки в умовах модернізації системи управління державними фінансами. *Причорноморські економічні студії*. 2020. № 52. С. 13–20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32843/bses.52-40>.

6. Питання Національної ради з відновлення України від наслідків війни : указ Президента України від 21.04.2022 № 266/2022. URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/2662022-42225>.

7. Economic repercussions of Russia's war on Ukraine – Weekly Digest. URL: [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2022/699540/IPOL_IDA\(2022\)699540_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2022/699540/IPOL_IDA(2022)699540_EN.pdf).

8. Petrukha S. Latest Global Challenges for Development of Agro-Food Clusters in the Context of Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. *Agrarian economy*. 2021. Т. 14, № 1–2. С. 110–116. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31734/agrarecon2021.01-02.110>.

9. Ryzhakova G., Petrukha S., Kunytskyi K. Institutional foundations and regulatory levers for the development of agricultural construction under conditions of systemic economic transformation. *Management of Development of Complex Systems*. 2019. № 40. P. 147–155. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.11969082>

10. Ryzhakova, Galyna, Ryzhakov, Dmytro, Petrukha, Serhiy, Ishchenko, Tetiana & Honcharenko, Tetyana. (2019). The Innovative Technology for Modeling Management Business Process of the Enterprise. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (IJRTE)*, 8, 4, 4024-4033. DOI: 10.35940/ijrte.D8356.118419