

13. Ракоїд О.О. Методичні рекомендації з комплексної агроекологічної оцінки земель сільськогосподарського призначення [Текст] / О.О. Ракоїд. – К.: Логос, 2008. – 51с.
14. Реміз С. Геоекологічні аспекти сталого розвитку Рівненської області//Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка. Серія: географія. [Текст] / С.Реміз, Н.Тарасюк. – Тернопіль: СМП «Тайп». – 2013 №1 (вип. 34). – С. 197-203.
15. Сорокіна Л.Ю. Оценка антропогенной трансформированности ландшафтов трансграничного полесского региона. [Текст] / Л.Ю. Сорокіна // Український географічний журнал - 2013. – № 3. - С. 25-33.
16. Стойко С. М. Сучасні види антропогенного впливу на життєве середовище [Текст]/ С.М. Стойко, І.Б. Койнова // Український географічний журнал. – 2012. № 1. – С. 50-57.
17. Тарасюк Н.А. Оценка природно-заповедного фонда западного региона Украины (на примере Ровенской области). [Текст] / Н.А. Тарасюк, С.А. Ремиз // Научный журнал «Вопросы географии и геоэкологии». – 2015. № 1. С. 35-42.
18. Третьяк А.М. Землевпорядне проектування: Теоретичні основи і територіальний землеустрій [Текст] : Навч. посібник. /А.М. Третьяк – К.: Вища освіта, 2006 – 528 с.
19. Царик Л.П. Геоекологічні підходи до оцінки ступеня збалансованості природокористування [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://old.geography.lnu.edu.ua/Publik/Period/visn/37/5_Tsaryk.pdf
20. Шищенко П.Г. Прикладная физическая география [Текст]/ П.Г. Шищенко. - К.: Головное издательство издательского объединения «Вища школа», 1988. – 192 с.

UDC 911.3:33:001.82

B.O. Chernov, PhD (Pedagogy), Professor,
SHEE «G. Skovoroda Pereyaslav-Khmelnytsky State Pedagogical University»

METHODOLOGICAL BASIS OF ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY (part 1)

Б.О. Чернов. МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ ЗАСАДИ ЕКОНОМІЧНОЇ ГЕОГРАФІЇ. Сьогодні глобальні економічні зміни вимагають вирішувати багато питань, пов'язаних не тільки з удосконаленням новітніх технологій в промисловості, сільському господарстві, але й в соціальній сфері розв'язанні проблем внутрішніх і зовнішніх міграцій населення. Ці питання до 60-х рр. ХХ ст. входили складовою частиною до економічної географії. Економічна географія у цей період досягла значних успіхів, була визнана не тільки у нашій країні, а й за рубежем. Свідченням цього триумфу були міжнародні наукові конференції та численні публікації. Після тривалої дискусії економічна географія як окрема самостійна наука перестала існувати. Тому постала проблема з'ясування сучасного статусу економічної географії в системі географічних наук, оскільки ця наука, на думку окремих географів, втратила самостійність і стала певним додатком суспільної географії. Насправді вона є самодостатньою наукою. Для доведення цього твердження намічені шляхи подальших досліджень.

Ключові слова: економічна географія, соціальна, соціально-економічна, суспільна географія, взаємозв'язки і впливи, криза географії, дискусія, втрата самостійності, нові дослідження.

Б.О. Чернов. МЕТОДОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОЙ ГЕОГРАФИИ. Сегодня глобальные экономические изменения требуют решения многих вопросов, связанных не только с усовершенствованием новейших технологий в промышленности, сельском хозяйстве, но и в сфере решения проблем внутренних и внешних миграций населения. Эти вопросы до 60-х гг. ХХ в. были составной частью экономической географии. Экономическая география в этот период достигла значительных успехов, была признана не только в нашей стране, но и за рубежом. Свидетельством этого триумфа были международные научные конференции и многочисленные публикации. После продолжительной дискуссии экономическая география как отдельная самостоятельная наука перестала существовать. Поэтому возникла проблема выяснения современного статуса экономической географии положения среди естественно-общественных наук, поскольку эта наука, по мнению отдельных географов, потеряла самостоятельность и стала определённым дополнением общественной географии. На самом деле она является самостоятельной наукой. Для доказательства этого утверждения намечены пути дальнейших исследований.

Ключевые слова: экономическая география, социальная, социально – экономическая, общественная география, взаимосвязи и влияния, кризис географии, дискуссия, потеря самостоятельности, новые исследования.

Verify the meaning of words, and you will save
the mankind from half of their delusions.
(Rene Descartes)

Today, as a result of the accelerating processes in the state and its economy restructuring there is a requirement for not only the fundamental changes in geographic science but also in the disproportion between natural, historical and social directions in geography. More active development of the social geography in foreign countries is explained by the market needs, profits, competitions, social inequality. But now all these have come to our state. An in-

creasing role of social science research has become more evident in providing nation-building, economic restructuring in conditions of almost absolute privatization, commodity and market relations, sudden enhancement of social economic directions, incredibly fast growth of social inequality, disastrous decline of agriculture, aggravated political processes.

Under these conditions, «there was a need, on the one hand, to strengthen the theoretical, especially methodological and methodical potential of the national geographic science that would allow it as the geography of many developed countries to put

and solve the most complex problems of environment, territorial aspects of social and economic development and the interrelation of the natural conditions, economy, culture, health and social well-being of a man. On the other hand, there is a complicated problem of active inclusion of geographic science in solving many practical problems of social revolution on the extremely difficult and rich for unpredictable events of the present stage of its development» [9, p. 8]. Certainly, there may be an immediate opinion that an important role has to be played by economic geography, but the priority is given to social geography. There is a problem of finding out a status of economic geography in the contemporary rapidly changing world.

Analysis of the latest researches and publications. Scientists study mainly problems of social geography but they don't leave behind attention to economic geography, in particular: M.D. Pistun «Theoretical Basics of Social Geography» (1996); O.H. Topchiev «Basics of Social Geography» (2001); O.I. Shablii «Basics of Social Geography» (2012), and others. O.I. Shablii developed his classification of social sciences, which united 61 sciences, he referred to economic geography as «a block of main disciplines, alongside with geography of population, social and political geography» [27, p. 20-21].

However, O.H. Topchiev ambiguously affirms that «soviet «economic geography» gradually has been transforming for the past ten years» from an independent science first in «economic and social» and later in «social and economic». Nowadays, this transformation comes to its logical conclusion, namely: from «social geography» in which economic geography is one of the components of social geography» [25, p. 179]. But, O.H. Topchiev, in another work on the geosphere, notes that «additional derivatives of *geosphere* are possible. For example, *sociosphere* can differentiate in *economy sphere* (social production processes), and in the *sphere of spiritual life*» [26, p. 79]. Thus, we can say that as a result of the complex and lengthy scientific way economic geography lost its independence.

The purpose of research is to determine the current status of economic geography, which in the opinion of some economic geographers has lost its independence and has become an addition to other social geographical sciences, although these sciences have not yet fully established today or have insufficient theoretical and methodological grounds but economic geography is included in their structure.

The research objectives are to establish the causes of economic geography changing meaning in the system of geographical sciences.

Statement of the main material. Philosophy, as the science of the general principles of being and

knowledge, the essence and general natural laws, society and thought, forms the general system views on the world and place of a man in it. Philosophy, acting as a general methodology of the objective knowledge world, gives every science a chance, in particular economic geography, to ground its own methodological basis. Today, the favourable conditions have developed for such grounds.

Firstly, the progressive development of philosophy with its inherent systemic vision of the world has led to the isolation of geographical landscapes, the essence grounds of geographical surface of the Earth, ways of existence which is the geographical form of the matter motion. Conversion from geological form of the matter motion in geography allows to study the history of geography origin that explains the theory of geography and is actively formed.

Secondly, the philosophical categories of general, special and individual enable geographers to study the object of geography – the geographical surface of the Earth, that for its complexity gives way except for philosophy, – at three levels: *global* or *planetary* (general physical geography), *regional* or *state* (regional geography) and *local* (regional ethnography). A dialectical method, as the methodological basis of knowledge of the natural and social reality, «in relation to scientific knowledge performs the integration and unifying function, overcoming apparent at first glance the incompatible and the opposite of natural and scientific and social knowledge, identifying internal unity, universality of these different spheres of human knowledge, explaining it as a reflection of the material unity of the world, which is in the process of continuous movement and development» [8, p. 7]. This allows the theory of geography «to plunge into the essence of the research objects, to remove the imaginary independence of separate phenomena, to lead them to an internal basis as a manifestation of the inner nature of the geographic relationship system» [20, p. 17].

Geography is the science about «the laws of space-time systems development, which are formed on the earth's surface (on a scale of general geographic and thematic maps) in the process of interaction between nature and society, the methods of regulation of these systems and their management.

«Space-time system is a landscape and landscaped areas, oceans and seas, river basins, lake hollows, biogeocoenoses, territorial and production systems (complexes), industrial hubs and industrial areas, economic areas, transport networks and systems, the city as a system and system of cities, areas of settlement, resort areas, etc. Each of these systems has to be examined in interaction of nature and society, that is the essence of all geographic science, its unity and integrity» [23, p. 11].

Today, to understand the unity of geography and to find out individuality of the objects to study physical and economic geography in this unity is extremely difficult, because most geographers have not consensus of opinion. This refers particularly to economic geography: today, it is unknown what status it has. Has economic geography stopped to perform its functions yet and become an insignificant addition to other sciences? And what kind of science is it at present: social, social and economic, social or still economic and geographic?

These questions ought to be studied and ascertain a place of science in the system of natural and social sciences. They are basic to the methodological justification. Without solving the main problem, it is not possible to solve partial ones, as the one «who takes to solve partial problems without solving the general, nevertheless will face these general problems» [15, p. 368]. However, it is important not to let this problem be «lost in a lot of other problems or a huge variety of contrary opinions; the most important here is to approach the question in terms of research, namely not forget the underlying historical ties, to look at this problem from the viewpoint of the historical origin of the known phenomenon, the main stages in its development, and that is actual for it today» [16, p. 67].

In the middle of the 60-s of the XX century the theory of economic geography was put forward by M.M. Baranskyi's ideas, and his followers quietly rested on their laurels; it affirmed that «economic geography plays a more important role in the society. This is well illustrated by the International Geographical Congress for the last ten years in which economic geography was and remains a widely acknowledged «Queen» [28, p. 5].

However, the situation changed dramatically in the 70-th years. The powerful attack began on economic geography, its existence as an independent science was questioned, since the economic geographers did not understand the differentiation of geographic science and thus, expressed their criticism towards it, namely:

1) economic geography is «in crisis situation» because of «its ill-founded methodology», ill-defined of the scientific research subject, «insufficiently shown up of an inherent mechanism of economic and geographic processes and phenomena», and its coordinating and integrating role in solving interdisciplinary problems of rational use, the environment protection and its preservation «gradually goes to economists, and not the economic geographers» [1, p. 14];

2) economic geography lacks the «highest level of its content, similarly, general natural geography» [20, p. 144; 7, p. 305; 22, p. 24];

3) the state of economic geography «is not up to the level as a number of related sciences and practice needs» [20, p. 148] and it falls behind of life [17];

4) «a spatial (territorial) approach is caused by «sprawling» economic geography because of ill-defined research subject» [5, p. 288]. As to the crisis of economic geography, foreign geographers expressed, too [29; 30].

What happened with such, at first sight, prosperous science as economic geography? The reason was in **ideologization**.

Ideologization of all geography was manifested in different forms. «The fight with various «ideological» movements affected adversely the development of geography in the 30-s-50-s years of the XX century. The fundamental ideas of geography were declared by scholasticism, a man always was opposed to nature. Anthropogeography and demography were defeated and political geography was depressed» [9, p. 63].

In the 40-s years of the XX century «Leningrad affair» was falsified, «the defeat of Leningrad University was organized by A.A. Voznesenskyi, the fight with «rootless cosmopolitan» was started. Ya.S. Edelshtein, an outstanding geographer, died in prison, V.M. Shtein, Dean of the Geography Faculty of LSU, was repressed» [6, p. 128].

At this time orientation of all geography was unilaterally pragmatic, especially its social sphere. «The dogmatism and blindness following the leaders' instructions prospered in geographic science. Narrow regional studies were encouraged, they pursued specific objectives, without considering general problems of science, without searching and analysis of the objective laws of the natural environment and society development » [10, p. 7].

In the 60-s of the XX century «a thaw» began, but it quickly passed, creating a period of «stagnation» in which all the negative trends extended in geographical science. These are: «antistate and anti-social personnel policy, creation of privileged «nomenclature» caste in science, political ban on the profession, in other words, science did not allow for talent and questioning to develop. «Dissidents» had not been shot yet, but they were persecuted and sent to «mental hospitals» and denaturalized» [6, p. 129].

As V.M. Kotliakov noted, the result of the aforesaid «was the de-intellectualization of science; in the USSR geography began to dramatically lag behind the world level in many positions. This is especially evident in areas of social geography. Most studies were conducted «in the interest» of BAM, transfer of the river flow, etc. These studies led to the loss of culture of scientific work facilitating separation of Geography from the fundamental sciences... Theoretical analysis was largely of scho-

lastic character, and mostly was grounded in the foreign works that had been recognized (D. Harvey, P. Haggett, R. Johnston and others)» [10, p. 7]. Moreover, the distortion of the scientific normal form activity «opened the way for causal scientists, but with good questionnaire and well-connected with the local elite. If we take into consideration that corruption, bribery, dressing, protectionism, sectionalism penetrated in science, you can imagine how polluted it was by careerists, ignorant people and hoodwinkers. However, these figures had got all the advantages of geography at international scientific forums» [6 p. 129]. Here, the foreign geographers' dictums should be remembered. For example, an outstanding French geographer said about the state of the world geography: «Crisis? – Certainly, it is! The scientific discipline that does not know a crisis, will fall into slumber, begin to die... So if you want – a crisis! The crisis has its positive and negative phenomena» [14, p. 6-7].

If we take into consideration the fact that at this time in the world scientific geographical literature denoted that the economic geography was in a deep long crisis, as well as all geographical science [6, p. 97; 18, p. 17], we can only imagine the confused state of the economic geographers who suddenly found themselves on the complicated way. Not much remained in this science, as it comes from the criticism of economic geography, namely: «methodological basis» is absent in it, «object is not clearly defined», «higher level of its content is not sufficed», «it does not correspond to the needs of the practice», it lags behind life, etc.

It is interesting to note that everybody was satisfied with such scientific development. For example, 100 collections on «Problems of geography» were issued by Moscow Affiliate of the Geographical Society of the USSR for 30 years (1946-1976), among of them 16 related to economic geography, 10 – population geography and geographical areas, 2 – geography of services and geography of tourism [24, p. 227]. Economic geographers were untroubled, and suddenly they found out that the cause of all that was economic geography!

Analysis of publications on economic geography for all these years has shown that in economic geography everything was grounded by these same authors. Then a question arises: Has economic geography as science exhausted itself? But is it so? It appears that there is some truth in this because «gradually modern economic geography was accumulating new facts which did not fit into the framework of the existing concept, formed critical positions in relation to the existing theoretical principles, and new socio-economic and geo-environmental situations demanded new solutions» [19, p. 155]. But there were no new solutions.

After a short time, «new solutions» came out of wastes of history and it was called **sociologization** of science.

In principle, this change of the research direction should be considered as a natural phenomenon, since it reflects the new social order of society, which coincided with the beginning of social practice sociologization.

Sociologization is a general direction of all sciences and social practice, closely connected with humanization, which manifests itself in increasing attention to the social aspects of development. In the 30-s years of the XX century, M. Baranskyi wrote about the need in sociologization of geography. In this period anthropogeography and demography development was interrupted in the former USSR, and all «unnatural» geography was practically led to the study of the economic sphere of the society. Then sociologization was «choked», it was explained by the industrial development of economy and scientific dogmas and bans that existed after the defeat of anthropogeography and demographics. Thus, «production definition of the essence of economic geography where the population was seen as a labor resource and some masses which consume industrial products and food» was formed for many years and attached to the geographical science and responsible scientists [17, p. 23].

In late 60-s – early 70-s of the XX century, at first, sociologization of science suffered «doubtful revival», and then there was a «more rapid» development. Ya.S. Nymmyk, exploring the basic theoretical problems of sociologization in economic geography and the formation of social and economic geography, cleared up that in 1968 Yu.H. Saushkin («the socio-economic territorial system» and «socio-economic spatial system») and A.M. Kolotiiivskyi with the Tartu's scientists («the socio-economic territorial complex» and «socio-economic region») introduced the foundations of a conceptual fund [19, p. 155].

Later, in the 70-s years of the XX century, such outstanding economic geographers as N.T. Ahafonov, E.B. Alaiev, S.B. Lavrov, V.V. Pokshyshevskyi and others affirmed that economic geography should be called socio-economic or even wider – the social science [2; 13; 21]. S.B. Lavrov and N.T. Ahafonov, analyzing the actual problems of economic geography at the XXIII International Geographical Congress (IGC, 1976), noted that we should distinguish the social and economic geography as an independent science. After S.B. Lavrov and H.V. Sdasiuk, describing the development of modern economic and social geography, noted that **«the leading role of the modern world geography belongs to social and economic problems»** [14, p. 6; marked in bold by the author]. The authors af-

firmed that «the underlying sociologization processes pervade all economic geography, make it economic and social, and they are two inextricably linked into one subsystem of geographical sciences. Not non-social economic phenomena. Not «non-social» economic development» [14, p. 10]. Therefore, vast majority of the economic geographers were surprised by the results of the XXIII International Geographical Congress because in some geographers' domestic and foreign reports, «with all the differences in methodologies dominant, was the idea of «sociologization» of economic geography and the formation of social and economic geography» [12, p. 4]. And since the beginning of the 80-s years of the XX century in scientific articles and works it was confidently noted that in the 70-s «everywhere economic geography is social and economic» [14, p. 11; underlined and marked in bold by B. Chernov]. All this is cleared up quite evidently in the scientific views of E.B. Alaiev.

Thus, after the Congress E.B. Alaiev was first to carefully admit that the term «economic geography» in relation to the discipline, as it is treated in science, is narrow compared with the contents of the scientific discipline; in any case, the term «socio-economic geography» might be more perfect» [2, 129]. And in 1980, the scientist categorically (expression of Nymmyk S.Ya.) affirmed: «Now it is

time to emphasize that domestic economic geography has transformed into social and economic geography» [3, 89; underlined by B. Chernov]. However, any justification was not said by the author.

But then some adherents appeared which supported «birth» and existence of socio-economic geography extremely emotionally. N.K. Mukitanov, Z.E. Dzenis, Yu.V. Porosionkov, M.D. Sharyhin, S.A. Kovaliov and others wrote about the need of socio-economic geography development. Analyzing these publications, S.Ya. Nymmyk noted that, for example, N.K. Mukitanov confined only a general statement of the need of social geography as the only true way of geographical knowledge sociologization. Z.E. Dzenis correctly spoke of the need to ground the research objects of social and socio-economic geography, but he did not substantiate them. The actual problems of content and methodological problems of socio-economic geography have not been considered by other researchers.

The actual methodological question remains unclear: how geographic science correlates with economic geography, social, socio-economic and political geography. These methodological constructions hide internal inconsistency that defines the relationship between the sciences. The answers to these and other questions require further thorough study.

References

1. Агранат Г. А. География и экономика: связи и зависимости (к поискам путей развития экономической географии) [Текст] / Г. А. Агранат. – Известия АН СССР. Сер. Геогр. – 1977. – № 6. – С. 13-26.
2. Алаев Э. Б. Экономико-географическая терминология [Текст] / Э. Б. Алаев. – М.: Мысль, 1977. – 199 с.
3. Алаев Э. Б. Социально-экономическая география: Актуальные вопросы развития науки [Текст] / Э. Б. Алаев // Известия АН СССР. Сер. Геогр. – 1980. – № 4. – С. 89-94.
4. Анненков В. В. Этапы развития современной географии [Текст] / В. В. Анненков, И. П. Герасимов, А. А. Минц // Известия АН СССР. Сер. Геогр. – 1972. – № 3. – С. 90-100.
5. Дружинин А. Г. География культуры: некоторые аспекты формирования нового научного направления [Текст] / А. Г. Дружинин // Известия ВГО. – 1989. – Т. 121. – Вып. 4. – С. 307-312.
6. Исаченко А. Г. География на перепутье: уроки прошлого и пути перестройки [Текст] / А. Г. Исаченко // Известия ВГО. – 1990. – № 2. – С. 127-137.
7. Исаченко А. Г. О единстве географии [Текст] / А. Г. Исаченко // Известия ВГО. 1971. – Т. 103. – Вып. 4. – С. 289-310.
8. Исторический материализм как методология познания и преобразования общественной жизни [Текст] / Под ред. В. В. Денисова. – М.: Наука, 1987. – 284с.
9. Котляков В. М. Географические аспекты нового мышления [Текст] / В. М. Котляков // Коммунист. – 1990. – № 11. – С. 61-70.
10. Котляков В. М. Географическая наука на пороге 90-х годов [Текст] / В. М. Котляков // Известия АН СССР. Сер. Геогр. – 1990. – № 4. – С. 5-16.
11. Котляков В. М. XXVI Международный географический конгресс [Текст] / В. М. Котляков, В. В. Анненков // Известия АН СССР. Сер. Геогр. – 1989. – № 1. – С. 7-19.
12. Лавров С. Б. Принципиальные вопросы экономической географии на XXIII Международном географическом конгрессе [Текст] / С. Б. Лавров, Н. Т. Агафонов // Известия ВГО., 1977. – Вып. 1. – С. 4-7.
13. Лавров С. Б. Теоретические споры и некоторые научно-практические задачи экономической географии [Текст] / С. Б. Лавров, Н. Т. Агафонов // Известия ВГО, 1974. – Вып. 2. – С. 148.
14. Лавров С. Б. Советская социально-экономическая география: некоторые аспекты международного значения [Текст] / С. Б. Лавров, Г. В. Сдасюк // Региональный экономико-географический анализ и прогнозирование – Фрунзе, 1980. – С. 11-13.
15. Ленин В. И. Отношение к буржуазным партиям [Текст] / В. И. Ленин. – ПСС. – Т. 15. – С. 67-68.
16. Ленин В. И. О государстве [Текст] / В. И. Ленин. – ПСС. – Т. 39. – С. 368-369.

17. Максаковский В. П. Географическая культура: Учебное пособие для студентов вузов [Текст] / В. П. Максаковский. – М.: Гуманит. изд. центр ВЛАДОС, 1998. – 416 с.
18. Машбиц Я. Г. Тенденции развития географической мысли [Текст] / Я. Г. Машбиц // Известия АН СССР. Сер. Геогр. – 1990. – № 4. – С. 17-27.
19. Мересте У. И. Современная география: вопросы теории [Текст] / У.И. Мересте, С. Я. Ниммик. – М.: Мысль, 1984. – 296 с.
20. Мукиитанов Н. К. От Страбона до наших дней [Текст] / Н. К. Мукиитанов. – М.: Мысль, 1985. – 234 с.
21. Покишишевский В. В. О самом главном в экономической географии [Текст] / В. В. Покишишевский // Вопросы географии. – М.: Мысль, 1974. – № 95. – С. 25-42.
22. Преображенский В. С. Феномен географии (раздумья географа) [Текст] / В. С. Преображенский // Известия АН СССР. Сер. Геогр. 1979. – № 4. – С. 20-27.
23. Саушкин Ю. Г. Географическая наука в прошлом, настоящем, будущем: Пос. для учителей [Текст] / Ю. Г. Саушкин. – М.: Просвещение, 1980. – 269 с.
24. Перспективы географии [Текст] / Сто сборников «Вопросы географии». – М.: Мысль, 1976. – Сб. 100. – 254 с.
25. Топчієв О. Г. Основи суспільної географії: Навч. посібник [Текст] / О. Г. Топчієв. – Одеса: Астропринт, 2001. – 560 с.
26. Топчієв О. Г. концептуально-поняттєвий апарат і предметна область географії [Текст] / О. Г. Топчієв // Теоретичні та методологічні проблеми суспільної географії: Зб. наук. праць на пошану Заслуженого професора Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка Олега Шаблія. – Львів: Видавничий центр ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2006. – С. 77-84.
27. Шаблій О. І. Основи суспільної географії: підручник для студ. Вищих навч. закладів [Текст] / О. І. Шаблій. – 2-ге вид. – Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2012. – 296 с.
28. Экономическая география в СССР: история и современное развитие [Текст] / Под ред. Н. Н. Баранского и др. – М.: Просвещение, 1965. – 653 с.
29. Gillmor Desmond A. Economic geography: its scope, development and methodology / Gillmor Desmond A. – «Geogr. Viewpoint», 1968, 1. – № 5. – 251-260 (Економічна географія – її зміст, розвиток і методологія).
30. Mazúr T. Geography of today and its perspective / T. Mazúr. – «Geogr. časop.», 1968, 20. – № 3. – 201-211 (Сучасна географія і її перспективи).