

Горизонти науки

UDC 911.3

Serhii Sonko, DSc (Geography), Professor
e-mail: sp.sonko@gmail.com
Uman National University of Horticulture

THE CONCEPT OF SPATIAL REDISTRIBUTION IN MODERN SUBJECT FIELD OF SOCIAL GEOGRAPHY

For 25 years of the Ukrainian independence the domestic geography “was looking for itself” in the methodology of modern science. Such searches were not always fruitful, as under conditions of the market economy they were largely carried out “by feel”. However, during this time the surrounding world was developing by its own laws, becoming multidimensional. It remains to be understood by most geographers of the old classical school. The geographical space and areas of its development, traditionally studied by social geographers, can be better researched from the standpoint of the concept of spatial redistribution proposed by the author. In his opinion, this concept should constitute the main foundations of the modern subject area of social geography.

Despite the intensive search for new paradigms in the domestic geography, there was no integrative idea or problem that would unite geographers regardless of the physical and economic direction. In reality, there is only one problem in the world – a gradual depletion of natural resources of the planet. Thus, the rest of others are derivative problems, on the principle of the increasing gear. But modern global economy continues to grow at the expense of the natural resources of the planet and the most developed countries have learned redistribute them skillfully in their favor.

The idea of spatial redistribution, in our opinion, should have a leading position in contemporary subject area of social geography. It should be based on more applied areas: energy redistribution; spatial inversions; spatial redistribution of mineral resources; spatial redistribution of environmental resources; spatial redistribution of material and energy flows of the biosphere; resource and financial spatial redistribution in the global economic system.

Keywords: methodology, paradigm, sustainable, development, spatial, redistribution.

Сергій Сосько. КОНЦЕПЦІЯ ПРОСТОРОВОГО ПЕРЕРОЗПОДІЛУ У ПРЕДМЕТНІЙ ОБЛАСТІ СУСПІЛЬНОЇ ГЕОГРАФІЇ

Протягом 25 років української незалежності вітчизняна географія «шукала себе» в методології сучасної науки. Такі пошуки виявлялися не завжди плідними, оскільки в умовах ринкової економіки здебільшого здійснювалися «навпомацки». Однак за цей час навколишній світ розвивався за своїми законами, ставши багатовимірним. Це ще належить зрозуміти більшості географів старої класичної школи. Географічний простір і напрями його освоєння, якими традиційно займаються суспільні географи, можуть бути краще досліджені з позицій концепції просторового перерозподілу, запропонованої автором. На його думку, ця концепція повинна складати головний фундамент сучасної предметної області суспільної географії.

Ключові слова: методологія, парадигма, стійкий, розвиток, просторовий, перерозподіл.

Сергей Сосько. КОНЦЕПЦИЯ ПРОСТРАНСТВЕННОГО ПЕРЕРАСПРЕДЕЛЕНИЯ В ПРЕДМЕТНОЙ ОБЛАСТИ ОБЩЕСТВЕННОЙ ГЕОГРАФИИ

На протяжении 25 лет украинской независимости отечественная география «искала себя» в методологии современной науки. Такие поиски оказывались не всегда плодотворными, поскольку в условиях рыночной экономики по большей части осуществлялись «наощупь». Однако за это время окружающий мир развивался по своим законам, став многомерным. Это еще надлежит понять большинству географов старой классической школы. Географическое пространство и направления его освоения, которыми традиционно занимаются общественные географы, могут быть лучше исследованы с позиций концепции пространственного перераспределения, предложенной автором. По его мнению, эта концепция должна составлять главный фундамент современной предметной области общественной географии.

Ключевые слова: методология, парадигма, устойчивый, развитие, пространственный, перераспределение.

Problem statement. Stepping up in methodological discussions, taking place in the domestic geographical science in recent years, causes suspicion (perhaps, wrong suspicion) that today the modern geography is not able to respond adequately to quick changes around and it is floundering in stormy sea of paradigms, concepts and hypotheses.

It seems as if the content of the modern subject area, especially social geography, is not outlined and even not marked about. The recent promulgation of the list of areas of training by Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine leads to this conclusion in which there were no social, economic, social and economic

geographies. Perhaps, this event was the result of 25 years of estrangement of the domestic social geography from its classical foundations started by M.M. Baransky. This estrangement is probably felt by most geographers, as it was discussed in reports of last Congress of Geographical Society in Vinnitsia. Although, there is no answer for the question “Where did the domestic social geography come to?” One thing is clear – during the last 15-20 years of the market economy our science was expected to give a very specific product, measured in monetary terms, not only dreamy considerations of the structure of the universe. We are deeply convinced that the lack of such product has prompted numerous publications about the “status”, “mission”, “prospects”,

“methodological transformations” that appeared regularly in recent years [1].

Main material. 25-year Ukrainian independence against the background of open borders and deepening of commercialization led geography, this romantic and sensual science into a dead end steadily and irreversibly. The disappointment from that there are no “blank spaces” left led geographers to clumsy attempts of the methodological expansion into computer science, economics, sociology, biology, mathematics, physics and other sciences. However, this impasse became even worse as domestic geographers once again gave birth to methodological simulacrum [14] like “spatial clusters”, many “paradigms”, “strategies of environmental management” and “sustainable development” (including “Housing and Utilities Economy”) ... Trying to combine them under the banner of: at first – “continuous geographic education”; then – “post neo-classics”; further – “human landscape science” and “constructive geography”; further – “sustainable development”; further – “sociogeosystems”; still hereinafter “environmental study”; further – “ecological networks” did not give anything qualitatively new.

In fact, the “blank spaces” have not disappeared anywhere on a modern map. However, the very world map and, truly, the world itself changed radically, becoming n-dimensional. Most geographers of the old classical school should understand it as they are accustomed to the two-dimensional black and white, or it is better to say gray, perception of complex spatial processes [23].

One would like to believe that with the fourth attempt (the first attempt was the article of I.G. Chervanev in UGJ [26], the second attempt was after the seminar in IGS NAS in 2010 [2], the third attempt was in 2015 after the scientific conference “Modern problems of geography and education in Ukraine” at Kiev National University named after Shevchenko) [24] the geographic community finally realizes that it is impossible to solve practical, evaluated with money, issues without a strong, adequate theoretical foundation.

“Information age” [1] caused a lot of noise among geographers but it turned out that natural resources can be successfully used [4,7,8] without geographic databases, inventories, remote sensing methods, geographical expertise and many other achievements of national geography¹. Moreover, under current conditions the ruthless exploitation of natural rent continues and any information about natural resources (as GIS or inventories) is deadly for the government (as it is obvious who, where and how much stole²). Perhaps, that is why today geographers should deeply think about the perspective of future development of the resource direction in geography. Why add itself automatically to the opposition? In particular, issues, and, most importantly, objectives in the study of different resource potentials and inventory

estimates should be “softer”. In other words, to convince the main resource users in “environmental management” not with calling for restriction (even scientifically based) but with stories about the future of their children who also want to make a profit from coal mining, ore or gas, electricity sales, grain, and others.

However, somewhere in the late 1990s, several Russian scientists drew attention to the problem, much more important than listed above [25]. Designation of this problem came down to the idea of a global redistribution of natural resources which the developing countries carry out “through informatization” [8, 9]. Understanding the idea of redistribution from the positions of geographical division of labor is also expressed in one of the author’s publications [18]. The author argues that today the domestic geography does not have a single constructive paradigm that would unite all geographers around one problem¹. In reality, the problem in the world is only one – a gradual depletion of natural resources of the planet². Thus, the rest of others are derivative problems, on the principle of the increasing gear: economic, environmental, social, humanitarian, rising inflation, regional conflicts and attempts to make “sustainable” development... A clear proof of it was impossibility more than 20 years (since Rio 1992) to make “sustainable” development, that is, all the time “supported” one, and above all, because of the lack of resources for such support.

For example, let us try “environmentally” estimate “Project 21” – Metallurgical Plant “Interpipe” on the basis of the concept of redistribution. However, there is quite effective method for such assessment, described in [15, 16]. In order to build a modern enterprise many high quality building materials are necessary that are produced not only in Dnipro but also in other regions: cement, granite, building ceramics and others. But they are all made on technologically outdated enterprises, and therefore, they “took away” a portion of the environmental resource of the biosphere in the course of this production. High-tech equipment of the “metallurgical miracle” probably made of heat-resistant, superalloyed metals for the production of which it is necessary to extract and enrich more than a thousand tons of polymetallic ores and ores of rare metals, spending energy carriers, polluting the environment with dust, eventually, taking the living space of other types for dumps. Finally, the operation of the electrometallurgical enterprise is connected with consumption of huge amount of electricity which should be produced at SDPP burning lots of coal, or at HPP radically changing the hydrological regime of rivers, or at NPP creating another Chernobyl.

Preventing accusations of supporters of new technologies and post-industrial development, we should assure the reader who has never supported alarmist ideas, whose main slogan is “close and prohibit”. I agree that in today’s globalized cruel world the leadership of the country is provided by advancing other countries and, above all, in the sphere of high technologies. However, it turned out [19], this “advancing” development is through the use of the environmental resource of other areas, particularly of less developed countries or those countries which still have significant areas of undisturbed ecosystems [6, 8, 19]. Thus, there is no “sustain-

¹The list in UGJ № 2, 2010.

²A kind of modern electronic declaration.

³Thus, the author deliberately blurs the artificially created line between natural and social branches of modern geography.

⁴Look: S. Lem “Futurological Congress”.

able”, “supported” development. To add something in one place it should be taken from another place or, in other words, to redistribute spatially [18]. In fact, the most developed countries are doing it successfully ever since the industrial revolution. Probably, a good term may be “to limit” here, as did the creators of the Kyoto Protocol.

But despite its existence, the modern world economy continues to develop at the expense of natural resources of the planet (let us remember which countries do not agree to ratify the Kyoto protocol?). Unfortunately, in these circumstances geographers cannot offer anything better than “to limit”. In particular, such restrictions are embodied today in different resource estimates (inventories, expertise) which become more important due to modern information technologies, particularly Geoinformatics. However, who among prudent investors will agree to invest in “limits”?

To honor of the Russian scientists, they were able to make the problem of exhaustion of planetary resources of state significance. In particular, through the disclosure of discrimination of the Kyoto Protocol [3, 5], followed by access to the geopolitics: “Russia is a world power which has a probable enemy/ enemies – countries that indirectly, that is through the mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol, plunder its natural resources”. The probable enemy is an appropriate military doctrine with appropriate MIC financing that today Ukraine feels very keenly by the results of the expansion of its northern neighbor. Perhaps, the Ukrainian geographers, following the concept of spatial redistribution, must seek for an adequate geopolitical response to the development of alternative geopolitical strategies [17].

Thus, the mediation [13, 20] is a main sign of that hidden mechanism of spatial redistribution of global natural resources which should be investigated by geographers today. The redistribution of resources in time (“We borrow the planet from future generations”) was written about a lot since the dawn of the development of the strategy for sustainable development [10].

In fact, [13] an objective assessment of conditions for such development is made in the article. “Invisibility” of resource consumption of the biosphere is provided by virtual mechanisms through financial, informational and political spheres that can be found in [7, 8, 19, 20]. In other words, the idea of redistribution is described by P. Protopopov in the bio correlation concept [27].

Conclusions. The idea of spatial redistribution, in our opinion, should have a leading position in contemporary subject area of social geography. It should be based on more applied areas:

- Energy redistribution [11, 12];
- Spatial inversions [16];
- Spatial redistribution of mineral resources [18];
- Spatial redistribution of environmental resources [9];
- Spatial redistribution of material and energy flows of the biosphere [21, 22];
- Resource and financial spatial redistribution in the global economic system [8].

In other words, spatial redistribution is a huge “blank space” that exists today on the world map and which should be soon eliminated by social geographers, according to the specifics of activities.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Багров Н.В. Статус, миссия и перспектива географии / Багров Н.В., Руденко Л.Г., Черванев И.Г. // Український географічний журнал. – 2010. -№ 2. – С. 5-9.
2. Географічна наука в нових соціально-економічних умовах розвитку України: Матеріали наукового семінару «Конструктивізм у сучасній географії» (Інститут географії НАНУ, 16-17 грудня 2010 р.) // Український географічний журнал. – 2011. - № 1.- 78 с.
3. Голубев Г.Н. Геоэкология и глобальные изменения / Г.Н. Голубев // Вестник Моск. ун-та. Сер. 5. География. – 1988. - № 4. – С. 23-34.
4. Горшков В.Г. Физические и биологические основы устойчивости жизни / Под ред. К.С. Лосева. – М.:ВИНИТИ, 1995. – 471 с.
5. Данилов-Данильян В.И. Экологический вызов и устойчивое развитие / Данилов-Данильян В.И., Лосев К.С. – М., 2000. – 415 с.
6. Екологічні основи збалансованого природокористування у агросфері: навчальний посібник / за редакцією С.П. Сонька та Н.В. Максименко. – Х.: ХНУ імені В.Н. Каразіна, 2015. – 568 с.
7. Кондратьев К.Я. Баланс углерода в мире и в России / Кондратьев К.Я., Лосев К.С., Ананичева М.Д., Чеснокова И.В. // Известия РАН. Серия географическая. - 2002. - № 4. - С. 9-16.
8. Липец Ю.Г. Глобальные проблемы – географическая панорама 2002 г. / Ю.Г. Липец // Материалы постоянно действующего междисциплинарного семинара Клуба ученых «Глобальный мир». - «Издательский Дом «ВЕК». Институт микроэкономики, 2002. – С. 5-14.
9. Лосев К.С. Бюджет антропогенного углерода и роль экосистем в его эмиссии и стоке в глобальном и континентальном масштабах / К.С. Лосев // Страны и регионы на пути к сбалансированному развитию. Сборник научных трудов. – Киев: «Академперіодика», 2003. – С. 36-41.
10. Наше общее будущее. – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – 376 с.
11. Письмак В.П. Энергоимпульсная сущность экономического базиса общества / В.П. Письмак [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа:
12. Подолинський С.А. Вибрані твори / С.А. Подолинський. – К.: КНЕУ, 2000. – 328 с.
13. Поздняков Д.В. Разработка и картографирование интегральных показателей устойчивого развития стран мира / Поздняков Д.В., Тикунов В.С., Федотов А.П. // Вестн. Моск. ун-та. Сер. 5. География. – 2003. - № 2. – С. 20-29.

14. Пустота и симулякр – ключевые символы постмодерна (Символы и знаки XXI века – часть 17 [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: <http://www.polit.nnov.ru/2009/03/03/symbolpoostota/>
15. Рогачев С.В. Закон сохранения географического пространства, или быстро хорошо не бывает [Электронный ресурс]. / С.В. Рогачев // География. – 2002. - № 10. – Режим доступа: <http://geo.1september.ru>.
16. Рогачев С.В. Пространственные инверсии. Десять ситуаций для анализа / С.В. Рогачев // География. – 1999. - № 27.
17. Сонько С.П. Балтійсько-Середземноморська геополітична доктрина та занепад євразійства / С.П. Сонько // Науковий вісник Херсонського державного університету. Серія Географічні науки. – Херсон. держ. ун-т.; «Видавничий дім «Гельветика». – Херсон, 2016. - № 3. – С. 74-77.
18. Сонько С.П. Географічний поділ праці або глобальний перерозподіл природних ресурсів? / С.П. Сонько // Вісник Харківського національного університету ім. В.Н. Каразіна. Серія Геологія. Географія. Екологія. – Харків, ХНУ імені В.Н. Каразіна, 2003. - № 610. – С. 116-121.
19. Сонько С.П. Засадничі принципи ноосферного природокористування у контексті концепції сталого розвитку / С.П. Сонько // Вісник Криворізького економічного інституту КНЕУ. – 2006. - № 8. – С. 74-87.
20. Сонько С.П. Просторові і часові механізми екологічної експансії агроландшафту / С.П. Сонько, Н.В. Максименко // Людина та довкілля. – Харків: Видавництво ХНУ імені В.Н. Каразіна, 2013. – Вип. 2(15). – С. 5-21.
21. Сонько С.П. Ноосферна динаміка просторових соціально-економічних систем / С.П. Сонько // Ландшафти і сучасність. – Київ-Вінниця, Гіпаніс, 2000. – С. 34-38.
22. Сонько С.П. Сучасна модифікація теорії економічного районування / С.П. Сонько // Регіональна економіка. – 2005. - № 3. – С. 13-28.
23. Список наукових праць професора С.П. Сонька станом на 15.12.2015. [Електронний ресурс]. Репозитарій Уманського НУС. – Режим доступу: <http://lib.udau.edu.ua/handle/123456789/1133>. - Позиції №№: 21, 22, 24, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 63, 65, 68, 71, 72, 73, 76, 80, 82, 85, 89, 92, 93, 95, 96, 102, 111, 124, 133, 140, 141, 160, 161, 171, 179, 184, 222.
24. Сонько С.П. QUO VADIS, вітчизняна суспільна географія? Сучасні проблеми розвитку географічної науки і освіти в Україні: матеріали V Всеукр наук.-практ. конф., (Київ, 26-28 лист. 2015 р.) / Київ. нац. ун-т ім. Тараса Шевченка. – К.: Обрії, 2015. – 202 с. - С. 51-53.
25. Страны и регионы на пути к сбалансированному развитию. Сборник научных трудов. – Киев-Капитановка, «Академперіодика», 2003. – С. 179-182.
26. Черваньов І.Г. Стімкими сходами донизу? (Роздуми про стан та перспективи сучасної географії) / І.Г. Черваньов // Український географічний журнал. – 1995. - № 3. – С. 47-52.

References:

1. Bagrov, M.V., Rudenko, L.G., Chervanev, I.G. (2010). Status, mission and the prospect of geography. *Ukrainian Geographical Journal*, 2, 5-9.
2. Geografichna nauka v novykh sotsialno-ekonomichnykh umovakh rozvytku Ukrainy *Materialy naukovoho seminaru «Konstruktivizm u suchasniy geografii»* [Geographic science under new social and economic conditions of the development of Ukraine]. (2011). In: Materials of the scientific seminar “Constructivism in modern geography”. Institute of Geography NAS, December 16-17, 2010. *Ukrainian Geographical Journal*. Kyiv: Institute of Geography NAS, 78.
3. Golubev, G.N. (1988). Geoekologiya i globalnye izmeneniya [Geoeology and global changes]. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Geography*, 4, 23-34.
4. Gorshkov, V.G. (1995). Fizicheskie i biologicheskie osnovy ustoychivosti zhizni [Physical and biological bases of life stability]. Moscow: VINITI, 471.
5. Danilov-Danilian, V.I., Losev, K.S. (2000). Eekologicheskii vyzov i ustoychivoe razvitie [Environmental challenge and sustainable development]. Moscow, 415.
6. Sonko, S.P., Maksymenko, N.V. (2015). Ekologichni osnovi zbalansovanoho pryrodokoristuvannya u agrosferi: navchalnyi posibnyk [Ecological foundations of sustainable environmental management in the agrosphere: Textbook]. Kharkiv: V.N. Karazin KhNU, 568.
7. Kondratiev, K.Y., Losev, K.S., Ananicheva, M.D., Chesnokova, I.V. (2002). Balans ugleroda v mire i v Rossii [The carbon balance in the world and in Russia]. *Proceedings of RAS. Geographic series*, 4, 9-16.
8. Lipets, Y.G. (2002). Globalnye problemy – geograficheskaya panorama 2002 g. [Global challenges – geographical panorama 2002. Global issues: geographical panorama 2002]. *Proceedings of the permanent interdisciplinary seminar of the Club of Scientists “Global world”*, Moscow: Institute of Microeconomics, 5-14.
9. Losev, K.S. (2003). Byudzhnet antropogennogo ugleroda i rol ekosistem v ego emissii i stoke v globalnom i kontinentalnom masshtabakh [Anthropogenic carbon budget and the role of ecosystems in its emission and effluent in the global and continental scales]. *Countries and regions on the road to the balanced development. Collection of scientific papers*. Kiev: Academperiodika, 36-41.
10. Nashe obshchee budushchee (1989). [Our common future]. Moscow: Progress, 376.
11. Pismak, V.P. Energoimpulsnaya sushchnost ekonomicheskogo bazisa obshchestva [Energy pulsed nature of the economic basis of the society]. Available at:
12. Podolynsky, S.A. (2000). Vybrani tvory [Selected works]. Kyiv: KNEU, 328.

13. Pozdniakov, D.V., Tikunov, V.S., Fedotov, A.P. (2003). Razrabotka i kartografirovaniye integralnykh pokazateley ustoychivogo razvitiya stran mira [Development and charting of integrated indicators of the sustainable development of the countries in the world]. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Geography*, 2, 20-29.
14. Pustota i simulyakr – klyuchevye simvoly postmoderna (Simvoly i znaki XXI veka – chast 17 [Emptiness and simulacrum-key symbols of the postmodern (Symbols and marks the twenty-first century – Part 17)]. Available at: <http://www.polit.nnov.ru/2009/03/03/symbolpoostota/>
15. Rogachev, S.V. (2002). Zakon sokhraneniya geograficheskogo prostranstva, ili bystro khorosho ne byvaet [The law of conservation of geographical space or it is not good quickly]. *Geography*, 10. Available at: <http://geo.1september.ru>.
16. Rogachev, S.V. (1999). Prostranstvennye inversii. Desyat situatsiy dlya analiza [Spatial inversions. Ten cases for analysis]. *Geography*, 27.
17. Sonko, S.P. (2016). Baltiysko-Seredzemnomorska geopolitychna doktryna ta zanepad evraziystva [Baltic-Mediterranean geopolitical doctrine and decline of Eurasianism]. *Scientific Bulletin of Kherson State University. Geographical Science Series*. Kherson: Helvetyka, 3, 74-77.
18. Sonko, S.P. (2003). Geografichniy podil pratsi abo globalnyi pererозpodil pryrodnykh resursiv? [Is it the geographical division of labor or the redistribution of global natural resources?] *Bulletin of V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series of Geology, Geography, Ecology*, 610, 116-121.
19. Sonko, S.P. (2006). Zasadnychi pryntsyipy noosfernoho pryrodokorystuvannya u konteksti kontseptsii staloho rozvytku [Fundamental principles of noosphere environmental management in the context of sustainable development]. *Journal of Kryvyi Rig Economic Institute KNEU*, 8, 74-87.
20. Sonko, S.P., Maksymenko, N.V. (2013). Prostorovi i chasovi mekhanizmy ekologichnoi ekspansii agrolandshaftu [Spatial and temporal mechanisms of ecological expansion of the agricultural landscape]. *Man and the environment*. Kharkiv: V.N. Karazin KhNU, 2 (15), 5-21.
21. Sonko, S.P. (2000). Noosferna dynamika prostorovykh sotsialno-ekonomichnykh system [Noospheric dynamics of spatial socio-economic systems]. *Landscapes and modernity*. Kyiv-Vinnitsa: Hypanis, 34-38.
22. Sonko, S.P. (2005). Suchasna modyfikatsiya teorii ekonomichnoho rayonuvannya [The current modification of the theory of economic regionalization]. *Regional economy*, 3, 13-28.
23. Spysok naukovykh prats profesora S.P. Sonka stanom na 15.12.2015 [List of scientific works of Professor Sonko S.P. as of 15.12.2015]. Repository of Uman NUH. Positions №21, 22, 24, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 63, 65, 68, 71, 72, 73, 76, 80, 82, 85, 89, 92, 93, 95, 96, 102, 111, 124, 133, 140, 141, 160, 161, 171, 179, 184, 222. Available at: <http://lib.udau.edu.ua/handle/123456789/1133>
24. Sonko, S.P. (2015). QUO VADIS, vitchyznyana suspilna geografiya? [Is QUO VADIS a domestic social geography?] *Modern problems of the development of geography and education in Ukraine*. In: *Materials of V Ukrainian Scientific Conference*. T. Shevchenko Kyiv National University, November 26-28, 2015. Kyiv: Obrii, 51-53.
25. Strany i regiony na puti k sbalansirovannomu razvitiyu (2003). [Countries and regions on the road to the balanced development]. In: *Collection of scientific papers*. Kiev-Kapitanovka: Academperiodika, 179-182.
26. Chervanev, I.G. (1995). Stimkymy skhodnyamy donyzu? (Rozdumy pro stan ta perspektyvy suchasnoyi heohrafiyi) [Rapidly down the stairs? (Considering on the status and prospects of modern geography)]. *Ukrainian Geographical Journal*, 3, 47-52.

Надійшла до редколегії 16.10.2016 р.