

UDC 1.16.165

[https://doi.org/10.30546/ifs.2025.1\(44\).53](https://doi.org/10.30546/ifs.2025.1(44).53)

INTERSCIENTIFIC AND INTERDISCIPLINARY INTERACTIONS: A PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS IN A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Vusal Zulfugarov

PhD in Philosophy, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of ANAS, Azerbaijan

vzulfugarov@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-7491-3520>

Abstract. The article examines the similarities and differences between the terms “interscientific” and “interdisciplinary” from a historical perspective. It is shown that these concepts have a unique content and meaning at each historical stage. They essentially complement each other. In a philosophical context, the concept of “interdisciplinary” is in each case a form of existence of the socio-cultural existence of the expression “interscientific”. In this sense, it is also about self-affirmation.

There have been references to this topic in the history of the philosophy of science. Their comparative analysis from a philosophical aspect allows us to explore the dynamics of the relationship between the terms “interscience” and “interdisciplinary”.

Thanks to this approach, the article makes it clear that the philosophical study of interscientific relations is essential for understanding the essence, content, and purpose of scientific knowledge. In particular, the article concludes that the theoretical content of science, the organization of scientific activity, and the practical application of the results obtained form a unity.

The thesis that interscientific relations are understood through the disciplinary structuring of sciences at each historical stage occupies a special place in the article. It is emphasized that in interdisciplinary relations, certain directions or directions may come to the fore, depending on the specifics of the historical stage.

In this context, the article justifies that the relevance of interdisciplinarity in the current historical period is linked to the belief in the leading role of the trend of knowledge integration.

The article uses an interdisciplinary approach. At this time, the methodological principles of intersubjectivity and synergistic formation are preferred.

Systematic comparative analysis is used as the method.

Based on the analyses conducted, two important philosophical conclusions are drawn. First, regardless of the functional form of the relationship between disciplines, it essentially expresses interdisciplinary relationships. Secondly, the progress of modern science can be viewed through this prism.

Keywords: scientific cognition, comparative analysis, systematicity, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, transdisciplinarity, intersubjective, synergistic formation, scientific progress.

ELMLƏRARASI VƏ FƏNLƏRARASI QARŞILIQLI ƏLAQƏLƏR: TARİXİ RAKURSDA FƏLSƏFİ TƏHLİL

Vüsal Zülfüqarov

Xülasə. Məqalədə “elmlərarası” və “fənlərarası” terminlərinin tarixi rakursda oxşar və fərqli cəhətlərinə nəzər salınır. Göstərilir ki, bu anlayışlar hər bir tarixi mərhələdə özünəməxsus məzmunu və mənə yükünə malikdir. Onlar mahiyyətcə bir-birini tamamlayırlar. Fəlsəfi kontekstdə isə hər bir halda “fənlərarası” anlayışı “elmlərarası” ifadəsinin sosial-mədəni mövcudluğunun varlıq formasıdır. Həmin anlamda da özünü təsdiq edir.

Elmin fəlsəfəsi tarixində bu mövzuya müraciətlər olmuşdur. Onların fəlsəfi aspektdə müqayisəli təhlili “elmlərarası” və fənlərarası” terminlərinin münasibətləri dinamikasını tədqiq etməyə imkan verir.

Bu cür yanaşma sayəsində məqalədə aydınlaşdırılmışdır ki, elmlərarası münasibətlərin fəlsəfi tədqiqi elmi idrakın mahiyyət, məzmun və məqsədinin dərk edilməsi üçün vacibdir. O cümlədən, məqalədə belə qənaətə gəlinmişdir ki, elmin nəzəri məzmunlaşması ilə elmi fəaliyyətin təşkili və alınan nəticələrin praktiki tətbiqi vəhdət təşkil edir.

Məqalədə elmlərarası əlaqələrin hər bir tarixi mərhələdə elmlərin dissiplinar strukturlaşması vasitəsilə dərk edildiyi haqqında tezis xüsusi yer tutur. Vurgulanır ki, fənlərarası münasibətlərdə müəyyən istiqamət və ya istiqamətlər tarixi mərhələnin spesifikasından asılı olaraq önə çıxıb bilər.

Bu kontekstdə məqalədə əsaslandırılır ki, indiki tarixi dövərdə fənlərarası münasibətlərdə interdisciplinarlığın aktuallaşması biliklərdə inteqrasiya tendensiyasının aparıcılıq təşkil etməsinə olan inamla bağlıdır.

Məqalədə interdisciplinar yanaşmadan istifadə edilir. Bu zaman intersubektivlik və sinergetik təşəkkül metodoloji prinsiplərinə üstünlük verilir.

Metod kimi, sistemli-müqayisəli təhlildən yararlanılır.

Aparılan təhlillər əsasında iki mühüm fəlsəfi qənaət əldə edilir: birincisi, fənlər arasında əlaqələrin funksional formasından asılı olmayaraq, mahiyyətcə, o, elmlərarası münasibətləri ifadə edir; ikincisi, müasir elmin tərəqqisinə məhz bu prizmadan baxmaq olar.

Açar sözlər: elmi idrak, müqayisəli təhlil, sistemlilik, interdisciplinarlıq, multidisciplinarlıq, transdisciplinarlıq, intersubektivlik, sinergetik təşəkkül, elmi tərəqqi

МЕЖНАУЧНЫЕ И МЕЖДИСЦИПЛИНАРНЫЕ ВЗАИМОСВЯЗИ: ФИЛОСОФСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ В ИСТОРИЧЕСКОМ РАКУРСЕ

Вусал Зулфугаров

Резюме. В статье рассматриваются сходства и различия терминов «межнаучный» и «междисциплинарный» в историческом ракурсе. Показывается содержание и значение этих понятий, по сути, дополняющих друг друга. В философском контексте понятие «междисциплинарный» в каждом случае является формой социокультурного существования понятия «межнаучный». Сравнительный анализ позволяет нам исследовать динамику взаимоотношений между терминами «межнаучный» и «междисциплинарный», благодаря которому становится ясно, что философское изучение «межнаучных» отношений очень важно для понимания содержания и назначения научного познания. В статье делается вывод о том, что теоретическое содержание науки, организация научной деятельности и практическое применение полученных результатов образуют единое целое. Особое место в статье занимает тезис о том, что межнаучные отношения понимаются через дисциплинарную структуризацию наук на каждом историческом этапе. В этом контексте в статье утверждается, что на современном историческом этапе актуализация междисциплинарности в междисциплинарных отношениях обусловлена убеждением в том, что основной тенденцией является интеграция в знаниях. Предпочтение отдается методологическим принципам intersubjectивности и синергетического формирования. На основании вышеприведенного анализа делаются два важных вывода: во-первых, независимо от функциональной формы взаимосвязи дисциплин, интеграция выражает межнаучные отношения; во-вторых, через эту призму можно рассматривать прогресс современной науки.

Ключевые слова: научное познание, сравнительный анализ, системность, междисциплинарность, мультидисциплинарность, трансдисциплинарность, intersubjectивность, синергетическое становление, научный прогресс

Introduction

The comparative understanding of the concepts of "science" and "discipline" remains relevant for the philosophy of science. Modern philosophical and scientific understanding has a high degree of renewal dynamics. This process constantly changes the content, methodology, and functional characteristics of sciences, and also drives structural change. That process has deepened considerably, and now philosophers analyze the issue of "scientific progress" in close connection with its structural features. Interestingly, a number of philosophers even try to justify the essence of scientific progress directly through the modern structural features of science (1, p. 24-32; 2, p. 36-40).

What are the cognitive and sociocultural reasons for the emergence of such a close relationship between the structural nature of science and the "philosophical measurement" of its progress? The search for an answer to this question is not a trivial matter and requires special research. In this article, we will only look at a limited part of that scientific problem. To do this, let's look at the modern definitions of the terms "science" and "discipline".

In English-language philosophical and scientific literature, science is defined as a "systematic discipline" that "creates and organizes knowledge". This form consists of hypotheses and predictions about the Universe (including forecasts) (3; 4, p. viii–ix; 5, p. 15-39). This kind of accepted science is currently divided into 3 branches: 1) natural sciences (physics, chemistry, and biology) – they study the physical world; 2) Social sciences (for example, economics, psychology, sociology, and humanities are also included) – they study humans and society; 3) Applied sciences (engineering and medicine) – they use scientific knowledge for practical purposes (6, p.2-20; 7). Mathematics, logic, and theoretical computer science are generally classified as "formal science" because they study formal systems based on "deductive reasoning" (8, p.158-186).

Of course, we have shown an example, and it is not an absolute truth. There are other classifications as well, but there are common theoretical points in the views about the main essence of the concept of "science". In other words, science as a field of activity is a special creative attitude of man towards the world and the Universe. This is the unity of spiritual activity and practical activity. Science has its own unique form of existence. This is a scientific or disciplinary form. Thus, a discipline is the confirmation of science in the social-cultural environment, its method of existence.

Philosophers draw the following conclusion from this: a scientific discipline is a certain systematized form of scientific knowledge. It implies the institutionalization of knowledge, the general ideals and norms of science, and the formation of the scientific community. In addition, it involves factors such as the specific type of scientific literature, the existence of certain forms of communication among scholars, and the creation of functionally autonomous organizations (in the status of entities responsible for the education and training of personnel) (9, p. 43-45; 10, p. 44).

Science exists in the form of disciplines in the socio-cultural environment. Within the framework of this approach, it is possible to reflect philosophically on the similarities and differences between the terms "interdisciplinary connections" and "intersciences connections".

An interdisciplinary approach is used to achieve the scientific goal highlighted in this article. For this, preference is given to the methodological principles of intersubjectivity and synergetic formation. Systematic comparative analysis is used as the method.

The scientific-theoretical and methodological basis of the article

The scientific-theoretical basis of the article is formed by the classification of sciences by J.L.Heilbron (4), E.Cohen (5), R.A.Nisbet (7) and D.C.Colander (6), as well as the ideas related to modern scientific disciplinarity by A.P.Ogurtsov (9), I.T.Kasavin (2) and D.T.Sokolov (1).

There is a similarity between the positions of J.L. Heilbron, E. Cohen, R.A. Nisbet, and D.C. Colander. Each of them views science as a systematic activity that generates knowledge through specific cognitive activity and in interaction with the social-cultural environment, functionalizes it, and ensures its existence in a particular form. In this capacity, science is a sphere of human activity that visualizes, confirms, and reactualizes knowledge (and information) obtained through purely cognitive characteristics in the socio-cultural environment in unique ways. This process takes place in the form of a "discipline" ("science") at each historical stage.

Therefore, science is realized in the discipline, through which it becomes visible, transforming from an intellectual artifact into a socio-cultural entity. In this process, the content and functional institutional form of the discipline plays a distinct role in the self-affirmation of science.

In this regard, A.P.Ogurtsov's definition of a discipline as "a special form of systematization of scientific knowledge" seems useful. Against this general definition, D.T.Sokolov's view of disciplinarity in the context of scientific progress has epistemological and methodological benefits. I.T.Kasavin addresses the same problem from a slightly different perspective. The difference between their approaches lies in the fact that D.T.Sokolov views the disciplinary organization of science purely as a "separation" event and puts forward the thesis that this makes the term "interdisciplinary knowledge" paradoxical (1). At this time, D.T.Sokolova relies on the concept of "disciplinary separation" of the Western philosopher F.Russo (11; 1, p. 25).

I.T.Kasavin, by changing the approach, emphasizes the possibility of avoiding the paradoxical conclusions of D.T.Sokolov. I.T.Kasavin writes that in interdisciplinary interaction, the integration of knowledge occurs in the form of disciplinary institutionalization (2, p. 36).

The essence of the highlighted provisions is conditioned by the fact that the methodological basis of the article primarily relies on the methodological systems applied in contemporary synthetic scientific approaches. At the same time, this article addresses the principles of intersubjectivity and synergistic formation. Intersubjectivity allows for philosophical examination both within the context of the science-discipline and in terms of the interactions between individual fields, as the process of mutual influence among scientific subjects from various disciplines. Synergistic formation allows us to justify the dynamic nature of this process.

Discussions

The study of the relationships between sciences in the context of the philosophical understanding of science reveals an interesting history. The issue is approached from several aspects. First, the relationships between sciences are generally viewed through the prism of the essence of human spiritual and practical activity. As an example, the ideas of E.Schrödinger and G.Gunn can be cited. The great physicist E.Schrödinger wrote that man, by his very nature, seeks to generalize knowledge because nature seems to him complete, whole, one-off, that is, "holistic" (12, p. 10-20).

G.Gunn is in the same position. He emphasizes that humans are naturally inclined towards solidarity. This characteristic manifests itself in scientific activity, as in other spheres of activity. G. Gunn notes that the quality of Human Solidarity brings different scientific perspectives (on a large scale, different fields of science) into a unified logical plane, which is clearly manifested in the collaboration of various scientific fields on specific topics and problems, or more broadly, in the epistemological, conceptual, and substantive connections between them.

G.Gunn emphasizes that in ancient Rome, various fields of science – mathematicians, material scientists, geodesists, physicists, logisticians, and others worked together in the construction of roads (13, p. 83-91). There is no doubt that the existence of none of the scientific fields emphasized as disciplines at that time was new to modern disciplines. However, in practical activity, particularly in road construction, which required a complex approach, representatives from numerous scientific spheres worked together. How can we call this event? "Interdisciplinary relations or interfield relations"? After presenting other aspects of the discussions, we will attempt to answer this question in the conclusions section.

J.T.Klein, S.Hoffmann, L.Deutsch, and M.O'Rourke prefer to approach the issue through the prism of scientific rationality. They emphasize that a tendency toward interdisciplinary integration has historically existed at the core of scientific rationality. Therefore, rationality, which is the "core cognitive space" of scientific activity, in itself encourages connections between sciences. The authors are confident that in this process, the integration of sciences plays a leading role (14, p. 3-9). So, against the backdrop of such an approach, how can inter-scientific relations and interdisciplinary relations be compared in terms of philosophical content?

Against the backdrop of this question, another approach seems interesting. In 1972, the famous French scientist J.Piaget wrote an article entitled "The Epistemology of Interdisciplinary Relations". Here, he analyzes the concepts of "interdisciplinarity," "multidisciplinarity" (or "multidisciplinarity"), and "transdisciplinarity" both separately and in the context of their mutual

relationships (15, p. 128-139). This approach later took a leading place in the approach to the problem in the West as a whole, and from here a contradiction that existed in J. Piaget's approach to the issue took on a traditional character. We mean that the relationships between "interscience" and "interdisciplinary" were not clearly defined by Piaget. Here we will analyze I.T.Kasavin's attitude to that contradiction, because we consider his explanation to be correct.

I.T.Kasavin writes that J.Piaget defined interdisciplinary (or cross-disciplinary relations) as the interactions between disciplines. This gives the concept a dual meaning from the start. First, in this sense, interdisciplinary relations can be abstracted and made synonymous with interscientific relations in general, and second, interdisciplinary relations can be understood as a synonym for interscientific relations, as well as a type of relations between specific disciplines and mainly as a type that creates integrative knowledge. It is through the prism of these two mutually exclusive approaches that J.Piaget projects interscientific relations into interdisciplinary relations and then applies that concept to one of the relations between specific disciplines. Precisely for these kinds of reasons, I.T.Kasavin considers the meanings of multidisciplinary and transdisciplinarity in Piaget's sense on one hand, as one of the types of interdisciplinarity, and on the other hand, as a system of specific relationships between disciplines – to be "hazy". "Interdisciplinary" as a concept becomes dual – it refers both to relations between sciences in general and to relationships between specific disciplines (2, p. 36-37).

Continuing his thoughts, I.T.Kasavin notes that this terminological confusion also creates contradictions in the philosophical understanding of scientific progress at the modern stage. As an example, it shows the paradox that D.T.Sokolova sees in that concept. In fact, this paradoxical nature is characteristic of the philosophical thinking of modern science as a whole. This can be seen in the approach to the problem by F.Russo and others (e.g., D.M.Levy, J.P.Sandra and others) (11; 1, p. 25).

F.Russo generally emphasizes that cognitive, epistemological, and conceptual transitions between closely related disciplines, or even within different branches of a single discipline, are very difficult, and from this, he absolutizes "disciplinary separation" as essential for modern science [11]. D.M.Levy and J.P.Sandra, based on various scientific examples, demonstrate that the differences in expert positions regarding economic policy are caused by both public interest and the expert's own interest. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to approach the issue in a broad aspect, within the context of the interaction of various scientific approaches, against the backdrop of the discussion within the expert community (16, p. 3-5).

Thus, the philosophical understanding of interscientific and interdisciplinary relationships is relevant, and different positions remain in this regard. The main point here is related to determining the philosophical meanings and contents of the terms "interscience" and "interdisciplinary". We will try to express our position on the conclusions we have reached in the light of the above discussions.

Conclusions

First, let's clarify the terminological issue. The expression "interdisciplinary relations" and the expression "interscience" differ not in essence, but in semantics. Both of these terms refer to the relationships between sciences at a general level. In addition, the term "interdisciplinary" refers to the relationships between various aspects of human intellectual activity, where the essence is science.

In this sense, the concept of "interscience" has the same essence in ancient Rome, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the Modern Era, the 20th century, and the first decades of the 21st century. However, each highlighted historical period has its own content, structural, and functional characteristics.

Thus, in ancient Rome, the Renaissance, or the Modern Era (until the beginning of the 20th century), the relations between sciences had different shades of content. This has found its expression in theoretical, conceptual, cognitive, and also socio-cultural aspects. More precisely, the aspects we have highlighted in the context of the relationships between different fields of science have been influential.

In addition, the content of relations between sciences during those historical stages was seriously influenced by the methods and forms of structuring the sciences. Specifically, the formation of scientific disciplines according to their ideal and norms, the organization and systematization

characteristics of theoretical knowledge, the criteria for understanding and verifying acquired knowledge, their practical nature, and other such characteristics have had a significant impact. In brief, the content of interdisciplinary relations is primarily influenced by the "culture" of the structuralization of its disciplines. From this perspective, the "culture" of disciplinarity (here the terms "disciplinary" and "scientific" are used synonymously) is always the manifestation of inter-scientific relations in the socio-cultural environment. In essence, this process is realized in the form of relationships between disciplines. At the moment, there is no other form of relationships between sciences. It is precisely for this reason that philosophers analyze the progress of science as a fundamentally philosophical problem in the context of the disciplinary structure of sciences. There is an interesting philosophical transformation here.

Different fields of science manifest in a specific disciplinary form and are realized in that quality. For example, in ancient Rome, physics had a "culture of discipline" that was in line with the requirements of that time. This culture underwent disciplinary changes in the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the Modern Era, and the post-non-classical stage of science.

As a result, the content of the relations between sciences in the ancient Roman or Modern Period stages has taken on significantly different shades in the most modern stage. This point is also proven by the fact that philosophers bring scientific rationality, the formation of scientific knowledge and the emergence of theories, changes in scientific norms and ideals, the transformation of the structural-functional characteristics of scientific activity, the impact of the latest scientific trends on the disciplinary culture of science, the formation of new scientific knowledge and theories, the verification of scientific knowledge, the contentization of the concept of "scientific truth", etc. to the forefront when studying problems such as.

In light of the comparisons we have highlighted, how can interdisciplinarity, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinarity be philosophically characterized as a form of socio-cultural existence of interscientific relations? As their names suggest, each of them pertains to different aspects of the disciplinary existence of science. Interdisciplinarity is characterized by the formation of a common epistemological and methodological domain in the relationships between disciplines.

Multidisciplinary refers to the mutual relationships of disciplines representing each scientific field involved in the relationship, while maintaining the epistemological and methodological characteristics.

Transdisciplinarity, on the other hand, reflects the transcendence of the epistemological and methodological boundaries of specific disciplines to study a specific subject of understanding. So, if we consider interdisciplinary research in the context of epistemological and methodological approaches based on the specific characteristics of the object of knowledge, we can discuss its interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, or transdisciplinary features. However, each of these, separately and together, generally express interscientific relationships.

It logically follows from this that interdisciplinary relations, in all their variants, express the relationships between sciences in the unity of cognitive and socio-cultural aspects. This allows for the actual possibility of the existence of scientific disciplines. If scientific fields and science as a whole had a different structural variation, then the term "interdisciplinary" would not be necessary, and it would not be included in the scientific communication discourse. So, here, the decisive and defining factor is "science," not the concept of "discipline".

In addition, without the concept of "discipline," the expression "interdisciplinary relations" would remain at the level of an abstract idea with no real utility.

The comparative analysis conducted here shows that interscientific and interdisciplinary relations are historical in nature - at each stage they have their own content and meaning. In this sense, these terms essentially complement each other. However, in all cases, the expression "interdisciplinary" is a form of existence of the socio-cultural existence of the expression "interscientific" and, in this sense, self-affirmation.

Results

Several conclusions can be drawn from the points expressed in the article. First of all, the philosophical study of interscientific relations is necessary not for classification, but for understanding the essence, content, and purpose of scientific knowledge. This means that the

theoretical content of science, the organization of scientific activity, and the practical application of the results obtained form a unity. There is a fundamental importance to this point in order to adequately understand the phenomenon of science.

The expression of interdisciplinary relations at each historical stage can be understood through the means of disciplinary structuring. Depending on the characteristics of the historical stage, a certain direction may emerge in the relations between disciplines. The relevance of interdisciplinarity in interdisciplinary relations at the modern stage is due to the belief in the leading trend of integration in knowledge. The progress of modern science is also viewed through this prism.

Finally, regardless of the functional form of the relationships between disciplines, it is always about interscientific relationships. That is, the analysis of relationships between disciplines is actually the study of relationships between scientific fields. In this regard, even in the distant future, it can be concluded that the relationships between disciplines cannot transcend the overall "field" of science.

References

1. Соколова, Т.Д. Концептуализация научного прогресса. Случай исторической эпистемологии // Эпистемология и философия науки. Москва, 2023, т. 60, № 2, с. 23–34.
2. Касавин, И.Т. Метафизика прогресса и дисциплинарная структура науки // Эпистемология и философия науки. Москва, 2023, т. 60, № 2, с. 35–41.
3. Science: [Electronic resource] // Wikipedia. https://en-m-wikipedia-org.translate.goog/wiki/Science?_x_tr_sl=en&_x_tr_tl=ru&_x_tr_hl=ru&_x_tr_pto=rq#:~:text=Sciencesystematicdiscipline,andpredictionsabouttheuniverse. Application date: 26.03.2025
4. Heilbron, J. L., et al. "Preface". The Oxford Companion to the History of Modern Science. New York: Oxford University Press. 2003, pp. vii–x.
5. Cohen, E. The boundary lens: theorising academic activity. The University and its Boundaries: Thriving or Surviving in the 21st Century. New York: Routledge. 2021, pp. 14–41.
6. Colander, D.C., et al. Social science and its methods // D.C., Colander, E.F. Hunt. Social Science: An Introduction to the Study of Society (17th ed.). New York: Routledge. 2019, pp. 1–22.
7. Nisbet, R.A., Greenfeld, L. Social Science. Encyclopædia Britannica. Archived from the original on 2 February, 2022.
8. Rucker, R. Robots and souls. Infinity and the Mind: The Science and Philosophy of the Infinite (Reprint ed.). Princeton University Press, 2019, p. 157–188.
9. Огурцов, А.П. Дисциплинарная структура науки. Ее генезис и обоснование: автореф. дис. ... д-ра филос. наук. Москва, 1988, 256 с.
10. Балабанов, П.И., и др. Методологический аспект взаимосвязи науки и научного исследования. Вестник КемГУ. Гуманитарные и общественные науки. Кемерово, 2019, № 3(1), с. 35-41.
11. Russo, F. Techno-Scientific Practices. An Informational Approach. Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield, 2022, 336 p.
12. Шредингер, Э. Анатомия разума. Об интеллекте, религии и будущем / Пер. с нем. Р.В.Смирнов. Москва, «Родина», 2020, 208 с.
13. Gunn, G. Human Solidarity and the Problem of Otherness. Religion and Cultural Studies Princeton University Press. 2001, p. 80-94.
14. Klein, J.T. et al. Integrate the integrators! A call for establishing academic careers for integration experts. Seventh Sense Research Group: India-USA. Nature portfolio: Journal “Humanities and Social sciences communications”, 2022, № 9(1), p.1-11.
15. Piaget, J. The Epistemology of Interdisciplinary Relationships. In: L. Apostel (ed.) Interdisciplinarity. Problems of Teaching and Research in Universities. Paris, 1972, p. 127–139.
16. Levy, D.M., Sandra J.P. Escape from democracy. The Role of Experts and the Public in Economic Policy. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017, 343 p.

Rəyçi: f.f.d.. dos. Həbib Hüseynov