

# **SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROCESSES IN PRYKARPATTIA: FROM FORCED INDUSTRIALIZATION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF TOURIST AND REHABILITATION INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Maliarchuk O. M., Palagnyuk M. M., Bzunko H. B.**

## **INTRODUCTION**

During the battles of World War II in 1944, the Red Army entered the lands of Western Ukraine, initiating the second Sovietization of the region. This process was accompanied by terror, deportations, and violence. Once again, the traditional political, economic, and social structures were destroyed, just as they had been during the first Sovietization and the so-called “socialist transformations” from September 1939 to June 1941. The Stalinist totalitarian regime imposed priorities that shaped economic and social policy strategies for the next half-century. Operational groups arrived in the western regions of Ukraine, forming local party, Soviet, law enforcement, economic, financial, and other administrative structures from dispatched personnel and a few local activists. A “cultural revolution” was launched, collectivization of agriculture was enforced, and large-scale industrialization of the western region of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (UkrSSR) began. With the actual elimination of private property, small and medium-sized businesses cease to exist. Western Ukraine becomes part of a unified Soviet economic space, strictly subordinated to a planned command-administrative system. Hundreds of large industrial enterprises were constructed in the region without proper economic or environmental justification. The totalitarian regime, focusing on the accelerated development of heavy industry, underestimated the importance of its innovative component. Moscow’s far-reaching geopolitical plans aimed to maximize the use of natural resources and human potential for the expansion of the Soviet Union’s military-industrial complex. Industrial production in Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast, as well as in other western regions, was concentrated in large enterprises and was unable to adapt to the transition from a planned to a market economy. The collapse of the Soviet economic space deprived industry of raw material sources and markets, leading to a significant deterioration in the socio-economic situation in the region and across the country. Global economic trends

indicate that in conditions of fierce competition and crises, small and medium-sized enterprises have the greatest chances of survival. However, during the Soviet era, these types of entrepreneurial activities were completely eradicated. At this historical stage, attention must be directed toward the development of the Carpathian recreational complex, as the region's natural potential remains underutilized. The priority remains the development of tourism and rehabilitation infrastructure in the Carpathians, particularly in response to the mental health challenges faced by vulnerable populations due to the ongoing Russian-Ukrainian war, which began in 2014, and the post-war recovery period optimizing assistance to improve mental health is now a pressing issue.

Various aspects of socio-economic processes in the 20th and early 21st centuries have been explored in domestic scholarly and regional studies. Notably, Oleg Maliarchuk<sup>1</sup>, Vasyl Ostapiak<sup>2</sup>, and Nataliya Petretska<sup>3</sup> have analyzed the industrial and agricultural potential of Western Ukraine under Soviet rule, including the forestry and woodworking industries, oil and gas extraction, agricultural systems, livestock structures, and social policies.

Maria Sankovych<sup>4,5</sup> has conducted an in-depth study of the “second Sovietization” and the establishment of the Soviet occupation regime at the district level in Stanislav (Ivano-Frankivsk) Oblast. Her research highlights key measures taken to Sovietize the region, including personnel deployment, mobilization of human and natural resources for wartime needs, resistance from the OUN underground, armed UPA

---

<sup>1</sup> Малярчук О. Соціально-економічні процеси в західному регіоні Української РСР (1964–1991): монографія. Вид. 2-ге, переробл. і допов. Івано-Франківськ: Симфонія форте, 2023. 552 с.

<sup>2</sup> Малярчук О., Остап'як В. Індустріальні процеси у Західному регіоні Української РСР: здобутки та прорахунки. *Український історичний журнал*. 2022. Вип. 2. С. 91–107. DOI: 10.15407/uhj2022.02.091.

<sup>3</sup> Малярчук О. Соціально-економічні процеси в західному регіоні Української РСР (1964–1991): монографія. Вид. 2-ге, переробл. і допов. Івано-Франківськ: Симфонія форте, 2023. 552 с.

<sup>4</sup> Санкович М. «Несемо нову культуру» – друга радянська Прикарпаття. *Вісник науки та освіти. Серія «Історія та археологія»*. 2022. № 1 (1). С. 335–344. DOI: 10.52058/2786-6165-2022-1(1)-335-344.

<sup>5</sup> Санкович М. Друга радянська Станіславська області – підготовка передумов до колективізації та індустріалізації. *Наукові праці Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка: Історичні науки*. 2023. Т. 42. С. 321–335. DOI: 10.32626/2309-2254.2023-42.321-335.

units, and the local population, as well as preparations for total collectivization and industrialization. Historiographical studies by domestic scholars such as Ihor Raikovskiy, Oleg Yehreshii, and Bohdan Paska<sup>6,7</sup> have also examined these processes.

However, a comprehensive history of the development and implementation of socio-economic policies under the Soviet totalitarian regime in the Ukrainian SSR, including shifts in economic strategies during the five-year plans, has yet to be written. Among scholars, there are differing views on the impact of socialist experiments at various stages. Soviet historiography traditionally glorified the Communist Party's infallibility, while some Ukrainian economists and historians argue that significant economic progress was made during the reforms. However, the prevailing opinion is that there was no real acceleration of industrial and agricultural production. The diversity of assessments stems not only from different economic calculation methodologies but also from the authors' perspectives on the contradictory policies of the Soviet occupation regime. Despite some technical and economic advancements, serious conceptual errors in reforms resulted from the monopolization of power by ministries and government agencies. As a result, on a national scale, the "socialist transformations" were ultimately nullified. However, at different stages, there were regional peculiarities and economic developments of the Ukrainian people.

Among the Soviet scientific literature that examines the socio-economic processes in the western Ukrainian lands, it is essential to highlight the monographs of Hryhoriy Kovalchak<sup>8,9</sup>. The author provides a detailed analysis of the improvement of industrial sector structures in the western regions of the Ukrainian SSR, highlighting the increasing share of processing industries, particularly the most

---

<sup>6</sup> Райківський І., Єгрешій О., Паска Б. Соціально-економічні процеси в Івано-Франківській області Української РСР в радянській історіографії. *Наукові праці Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка: історичні науки*. 2023. Т. 42. С. 179–192. DOI: 10.32626/2309-2254.2023-42.179-192.

<sup>7</sup> Райківський І., Єгрешій О., Паска Б. Українська історіографія соціально-економічних процесів в Івано-Франківській області УРСР. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук*. 2024. Вип. 72. Т. 3. С. 33–41. DOI: 10.24919/2308-4863/72-3-5.

<sup>8</sup> Ковальчак Г. І. Індустріальний розвиток західних областей України в період комуністичного будівництва. Київ: Наук. думка, 1973. 236 с.

<sup>9</sup> Ковальчак Г. І. Економічний розвиток західноукраїнських земель. Київ: Наук. думка, 1988. 251 с.

advanced branches of heavy industry – machine building, chemical, and fuel and energy sectors. Significant attention is given to the growth of the region’s industrial centers. A considerable part of the book is dedicated to Stanislavshchyna (Ivano-Frankivsk region), which became one of the most developed industrial areas in the western part of the Ukrainian SSR and, after Lviv region, was meant to serve as an example of “socialist transformations”.

Particular attention should be given to the articles and book of scholar-practitioner Yaroslav Fedorchuk<sup>10,11</sup>. As the First Secretary of the Dolyna District Party Committee, he developed the economic concept “The State’s Economy Strengthens: The People’s Well-Being Grows”. Its core idea was that the state should allocate appropriate funds to meet the social needs of ordinary people—education, healthcare, culture, and infrastructure development. The economic growth of the western region of the republic and its related infrastructure depended on local leaders who not only pursued career advancement and blindly followed higher directives but also genuinely cared about the well-being of the people. Despite both open and covert resistance at various levels, some local officials used their positions in the party-state apparatus to implement progressive initiatives. Under the oppressive conditions of totalitarianism, the Ukrainian people managed to preserve their language, culture, and traditional spiritual values, largely due to the efforts of intellectuals like Yaroslav Fedorchuk. Local communities benefited from employment opportunities, free housing, social guarantees, kindergartens, summer camps, higher education, health resorts, departmental sanatoriums, rural hospitals, and paramedical stations<sup>12</sup>.

The relevance of this study lies in examining the historical experience of rebuilding Ukraine’s economy and civil infrastructure after the destruction caused by World War II. Over the past three

---

<sup>10</sup> Федорчук Я. Вплив нової техніки на співвідношення трудомісткості, фондомісткості і матеріаломісткості промислової продукції. *Економіка Радянської України*. 1975. № 11. С. 57–62.

<sup>11</sup> Федорчук Я. Економіка підвищення якості продукції. *Економіка Радянської України*. 1977. № 10. С. 53–56.

<sup>12</sup> Maliarchuk O., Sabadukha V. Yaroslav Fedoruk’s scientific and administrative activities under the conditions of the crisis of the Soviet system (1960–1980s). *East European Historical Bulletin*. 2023. Issue. 29. P. 163–172. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.29.292937

decades, there has been an accumulation of historical knowledge with a strong emotional component, often presenting an oversimplified, “black-and-white” perception of the recent Soviet past, which altered the long-standing traditions of the Ukrainian people. Russia’s military aggression has intensified the need to critically reassess the Soviet legacy.

### **1. Historical prerequisites for the formation of the economic complex**

During the communist totalitarian occupation regime, the Communist Party controlled all spheres of socio-political and socio-economic life based on its developed guidelines. The essence of the party-state policy in the USSR was to determine the goals, principles, and paths of social development and to develop the methods and mechanisms for their implementation. Particular attention was given to the formulation and execution of economic policy and the implementation of practical measures to achieve set objectives, including socialist experiments such as nationalization, collectivization, and industrialization. In achieving the strategic goal – the construction of a “communist society” – the working class was assigned the leading role, as it was officially considered the most progressive social group, in alliance with the collective farm peasantry and the laboring intelligentsia. Heavy industry was always regarded as a priority sector of the economy, driven not only by socio-economic factors but also by class and ideological considerations.

The official doctrine of the USSR proclaimed the accelerated development of industry through the transformation of a multi-structured economy into a socialist one, the expansion of production scales, and fundamental changes in the social structure of society – changes that were never questioned. The process of imposing “socialist transformations” in Western Ukraine between the late 1940s and the 1980s can be divided into several periods. In the first period (1944–1953), the main focus was on rebuilding industry based on the pre-war model using extensive factors. In the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s (the second period), the industrial structure of the western region of the Ukrainian SSR began to take shape. From the mid-1960s (the third period), industrial policy shifted toward intensifying production through accelerated industrialization of the western region of the Ukrainian SSR. The fourth period (the second half of the 1980s) was

marked by unsuccessful attempts to halt the economic crisis, which lasted for decades and carried over into the economy of independent Ukraine.

The resolutions of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, such as "On Urgent Measures for the Reconstruction of the Economy in Areas Liberated from the German Occupiers" (August 1943), "On Deficiencies in Political Work Among the Population of the Western Regions of the Ukrainian SSR" (September 1944), and "On Measures to Assist the Western Regions of the Ukrainian SSR in Improving Mass Political and Cultural-Educational Work" (December 1944), among others, defined the key tasks for the socio-economic and socio-political development of the western regions. A special resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Ukraine and the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR, dated May 7, 1945, "On Measures for the Reconstruction and Further Development of the Economy in the Lviv, Stanislaw (now Ivano-Frankivsk), Drohobych, Ternopil, Rivne, Volyn, and Chernivtsi Regions of the Ukrainian SSR for 1945", aimed to eliminate the negative consequences of wartime economic destruction as quickly as possible and to ensure the development of all sectors of the region's economy.

From an economic and demographic perspective, the western regions of Ukraine suffered significantly more from the war and post-war reconstruction compared to the eastern regions. In the first months after the establishment of Soviet rule, authorities began mobilizing the working-age population for labor in various locations within the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR. Using various methods to extract labor resources, approximately 800,000 people, primarily young individuals, were relocated from the western regions to different parts of the USSR between 1944 and the 1950s. A significant portion of them never returned to their homeland. This policy turned western Ukrainian labor resources into an important donor for the development of a powerful economic complex in the eastern regions of the USSR. World War II not only caused massive destruction to Ukraine's industry but also reshaped its geographical and sectoral structure. Due to the evacuation of industrial enterprises from the Ukrainian SSR to the eastern regions of the USSR, a powerful industrial base was established in the Urals, Siberia, and the Volga region. As a result, Ukrainian industry never

regained its pre-war leadership role, as the new industrial centers in the eastern USSR developed at a much faster pace. From the moment the Red Army entered Western Ukraine, the Soviet repressive system implemented mass deportations of the indigenous population. The Soviet occupation regime introduced the category of so-called “special settlers,” which included anyone who showed even the slightest resistance or signs of national consciousness. Between 1944 and 1951, a total of 65,906 families, amounting to 203,662 people, were deported from Western Ukraine. Specifically, 24,016 families (79,506 individuals) were deported from Lviv region, 13,817 families (40,692 individuals) from Ivano-Frankivsk region, and 10,962 families (32,069 individuals) from Ternopil region. Deportations from Rivne (26,000 people), Volyn (21,000 people), and Chernivtsi (4,000 people)<sup>13</sup> regions were slightly smaller in scale.

Economic model of the USSR unlike the advanced European economies, the Soviet economic model had significant structural differences. Economic policy and development were directly dependent on ideological directives. The confrontation of the Cold War, financial aid to socialist bloc countries, and other ambitious but unrealistic projects largely dictated the main directions of Soviet economic policy. The very approach to economic modernization, based on extensive growth factors, proved to be fundamentally flawed.

## **2. Structural Changes in the Economic Concept of the Region**

The Soviet economic strategy in the Stanislav (now Ivano-Frankivsk) region in the early post-war years had a distinct characteristic – a clearly defined focus on raw material extraction. Moreover, this was not seen as a temporary measure but as a long-term economic perspective. An analysis of archival party documents highlights the primary challenges at the time: the extraction of brown coal, oil, and gas, along with their local processing; timber harvesting and regular railway transportation; centralized grain procurement; and the preparation and implementation of the autumn sowing campaign. As a result, the economic strategy primarily focused on increasing coal and oil production, as well as timber harvesting. Key economic sectors

---

<sup>13</sup> Росія – Україна: зради, союзи, війни / відп. ред. М. Литвин. 2-ге вид. Львів; Тернопіль: «Лібра Терра», 2024. С. 543. URL: <https://www.institut-ukr.lviv.ua/uk/publications/books/book/?newsid=1210>

– including coal mining, oil and gas extraction, chemical production, and logging – were able to recover rapidly. Industrial activity was concentrated in the regional center of Stanislav, as well as in the cities of Kolomyia and Kalush, and the surrounding lowland areas.

The Soviet economic strategy in the Stanislav (now Ivano-Frankivsk) region in the early post-war years had its own specifics, and priority was not given to the components that formed the basis of the “main indicators of plan fulfillment for gross production” – 56%. From the key economic indicators of the region in the early post-war years, a general picture can be drawn. The first component was the forestry and furniture industry – 23.745 million rubles, or 25.6%. The second was the meat and dairy, food, and flavor industry – 9.372 million rubles, or 20.2%. The third was the light, textile, and pulp and paper industry – 9.168 million rubles, or 10%. However, in reports that considered future prospects, the ranking was different. In the first place was the coal industry and ozokerite extraction – 495 thousand rubles, or 0.5%. In the second place was the oil and gas industry – 2.562 million rubles, or 2.7%. In the third place was the chemical industry – 1.16 million rubles, or 1.2%. In the fourth place were construction materials – 937 thousand rubles, or 1%<sup>14</sup>.

The early 1950s in the Stanislav region marked the end of Stalinist despotism, followed by controlled de-Stalinization. Nikita Khrushchev's economic doctrine focused on industrial processes and emphasized social issues. In the mid-20th century, significant changes took place in the strategic economic concept of the Stanislav region. According to “Soviet strategic priorities”, the chemical industry, linked to the development of potash salts at the Kalush Chemical and Metallurgical Plant, took the leading position due to the state program for the chemicalization of the national economy. Oil and gas extraction and processing remained in the traditional second place. The third position was occupied by electricity production (the construction of the Burshtyn Thermal Power Plant), which, during the Eighth Five-Year Plan, would take the leading position in all indicators, pushing the chemical industry to second place. At the same time, during the Sixth Five-Year Plan and the Seven-Year Plan, the “main indicators of plan

---

<sup>14</sup> Санкович М. Структурні зміни в промисловості Івано-Франківської області Української РСР. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук. Серія. Історичні науки*. 2024. Вип. 73. Т. 3. С. 21–28. DOI: 10.24919/2308-4863/73-3-3.



fulfillment for gross production” in the Stanislav (Ivano-Frankivsk) region traditionally belonged to the forestry and woodworking, food, and light industries, along with their sub-sectors.

By the early 1960s, the Stanislav (now Ivano-Frankivsk) region was producing 70% of all Ukrainian oil, more than 50% of potash fertilizers, and its timber harvesting volume accounted for 30% of the republican total. According to the industrial development plan of the Stanislav Economic Council, by 1965, compared to 1958, oil extraction was expected to increase by 5.3 times and gas extraction by 3 times. As a result, significant funds were allocated for the construction of new and the expansion of existing oil and gas industry enterprises. From the perspective of state priorities, centralized financing was directed primarily at the construction and reconstruction of industrial enterprises, while everything else was financed on a residual basis from local budgets. State funds were not intended to be spent by the Councils of Workers’ Deputies on urban and rural infrastructure improvements. Such expenditures were considered “mismanagement”, “misuse of funds”, and “waste of scarce materials”. The entire range of issues related to the improvement of settlements was placed on local industry enterprises and carried out through various voluntary labor initiatives, such as weekend community workdays (subbotniks and nedilnyks) and public construction projects.

The long-term industrial development strategy of the Ivano-Frankivsk region for 1959–1975 was based on the more complete utilization of mineral resources and the advancement of already developed industries. Alongside the construction of new enterprises, the plan aimed to increase production output through the reconstruction of existing facilities, mechanization and automation of production processes, modernization and replacement of outdated equipment, and overall improvement of manufacturing. During the Eighth Five-Year Plan, the economic development concept of the Ivano-Frankivsk region prioritized electricity production, the chemical industry, oil extraction, and oil refining. Between 1966 and 1970, the focus was on electricity production (1.771 million rubles), the chemical industry (1.535 million rubles), oil extraction (1.255 million rubles), and oil refining (992 million rubles)<sup>15</sup>. However, the enormous

---

<sup>15</sup> Санкович М. Аграрна політика радянської влади в Карпатському регіоні – матеріали преси і реальний стан справ. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук*.

expenditures on oil and gas extraction no longer justified themselves. The oil and gas deposits of Prykarpattia were being depleted. Both objective and subjective factors were linked to management shortcomings. The mechanisms of administration and planning, economic management methods, and executive discipline lagged behind global standards. At the republican level, the focus shifted toward the development of oil and gas fields in the Shebelinka region and southern Ukraine.

When developing the main directions of economic policy, the state leadership only partially considered the changes taking place in the world. In developed countries, scientific and technological progress was gaining momentum, with the introduction of the latest machinery, technologies, and management models. In contrast, economic life in the USSR was directly dependent on party organs, which actively interfered with the operations of enterprise and institution managers at all levels. The command-administrative economy placed primary importance on organizational factors. Key economic indicators such as profitability, resource efficiency, labor productivity, profit margins, capital efficiency, production capacity utilization, rational use of machinery and equipment, and the introduction of new products played a secondary role.

### **3. Socio-Economic and Political Transformations**

The economic model that had been created functioned primarily for its own maintenance, consuming significant material, financial, and labor resources while parasitizing on agriculture, light industry, and the social sector. The main criterion for evaluating economic development remained the volume of gross output. This approach to economic activity led to a narrowing of the scope for applying economic factors, the disregard of the principle of economic feasibility in production, and the reinforcement of an inefficient, high-cost economic model.

By the mid-1950s, the new leadership of the USSR was forced to acknowledge the changes occurring in the global economy. In developed countries, economies were entering a post-industrial stage due to advancements in science and technology. The Soviet planned economy, however, was unprepared for the demands of post-industrial

development. Its vast, scattered, and extensive industrial base – focused on raw materials and arms production – proved poorly suited for technological progress, which had to be introduced through command-administrative measures.

In our view, one of the main reasons for the secondary importance of this issue to Soviet authorities was the isolation of the socialist economy from the global free market. Under the conditions of economic dictatorship by the Communist Party and the lack of internal incentives for technological advancement, economic development remained centered on military-industrial priorities. The military-industrial complex of the USSR achieved significant results in the implementation of missile-nuclear, space, and several other projects.

The essence and specific features of this reform in the Ukrainian SSR are thoroughly examined in the monograph by Volodymyr Baran<sup>16</sup>. Under the command-administrative economy, the authorities placed great emphasis on organizational factors in their economic policy, considering them the most crucial component of the overall state management system. During this period, “organizational changes” received special attention. This was reflected in the decentralization of economic governance following the abolition of branch ministries and the establishment of regional economic councils (radnargospy) in 1957. The regional economic councils sought to improve the territorial organization of the economy: they facilitated better labor distribution and cooperation within economic regions, accelerated the development of production and social infrastructure, and created opportunities for a more effective use of local resources. The dominance of the territorial management principle provided regions with conditions for a more independent policy from the union center, although true autonomy was never fully realized.

Despite certain achievements, the territorial form of production management proved to be flawed overall. It led to a decline in the efficiency of production assets and capital investments, a slowdown in production growth, and reduced labor productivity. Integrated into the command-administrative system, the regional economic councils were unable to employ economic management methods and, in practice,

---

<sup>16</sup> Баран В. Україна: новітня історія (1945–1991 рр.). Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 2003. 670 с. URL: <https://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001059>

functioned as ministries within a specific territory rather than an industry. Ultimately, this reform was yet another attempt to address new challenges using an old economic mechanism that itself remained unchanged.

Meanwhile, in the developed countries of the West, the scientific and technological revolution was in full swing, driven by cutting-edge technologies, the rational use of new materials (plastics, semiconductors, nylon), and the introduction of electronic computing technology. In contrast, the Soviet party-state leadership continued to focus primarily on increasing quantitative economic indicators – such as steel production per capita, coal mining, and electricity generation. The paradox of the situation was that the Soviet government planned to catch up with and surpass Western countries in key industrial and agricultural production indicators. Nikita Khrushchev pursued his “Bolshevik-style” agricultural policies, disregarding basic economic principles. In a purely communist spirit, and with the goal of surpassing the United States, every agricultural enterprise was assigned “new ambitious targets”. However, these were often impressive but completely unrealistic and detached from reality.

A key challenge in the development of the economy was the technical re-equipment of the national economy. However, the state’s investment policy did not facilitate this – a significant portion of capital investments was directed toward expanding production through new construction rather than modernization. This issue was especially relevant to the western regions of the republic. The intensification of production required shifting the focus from capital investment to reconstruction and modernization. Although party documents constantly proclaimed a shift to an intensive development model and the acceleration of socio-economic progress, in reality, these changes were postponed for the future. It is important to note that numerous attempts were made to improve the situation, but they were driven less by economic and scientific considerations and more by political factors.

In the economic policy of the USSR, there was a constant search for effective methods of managing industry and agriculture, balancing economic and administrative factors. Between 1965 and 1970, these processes became associated with the “Kosygin reform”. However, the internal contradictions of Soviet reforms and inconsistency in their implementation often led to economic failures. Additionally, there was

a lack of unity within the party and state leadership, as well as resistance from central agencies unwilling to sacrifice their own interests. While Alexei Kosygin supported the reformist agenda, Leonid Brezhnev displayed a marked indifference toward reforms. During this period, the central government abandoned radical economic changes and instead focused on “improving” and “rationalizing” the existing economic system’s organizational structure.

However, the crisis in industry and agriculture extended beyond production issues, taking on a socio-economic dimension. It threatened the country’s supply of essential goods and food, creating social tension. By the late 1980s, the consumption of food per capita declined, and shortages of consumer goods increased. Investment in rural areas nearly stopped, leading to mass job losses and unstable incomes for agricultural workers. The decline in agricultural production caused food industry enterprises to operate below capacity, reducing employment opportunities. The negative attitude toward transformational processes in the countryside was demonstrated by farm managers and government officials, who feared losing control over the peasants. As a result, amid the continuous deterioration of economic indicators, violations of labor discipline and the misappropriation of public property became increasingly widespread.

### **3. Internal Ukrainian Issues**

The conducted research has proven that socio-economic processes include two consecutive stages: the development of a scientifically grounded concept and its practical implementation. An analysis of the historical development of the socio-economic sphere in Prykarpattia indicates that from the late 1940s to the early 21st century, multiple attempts were made to reform the economic complex of Western Ukraine. In essence, this was a continuous process. A study of nearly half a century of constant modifications to the Soviet socio-economic system, using one of the most industrially developed regions of Western Ukraine – Ivano-Frankivsk (formerly Stanislav) Oblast, second only to Lviv – demonstrates that the primary factor behind its inefficiency was the chaotic nature of the implemented changes. These changes affected ownership structures, intellectual resources, the labor market, and other systemic elements. Essentially, the party-economic apparatus was unable to keep up with the transformations. The

disproportionate development between the production of means of production and consumer goods, the incompatibility of enterprises' interests with the objective demands of scientific and technological progress, and the conflicting priorities of ministries and agencies led to mismanagement and resource wastage. Indifference to urgent consumer needs became a persistent issue, reaching an astonishing scale.

The economic policy of the USSR prioritized heavy industry, while agriculture played a secondary role, and social infrastructure was developed on a residual principle. The industrial expansion was financed by extracting resources from the agricultural sector through unequal exchange. Farmers, particularly kolkhoz workers, produced agricultural goods but had to sell them to the state at symbolic prices, leading to severe economic consequences. Although state initiatives such as the 1965 "New Course" and the 1982 "Food Program" aimed to balance agricultural and industrial prices by increasing procurement prices for farm products, they failed to ensure stable incomes for kolkhozes. The Soviet government created a few model kolkhozes (so-called "millionaire farms") in each region, including Ivano-Frankivsk, and promoted them to highlight the "advantages" of the socialist economic model<sup>17</sup>.

The analysis of Prykarpattia's agricultural sector indicates that, compared to industry, it played a less significant role. Its structure was dominated by branches focused on meeting the population's food needs, yet food shortages were a persistent issue. Agriculture in the oblast, the region, and the republic developed in a "zigzag" manner – experiencing certain "achievements" due to industrialization, electrification, chemicalization, land reclamation, and mechanization, followed by periods of absolute decline in crop and livestock production. Instead of intensifying production, land reclamation and chemicalization led to significant soil degradation and decreased fertility. A portion of the investments allocated to agriculture was absorbed by related industries, preventing sufficient mechanization of agricultural production. As a result, mechanization remained at a low level, and labor productivity grew at an extremely slow pace. Manual

---

<sup>17</sup> Райківський І., Єгрешій О., Паска Б. Сільське господарство Івано-Франківської області УРСР в період загострення кризи радянської системи (1965–1985 рр.). *Вісник науки та освіти*. 2024. № 5 (23). С. 1771–1785. DOI: 10.52058/2786-6165-2024-5(23)-1771-1785.

labor predominated in rural areas: production processes were carried out under difficult conditions, mostly by elderly people, while the youth tried to move from the village to the city.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the commissioning of the Burshtyn Thermal Power Plant (DRES) in Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast provided cheap electricity not only to Western Ukraine but also to neighboring socialist countries. The rapid introduction of electrification into production processes spurred technological progress across all industrial sectors, including agriculture. Western Ukrainian machine-building and metalworking industries – such as Lvivsilmash, the Lviv Forklift Plant, the Lviv Bus Plant, the Motorcycle and Bicycle Plant, the Lutsk Machine-Building Plant, the Stanislav Instrumentation Plant, the Kolomyia Agricultural Machinery Plant, the Rivne High-Voltage Equipment Plant, the Ternopil Combine Plant, the Industrial-Production Association “Vatra”, and many others – began adopting the latest machinery produced both in various Soviet republics and in “brotherly socialist” and “people’s democracy” countries.

The machine-building industry in the western region of the Ukrainian SSR developed as a complex and multi-sectoral system, with agricultural machinery manufacturing playing a leading role. The majority of machine-building enterprises were oriented toward meeting the needs of agriculture, energy, and the oil and gas extraction industries in the region. Unlike oil and gas extraction, which shifted toward the Shebelinka fields in Kharkiv Oblast, the machine-building sector experienced relatively stable development, undergoing both quantitative and qualitative changes. Production volumes increased rapidly, and the range of products expanded. However, one of the key industrial issues – inefficient investment – remained unresolved. Unlike developed countries, where investment was primarily directed toward the reconstruction and modernization of existing plants, in the western region of the USSR, production growth was achieved by building new manufacturing facilities. As a result, most machine-building products from the region remained low in quality and uncompetitive on a larger scale.

Ivano-Frankivsk region became home to a powerful chemical industry complex, which experienced significant growth during the 1960s–1980s. On April 25, 1975, Order No. 300 of the Ministry of Chemical Industry renamed the Kalush Chemical and Metallurgical Plant into the Kalush Production Association “Khlorvinil”. Key

branches of the chemical industry included the production of chlorovinyl, magnesium, perchloroethylene, zineb, and chlorine-free potash fertilizers. Soviet propaganda promoted numerous myths about this “giant of Prykarpattia’s chemical industry”. A major focus of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast’s chemical sector was the development and production of new synthetic materials, particularly polyvinyl chloride (PVC). More than 150 different types of materials were manufactured using PVC, leading to significant savings in yarn, lead, rubber, and other resources.

The chemical industry in Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast included the Ivano-Frankivsk Plant of Fine Organic Synthesis (TOS). Its construction began in accordance with the resolutions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) and the Council of Ministers of the USSR: No. 950 (November 19, 1970) and No. 569 (August 12, 1971). The initial plan projected that the first phase of production facilities would be operational by 1973, with full-scale production, including additional capacities for manufacturing chemical additives for polymer materials, set for 1975. However, due to various circumstances, the plant only became fully operational in 1976. The plant produced dozens of chemical products used in various industries and household applications. One of its most well-known products, the highly effective laundry bleach “Lilia”, gained popularity beyond the Ukrainian SSR. Despite the region’s expanding chemical production, the industry remained poorly oriented toward social needs, and its environmental and technological shortcomings were evident.

The rapid concentration of chemical production in industrial centers such as Kalush and Ivano-Frankivsk, combined with underdeveloped waste-free technologies and ineffective environmental protection measures, significantly worsened the ecological situation in western Ukraine.

Despite multiple attempts to improve social conditions, the totalitarian regime failed to achieve changes that adequately met the demands of society. While the overall standard of living in the region improved—wages were systematized, pensions increased, consumer goods production expanded, and progress was made in housing, education, healthcare, and culture—the improvements were inconsistent and insufficient. On the one hand, there were visible advancements in social and living conditions. On the other hand, these improvements lagged



behind the minimum needs of citizens and varied significantly between rural and urban populations.

During this period, the bureaucratic term “unpromising village” emerged, which negatively affected the development of rural areas. In such villages, social and household construction was “frozen”, and various facilities were neglected, left unrepaired, or even closed. This policy caused irreparable damage. Many schools, clubs, libraries, and kindergartens were opened in makeshift buildings or constructed using outdated designs. In some remote settlements, the problem was even more severe: these institutions either did not exist or were non-functional. The network of healthcare facilities and the effectiveness of medical services were significantly inferior to urban standards. Overall, rural workers lacked proper living conditions and leisure opportunities, making it difficult for them to fully meet their cultural and educational needs.

#### **4. Outlining Future Prospects**

The socio-economic development of Western Ukraine, particularly Ivano-Frankivsk region, has exhibited distinct characteristics shaped by the distorted structure of production. During the totalitarian regime, the primary focus was on the development of heavy industry, while agriculture and the social sector were treated as secondary. This imbalance led to a lack of investment in rural infrastructure and public services, deepening regional disparities. The dominance of environmentally hazardous chemical industries, intensive soil chemicalization and land reclamation, and industries with harmful working conditions severely affected public health and life expectancy in the region. The educational, cultural, and spiritual needs of the population were neglected.

Since Ukraine gained independence, the transformation of the socio-economic sphere of Prykarpattia has been slow and painful. The region, like the country as a whole, has faced a deep crisis affecting all areas of political, economic, and cultural life. Due to the Russo-Ukrainian war that began in 2014 and the full-scale invasion on February 24, 2022, the path toward an open democratic society, a socially oriented economy, and the creation of conditions capable of ensuring a decent life and the free development of every citizen has been hindered.

Economic impact – rehabilitation tourism has great prospects as a strategic direction for the socio-economic development of the Carpathian region of Europe and household infrastructure.

Social impact – to provide access to primary psychosocial assistance to as many war victims as possible in order to restore life resources and develop human potential for an active role in society.

Improving the correlation level of rehabilitation based on innovative technologies, leveraging the tourism potential of the Carpathians, will contribute to improving the health of Ukrainian citizens, fostering friendly relations with European Union countries, and advancing scientific research in the fields of pedagogy, medicine, psychology, sociology, and economics.

Awareness of the positive and negative trends in the socio-economic life of the western region of Ukraine during the studied period makes it possible to develop an economic development program and some practical recommendations:

- the main focus should be on the legal framework of the reforms. The provisions of the Constitution of Ukraine and Presidential Decree No. 543/2019 “On the Development of the Ukrainian Carpathian Region”, which aim to stimulate socio-economic development, enhance investment attractiveness, and promote the development of the recreational, tourism, and ethnocultural potential of the Ukrainian Carpathian region, apply to Ivano-Frankivsk, Lviv, Zakarpattia, and Chernivtsi regions;

- the successful implementation of reforms is possible within an appropriate educational and informational network, provided that qualified specialists and managers are involved;

- reforms should be carried out consistently, taking into account the experience of neighboring countries;

- a key component of social policy is labor market management and the implementation of active employment policies;

- environmental protection and restoration are vital both for the region and for Ukraine.

The optimal resolution of socio-economic issues depends on government authorities, research institutions, and private initiatives. The market system operates on the principle of “producing what sells”. Structural industrial restructuring includes: the closure of economically inefficient and environmentally harmful enterprises that cannot be repurposed to produce competitive products or transformed into envi-

ronmentally safe facilities; the downsizing of large enterprises and their subsequent reorganization to manufacture profitable products in demand; the establishment of private manufacturing enterprises and the expansion of service industries related to green tourism.

Ivano-Frankivsk region ranks among the top in terms of financial revenues from domestic tourism. The official website of the Department of International Cooperation, European Integration, Tourism, and Investment of the Ivano-Frankivsk Regional State Administration lists the most popular tourist attractions (14) and tourist routes (6), including hiking, skiing, cycling, automobile, water, and mountain trails. Green tourism is becoming increasingly popular, with 800 hosts welcoming tourists in their homesteads.

Today, as we strive to comprehend the past and find guiding principles for the future, it is essential to thoroughly study the issues of Ukrainian mentality that have contributed to spiritual revival and economic development. The time has come to objectively reconstruct Ukraine's history at various stages, free from ideological layers and censorship. After all, while carrying out "socialist transformations in the countryside", the regime sought by all means to prevent political self-expression. The absence of peasant political organizations complicated the search for common ground and the development of a unified policy for rural areas.

The transformation of the economy from one type to another has the greatest impact on the social sphere. In addition to the revival of national forms of worldview, new value systems characteristic of Western civilization are also being introduced. Economic growth and competitiveness are closely linked to the country's overall economic advancement, making education a matter of national importance. The cultural and educational sector, as well as scientific potential, are gradually modernizing, acquiring an appropriate character and level. The general strategy for the development of scientific research is focused on a systematic analysis of society in its entirety, dynamics, internal contradictions, and prospective trends.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Tourism is a strategic direction for the socio-economic development of the western region of Ukraine and a priority for the European Carpathian region, focusing on international cooperation management, European integration, and investments. The geographical location of

Ivano-Frankivsk region within the western part of Ukraine is highly favorable for economic development, particularly tourism. Major transportation routes pass through the region, connecting it with Zakarpattia, and further with Romania, Hungary, Slovakia, and Poland. Transport arteries also link it with neighboring regions such as Lviv, Ternopil, and Chernivtsi, opening broad opportunities for establishing production ties with both Ukrainian and foreign enterprises. Rehabilitation tourism in Prykarpattia has significant future potential for the region's economic development and its socio-economic infrastructure.

This section of the monograph was prepared as part of participation in the 2024 national competitive selection of fundamental and applied scientific research projects in Ukraine: "Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of Rehabilitation for Ukrainian Armed Forces Personnel and Combat Veterans Using the Tourism Potential of Prykarpattia". The first stage took place from September 25 to October 27, 2024, in higher education institutions and national research institutions within the national electronic scientific and information system. The second stage was held from October 28 to December 12, 2024, at the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine.

## **ABSTRACT**

This study attempts to characterize the main stages, directions, and the current state of research on the socio-economic development of Prykarpattia from the second half of the 1940s to the first quarter of the 21st century. In the second half of the 20th century, a significant industrial, agricultural, and social potential was developed in the western region of Ukraine, which was intensively utilized within the framework of the all-Union and republican economic complex. However, this was a distorted, inefficient, and static socio-economic structure subordinated to the military-industrial complex of the USSR. Numerous attempts to revitalize it and stimulate the development of positive economic factors were unsuccessful. The proposed reforms failed to address the fundamental foundations of the command-administrative totalitarian system and remained superficial. Regional experience, particularly in the Ivano-Frankivsk region, demonstrates that the systemic crisis, gradual decline, and collapse of the planned socialist economy were natural consequences of the Soviet economic model under the occupation regime. Throughout different historical

periods, the Ukrainian people have consistently demonstrated self-organization and accumulated valuable economic experience. In light of new geopolitical challenges, particularly the ongoing Russian-Ukrainian war, it is crucial to focus on the existing tourism potential of Prykarpattia. With adequate state support, this sector can reach a new qualitative level and serve as a catalyst for various industries and social infrastructure. A key priority should be the rehabilitation of Ukrainian Armed Forces personnel and their families.

## **АНОТАЦІЯ**

У роботі здійснено спробу здійснити характеристику основних етапів, напрямків і сучасний стан розробки проблеми соціально-економічного розвитку Прикарпаття в другій половині 40-х ХХ ст. – першій чверті ХХІ ст. У другій половині ХХ ст. у західному регіоні України було сформовано потужний промисловий, аграрний та соціальний потенціал, який інтенсивно використовувався в межах загальносоюзного і республіканського господарського комплексу. Проте це була деформована, неефективна, нединамічна соціально-економічна структура підпорядкована військово-промислового комплексу СРСР. Численні спроби реанімувати її, надати економічного поштовху у розвитку позитивних чинників не мали успіху. Спроби реформ не зачіпали засадних підвалин командно-адміністративної тоталітарної системи та носили паліативний характер. Регіональний досвід, на прикладі Івано-Франківської області, засвідчує, що системна криза, поступовий занепад і крах планової соціалістичної економіки – це закономірний процес радянської моделі господарювання окупаційного режиму. Український народ на різних історичних етапах завжди виявляв самоорганізацію та напрацьовував господарський досвід. У нових геополітичних викликах, пов'язаних з російсько-українською війною, необхідно робити акцент на наявний туристичний потенціал Прикарпаття, який здатний при державній підтримці вийти на новий якісний рівень та активізувати різні галузі економіки та соціальної інфраструктури. Пріоритетом має виступати реабілітація військовослужбовців Збройних Сил України та членів їхніх сімей.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

1. Баран В. Україна: новітня історія (1945–1991 рр.). Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 2003. 670 с. URL: <https://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001059>
2. Ковальчак Г. І. Індустріальний розвиток західних областей України в період комуністичного будівництва. Київ: Наук. думка, 1973. 236 с.
3. Ковальчак Г. І. Економічний розвиток західноукраїнських земель. Київ: Наук. думка, 1988. 251 с.

4. Малярчук О., Остап'як В. Індустріальні процеси у Західному регіоні Української РСР: здобутки та прорахунки. *Український історичний журнал*. Київ. 2022. Вип. 2. С. 91–107. DOI: 10.15407/uhj2022.02.091.
5. Малярчук О. Соціально-економічні процеси в західному регіоні Української РСР (1964–1991): монографія. Вид. 2-ге, переробл. і допов. Івано-Франківськ: Симфонія форте, 2023. 552 с.
6. Maliarchuk O., Sabadukha V. Yaroslav Fedoruk's scientific and administrative activities under the conditions of the crisis of the Soviet system (1960–1980s). *East European Historical Bulletin*. 2023. Issue 29. P. 163–172. DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058X.29.292937>.
7. Maliarchuk O., Petretska N. (2024). Nature protection activity in the Western region of the Ukrainian SSR: on the example of Ivano-Frankivsk region (the 1960s – 1980s). *East European Historical Bulletin*. 2024. Issue 31. P. 173–182. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.31.306348.
8. Райківський І., Єгрешій О., Паска Б. Соціально-економічні процеси в Івано-Франківській області Української РСР в радянській історіографії. *Наукові праці Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка: історичні науки*. 2023. Т. 42. С. 179–192. DOI: 10.32626/2309-2254.2023-42.179-192.
9. Райківський І., Єгрешій О., Паска Б. Українська історіографія соціально-економічних процесів в Івано-Франківській області УРСР. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук*. 2024. Вип. 72. Т. 3. С. 33–41. DOI: 10.24919/2308-4863/72-3-5.
10. Райківський І., Єгрешій О., Паска Б. Сільське господарство Івано-Франківської області УРСР в період загострення кризи радянської системи (1965–1985 рр.). *Вісник науки та освіти*. 2024. № 5 (23). С. 1771–1785. DOI: 10.52058/2786-6165-2024-5(23)-1771-1785.
11. Росія – Україна: зради, союзи, війни / відп. ред. М. Литвин. 2-ге вид. Львів; Тернопіль: «Лібра Терра», 2024. 543 с. URL: <https://www.instr-ukr.lviv.ua/uk/publications/books/book/?newsid=1210>
12. Санкович М. «Несемо нову культуру» – друга радянська Прикарпаття. *Вісник науки та освіти. Серія «Історія та археологія»*. 2022. № 1 (1). С. 335–344. DOI: 10.52058/2786-6165-2022-1(1)-335-344.
13. Санкович М. Друга радянська Станіславська область – підготовка передумов до колективізації та індустріалізації. *Наукові праці Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка: Історичні науки*. 2023. Т. 42. С. 321–335. DOI: 10.32626/2309-2254.2023-42.321-335.
14. Санкович М. Структурні зміни в промисловості Івано-Франківської області Української РСР. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук. Серія. Історичні науки*. 2024. Вип. 73. Т. 3. С. 21–28. DOI: 10.24919/2308-4863/73-3-3.

15. Санкович М. Аграрна політика радянської влади в Карпатському регіоні – матеріали преси і реальний стан справ. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук. Серія. Історичні науки*. 2024. Вип. 72. Т. 3. С. 42–49. DOI: 10.24919/2308-4863/72-3-6.

16. Федорчук Я. Вплив нової техніки на співвідношення трудомісткості, фондомісткості і матеріаломісткості промислової продукції. *Економіка Радянської України*. 1975. № 11. С. 57–62.

17. Федорчук Я. Економіка підвищення якості продукції. *Економіка Радянської України*. 1977. № 10. С. 53–56.

## REFERENCES

1. Baran V. *Ukraine: novitnia istoriia (1945–1991 rr.)*. Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy, 2003. URL: <https://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001059> [in Ukrainian].

2. Kovalchak H. I. *Industrialnyi rozvytok zakhidnykh oblastei Ukrainy v period komunistychnoho budivnytstva*. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, 1973. [in Ukrainian].

3. Kovalchak H. I. *Ekonomichnyi rozvytok zakhidnoukraisnykh zemel*. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, 1988. [in Ukrainian].

4. Maliarchuk O., Ostapiak V. Industrialni protsesy u Zakhidnomu rehioni Ukrainskoi RSR: здобутки та prorakhunky. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*. 2022. Vyp. 2. S. 91–107. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/uhj2022.02.091>. [in Ukrainian].

5. Maliarchuk O. Sotsialno-ekonomichni protsesy v zakhidnomu rehioni Ukrainskoi RSR (1964–1991). Vyd. 2-he, pererob. i dop. Ivano-Frankivsk: Symfoniia forte, 2023. URL: <http://elar.nung.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/9448/1-/7394s.pdf>. [in Ukrainian].

6. Maliarchuk O., Sabadukha V. Yaroslav Fedoruk's scientific and administrative activities under the conditions of the crisis of the Soviet system (1960–1980s). *East European Historical Bulletin*. 2023. Issue 29. P. 163–172. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.29.292937. [in English].

7. Maliarchuk O., Petretska N. (2024). Nature protection activity in the Western region of the Ukrainian SSR: on the example of Ivano-Frankivsk region (the 1960s – 1980s). *East European Historical Bulletin*. 2024. Issue 31. P. 173–182. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.31.306348. [in English].

8. Raikivskyi I., Yehreshii O., Paska B. Sotsialno-ekonomichni protsesy v Ivano-Frankivskii oblasti Ukrainskoi RSR v radianskii istoriohrafii. *Naukovi pratsi Kamianets-Podilskogo natsionalnogo universitetu imeni Ivana Ogiienka: istorychni nauky*. 2023. T. 42. S. 179–192. DOI: 10.32626/2309-2254.2023-42.179-192. [in Ukrainian].

9. Raikivskyi I., Yehreshii O., Paska B. Ukrainska istoriohrafiia sotsialno-ekonomichnykh protsesiv v Ivano-Frankivskii oblasti URSR. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk*. 2024. Vyp. 72. T. 3. S. 33–41. DOI: 10.24919/2308-4863/72-3-5. [in Ukrainian].

10. Raikivskiy I., Yehreshii O., Paska B. Silske gospodarstvo Ivano-Frankivskoi oblasti URSS v period zahostrennia kryzy radianskoi systemy (1965–1985 rr.). *Visnyk nauky ta osvity*. 2024. № 5 (23). S. 1771–1785. DOI: 10.52058/2786-6165-2024-5(23)-1771-1785. [in Ukrainian].
11. *Rosiia – Ukraina: zrady, soiuz, viiny / vidp. red. M. Lytvyn*. 2-he vyd. Lviv; Ternopil: “Libra Terra”, 2024. URL: <https://www.instrukr.lviv.ua/uk/publications/books/book/?newsid=1210> [in Ukrainian].
12. Sankovych M. “Nesemo novu kulturu” – druha radianizatsiia Prykarpattia. *Visnyk nauky ta osvity. Seriia «Istoriia ta arkeolohiia»*. 2022. № 1 (1). S. 335–344. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2022-1\(1\)-335-344](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2022-1(1)-335-344). [in Ukrainian].
13. Sankovych M. Druha radianizatsiia Stanislavskoi oblasti – pidhotovka peredumov do kolektyvizatsii ta industrializatsii. *Naukovi pratsi Kamianets-Podilskogo natsionalnogo universitetu imeni Ivana Ogiienka: Istorychni nauky*. 2023. T. 42. S. 321–335. DOI: 10.32626/2309-2254.2023-42.321-335. [in Ukrainian].
14. Sankovych M. Strukturni zminy v promyslovosti Ivano-Frankivskoi oblasti Ukrainiskoi RSR. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk. Seriia. Istorychni nauky*. 2024. Vyp. 73. T. 3. S. 21–28. DOI: 10.24919/2308-4863/73-3-3. [in Ukrainian].
15. Sankovych M. Ahrarna polityka radianskoi vlady v Karpatskomu rehioni – materialy presy i realnyi stan sprav. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk. Seriia. Istorychni nauky*. 2024. Vyp. 72. T. 3. S. 42–49. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/72-3-6>. [in Ukrainian].
16. Fedorchuk Ya. Vplyv novoi tekhniky na spivvidnoshennia trudomistkosti, fondomistkosti i materialomistkosti promyslovoi produktsii. *Ekonomika Radianskoi Ukrainy*. 1975. № 11. S. 57–62. [in Ukrainian].
17. Fedorchuk Ya. Ekonomika pidvyshchennia yakosti produktsii. *Ekonomika Radianskoi Ukrainy*. 1977. № 10. S. 53–56. [in Ukrainian].

#### **Information about the authors:**

##### **Maliarchuk O. M.**

Ph D hab. (History), Professor the department of social sciences, Interpreting and Translation of the Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, 15, Karpats'ka Str., Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine, postal code 76019  
([oleg.malyarchuk@gmail.com](mailto:oleg.malyarchuk@gmail.com))

##### **Palahniuk M. M.**

Ph. D. (Philosophy), Associate Professor of the Department of Social Studies, Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, 15, Karpats'ka Str., Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine, postal code 76019  
([mykhailo.palahniuk@nunge.edu.ua](mailto:mykhailo.palahniuk@nunge.edu.ua))



**Bzunko H. B.**

Ph. D. (History), Associate Professor of the Department of Social Studies,  
Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, 15, Karpats'ka  
Str., Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine, postal code 76019  
(bzunkogalina@gmail.com)

**Інформація про авторів:**

**Малярчук О. М.**

доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри суспільних наук, усного та  
письмового перекладу, Івано-Франківський національний технічний  
університет нафти і газу, вул. Карпатська, 15, м. Івано-Франківськ,  
Україна, індекс 76019 (oleg.malyarchuk@gmail.com)

**Палагнюк М. М.**

кандидат філософських наук, доцент кафедри суспільних дисциплін,  
Івано-Франківський національний технічний університет нафти і газу,  
вул. Карпатська, 15, м. Івано-Франківськ, Україна, індекс 76019  
(mykhailo.palahniuk@nung.edu.ua)

**Бзунько Г. Б.**

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри суспільних дисциплін, Івано-  
Франківський національний технічний університет нафти і газу,  
вул. Карпатська, 15, м. Івано-Франківськ, Україна, індекс 76019  
(bzuncogalina@gmail.com)