

DOI: 10.37930/2782-618X-2022-1-1-75-85

Kaysyn A. Khubiev

Lomonosov Moscow State University (Moscow, Russia)

ON THE TRANSITIONAL FORMS OF THE «FADING» OF ECONOMIC RELATIONS IN THE THEORETICAL MODEL OF NOONOMY

Abstract: The Coronavirus Crisis and the Fourth Industrial Revolution, as the main drivers of global trend changes, have called for new scientific approaches to understanding the “new normal.” Theories based on the values of methodological individualism have shown their limitations and even their insolvency in the face of the new challenges. The virus was most successful in its spread where it encountered an individualism that had degenerated into egoism. The emergence of Noonomy, among other concepts, was a reaction to the insufficient potential of existing theories in the face of the challenges of the new era. The theoretical model of Noonomy relies on a perfect technology that provides citizens with the necessary benefits of life and frees them from the need for forced labor in production, and on new people, with creative motivation at the forefront and free from individualism. The article focuses on the fact that the transition from the current state of the economy, economic science and economic man to Noonomy and creative man is a great distance from the transitional states. The necessity of their research represents a global scientific task. The author justifies the necessity of such research, highlights some existing transitional forms and notes the emergence of new forms based on an evolving reality.

Keywords: noonomy, goodwill, solidarism, noosphere socialism, liberalization, transitional relations.

For citation: Khubiev K.A. (2022). On the transitional forms of “fading” economic relations in the theoretical model of Noonomy. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 75–85. DOI: 10.37930/2782-618X-2022-1-1-75-85.

Received December 10, 2021

乎比耶夫 K. A.

莫斯科大学, 莫斯科

智力经济理论模型中经济关系“消逝”的过渡形式

摘要: 新冠危机和第四次工业革命作为全球趋势变化的主要因素, 要求用新的科学方法来理解“新常态”。基于个人主义价值观的方法论在面对新的挑战时已经显示出其局限性和缺乏力量。在出现个人主义堕落为利己主义现象的地方, 这种病毒的传播最为成功。“智力经济”概念的出现是现有理论无力应对新时代挑战的体现。智力经济的理论模式依赖于完美的技术, 这种技术为民众提供必要的生活福利, 可以使他们避免从事不想从事的生产劳动并成为具有创造力优势和不受个人主义影响的新人。文章强调, 从经济、经济科学和经济性人的现状过渡到智力经济和创造性人, 需要经历一个长时期的过渡状态。对他们的研究是必须进行的一项伟大的科学任务。文章论证了这种研究的必要性, 指出了一些已经存在的过渡形式, 以及在不断发展的现实基础上正在出现的新的过渡形式。

关键词: 智力经济学、团结主义、智力圈社会主义、自由化、过渡关系。

引文注释: 乎比耶夫 K. A. (2022). 智力经济理论模型中经济关系“消逝”期间的过渡形式//智力经济和智力社会. 新兴工业发展研究所论文选, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 75–85. DOI: 10.37930/2782-618X-2022-1-1-75-85.

文章已收到 2021 年 12 月 10 日

Introduction

The most important events of the early 21st century were the start of the industrial revolution 4.0 and the coronavirus pandemic. The latter also stimulated the development of some areas of the former: digital technology, biotechnology. These events of global scale could not fail to affect the fundamental bonds of social being. Values and models of social development became the subject of current discussions in scientific forums at various levels.

The coronavirus attacked humanity in solidarity, unity and aggressiveness. The same response was demanded from humanity. But not all the values that humanity has developed and that form the foundation of its self-organization have been successfully tested. One of the most vulnerable principles of the socio-economic structure of the modern, economically most developed part of the world turned out to be individualism and the principle of methodological individualism in economic theory that grew out of it, as well as the model of “economic man”. The inadequacy and even viciousness of this principle has manifested itself in socially significant negative phenomena both at the individual level and at the level of states based on the values of individualism, no matter what pseudo-democratic rhetoric may accompany it. At the very beginning of the pandemic, an extraordinary speculation with personal protective equipment and the production of counterfeit products developed. Later, speculation with pharmaceuticals, hospital conditions, and hospital care continued and continues to this day. Shady price lists for healthcare services surfaced and became prevalent. There was also a behind-the-scenes battle over public contracts with private organizations for services in vaccine sales. Unfair competition for the vaccine market has developed at the international level, with political motives and means. This does not cover the variety and scope of individualistic events. All participants in the above events pursue individual interests and maximize their own benefits. They cannot be confronted with sick people, although they are also free citizens with equal rights. It is precisely in the period of threats and trials that individualism has manifested itself in a perverse way. At the same time, the experience of vaccination in the Soviet period and the experience of the successful fight against infection with the coronavirus testify to the higher effectiveness of the values opposing individualism.

Against the background of these events, the discussions about the problems of modernity, including the criticism of the modern capitalist world order, have intensified. Against the background of criticism of certain features of capitalism, concepts of new directions of socio-economic development and new models of organization of society and economy are emerging, which represent an alternative to capitalism. Let us consider some of them.

Main findings and discussions

A model of society based on the values of solidarism has been developed for several years [Belyaev, Koshkin, 2020]. The main focus of this experience is on property and income: According

to this approach, all citizens of the country receive an unconditional income not lower than the subsistence level, have labor income and income from property; the means of production are common property and income is subject to equal distribution. Therefore, such a form of distribution as wages is not relevant in this system. We note that while this concept is sufficiently well founded economically, it lacks a technological side. An important question remains unanswered: On the basis of what level of development of technology (productive forces) will this be done. Since the authors take a political economy approach, it makes sense to ask which productive forces (technologies) are appropriate to the economic relations that form the basis of the solidary society or solidarism.

Closely related to the considered concept is the concept of Kinderness [Kretov, 2019]. With the value overlay that comes from its name, this concept has a solid justification. It claims its own original methodology under the general name “cybernetic epistemology”. The model of society structure absolutizes the harmonious unity of nature and society, waste-free technologies, moderate consumption of natural resources and excludes elitist, demonstrative and other excessive consumption. Such a society cannot be elitist differentiated (class). There are theoretical studies on certain aspects of the economy and the economic system as a whole (property, reproduction, etc.) and the development of the main instruments for the functioning of the economy, from which we will distinguish a special system of money and money circulation (Gisel money). As for technology (productive forces), it is described in general terms: it must be efficient and not wasteful, and must not disturb the harmony of natural development.

In recent years, a concept called Noonomy has appeared and is actively developing [Bodrunov, 2020].

In the twenty-first century, the idea of harmonizing human existence and the environment has gained popularity. Some work in this direction has evolved into an assessment of social development models. Capitalism has been criticized both externally and internally for the destruction of habitat through the pursuit of profit. Accordingly, alternative systems of social development were constructed. A.I. Subetto was most active in this direction [Subetto, 2007]. His works combine the values of social justice and environmental sustainability with a critique of capitalism. This direction can be called noosphere socialism. All these directions (with the exception, perhaps, of the solidarity model) are in one way or another related to the problems of harmonizing the life of nature and society and go back to the legacy of Vernadsky. But in the further course differences appear. The works of A.I. Subetto speak unequivocally of a socialist alternative to capitalism. Other authors try to avoid “isms,” but the critical attitude toward capitalism is quite obvious in all of them. Finally, there is a stratum of the social elite, consisting of figures from science, politics and education, which adheres to the paradigm of the eternity and immutability of the capitalist world order, which is considered “the best of all worlds.” The representatives of this strand do not consider it necessary to discuss alternatives to capitalism, but they propose to improve it. A number of prescriptions are repeated and are well known: Protection of private property rights, creation of competition, independent judiciary, reduction of the share of the state, doliberalization of the economy, including a “second wave” of privatization.

What the listed concepts have in common, with the exception of the last one, is the absence of transitional economic relations and forms that lead to very attractive models of socio-economic organization of society and its economy. It even seems that this is the main scientific problem for finding an alternative to the established reality. Let us consider this problem in detail using

Noonomy as a scientifically active problem as an example. In doing so, attention will also be drawn to other concepts. In particular, we will focus on the neoliberal model of improving the existing reality.

The concept of Noonomy rests on two essential foundations. A fundamentally new man: creative and innovative. As such, he is radically opposed to the “economic” man, based on the principle of individualism. As such, he is highly responsible, not only for himself, but also for his environment. Another bulwark is high technology, which provides people with the benefits they need. These technologies are not only highly efficient, but also ecological. Man is lured into the sphere of production not by the necessity of subsistence and survival, but by a natural urge to express his creative abilities, to master new technologies, to create new products, and to innovate in general. In this system, people are pushed out of the process of producing goods as we understand it. Moreover, in this system, economic relationships die out.

You should pay special attention to two points that arise from the nature of Noonomy. In the process of technological progress in the form of Noonomy, man is pushed out of the direct production process and out of economic relations. That is, the latter simply disappear. The displacement of man from the direct production process is a natural phenomenon, confirmed by the history of technological development. The thesis of the disappearance of economic relations seemed unexpected, because it was not explained how this would happen and what transitional forms would lead to it. For an economist (and not only for him) it is very difficult to imagine such a society even in imagination. But as time went by, these doubts began to fade, and factual arguments came to light that the author of this concept did not cite because he did not pay much attention to the transitional forms.

Today there are reasons to agree with these theses and to put forward arguments in their favor that correspond to reality. In the present reality, we already have reason to claim that radical changes are in store for humanity in the future if it continues to move along the path of technological progress.

Why do we attach so much importance to transitional relationships? The world today lives in a stream of prevailing values, principles and mechanisms of a market economy based on individualism. This order is suitable only for the last of the positions mentioned above. How will the transition from one reality to another, a fundamentally different one, be accomplished? This question must be answered by science, which cannot refrain from studying the steps, the phases that lead from one state to another. Only political economy has experience in such studies. But lately it has fallen into oblivion. Meanwhile, the natural sciences, in the course of their development, have paid great attention to the transitory processes and states of objects of research that are subject to change.

Economic relations are evolutionary and the road to their replacement is very long, and science cannot make the leap from the rule of capitalism to the realm without economic relations. There is still much to be done in the study of transitional economic forms and states. A technologically convincing concept must be complemented and accompanied by a study of the dynamics of economic relations corresponding to the level and nature of the productive forces of Noonomy.

One cannot ignore the fact that today we are in a reality in which the world is dominated by a capitalist economy and an economic model of human behavior is powerfully imposed on man, in an accentuated liberal version based on the methodological individualism already mentioned. It is certain that this model will change and even be displaced in the course of civilizational de-

velopment, which includes technological progress and social development. However, the reality is that this is a long road and the stages on the way to the goal are still largely unknown. Here, it is the task of science to explore the transitional relationships and processes. And what is the situation in science itself?

The scientific reality is that the mainstream, the scientific ideological accompaniment of the capitalist system, has also dealt with human beings and created a corresponding theory of human capital. And in the process of scientific work, we have to critically engage with this current and argue against it. We fully agree with the criticism of S. D. Bodrunov that neoliberalism has put the maximization of individual utility in the foreground and then replaced this thesis with the maximization of monetary income, and with his final conclusion that this ideology leads humanity to a primitive commercial dead end.

It is not difficult to prove that the consistent application of the principle of individual utility maximization, taking into account Pareto efficiency, leads the same neoliberal theory to the conclusion that the most rational and efficient in terms of total utility is equalization distribution, which is fundamentally contrary to the essence of the market economy. This is not the place to go into the other contradictions of neoclassical theory, which is based on methodological individualism.

It is useful to go into the essence of the theory of human capital, as it contradicts the theory of creative man. Schulz and Becker, who are considered the pioneers of the market theory of human capital, stated that part of people's consumption expenditure should be considered as investment: Education, medicine, etc. And why? Because spending in this area prepares individuals for higher income in the future. In terms of the fundamentals of the market economy, a person's consumer spending has become investment spending, and his economic behavior has been reduced to a market pattern of costs and outcomes. Individuals spend for themselves by increasing their human capital, and they themselves benefit. And all this culminates in the theory of the life cycle. A person comes into the world without anything, then he accumulates human capital, with which he earns an income in the first, active part of his life. Then, in the second, more passive part of his life, the person spends all his accumulated capital, and at the end of the life cycle he enters the next world with an income of zero. In this theory, liberal pragmatism is reduced to absurdity.

This theory, which originated in the United States, was immediately challenged when it came to the European area. In Europe, costs and outcomes are asymmetrical. For example, the state spends money on education, while individuals reap the benefits. Here the discussion moves into the realm of taxes to pay back these costs, etc. But this discussion does not touch the methodological basis of the theory itself.

The difficulties of human capital theory do not end here. At the level of an organization (firm), it is not the sum of individuals, each of whom maximizes his or her utility, but communities in which individuals are linked by teamwork. Moreover, the individual well-being of each worker depends entirely on the well-being of the organization (company). The welfare of the firm, in turn, depends on the macroeconomic situation of the country. The principle of methodological individualism breaks down at various levels. In this context, the turn to the theory of creative man and social man is a promising alternative to the theory of human capital.

The results support the theory of Noonomy and justify the need to complement it with a study of transitional relations and forms of social organization, given the reality of the current starting position of the movement toward a society of the future, Noonomy.

Let us now consider the practical component. The thesis of the future disappearance of economic relations in Noonomy is at first perceived as a fantastic conjecture. But practice gives rise to a change of perspective. The work of Klaus Schwab provides data on how the new technological revolution is actually displacing people from the production process on a large scale. As an example, it cites how the transition from Detroit to Silicon Valley increases by a factor of 10 in terms of capitalization of the largest companies, and decreases employment by the same factor [Schwab, 2017, pp. 19-20]. This is already a fact of worker displacement from manufacturing, not somewhere behind a fantasy horizon, but at the origins of the new industrial revolution. But the displacement of workers from direct production is not a “displacement” of economic relations. The unemployed in the system of capitalist relations do not cease to be subjects of economic relations because they are alienated from the conditions of production and food.

But there are other signs of the dissolution of economic relations: In the industrialized countries, there is currently an intense discussion about an unconditional income for citizens, regardless of their participation in the production of goods and the creation of income. This idea is already on the verge of being put into practice. To the extent that the practice of unconditional income is introduced into the existing socio-economic format, economic relations will be displaced to the same extent. And to the extent that this social plan develops, objective economic development will move in the direction outlined in the theory of Noonomy.

It remains to consider the position according to which the system currently prevailing in Russia is considered a natural and efficient model that does not require fundamental changes. Improvements are needed in certain aspects and areas: protection of private property, ensuring competition, creation of an independent court, etc. Sometimes this is complemented by the creation of a high-quality institutional environment.

Protection of private property rights. No other country in the world has done as much for private property as Russia. An interest-free amount of property and resources, including natural resources, has passed into private hands. It is enough to refer to the materials of the Accounts Chamber of the Russian Federation to convince oneself of the unfoundedness of the opinion that private property is violated by the state [Analysis of Privatization Processes, 2004; Polterovich, 2012]. In fact, other forms of property that reflect the interests of the vast majority of Russian citizens and are protected by the Constitution are in need of protection.

Protection of competition. Competition is a natural condition and consequence of private property. If privately owned structures do not compete with each other, this indicates a fundamental flaw in private property itself. However, there are two factors that are independent of competing entities in the economy: Monopolism and high government involvement in the economy, up to 70%. As far as monopolies are concerned, Russia has created a set of rules and a structure in the executive branch (the Anti-Monopoly Committee with regional units) specifically designed to combat monopolistic dominance. Thus, there are no power-political problems, and proposals to combat monopolism must be specific and targeted. As for the excessive participation of the state in the economy (70%), this is a unique misunderstanding in Russian science and practice. This figure appeared in a 2014 report of the Antimonopoly Committee and was widely circulated in the highest circles of science and politics. It later turned out that this figure was not methodologically derived, but borrowed from World Bank analyzes. A detailed analysis of this universal fallacy is beyond the scope of this article. The results have been published [Khubiev, 2016] A very brief statistical note will suffice here. In 2019, i.e. before the pandemic, according to official data,

the state owned only 15% of fixed assets [Polterovich, 2016, pp. 314, 336] If the state generates 70% of GDP with 15% of fixed assets, this can only indicate a very high efficiency of the public sector, with all the resulting conclusions on the restructuring of property in the creation of a new economic model.

The disregard of reliable sources and the preference for unjustifiably exaggerated data on the share of the state in the economy were necessary for two purposes. First: to blame the “excessively bloated” public sector for stagnation and technological backwardness; second: to justify the implementation of the idea of a “second wave” of privatization. The goal is to create a “second wave” of oligarchic elites.

Creation of an independent judiciary. Here the problem is turned on its head. The excessive freedom and independence of judges is the main reason for the multi-layered corruption in this system. What we really need is control of judges, but not government control, but public control. An advance over the current system would be to use the Soviet experience: electing judges, reporting regularly to the electorate, and establishing popular judges. The excessive independence of judges is the main problem with this branch of government, not the lack of it. Judges who have made decisions are in no way accountable for them. They do not even attend the appellate sessions where they could be questioned about their decisions and where they could give reasons for their decisions. The proposals for an independent tribunal have a different context. The complicated and expensive judicial process requires high costs for lawyers and expertise. And if we take into account the corrupt market for judicial services, the outcome of judicial disputes is obvious in favor of the richest party. This is the essence of the talk about the independence of judges behind the rhetoric of democratization.

The second approach has no potential to change the system. On the contrary, the proposals to “doliberalize” the Russian economy will only exacerbate its inefficiency. All the proposed institutions have already been created: Private property, an anti-monopoly committee, an independent court. Instead of studying their ineffectiveness or even their failure, it is proposed to expand the system. If the model is ineffective, it will not produce the desired result. No matter how much money is poured into the millstones of an ineffective model under various names (innovative development, development institutions, priority projects, national projects), the existing economic model does not contain personalized incentives for breakthrough development. If the state is a subject of breakthrough development, its cash flows should be aimed at creating specific objects and complexes that will become locomotives of new technology development. This must be preceded by planned work arising from Presidential Decree No. 633 of November 8, 2021 and the functions of a reproductive economic policy.

The institutional resource requires special attention. The progression of the economy through stages, phases, and other states of transition is accompanied by the creation of some institutions and the abolition of others. Therefore, the method of approaching Noonomy through a special study of transition processes must be supplemented by considering institutions as a resource, along with capital and human resources. At the same time, we need to address the methodological issues of correlation between neo-institutional economic theory (NIET) and neoclassical economic theory (NCET).

The institutional changes in Russia in the 1990s had unprecedented catastrophic consequences for the economy. The decline in output in Russia surpassed the Great Depression. GDP in 1998 was estimated to be between 42% and 50% of its 1990 level, investment had fallen by 80%, and

the population had shrunk by more than 10 million people. This was the result of radical institutional changes. They had their ideological and scientific background. Neoclassicism and neo-institutionalism as its current were popular in theory. Political economy was not allowed to justify radical reforms. It found itself in a semi-legal position in the system of education and analytics in general.

Neoclassicism does not contain a theory of transitions and transformations of economic systems, relations and structures. Having “digested” institutionalism and made it its integral part, NIET (neoclassical economic theory) received a section that supplemented this deficiency. But NIET (neo-institutional economic theory) subjectively covers only a marginal layer of economic relations proper and moves into the realm of non-economic relations, especially legal relations. Therefore, its normative functions do not have the reliability of a scientific level. Legislation can redistribute rights and introduce new rights by creating executive bodies to implement them. That is, both individual institutions and their systems can be created. But there is no guarantee and no basis for an effective outcome.

The example of the disastrous results of privatisation is well known. Nevertheless, without an objective analysis of its results and without having fully overcome its devastating consequences, the government is adopting new privatisation plans. Without taking into account the deep trauma inflicted on the economy, plans for a “second wave” of privatisation are being hatched. The main result of privatisation in the 1990s was the formation of an oligarch class. A new wave of privatisation will produce a new wave of the same class of oligarchs. No obvious results reflecting national interests can be found without special studies of the economic system in its present transitional state. In the new wave of privatisation the unity of economics and politics is clearly visible. The ideological underpinning and accompaniment of both the first and second waves of privatisation is the NCET with its absolutisation of private property and the free market.

The theoretical, methodological and instrumental rationale is the NIET, which also espouses the ideas of a free market and private property. The main negative result of the failure of the Russian economy in 1990-2000s is the loss of historical time, which was expressed in a deep technological backwardness. The results of the study of the causes of this failure depend on the methodology used. The systemic approach focuses on the search for the fundamental causes, which are located at the level of the foundations of the system. Radically destroying the foundations of the former system, the reformers created a situation of “incorrectly buttoned first button” with a new set of institutions. The bulk of state-owned enterprises were formally transformed into joint-stock companies, having nothing to do with the nature and essence of joint-stock companies.

The experience of creation of joint-stock companies, including Russian experience of the late 19th century, testifies to the fact that they carried out a breakthrough development of spheres and sectors of the economy. This result was possible for the following reasons. JSCs were created by motivated entities, which developed a project in advance, as a rule, an innovative one. Both own and borrowed funds were sought for its realisation. Shareholders risked not only funds, but also their reputations and fortunes (the example of Mamontov). Energy, skills and abilities were mobilised to implement the project. The result was not only new jobs, but also new production and infrastructure facilities. The creation of joint-stock companies, in accordance with their nature, was a powerful impulse of innovative development of the Russian economy.

The establishment of joint-stock companies in the 90s only formally corresponded to their name, but in essence they were their opposite and, therefore, the results could not be otherwise.

No new projects were developed, no new funds were attracted and no new jobs were created for the JSCs being established. The new owners did not bear any risks or responsibilities. They did not create or acquire new property, but were given it. The essence and consequences of the emergence of such property were obvious for domestic economists. The practical events of the 1990s confirmed the alarming socio-economic forecasts made on the basis of the political economy approach. By the end of the second decade of the 21st century, neoclassical theory had found an ally in 2017 Nobel Prize laureate R. Thaler. He justified the inefficiency of vested (unearned) property. The economic system, which was based on the institutional transformation of inefficient property, could not be otherwise. And vain, or even hypocritical, were the public assurances that by converting “inefficient” state property into “efficient” private property, the incentives of private enterprise would be incorporated: competition, innovation initiative. There was a belief that the energy of entrepreneurship and the laws of the market would take the economy to the heights of technological progress. None of this happened and could not happen by definition. Vested property developed the skills to exploit resources predatorily, and to take the proceeds abroad.

Russia’s technological development was at a standstill. The liberal strategy of technological breakthrough through privatisation and the launch of a competitive mechanism failed. Liberalisation of foreign economic relations led to a comprador attitude of the financial and economic elite towards the national economy.

The state could not stand idly by and watch the disastrous lag behind global trends. A whole series of documents was drafted, aimed at industrial and technological development. Their milestone was the May Decrees of the President of the Russian Federation (2018), aimed at pioneering socio-economic development. But there are already experiences with the implementation of such important documents that were not successful. For example, in 2008, the concept of long-term socio-economic development of the Russian Federation until 2020 was adopted. According to the concept, the share of enterprises implementing technological innovations should increase from 13% in 2007 to 40%-50% by 2020. The concept has remained wishful thinking and there has been no significant progress in innovation. The same fate befell other major government decisions. But government programs continue to build and accumulate a number of initiatives. To this end, national projects 2019-2024, priority programs, federal development institutions and regional development institutions have been developed. There are also single important projects for which budget funds have been allocated.

The state’s attempts to act as an initiator and catalyst for development, including through the implementation of priority national projects, do not hold potential or guarantees for breakthrough development. Efforts at the federal level can be characterized as another project of benign political significance, similar to recent but now shamefully forgotten projects of innovation and innovative development. The private sector, to which resources have been transferred in the course of radical privatization that is historically unprecedented in scope and pace, has assumed a predominantly parasitic - compraditory - position. It is not interested in the development of the domestic economy. The state, which periodically initiates breakthrough development, no longer has the resources to do so. This is the deepest contradiction of economic policy at the federal level, and there is no prospect of its solution.

State-level initiatives for breakthrough development are impressive in their conception, scope, and funding levels. However, there is a question about their effectiveness. There is no guarantee that the level of effectiveness and implementation of the new initiatives will be higher than that

of previous initiatives at the same level unless the economic system changes at its core and the implementation mechanism changes significantly.

The initiatives of the country's leadership with the aim of triggering and driving development from the economic policy point of view belong to the stimulative financial policy and aim at the country's breakthrough technological and socio-economic development. However, it is hindered by monetary policy, which is the opposite of this. The central bank has placed the inflation target at the center of its policy, which is one of the classic tools of a containment policy. The simultaneous implementation of two opposing policies can only lead to an ineffective use of resources. But a third force affecting the outcome of the national economy must also be taken into account. This is big capital, headed by the oligarchic layer. It appropriates the sources of income and transfers them abroad. It is a mechanism of "leakage" rather than "injection" into the national economy. The economic policy resulting from the interaction of three differently directed forces: stimulating, inhibiting and comprading, cannot be effective by definition. This is one of the manifestations of the economic system on the surface of its functioning.

Conclusions

Russia's economic system is fundamentally distorted at the level of ownership. The interests of the vested interests are not organically connected with the initiatives of the subjects of Russia's pioneering technological development. Nor are they related to the interests of economic subjects alienated from ownership of capital and natural resources. The system, flawed from the base to the specific level of functioning of the economy, does not contain the potential for breakthrough development. And the effort to flood it with more and more money (coming mainly from resources) will not solve the systemic problem.

In this regard, economic science faces the ambitious task of developing the Russian economic model itself, taking into account its peculiarities and the direction of the relevant transformations. Research is being conducted in this direction, but the task is complex and requires the mobilization of great scientific potential. A breakthrough development is possible only if the interests of the main "players" are reconciled. And the solution of this level of problems is connected with redistribution of property or economic power and social structure of society. Any changes in the present should be directed towards goals in the future. If there are no clear goals, change is meaningless. In an aimless movement, one of the economic winds can only be a tailwind. But even with clear goals, the strategy and tactics of successive steps along the way must be worked out coherently.

To move toward new models of the economic system, it is necessary to identify the transitional states through which the real existing system must pass and which social forces will drive this process. This is an ambitious scientific project that requires the mobilization of large research resources. But without such work, none of the options and concepts for a new model of the economic system can be considered full and complete.

References

- Belyaev S., Koshkin V. (2020) Can the economy be solidary? *Expert*. No. 14 (1158). (in Russ.)
- Bodrunov S.D. (2020) *Noonomy: the trajectory of global transformation*. Moscow: Kul'turnaya Revolutsiya Publ. (In Russ.)
- Kretov S. (2019). *Theory and practice of coexistence of human with nature*. Moscow: Dobrotvorenje Publ. 1370 p. (In Russ.)

- Polterovich V.M. (2012). *Privatization and the rational ownership structure*. Ch. 1. Economics of Contemporary Russia. No. 4 (59), pp. 7–23. (In Russ.)
- Polterovich V.M. (2013). *Privatization and the rational ownership structure*. Ch. 2. Rationalization of the ownership structure. Economics of Contemporary Russia. No. 1. (In Russ.)
- Russian statistical yearbook (2020) p. 314. (In Russ.)
- Subetto A.I. (2007). *V. I. Vernadsky: from the beginning of the noosphere-oriented synthesis of sciences – to the Vernadskian revolution in the system of scientific worldview at the beginning of the 21st century and to the formation of noospherism at the beginning of the XXI century and to the formation of noospherism*. Kostroma: Nekrasov Kostroma State University Publ. 105 p. (In Russ.)
- Shvab K. (2017). *Fourth industrial revolution*. Moscow. pp. 19–20. (In Russ.)
- Analysis of the processes of privatization of state property in the Russian Federation for the period 1993-2003 (expert-analytical event). URL: <http://nationalization.ru/biblioteka/Analiz-processov-privatizacii-gosudarstvennoj-sobstvennosti-v-rossijskoj-federacii-za-period-1993-2003-gody.pdf>. (In Russ.).

Information about the author

Kaysyn A. Khubiev

Dr. Sc. (Econ.), Professor of the Political Economy Department, Faculty of Economics of Lomonosov Moscow State University (1 Leninskie gory, Moscow, 119991, Russia)
E-mail: khubiev48@mail.ru