

Theoretical-Methodological Preconditions for the Formation of Mixed Economy in the Russian Federation*



Aleksandr Ivanovich

TATARKIN

RAS Academician, Professor

Institute of Economics, Ural Branch of RAS

29, Moskovskaya Street, Yekaterinburg, Sverdlovsk Oblast, 620014, Russian Federation

tatarkin_ai@mail.ru

Abstract. The article presents the author's point of view on the formation of the mixed (convergent, double-track) model of socio-economic and community development in the Russian Federation – as inherent in the federal state with multinational population, open space, and diversified economic orders determined by historical and national-cultural traditions. The author's stance is based on the widely discussed and debated thesis about the necessity of organic combination of primary state regulation of macroeconomic processes with predominant market self-regulation of microeconomic processes. The framework of the mixed model of socio-economic and community development presupposes more active and effective use of the “point” state regulation in the creation of favorable and equal conditions for the systematic development of all forms (private, with public participation) of business and the expansion of the “corridor of opportunities” for the spatial development of all regions and the improvement of quality and standard of living of the Russian population (regardless of place of residence and position). The article substantiates theoretical and methodological possibility of successful implementation of the mixed model in the Russian Federation.

Key words: theoretical-methodological directions of socio-economic development regulation, their role in regulation, liberal-market, state-planned, mixed regulation, their strengths and “failures”, regulatory potential of the society, quality of regulatory impact and its “boundaries”, assessment of regulatory impact efficiency.

* The article was prepared under the financial support of the Ural Branch of RAS Program No. 14.

Great nations are never impoverished by private, though they sometimes are by public prodigality and misconduct.

Adam Smith. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* [1, p. 349].

World and domestic literature actively discusses the increasing role of regulating influence of society and the state on socio-economic and community processes for the purpose of improving sustainability, consistency and effectiveness of social development [2, pp. 96-100; 3]; authors discuss different methodologies and propose their own methods for assessing the quality and effectiveness of government's regulatory impact on socio-economic and social processes [4; 5]; researchers substantiate proposals for the improvement of legal institutions in order to achieve saving mode and sustainable development [6; 7; 8]. They offer to use mathematical models for achieving the "optimality of the developed regulatory solution" [4; 9]; "the failure of current Russian economic system and the errors of its design are explained with the help of economic and mathematical modeling" [10, p. 2 (summary)].

All this gives reason to believe that the issue concerning the quality of managing socio-economic and community development requires the following efforts to be implemented: first, it should be continuously and professionally updated in order to improve the quality and effectiveness of regulation taking into account changing conditions (international and domestic); second, it should be constantly "focused" on the optimization of public expenditures for the maintenance of the state

apparatus, effective and efficient spending of public investment and preferential credit resources, the implementation of the comprehensive saving regime as the decisive condition for the stability and competitiveness of any market system; third, it requires the active and comprehensive use of innovation factors and development sources of leading branches of the real sector of the economy and all levels of management and regulation. This requires not so much to carry out constant reforms that to "adjust" science (academic, applied, sectoral), education (general, vocational, higher), health and other social sectors to suit the needs of sustainable and socially-oriented development of the Russian Federation.

Theoretical approaches to the choice of regulatory models for socio-economic development in different countries

Traditionally, every country has many regulatory impacts on all the subjects and participants of the market and uses them in the interests of comprehensive and sustainable development, focusing on historical, national, cultural and other traditions and the way of life of the population and the priorities for their conservation and development. A significant role in the choice of development priorities belongs to the power structure (unitary, federal, confederal), and the form of government (monarchy, presidential republic, parliamentary republic). On the other hand, every country relies on the structural, spatial, infrastructural, social and other features that require urgent solving in order to maintain development consistency and sustainability. Depending on these features, we can classify

basic theoretical approaches and regulatory models (regulators) in three integrated groups.

The market model (liberal-market model) – one of the earliest models; it is a largely effective and universal model of regulatory impact on socio-economic and public processes; its development was based on several theoretical directions and schools. The most famous of them is the so-called School of Salamanca (Juan de Matienzo, Juan de Lugo, etc.) that prevailed in the 16th – 17th centuries and was considered the founder of the theory of free markets with competitive rivalry and absolute freedom of market agents. The role of government regulation consisted in creating conditions for free entrepreneurship and limiting outside competitors. From the late 17th up to the early 20th century, all national market systems developed in the framework of the classical school founded by great economists such as William Petty, Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Jean-Baptiste Say. In their view, the use of *laissez-faire* principles and absolute freedom of market automatically provide effective distribution of the goods (services, works) according to Pareto. Their main postulate of market self-regulation is based on the assumption that overproduction in the market economy is impossible in principle, because, with the help of market mechanisms and “the invisible hand” (A. Smith), production would automatically generate its own demand and support (again automatically!) the balance on the national market.

By the way, the “invisible hand of the market” is used by Adam Smith in an entirely different sense, not in terms of recognizing the

market as the universal and the only effective regulator, but as a mechanism capable of providing “support to domestic industry” through achieving private economic interest in the production and appropriation of surplus value. A. Smith continues: “He (the owner of capital. – A. T.) generally, indeed, neither intends to promote the public interest, nor knows how much he is promoting it.... He intends only his own security... He intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention...” [1, p. 443]. A. Smith consistently spoke against restrictions of the freedom of entrepreneurial self-regulation, including the restrictions of monopolization of the economy, excessive government intervention, increased public spending.

The Cambridge Scientific School of Alfred Marshall and other prominent economists emerged in the 19th century and gained popularity in the 20th century. A. Marshall considers free competition – a special institution of self-organization and self-regulation – as a special form of freedom of production and entrepreneurship. Free competition is presented as a way of organization that ensuring optimum allocation of labor and resources between market agents.

Representatives of the Austrian School of Economics (Friedrich von Hayek, Ludwig von Mises, Benjamin Anderson and others, 19th – 20th century) carried out their theoretical studies proceeding from the proposition that effective exchange and efficient use of resources are possible only through the price mechanism on the market that is free from

state intervention. The price mechanism, in their opinion, is able to optimally share and synchronize common and personal knowledge, allowing society to achieve the highest results at the expense of self-organization. The Chicago School (Milton Friedman, Arnold Harberger and others) is considered close to the Austrian School. The central idea of the Chicago School is the decentralization of power and transfer of power to the grassroots level, because, in their opinion, there is a direct dependence of economic growth on the level of economic freedom of the population and market agents.

The state-planned model of regulation of socio-economic and market relations and processes. Two scientific schools are of interest in this group. Representatives of the Romantic School in economics (Jean Charles Léonard de Sismondi, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon) proceeded from the premise that “the invisible hand” of the market does not necessarily endorse the equilibrium, neither does the strive to increase personal income. Hence the necessity of the regulatory intervention of the state for “smoothing the suffering of the population” in times of crises that result from advanced development of production.

The prominent representatives of the Marxist school of thought (Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Karl Kautsky, Vladimir Lenin and others) insisted that only the socialization of property and the systematic regulation of reproduction processes were able to eliminate “anarchy” and “distortions” of the market and provide comprehensive and sustainable socio-economic and social development.

The mixed model of optimal and flexible combination of state regulation of macro-economic parameters of socio-economic and social development with market self-regulation at the micro level.

Many authors consider it as a double track or converging economy. Pitirim Sorokin, an American sociologist of Russian origin, is considered the founder of this model. His ideas are being implemented quite successfully in Sweden, Finland, China, Kazakhstan, Belarus and other countries. The mixed model of regulatory impact on the socio-economic development has its own relatively autonomous scientific schools and research directions. In particular, Keynesian economics (John Keynes, Joan Hicks, Joan Robinson and others) based its research on the inevitability of economic crises and their cyclic nature in the conditions of market overproduction, which makes the participation of the state and its regulatory and supervisory capabilities inevitable for maintaining sustainability and balance of supply and demand. Representatives of the scientific direction of convergence (rapprochement) of the capitalist market and the state planning regulatory systems (John Galbraith, Thorstein Veblen and others) rely on the inevitable convergence of the two regulatory models by borrowing each other’s positive qualities in order to form a post-industrial society, free from market and planned defects [11, p. 27, 28].

A brief overview of the most discussed models of socio-economic and community development allows us to allocate common features that unite them and essential features that separate them. The uniting element for

all the schools and their proposed regulatory models is the search for the most effective (from the point of view of costs) and efficient (from the standpoint of the end result) government regulators (GR) and market regulators (MR) that correspond to the national and historical specifics of the country and the mentality of the majority of its population. At that, other models and approaches are usually rejected on ideological, political and moral, i.e. non-economic, grounds. All of the above models and schools are separated, in our opinion, by the lack of will to realize the obvious truth: nature and society do not and cannot have any phenomenon (process, model, relation, institute, mechanism, etc.) with only positive or only negative properties or characteristics, just like there is and can be no atom with only positive or only negative charge. Especially if we talk about regulating the problem of socio-economic development, where even a small growth factor may be decisive in competitive struggle.

The dialectics of development of any phenomenon (process, institution, relationship) is based on the “struggle of opposites”, which become, when regulated professionally, the source of their sustainable and systemic development. The lack of professionalism inevitably slows the development and reduces its effectiveness. That is why we propose to consider the regulating potential of society in the unity of all existing and current forms of institutions and patterns of regulatory impact of the actors (government, its competent bodies, market agents) on socio-economic and public processes in order to achieve a predictable end result (promotion of

sustainable and balanced economic growth, modernization upgrading of production, economic restructuring, promotion of social harmony in the society, improvement of the quality of life).

The practice of recent years shows that the proposed representation of the regulatory potential of the society requires its greater specification with regard to different levels of social and public construction, private companies and monopolistic associations, public associations and civil society institutions. Special forms of regulating influence should be applied to regions and municipalities, financial and fiscal systems, spatial formations (agglomerations, economic zones, territories of priority development, cluster associations, innovation centers, etc.), small and medium businesses, especially in the agro-industrial complex.

We shall make an attempt to understand from the theoretical and methodological aspect how efficiently and effectively the regulatory potential in the Russian Federation is used and what prevents its full, efficient and effective use in the interests of the system and sustainable development for the common good?

Methodological approaches to the evaluation of criteria for assessing the quality and effectiveness of economic regulators

There is a widely accepted theoretical postulate that economic regulators can have different impacts on socio-economic and community development. First, they are able to promote and motivate the development of society in the desired direction and the achievement of desired results, if they

objectively take into account external conditions and no less objectively assess the resource potential of society. Second, the regulatory effect may be an impediment to socio-economic and community development because of the low quality of the regulator, formal evaluation of the final result of the regulatory impact, lack of professionalism in the development and use of the regulator. Russia knows a lot of various examples of such deterrence: for instance, a purely subjective “desire” of government officials to raise the prices and tariffs on gas, electricity, rail transport and utilities by 8–31% in 2011–2020 rather than raise salaries, pensions and child allowances; or the increase in insurance and pension contributions of small businesses and individual entrepreneurs that has led to a sharp reduction in their numbers, and the slowdown of business activity in all the regions and municipalities.

Third, given its poor scientific elaboration, the regulatory impact can serve as an artificial “barrier” to comprehensive sustainable socio-economic development as a whole and its separate directions. According to T. Fomichenkov, “500 thousand or even a million people can be additionally involved in small business, if the tax system is properly adjusted and regulated” [12, p. 5]. Unfortunately, the Russian government often delays the “adjustments”, as it happened to its latest promise (it is already February 2016, but the regulation has not started yet!), or these “adjustments” cause significant damage to market agents, people and society as a whole. The fact that the RF Government more than twice raised the amount of the fixed

insurance premium for compulsory pension insurance for individual entrepreneurs and did it without any professional preparation has caused a sharp decline in the number of these entrepreneurs: in the Vladimir Oblast – 6,800, in the Kirov Oblast – 6,493, in the Republic of Buryatia – 4,133, in the Tomsk Oblast – 4,000, in the Kaliningrad Oblast – 2,872, in the Bryansk Oblast – 7,557 [13, p. 1, 3].

A regulatory decision that was prepared non-professionally not only “tossed” more than 100 thousand people from economic activity, depriving individual entrepreneurs (and their employees) of the source of income, but also did not help achieve the goal of filling “to the brim” the insurance part of the pension fund. Moreover, considerable damage was inflicted on regional and municipal budgets. According to Yu. Roslyak, an auditor at the Accounts Chamber, the budgets of the Belgorod Oblast lost 247 million rubles, Vladimir Oblast – 46 million rubles, Kirov Oblast – 28 million rubles [ibidem, p. 3] thanks to the “regulatory innovations of the government”. And these are only direct taxes. And what damage has been done to business?

Conclusion in such cases arises is straightforward: the unprofessional and often formal attitude of the power elite to the state regulators costs the Russian society too much.

The Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs (RUIE) has serious complaints about the quality of state regulation. The main problem, according to the Union, is the shortage of skilled staff and insufficient research on the regulatory decisions adopted by the government [14, pp. 38–41]. Judging by

the results of the survey of members of RUIE, the problem of price and tariff regulation continues to be the main “deterrent” factor in business development. More than 38% of the respondents expressed concern over the following facts: the growing “lack of control”, the growth of prices and tariffs (to some extent “lobbied” by the government), the creation of preferential price and tariff conditions for individual companies by government authorities, the lack of effective regulators of price actions of intermediaries. The representatives of business suggest a wider use of “price, investment, tax and credit incentives” for import substitution, development of innovative and competitive products, modernization and reindustrialization of domestic economy.

Business representatives, heads of regions and municipalities, scientific and educational community, and the majority of Russian citizens are concerned about the task of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of regulatory influence of the government on socio-economic and community development. There are different forms of social evaluation of the regulatory impact projects: on the one hand, their approval by the community, the conditions of which are changing (for instance, the meeting of Alla Pugacheva [a famous Soviet and Russian singer and producer. – Translator’s note] with the State Duma deputies), the transition to the project management with scientific justification of the aim and the end result, appointment of persons responsible for support of the project and for monitoring its implementation; on the other hand, the rejection of any

regulatory reforms and initiatives “imposed” on the society without serious scientific and legal expertise and public endorsement. We consider the viewpoint of Herman Gref to be most representative: opening the discussion at the Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum, he said: “The only difference between successful and non-successful countries is the quality of their state apparatus and its management. History knows cases when the state had all the resources and remained poor for centuries. There are states that do not have the resources, but due to the quality of public administration they achieved significant success in the development and well-being” [15, p. 17]. Foreign politicians and representatives of the business community have to point out the need for increased attention of the Russian leadership to the issue of the quality and effectiveness of state regulatory impact on the socio-economic and community processes.

Delivering his speech at the Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum, a former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair said that comprehensive transformation of society required the methodology of reforms that would be crucial for achieving the forecast result. “You need to have the tools for the implementation of reforms that will help people understand what you do, and help your country to follow you” [15, p. 19]. Lim Siong Guan (President of Government of Singapore Investment Corporation, Singapore) supported this idea and pointed out that “the government’s goals should reflect the needs of society in general and... attract professionals to achieve these goals” [ibidem, p. 20]. At the

Saint Petersburg Forum and then at the Gaidar Forum it was noted that in order to focus Russia's economy on the path of sustainable development it will be necessary to restructure the economy, to reform and upgrade the government (by involving professionals in it), which must finally determine its course (model) and work on the basis of trust to improve business innovation and investment climate. The fact that this has not been done so far, is regarded by foreign and domestic experts as one of the most serious flaws of the Russian political leadership [16, p. 1, 2]. "Of course, we carried out modernization, but not at the pace that could be, if we did not have such social spending", – said Dmitri Medvedev, adding that the welfare is increasing faster than the growth of the economy [16, p. 2].

Quite a long period of development of most countries that use different models of the market system of economic management suggests that each model has not only the drawbacks that were extensively analyzed and the society and the state tried to minimize them. Each state defined and worked out the models of market development that take into account the historical, national-cultural, structural-industrial, spatial, scientific, educational and other features that make public bodies more responsive to the needs of all population groups and contribute to their fulfilment. The countries with developed market economy use mainly two models: the liberal economic model (LEM) and the model of the social market state (MSMS), each of which has advantages and disadvantages, discussed in detail by V.A. Kashin [6, pp. 47-62].

Any market system has its national advantages that are to be understood professionally and used comprehensively in the interests of sustainable development and improvement of the welfare of the entire population; this should become a driving force of the activities of Russia's authorities. What are the advantages of the market system that make it attractive to many countries, including former socialist states?

Let us highlight the advantages that are the most significant and the most important for development, but still often disregarded by the Russian leadership and officials.

1. Private initiative and entrepreneurship of the majority of the population in conditions of market competition becomes the "engine" of innovation development of production and formation of the economy based on the latest knowledge; this is why their systemic government support should be the norm and not the exception.

2. Private initiative and entrepreneurship involves labor, money and resources saving. The action of the universal law of economy of time in a market system turns into the crucial source of systemic and sustainable socio-economic and community development. No doubt, stability is often disturbed by economic crises of overproduction, which, in our opinion, is the further evidence of "imbalance" of the efforts of government and business in their consistent regulation of socio-economic development. This essential axiom of any market, unfortunately, still does not find understanding with the Russian leadership. The call for the Russian authorities to reduce government spending and optimize

the state apparatus can be considered a positive recommendation voiced at the Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum. Current government spending amounts to 40% of the country's GDP, more than 32% of them go to the maintenance of the state apparatus, which is 2.5 times higher than in the U.S. (13%), three times higher than in Germany (11%), three times higher than in the UK (10%) [22, p. 69].

3. Private initiative and entrepreneurship help develop the most competitive sectors of the national industry systematically and at a high technological level, turning them into an engine of socio-economic and community development, increasing international recognition of the country.

4. Free market pricing should be controlled by society represented by the government. The "price range" set by many states (including the U.S.) for socially important goods and services was designed not only to limit their production, but to support the social well-being of the majority of the population in the globalizing and rapidly changing world community.

5. The problem of social welfare is solved in the countries with the developed market system taking into account historical and national-cultural traditions. Under the conditions of LEM, as V.A. Kashin notes, the fundamental basis of social security of citizens is decent salary (the minimum amount of which is regulated by the government) and their social insurance, i.e. government involvement in social services is limited. The state "takes care of the citizens only in case of insured events – when they are physically

not capable to provide for themselves (due to illness, disability, etc.). In other cases, the citizens who are able to work should solve their social problems on their own..." [6, p. 51].

When the SMS model is used, the government, on the contrary, assumes all the costs of organizing and financing (full or partial) the social security of its citizens regardless of their status and income. Both the first and the second models have their advantages and drawbacks; therefore, this question can not be resolved without the support of the majority of the population. Thus, even in the framework of the model of the SMS model there are the Swedish, German, Greek and other national models. The Russian Federation government has its own attitude toward social welfare of the population.

According to the Constitution, the Russian Federation is a "social state", but in fact and judging by its policy, especially in recent years, it is hard to agree with that. The Russian leadership regularly talks about the necessity to improve the quality of social support, adjusting it to different national models, is designed more to reduce budget funding of the social sphere, to depart from the constitutional norm by shifting the "concerns about social well-being" to the Russian population itself, which is in a very difficult financial situation. According to estimates [17, pp. 44–60], since 2014 unemployment rate has been increasing, prices of goods and foodstuffs have been growing, as well as the tariffs on utilities and other services. These processes inevitably "spur" inflation, devaluing the already meagre savings of the Russian population, and limiting

the standard of living and quality of life in comparison with the populations of other countries.

No doubt, the Russian society needs reforms, especially those that can change the lives of the majority of the population for the better. Scientific analysis and practice of successful implementation of planned reforms (Alexei Kosygin's reforms in the Soviet Union, Lee Kuan Yew's reforms in Singapore, reforms in newly industrialized countries, reforms in China, India, Brazil, etc.) help generate a model for designing reforms and develop a road map for phased project implementation oriented on the final result.

Designing the reforms in transition economies: from the project to the road map of step-by-step implementation of the final result

The reform of the state sector, economy and social sphere of the Russian Federation, active formation and use of market institutions of spatial development and spatial planning started in 1992 and is still going on. During this period, several reforms were initiated in different spheres and segments of the Russian society, but only one of them was brought to its logical conclusion, and its result is questionable: the majority of state enterprises were privatized, but the country and the economy, unfortunately, did not get "effective owners". Even a small excursion into the history of reformation of the Russian society suggests that the failures of the majority of conducted reforms were due to their weak and often extremely formal and professional preparation and execution – not so much to achieve socially significant results, as to make a report to one's superior. In such a way the

following reforms were initiated: the reform of the education system (general, vocational and higher education), healthcare reform, the reform of the Russian Academy of Sciences, which, after short interruptions, are still going on today, and the society still cannot feel or evaluate any positive effect of these reforms.

Reforming a large and complex socio-economic and community system like that in the Russian Federation, indeed, is a complicated and time-consuming process. It is almost impossible to rebuild from scratch and quickly "a complex system so that it initially became effective; it is not possible to reform a complex system radically (be it a country, a system of federative relations, local self-government, education, healthcare, housing and utilities or the Russian Academy of Sciences, etc. – A. T.) so that it became effective" [19, pp. 50-53]. A system is considered to be complex, first, because it is the result of long evolutionary transformation and development. Systemic reform of such objects is always considered as an inevitable return to the origins of their high performance in previous periods and as the simulation of possible development scenarios to meet changing conditions until the final decision on the need for reform.

Scientific community pays much attention to the issue of social development reforms regulated by the government [see: 10; 18; 20]. Scientists substantiate and propose different approaches, models and sequences of organizing, designing and implementing the reforms using the most effective marketing and planning institutions and mechanisms of their implementation to achieve the designed

result. We agree with RAS Academician V.M. Polterovich who proposes to begin the reforms with the development and understanding of the most important elements of the reform theory, so as not to “wander senselessly” in the mazes of darkness deprived of the light of theoretical knowledge [20]. World experience of successful reforms allows us to work out a definite road map for designing the reforms and the step-by-step implementation of the project focused on the result.

1. Execution of the comprehensive analysis of the state of the object of regulation (reform) (for instance, objects such as general and higher professional education system, healthcare, the Russian Academy of Sciences, municipalities, etc.) with the involvement of experts and academic community representatives and determination of its weak and strong sides. The second stage should identify “the causes of weakness of the system” and identify the real measures for their reduction (minimization) from the professional point of view; in this case it is also necessary to define professionally the measures to “reinforce and enhance” the strengths of the system. In our opinion, the next step is to offer the professional community to discuss and identify opportunities and mechanisms for quality updates of the system to achieve a given public outcome of its functioning. According to the results of this discussion, relevant decisions can be made concerning the partial reform of the system through its optimization, increase of professional level of employees (managers), improvement of the structure and motivation of labor, etc.

We think that the continuing practice of administrative reform is explained by the “substitution” of the issue of increasing the quality and effectiveness in the functioning of the system with the cynical reduction of its financing from the budget. But this does not solve the issue; on the contrary, it exacerbates the problem, making it not only challenging, but also more costly and long-lasting [32; 33].

2. The formation of achievable goals and socially significant end result (economic, social, environmental) of the reforms understandable to every citizen, so that the residents could see themselves as part of the projected reforms and assess their own (family, corporate, group, national) interest in the success of the reforms and in the achievement of the goals. Brashness in the initiation of reforms, their insufficient elaboration and often the complete lack of preparation in the absence of clear targets and projected results perceived by the majority of the population, and inconsistency in the implementation of the reforms have turned the recent reforms carried out by the Russian government into “the games of reforms”, the hidden purpose of which is to shift to the population and business the increasing costs, unprofessional regulation and control of social development.

It is noteworthy to pay attention to the evaluation of the quality of state regulation of socio-economic and community processes in Russia presented by former Minister and Deputy Head of the Government of the Russian Federation Alexei Kudrin, who was also the initiator of budgetary funds centralization and abandonment of fiscal self-sufficiency of regional and municipal

authorities. Commenting on the results of the audit carried out by the Prosecutor General's Office regarding the use of budget funds and on the decision of the RF Government to attract businesses and people to control budget spending, Alexei Kudrin admits that "the efficiency of the government does not depend on the work of official control bodies like the Accounts Chamber and Gosfintnadzor (Federal Service for Fiscal and Budgetary Supervision of the Russian Federation)... We all pay taxes, but we don't always ask about where the money received by the Treasury go. The government can't be effective without this form of control of the expenditure of budgetary funds" [cit. by: 13, p. 1, 2]. Herman Gref agrees with that and suggests that the Government of the Russian Federation should establish "the Center for change management" that would be professionally engaged in designing and implementing the reforms through the attraction of science and by relying on public opinion [cit. by: 22, pp. 63-65].

3. The project as one of the effective institutions of program-project planning with the use of various forms of public-private partnerships can be the most effective mechanism of target-setting, sequence (phasing), resource and staffing and the final public significant result of the reform [8, pp. 9-27; 23, pp. 19-25]. A professionally elaborated project must undergo scientific and legal examination as to its relevance and provision with resources and personnel, and compliance with the Constitution of the Russian Federation. The representatives of the scientific community can, and should be involved in the development

of the project from the moment the project ideas are discussed and up to the evaluation of its results. The Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation may and must carry out the legal examination on compliance of the project with the Constitution of the Russian Federation, and if the conclusion is positive, it should be regarded as the permission to carry out the reform.

In order to improve the quality of projects it is proposed to establish specialized project institutes and/or design bureaus, which "must involve not only engineers, economists, managers, but also demographers, sociologists, lawyers, etc. But the management of the project, its development and implementation should be carried out on the principles of undivided authority" [21, p. 12]. We agree with the opinion of Academician V.L. Makarov who points out that a project should be supervised by the general or chief designer, a professional in engineering business and project development. "And a manager, a specialist in business can be the second person..." According to the author, the project supervisor "should keep in mind the main thing – the achievement of the goal. And if the project is supervised by a manager or a businessman, than whatever the original purpose, they will seek to gain profit... This is impossible in a purely market economy, because everyone wants to obtain profit rather than implement a project objective" (our italics. – A. T.) [ibidem]. The privatization of objects of state and municipal property, the establishment of RUSNANO and SKOLKOVO with the "curators" of business are the telling examples in this regard.

The assessment of the project's compliance with public needs, the relevance of its goals and the tangibility of achieving the end result is one of the possible and, in some areas, mandatory directions of participation of scientists in public discussions of the project. Before the "launch" of the project, it is advisable to scientifically assess the completeness and effectiveness of relevant forms, mechanisms and institutions of support of the processes of implementation, monitoring and adjustment of the project under the influence of the changing environment. It is necessary to forecast the impact of project implementation for the whole country, its population, and status in the world community.

4. Any management decision designed to regulate socio-economic and/or community processes and relations must comply with the Constitution of the Russian Federation. Strict compliance of the developed and implemented project (law, decree, regulation and other normative acts) with the constitutional norms of the Russian Federation requires, in our view, a mandatory expert examination of the project by the Russian Constitutional Court and a public disclosure. Seemingly harmless deviations from the constitutional norms concerning the elections of deputies to the legislative assemblies at various levels on the party lists have become a "snowball" of solid and increasingly dangerous "disregard" of the will of the people. Abandonment of direct elections of governors, the establishment of institution of city managers in municipalities, the change of the terms of elections of deputies and the President, the fact that metropolitan centers of regions are turned into a kind

of "hybrid" of local government and its administrative regulation allow us to speak about serious flaws in the Russian practice of civilized and optimal regulation of social processes.

The Constitution of the Russian Federation states: "The bearer of sovereignty and the only source of power in the Russian Federation shall be its multinational people" [25, Article 3, Item 1]. The same article (Item 3) states that "the supreme direct expression of the power of the people shall be referenda and free elections, without any restriction and derogation, since "no one may usurp power in the Russian Federation. Seizure of power or usurping state authority shall be prosecuted under federal law" [ibidem, Item 4]. The Constitution of the Russian Federation as the Basic law is obligatory for observance and execution by all Russian citizens – from ordinary people to MPs and the President of the Russian Federation, for according to the Constitution, the President is its Guarantor [Article 80, Item 2] with all that it implies. If we compare Russia's recent and ongoing reforms with what is stated in the Russian Constitution, it appears that many of the reforms (education system, healthcare, higher education, the Russian Academy of Sciences, the limitations of the constitutional rights of local authorities, etc.) are carried out with deviation from the procedures prescribed by the Constitution.

Experts, politicians and top leaders of the country pointed out many times that one can criticize the Constitution, demand its revision and refinement, "adjusting" it to different current needs. But the Constitution is

recognized as the Basic law so that any attempt to modify, clarify or cancel its provisions requires a special procedure in the form of the public referendum. And only the referendum can make changes legitimate and make it the duty of all to accept and obey them., Russian President Vladimir Putin at the meeting with the constitutionalists admitted that the Constitution “is not a law that can be changed and altered to accommodate the current events...” [cit. ex.: *Kommersant Newspaper*, 2013, no. 210, November 15, pp. 1-2].

5. Any governing norm, if it aims to change the already established rules, norms and regulation of conduct of staff, community or institutionalized population groups should be discussed and approved by the community, whose conditions of functioning can change. And only with the consent of the community can the regulatory norm be formally adopted by an appropriate authority. Here is a telling example: the attempt of the State Duma to change the conditions of concert activity in the Russian Federation without the coordination with the creative community aroused indignation on the part of representatives of the entertainment sphere. “This is criminal indifference! – Alla Pugacheva said at the meeting with the Duma deputies. – We (the artists with whom the authorities have not even bother to consult. – A. T.) are the serfs like animals that will accept anything that will be done!.. Any excessive orderliness always leads to a mess” [cit. ex.: *The Arguments and Facts Newspaper*, 2016, no. 5, February 3-9, p. 2]. Ultimately, the draft law had to be brought back for revision. Indeed, we can defend our professional interests when we want to!

The current practice of initiating, discussing and adopting such regulations stems from the presumption of the “rule of the power over the people”; this presumption contradicts the Constitution (Article 3, Item 1): “The bearer of sovereignty and the only source of power in the Russian Federation shall be its multinational people”. If we strictly follow the Constitution, then the laws adopted by the Federal Legislative Assembly and aimed to reform the Russian Academy of Sciences, to change the status and working conditions of employees of schools and universities, to impose legislative restrictions on the rights of the population to free health care and others violate the Basic law, because they are adopted without discussion and approval by the professional Community and without their discussion at the referendum.

The proposed practice of improving the quality of regulation of social processes will require that the government work out draft laws more professionally, it should also involve representatives of science, business, public and creative associations and unions, and the public from regions and municipalities in the elaboration and discussion of draft laws. First, this practice will significantly improve the quality of state-legal regulators by carrying out a more objective assessment of the need to update the regulatory impact to support the sustainability, balance and social orientation of development. The quality of regulatory impact in the context of globalization and updating of domestic sources and development becomes a priority for the Russian Federation. It is the quality of public administration and regulation of social processes in the absence of social

and public beneficial results of the reform of “all” limits the opportunities for Russia’s sustainable and systemic development.

Second, this practice will enhance responsibility and motivate the authorities, officials and developers of regulations to take more responsibility for their quality, also with the help of scientific and professional expertise, discussion and consideration of proposals, monitoring of implementation and achievement of the goal. The proposal will be implemented more efficiently and effectively if the current project defines initiators, motives and the appropriateness of taking regulatory decisions, developers and experts, forecast outcomes (results) of its implementation.

Third, this practice will significantly strengthen the confidence of the population and the entire Russian community to the government and its policies on the development of democratic principles in the administration of community development. Not a very long practice of using the institution of “feedback” of the municipal authorities of Yekaterinburg and its urban community has shown and proved that this institution is able to contribute new impulses to the processes of system-wide and accelerated development of not only large cities and municipalities, but also regions, federal districts and the country as a whole. The impulses based on mutual respect between the government that adequately represents people’s interests and the people who elected it, can become an additional and significant source of development. The institution of “feedback” can be compared to the “road with the meeting of traffic” which speeds up traffic and makes it more comfortable and safe,

without traffic jams and other impediments to sustainable movement.

6. We believe that the reasonably optimal combination and use of planned and market institutions and mechanisms of regulatory impact on reforming processes is a compulsory theoretical and methodological requirement for any reform carried out in the Russian Federation. This should be done not only for the purpose of involving in the reform the maximum number of citizens that represent a diversity of views on the model (market or planned) of Russia’s socio-economic development. It seems that the main reason lies in the fact that in modern conditions there is no country that would not use the elements of the mixed (convergent, double track) models of socio-economic development. The differences are seen in the share of market (free) or planned (public) regulators in maintaining the sustainability of socio-economic and community development processes. In France, the UK, Japan and many other developed countries there are planning commissions, committees, ministries, etc. engaged in state planning.

In the U.S., for example, there are many liberal market institutions and mechanisms; as for state regulators, they are used, on the one hand, to create and maintain equal macroeconomic conditions for sustainable development of all forms of business through participation in the regulation of loan and mortgage rates, competitive placement of state orders, etc. On the other hand, state regulators are used for regulating social processes by establishing a minimum hourly wage for employees, price caps for socially

important goods and services to the population, development of environmental standards and strict control over their observance.

The position of the UK, a country with more than two hundred years of practice of market liberal economic model (LEM), is a telling example. In March 2012, the UK published a draft government document on the further development and refinement of the system of planned management of socio-economic development headlined “National Planning Policy Framework”, which defines procedures for the development of plans of different levels, harmonization of national, regional and local development priorities with the participation of the population and business, etc. The document from the state positions raises the national issue of the necessity of compliance with the requirements of environmental protection and promotion of sustainable growth. Greg Clark, the UK Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, drew attention to the focus of the document on the achievement of goals, he said in the foreword: “The purpose of planning is to help achieve sustainable development. Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves don’t mean worse lives for future generations... So sustainable development is about positive growth – making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations. The planning system is about helping to make this happen. Development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay – a presumption in favor of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan, and every decision...” [cit. ex.: 26, p. 169].

The draft document was discussed by experts, representatives of business, academia and the public for about a year. In general, it received positive assessments, and a lot of ideas were put forward, which were reflected either in the plan, or in some other solutions.

An example of systemic sustainable development of Singapore is also instructive, it combines market and planned institutions and mechanisms in a smart way. In his book “From Third World to First: The Singapore Story” [27], Lee Kuan Yew, the initiator and head of the government of reformers, says their success is due to two essential requirements. First: the design and successful implementation of reforms requires a team of professionals and its constant renewal under changing priorities and conditions for development. Second: continuous feedback between the authorities and population helps find compromise solutions even in the most difficult and complex situations.

The state legal regulator, like any other governing document, has its life cycle; therefore, it objectively requires continuous and timely upgrade or replacement. It is impossible to be proactive without making timely adjustments in the current regulators and without the partial (to meet the changing needs of the development) upgrade of the team of professionals, which needs to be focused on achieving the larger goals useful for society. In this sense, the state regulator can be considered as a special kind of project, the consistent implementation of which can be carried out by the executive directorate under the agency or body charged with following and monitoring the process of its

system implementation. It is clear that this proposal could be perceived negatively due to the possibility of increase in the number of officials, the number of which is already too great for the market (resource-saving system) economy. But two circumstances make it necessary to submit this proposal for discussion. First, this proposal is already under discussion at the Expert Council of the Open Government of the Russian Federation and is considered to be the most effective form of improving the quality of project control focused on results. Second, the executive management may be formed from the staff of one or two departments of the ministry – the initiators and developers of the regulatory project – without increasing the total number of officials.

Modern models of socio-economic development in the estimates of the Russians

Internal and external crises and constraints that accompany socio-economic and community development of the Russian Federation have a critical impact on the pace and sustainability of development, quality of life and well-being of the population, prestige of the country in the international arena. Attempts to seek the guilty ones in the international community are, frankly speaking, not always a good thing, though, because in any confrontation it is both sides that bear the blame. What are the origins and the causes of misunderstanding? Yevgeny Primakov in one of his latest scientific papers at the meeting of the Mercury Club identified and convincingly showed the flaws and failures of market self-regulation, which are essentially impossible to eliminate and even

minimize within the liberal market model [Rossiiskaya Gazeta, 2014, no. 6, January 15, p. 5]. Primakov substantiates his position by the fact that the crises and constraints in the development of Russia are caused by internal rather than external factors.

Yevgeny Primakov highlighted several reasons that prove the necessity to demand a fundamental correction of the neoliberal course of the Government of the Russian Federation in order to make it more suitable for the needs and traditions of the majority of the Russian population. We pay attention only to one reason: the principled attitude of the neoliberals towards social justice is derived from free competition of “economic forces” rather than from government regulation of price, production and labor, environmental and other restrictions, which is widely practiced in most countries with the market system of economy.

Other authors also point out the fundamental uncertainty of the market and market regulation. Yu.Ya. Olsevich argues that “the fundamental uncertainty of the market can be overcome only by ensuring the optimal necessary and coordinated state regulation at all three levels – macro-, meso- and micro-levels... The market is able to adjust itself to competition only to the extent to which the state provides regulation of the institutional and organizational framework of the market and its macro-properties” [28, p. 95].

Those who support the universality of market self-regulation put forward one more argument – the lowering efficiency of state regulation and functioning of state corporations. Actually, according to estimates

of the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs, public corporations continue to be the “engine” of Russia’s economic development, although there a lot of claims to their work, and most of them are fair. While Russia’s Gazprom consider that its priority is to obtain from the government the right to raise domestic gas prices annually, French energy companies that are wholly or partially owned by the government carried out successful international pricing and service expansion over the past 15 years. This trend was the result of consolidation process organized and directed by the state in the framework of planned EU directives for the implementation of successful competition on the European and world markets.

Comparing the effectiveness of regulatory impact of the Russian and French governments, Yannick Mireur provides examples of successful coordination and integration of state planning regulators with the self-organization of public and private companies in order to maintain social stability and develop competitive advantages. In his opinion, “the political rather than legal environment in which Russia’s state-owned industry is developing does not create similar opportunities and hampers the chances of obtaining international status by Russian industrial groups” [29, p. 161].

Many countries such as Sweden, China, India, Belarus, Kazakhstan, etc. provide examples of successful combination of state (planned, programmed and designed) regulators and market self-regulation in the “mixed model” of socio-economic and community development. If we think about

what political ideas and theoretical models are used by newly industrializing economies like China, India, Vietnam, etc. that made a leading breakthrough in economic development, it turns out that they are not the same, which were imposed on the Russian society since the early 1990s and until the present time. In these countries, the state uses regulatory measures and provides a “socially useful supervision” of priority directions of socio-economic and community development and supports the system sustainability and socio-political harmony in society. The state does not abolish market institutions, but becomes an initiator and main developer of the national project on their socio-economic and community renewal with the aim to bring the country to a higher level of scientific, technological and industrial development and achieve a new and better quality of life.

The recently formed world practice of choosing the national model of social development is based on three crucial conditions. The first one: only the national Leader (head of state, head of Government) can urge people to choose and support a model of socio-economic and community development, persuade the majority of the population to participate in its discussion and implementation. This Leader enjoys the trust of the people and is not going to put the idea of the reform “on the shelf”; on the contrary, he will develop and propose to the society the project for gradual formation of the model of development and its implementation on the basis of the existing national and historical traditions, recommendations of science and opinion of the population.

The second condition: it is necessary that society support the proposed model of social development so that each group, each community, each state agency and each person could determine their place in the reforms and actively participate in them with personal interest. The third condition: the social perception of the idea of forming a new model of development requires clear and understandable setting of the goal of the reform and gradual determination of the end result in order to correct or clarify the project.

The published results of opinion polls of the Russian population allow us to say with a certain degree of conditionality that not all the population supports the policy of the Government and top management of the Russian Federation focused on the liberal economic model of development, especially in the interpretation of the Government [30]. The opinion of the Russian population expressed in the opinion polls of 2012–2015 and showing their preferences regarding the planned and market regulatory institutions and models of further socio-economic development of the country is fundamentally inconsistent with the policy of the authorities. An opinion poll by Levada-Center (2012) carried out among over 10 thousand Russians from 47 regions on the subject of “Expediency of using the institution of planning in the Russian practice” shows not just the mismatch between positions of “power” and the population on fundamental problems of Russia’s development. Over 51% of respondents believe it is appropriate to use planning institution, especially in terms

of socio-economic planning and spatial development of Russia’s territories. 15% of respondents consider it possible to use planned regulators to address priority development challenges.

The Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (2011–2012) carried out a survey of 1,750 respondents from 22 subjects of the Russian Federation; they answered a different question: “What kind of social structure is most suitable for Russia?” The results of the survey once again do not “fit” into the mainstream of socio-economic and public policy pursued by the Russian leadership. More than 56% of respondents preferred the model of “mixed economy” in the framework of which more than 31% of respondents said they preferred “socialism with a planned economy and elements of market relations” and 25% preferred “capitalism with a market economy and elements of planning and preservation of socialist principles” (accessible education, health care, government regulation of prices and tariffs in the interests of people and not monopolies and state-owned companies, differentiated taxation, etc.). Twenty-two percent of respondents advocated “socialism with a planned economy and the dominance of state and kolkhoz-cooperative ownership”, and 17% said they preferred the liberal market model – “capitalism with a free market economy and the rule of private property” [31, pp. 27-30].

What positive and negative features can be the result of continuing confrontation between power structures and people with regard to choosing a model of socio-economic and

community development? We can say that the expression: “Truth is sprout in discussion” could be named among positive features to a certain degree. In this particular case, there is neither dispute nor dialogue and they are not expected in the near future. The tenacity with which the Russian government under various pretexts “imposes” on the society the exclusively liberal economic development model that is not considered professionally and that is implemented at the expense of increasing costs is akin to the tenacity with which the Russian population rejects this model. Ivan Krylov in his fable “Swan, Pike and Crawfish” described such a situation as follows:

When partners can't agree
 Their dealings come to naught
 And trouble is their labor's only fruit...
 Who's guilty here and who is right is not for us
 to say –
 But anyway the cart's still there today.

[cit. ex: Krylov I. A. *Writings in 2 Volumes*. Volume 2. Moscow: Pravda, 1984. P. 79].

The essence of the fable reflects the current situation in Russia: “When the society cannot agree” (already about a quarter of a century!), then there are no conditions in the format of a public platform to establish a coherent system of sustainable development, growth of people's welfare, prosperity of the Russian state, enhancement of its international status. And this is more than the negative, which is able to restrain and “destroy” stability, depriving it of the sources and driving forces of systemic development and growth of welfare. The unwillingness of state leaders to reckon with

the opinion of the population and society as a whole gives rise to the negatives that produce more “failures” in relations between the state and society.

Public opinion experiences continuous pressure that is direct and indirect, official and “hidden” by the actions of government agencies (Central Bank, Ministry of Finance, etc.), it drastically reduces the credibility of the government and its leaders due to their incompetence and inability to ensure systemic and sustainable socio-economic development of the Russian Federation in the interests of the entire Russian population. What arguments do the Russians give in favor of the mixed model of development?

The first argument: no matter how badly socialism is criticized for its “flaws” and excessive planning centralization “of everything”, in its essence and social orientation it claimed to be and in fact it was one of the most “socially equitable and sustainable” models of development. Universal accessibility and government support for public and higher education, its quality and importance in the society remain a model of imitation for many countries and nations, except Russia. The quality of medical services and the health system as a whole complied with world standards not by all its indicators. But it was available for everyone. There was no such sharp differentiation in incomes. According to Yevgeny Primakov's estimates [*Rossiiskaya Gazeta*, 2014, no. 6, January 15, p. 5], 110 Russian billionaires control 35% of all Russian assets. He cites the international financial corporation Credit Suisse Group and it has to admit that “during the transition period there

were hopes that Russia would be converted to highly profitable economy with highly skilled workers and strong social protection programs inherited from the Soviet times. In practice it turned out to be almost a parody” [ibidem].

Today’s Russia is hardly inferior to the Soviet Union by the number of schools, health facilities and even the number of higher education diplomas. But as for literacy, professional skills, ability of a teacher or university professor to teach and train professionals efficiently: to train doctors to provide better treatment, to train scientists to provide social development with innovative ideas and solutions –the Russian Federation has not just lagged behind in these aspects. The majority of the population thinks that Russia can become more and more backward. The government allowed the functioning of private educational, medical and scientific organizations, and it contributed to the fact that they focus their activities not on “the quality of training (treatment, research)” but on “making money”, which has become the purpose of their activity, the main motive and the end result. On the other hand, the government allowed state-financed institutions in the interests of “reducing the load on the budget” to introduce fees for the provision of public services, which inevitably increased the burden on workers, reduced the quality of services and limited the availability of public services for a significant amount of the population. And this despite the fact that according to the Constitution of the Russian Federation the state and municipal institutions provide services to the population free of charge.

The second argument: the majority of foreign and domestic researchers consider a competitive market to be the socially necessary, but not sufficient, condition for systemically sustainable development of the country and growth of public welfare. In most evaluations, the market is considered as a favorable environment that may or may not provide social development and people’s well-being [35, pp. 9-10]. Only the diversity of ownership and diversity of the economy under centralized planned management of priority development directions with the use of efficient sources and institutions can provide a systematically sustainable and harmonious functioning of the whole society. This norm becomes particularly relevant when national projects are developed and implemented: when there is a change or updating of socio-economic structures, when social and/or socio-economic systems are reformed, when individual territories undergo development and spatial arrangement (the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation; territories of the Far East), when there is import substitution and economic re-industrialization, etc. We agree with G.N. Tsagolov who points out that “left to its own devices, the economy is incapable of sustainable development” [35, pp. 229-230], maintaining political peace and social harmony in the society.

The professionally regulated market economic system acquires complete integrity and full capacity for sustainable development and renewal only if this system is subordinate to the public interest in general, evidence-based needs and priorities for development. The regulatory functions of the state under

these conditions acquire characteristics of the basic standards of social behavior of all the participants of market relations, and market economic system reaches its completed form and operates effectively and efficiently in the interests of the majority of the population.

The third argument: the ratio of market and state regulators and institutions in each national model of a mixed economy can be different in practice; it depends on political-economic, cultural-historical, national, natural, and other features. For example, in Belarus and Kazakhstan, where different cultures, religions, political orientations coexist and where there are different lifestyles of the population, there are mixed planned-market economic systems. Belarus is dominated by state-planned regulatory institutions of social development, and Kazakhstan is dominated by market regulation institutions and private-capitalist modes. But in both these national socio-economic systems there is the balance of state and market regulators that are different and largely opposite, but complementary at the same time.

If we turn to the world practice of using the model of the mixed economy, it turns out that it is these countries, having the optimal combination of state planning and market regulators, are the most stable in socio-economic and social development, they are socially and politically more consolidated and sustainable in times of global crises. Socio-economic development indicators of Sweden, Norway, China, Vietnam, Finland and some other countries clearly confirm this conclusion.

The fourth argument: from the viewpoint of the objects of regulatory impact of planned and market institutions, the practice of countries with the mixed economy allows us to assert that the forecasting and planning state regulators are the most efficient and effective when they are supervised by the government, when macroeconomic processes are regulated and socially important programs and projects are implemented, which requires the mobilization of funds and resources, initiative and enterprise, professionalism and social activity of the population.

Self-regulating market mechanisms and institutions, as evidenced by the more than two centuries of experience of developed countries, perform their regulatory functions most effectively at the micro level, in the relations between market agents, and their employees, the state and its agencies when they execute state orders and competitive projects and with appropriate control of the buyer, customer, consumer and society in general.

The fifth argument: the proposed delimitation of the spheres of regulatory influence of state and market mechanisms is largely conditional, because the model of the mixed economy is based not on confrontation, but on the convergence of planning and market mechanisms of regulation and their optimal combination for greater effect and efficiency. State planning of modernization and reindustrialization cannot be effective and efficient without the active use of market institutions and mechanisms of motivation and internal control. The institution of public-private partnership and other market

institutions (concessions, corporate social responsibility, consumer cooperatives, etc.), originated and evolves, in our opinion, solely as the institutional framework of the mixed (converged) model of socio-economic and community development. Of course, they need to be developed, updated, improved and adjusted to changing conditions. But the very fact of their use gives reason to believe that they have great opportunities for systemic and sustainable development and solution of social problems of territories.

The growing needs of regions and municipalities in a system and sustainable development and spatial arrangement of territories under the increasing shortage of their budget provision make it necessary to involve people and business through the use of PPP for the implementation of regional and municipal programs and projects. For this purpose, certain municipalities, primarily million-plus cities, have started to implement the institution of program and project development of municipal infrastructure by smoothly connecting in a single document – the Strategic plan – the forecast parameters of development with market needs and opportunities of the urban population, the

business community of the city and adjacent territories. The results of their work [23, pp. 19-25] suggest that the mixed model has a great future, because it helps use the socially significant advantages of market and planned systems in the interests of sustainable system-wide development.

The specific feature of protracted crisis in the Russian Federation is seen not so much in the “machinations of enemies” as in meaningless attempts of the authorities to maintain the same line of socio-economic and community development, which only exacerbates the crisis, condemning the economy, society and the population to degradation and stagnation. It is time to understand and realize that Russia has a limited number of options to choose from: the classical market model, the centralized planned model and the mixed model. It is time to decide where to go and what colors to hoist. And this time, inaction and another error in the choice may prove fatal. We can still pin our hopes on the Understanding of the situation, on the Selflessness in decision making and on the Political will of the government to be with the people and to serve the community... And we will succeed!

References

1. Smith A. *Issledovaniya o prirode i prichinakh bogatstva narodov* [Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations]. Translated from English, introduction of V.S. Afanas'ev. Moscow: Eksmo, 2009. 960p.
2. Less T. Antirynochnaya revolyutsiya v Vostochnoi Evrope [Eastern Europe's Anti-Market Revolution]. *Mir peremen* [The World of Transformations], 2015, no. 4, pp. 96-100.
3. Lin I.Y. *The Quest for Prosperity*. Princeton University Press. Prentseton, 2012. 369 p.
4. Zutler I.A. Optimal'nyi vybor markovskim bluzhdeniem [The Optimality of Choice by Markov Random Walk]. *Zhurnal novoi ekonomicheskoi assotsiatsii* [Journal of the New Economic Association], 2013, no. 4, pp. 33-51.
5. *Ispol'zovanie otsenok reguliruyushchego vozdeistviya dlya sovershenstvovaniya korporativnogo zakonodatel'stvam* [The Use of Regulatory Impact Assessments for the Improvement of Corporate Legislation]. Team of authors:

- S.B. Avdasheva, R.A. Kokorev, P.V. Kryuchkova, S.P. Plaksin, A.E. Shestiko; Byuro ekonomicheskogo analiza. Moscow: TEIS, 2006. 255 p.
6. Kashin V.A. O novoi modeli razvitiya dlya Rossii [On the New Model of Development for Russia]. *Mir peremen* [The World of Transformations], 2015, no. 3, pp. 47-62.
 7. Margolin A., Buchnev O. Pravotvorcheskaya deyatel'nost': otsenka reguliruyushchego vozdeistviya [Lawmaking Activities: Regulatory Impact Assessment]. *Problemy teorii i praktiki upravleniya* [Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Management], 2014, no. 1, pp. 24-28.
 8. Tatarin A.I. Samorazvitie territorial'nykh sotsial'no-ekonomicheskikh sistem kak potrebnost' federativnogo obustroistva Rossii [Self-development of Territorial Social and Economic Systems as a Requirement of the Federal Structure of Russia]. *Ekonomika regiona* [Economy of Region], no. 2013, no. 4, pp. 9-26.
 9. Eisen N., Gorbunov V. Politekonomicheskie aspekty realizatsii funktsii upravleniya sistemoi "nauka – proizvodstvo – potreblenie" [Political Aspects of Implementing the Function to Manage the System "Science – Production – Consumption"]. *Obshchestvo i ekonomika* [Society and Economics], 2013, no. 11–12, pp. 67-84.
 10. Daskovskii V.B., Kiselev V.B. Kontury novoi modeli razvitiya ekonomiki Rossii [Contours of the New Model of Economy Development in Russia]. Moscow: "Kanon+"; ROAI "Reobilitatsiya", 2013. 592 p.
 11. Galbraith J. Tretii krizis v ekonomicheskoi nauke [The Third Crisis in Economics]. *Mir peremen* [The World of Transformations], 2013, no. 1, pp. 24-28.
 12. Fomichenkov T. Soberut u odnogo okna. Vse nalogi dlya malogo biznesa mogut zamenit' odnim platezhom [Gather at One Window. All Taxes for Small Businesses can be Replaced by One Payment]. *Rossiiskaya gazeta* [Russian Newspaper], 2014, no.17, January 28, p. 5.
 13. Titov D. Biznes i grazhdan priglasayut kontrolirovat' gosraskhody [Business and Citizens are Invited to Monitor Government Spending]. *Ekonomika i zhizn'* [Economics and Life], 2014, no. 5, pp. 1-2.
 14. *O sostoyanii delovogo klimata v Rossii : doklad. Kratkaya versiya* [On the State of Business Climate in Russia]. Moscow: RSPP, 2014. 56 p.
 15. Reforma gosudarstvennogo apparata ili smena mentaliteta [Reform of State Apparatus or Change in Mentality]. *Effektivnoe antikrizisnoe upravlenie* [Effective Anti-Crisis Management], 2015, no. 3, pp. 16-22.
 16. 2016: Goryachii kamen'. O goryachikh problemakh rossiiskoi ekonomiki govoreli na Gaidarovskom forume [2016: Hot Stone. About Hot Problems of the Russian Economy at the Gaidar Forum]. *Rossiiskaya gazeta* [Russian Newspaper], 2016, January 14, pp. 1-2.
 17. Sotsial'naya situatsiya v Rossii v seredine "novogo starogo" politicheskogo tsikla: chto proiskhodit i kakie perspektivy prosmatrivayutsya? Uchastniki obsuzhdeniya sotsial'nykh protsessov: V. N. Bobkov, d.e.n., professor; S.Yu. Glaz'ev, akad. RAN; d.e.n. M. G. Delyagin [Social Situation in Russia in the Middle of the "New Old" Political Cycle: what Happens and what Prospects are Viewed? The Participants of the Social Processes Discussion: V.N. Bobkov, Doctor of Economics, Professor; S.Y. Glazyev RAS Academician; Doctor of Economics M.G. Delyagin]. *Rossiiskii ekonomicheskii zhurnal* [Russian Journal of Economics], 2015, no. 4, pp. 44-60.
 18. Vinslav Yu. Proektnyi podkhod kak mnogourovnevnyi upravlencheskii fenomen: obshchesistemnoe sodержanie, aktual'nost' primeneniya na makrourovne, neobkhodimost' i spetsifika ispol'zovaniya na urovne krupnykh integrirovannykh korporatsii [Project Management Approach as a Multilevel Phenomenon: System-Wide Content, Relevance of the Application at the Macro Level, Need and Specifics of the Use at the Level of Large Integrated Corporations]. *Rossiiskii ekonomicheskii zhurnal* [Russian Journal of Economics], 2015, no. 5, pp. 79-84.
 19. Konopatov S.N. Metodologiya gosudarstvennogo upravleniya RF: analiz reformy Akademii nauk [Methodology of Public Administration of the Russian Federation: Analysis of the Reform of the Academy of Sciences]. *Menedzhment v Rossii i za rubezhom* [Management in Russia and Abroad], 2013, no. 6, pp. 50-53.
 20. Polterovich V.M. *Elementy teorii reform* [Elements of the Theory of Reforms]. Moscow: Ekonomika, 2007. 447 p.

21. Makarov V.L. K voprosu o proektnoi ekonomike [To the Question about Project Economy]. *Ekonomicheskie nauki sovremennoi Rossii* [Economic Sciences of Modern Russia], 2013, no. 3, pp. 8-14.
22. Krass M. Model' otsenki reformirovaniya ekonomiki Rossii [Model of Assessment of Economic Reforms in Russia]. *Effektivnoe antikrizisnoe upravlenie* [Effective Anti-Crisis Management], 2015, no. 3, pp. 62-71.
23. Tatarkin A.I., Nekrasov A.A. Teoretiko-metodologicheskie podkhody k otsenke strategii gorodov-millionnikov: rol' mestnogo soobshchestva [Theoretical-Methodological Approaches to the Assessment of the Megacity Strategy: Role of Local Community]. *Upravlenets* [Manager], 2014, no. 1, pp.19-25.
24. Goryashko S.S. Grazhdane ne zhduť chudes ot ekonomiki. Vpervye s nachala krizisa bolee poloviny rossiyan schitayut situatsiyu plokhoy [Citizens do not Expect Miracles from the Economy. For the First Time since the Beginning of the Crisis More than Half of Russians Believe the Situation is Bad]. *Kommersant* [Kommersant], 2016, no. 19, February 5, p. 3.
25. *Konstitutsiya Rossiiskoi Federatsii: k 15-letiyu Osnovnogo zakona: Teksty. Kommentarii* [The Constitution of the Russian Federation: to the 15th Anniversary of the Basic Law: Texts. Comments]. Moscow: Statut, 2009. 239 p.
26. Krasnopol'skikh B.Kh. Prostranstvenno-ekonomicheskoe planirovaniye: opyt Velikobritanii (o doklade "Ramki politiki natsional'nogo planirovaniya") [Spatial-Economic Planning: the UK Experience (on the Report "National Planning Policy Framework")]. *Prostranstvennaya ekonomika* [Spatial Economics], 2012, p. 168-173.
27. Lee Kuan Yew. *Singapurskaya istoriya: iz tret'ego mira v pervyi (1965–2000)* [From Third World to First: The Singapore Story: 1965–2000]. Moscow: Izd. Mann, 2013. 347 p.
28. Olsevich Yu. Ya. Ekonomicheskaya nauka i politika pered fundamental'noi neopredelennost'yu rynka [Economic Science and Politics before Fundamental Uncertainty of the Market]. *Voprosy ekonomiki* [Economical Issues], 2013, no. 6, pp. 92-95.
29. Mirer Ya. Ogranichennaya Rossiya [Organic Russia]. *Mirperemen* [The World of Transformations], 2011, no. 4, pp. 153-169.
30. Medvedev D.A. Novaya real'nost': Rossiya i global'nye vyzovy [New Reality: Russia and Global Challenges]. *Voprosy ekonomiki* [Economical Issues], 2015, no. 10, pp. 5-29.
31. *O chem mechtayut rossiyanе: ideal i real'nost': monogr.* [What do the Russians Dream About: Ideal and Reality : Monograph]. Under editorship of M.K. Gorshkov, R. Ktumm, N.E. Tikhonova. Moscow: Ves' Mir, 2013. 400 p.
32. Golubev V., Tarko A. Neravenstvo i razvitie [Inequality and Development]. *Ekonomist* [Economist], 2015, no. 12, pp. 3-13.
33. Ivanter V.V. Genri Ford okazalsya prav [Henry Ford Was Right]. *Rossiiskaya gazeta* [Russian Newspaper], 2016, no. 6894 (26), February 9, pp. 11.
34. Kleiner G.B. Ekonomicheskie zadachi ne reshit' bez uchastiya gosudarstva [Economic Problems Cannot be Solved without State Participation]. *Ekonomika. Nalogi. Pravo* [Economics. Taxes. Right], 2013, no. 2, pp. 7-10.
35. Tsagolov G.N. *Pochemu vse ne tak* [Why is it not That]. Moscow: Ekonomika, 2012. 356 p.

Cited Works

1. Smith A. *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Translated from English, introduction of V.S. Afanas'ev. Moscow: Eksmo, 2009. 960p.
2. Less T. *Eastern Europe's Anti-Market Revolution*. *The World of Transformations*, 2015, no. 4, pp. 96-100.
3. Lin I.Y. *The Quest for Prosperity*. Princeton University Press. Princeton, 2012. 369 p.
4. Zutler I.A. The Optimality of Choice by Markov Random Walk. *Journal of the New Economic Association*, 2013, no. 4, pp. 33-51.

5. *The Use of Regulatory Impact Assessments for the Improvement of Corporate Legislation*. Team of authors: S.B. Avdasheva, R.A. Kokorev, P.V. Kryuchkova, S.P. Plaksin, A.E. Shestiko; Byuro ekonomicheskogo analiza. Moscow: TEIS, 2006. 255 p.
6. Kashin V.A. On the New Model of Development for Russia. *The World of Transformations*, 2015, no. 3, pp. 47-62.
7. Margolin A., Buchnev O. Lawmaking Activities: Regulatory Impact Assessment. *Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Management*, 2014, no. 1, pp. 24-28.
8. Tatarkin A.I. Self-development of Territorial Social and Economic Systems as a Requirement of the Federal Structure of Russia. *Economy of Region*, no. 2013, no. 4, pp. 9-26.
9. Eisen N., Gorbunov V. Political Aspects of Implementing the Function to Manage the System “Science – Production – Consumption”. *Society and Economics*, 2013, no. 11-12, pp. 67-84.
10. Daskovskii V.B., Kiselev V.B. *Contours of the New Model of Economy Development in Russia*. Moscow: “Kanon+”; ROAI “Reobilitatsiya”, 2013. 592 p.
11. Galbraith J. The Third Crisis in Economics. *The World of Transformations*, 2013, no. 1, pp. 24-28.
12. Fomichenkov T. Gather at One Window. All Taxes for Small Businesses can be Replaced by One Payment. *Russian Newspaper*, 2014, no.17, January 28, p. 5.
13. Titov D. Business and Citizens are Invited to Monitor Government Spending. *Economics and Life*, 2014, no. 5, pp. 1-2.
14. *On the State of Business Climate in Russia*. Moscow: RSPF, 2014. 56 p.
15. Reform of State Apparatus or Change in Mentality. *Effective Anti-Crisis Management*, 2015, no. 3, pp. 16-22.
16. 2016: Hot Stone. About Hot Problems of the Russian Economy at the Gaidar Forum. *Russian Newspaper*, 2016, January 14, pp. 1-2.
17. Social Situation in Russia in the Middle of the “New Old” Political Cycle: what Happens and what Prospects are Viewed? The Participants of the Social Processes Discussion: V. N. Bobkov, Doctor of Economics, Professor; S.Y. Glazyev RAS Academician; Doctor of Economics M. G. Delyagin. *Russian Journal of Economics*, 2015, no. 4, pp. 44-60.
18. Vinslav Yu. Project Management Approach as a Multilevel Phenomenon: System-Wide Content, Relevance of the Application at the Macro Level, Need and Specifics of the Use at the Level of Large Integrated Corporations. *Russian Journal of Economics*, 2015, no. 5, pp. 79-84.
19. Konopatov S.N. Methodology of Public Administration of the Russian Federation: Analysis of the Reform of the Academy of Sciences. *Management in Russia and Abroad*, 2013, no. 6, pp. 50-53.
20. Polterovich V.M. *Elements of the Theory of Reforms*. Moscow: Ekonomika, 2007. 447 p.
21. Makarov V.L. To the Question about Project Economy. *Economic Sciences of Modern Russia*, 2013, no. 3, pp. 8-14.
22. Krass M. Model of Assessment of Economic Reforms in Russia. *Effective Anti-Crisis Management*, 2015, no. 3, pp. 62-71.
23. Tatarkin A.I., Nekrasov A.A. Theoretical-Methodological Approaches to the Assessment of the Megacity Strategy: Role of Local Community. *Manager*, 2014, no. 1, pp.19-25.
24. Goryashko S.S. Citizens do not Expect Miracles from the Economy. For the First Time since the Beginning of the Crisis More than Half of Russians Believe the Situation is Bad. *Kommersant*, 2016, no. 19, February 5, p. 3.
25. *The Constitution of the Russian Federation: to the 15th Anniversary of the Basic Law: Texts. Comments*. Moscow: Statut, 2009. 239 p.
26. Spatial-Economic Planning: the UK Experience (on the Report “National Planning Policy Framework”). *Spatial Economics*, 2012, p. 168-173.

27. Lee Kuan Yew. *From Third World to First: The Singapore Story: 1965–2000*. Moscow: Izd. Mann, 2013. 347 p.
28. Olsevich Yu.Ya. Economic Science and Politics before Fundamental Uncertainty of the Market. *Economical Issues*, 2013, no. 6, pp. 92-95.
29. Mirer Ya. Organic Russia. *The World of Transformations*, 2011, no. 4, pp. 153-169.
30. Medvedev D.A. New Reality: Russia and Global Challenges. *Economical Issues*, 2015, no. 10, pp. 5-29.
31. *What do the Russians Dream About: Ideal and Reality : Monograph*. Under editorship of M.K. Gorshkov, R. Ktumm, N.E. Tikhonova. Moscow: Ves' Mir, 2013. 400 p.
32. Golubev V., Tarko A. Inequality and Development. *Economist*, 2015, no. 12, pp. 3-13.
33. Ivanter V.V. Henry Ford Was Right. *Russian Newspaper*, 2016, no. 6894 (26), February 9, pp. 11.
34. Kleiner G.B. Economic Problems Cannot be Solved without State Participation. *Economics. Taxes. Right*, 2013, no. 2, pp. 7-10.
35. Tsagolov G.N. *Why is it not That*. Moscow: Ekonomika, 2012. 356 p.

Information about the Author

Aleksandr Ivanovich Tatarkin – RAS Academician, Professor, Institute of Economics, Ural Branch of RAS (29, Moskovskaya Street, Yekaterinburg, Sverdlovsk Oblast, 620014, Russian Federation, tatarkin_ai@mail.ru)