

Д. С. Кезина, Г. И. Драчева

Уральский федеральный университет
им. первого Президента России Б. Н. Ельцина
г. Екатеринбург, Россия

О ключевом вопросе неоиндустриализации в России

Авторы проводят данный аналитический обзор, рассматривающий формирование концептуальных положений новой индустриализации в условиях современной технико-экономической парадигмы с позиции вопроса отношений собственности, как ключевого, для проведения неоиндустриализации в современной России.

On the key issue of the neo-industrialization in Russia

The main problem of Russia as a great civilization and the state is its development. First of all we mean the development of the economy, the productive forces, building relations of production and the development of the factors that would ensure Russia's well-being and steady progressive growth in strengthening the industry. Paraphrasing Chernyshevsky in his work "What to do?" we ask a question "What should Russia do to go down in history?" What fundamental conditions must be created in our country?

Many leading Russian scientists and politicians come to the conclusion that neo-industrialization is the necessity and characteristic feature of the modern stage of economic development of Russia. Let's quote some sources:

- "...the course on new industrialization became one of the major requirements of the main political forces, including even the opposite ones..." [1, p. 1];

- "...One of the main problems of modern Russia, like of many other countries is the problem of neo-industrialization of its economy as a kind of alternative to the formation of the post-industrial economy" [2, p. 68];

- "...we are convinced that the purpose of transferring economy to the innovative way of investment activity development can be achieved within the next 5–10 years. The challenges of modernization and technological

development together with global competitiveness can be achieved within the next 15–20 years, with the first significant results of technological modernization being achieved within the first 3 to 5 years...” [3]

As the famous Russian economist S.S. Gubanov writes, «...In the context of the 2011–2012 electoral cycle the all Russia national front, the Communist Party of the Russian Federation, The Liberal Democratic Party, The Fair Russia, The Business Russia, “The Manifesto of the Right Thing» and many other political forces called for a new industrialization of Russia. Thus, neo-industrial consensus is achieved, at least in the statements of the existing political forces of the country...” [1, p. 1].

So, under what basic conditions should Russia be neo-industrialized?

The key issue of functioning and developing of Russia has always been a question of property relations (according to the code of Napoleon, the question of ownership, disposal and use), and it is these relations that lie at the basis of functioning of any economic system. “...The neo-industrial consensus will be haphazard, and therefore unsuccessful until Russia reaches the principal social consensus about the form of property and systematic basis of the new industrialization process” [1, p. 2].

So S. S. Gubanov substantiates this idea: “...Contrary to the reactionary ideology and primitive beliefs of the reformers, it is vertical integration that makes capitalism the highest and competitive form, but not the market or competition.

One can take any of the advanced industrial nations of the world, and in each one with all national differences in the economic model there is a compulsory and unchangeable clear system with common features. Such as the same system of implementation of the law of vertical integration – with a predominance of mixed public-corporate ownership and the economy of intersectoral corporations.

In each advanced industrial nation of the world the primary assignment of the main mass of the added value is raised vertically: from the level of private industry enterprise to the level of inter-sectoral corporation. Inside the corporation itself, from the level of extraction, the mining and intermediate production to the level of the final stage, specializing in the output of products with high added value and subsequently to the sphere of personal consumption.

Whether it is the Anglo-Saxon model, or ‘Rhine’ or Japanese, or Chinese – there is still no single exception to that. It can not be, if any advanced power of the highest capitalism rising to the neo-industrial society is taken...” [1, p. 11].

Professor Gubanov assumes that the economy can only be competitive when the economic system of a society is competitive, i.e. the system of organization and functioning of social reproduction. In order for Russia to be able to conduct neo-industrialization one must make a choice in favour of the vertically-integrated, state-corporate form of ownership.

How should we neo-industrialize Russia? For this we need to define its models, stages and centers, from which it will begin.

As Ural economists O. A. Romanova and U. G. Lavrikova consider, "...the most promising models of development are those within which the territories are not just passive areas where the branches of large corporations are located, but those models which are capable of creating specific resources, innovative activity and are competitive. By creating their political effectiveness they will be able to increase their attractiveness for businesses..." [2, p. 68].

Those authors have developed the scenario of neo-industrialisation in the Urals. It is the following:

- the first stage (2012–2013) – restoration of volumes of industrial production to the level of 2007, combined with the formation of clusters of innovation in basic industries;

- the second stage (2013–2017) – the sector of large industry based on resource- and labour-intensive industries (heavy engineering, fuel and chemical industry, metallurgy etc.);

- the third stage (2018–2020) – the criterion of effectiveness of the Ural industry will not be the growth of GRP (gross regional product), but qualitative development of the regional industry.

Neo-industrialization should be conducted with proper consideration of world economic development and understanding the structural components of the crisis, which are determined by the changes of technological modes.

Russian academicians S. Y. Glazyev and G. G. Fetisov consider that "...the exit from this crisis is associated with the new wave of innovations which are building the road to the formation of a new technological structure... Those who will be able to reach the path of growth of a new technological structure quickly and invest in its production in the early phases of development will prosper. On the contrary, for the latecomers the new technological trajectories will become more and more expensive in the future..." [3].

In conclusion, it is noted that the process of neo-industrialization in Russia and its transition to a new technological level are inseparable, but

the process is hampered by the unwillingness of the current socio-economic environment to use them widely. The key issue for conducting neo-industrialization of Russia is that of property relations. Changing property relations in favour of the vertically-integrated, state-corporate form of ownership, Russia will be able to carry out neo-industrialization successfully.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Губанов С. С. Неоиндустриальный консенсус России и его системные основы // *Экономист*. 2011. № 11.
2. Романова О. А., Лаврикова Ю. Г. Промышленная политика как инструмент неоиндустриализации региональных промышленных систем // *Экономические и социальные перемены: факты, тенденции, прогноз*. 2012. № 6.
3. Глазьев С. Ю., Фетисов Г. Г. Новый курс. Стратегия прорыва / Научный доклад Национальный институт развития РАН. URL: http://russian-greens.ru/docs/dokl_strategy_2012.pdf (дата обращения: 20.01.2013).

УДК 81'243:33

М. Ю. Кирилов, И. П. Борчанинова
Уральский федеральный университет
им. первого Президента России Б. Н. Ельцина
г. Екатеринбург, Россия

Влияние глобализации на развивающиеся страны

Одним из самых значительных событий последних десятилетий стало вовлечение в международную рыночную экономику многих стран, ранее практически изолированных от остального мира – стран постсоветского пространства, Эквадора, Индонезии и др. После развала СССР началось формирование «однополярного» мира, в котором сегодня пытается господствовать одна глобальная империя. Однако ход событий мирового масштаба показывает, что это господство крайне неустойчиво и порождает