DOI: 10.30680/ECO0131-7652-2022-4-4-7

So what is the code for success?

At present, perhaps one of the main topics of numerous publications on economic policy issues is science and innovation, which are credited not only with producing new goods and services, but also with offering new approaches to solving many of the problems confronting the domestic economy. Science is assigned the role of the main source of obtaining fresh knowledge about the world around us – in its various manifestations. Rather, innovation is the solution of practical problems based on an interdisciplinary approach, the use of previously obtained knowledge, as well as changes in the organizational and institutional conditions of activity.

It would seem that from this understanding of the role and place of science and innovation, the key principle of their development and promotion inevitably follows – let us call it a code. In the case of science, this is, first of all, creating conditions for exploratory research; the most important of them are adequate funding (taking into account the specifics of a particular branch of knowledge), modern material and technical base and, what is important, ensuring decent working and living conditions for people of science. Innovations have their own specificity, which consists in the necessity of practical demand for the results of the activity of enterprising creators of new goods, services and approaches to their application.

Alas, as follows from the papers in the thematic selection of this issue of "ECO", the noted conditions are far from being sufficient for the success of both scientific search and innovative activity. In the case of science, among other things, dedication and the willingness to keep at it despite setbacks and all sorts of difficulties are necessary. In the case of innovation, the possibility of effective cooperation and fruitful collaboration of many participants in the innovation process should certainly be added to the number of basic conditions. One such participant is the state, represented both by various structures and in the form of a regulatory framework regulating the rules of interaction between the parties (copyright, taxation conditions, etc., etc.).

Both dedication to science and the ability to interact with many counterparties in the process of solving applied problems (not so much

in a specific case, but in the general framework of socially oriented activity) are, in the author's opinion, the most important elements of the success code on which the achievement of the set benchmarks in science and innovation depends.

The authors of this thematic compilation are forced to state bitterly that in Russia an effective "formula" for such a code has still not been found. The permanent changes in the system of higher education are characterized by the loss of general cultural values formed in the course of Russian history (S.A. Barkov and V.I. Zubkov's paper), while the research activity is largely oriented towards achieving scientometric indicators (E.E. Emelyanova and V.V. Lapokina's paper). At the same time, attempts to form an "ecosystem of student technological entrepreneurship" have little effect, both due to insufficient general educational level of their participants and due to the virtual absence of venture capital market for financing such projects (the paper by V.G. Zinov and N.G. Kurakova).

The development of both science and innovations is largely determined by socio-cultural and communicative factors, which we see many convincing examples of in the world. Thus, the success of innovation processes in the oil and gas sector of Norway is largely due to the simultaneous openness of all participants (in terms of economic and technological components) and the focus of state regulation on the complicity and cooperation of many companies in the implementation of new high-tech projects. The beginning of work on each major project is preceded by a joint discussion of the topic, focus and conditions of its implementation. Practical orientation of such projects (as well as doctoral studies within their thematic framework) automatically eliminates the problem of assessing their effectiveness and significance[1].

The socio-cultural component is no less important for successful and productive scientific activity than the issues of financing research and providing working and living conditions for researchers. The fall of the social prestige of decent education, excessive commercialization and frequent organizational innovations in higher education have largely contributed to the decline of interest in doing science in our country. Let's recall the experience of Novosibirsk

[1] BRU21: Research and Innovation Program in Digital and Automation Solutions for the Oil and Gas Industry.URL: https://www.ntnu.edu/bru21

Akademgorodok half a century ago. In the second half of 1960s there was created a unique organization – scientific-innovative firm "Fakel", which was engaged in solving applied problems associated with the implementation of major projects in various sectors of the economy on the basis of self-financing. Concentration of creative people in "Fakel" allowed to realize an interdisciplinary approach, speed and quality of task solving, absence of bureaucratic delays in registration of results and technology transfer caused a significant demand for its services. Quite quickly the amount of innovative work performed began to run into millions of rubles.

However, the rapid rise of the new business was followed by its no less rapid decline. The main reason is that the romantic researchers of the first wave were replaced by "construction team leaders" – the forerunners of cooperatives and "Komsomol" bankers of the second half of the 1980s. The lack of transparency in the decisions and the selective position of the leaders led to the closure of the firm in 1971. The prejudiced attitude of the ideologists of "pure socialism" who said "that Fakel set fire to the planned socialist economy" also played its role[2].

However, the case of "Fakel" is primarily an example of the loss of the "code of success" by the leaders of the second wave, who put the possibility of earning extra money above solving complex scientific and practical problems. "We wanted Goettingen, but got Klondike," the legendary physicist Yu. Rumer said sadly on a similar point[3].

The "code of success" in science and innovation activity is largely set by cultural-historical and socio-valuable guidelines. Their consideration in determining the directions of development is a prerequisite for success. But substitution of these guidelines by short-term purely commercial criteria – return on investment, "practical relevance" of knowledge and skills acquired in universities (not to be confused with business schools and centers of narrow professional training) – inevitably results in loss of interest in science on the part of young people and active imitation of innovative processes (aimed not at creating something new, but at reproducing previously developed projects and solutions).

[2] NGO "Fakel": as it was / Ed. I Samakhova. Saint-Petersburg, 2012. 133 p. [P 62]. URL: http://npo-fakel.su/

[3] Ibid. P. 95

Fortunately, the awareness of the role of the cultural and educational "code of success" is gradually taking hold of the masses. We hope that the reformist zeal will inevitably be replaced by thoughtful and painstaking work to preserve, augment and develop the traditions and approaches of scientific and educational activities, created by the best minds of our Fatherland[4]

Главный редактор «ЭКО» КРЮКОВ В.А.

[4] "It should be noted that Mendeleev, with his skilful hand, leading us to generalizations, concisely and clearly set out for us particulars, not limiting himself to modern scientific information, but always almost informing us also of the historical course of development, understanding of which he considered necessary for a correct understanding of what is now accepted as truth". See: Weinberg B. P. From memoirs about Dmitri Ivanovich Mendeleev as a lecturer. Tomsk, 1910. 42 p. [P. 19].