

The basis is constructive interaction

The current geopolitical and economic situation has aggravated a lot of chronic and generated many new problems in the development of our country. Their list alone would probably amount to more than a dozen pages, its formation and prioritization is a matter and duty of both the scientific community, which studies various aspects of socio-economic development, and professional practitioners in various sectors of the economy and social sphere.

In our opinion, the primary problems and questions should include:

- the role and place of the state in socio-economic processes – first of all, in terms of determining the directions of development and involvement in their practical implementation;
- consideration of spatial features of managed objects, which significantly affect the choice of various mechanisms and tools for implementing the proposed approaches and solutions;
- correlation of the role and place of different levels of government in determining and implementing the steps and measures of socio-economic policy.

Almost all researchers and practitioners understand the importance of the above-mentioned problems. Hardly anyone today will deny the defining and organizing role of the state in socio-economic development, improvement of living conditions and activities of present and future generations (including you and me, dear reader). The "watershed" is about the degree (degree) of state participation in the implementation of economic policy, as well as in the definition and implementation of the role and place of the regions and their population in this process.

The poles on this "scale" are, on the one hand, management based on all-encompassing planning, on the other – a system entirely built on the free market coordination of all participants of socio-economic processes. Neither approach in its pure form is implemented in any country in the world today.

If the state is universally "responsible" for the development and definition of the principal strategic directions of the country's

development (see A.V. Alekseev's paper), then in the course of their implementation, when moving "deep into" the real economic processes, as a rule, the forms of direct state participation (in the status of the owner of assets or investor) are weakening. This is reflected in the emergence of an increasing number of participants, the development of competition and the formation on this basis of a new quality of goods produced and services provided.

From this point of view, for example, the cluster form of organization of economic activity on a particular territory may well be the result of a purposeful state policy on the formation of procedures and mechanisms of interaction between various economic agents. Similarly, in investment projects the modern state, as a rule, takes part not so much in the format of direct dominant participation, but as a source and guarantor of the system of contractual relations and mutual obligations of representatives of the business community.

The noted principal moments change from country to country and from one historical period to another. Taking into account these features for each specific case – the achieved level of economic and industrial-technological development, cultural-historical and spatial characteristics influencing the course of socio-economic processes – is impossible without the involvement of both scientific and expert community, and public institutions representing different strata of citizens.

These thoughts and considerations today are inspired not only and not so much by the complication of the geopolitical and geoeconomic situation, as by the realities of domestic economic policy, which, unfortunately, not only ignore the above circumstances, but, in a certain sense, set the country back in solving the long-standing Russian problem of "overcoming the curse of distance"¹.

In the opinion of the authors of this issue (see papers by V.I. Klistorin and A.K. Tulohonov), they include the updated "Strategy of socio-economic development of the Siberian Federal District until 2035"². This document seems to be a huge "step backward", especially when compared to the works and ideas of its outstanding predecessors.

¹ Kryukov V.A. Does Siberia need a new development strategy? // Rossiyskaya Gazeta: Ekonomika Sibiri. 2023. No. 11 (8956), 19 January.

² The Government approved a new Strategy for socio-economic development of Siberian Federal District up to 2035. Order #129-r dated January 26, 2023. January 27, 2023. Documents – Government of Russia (government.ru)

Thus, in one of the first strategic documents on the development of Siberia it was noted: "...Overcoming the distance is the most important task of economic construction for the Siberian region... Not coal, but coke and chemical products; not round timber, but lumber, plywood, wood pulp, pulp and chemicals; not grain, but flour; not oilseeds, but oil; not milk, but butter, cheese and casein; not frozen meat and fish, but bacon and canned goods; not fiber, but cloth, etc.. The guiding principle is that Siberia's interests should be connected in every way with the needs and requirements of the whole state, and the interests of the whole should be subordinated..."³.

Almost a hundred years ago, the main features of the proposed approach to the development of the region – production cooperation and the formation of interconnections and interaction with other regions of the country – all that we still consider archival today, were quite clearly and definitely noted. Our respected predecessors considered the deepening and expansion of industrial and technological cooperation not only through the prism of planning and distribution of state investments (there were no other sources at that time), but also in the context of inter-sectoral territorial coordination and active participation in these processes of the scientific and expert community:

"...Grouping of enterprises into related technological territorial groups; "in-line" arrangement of plants in the direction of raw materials, industrial products, waste, energy flows; combination of production processes; combination of production processes at different plants and transport according to the principle of unified technological schemes and schedules; common service arrangement for entire groups and regions; common engineering and architectural devices; organization of district and communal services; unified planning – with consistent use of the following methods It is expedient to create coordinating centers for research, planning, architectural planning, inspection and coordination and part of the construction activity"⁴.

³ Main provisions of the General plan of development of national economy of Siberian region 1926/27–1940/41. The Siberian Planning Commission. Novosibirsk: The publication of the Siberian Regional Planning Commission. 1927. 134 p. [P. 14].

⁴ *Kolosovsky N.N.* Baikal-Cheremkhovsky industrial-territorial complex in connection with the tasks of district planning. Conference on the Study of Productive Forces of the Irkutsk Region. 4–11 August, 1947. Theses of reports. THE USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES. Council for the Study of Productive Forces. [P. 315,317]. Executive Committee of the Irkutsk Regional Council of Workers' Deputies. M.-L.: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. 1947. 344 p.

The transition to a "supply economy" declared at SPIEF-2023 is conditioned, in our opinion, not only by the new geopolitical reality, but also by the urgent need to overcome the negative consequences of the overly hasty incorporation of the economy of our country and (especially) its eastern regions into global value chains. This transition involves the formation of projects of national importance, based on such (still little accustomed to us) methods of regulation and public administration, as coordinated coordination based on mutual obligations and agreements of all parties involved⁵.

This is what makes the modern vision fundamentally different from the approach that was implemented during the industrial development of Siberia and the East of the country.

The implementation of new approaches aimed at achieving sustainable socio-economic development in Russia is unthinkable without expanding the degree of involvement of regional representatives and civil society institutions in these processes. And everything has been said about this for a long time, too:

"... The future development of the public economy in Siberia, if Russia is destined to get out of that terrible deadlock, into which it was driven by revolutionary events, will depend on the policy of the metropolis towards the outskirts, which will be accepted by the revived Russian people... Siberia holds a lot of opportunities of all kinds. Its economic prospects, its wealth can, after the revolutions have calmed down, play a major role in the restoration of the productive forces of the metropolis ..."⁶.

There is nothing to add here.

Editor in chief of 'ECO'



V.A. Kryukov

⁵ *Uss A.V., Kryukov V.A., Nefyodkin V.I., Krivorotov A.K.* How to increase the regional effects of resource projects. 2022. № 2. P. 27–46.

⁶ *Serebrennikov I.I.* Siberian Studies. A synopsis of lectures on Siberian Studies, given at the cooperative courses in Harbin, in May-June 1920. Harbin. 1920. 212 p. [P. 210].

