Considering Historical Features and External Circumstances

DOI: 10.30680/ECO0131–7652–2024–6–4–7

The issues of environmental change affecting the health and well-being of present and future generations were discussed 40–50 years ago mainly in narrow circles of progressive thinkers and scientists[1]. Today, they have become one of the most pressing economic, political and social issues of global discourse. First of all, in terms of climate change associated with the increase in the average temperature on the planet and the emission of greenhouse gases.

However, despite the significantly increased global relevance of the "climate agenda", the urgency of setting and implementing relevant practical measures varies considerably from country to country and from macro-region to macro-region. Foreign policy circumstances often act as an additional complicating factor. In particular, the processes of de-globalization and fragmentation of macro-regional economic ties, which are taking place before our eyes, contribute significantly to approaches towards solving both climate and environmental problems (paper by I.Y. Blam and S.Y. Kovalev).

Energy production and consumption is one of the dominant factors of climate change on planet Earth. Therefore, the topic of "climate agenda" is often associated with the topic of "energy transition". However, due to geographical, economic, historical and other peculiarities, the countries of the world differ in their approaches to energy supply. Some have long since passed the peak of energy consumption, others are just approaching it, some are primary energy suppliers, while others are mainly consumers. There are huge differences in the structure of energy sectors. For example, in Russia, such components as domestic energy distribution and consumption go back to the industrialization era, including its earliest period.

[1] It is impossible not to mention the contribution of Russian and Soviet scientists to the study of these issues – V.I. Vernadsky, A.I. Voeikov, M.I. Budyko and a number of other researchers.

Oldfield, J., Poberezhskaya, M. (2023). Soviet and Russian perspectives on geoengineering and climate management. WIREs Climate Change published by Wiley Periodicals LLC. – WIREs Clim Change. Vol. 14, Issue 4 – e829

https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.829

Given the above, it appears that it is not only inexpedient but also counterproductive to form and promote "one-size-fits-all" approaches to solving the problems of energy transition. It is extremely difficult for many countries to "leapfrog" from the stage of development of traditional (industrial) energy to energy 4.0 based on flexible intelligently controlled distributed systems. If we recall the terminology of Marxist-Leninist theory, such a leap can be compared to the transition from "feudalism" to "socialism" at once, bypassing the stage of "capitalism" (as the path of socio-economic development of some Asian nations in the XX century was once imagined).

Yes, some economically developed countries (first of all, the EU countries and the USA) have intellectual and production capabilities for the formation and development of the above-mentioned energy systems (paper by L.L. Razumnova and N.P. Savina). However, a significant part of the world countries either do not have such capabilities or are not ready to use them to artificially force events. In particular, the production and technological complexes created in Russia are so large and complex that their transformation requires enormous costs – financial, time, labor and others. In addition, the sources of energy resources in our country are located at a considerable distance from the main centers of energy consumption. This circumstance can be fully characterized as "idiosyncrasy (specificity) of the main assets"[2]. This specific nature is largely due to the socio-economic system within the framework of which these assets were once created. Perhaps there are no such large-scale linear hierarchical systems of energy distribution in the world as was created in our country.

Therefore, without denying the importance of the "climate agenda" and energy transition, it is necessary to keep in mind the above-mentioned circumstances when developing and making management decisions. Yes, "alternative" approaches to energy production, distribution and consumption must be developed, but the pace and nature of this development both in our country and in a huge number of other countries will have significant peculiarities.

The authors of the thematic selection of the present issue of the journal very clearly show that purely market approaches and solutions aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions do not always work, and often

[2] *Williamson O.* Economic Institutions of Capitalism. Firms, markets, "attitudinal" contracting. St. Petersburg: Lenizdat, 1996. P. 167–172.

their application is possible only in the presence of an appropriate social environment (the example of railroad transportation – paper by O.V. Tsygankova; shipping on the Northern Sea Route – paper by A. Yu. Knizhnikov, A.M. Pakhalov, E.A. Shvarts, T.V. Shuvalova). In Russia, this is due not so much to the rejection of classical "market" approaches as to the dominance of previously created assets in its economy and the fact that their new types, oriented to work in a different institutional environment, are just beginning to emerge.

In view of the above, the original position of the Russian delegation at the UN Climate Change Conference (Baku, November 2024) seems quite logical and reasonable to the author[3]: "The Russian delegation … will promote new formats of climate cooperation (including the creation of common carbon markets with the BRICS countries), criticize sanctions and other trade prohibitive measures linked to the "green" agenda, as well as defend the principle of technological neutrality – when countries themselves decide how to reduce or absorb emissions and what technologies are considered low-carbon".

It is also extremely important that the solution to the "climate agenda" involves not only the development of new systems of energy production and use, but also the "socialization" of the process of interaction between Nature and Society. One cannot but agree with the opinion of our American colleague that[4] "…the rethinking of nature that took place in the period from the invention of the steam engine in the late 18th century to the modern large-scale burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil, natural gas) must entail a profound scientific reassessment – not only within the natural sciences, but also within the humanities… we need a new history and a new ethics in the twenty-first century because we risk facing another 'death of nature,' and it may already

[3] *Davydova A.* Money for emissions. The UN conference in Baku will try to agree on new climate finance // Kommersant. 2024. November 12.

[4] *Merchant K.* The Anthropocene and the Human Sciences. From the Era of Climate Change to a New Era of Sustainability / Translated from English by P. Gavrilov). SPb: Academic Studies Press / Bibliorossica. 2024. P. 8, 163.

include humans as a species and much of the modern physical and biological world. But if we can build a new history, a history of sustainability, we will find our way out of the Anthropocene era …"[5].

Among the most important steps is mutual understanding and constructive cooperation at all levels, from individual sites and projects to countries and our planet as a whole.

Editor-in-Chief of the journal,
academician of the RAS  V.A. Kryukov

[5] "The concept of the so-called era of humanity, the Anthropocene, … is directly related to … anthropogenic causes of climate change" (ibid. P. 14)