

The Path of Goodness

DOI: 10.30680/ECO0131-7652-2026-5-4-6

The Russian troika is drifting ever farther from west to east. Slowly but surely, the few remaining points of contact with Europe are being lost. Relations with the U.S. are taking a paradoxical turn: the public, high-profile diplomacy of the presidential administration – which seems to be striving to reach pragmatic compromises with Russia – is coupled with the quiet hostility of Congress and the business establishment, which, on the contrary, are determined to continue opposing our country's rise by any means at their disposal.

All of this looks like a rather absurd spectacle, which, however, is being watched with morbid interest by a certain segment of our society – those who, without a hint of irony, expect that “foreign countries will help us.” It is probably no coincidence that this phrase from the satirical novel by I. Ilf and E. Petrov has become so firmly embedded in our language and culture: it succinctly and wittily captures the mindset of those who do not consider it possible or advisable to methodically follow their own path, independent of foreign ideological and material assistance.

The cargo cult of expecting free aid from the notorious “abroad” – whether the historically alluring, civilized West or the enigmatic but increasingly powerful East – has proven surprisingly resilient, even in the face of openly hostile actions such as the attempts at political and economic isolation in recent years, which our “former partners” repeat with astonishing tenacity.

It has long been clear that the concept of integration into a “rules-based world”—which they impose on their new “partners”—is nothing more than an ideological cliché that, in practice, amounts to nothing more than a one-sided demand to submit to the interests of others in exchange for modest compensation, for example, in the form of payments for scarce natural resources. Discussing the equivalence of such exchanges is not customary among “true gentlemen” – after all, they have not spent the last few centuries building that very beautiful “proper” world just to negotiate today with those who are destined to play the role of suppliers of scarce raw materials, but by no means to be regarded as equals in status and significance as players in global politics and economics.

Victory in World War II – after which we had to be reckoned with in all global affairs – and the subsequent decades of the Cold War are today presented by them, at best, as an unfortunate episode in a history that is already quite distant. The failure of the project to build the most powerful socialist state

on the planet came at a high cost to several generations of Soviet citizens, who were instantly left without jobs or the means to live with dignity.

Fortunately, we are no longer in the catastrophic year of 1992. The high price of overcoming the consequences of the transformational crisis has been paid. New generations of Russians are growing up. For them, the events of the painful transition of the Russian economy from a planned to a market economy – nothing more than distant history, a superficial understanding of which is shaped not even by textbooks, but by short clips on social media.

Russia today is stronger than ever. Perhaps we need to remind ourselves of this more often, without hesitation, that we are all proud citizens of one of the most powerful nations in the world.

Our country's foreign policy strategy is consistent and well-defined: to continue to ensure that Russia's interests and global standing are respected, despite the inevitable attempts to oppose this. Russian President V.V. Putin systematically and patiently conveys this position to all who are able to hear and understand it¹.

In domestic policy, however, we must continue to pursue a course toward achieving sovereignty in all key areas. There can be absolutely no question of building an autarkic economy – indeed, that would be impossible under modern conditions. We must and will participate in international trade, cross-border investment flows, and the migration of specialists. However, the primary criterion for decisions regarding state support for sectors of the Russian economy should be the extent to which such support promotes the development of domestic production.

In his paper, F. Chernitsyn introduces the term “home-centrism”—that is, the formulation of a national strategy exclusively in the interests of one's own “home.” This simple and clearly articulated idea accurately reflects the necessary imperative. It follows that when making government investment decisions, it is important to consider not only the scale of the project itself, its return on investment, and other financial parameters, but also their strategic benefit for the development of domestic production.

If, however, a project serves only the interests of foreign capital and partially satisfies domestic demand for a particular product, it is only fair to develop it exclusively using the resources of the interested foreign investor. And then it will immediately become clear how much the investor believes in their product, its market, and the possibility of developing it without significant

¹ Putin outlined Russia's key foreign policy goals // RIA Novosti. 2026. Jan. 15. URL: <https://ria.ru/20260115/putin-2068100639.html> (accessed on Sept. 15, 2026).

preferential treatment from a foreign government. After all, isn't that exactly how a true market economy is supposed to work?

Russia is self-sufficient and has no need to adapt to any particular type of market system or any concept drawn from imported textbooks. It is necessary to study and understand them. However, it is important to remember that they are written based on the worldviews and specific experiences of economists who came of age within completely different socio-economic systems. Furthermore, it is obvious that these authors base their recommendations primarily on the interests of their own countries, not ours.

Therefore, under no circumstances should we neglect to study and reflect on our own literature and our rich, largely unique experience². The specific challenges of today are strikingly similar not only to many problems of the distant past but can also be solved using the same solutions.

We will continue to follow our own path, the path of goodness, making every effort to ensure the prosperity of the Russian economy and to satisfy the interests of society as fully as possible. We simply have no other choice.

Editor-in-Chief
Candidate of Economic Sciences



A.I. Pyzhev

² Kryukov, V.A. The Russian Academy of Sciences and the Study of the Siberian Economy: From Description and Analysis to Designing Development Pathways in a Changing Environment // *Region: Economics and Sociology*. 2024. No. 1. pp. 13–65. DOI: 10.15372/REG20240101