Impact Factor:					
ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	РИНЦ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 6.004	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

SOI: 1.1/TAS DOI: 10.15863/TAS

International Scientific Journal

Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) **e-ISSN:** 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2026 **Issue:** 06 **Volume:** 158

Received: 16.05.2026
Accepted/Published: 30.06.2026

https://T-Science.org

Issue Article

Yulia Igorevna Prokhorova
Institute of Service and Entrepreneurship (branch) of DSTU
Bachelor

Vladimir Timofeevich Prokhorov
Institute of Service and Entrepreneurship (branch) of DSTU
Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor,
Shakhty, Russia

Lyudmila Anatolyevna Romanova
Yug Test LLC
Ph.D., Associate Professor, deputy Director
Rostov -on-Don, Russia

Svetlana Yurievna Korablina
Orthomoda
Candidate of Technical Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Director

Galina Yurievna Volkova
Orthomoda
Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor, General Manager. Director
Moscow, Russia

ON THE NEED TO CREATE FUNDS TO SUBSTANTIATE THE EFFECTIVE PRODUCTION OF PRIORITY AND IN-DEMAND PRODUCTS

Abstract: *In this article, the authors note the Russian reality of entrepreneurs and their employees' propensity to bribery, concealing income from the tax authorities, falsifying documents, and disregarding ethical standards when dealing with competitors. A communication gap emerges between managers and employees; in other words, the company's manager is inaccessible to lower-level workers. It is also noted that Russians have an average level of individuality and often try to avoid uncertainty. As a result, the conclusion suggests that in Russia, companies and HR management are ineffectively structured, and teamwork is virtually nonexistent. Companies focus entirely on fulfilling the conditions imposed by government bureaucrats rather than fulfilling their responsibilities to consumers and society. Therefore, it is difficult to implement progressive foreign management methods in Russian practice. The authors recommend that the market rethink its concept of filling it with in-demand and priority products, taking into account their demand. Such a concept will fully correspond to the consumer's desire to satisfy their aspirations and desire to make a purchase taking into account their social status, ensuring that manufacturers sell their products in full and guaranteeing enterprises sustainable economic benefits from their activities.*

Key words: *quality, import substitution, consumers, producers, profit, sales, demand, relevance, competitiveness, sustainable energy efficiency, economic policy, financial condition, innovation, flexible process, digital production, efficiency, market, sales.*

Language: *English*

Citation: Prokhorova, Yu.I., Prokhorov, V.T., Romanova, L.A., Korablina, S.Yu., & Volkova, G.Yu. (2026). On the need to create funds to substantiate the effective production of priority and in-demand products. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 06 (158),* 221-235.

Soi: https://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-06-158-10 ***Doi***: https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2026.06.158.10

Scopus ASCC*: 2000.*

Introduction

UDC 338.56:303.78

Man began to realize his rationality and its advantages much later than he became homo. Sapiens. The understanding of intelligence -apparently arose under the influence of economic activity, specifically, during the historical period when the process of diversification of socially important labor began—productive labor significantly supplanted gathering, and those who tamed and controlled domestic animals emerged from among hunters of purely natural products, along with farmers who were the first to explore the constructive potential of intelligence.

Productively structuring the desired outcome within the context of a natural order that existed long before one's existence is still extremely problematic, and in the early days of human history, it was almost hopeless. Nevertheless, it was then that what can be defined as proto- -planning, or arch- -planning, arose. Humans tapped into the reserves of their rationality.

Reason is the ability of a person, within the framework of systemic relations with the natural environment, to complete the animal (biological) form of subordination to nature not only through the art of adaptation, but also through transformation.

Planning arose as humans mastered the advantages afforded by rationality. Here, it is necessary to clearly contrast rationality and consciousness as specific characteristics of modern humans. Rationality is primarily a biological trait, while consciousness is its concrete historical development within the context of the social form of human life, a way of realizing the potential of rationality. Therefore, the systematic use of the concepts of "consciousness" and "rationality" differs. "Rationality" is part of consciousness as a tool for constructing the latter. Rationality distinguished humans from the totality of biological species; consciousness allowed them to develop into modern humans and build their human, social structure of relationships, thanks to the ability to foresee and plan, and, in planning, to foresee possible—desired and undesirable—outcomes. Planning is an attribute of activity, one of its qualitative characteristics. It is doubly qualitative: both as a qualitative characteristic of activity and as a measure of the level of perfection of activity. The active side of homo manifests itself in the art of planning. Sapiens. To a certain extent, this is a sign of a higher state of activity. Attempts to contrast planning and creativity are nothing more than a desire to limit the universality of planning, to simplify the nature of human rationality. It is also a mistake to contrast planning with free competition. Both creativity and competition are modes of activity, and therefore, all its attributes must be present in them. Another matter is that the general is realized through the particular and, therefore, in its reality, is specific, concretized. S.V. Kovalevskaya dared an original solution to the problem of describing the rotation of a rigid body with a shifting center of gravity—an aerobatics in mathematics, according to the Paris Academy of Sciences, previously accessible only to L. Euler and J. Lagrange. She planned her actions both in terms of subject matter and in time, meeting the deadline. Even the ancestors of today's apologists for the fight against the planned economy -the pioneers of the development of the riches of North American lands—planned their actions within the limits of available knowledge.

Main part

In 2025, the global economy grew by 3 percent, while the EU economy grew by approximately 2 -percent, keeping pace with its Western neighbors and Russia. These indicators can be classified as satisfactory, based on scientific findings that the fundamental indicator of social development in the context of ecosystem stress caused by exploited technologies in industrial and agricultural production is the sustainability of growth, not the absolute value.

Slowing down the growth of production may be undesirable within the current context, but it is necessary as a temporary measure. It is more important for modern humanity to gain time, and for nature to gain hope that the global scale of the environmental problem can be addressed without a global cataclysm. Both nature and humanity have reserves. The key now is not to increase the pace of production, but to use the "reserve time" to develop energy-saving technologies and restructure production, especially those that are materially and energy-intensive and have open cycles. The fate of humanity will depend on how intelligent it truly is. It seems that homo Sapiens is once again being tested for survival, with the difference being that this time it has forced nature to test its own resilience. Climate change is already calling into question the much-touted ability of technological progress to protect humans. Humanity as a whole is not yet aware of this danger, but it is already frightening residents of certain places, regions, and continents that recently seemed prosperous.

This analysis of the situation is also directly relevant to the Russian Federation. We also face a rapid transition from the idea of absolute mass

production and gigantomania in distribution centers to a relative subordination of the economy to the principle of "satisfying the customer's needs here and now." Manufacturers must know their customers "by sight"; only then will production costs be rationalized and everyone—nature, the producer, and the consumer—will be satisfied. The functions of trade will also change; it will become an industry providing a direct connection between consumer and producer. The market will be forced to invest in science to obtain a true picture of the market's state, understand trends in current interests and consumer purchasing power, be prepared to promptly provide door-to-door product routes, and solve logistical problems on the ground in real time. "Consumer society" will gradually return to " production society," and public consciousness will once again closely link consumption with participation in production. Fake labor—the product of the virtual part of "production"—will decline; fake workers will be legitimized and begin to work for their own future.

Big science, through systems analysis, is called upon to determine optimal rates of economic growth on the scale of national, regional, continental, and global progress, rather than a phantom "world government" acting in narrow, acquisitive interests. At the beginning of the third millennium, the most pressing question is how to optimize the organization and management of production development, prioritizing consumer interests and environmental safety. Underestimating the strategic scale of planning reveals flaws in the understanding of rationality, and ultimately, flaws in the rational capacity of those behind the attacks on the universality of planning. In attitudes toward planning, it is easy to discern:

firstly - the lack of panoramic thinking;

secondly - his ideological orientation towards the narrow format of utilitarianism as a perverted pragmatism.

The ideological pluralism that replaced communist ideology must be viewed critically. The right to work is not the same as guaranteed employment. With the right to work, you can remain unemployed, and complaining has no legal meaning. Something similar is observed with ideological pluralism. The guaranteed right to adhere to the ideological concept that is closest to the values of one's consciousness is blocked in the information society by the ownership of official and most significant sources of information. The internet and its "toys" are portrayed as a competitive means of ideological monopoly, but in reality, it is not. Ideological pluralism can fairly be compared to a large river, for example, the Don. A large river is not born large; it becomes so as smaller rivers and streams flow into it, their traces dissolving. Rostov is on --the Don, but, in the grand scheme of things, not on the Don, but on a collection of water sources that merge into the Don. However, all these sources will remain nameless in Rostov. To the question: "What river is this?" The answer is short: the Don, and it will appear on the map. In pluralism, -one aspect typically dominates, reflecting the balance of power, backed by economic interests and financial resources. Today, the media, general and vocational education programs, and pop culture practices induce a worldview shaped by liberal values. At the same time, few people acknowledge that modern liberalism is not the same democratic liberalism under whose banners Europeans stormed the citadels of absolutism, and under whose banner the bourgeoisie of the 18th – 11th centuries won the historical right to build social relations required by the specifics of capitalist production.

The founders of political economy as a science—A. Smith, D. Ricardo, D. Hume, and J. Sismondi—relied on the systemic significance of labor in any production system. They were the first to recognize the growing importance of the skill component of labor in connection with the scientific and -technical advancement of the industrial form of labor organization, which is where the rationality of human status manifests itself. Capital, in order to realize its potential, had to grow through freedom of advancement, and the freedom of capital movement was only possible under conditions of the freedom of the subject of labor, their social independence, formalized in legislation and guaranteed by a new type of state. They were socially oriented liberals; for them, the concept of "people" had a concrete -historical meaning—a collection of individuals whose lives were conditioned by the development of production. Science, whose subject was the organization and meaning of production and economic activity, was expected to protect the producer from arbitrary action. The revolutionary bourgeoisie emphasized the value of fairness in distribution—remuneration in any form should be tied to the quantity and quality of labor and to one's place in the management hierarchy of production. It's no coincidence that Adam Smith noted the widespread disruption of the correlation between productivity growth and compensation. In keeping with the spirit of the times, the Scottish scholar attributed this to the moral decline of property owners. In his famous work, "New Principles of Political Economy" (1819), J. Sismondi argued for the regulation of economic competition and the balance between supply and demand, and advocated social reform as a law of production development. His ideas later inspired the 20th- century classic, J.M. Keynes.

The outstanding achievements of the classics of political economics include precisely what the learned economists, who guard the interests of the current heirs of the revolutionaries – the bourgeoisie of the 18th- 19th -centuries – strive to carefully conceal, namely:

- a fundamental position in the production of that labor which can be specifically measured in the produced product;

- development of a theory of value in relation to such work;
- freedom of the producer as a necessary condition for the development of production;
- the decisive factor in the development of production is labor productivity, and the improvement of labor productivity is due to the division of labor, which also facilitates the introduction of scientific and technological achievements into production;
- The goals of economic movement are only partly within the development of production; the main goal is determined by the systemic position of production itself in the life of man and society.

Production -is a tool for solving problems of social and personal development, therefore planning must be socially and culturally oriented.

It is curious that all the leading economic -theorists of the 18th – early 19th centuries have left their mark on the history of thought as philosophers. No one has yet attempted to explain this fact, apparently -assuming its insignificance. In vain. The combination of philosophy and economics in research has proven a tradition in subsequent times – Proudhon, Dühring, Marx, Engels, Mill, Spencer – the list goes on. The essence of this alliance lies -in the specific epistemological and methodological purposes of philosophy and science. Philosophy is more oriented toward discovering and defining developmental problems, science – toward methods for resolving them. Hence the normative nature of scientific knowledge. Adam Smith and his contemporaries saw, first and foremost, the problems of economic movement – that is, they demonstrated their philosophical talents – and then took up their scientific understanding. The need for economic planning was initially discussed exclusively in the context of its optimization, since planning was envisaged by the rational nature of the organization of production. Planning was a phenomenal expression of management, and management -an attribute of production. The titles of D. Ricardo's numerous studies, which served as material for his successors—both worthy and dubious—do not contain the word "planning," but the content of their works is structured as a superstructure over the process of planning the corresponding economic actions. The British economist D. Ricardo was particularly interested in pre-planning— -the set of calculated mental operations that preceded planning at the stage of determining the objective actions—choosing the direction and nature of participation, and in evaluating results, when subsequent actions are planned. Neither S. Smith, nor D. Ricardo, nor Sismondi contrasted freedom of economic choice with planning, nor did they view planning as an action incompatible with economic freedom. They interpreted freedom within the framework of the political conditions of life, that is, in the spirit of the ideological positions of the class solving the historical problem of changing the socio-political, economic, and cultural structure of social relations. It should be noted that a certain sophistication was also characteristic of the methodological foundations of their scientific research. They contained some limitations, but it's easy to see that these shortcomings were actively overcome when it came to scientific calculations. Unlike most of their descendants—today's academic economists—the classic economists sought to incorporate fundamental categories of economic science into economic analysis, rather than mathematical methods and narrowly defined concepts. Their talent built the theoretical foundation for scientific analysis. Essentially - the progress of scientific economic knowledge in the 20th century was a superstructure on this foundation, and what emerged from it resembles the Leaning Tower of Pisa. The intense debate regarding the content of basic political economic concepts in the 19th century is not difficult to explain; the emergence of new theoretical concepts requires methodological advances. To understand the mechanism of a clock's pendulum, Huygens had to independently expand mathematical analysis in six areas. A. Smith, a pioneer in economic theory, was solving methodological problems and was unable to distinguish between labor purchased and labor expended. Smith's mistake was corrected by D. Ricardo, who explained that his predecessor had overlooked the fact that the cost of a commodity must also include the costs of production and operation of equipment. Furthermore, D. Ricardo himself had overlooked the costs of raw material production. Sismodi, Smith, and Ricardo all assessed value primarily in terms of relationships between things. Historically conditioned human relationships remained, as it were, unrelated. This explains the inconsistency in their understanding of the political essence of production relations and their class nature. For them, production was a stage on which the scenario of production unfolded as a relationship between partners. Some had capital, others knew how to make things. Each received -a share of the common cause. In this combination, the political essence of the economy is reduced to the foundations of organization, development planning, and distribution—that is, it is simplified to the level of specialized knowledge, moral responsibility, and integrity of the participants.

How does the above relate to the theory and practice of modern planning? Directly. The preceding analysis provides grounds for asserting that the effectiveness of practical planning is directly dependent on the quality of theoretical understanding, reflecting the lawful nature of the emergence and development goals of production. The quality of planning theory is determined by the political and -economic methodology that underpins it. Planning reflects the depth of knowledge of the

economic process requiring management and the degree of rationality of management actions. The latter requires special clarification.

Rationality, as a phenomenon, has a dual interpretation. In philosophy of the past and in the new century, "rationality" was and is understood as an independent phenomenon, realizing the identity of thought and being—for example, Hegel expressed this in the absolute idea. Alternatively, it is viewed as a unique capacity of the subject, -the highest level of ideal ability to reflect reality. The characteristics of this level are determined by the adequacy of thought's reproduction of what occurs outside of it. Rationality guarantees the possibility of obtaining an ideal copy of objective reality. The task of rational thinking is to transform possibility into a corresponding result. The process of cognition—reflection of reality by thought—is lawful, and therefore can and should be planned. Here, the main condition for obtaining a product is to match actions to the nature of the object. The path to truth is fraught with many obstacles, related both to the nature of the planned action and to the specific nature of thinking itself. Thinking is capable of knowing the truth, but it is also prone to movement in a false direction, which can be a delusion, or it can be deliberate with the aim of adjusting the result to the fulfillment of someone's interests, or be a consequence of moral dishonesty.

Most of the flaws in the search for correct solutions to economic problems have fundamental roots. They stem from a one-sided understanding of the functions of economic research, particularly the sequestration of the political essence of economic science. Planning as a tool is viewed in a utilitarian sense, allowing for the process to be simplified, leaving out everything not directly related to production. The essence of the economic reforms in Russia in the 1990s -and their continuation in the 21st century consisted of removing responsibility for social development from the economy, which meant pitting economics against social policy. Politics was the business of the state and its institutions, and the new owners were supposed to focus solely on production. What had traditionally been considered non-economic was supplemented by no less than what had traditionally been considered economic. The new owners relegated all these additions to the status quo, considering them to be support for production, in other words, its infrastructure. That is why we have developed an oligarchic semblance of capitalism: the acquisition of the most economically profitable property with the help of the state, outright robbery through corporate raids, and the induction, with the help of its people in the state, of political activity in the direction of objectifying and legitimizing the "new economic policy."

Corruption is not the abuse of power for personal gain or the securing of lucrative economic projects through bribes; it is the fusion of business and government. A country as rich as the Russian Federation could not have become poor in ten years due to irrational economic policies and miscalculated planning. Poverty did not arise for economic reasons; it was the result of the usurpation of power by political clans expressing the economic interests of those who had unlawfully become the masters of national wealth. According to clearly understated statistics, at least 71 percent of resources are currently controlled by one million owners, while 140 million cannot reliably claim even the remaining 29 percent, as the -economic "reforms" that began in the 1990s continue.

Economic violence was carried out under political and ideological cover. The democratic reformers carried out a gigantic scam, disguising their actions as the need for a decisive struggle against the centralized planning model. Understanding that their own practice and theory were doomed to failure, the initiators of the collapse of the socialist economic system rushed to take advantage of what the people of a great country had created and scatter across the world in the hope of finding refuge among its enemies. The "scholarship" of the reformers was so high that it failed to prompt them to the most basic things. -The idea of socialism has long since ceased to be a phantom in various parts of the world and has become a political program, including that of government parties. Socialism is attractive because it condenses the logic of social progress and the meaning of the systemic position of production. The concreteness of socialism reflects the specifics of historical time and national history. The socialist orientation and organization of production crystallizes the systemic principle of social life—the dialectic of the individual and society. Society is a form of reality of human existence, but the reality of human existence itself exists and develops only thanks to three hypostases. Personality. Social history begins with the individual; they are the primary subject of its advancement, and within them lies the goal of social progress. Production is called upon to be the economic foundation of social practice, aimed at creating sociocultural conditions for the comprehensiveness and harmony of the human personality. Economic policies, which determine the form and purpose of planning, may vary, but all this political economic diversity ultimately resolves itself into two sets of actions. The first set consists of those programs that express private interests and are oriented toward the social benefits of representatives of these groups. Typical examples of such economic plans are the political programs of Trump in the United States and Macron in France. These programs are real, but not historical. They condense one aspect of production— -stimulating its growth—but do not define the other, -ultimate goal of the systemic status of production. The systemic place of production in social progress is camouflaged. Let us repeat: production serves as a means of personal

development. Through participation in production, the individual earns the reality of their existence, and the desire for development to be the only way to realize their potential seems natural. In the terms of Hegel's genius, economic planning is divided into "real" and "rational," aimed at creating conditions for personal satisfaction with one's own development, and "situational," that is, beneficial to those social groups that create this situation for their own personal, rather than historical, interests. Such a reality is possible, but it lacks the "rationality" that reveals the logic of social progress. Here, one can achieve temporary and private satisfaction, for which all subsequent generations will have to pay a hundredfold. Actual history will inevitably carve out its own path through such economic "blockages." But the "tax" of historical logic on the illogicality of human economic activity is quite high. When the saying goes, "Measure seven times, cut then," compared to the "tax" on the irrationality of economic policy, this ratio seems modest. Calculations show that for every year of "bazaar-like," -criminally -arbitrary planning practices, -a country can pay with eighteen years of restoration. The "breakers" of the 1990s -defeated the planned nature of economic development on a national scale. They proved more active than the "masters" of the 1980s -, confirming the old truth: history demands an active approach. Naturally, the complex history of the Russian Empire and the USSR did not deserve the continuation described above. Russia's economic status needed to be reactivated differently. Russia will have to expend considerable effort and resources to restore its international authority. Politicians love to write about how the evil Americans and NATO members deceived the first presidents of the USSR and the Russian Federation. Much less common are analytical materials showing how Gorbachev and company, and Yeltsin and his associates, deceived those around the world who looked with hope to the fate of socialism in the USSR and, not without reason , counted on an alliance with the new Russia. It would be interesting to mentally retrace the steps of the 1990s reformers' "road map -," if only to bring some sense to their heirs, today's political liberals, who remain unrelenting two decades later. Trace how they sought a replacement for the previous practice of economic planning, completely ignoring not only national idiosyncrasies, which could be -explained, but also the concrete nature of the historical process. In their search for a possible model, Russian engineers and economists have considered countries on all continents. And yet, it remains unclear what should happen after the "transition period" ends. What kind of economic order should we prepare for? The arrow could point us both to capitalism, although here we are a century and a half late, and to socialism, which we have seemingly abandoned. Let us attempt to analyze the current situation using objective criteria. Despite differences in detail, economic reformers remain within the general framework of purging economic planning of social aspects. While the banners of the revolutionary bourgeoisie bore the inscription "liberté," which gave liberals their name and demanded that the state grant full civil liberties, the new generation of liberals seeks to achieve freedom by removing the state from active participation in the development of production through planning and control. They seek to decentralize economic governance, remove social responsibility from economic activity, and force only the state to bear social responsibility, while at the same time impeding in every way those state actions that lead to an increased social burden on economic profit. Essentially, -liberal economist reformers strive for special freedom and a privileged status within the state. Any objectively reflective analyst will recognize a clear historical alogism: the -founding liberals who laid the foundations of liberal ideology clearly defined the core value of liberalism—equal freedom for all—as a necessary condition for social responsibility, while their successors in the 21st century are burning with the desire to be so free as to not bear responsibility for social progress. Essentially, this is nothing less than a 180-degree turn toward the model of social inequality. Social equality is built not only by the state as a political entity, but also by all other actors in society. Even more than the state, they owe their social status to being responsible for the exercise of constitutional freedoms. The excesses in the liberal interpretation of the foundations of social relations are easily forgiven by A. Smith, who was convinced of the system-forming status of morality. However, after it became clear that morality has a historical form and is formed under the active influence of an economic foundation, and is not a unitary entity—several varieties of morality operate simultaneously in society—it is immoral to separate the economy from direct participation in sociocultural improvement, positioning its progress as self-propelled, and planning to purge it of sociocultural burdens. The idea of "infrastructure" may be a useful scientific acquisition, but not in the case of economic development. Human rationality has its own unique history, but it is absurd to examine it separately from biological evolution and the sociobiological continuation of natural history. Before human rationality emerged as the singular acumen of liberal economists inspired by the idea of reform, it was itself a derivative product of labor, that is, the formation of economic reality. The actual history of the mind is, through a natural -historical process, embedded in the development of what eventually became known as the economy. Consequently, sociocultural progress, which reveals the potential of human rationality, must inherently belong to the economic movement. The concept of "superstructure" doesn't characterize -some artificial structural addition to the main structure; it helps us understand the architecture of a monolithic

building. No matter how you depict the first floor or call the second the first, you cannot escape their structural unity. -The second will be seen above the first, and the second will exist because of the first: without the first, there will be no second. But the first without the second is quite independently real. The history of labor has a natural origin in the lives of animals. It was in the animal world that nature "refined" the model of human reality and "understood" that without achieving the sociocultural effect of such practice—psychological progress; the transformation of quick-thinking into conceptual thinking through the development of abstract ability; the development of the significance of a holistic perception of the world based on imagination and the strengthening of the social value of responsible behavior— -that is, the development of rationality—labor will not be able to realize its potential. The history of labor, which evolved into the history of production, which became the object of specialized scientific analysis, providing the subject matter of economic science, is the history of a single, interdependent process consisting of labor activity and its sociocultural support. The only question is, to what extent is the sociocultural factor economic? Trying to be smarter than everyone else, liberal economists found themselves above both science and the achievements of philosophical understanding of the reality of human existence. In the interests of business, they decided to reconstruct the logical structure of the historically established system of social existence. To simplify the basic part of the social structure—to separate economic activity from sociocultural activity, disregarding both the objectivity of these connections and the regularity of development. To this end, reformers devised a new scheme: to enclose the sociocultural sphere within the state. The state indeed performs this function, but it is not the only responsible social actor. Rationality and sociality are immanent attributes of everything that constitutes social life. The attempt to free ourselves from "super-economic" burdens, citing the need to rationalize and optimize the structure of relations—to replace immediacy with indirection; in the economic policy of " -we pay taxes to the state, and it fulfills sociocultural responsibility for us"—is a typically egotistical move. The goal here is obvious, and unfortunately, it is not to improve production, but to pay less for the right to produce, leaving a larger margin for ourselves. One example to illustrate: the first libraries, cultural institutions, and, in many places, schools in Siberia appeared only with the construction of the railroad and with its help. The railroad builders and managers did not consider such activities an infrastructural burden; on the contrary, they saw them as the messiah of a new mode of transport. Compare what Russia gained from the reform of railway management in the 1990s -and 2000s -: in the 1990s alone, -the length of railways in the Russian Federation decreased from 87,200 km to 86,000. The reformers built nothing, closing service on bypass roads and sections connecting settlements formed on the sites of large-scale timber and peat mining operations with the main line; they stopped maintaining the socio-cultural infrastructure of residents, including railway workers. Thousands of settlements and millions of people lost their stable access to district and regional socio-cultural benefits. Planning shifted exclusively toward a transition to full business accounting, which meant -"optimizing the economy" by cutting costs, primarily "non-production," which included the socio-cultural complex. In words—in speeches and publications—leaders called for mobilizing reserves to create sufficient conditions for the development of "human capital" as the main resource for production progress, but in reality, the situation turned out to be quite different. The bureaucratic apparatus did not deprive itself of the benefits of socio-cultural support. Full economic accountability in the Russian Federation during the period of complete transition to a new economy was presented in the planning context as extremely simple: not so much increasing labor productivity through scientific and technical equipment of production and creating socio-cultural conditions for the growth of human capital, but rather "optimizing" expenses. Before the reforms of the 1990s -, there was a long waiting list for "train drivers"; the reform shortened it and led to a shortage. There are many places, especially in Siberia, Transbaikalia, and the Far East, where the railway service would have been completely deserted if people had other jobs. Railways are our main national mode of transport. Russia and the USSR expanded with railways, actively building them and developing their socio-cultural infrastructure with people in mind. A socially and culturally well-off people is the number one value in a state. Even Catherine the Great lamented: "I would be happy to build an enlightened society, but we don't yet have an enlightened people." Railway construction had been planned since the 1840s -; Nicholas I personally played the role of a domestic Hamlet, deciding the question of whether railways should be built. The court tried to dissuade the emperor, arguing that the railways would bring revolutionary scum from Europe, and that our climate generally made railway construction unprofitable. Scientists, entrepreneurs, and cultural figures actively advocated for the country's future on the railways. The destinies of the economy and culture were already converging in economic policy, revealing the dialectic of interdependence in the planning of economic and sociocultural interests. The reforms in Russia in the 1990s were economic in motivation and purpose, but essentially political. Redistributing state property among enterprising businessmen within 10 years was only possible with the full support and patronage of the state.

The impact of the reforms has proven proportionate to the new approaches to planning and management: the economy has failed to recover in thirty years. The exception is the extractive industries, which have increased production, primarily developing previously discovered deposits. Agriculture has increased grain production, which is an exportable product. Construction has ramped up, but not a single one of the population's chronic problems has been resolved. The picture is consistent with the analysis above. Only export-oriented production is progressing smoothly. It is either owned by oligarchs or under their effective control. They are ready to supply the entire world with gas, but their own population is eagerly awaiting it, especially those located off the main pipeline. Gas and gasoline prices are painfully hurting those advertised as owners of fossil fuels. The declaration: "Gazprom is a national treasure" is increasingly irritating Russians. Optimization in planning has destroyed the healthcare and education systems; Forest fires have become regular disasters, and floods, significantly different from the usual and long-established ones, have been added. Authorities are trying to blame them on "natural disorder" caused by climate change, but few believe this explanation anymore. Populations are migrating from the Far East, Eastern Siberia, and Western Siberia is next. Just -50 years ago, people were flocking to these places to build, develop science, and cultivate culture. The Baikal-Amur Mainline (BAM) was built by a global effort; funding was limited, but money was found for social and cultural services, albeit modest. Those who developed the plans understood from real-life experience that projects cannot be implemented without something that fosters personal development, satisfies cultural needs, and warms the soul. After all, people were moving to large construction sites from established and developed areas. The answer to the question: what's going on? During the described period of growth, despite all the setbacks and losses, the goal was universal—the well-being of the Fatherland. Of course, even then, the wealth was unequally distributed; -there were both rich and poor, but the main thing was that the goal was unified and, if possible, equal opportunities were sought for careers. Building and producing were not for the pleasure of "golden parachuters"; they were promoting the country and themselves along with it. The liberal ideology of planning, clearly dominant in modern economic policy, reflects the objective state of society, which found itself in a difficult development situation, when the previous understanding of the political and socio-economic outlook, either unable to overcome the emerging crisis or having realized its creative potential, demanded replacement. In both scenarios, opposition forces, claiming the right to resolve social contradictions, were involved. The rise of globalization also impacted the political and economic changes in the domestic reality. Our "messionaries" were helped by their foreign comrades to direct public consciousness toward liberal ideology, but the essence of what happened in the 1990s was not determined from outside. A foreign policy conspiracy undoubtedly existed. This is evidenced by the collapse of energy prices, which was clearly artificial, and the numerous promises of aid that turned out to be false, as well as the demonstrations of sympathy for change and the willingness to share accumulated ideological experience. At the end of the 1980s -and the beginning of the new decade, the world was still bipolar. We generally -never considered our competitors enemies. For us, they were adversaries. And suddenly, the enemy appeared as a friend, ready to help in every way. This metamorphosis in attitudes should have forced one to ponder: why such grace? The answer was obvious. New relations were offered in exchange for a change in political and economic course, which was supposed to begin with a radical methodological overhaul. Gorbachev's "new political thinking" found objectification in perestroika, which blurred the contours of social development guidelines. We have strayed from our path instead of repairing it once again, as was the case in much more difficult conditions. It is enough to recall the NEP: socialist industrialization; reforms of higher education that made it one of the best in the world; creation of optimal conditions for scientific development, mobilization of scientific -and technical resources, which made it possible to prevent a third world war; initiative to use atomic energy for peaceful purposes; space exploration program and much more. It was necessary not to “patching holes” in what had outlived its usefulness, but to develop new options for socialist construction on the previous methodological and socially oriented platform. Capitalism, we repeat, by the 20th century had completed its “classical” history and was forced to restructure, forcibly abandoning what had once helped it quickly accumulate advantages: the colonial system disintegrated as a result of a long struggle for independence; wars aimed at the redistribution of property became a dangerous business that -could boomerang; it was necessary to agree with the idea of peaceful coexistence; It became necessary to strengthen the social dimension of economic policy; the issue of the maximum burden on the natural environment became acute. The history of capitalism has already seen various stages: the primary accumulation of capital; revolutionary activity; the monopolization of capital; and the concentration and dominance of financial capital. A biogenetic law operates in nature, according to which representatives of a more advanced species, during the process of their intrauterine development, rapidly repeat the main stages of biological evolution. Thus, nature links the course of evolution, ensuring continuity and strengthening the strength of evolution. Something similar can be conditionally identified in

social history. At the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries , trying to become a capitalist was entirely feasible, but becoming capitalism, fitting into the system of capitalism as a socio- -economic entity that had been developing for centuries, was highly questionable. The train had been formed, but the locomotives, called upon to be the driving force, were at the limit of their capabilities. The new "cars" threatened to slow down the movement, increase the frequency of "stops" in the form of economic recessions, and exacerbate political tensions in social relations.

Only domestic liberals, blinded and stupefied by their hatred of communist ideals, rejoiced at the prospect of capitalism in the Russian Federation. Even twenty years later, they believe that capitalism, not communism, holds the bright future for humanity. The metaphysical nature of liberal thinking manifests itself in the desire to entrench linear thinking within ideology, to halt historical development at the level of the bourgeois organization of social relations, to tear the capitalist spiral out of the spiral of social progress, and to declare that at this stage, the nature of society's development has fundamentally changed—the historical spiral has straightened out and become forever a linear movement. One could agree with and accept their understanding as an alternative if liberal reflection had an internal systemic form and did not simplify the vision of social development to the point of rupturing systemic relations.

The liberal approach to economic planning, which separates the solution of economic problems from the systemic nature of social relations and contrasts economics with socio-cultural improvement, leaves no grounds for compromise with adherents of the liberal course.

A critical analysis of the liberal planning methodology provides sufficient material for a number of fundamental conclusions.

First of all, it's worth noting the 21st-century liberals' pursuit of a methodological simplification of knowledge and social construction, including planning and economic development. While actively incorporating mathematical apparatus into economic science and resorting to IT technologies, academic economists fail to utilize the inherent methodological resources of economic science. Compared to the contributions to the methodology of economic cognition and transformation made by A. Smith, D. Ricardo, K. Marx, J. Mill, and G. Spencer, the methodological advances of the 20th century seem more like a profound depression in philosophical and scientific reflection. A small number of contemporary researchers continue to seek ways to advance dialectical and systems approaches, recognizing the limitations of mathematical apparatus. Mathematics in economic research serves as an auxiliary methodological tool for solving development problems identified by research experience. It cannot even formulate the problem; its capabilities help to quantitatively assess the state of economic processes. Mathematical modeling is effective in terms of developing possible prospects for spontaneous and constructed processes, but it has never been “political mathematics,” unlike political economy.

We must heed K. Jasker's warning about the fundamental difference between striving for simplicity in scientific thinking and oversimplification as a search for a way out of a complex scientific situation by sequestering its content. Simplicity is -the path to true understanding, while oversimplification -is a move away from it under the guise of scientism. Direct confirmation of this conclusion is the recognition of the "permissibility of speculation" in economic research and projects.

Speculative thinking is a well-known phenomenon arising in philosophical reflection or during scientific discourse. Its epistemological nature has been well studied—the unsystematic evaluation of individual aspects of the subject of thought and, consequently, the absolutization of the significance of these aspects. Mental speculation falsely reflects objective reality, and therefore can be classified as a cost in the production of sought-after knowledge. Speculation has rarely been the product of artificially inducing the cognitive process in a false direction. The "scientific permissibility of speculation" (as defined by liberal economists) has a completely different epistemological mechanism of formation, indicating that their thinking has nothing in common with the postulates that distinguish scientific from non-scientific methods of knowledge.

It is always necessary to clearly differentiate between philosophical reflection, scientific thinking, and non-scientific methods of understanding the world. The problematic nature of philosophical knowledge is logically compatible with the subjective limitations of thought. The falsifiability of philosophically identified problems is limited, since philosophical knowledge is conditionally standardized.

Scientific knowledge must be subject to either rigorous verification or equally rigorous falsification. It does not reproduce its relationship to the object (subject) in consciousness; in its content, it is a 100% objectified process. Even the subject's choice of coordinate system, reference point, and so forth is regulated at all stages of cognition. When scientific knowledge is "enriched" by the "admissibility of speculation," such an addition indicates one thing: a desire to modernize the post-classical stage of scientific history with something that has no relation to the current era or to scientific history at all. By admitting speculation not as a cost, but as a scientific phenomenon in understanding economic movement, innovative economists seek to squeeze an inherently subjective action into the chain of objective reflection

of evolving reality, ultimately descending into solipsism. Scientific knowledge is objective; objectivity is the defining characteristic of scientific knowledge. If economic thinking aspires to be scientific, it must filter knowledge by the criterion of objectivity. "The permissibility of speculation" is tantamount to its legalization in scientific knowledge. This is -nonsense for legal sciences, logic, ethics, aesthetics, and cultural studies, and a negative phenomenon for historical science, political science, and sociology. As a fact of objective reality, speculation undoubtedly exists, and therefore, scientific interest in it—economic, political, psychological, and legal—is justified. However, scientific attention to a fact is one thing, and -the desire to substantiate the systematic nature of speculation as a necessary condition for its development is quite another.

"Speculation," by definition (ignoring its philosophical interpretation as "contemplation, contemplation") is "a calculation or intent based on something -, the use of something -for selfish gain." Speculation, therefore, should be addressed by law enforcement agencies; they would do well to also pay attention to the speculative manipulations of those who seek justification for speculative actions in economics and political science. Political liberals, for example, make little secret of their desire to incite terrorists to act, which would easily eradicate terrorism. The US and its partners have officially recognized the Taliban as an opposition political movement, thus legalizing it. Next in line are Al-Qaeda and ISIS -, organizations banned in Russia. Speculators in economic science are no less dangerous in the context of social progress than advocates for terrorists. It's just that the negative effects of their impact on economic and socio-cultural development are not so psychologically resonant, and, moreover, they have become ingrained in the existing corruption scheme and seem familiar to many.

The rise of economics, as follows from the above, is no accident. It is primitive, manipulative, and controllable; it is not anchored by the demands placed on objectivity and the essential reflection of reality by scientific knowledge. Scientific knowledge uncovers facts in order to understand the laws of their existence, while economics describes the structure of these facts in a scientific manner. The second main conclusion is no less obvious: on the basis of methodological simplification of scientific analysis, the curtailment of the systems approach, and the rejection of dialectical thinking in favor of methodological anarchism and borrowing, liberal economic theory systematically downgrades the epistemological and sociological status of the concept of "planning." The task here is to simplify the concept to such a degree that its scope of application opens the possibility of a purely digital solution to all problems under a program of economic optimization. Planning must be a technically implemented action, free from social politics. The main obstacle is the increasing demand of social progress for the effectiveness of economic development. If we were to convert the historical content of the current stage of social development into a purely economic process—that is, to remove sociocultural construction, "shoving" it off on the state—then economic planning would be completely liberated and would move forward, driven by the prospect of maximizing profits and the absolutization of competition. Liberals conceal the growing contradiction of economics from everyone else. The day is not far off when mathematics, too, will present -its bill to liberal economists. Economists, mercilessly exploiting mathematics, are failing to yield the expected results either in the development of production management or in mathematics itself, and in fact, they devalue the value of mathematical analysis with their extremely low productivity. Political strategists have promised yet another "lifeline" to economics by arguing in favor of a "digital economy," substituting the concept of "economy" for the concept of "production." Production will become digital. The economy arose, It has emerged and will continue to develop as a fundamental social instrument of social progress, which, in turn, has been and will remain the primary factor in human development. The economy must have a human face. All its other characteristics are derived from its humanitarian vector. However, in the liberal -economic dimension, economic planning consistently moves away from satisfying personal development needs.

If it were otherwise, there would be no point in "scientizing speculation." Speculation is persistently presented as a necessary component of scientific thinking, and this is done in the interests of the minority that controls distribution rather than produces the actual product. Speculation has long flourished legally within the artificially constructed relations of the superstructure of production, but it is unnatural within the lawful framework of the established system of production itself, where everyone, regardless of their position, is a participant and has the right to expect their legal share in the product. The order of distribution is determined primarily by ownership, and only then by the share of participation in the production of the commodity. The gap that has emerged due to the lawful development of production and the social superstructure between the two realities of -labor and property, the direct creator of the actual product and its actual owner, opens up a real opportunity to supplement the objectively lawful reality with a conventionally existing, virtual, or speculative reality. This reality -is seen as the path to property.

Speculation is -a roadmap to the capital sufficient to initiate real business. And in this case, speculation has real meaning and can be a conditional fact of

scientific research. But under the dominance of financial, essentially speculative capital, speculation has become a persistently autonomous form of activity, divorced from the production of real goods. Market speculation is an excessive form of intermediary activity. It has already become an obstacle to the development of production. And therefore, the costs of social movement have begun to concentrate in it. By and large, speculation has matured, blossomed, and outgrown the boundaries of legally protected reality.

It is -a typical phenomenon of that form of reality that hinders progress, having squandered the rationality of its actions, and is subject to denial. However, everything will remain as -before, for speculation has a reliable "roof" protecting it from political control: financial capital on a transnational scale.

Thus, historical logic demands that economic planning be implemented in a systemic manner, create optimal conditions for socio-cultural development, and be consistently focused on humanitarian outcomes. Economic planning is driven by the solution of socio-cultural problems, so economic planning models should be more complex, not simplified. The economic analysis of the situation preceding planning should be based on specialized scientific research and be conceptual. Deepening the epistemological and methodological foundation of economic reflection presupposes the active application of dialectical thinking—a comprehensive engagement with historical dialectics and a sufficiently comprehensive analysis of the relevance of this engagement, as well as the advantages of a systems approach. Domestic specialists should keep in mind that foreign researchers also criticize liberal innovations, countering them with an objective analysis of production development trends. This is something of interest to us. Let us take as an illustration the reasoning of the authoritative American specialist J. Galbraith. In his renowned book, "The New Industrial Society," he critically traced the history of the contemporary 20th-century industrial system, which had subjugated the formation of social relations and the human personality itself. Ultimately, Galbraith concluded that radical changes were needed, but not the kind advocated by liberals.

J. Galbraith compared the development of industrial systems under two significantly different scenarios: a planned economy, which liberal economists identify with socialist governance, and a market economy, regulated by competition. Liberals always cite the latter as the ideal embodiment of economic freedom. Drawing on the economic history of the last two-thirds of the 20th century, encompassing both boom and depression, peacetime and wartime, the American scholar demonstrated that economic progress is not inconsistent with state planning. By analyzing economic processes in the context of social and personal change, J. Galbraith convincingly demonstrated the limitations of the liberal concept of economic freedom.

J. Galbraith's conclusions are relevant for a proper understanding of what happened in Russian society at the end of the 20th century and the early decades of the 21st century, on the one hand, and for an adequate assessment of the futility of the ideas of Russian liberals-turned-conservatives, both in scientific and practical terms. The industrial system is dangerous due to its high level of organization; it is increasingly turning into a gigantic mechanism operating according to its own order, functionally ensnaring the individual, subordinating their freedom to its organization. The industrial order, so important and beneficial for the development of production, becomes a trap for individual progress, leading to a one-sidedness of individual development—the formation of a technical man. The "specialist" displaces the individual from the goals of social development. Economists need a specialist honed in the technology and organization of production, while liberal economists view personal development as transcendental to the goals of production. For its development, production requires not the individual, but a knowledgeable and capable specialist. They also organize the functions of culture and education around the preparation of a specialist. There's no need to look far for arguments; there's no need to delve into US history. We simply need to focus on modernizing domestic specialized education—both secondary and higher—by eliminating from curricula anything that promotes personal development in favor of focusing on training specialists in a specific field. The personalized model of education has given way to a competency-based one. The US experienced this reform back in the 1960s -and, according to J. Galbraith, became disillusioned with the idea of rigging education for specialized training. In both foreign and domestic economic policy, Galbraith wrote, everything under consideration is questioned—and not without reason— -as the automatically accepted or taken-for-granted position of people now called the "establishment." These mindsets require political guidance. This reassessment of objectives arose because the idea of liberal reform is no longer valid. In the past, liberals acted as economic liberals; reform meant economic reform. The goal of this reform has been reiterated in hundreds of programs, speeches, and manifestos. Production must grow; income must increase; income distribution must improve; unemployment must decline. This has been the program of liberal reformism for decades. Even the Ten Commandments of the Bible are less well known and certainly less implemented than these demands. The role of a liberal reformer is effortless; it does not involve any -heated debates or scandalous squabbles; no one needs to be convinced or persuaded. All that is required is to stand still and bow as the

Gross National Product increases again. At the end of his book, J. Galbraith concludes: “The progress we are talking about now (let us remember that the book was published in 1967) will be much more difficult to measure than the progress that is associated with the percentage growth of the gross national product or with the level of unemployment. This is explained by the fact that the tasks that the industrial system sets for itself are so narrow that they can be precisely measured statistically. But life is complex. The definition of the concept of the prosperity of society must be the subject of discussion.” We would like to conclude the study of the methodology of planning the development of production by listing the monographs of J. Galbraith: “American Capitalism” (1952), “The Great Crash” (1955), “The Affluent Society” (1958), “The Age of Liberalism” (1960), “The New Industrial Society” (1967). The author seemed to have found a name for modern society, and perhaps he did, but when J. Galbraith uncovered the essence of the "new industrial society," he realized that this society, despite its novelty, was also outdated. The scholar didn't know what the future society should be like, so he carefully defined the emerging society as the "prosperous society," emphasizing the fundamental importance of social and humanitarian goals in managing economic processes.

J. Galbraith adjusted the status of economics to the dynamics of welfare in society. As prosperity increases, the role of economic research changes. When people are underfed, poorly clothed, inadequately housed, and dying of disease, the primary tasks become those that contribute to improving their material living conditions. It is necessary to seek economic ways to increase incomes—"people seek the salvation of their souls most diligently when their stomachs are full." At high income levels, problems other than physiological ones arise, and society is obliged to help its citizens solve them. The advantages of a comprehensive analysis of change are significant, J. Galbraith argued. "Also great—and increasingly greater over time—are the advantages of such an analysis of change that extends beyond economic science. This is explained by the fact that, as national prosperity increases, economic science becomes increasingly incapable of providing a reliable basis for judgments about social problems and a guide to public policy."

J. Galbraith generally adhered to the "general line" of the contemporary interpretation of the subject and functions of economics in the West. He distinguished scientific economic research from political problems, believing that their solution was beyond the competence of economics and the prerogative of the authorities themselves. We will not judge the validity of his position. It is worth recalling that this was a post-war period of clear successes in capitalist construction; economics was not interested in a broader interpretation of its subject matter, in being political economy, or in explaining economic inconsistencies through political relations. Secondly -, we note that J. Galbraith felt deeply uncomfortable, realizing that by limiting economic analysis, like liberals, to a simple study of the dynamics of the economic characteristics of production, he was driving himself into a dead end. Understanding the system requires a systems approach.

Economic globalization is a policy that exploits the objective trend of integrating national economies. This is clearly demonstrated by the example of the WTO. The WTO, on the one hand, encourages planned economic management, while on the other, -it strictly regulates the ability to plan economic development on a national scale, subordinating national interests to global goals whose scientific justification appears insufficient and politically biased. Meanwhile, by joining the WTO, a country is forced to accept the terms of this largely political game.

National economic development projects are increasingly overburdened and adjusted to detrimental national interests, which must be accepted as a cost of globalization. At the same time, it should also be kept in mind that there is no alternative to integration. Sapiens exists as a universal species. Earth is its common home, and development is its shared interest, synthesizing biological evolution and socio-cultural development.

When planning, it is necessary to proceed from the dialectical requirement of a comprehensive, objective analysis of reality, first, and the need to act together in the common interest, second. States have much to divide, but history cannot be tested; humanity has no other, and never will. Dialectics has revealed to us the range of opposition, both practical and theoretical. Struggle is rational only within the boundaries of unity, therefore contradictions must be filtered through the need to achieve a common result that corresponds to the laws of movement of human reality.

Scientific knowledge is associated with costs. A scientist's understanding of what is happening does not always result in true knowledge; error is -the natural progression of any knowledge, and a critical mindset is essential. A scientist should not believe; he must doubt. J. Galbraith is an honest scientist, aware of the limitations of his scientific potential. He logically engages in debate, seeing a way out of dead ends and dubious judgments in scientific disputes. K. Marx was careful about the mistakes of those who served science, believing that scientists, not politicians, are called upon to determine the paths of economic development. Politicians should create the political conditions for resolving economic problems, following the recommendations of scientists. J. Galbraith is absolutely right when he speaks of the complexity of social development and the consequent need to consider economic knowledge and planning in

a new, -broad sociocultural framework. An American scholar with a similar methodological approach fell out of favor with our -liberal reformers at the end of the last century, when the economic reforms had become compressed and a trail of flaws in their actions followed. Our liberals' idol turned out to be Soros, a typical financial and political speculator. Speculators without ideas found a speculator with ideas. As a result, instead of an improved development planning methodology, Russia received a methodology of economic and sociocultural crisis.

Conclusion

Quality is destined to always be at the forefront of both scientific and amateur reflection. The problem of ensuring quality in activities is not only universal and relevant, it is strategic.

The domestic light industry is going through hard times, and consumers are being offered products of dubious quality that have entered our markets through counterfeit and other illegal means. These products offer no guarantees for consumers to exercise their rights to protect themselves from unscrupulous manufacturers and suppliers.

Reinvigorate the role and importance of a quality-focused strategy, as only then will enterprise managers be subjectively and objectively compelled to improve their production processes using nanotechnology, innovative processes, and digital manufacturing, ensuring that competitive and import-substituting materials and products fully meet the needs of domestic consumers. Furthermore, our assertion that the consumption of domestic materials and products is regulated by the market is substantiated. In this case, market demands should shape the role of the state and consumers in production to foster sustainable demand for domestic materials and products, namely:

maintain the range of goods, regulating it through federal, regional and municipal orders;

stimulate price stability;

Increase consumer value and gradually improve their quality. Achieving these objectives will create the foundation for consumers to recognize the need to pay for the benefits of high-quality materials and products, and for manufacturers to understand that improving the quality of materials and products cannot be achieved solely through price increases, but also through technical innovations in digital manufacturing aimed at implementing new technological and engineering solutions. Today, and especially tomorrow, it is crucial to implement one of the defining principles of production efficiency: the manufacturer produces precisely what is needed not only by domestic but also by international consumers.

It is equally important to understand the role and significance of quality activity, that is, to what extent leaders have penetrated the essence of things, learned to manage things, change their properties (assortment), form, forcing them to serve people without significant damage to nature, for the benefit and in the name of people.

Both political leaders and government officials have recently begun to discuss the need for a sound industrial policy. However, a closer look at the regulatory and methodological documents on industrial restructuring suggests we're falling into the same traps we've been making throughout the years of reform.

What is the essence of economic reforms and the importance of industrial policy in them, which are theoretically justified and tested in practice in a number of developed countries?

This includes combating inflation, strengthening the national currency, and financial stabilization. This includes changing ownership patterns in various sectors of the economy through privatization. This includes restructuring the economy to accommodate market conditions.

At the same time, structural restructuring must form the foundation of all these fundamental processes of economic reform. Both financial stabilization and privatization must be subordinated to the process of structural restructuring, as it is structural restructuring that determines the final outcome of reforms and the effectiveness of adapting various forms of production to civilized market relations.

The foundation of economic restructuring must also be the end result—products and services, -and their competitiveness in domestic and global markets.

What was happening in the Russian reforms? All three basic processes (financial stabilization, privatization, and structural adjustments) proceeded independently, without any interconnectedness. Therefore, the methods used by the government and the Central Bank to combat inflation and other economic indicators often ran counter to the goals of structural adjustment.

Regarding the process of structural adjustment, the government's position is expressed in the following statement: "The market itself will put everything in its place." Given this stance on structural adjustment, it's not surprising that national economic policy at that time found no place for such terms as quality, competitiveness, and import substitution. This, unfortunately, is the reality of the reforms that have been implemented. In this regard, I would like to cite well-known international experience.

A world-renowned quality specialist, E. Deming, who was once a scientific consultant to the Japanese government and led Japan out of the economic crisis, says in his book Out of the Crisis: “Managing paper money, rather than a long-term strategy for digital production, -is a path to the abyss.”

Regarding the need for the state to pursue industrial policy, one can cite the statement of the outstanding economist of the past, Adam Smith, who

200 years ago laid the foundations for the scientific analysis of the market economy. Regarding the role of the state, he said: "Only it can, in the interests of the nation, restrain the greed of monopolists, the adventurism of bankers, and the egoism of merchants." This seems to apply to us and our economic situation today. What are the current results of economic activity, what are the achievements in this area? Growth of gold and foreign exchange reserves, reduced inflation, budget surpluses, and other financial and -economic achievements. But is this the end result of public administration? And not the quantity and quality of goods and services sold on domestic and foreign markets, not the population's ability to purchase these goods and services? And, ultimately, not the quality of life of the country's population? Therefore, it is entirely logical today that the task is being set for all levels of the executive and legislative branches of government -to improve the quality of life of Russian citizens.

Let's conduct a broad factor analysis of the "quality of life" problem. Citizens' quality of life depends on the quality of goods and services consumed, -from birth to funeral services, as well as on their ability to pay, which allows them to purchase high-quality goods and services. These two factors (quality and ability to pay) depend on the state of the country's economy, which in turn depends on the performance of enterprises in various sectors, including light industry. Enterprise performance depends on the state of management and the level of application of modern management methods.

The current global practice of widely applying modern methods is based on standardization and certification. Standardization allows for the consolidation of best practices, their formalization in an accessible and understandable form, and their availability to all those wishing to apply these best practices. Certification allows for the assessment of the level of implementation of standard requirements in practice and provides the corresponding guarantee to the consumer. Currently, no more effective mechanism for disseminating best practices has been devised. experience in solving various problems, and corresponding international standardization and certification structures have been established worldwide. An analysis of current international standards aimed at improving enterprise management reveals the following areas of their action:

– quality management systems (ISO 9000 series of international standards and industry supplements);

– environmental management systems (ISO 14000 series of international standards);

– occupational health and safety systems (OH S A S 18001);

– social responsibility systems (SA 8000).

The structure of the problem of "quality of life" and a set of international standards aimed at solving it.

Moreover, international quality management standards are the most significant and comprehensive. Their application of modern methods allows us to address not only the issue of quality improvement, but also cost-effectiveness and productivity. Thus, today the concept of "quality management" is evolving into "quality management."

Thus, the task of increasing the efficiency and competitiveness of the economy, and ultimately the quality of life, is impossible without the implementation of a well-thought-out and competent industrial policy, in which innovation based on digital production and quality should become priority areas of the state's economic policy.

References:

1. Aleshin, B.S. (2024). *Philosophy and social aspects of quality*: - Moscow: Logos, 438 p.
2. Jaspers, K. (2024). *The meaning and purpose of history* - Moscow: Politizdat, 527 p.
3. Hegel, G. (2025). *Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences*: v. 1. Science of Logic, Moscow, Mysl, 452 p.
4. Engels, F. (n.d.). Preface to three editions of Anti-Dühring, K. Marx and F. Engels. *Works*, vol. 20, Moscow, Gospolitizdat, pp. 5-15.
5. Engels, F. (n.d.). Dialectics of Nature: K. Marx and F. Engels. *Works*, v. 20, Moscow, Gospolitizdat, pp. 339-626.
6. (2025). *Britannica. The illustrated desktop encyclopedia:* Moscow: AST. Astrel. Vol. II, 2025, 2325 pages.
7. (n.d.). *Large illustrated encyclopedia in 32 volumes*, volume 27, 503 p.
8. Dahl, V. I. (2024). *Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language*: Vol. 1-4. Moscow: Rus. lang., 1981-1982. Vol. 4, 2024, 683 p.
9. Brockhaus, F.A., & Efron, I.A. (2025). *Illustrated encyclopedic dictionary in 24 volumes*, volume 20, Moscow: Eksmo, 256 p.
10. Galbraith, J. (2025). *The New Industrial Society*, Moscow: Progress, - 480 p.

11. Popper, K. (2024). *Logic and the growth of scientific knowledge:* Moscow: "Progress", 606 p.

12. Lazhentsev, V.N. (2024). Academic science and new industrialization. On example Republics Komi. *Regional economy*. — 2024 — T. 12, issue 4. — pp. 989-1000.