

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
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: 2023 Issue: 09 Volume: 125

Published: 20.08.2023 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Artur Alexandrovich Blagorodov

Institute of Service and Entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
master

Svetlana Vasilievna Rubtsova

Institute of Service and Entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
Senior Lecturer

Vladimir Timofeevich Prokhorov

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

Galina Yurievna Volkova

LLC TsPOSN «Orthomoda»
Doctor of Economics, Professor
Moscow, Russia

HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE IN RUSSIA IN OVERCOMING ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

Abstract: *in the article, the authors came to the conclusion that “forced autarky has become a powerful stimulus for such an impressive growth,” but it is not necessary and impossible to repeat the experience of overcoming it today. We believe that with Today, the main, principled, long-term line of our state should be to leave the state of autarky and move as quickly as possible onto the tracks of normal economic, above all, cooperation with other countries. Practical significance: the main provisions and conclusions of the article can be used in scientific and pedagogical and propaganda activities for a deeper understanding of the history of industrialization in the USSR and for the search for methods and techniques to overcome autarky, regardless of its origins. At the beginning of the 21st century, a significant difficulty arises in determining the main trend in the development of human society. The 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century were the era of the autarkic struggle, while the second half of the 20th century. - the era of the struggle between two projects of globalization - communist and capitalist. After the collapse of the USSR, researchers begin to talk about the inevitability of one project - the capitalist project of Western liberal democracies. However, the beginning of the 21st century is marked by increased international tension and an increase in protectionist measures, and, in this regard, autarky and imperialism are again on the agenda. Arguing on this topic, the authors conclude about a hybrid of globalization and autarky, as well as a new clash of modern globalization projects.*

Key words: *autarky, industrialization, import substitution, collectivization, loans, economic isolation, economic growth, foreign specialists, principles of trade, social policy, globalization, imperialism, civilization.*

Language: English

Citation: Blagorodov, A. A., Rubtsova, S. V., Prokhorov, V. T., & Volkova, G. Yu. (2023). Historical experience in Russia in overcoming economic sanctions. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 09 (125), 39-45.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-09-125-3> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2023.09.125.3>

Scopus ASCC: 2000.

Introduction

UDC 330.35:339.36.

The current state of the Russian economy, the proclamation of the policy of import substitution is pushing Russia onto the path of autarky, that is,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

towards "self-satisfaction, the creation of a closed, autonomous economy within a separate country." Today, autarky has actually become a weapon of struggle against our country, a means not only of economic isolation, but also of economic strangulation. How to survive in the conditions of an undeclared but ongoing economic and ideological war is the most important problem today. Life, difficult economic circumstances force our state to look for new, even unusual ways of economic development. There is a kind of economic mimicry going on.

Few people know that we, that is, the Soviet Union, already experienced a similar situation, although under completely different circumstances, during the years of Soviet industrialization. But the origins of autarky in the 1920s and 1930s the last century and the present are different. Now this is an element of economic warfare, and by no means the desire of the leadership of Russia and its inhabitants to separate themselves from anyone else. On the contrary, for almost a quarter of a century the new (politically) Russia has been striving to be part of the world economy. Today, no one in the country, being in his right mind, dreams of creating an absolutely independent economy, producing everything by himself and not being dependent on anyone. But during the period of Soviet industrialization, the question was practically raised in this vein. To make the economy of the USSR independent of the capitalists, to produce everything ourselves - these were both the slogans and the practice of being. "Get rid of imports" "We are 50-100 years behind the advanced countries. We have to run this distance in 10 years, or we will be crushed." The 20th century is the era of two opposing trends - autarky and globalization. The category of "autarky" belongs to such a discipline, as geopolitics, and its popularity among researchers of the early 20th century was due to the complex legacy of the 19th century. By autarky is meant the economic and geographical independence of a region. One of the representatives of the German school of geopolitics - Karl Haushofer - connects autarky with the expansion of living space (Lebensraum), thereby justifying Germany's imperialist war against other states. The militant spirit of Germany at the beginning of the 20th century was due to the fact that this country was late to the division of the world and was interested in changing spheres of influence. In the 19th century, the main concern of the Germans was the unification of their lands and the creation of a single state, while global politics were created by the Russian and British empires, whose confrontation became known as the Great Game. Until the end of World War II, international politics consisted of the struggle of various states for their interests. However, after its end, the situation changes, as the USSR becomes one of the largest economies in the world, with huge political influence on other states. Offering an alternative to the social structure of

Western countries, the USSR became the center of the communist bloc of states, which entered into confrontation with the bloc of capitalist states, in the center of which was the United States. The presence of nuclear weapons in both blocs served as a deterrent, and therefore, instead of a "hot" war, the conflict took on the character of a "cold" war, expressed in a clash of countries controlled by large forces and a diplomatic game. At times, the cold war threatened to turn into a hot one - an example is the Cuban Missile Crisis, during which the world was on the verge of a nuclear catastrophe. Second half of the 20th century in international relations, this is no longer a struggle of states, but a struggle of socio-economic systems and their corresponding ideologies. The USSR and the USA offer two different types of globalization - communist and capitalist.

Main part

The collapse of the USSR and the subsequent disintegration of the bipolar system led many researchers and intellectuals to the idea that the only possible future of mankind is liberal democracy, which dominates in Western countries. According to this idea, sooner or later a liberal-democratic system will be established in every country of the world. In 1992, Francis Fukuyama announced the "end of history", which is the inevitability of the liberal-democratic path. The idea of democratic transition is becoming popular. The transition from authoritarianism to democracy in Spain, the softening of dictatorships in Latin American countries, and democratization in the former countries of the socialist camp served as an empirical basis for these theories. A common thread in most early theories of globalization is the notion that that globalization is an inevitable and universal process. It brings progress, political and economic freedoms; with globalization, the world will experience fewer international conflicts and economic disasters.

Globalization is an extremely complex concept with many interpretations. On the one hand, globalization can be understood as a global trend in the development of society, on the other hand, as a subjective process, which is an expression of the struggle of great personalities who alone create history. The primacy of the political aspect in globalization is found in the theories of democratic transition, while the economic nature of globalization is expressed in Marxism. There are ideas about competing types of globalization - the clash of civilizations (cultural approach) or the clash of economic systems (Marxist approach). According to the scientist L. A. Musayelyan, globalization is a process of strengthening the economic, financial, technological, political, cultural interconnectedness and interdependence of states (peoples), regions.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

The content of the modern type of globalization is determined by the dominant type of civilization - capitalist civilization. One of the key features of capitalism is its tendency to expand in search of new markets, sources of raw materials and cheaper labor. Following this logic, capitalism draws more and more regions and states into its sphere of influence, "globalizes" humanity, establishing a complex system of relationships in it. Having included various countries in its sphere of influence, capitalism changes their production in such a way that it meets the needs of the modern global system. In this regard, capitalism should be understood not simply as a set of social relations, a set of legal norms, or the economic structure of any particular state. The researcher Immanuel Wallerstein called the modern world system the capitalist world economy. The capitalist hierarchy is dictated by the logic of the international division of labor. The international division of labor is diversity in unity, and it is this that explains the various "national capitalisms" within the framework of one "global capitalism". As the beginning of the 21st century showed, the optimism of the early theories of globalization turned out to be unnecessary. In many countries, there has been a reverse transition (movement from democracy to authoritarianism) and conservation of the regime. The Russian researcher Melville says that the authoritarian regimes of our time can be not transitional, but quite consolidated and well-established. The establishment of a unipolar world not only did not lead to the cessation of wars, but became the cause of new conflicts. The end of the globalization project is often associated with the events of September 11, after which the project of empire takes its place, the essence of which lies in US hegemony in the international arena. However, according to researcher Radika Desai, the events of September 11 served only as a pretext for a change in US policy in the international arena. In essence, the imperial project is a transformed form of the globalization project - it is a globalization that has bared its teeth, a globalization centered on one hegemonic state. However, the militant globalization of the United States has faced a problem that cannot be solved by war. Back in the second half of the 20th century. The United States and China agreed to move part of American production to China. The benefit for China was the development of industry, while the US gained access to cheaper labor. The result was a significant integration of both economies, which, in fact, is a sign of economic globalization. However, in the XXI century. The Chinese economy has shown unprecedented growth, becoming one of the largest in the world. In addition to China and the United States, modern India is also among the largest economies in the world. China and India have become pretender states whose interests conflict with those of the United States. The United States itself, under President Trump, is proclaiming so-called "economic

nationalism." China and India, in turn, choose "self-sufficiency" - jili gensheng in Mandarin and atmanirbhar in Hindi. According to analyst Scott Malcomson, over the past ten years, these three countries, having increased GDP per capita, nevertheless, reduced the level of international trade, which is measured by the ratio of trade to GDP. The politicians of these countries declare their adherence to such principles as "nationalism", "self-sufficiency" and "independence" also because, in their opinion, the implementation of these ideas can ensure the security of states. At the same time, the clash of American economic nationalism and Chinese self-sufficiency has led to a trade war that has hurt both economies. This is due to the high level of economic interconnection between the two states. A natural question arises - does this mean the complete curtailment of the globalization project and the beginning of a new era of autarky and imperialism? Malcomson, mentioned above, calls this model of globalization differentiated globalization and defines it thus: "This new globalization will not be like the old globalization. It will be based on both self-sufficiency and openness, and it will replace [trade] internationalism with nationalism, mercantilism and something close to imperialism." Malcomson notes that differentiated globalization need not be expressed in the aggressive imperialism of the 20th century. Indeed, today's contradictions between states are very different from the struggle for colonies of the era of the Great Game and the struggle of global public projects of the era of the Cold War. However, it also cannot be said that in the current situation there are no conditions for the transition of the conflict into a more violent form. One of the sources of development of modern China is the domestic market. However, China is already showing interest in new markets and is coming to Africa, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe. One of the interests of the United States, in turn, is to reduce the cost of labor. The United States, seeing that China has turned from a simple assembly shop of the Western world into a state claiming international dominance, is seeking to transfer its industrial capacities to other countries of the Far East, such as Indonesia.

These factors in a sense already "know no boundaries": the informational influence of giant media corporations (information factor) extends to the whole world, nuclear weapons (scientific factor) are what keeps the world from starting a new full-scale world war, and the international division of labor, The dominance of the dollar and the digitalization of the economy (an economic factor) only contribute to the integration of various economies into one.

The principles of trade and, in general, the conditions of economic contacts between the USSR and the countries of Western Europe and the USA were also pushing towards practical autarky. Primitively, but figuratively, these principles are

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

shown by the well-known expression from the immortal work of I. Ilf and E. Petrov: “In the evening, money - in the morning chairs, in the morning money - chairs in the evening”, i.e. really pay and you will receive your product (car, machine tool, raw materials, tractor, etc.). And if today Russia's refusal to receive various kinds of loans is used as a way of economic strangulation, then in the 1920s and 30s. Who will give money to someone who can nationalize (take away) property (which was done in 1918–1920). Therefore, the Soviet leadership practically did not even try to negotiate loans, and had to find opportunities to get real money (currency) to buy equipment for the mass of factories under construction. From here was born the secret principle “We won't finish it, but we'll sell it” - this is about the sale of bread (grain). Due to the urgent need for foreign currency to buy machinery and equipment for factories and factories being built on a mass scale, collectivization arose.

It can even be argued that the inevitable autarchy of the 1920s and 1930s led to collectivization. The famous grain procurement crisis of 1927–1928. put before the Stalinist leadership the question of how to take bread from the peasants. It could be done economically by setting a real, acceptable price for the bread that the peasants would sell. But then it is necessary to “tie up” with industrialization, because then the money will go to the countryside, and not to industrialization. Under no circumstances could the Soviet leadership agree to this: the question of curtailing or even slowing down the pace of industrialization was never even raised.

And the village, the peasants were sacrificed to industrialization, industrial leap, independent economy (autarky). The implementation of the policy of autarky in Soviet Russia was also facilitated by the historical tradition of previous years, i.e., Tsarist Russia. In fact, Russia until the beginning of the 20th century. was almost the only country in the world that was approaching autarky, that is, it had an economic structure that allowed it to exist independently and fully, regardless of foreign import and export. In relation to the outside world, Russia was largely autonomous, providing itself with many necessary goods, and itself consuming almost everything it produced. High protective duties on many goods, especially actively introduced by S. Yu. Witte, stimulated the domestic economy. Foreign imports did not play a vital role for the country. Russia's share in world imports at the beginning of the 20th century was a little over 3%, which was negligible for a country with a population then equal to a tenth of all mankind. For comparison, we note that most Western countries, having a small population, had a share in world imports many times greater, i.e., they were economically dependent on imports. That is why, by the beginning of the 20th century, a unique economic mechanism had developed in Russia that provided the

country's population with everything necessary and was almost completely independent of other countries. A system of a largely closed self-sufficient economy was formed, the main features of which were self-sufficiency and self-satisfaction, and economic activity for the Russian people was part of a rich spiritual life. The struggle to achieve economic independence was especially active and persistent in the early 1930s, that is, back in the years of the first five-year plan.

In the 30s. An unexpected way to circumvent the economic (and hence technological) blockade and solve the problem of creating an import-independent economy was to invite foreign technical specialists. They were paid very high wages, sometimes 2-3 times higher than the "salary" of their engineers and technicians. They were given more comfortable and convenient housing. The first experience of such invitations dates back to the mid-1920s, but this phenomenon became widespread in the early 1930s. For example, in 1931-1932 about 6 thousand foreign specialists worked in the industry. Their number has been growing every year. In fact, it was a way to overcome a technical or technological embargo, to a certain extent successful.

The mass attraction of foreign specialists was launched in the summer of 1930 at the 16th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, when it was decided to expand the practice of sending Soviet workers and specialists abroad and inviting foreign engineers, craftsmen and skilled workers to the USSR. As part of the movement of international proletarian solidarity, a campaign was launched in support of socialist construction in the USSR. Foreign specialists as experts, consultants, etc. participated in the design and implementation of almost all major construction projects of the first five-year plan. The majority came from Germany and the USA, and the main part of imported equipment was also purchased in these countries.

The most successful example of the use of foreign specialists in the industrial development of the country was the long-term cooperation of the Soviet company "Amtorg" with the firm of an American architect A. Kana (Albert Kahn, Inc.), with whom an agreement was signed in February 1930, according to which Kahn's firm became the chief consultant of the Soviet government on industrial construction and received a package of orders for the construction of industrial enterprises worth \$ 2 billion (this is about \$ 250 billion in prices of our time!). This firm provided the construction of more than 500 industrial facilities in the USSR. A branch of Albert Kahn, Inc. was opened in Moscow. Entitled "Gosproektstroy". Its leader was Moritz Kahn, the brother of the head of the company. It employed 25 leading American engineers and about 2,500 Soviet employees. At that time it was the largest architectural bureau in the world. Over the 3 years of Gosproektstroy's existence, more than

Impact Factor:

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| ISRA (India) | = 6.317 | SIS (USA) | = 0.912 | ICV (Poland) | = 6.630 |
| ISI (Dubai, UAE) | = 1.582 | ПИИИ (Russia) | = 3.939 | PIF (India) | = 1.940 |
| GIF (Australia) | = 0.564 | ESJI (KZ) | = 8.771 | IBI (India) | = 4.260 |
| JIF | = 1.500 | SJIF (Morocco) | = 7.184 | OAJI (USA) | = 0.350 |

4,000 Soviet architects, engineers and technicians have passed through it, studying the American experience. The Central Bureau of Heavy Engineering (TsBTM), a branch of the German company Demag.

A. Kahn's firm played the role of coordinator between the Soviet customer and hundreds of Western companies that supplied equipment and advised on the construction of individual facilities. Yes, technology project Nizhny Novgorod Automobile Plant completed by the company Ford, construction - American company Austin Motor Company. Construction of the 1st State Bearing Plant in Moscow (GPZ-1), which was designed by the Kahn company, was carried out with the technical assistance of the Italian company RIV.

Stalingrad Tractor Plant, designed by Kahn in 1930, was originally built in the USA, and then was dismantled, transported to the USSR and assembled under the supervision of American engineers. It was equipped with equipment from more than 80 American engineering companies and several German firms. American hydrobuilder H. Cooper became chief construction consultant Dneproges, hydro turbines for which were purchased from companies General Electric and Newport News Shipbuilding.

Magnitogorsk Iron and Steel Works was designed by the American firm Arthur G. McKee and Co., which also oversaw its construction. Standard blast furnace for this and all other metallurgical plants of the period of industrialization was developed by the Chicago company Frey Engineering Co.

As we can see, the economic isolation of the USSR in the years under review was very relative. It seems that at that time the Soviet leadership found very successful "workarounds" for the economic blockade. But even today you can follow a similar path. "If they don't let you through one door (financial in our case), you have to go to another" (corporate).

When asked whether the USSR succeeded in the 1930s. to create an economy based on autarky is difficult to answer unambiguously. More likely no than yes". Life itself, the "logic of being" forced to gradually move away from isolation. For example, in the ten pre-war years, about 700 thousand tractors were produced in the USSR, which accounted for 40% of their world production. This, it seems, speaks of independence in the production of tractors. But it is known that at least two-thirds of the machine tools and equipment of the new factories (the same tractor ones) were imported. Abroad in the 1930s the country bought about a quarter of textile equipment, more than half of steam turbines, almost 70% of machine tools and tractors, etc. That is, the country's economic power was forged, including (and possibly to a large extent) with the help of foreign technology. But you can give numbers of another series: the country almost stopped importing agricultural machinery and tractors; cotton imports, the cost of acquiring ferrous

metals from 1.4 billion rubles in the first five-year plan was reduced in 1937 to 88 million rubles.

Paradoxically, the autarky of the 1930s became a powerful stimulus for the enormous growth of industry, literally the industrial leap. After all, you could only rely on your own strength and capabilities. For 1928–1941 Almost 9,000 large and medium-sized enterprises were built in the USSR. During this period, the growth rate of industrial production in the USSR exceeded the corresponding indicators in Russia in 1900–1913 by about 2 times. and amounted to almost 11% per year. In the 30s. The USSR became one of the four countries in the world capable of producing any kind of industrial product. In terms of absolute indicators of the volume of industrial production, the USSR came out on the 2nd place in the world after the USA (Russia in 1913 occupied the 5th place). In 1940, the USSR surpassed England in electricity production by 21%, France - by 45%, Germany - by 32%; for the extraction of the main types of fuel, respectively, England - by 32%, France - more than 4 times, Germany - by 33%; in terms of steel production, the USSR during this period surpassed England by 39%, France - four times, Germany - by 8%. The backlog of the USSR from the advanced countries of the world in terms of industrial output per capita has also decreased.

In general, it can be argued that forced autarky has become a powerful stimulus for such impressive growth. However, this does not mean at all that such a phenomenon can be repeated in our days. The country is different and the people in it are different. But one must know one's own historical experience - negative and positive. Analyzing the possible results and consequences of today's autarky in Russia, it is appropriate to ask the question - who or what will be sacrificed to the inevitable crisis by the current leadership of the country? Obviously everyone will pay. This is not the fault of today's government and authorities in general, but an inevitable consequence of the creation of an autonomous, independent (or rather, slightly dependent) economy. Based on this, today the main task of the country's leadership is to make sure that the "payment" for forced autarky is as less painful as possible.

Is it possible to use for our days the historical experience of existence in conditions of economic isolation, what is acceptable and what is not? In our opinion, little of the past experience of existence in conditions of autarky can be used today. Let's start with the fact that the initial, starting conditions are absolutely different. The Soviet leadership deliberately, systematically and doctrinally created an independent, autonomous economy. Such a policy, as already noted, was dictated by fear of the capitalist encirclement. The slogan "We are a hair's breadth from any invasion" was constant. Then, completely unacceptable options were used today: "brutal savings on everything", the use of forced labor, artificial

Impact Factor:

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| ISRA (India) = 6.317 | SIS (USA) = 0.912 | ICV (Poland) = 6.630 |
| ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582 | ПИИЦ (Russia) = 3.939 | PIF (India) = 1.940 |
| GIF (Australia) = 0.564 | ESJI (KZ) = 8.771 | IBI (India) = 4.260 |
| JIF = 1.500 | SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184 | OAJI (USA) = 0.350 |

intensification of labor (social competition), the sale of national cultural values, forced loans from the population, unrestrained emission of money (as a result, devaluation), curtailment of many social programs, mass poverty and, finally, the ruin of the countryside, the transformation of peasants into semi-serf states, etc. Russia.

It is inevitable that the number of "simple" (i.e., not rich) people under autarky will grow. Therefore, the state should also seek to increase the "social responsibility of business" as one of the important conditions for painlessly overcoming the economic blockade.

Today, unlike in the 1930s, it is not necessary (and it is impossible without social upheavals) to ruin and humiliate anyone. No need to part with cultural values, no need to revive the Gulag and curtail social programs, no need to strangle people with "voluntary-compulsory" loans. Today, there is no need to slide into a "drunk budget", that is, to receive income from the sale of alcoholic beverages, the sale of which expanded in the 1930s. By the end of the 1920s. income from vodka reached 1 billion rubles and the industry gave about the same amount.

Conclusion

Summing up, we can say that the modern era is an era in which globalization is an absolute trend, including autarky as an element. The opposition between globalization and autarky is not absolute. Their unity was expressed in the complex processes characteristic of the 21st century. The trend towards globalization exists implicitly in autarky itself: every state that is fighting to expand its living space, or a pretender state that wants to change the configuration of the international division of labor, seeks to "globalize" the world in one way or another. This aspiration exists even if it is not realized by the political elite of this or that country. Despite the statements of American politicians about "economic nationalism", the United States needs the existing international division of labor in the world. Americans want to maintain their dominant position in this system through media influence and economic control over other states with the help of the dollar, which is both the national currency of the United States and the currency in which international trade is carried out. This desire was one of the reasons for the victory of the Democratic candidate in the last presidential election. Modern China also needs globalization, which understands that a large domestic market

cannot always be the basis of the Chinese economy, and sooner or later the PRC will have to face the economic interests of other countries in the international arena. Despite all the conflicts and contradictions, the modern world-system is still a capitalist microeconomics. In this regard, we can say that the modern era is not just an era of globalization, but the era of globalization - in this regard, it is very similar to what happened in the 20th century. The key difference from the 20th century is that modernity is characterized not by the clash of opposing friend of socio-economic systems (capitalism and communism), and the struggle of various forms of the same system - capitalist. And the struggle between the autarchies is being fought over what will be the new hegemon in the capitalist micro-economy of the future.

Naturally, today we need to quickly do what they have been talking about for the last 10 years - "get off the raw material needle in exports." The idea is absolutely banal and obvious. As for the experience of the times of industrialization, it is necessary to point out the propaganda delusion - industrialization was carried out through the sale of grain (bread). This is not entirely true. Here are the figures: The largest revenue for the export of grain was obtained in 1930 - 883 million rubles. In subsequent years, grain prices on the world market fell sharply. The export of a large amount of grain in 1932-1933, when the country was starving and was on the cards, brought a total of 389 million rubles, and the export of timber gave almost 700 million rubles. Only the sale of furs in 1933 made it possible to earn more money than for the exported grain (and after all, grain was bought from the peasants at a very low price).

But today we need to honestly explain to people what awaits them in the near future, and how long the period of forced autarky will continue. This is being done now, but is it enough?

The main, principled, long-term line of our state should be to leave the state of autarky and move as quickly as possible onto the tracks of normal economic, above all, cooperation. Using military terminology, the term "permanent offensive against isolation" can be proposed. Still, the main goal should not be the creation of an independent autonomous economy, as they tried to do in the 30s, but, on the contrary, the use and attraction of all the achievements of civilization in general and modern technologies in particular.

References:

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИЦ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

1. Haushofer, K. (2001). *About geopolitics. Works of different years.* (p.426). Moscow: Thought.
2. Fukuyama, F. (n.d.). *The End of History and the Last Man.* Retrieved from <https://gtmarket.ru/library/basis/>
3. Melville, A. Yu. (2007). *Democratic transits. Political science: lexicon* / ed. A. I. Solovyova, (p.123). Moscow: Ros. polit. encycle. (ROSSPEN).
4. Musaelyan, L. A. (2016). *Historical process and globalization: monograph.* Perm. state nat. research. un-t, (p.128). Perm.
5. Wallerstein, I. (2006). *World-system analysis: an introduction* / per. N. Tyukina, (p.248). Moscow: Territory of the future, (University. Library of Alexander Pogorelsky).
6. Desai, R. (2020). *Geopolitical Economy: After American Hegemony, Globalization and Empire: Monograph* / scientific ed. grew up ed. S. D. Bodrunov, (p.328). Moscow: INIR im. S. Yu. Witte: Center catalogue.
7. Malcomson, S. (n.d.). *The new age of autarky. Why globalization's biggest winners are now on a mission for self-sufficiency.*
8. Verkhoturov, D. (2006). *Stalin's Economic Revolution.* (p.175). Moscow: Olma-Press.
9. Munchaev, Sh.M., & Ustinov, V.M. (2003). *History of Russia: a textbook for universities.* (p.768). Moscow: Norma.
10. Bezuglova, M.N., & Markaryan, Yu.A. (2017). Problems of small business and its role in the socio-economic development of the national economy. *Science and education: economy and economy; entrepreneurship; law and management*, 2017, No. 1 (80), pp. 11-13.
11. Bykovskaya, Yu.V., Ivanova, L.N., & Safokhina, E.A. (2023). Small and medium business in modern Russia: state, problems and directions of development. *Bulletin of Eurasian Science.* 2018. No. 5 [Electronic resource]. <https://esj.today/PDF/12ECVN518.pdf>
12. (2023). *National tourism portal. Regions of Russia. News.* Retrieved 08/01/2023 from <https://russia.travel/>