

NEO-DIRIGISME PLUS NEO-LIBERALISM: ECONOMIC RELEVANCE

YURIY M. OSIPOV,
Lomonosov's Moskow State University, Russia

Abstract

Modern economics requires optimum combination of recognizing each other neo-liberalism and neo-dirigisme.

Keywords: *economics, state, politics, neo-liberalism, neo-dirigisme.*

JEL Classification: B 31; B 50;

Review

Received: April 02, 2012 / Accepted: June 17, 2012

Economics without authoritative whether economic or noneconomic organization is not possible and cannot be. Textbooks which do not take into account this fact are simply lying.

Economics cannot exist without some and quite sound freedom of economic agents and at least some of agents- communities, workshops, guilds, corporations, which is the same to the structural, cluster and network structures representing holistic formations-institutions rather than economics elements, consisting of the elements, but mostly elements-parts. Within these formations, there is not that much of freedom and market for their constituent elements, but enough power on top and subordination, which is implemented at the bottom. Moreover, in the field of economics there are many agents-centers which can create and control for themselves and in their interests considerable if not big economic and market space, including the hosts of «independent» and «free» agents disposed in these spaces, formally not included in the complex corporate and proprietary formations. Among these centers there are some really great centers—so to say «central hubs», which are able to design and organize on their own account huge affiliated spaces, to directly and indirectly manage ongoing processes and reproduction parameters implemented in them. This is what the economic power within the economy, its extensive system, allowing wide latitude to government entities and only narrow, i.e. limited, freedom for economic agents subordinated to these entities, are about.

And such authoritative economy superficial economic science, which lost its responsibility to the reality long ago, following grotesque publicists from the postmodern «society of knowledge», calls liberal, i.e. free.

But this is only the beginning. Liberalism does not pay, or almost does not pay any attention to the fact that a developed large-scale and sustainable economy cannot be not only without authoritative economic organization, but also without authoritative non-economic organization: legal, prosecutorial, judicial, penal, control, fiscal, monetary, financial, budget, investment, redistribution, consumer, etc., carried out by either state or public institutions, and most importantly by not so much economic subjects. Scholar and political liberalism is of course well aware of it, but does not like mentioning it, because its mission is to defend, generally speaking reasonable, the freedom of economic agents, as well as to justify implemented by them or at least by part of them powerful economic tyranny exercised by and through the secret and open agreements, collusion, coercion and compulsion, widely, if not globally spread in the economic environment. Liberalism, whether it wants to or not, but rather yes than no, at least from the turn of XIX—XX centuries., serves not so much some kind of market-competitive freedom but the possibility for the economic and first of all financial powers that be for the outright constrained, in many respects abused dirigisme. Never stopping talking about economic freedom, which is not so bad, liberalism

is shamefully silent about the domination in the economy of the most common non-freedom coming mainly from the most free, though not liberal at all, economic entities-giants.

What liberalism clearly does not want what it constantly and consistently fights, is the state managing intervention in the economy, i.e. with the national-state economic dirigisme. According to liberals, even Keynesian era which came to the suffocating from itself capitalism aid in the mid-XX century has already passed. In globalized and financialized economy, when economic management baton was picked up by the corporate-network giants, national-state dirigisme proved to be a very unwanted nuisance for the corporate-network dirigisme, and was subjected to distinct weakening and limitation if not complete elimination. This is what takes place in a modern «liberal» world.

Hence liberalism is a political and intellectual once, struggling with the national-state dirigisme in favor of a global corporate-network dirigisme.

However, the national-state dirigisme, now supplemented by regional international and global intergovernmental dirigisme, though retreated under the onslaught of a globalized liberalism, and in fact, of a global corporate-network dirigisme, does not completely lose the ground, and most importantly simply cannot lose, because it is absolutely necessary as well as the supplementing dirigisme.

It is appropriate to note that the national-state dirigisme, as well as its supplementing international dirigisme, does not shy away from cooperation with the global corporate-network dirigisme, and does not neglect the opportunity to clearly express itself in the metropolitan-colonial field. Economic imperialism is still here, altered, but even not all the parameters.

Russia is an absolutely dirigisme country! Apogee of national-state dirigisme came to the Soviet — planning, prescriptive and administrative — period, which was not even economic in its essence, but more of a natural (economic basis was only supportively supplying natural basis, more in letter than in spirit— in the USSR there was no economy in full sense of the word).

As a result of the revolution of 1991 and the following socio-economic reforms in the Russian Federation, the remained part of the USSR, apparently liberal and globalist economization of the economy and society was carried out, capitalization and marketization, although no truly liberal economic system in Russia did not appear, but appeared a highly original system of arbitrary administrative and financial despotism, combining the freedom of the criminal dirigisme in the environment of what is claimed to be free economic entities with the freedom of not less criminal dirigisme on top. Privatization, appropriation, accumulation, redistribution, looting, exploitation, repartition are the main pillars of the new economic ... urn... rather disorder than order, or rather the most disgraceful order among the most horrible mess.

Note that despite privatization, capitalization, marketization and even a kind of liberalization, Russian dirigisme— native Russian! —not only lasted, but also increased, in private-appropriative purposes instead of socio-productive. The revolutionary government carefully — and not in vain! — took care of the formation (inculcation) and the prosperity of Russian capitalism, twisted in the global economic world, rearranging (exactly so: rearranging!) all the Soviet heritage, brazenly captured by the revolutionary power in accordance with this absolutely diabolical project. Today Russia's economy is nothing butane ugly sub-economy: energy- and commodity-based, semi-finished, export-oriented, import-dependent, rigid, non-innovative, non-high-tech, not capable of independent integrated development.

Yeltsin's plutocratic dirigisme, somehow refocused on the national needs in the 2000-s, drove the developed space faring nation into an absolutely fantastic state — criminal- comprador-colonial capitalism. The country cannot last long in this state, which seems already clear to the most forward-thinking circles of the current powers that be. Obviously the full recovery of the society, economy and state is needed, that it may be possible only through the guided transition to the new Russia — already post-reform, if we take Yeltsin's reforms as a starting point.

And to carry out such a great maneuver is possible only through the *neo-economic changes*, based on the one hand on *neo-liberalism* and on the other on *neo dirigisme*, and better to say based on *neo-dirigisme* the fundamental principal, and *neo liberalism* as the supportive one.

Yeltsin's destructive appropriative dirigisme, coupled with the same in essence Yeltsin's liberalism needs to be replaced by the *new* dirigisme, coupled with the *new* liberalism, capable of solving social and productive, innovative tasks instead of private-accumulating and purely exploitative tasks, and making possible independent, integrated and balanced development of the country.

Argue that the current ugly, comprador-colonial, backward and not capable of comprehensive development Russia needs a holistic and consistent dirigisme, combining national-state and national-corporate dirigisme means to knock at an open door! Russia — historically, fundamentally and visionary— is a dirigisme country. There is no point to prove that any efficient and growing economy cannot be without a significant share of economic freedom in an environment of economic agents.

Yes, Russia by the heritage and spirit is not a liberal country, but that does not mean that there should be present and act no liberal component. There from come *neo-dirigisme*, considering liberalism, and *neo-liberalism*, which considers dirigisme. It may be said that *neo-dirigisme* and *neo-liberalism*, up springing in modern Russia, are reinterpreted and redirected dirigisme and liberalism, intended not for the joint confrontation and mutually destructive struggle, but for the effective relative position and solidarity. Otherwise, what for were these extreme experiences of the state —both totally prescriptive in the Soviet Union and totally permissive in Yeltsin's Russia!

Neo-dirigisme is a dirigisme focused on key areas, providing leverage on a number of key points and parameters of the economic environment and by the means of implementation mainly institutional, financial and incentive, i.e. not total, not physical perceptive, although at the same time supervisory responsible. Such dirigisme is obliged to systematically group with liberalism, but liberalism modified as well as dirigisme — not spontaneously, but restrained and regulated, the very liberal, which is now regarded by the projective minds as *neo-liberalism*.

It is good to say «*neo-dirigisme coupled with neo-liberalism*», but how to achieve it? Of course, not sitting on the piles of money or slouching haughty in high and mighty chambers. Perception of the urgent necessity of the drastic changes should flow into the regular work on their unconditional implementation. You could ignore all this, but the circumstances urge forward: the competitive world is watching, the merciless to the laggard history goes on, the pressure of the rough and ever-changing reality does not ease. If some do not do it, others will do, but ... replacing, and not without complaints, those who did nothing.

No carefree pleasures to come for anyone!

Either hard work on deep and large-scale rebuilding of Russia, or... straight into oblivion... both for shortsighted non-worker sand nodding Russia.

Time is tight, all the deadlines are missed, that is why we must set to work, ladies and gentlemen, - to the effort-consuming, dangerous, but ... saving work!
